
CR - ALAC and Regional Leadership WG
Sunday, March 11, 2012 – 09:00 to 18:00
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

One minute till we start, one minute and counting.

Okay, so can I have the recording on, please? Right, good morning everybody. This is the ALAC first session on our Sunday today. Welcome, everyone, for having made it to Costa Rica. Welcome to this well, what looks like a big box that we're in. You should get acclimatized to it because we're going to spend a serious amount of time in here, but I hope you've all had a good and safe trip to here and are ready to work a full week of exciting challenges that are coming our way.

I'm going to start asking for a quick roll call, and in fact the way we'll do it is to go around the table. I just wonder who should we start with – Yaovi or Cheryl? Let's start with Yaovi and then we'll go clockwise, since time is ticking. So Yaovi, go ahead please – introduce yourself and we'll go in this direction. Thank you.

Yaovi Atohoun:

Thank you. My name is Yaovi Atohoun from AFRALO.

Natalia Encisco:

Good morning, I'm Natalia Encisco from LACRALO.

Wolf Ludwig:

Wolf Ludwig, EURALO.

Sandra Hoferichter:

Sandra Hoferichter, EURALO.

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.

Yrjö Länispuro: Yrjö Länispuro, EURALO.

Garth Bruen: Garth Bruen, At-Large.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Sergio Salinas Porto, LACRALO.

Matt Ashtiani: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

Silvia Vivanco: Hello, Silvia Vivanco, ICANN staff.

Gisella Gruber: Good morning, Gisella Gruber, ICANN staff.

Heidi Ullrich: Good morning, Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Hello, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, member of ALAC.

Evan Leibovitch: Evan Leibovitch from Toronto, Vice-Chair ALAC from NARALO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Olivier Crépin-Leblond, ALAC Chair.

Carlton Samuels: Carlton Samuels, ALAC Vice-Chair.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC and AFRALO.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Fatimata Seye Sylla, AFRALO Chair.

Titi Akinsanmi: Titi, AFRALO and ALAC member.

Aziz Hilali: Aziz Hilali, Secretariat AFRALO.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ALAC.

Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg, ALAC Liaison to the GNSO.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Sala from ALAC and APRALO.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung, ISOC Hong Kong, APRALO.

Ganesh Kumar: Ganesh Kumar, ALAC from North America.

Beau Brendler: Beau Brendler, North America.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, LACRALO Secretariat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO and ALAC Liaison to the ccNSO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, everyone, and for the record Darlene Thompson was here as well but she had to get her computer. Oh, is she back? Oh no, there's also somebody else that's arrived at the table.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Siva Muthusamy from ISOC India Chennai ALS and APRALO.

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche, Vice-Chair APRALO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. So yes, Darlene Thompson has gone to get her computer. She's only just managed to make it here so hopefully she'll be back soon.

Right, the rules – there are very few rules here as you might know but there are a few that we need to follow very closely. The first one is to speak close to our microphone. You might have noticed that they don't seem to be too loud at the moment, and for those people who are joining us remotely – and I will ask Matt if you can note if there is anybody who is actually following remotely – speak into your microphones.

And also when you speak say your name before you speak, both for the remote participants but also for the transcript, and also for the interpreters since otherwise it sounds as though we're all schizophrenics. So thanks for all being here.

Unfortunately I have a prior engagement so I have to run out at this very minute, but for the first part of this session I will hand the floor over to my Vice-Chair Carlton Samuels who will be able to take you through the morning's activities. So Carlton, the floor is yours.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Chair. Welcome everybody. We are going to have a timekeeper; I gather Sandra is going to be our timekeeper for this morning's session. So we're going to try to keep to the agenda, and the agenda detail for Sunday is on the board. You can get it from the Wiki.

We are going to start talking about the At-Large Working Groups' next steps and the first one: we're going to have the Future Challenges Working Group led by Evan Leibovitch and Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Then we'll say a little bit about the WHOIS Working Group and then the IDN Working Group, and Edmon Chung is here; and then we will go to the Rules and Procedures and ALAC Metrics Working Groups which is being steered by the Queen of Process herself Cheryl Langdon-Orr; and the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Working Group with Beau Brendler; and Technology Taskforce led by Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

So we'll work our way through them and the first one up here is the Future Challenges Working Group. The floor is now open to Evan Leibovitch and Jean-Jacques Subrenat to take us through the details of that. Gentlemen?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you, Chair – this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat speaking. I'm one of the two Co-Chairs with Evan Leibovitch of the Future Challenges Working Group. Now, just a few words to remind you why and how this was set up. This came out of a suggestion that had been made at the Los Angeles ICANN meeting because some of us had felt, and I had formulated this as a realization as a new member of the ALAC that there was a lot of very important work which was done in ALAC but it was of a reactive nature very often. It was in reaction to

things which were being ascertained or worked on in other parts of ICANN, and it was therefore felt that at a certain point it would be useful for ALAC to propose an overview not only of the way it works but also of the challenges. And that's behind the idea of setting up this Future Challenges Working Group.

Now, we started off with a fairly open agenda and we had called for suggestions on topics which would be of interest to the members of this working group and more widely to the members of the At-Large. But then we narrowed it down and Evan came up with a suggestion of actually drafting a white paper, and we have two main drafters so far with contributions, very important contributions from some of you whom we wish to thank now.

But this draft white paper is in fact the embodiment of the idea which we had originally of looking at the wider challenges – not only, by the way, for ICANN, but for the internet in the coming years. And in addressing these challenges we hope to find solutions which can be proposed for very important topics such as, for instance, how can we improve the multi-stakeholder model and what can be done in order to make the various stakeholders more equal in their contribution; but also in the effectiveness of their role within ICANN?

So having said that, I pass the microphone to Evan for a presentation of that white paper.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi there. This is Evan. I just wanted to touch a little bit on the substance of this because I know we don't really have a lot of time. Essentially what we have been trying to do is to identify at a very high level what ICANN needs to go forward – what it needs to really embrace the multi-stakeholder model and what it needs to do in order to meet its Affirmation of Commitments that it has made to the world and that we want to use as a foundation for how ICANN has to move forward.

We realize that there's a number of threats, there's a meeting of the ITU later this year; there's a number of external pressures that are coming to bear from

people who do not believe that ICANN is representing the public interests the way it needs to be. And so this document tries, as Jean-Jacques said, to take a very proactive view, a very high-level view of what needs to change.

The document is in the Adobe Connect room as we speak. It is also on the Confluence Wiki. It has not been a very public document until now because essentially the Working Group internally has wanted to be able to make sure that we had the ideas fully fleshed out and that we had our ideas in order before actually bringing this forward. So our intention is to bring this to ALAC for consideration, to invite community participation, to invite some input; and then in Prague to have a workshop where this is presented to the greater community.

We have broken down what we consider to be... The title of the paper is “Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected.” This is I believe a very ambitious work. It makes some recommendations that in some ways are evolutionary; in some ways, some we’ve considered to be almost radical in the sense of things that ICANN needs to do. Essentially we’ve broken it down into four areas: the global public interest, the multi-stakeholder model vs. the intergovernmental approach, issues of global governance, and institutional and political practical cooperation not only inside ICANN but outside ICANN with the global community.

What you see in front of you in this document is a refinement of a great many ideas. There’s another document alongside this called “Supporting Documents” that in fact is going to be far lengthier, but we’ve been going under the presumption that a white paper should not be more than four pages long or most of its intended audience will not read it.

So, there is a meeting of the Committee tomorrow at 10:00. Unfortunately it cuts into the last half hour of the Opening Ceremonies but because of the compacted meeting schedule we really didn’t have much choice. So if you would like to it’s in this room tomorrow at 10:00. So if you have not been part of the Future Challenges Group and are interested in participating, please come. Right now we’re at the point where we have a very ambitious document; it

needs a lot of behind-the-scenes work, it needs a lot of advocacy and we need a lot of bridge building to other communities to get support for it.

If the link can be put into the chat that would be great. Okay, alright. One of the discussions we've been having in fact is how widely this is to be distributed and publicized, and for lack of a better description we're using a philosophy borrowed from some government called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" in a sense that it is not a closed document, it is not a private document but we are not going out of our way to advocate or publicize it outside of At-Large until it's had sufficient internal community vetting. So while it's not our intention to have this as a closed document we're not ready to announce to the world "Here it is."

[background conversation]

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so Heidi has said that the hyperlinks exist. Like I say, we are not publicly broadcasting this outside At-Large. It still needs a lot of work within the community but it's not a closed document. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Evan. We have a few minutes for our members who might want to ask some questions or make some comments. The floor is open.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Is this working group open for participation and after a while, is it planned that membership will be open to other constituencies?

Evan Leibovitch: As of right now we're keeping participation to within At-Large. We're inviting anybody who's at this table to join us at the meeting tomorrow. As we proceed we will be engaging more communities and inviting more parts of the

community to get involved. This will not survive very long simply as just an At-Large document. We're going to need to build bridges; we're going to need to build in a much larger community, arguably not just inside ICANN but also outside ICANN. And so eventually it's going to have very broad community participation, but for right now, for this week we're trying to keep the participation within At-Large to make sure that we have our own message in order.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

I'd like to add the reason for this: there's a choice between opening the whole exercise as widely as possibly, and obviously that would be good for transparency and accountability. But at the same time we're very concerned about the effectiveness of our approach, and that is why we think it is only fair and certainly more efficient to start off with a limited exercise – limited in number of participants – in order to have the right content. And once that is drafted then we put it out for discussion. What we're aiming at roughly is to have a final draft as it were to be presented to the wider community by the June meeting of ICANN, ICANN 44 in Prague.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy:

That's an excellent approach. I don't have any disagreement with that and I would like to take part in this group.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay. Again, the best thing we can ask for is there'll be a meeting tomorrow at 10:00 AM in this room to go through it, both on substance and on how we go forward. I just wanted to make one note that the document you see in the Adobe room right now has been password restricted to members of the working group, but that will very shortly be lifted so it will be a publicly accessible document. We're now at the point where until now you've needed a login and password and authorization to get into the page to use it. Those restrictions are being removed shortly.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani from staff. As a reminder, please remember to say your name before you speak.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Matt; I was about to remind people of that. The person who asked the question was Siva from ISOC Chennai, so Siva, next time remember that. Sergio Salinas Porto.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Good morning to you all, my name is Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Just a question because I didn't understand something that you said. When you say that there is going to be or we are going to have access, what do you mean – ALAC members or all of us?

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan. Until today, this document has been limited to access by members of the working group. Effective immediately we've asked to lift the restrictions so that anybody who goes to this URL will be able to see the page. It will not be a restricted document.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Any other comments, questions? Are members comfortable with the broad themes that have been addressed by the Future Challenges Working Group? Is there a question or proposal, a clarification? Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the record, and I'd like to congratulate the excellent work done by Evan and Jean-Jacques and the team in initiating this. And it's a critical thing from a global public interest point of view in terms of

preparing and assembling the strategies and that sort of thing, and it's good that you've done the legwork and I congratulate you.

Evan Leibovitch:

This is Evan. I thank you and I would only ask at this point that the work has just started and it needs to be spread around. The document itself that you see on the screen is only four pages long. There's a substantial amount of documentation that needs to go behind that: definitions, rationales, logic, etc. And we are going to need help going forward in making that all concise and understandable and an appropriate backup to justify what we are doing. So we can definitely use some more help and if you are interested in helping please come tomorrow.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Evan. Any other? I see Cheryl's hand. Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan:

Thank you, Carlton, this is Cintra Sooknanan. With the non-renewal of the IANA contract, would that also be forming parts of this document?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

No, the purpose of this white paper is not to address any specific issue however important it is at the moment or for the next year, for instance. It's the wider approach of structural changes if they are necessary, but of course we have to take into account whatever may come out of the discussions. But at this stage we have not purported to have a chapter, let's say, on the IANA contract.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Yaovi?

Yaovi Atohoun: This is Yaovi. I have on the link, when I go to the page I can see “Future structure accountability and transparency of ICANN.” I want to be sure this is the same, because if the grouping is “Future Challenges...”

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, this is Evan. Yaovi, that is not the same document. This one says at the top “Future Challenges” and it will be very specific. What you’re looking at is something different.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Time has gone now; I think we need to move to the next chapter, and saying this I move directly into the WHOIS issue. You will see there, as most of you will know we have a standing working group, At-Large working group for WHOIS. Those of you who are not familiar with all of the issues, it’s a very complex thing that’s been around for a little while. There are issues of data, issues of process, issues of access; there are matters pertaining to privacy and so on. They’re all swirling around this WHOIS issue.

There’s been a lot of work done by many groups about WHOIS. We had a briefing last week by [Gonzales Gaston and Company] including our own Seth Reiss who provided a lot of background information on WHOIS. It is a very complex subject. There’s been a Review Team that has been working on WHOIS review and that is an outcome of the Affirmation of Commitments that was signed by ICANN that committed ICANN to having these review teams periodically. They did some excellent work in gathering information from the community, a lot of outreach efforts; and out of that they did some really good work in putting forward a report.

The report in full is available on the Wiki. Our task was before the WHOIS team went to work, when they had meetings with the At-Large and the ALAC leadership, and we had an aspirational statement as to our expectations from that work. There was a report substantially delivered on the expectation. The report is now up for public comment and out of that we authored a draft ALAC

statement on the report. The report is available, it's on the screen as you see it. Just look at the substance of it.

If you look at the WHOIS Review Team report, it pretty much endorsed almost all of the At-Large positions that we've taken historically and to date. It recommended a major overhaul or a perspective, a change of perspective for WHOIS which was the biggest one. It recognized that there was no really coherent WHOIS policy and recommended that we should move, the community should move to have an ICANN policy promulgated on WHOIS. It went into detail about several factors and taking into account the views of the community.

It especially looked at some of the problems of data accuracy, verification of WHOIS data. It treated with the access requirements for WHOIS data. It looked at some of the law enforcement association issues with WHOIS and endorsed them, and then it proposed a roadmap for addressing these WHOIS issues. We endorse all of them. The extension of our statement speaks to two major issues with WHOIS: the issue of privacy/proxy services and whether or not the reach of regulation should affect and impact WHOIS availability to end users.

The position that we've seen so far is that there is, while privacy and proxy services exist there has been no official recognition for them, and it has been, our posture is that they exist and instead of taking the course that they should be outlawed we took the position that they should be formalized and regularized. And we took a further position that if you have proxy and privacy providers then we would hope so as to keep the integrity of the intent of WHOIS for end users, that privacy and proxy registrations would devolve the requirements for verification and for responsibility to the WHOIS provider. Because if you have a system where the privacy and proxy registration was allowed to thwart or defeat the actual access of end users to WHOIS data it would undermine totally the principle, the basic principle upon which the At-Large has spoken to date.

That statement, the public comment is open until March 18, and as we are now it would be very instructive if our members could look at this statement critically and add comments or reflections that might in fact end up in the final ALAC statement. So I urge all of you to look critically at this statement, the draft in context of what the Review Team reported; reflect on previous ALAC statements and ALAC positions on the several issues dealing with access and privacy/proxy and dealing with the data, the WHOIS data itself; and add your comments, your reflections so that they can be taken properly into account before the statement is presented to the ALAC for final resolution.

So we have time for one question. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

Not a question but a statement: the Review Team took pains to note that although we have often used the terms interchangeably, privacy and proxy are two very different things, one of which we have some control over if we choose to; the other of which we're completely impotent to do anything about. Anyone can go to their lawyer and have the lawyer do something on their behalf and take full responsibility for it, which is what a proxy is. So we should be careful when we're talking about them to not use the terms interchangeably. They are quite different and the impact that ICANN can have on the two are different.

Carlton Samuels:

You're quite right. That's the GNSO Liaison who sits through many of these boring meetings, so he knows what he's talking about. [laughter] Holly, we'll just take you, Holly – thanks.

Holly Raiche:

Thanks, Carlton. I think listening to the earlier discussion that was in Senegal, what they wanted to do specifically was to say “We want privacy service specifically accredited to be such and then to have rules surrounding that,” and not to talk about proxy at all – simply to say “Look, this is an agent of and therefore if it's an agent, what we will do is simply treat them as an agent of and

then assume all the responsibilities fall on the registrar” and not go any further than that, recognizing that in fact there’s a whole heap of responsibilities that will fall on the agent. This is the way they dealt with that issue.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Holly. We are running behind time here so we’re trying to catch up. May I ask the IDN Working Group Chair, Edmon Chung, to take over here?

Edmon Chung:

This is Edmon Chung; thank you, Carlton. I’ll be brief. So we started restarting the IDN Working Group in Singapore. I think we decided to move forward and have a standing IDN Working Group, and then I guess as IDN Liaison I have been helping get it started. We had our first face-to-face meeting in Dakar and I think just to very briefly summarize I think the approach that we talked about is to become more proactive to talk about IDN issues from At-Large and not just being reactive to public comments; and to look at providing actual advice and not just comments, and to explore opportunities to influence decisions down the road. I think those are some of the things that we took away from the Dakar meeting.

Since then we had two further teleconferences and well, in a way regrettably we have been reactive in most of the work that we have been doing so far. But we did continue to produce a couple of responses, one on the IDN Variant Issues Project Final Report and one on the Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs. In a recent teleconference, the last one, we started preparing for our face-to-face meeting here in Costa Rica although still pats of it being a reactive mode to respond to the IDN Variants Issues Project’s project plan because it seems to be of a significant interest both in terms of the IDN issues as well as in the budget issue. In our FY’13 response we have also included a section specifically on this and we’d like to expand on it. It seems like the budget for the VIP going forward is quite large and we have some concerns on it.

So in terms of the upcoming meeting and I guess beyond the Working Group members who have already volunteered, you are very much welcome to join us. We'll be having a meeting here in Costa Rica on Monday, March 12 from 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM at the Heliconia Room. We've identified three areas that we want to talk about: a response on the VIP project plan as I mentioned, and the other two we'll try to be a little bit more proactive – starting to be – and we'll talk about how we want to reach out and work with other parts of the ICANN community on this and other IDN issues.

Speaking about the upcoming meeting on Monday, I understand that it conflicts with some other meetings. I've been, well basically it's very difficult to find timeslots at ICANN meetings, I understand, and meeting rooms are quite tight. So I would suggest that we continue with the allotted timeslot to start at 5:00 PM in the Heliconia Room on Monday, but I intend to run it a little bit long if the room is open so that I think Cheryl and some others have indicated that they might have conflict and might only be able to come after the hour. So the suggestion is to continue the meeting, and start it at 5:00 but I'll run it till perhaps 6:30 or a little bit more if the room is available. So for those who couldn't make it at 5:00 please join us at 6:00.

So I guess just adding to that, I can see from the great work from the Future Challenges Working Group, I think we'd like to – from the IDN Working Group – we'd like to produce the type of document or put out our thoughts like that, focused on IDN challenges ahead so we can really start to become proactive and really try to sort of set the agenda and introduce more influence on IDNs, which I think is definitely an issue that ALAC cares a lot about. So that's the update.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Edmon. Comments? None? Okay. So moving on, we now call on Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the Rules of Procedure and ALAC Metrics Working Groups, as well as the At-Large Improvements Taskforce – the Queen of Process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Carlton – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I will be starting with the ALAC Improvements Implementation Taskforce, because that is the umbrella part of a great deal of work that’s been done by a cross-regional ALAC work group. The AIITF – because we like to do letters – has met some twelve or thirteen times in weekly meetings since the end of last year and has gone through all 13 Recommendations from the ALAC Improvements Review.

All of the recommendations have now been established as to exactly where they are in milestone and date, and perhaps, Matt, if you wouldn’t mind queuing up... “It’s coming’ he’s telling me, okay. [laughs] And allocations to other perhaps parts of ICANN if it’s, for example, senior staff needs to be involved in the implementation; parts of ourselves, be it the work group, ALAC as a whole, or some component such as the Executive Committee of ALAC – responsibilities have been allocated to ensure that all of the implementables from those 13 recommendations, and we had a number of them with subtasks, have been allocated totally.

Now, in the fullness of time what you’ll be seeing on your screens will be the familiar-to-some-of-you table that shows the status of each of the 13 recommendations. In the absence of visuals I’ll just talk you through it.

The first recommendation, which is the ICANN bylaw changes which were required for a number of reasons – some of which are to clarify the purpose and the mission of ALAC but some of which were associated with Board member selection by the At-Large community – is 100% completed. We know that the At-Large-selected Board member for Seat #15 of the ICANN Board is completed, but there is an ongoing action item because it is in fact at the end of this year when we have to start convening our subcommittees to begin the process for the next round of selection. So we actually don’t have that long before we go through the cycle again.

The RALO ALAC structure which was a review and a whole set of flowcharts and purposes is now 100% completed. The #4 – education and engagement of the ALSes and regions – is sitting at 75%, and that work we trust will be

completed between now and Prague but will be the responsibility of some Secretariats' work: some within regional work and most definitely things like the Rules of Procedure Work Group which is also going to be working with Metrics. So there's a couple of ties that need to be threaded together and hopefully woven into a cloth at the end of that.

#5... And am I going to grow old and be at my next meeting before all of this comes up, Matt? I can filibuster but I do actually have a 10:00 somewhere else. Sorry, #4, which is the education and engagement is another recommendation which is sitting at 75% mark. We've gone through and allocated with a whole lot of what we need to do next: things like the ICANN Academy, coming to that but there is also more to do. And what we would be envisaging is that we'll have a great deal more clarity outside of resolutions and discussions at this meeting as to where those types of education and engagement programs would go.

We would note, however, that we have I think a very good and exciting set of opportunities coming out from ICANN itself with the various guides, and many, many of the guides are very much fodder for our ALS use and regional use. But what we don't seem to have is the nexus between what is being resource-available and being found by the regions. So one of the things Silvia, working with the regions, will be doing will be trying to get that extra 25% of the information, not only out to the edges but finding from the edges what they need to do.

Strategic and operational planning is also sitting at 75%. There's a number of changes that we need to make sure are tidied up. I would encourage each of you to have a look, because it's clear that you're not going to be seeing it on the screen today, at a URL which is the three- or four-page report plus an appendix that's been prepared by the Improvements Implementation Taskforce for presentation during this ICANN Meeting #43 to the Structural Improvements Committee. It's a good synthesis, it has all the hyperlinks. It gives you that ground and most importantly it will give you the linkage to the Wiki pages

because there is a dedicated page to continually track each one of these recommendations. So that's going to be an ongoing piece of work.

Oh look, there it is! Pretty colored pictures – that's what we wanted to see. Okay, so now as you can see we've got our cost models and our communications tools sitting at 100%. That is not to say that work does not continue; what it says is the implementables are completed to 100%.

The public comment period sitting at the 50%, because as you know we have the reply, the comment/reply new system coming in. When the ALAC Improvements was set out, that particular model was not part of the ICANN infrastructure and there is a couple of mismatches between what our recommendations were saying in the absence of this better model and what we have now. So there's a little bit of tidying up to do, and I know that Olivier is also pursuing a couple of issues with the Communications and Public Participation Committee on that. We would expect that to be a final 100% by the Prague meeting.

Translation processes are sitting at 100% but that does not mean that the work and the ongoing watching brief on that does not need to be held by the ALAC. #10 and #11 really link up to #1 to some extent – there was specific bylaw recommendations that have in fact been completed, which make sure that we are established in the DNA of ICANN as the home of individual users; and we also have the Board statement affirming the role and mission of ICANN. We have input from consumer reps and policy advice mechanisms also sitting at the 75% because there is some work still to be done.

If I could ask now for you to bear with me just for a moment. We are only 18 months away from our next Review starting. It's absolutely essential that what we have for the next review, which is an external review, is a highly trackable, highly auditable system of what we did in response to the first set of recommendations. We have chosen to put this together as a group of Wiki pages, but what we need – what the Work Group needs from each and every one of you in your ALS and regional roles – is feedback now on “Does this make

sense?” Is it clear to you what we are saying, where the responsibilities are allocated; and is there a place and pace for your information to be properly conduit-ed back into any changes that may be coming between now and our next review period?

One of the very important things that is coming out of this Implementation Improvements Taskforce – as we said, there was a set of allocations to work groups and subcommittees – is the long awaited for Rules of Procedure Review. At the end of February it was resolved that the work of the Metrics, the ALAC and At-Large Metrics Work Group, would become part of the Rules of Procedure Review. So whilst in Senegal we were talking about two separately chartered and convened workgroups. There was a lot of overlap between those two activities and we’ve now got them as component parts. Matt will be I think magically making an announcement go out later today on the ALAC Announce to call for membership of the Rules of Procedure Work Group.

It is essential that regional leadership have someone, preferably more than some “one” – some two or some three people in that Work Group. It is possibly one of the most important pieces of process work we will be doing because it’ll also be moving towards harmonization between the regions. When we then look to the metrics, it’s going to be looking at metrics of ALSes, so it’s equally essential that we have individual ALS representatives join this Work Group. There is no large maximum number, there is no cut-off point. We’re not saying there has to be two from each region; there’s no maximum. I’m happy to have 60 on the mailing list; 160 is fine because only 13 will do the work anyway, we know that. But what we must have is a minimum.

It’s essential for the RALO leadership to be absolutely involved in this Review because this is setting up all of how we’re going to be working for the next three to five years. It’s incredibly important. Look to the skillsets and talents you have and please encourage people to respond. There will be a mailing list. It will be Wiki-based work. It will be meeting weekly. It’s a huge request. This is not a little piece of work; this is a big piece of work. That request for people to put their hands up will be going out today but the regional leadership and the

ALS reps actually need to have their job description include “Get people on that.”

At the ALAC meeting we had a couple of people indicate that they would like to be members. I’ve asked Matt if he can go through the transcript from the last ALAC meeting to ensure we capture – I know Sergio, I know Natalie, but there were people who said “Me, me, me.” They will be added onto the list; they do not have to say “Me” again. But the regional leadership needs to put I would suggest at least two and maybe more people on this work group, because some of you will be going to do the metrics in a little enclave and then coming back to the main group. So we need a large talent pool to make this work effectively.

I’d like to open for any questions now, but basically it’s a sales pitch; and all’s well but we have some extremely important work to do, and we have to do it pretty much before the Prague meeting. It’s going to be a very intense couple of months. Opening the floor; back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Cheryl, for that explanation. We see Sergio on the floor. Sergio?

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. For the record, my name is Sergio Salinas Porto. Cheryl, I would like to say that you have been doing a great job in the Taskforce working group. I think it would be important, because we had a situation in our RALO and the participation in our working groups; and this is the simultaneous interpretation. We used to have interpretation, and then we have a problem with the timetables, and in the region we are working with, all the members work in their everyday activities so participation sometimes is quite complicated. So please, I ask you to take into account on one hand the fact of having simultaneous interpretation available when we are two or three Spanish- or French-speaking members, and secondly, I would like to see if we can have schedules for all the participating regions. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Sergio. One of the important differences between what was the regional taskforce for reviewing and seeing the implementation tracking is done and the Rules of Procedure and Metrics Work Group, is that the first one, the one that whilst it hasn't been closed up it still has work to do: it is all about being representational on a strategic management perspective. It won't be meeting weekly from now on but it will be convening once or twice as it prepares for its final report. It's a very different style of work group than what we have in the Metrics and Rules of Procedure.

For the Metrics and Rules of Procedure, we need to remember that of course it's not just one region that actually has people who try and earn their keep – it's every single region. So we have a 24-hour clock that we need to deal with. There are some regions, for example, where it is actually preferable because of the telecommunications provision, for it to be in working hours. There are other regions where it is impossible for them to take other-than-work-related calls during working hours. So we're always going to have those tensions.

But that said, the plan would be to rotate the times of the meetings under the principle that everyone will be equally inconvenienced, right? So that is how this one will run, because this one needs a much larger talent pool. In terms of simultaneous interpretation, that is purely a numbers game. If it's two or three... Heidi, can you confirm – is it three? As long as three people say, I'm just following the rules that ALAC has set. As long as three people say they need a particular language, in our case either French or Spanish, then it will happen. That will be on a meeting-by-meeting base.

Gisella will put out the reminder. If you have interpretation needs you need to say "I will be at that meeting." Otherwise the particular language you need may not be provided. But it's purely a numbers game. So we're talking rotation and numbers.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Cheryl, for that clarification. We have forbearance for one more question. Sala, you have the floor.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. Thank you, Cheryl. In relation to the rotation and the desire for increased ALS involvement, I welcome the rotation especially in terms of the APRALO region. One of the comments that have come from the region, bottom-up of course, is that they've had challenges in attending meetings because of the times. Of course you have exceptions; those who are perhaps motivated to attend and that sort of thing, but quite aside from that I'd also like to add that it's critical, if we also want to increase ALS involvement to also address the capacity building – the element in relation to policies emerging quite aside, and also the challenges of understanding rules and procedures for those who may not necessarily speak English and that sort of thing. But of course that's for another section, but I just thought I'd make that brief comment and interjection, Cheryl. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much for that, Sala, and I think what's important also – and I think. Sergio, those who find challenge with time of day and requirements of employment will benefit from this: one of the reasons that the work is duplicated from list to Wiki is that it is absolutely possible for significant contribution to be made by people on that work group who never attend an actual teleconference, because you can do it via Wiki. That contribution is just as valid as having it recorded for the transcript.

So there is no first- or second-class input. All input is equal. Therefore, if someone can only operate at 4:00 AM their time and we never happen to have a meeting that fits in at 4:00 AM their time, they can interact with us through the mailing list and through the Wiki. And if it happens through the mailing list it gets duplicated to the Wiki. The Wiki is the archive. So we have no good reason for lack of participation, because on the Wiki you can write it in whatever language you like.

Okay?

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Cheryl. I really appreciate you pointing out the fact that the Wiki is always available and you don't have to be on the call to participate. Time is on us so we have to move to the next working group, and we have the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Group, and my friend Beau Brendler is on hand for that. Beau, you have the floor.

Beau Brendler:

Thank you, Carlton – Beau Brendler for North America. As you have probably seen perhaps from some emails and material I've been posting to the chat, the Registrant Rights Working Group is underway. And briefly, to just sort of say the evolution of that – this particular group, I think it's important to point out, is not chartered in the same way that the last one was. The last one was an effort that the GNSO wanted to try and come up with some means to modify the RAA in 2009; in other words, update the actual document with material and statements that had already been agreed to and the scope of that particular working group was in fact much more limited than I think many of us thought.

However, we have no such limits in this group. So those of you who have seen the communications I sent out this morning: we're lucky enough to have access to the versions, they're in multiple languages – versions of the RAA that's been translated into layman's terms, so it's not such a heavy lift in terms of a legal document. It's been translated into five languages, I'm told, which is terrific. And if there was one good thing that the previous RAA Group did was that, among a few other things. But we have a version of the RAA that we can read, that we can share with other people.

And then also you'll notice, and this is for anybody that's interested in the Working Group or just interested in the RAA, there is a link that I posted to the current progress on the RAA, current negotiations which is a particularly interesting movement on the RAA because there's a lot of input from the law enforcement community.

And then finally, another document that we're going to be reviewing is the current guidance document for registrars that... Someone's familiar with the current guidance document, I'm so happy to hear that. It's ten years old; it pertains to how the registrars should basically interpret the language on WHOIS data which of course has been a particular arena of concern. Our colleague Garth Bruen has done a lot of research related to how registrars are and are not obeying the letter of the contract agreement on that.

So we have a lot of homework to do. We will be getting together with the members of the working group shortly after Costa Rica to set up more of a sort of traditional structure – that is having conference calls and whatnot. So we invite anyone who would like to join to join us. We can use some legal help – those of you who are attorneys, if you just Skype me your name in the Skype chat I will see to it that you get added to the mailing list. And my wish for this group is to really have a document at the end that's more than just an aspirational set of things that we think should happen but actually concrete recommendations based on a thorough review of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and backup documents to it that we can use to change the process.

So I don't really think there's too much more to say about the group than that; it's pretty straightforward in terms of what it's set out to do. But lastly I would just say, I would remind you that this is not a circumscribed group with a very limited scope that can be... A lot of times "scope" I think is used to limit discussion among certain types of working groups, so in this case this is our group. This is what we need to do and we have the ability to at least get a discussion going and make some solid agreements without interference, shall we say. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Beau. Question? We have two. We will first go to Olivier and then to Jean-Jacques. Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. It's Olivier for the transcript, Olivier Crépin-Leblond. I've noticed that you mentioned you need legal help, Beau, and I cannot help but thinking that having been on several LACRALO calls recently I have noticed that there are a lot of lawyers in LACRALO. So I do hope that this invitation will be taken up by the lawyers of LACRALO, and I can see them smile already so thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Olivier. Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you, Chair – this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat speaking. I had a question to Beau about a fairly wide topic regarding the RAA. I'm struck by the fact that there are two realities or two constraints. One is that most of the registrars, for what it's worth, are located or operated from the United States of America. The other thing is the legal constraint, which is that for the same reason, most of them are operating under California law. And the Registrar Agreement is therefore submitted to California law.

Now, this will not continue for our lifetimes. I suppose that things are going to move in a certain way, and I'd be interested to know to what extent your group, your Working Group can contribute to the reflection on that. What would it take in order to adapt the structure, the framework of the RAA, in order to progressively accommodate other jurisdictions than California law? I think this is a very important issue because we've been talking about the internationalization of ICANN forever. And this is certainly one of the areas where we'll have to move; otherwise there will be a very strong temptation to create other systems rather than to enter into this particular type of agreement which has been operating so far.

Beau Brendler: If I can just briefly respond to that, we had not – that's a very interesting point to consider that I had not thought of. And since we're at the beginning of

establishing the scope of what the group will look into, Jean-Jacques, I think that's a great recommendation. So we will take it up.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Beau, and Jean-Jacques for that question. It's really key, some of us have been talking about for a little bit. Evan, you have the floor, sir.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, this is Evan. Maybe my wishes from this group actually go sort of to the high level, in the sense that I'm hoping if this group accomplishes what at least I'm hoping it might is that this would actually come up with the result that would be embedded into ICANN's DNA in a way that it treats not just the RAA but everything to do with Compliance and every other time that it comes up with policies or procedures – that it bakes in from the very beginning the need to have an appreciation of the bottom of the chain, the bottom of the pyramid. And so it's my hope that our work in this goes beyond simply dealing with the RAA, and goes to the source of ICANN's approach in its dealing with contracted parties, in its dealing with other groups – that it cannot and should not do that without considering the purchasers of domains and the people below that on the pyramid that don't even have a say in the transaction; that they should be helping to guide ICANN's moving forward with how it makes their relationships.

Carlton Samuels: Our timekeepers signal that we are out of time, but I have giving Siva just an opportunity, just one minute please. Thank you, Sandra, for reminding me.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Okay, yeah, this is Sivasubramanian Muthusamy for the record. Beau was saying about the face-to-face meetings: he said that "If you're a lawyer I invite you to participate." Why is there so much focus on lawyers when it comes to a topic on rights and responsibilities? These have to deal with users and why not

start with what the users really want rather than start with what the lawyers think is feasible and what is workable? So that brings in a lot of limitation even at the very start. Start without constraints.

Carlton Samuels:

Well, that's not what I think I heard, but Beau, I will allow you to respond here.

Beau Brendler:

Yes. I hope I did not give the wrong impression that we want only lawyers for this group. I'm not a lawyer but you know, my point really in asking for that is I'm not sure that among the community of us who are supposed to represent the user, to represent "the bottom of the ICANN food chain" as it's been said – I'm not sure that there's ever been a thorough review and understanding of the legal document that is the RAA. And now that we have it in layman's terms that we can begin to, it would be I think critical to have some legal perspective from people who are familiar with contracts, from people who know contract law, to be able to help us understand how to go about suggesting workable amendments to contract.

I know we're short on time, but if you look at some of the work that [New John] has done – I mean it's not totally out of the question to say that the RAA and ICANN enforcement of the principles of the contract could very well do a great deal to limit or to affect the amount of fraud on the internet. So we need, we just need some talent in this group to be able to speak the same language that all of the lawyers and lobbyists that the registrars have to show up to all of the working groups, that we have some language that we can use.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Beau, and I just might add that what we were asking for were lawyers from our own community, not from outside of the community. We have to move to the next one – thank you, Sandra, I will keep track better. We now have the Technology Taskforce, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh will join us here. Dev, you have the floor.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Thank you, Chair. Dev Anand Teelucksingh here for the record. So the Technology Taskforce was recommended by the ALAC At-Large Improvements Milestone Report and it stated quite explicitly that it was to establish a technology taskforce of community members that would periodically review the appropriateness of available technology and help train RALOs and At-Large Structures in new technologies introduced and possibly staff a help desk.

And there's been other recommendations introduced into the At-Large Structures: selected information dissemination, communication, and collaboration tools and provide training. So well, participation from At-Large and policy discussions involves daily if not hourly use of an increasingly diverse set of tools and technologies over the internet, and it's important also for At-Large and for the ALSes because ALSes are supposed to be disseminating this information within their own At-Large Structure and to the general public. So At-Large understanding the tools, their awareness of the tools and being able to use them effectively is important in order to fulfill that objective.

So as part of that Taskforce on the At-Large Improvements Project that Cheryl mentioned earlier, we recently established a Wiki space and the Wiki space will contain information and links to the various technologies and the social media tools that At-Large uses. And the [trend] will be to try to present the use of technology in clean language and try to avoid as much as possible the techno-speak. This will then make it easier to make that material available in multiple languages and to affect the diversity of At-Large, and highlight where possible the various platforms – and not just the platforms like desktop/laptop perspective but for the mobile market, and, for example, the recent trend of tablets; and also in looking at those tools highlight the various add-ons that may be helpful to At-Large such as translation add-ons, for example, for instant messaging.

For example, instant messaging – there are translation add-ons that will allow you to, when you chat it's machine-translated into a language of your choice.

So those types of tools would be highlighted. And on the screen there you will see the Wiki space – it’s partially populated due to the intense schedule of the planning of LACRALO events. So I just wanted to quickly mention that when you hear the word “technology” it implies that you’re in with technology gurus or something, or something like that – that’s really not the case. We’re also looking for persons who are willing to just evaluate the various tools and share their feedback on using their tools so we can then get a better understanding of what works and what doesn’t work.

And also regarding the Technology Taskforce, we’ll be looking to offer advice when asked by At-Large on the various technology options to be set up and possibly available. So we’re hoping to start the formal call soon after Costa Rica, and I think that’s about it. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Dev. A question from Siivas.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy:

Yeah, Sivasubramanian Muthusamy for the record. I’ll start with what was Cheryl’s reply to Sala’s point a moment ago – it is quite relevant to what the working group is doing at the moment. And she was saying that Wikis are available for participation by anyone; it is open irrespective of region or time differences or languages. So the difficulty with the Wiki is that the Wiki looks so technically complicated, and there is also a lot of complications with the way we archive previous reports, present working committee reports. And it’s very difficult to navigate and find the information you are looking for, even if you are a part of the process for years.

Consider the difficulties for a newcomer. Have you considered recommending to ICANN, not only for At-Large but for the whole of ICANN, some kind of a user interface design which makes it easy for a newcomer who’s a non-technical newcomer – not the kind of experts that we have in the room – to look at just a page and look at what he wants to locate: maybe just a constituency working

group or an issue. That requires quite a lot of expertise at user interface design and maybe even we can call it the ergonomics of web design. So have you thought about looking at those aspects to improve participation?

Carlton Samuels: In the interest of time I am going to ask Matt to respond directly to one of the issues raised by Sivas. Matt, you have the floor sir.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani from staff. Just very quickly, actually, on the page that's up, there's the *At-Large Wiki Confluence Guide*, so we do have guides available for all users. At this meeting if you think that you could require additional training, I know there is a meeting being held by Carole Cornell for additional training on the Confluence Wiki. Oh, and also the *Guide* is available in multiple languages, excuse me.

Carlton Samuels: Olivier, before I come to you, Sala, I'll come to you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and just to add on to what Matt has written – it's Olivier for the transcript – there is currently a reorganization of the Wiki that is ongoing that Matt is only able to do during his spare time. As you might know he doesn't have that much spare time so at the moment he's been going very slowly, but as soon as he finds time for a holiday he'll be doing this during his holiday time. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Sala, thank you. Yaovi, I'm trying to get to you but I can't promise.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the record. First of all, I'd like to congratulate Dev and the Technology Taskforce for the most excellent work that they're doing – not easy. And also I'd like to thank Matt for the excellent work that he's been doing trying to reorganize the Wikis. But I think in relation to the matter that Siva brought up, I think there's also a responsibility on the part of the Working Group to help the Technology Taskforce team to sort of assemble the information together and get it to staff. Take, for example, I'll give you a recent example – our IDN workspace, when I sort of joined ALAC and that sort of thing, I put together a chronology to reassemble the information. And I think given the amount of work that staff have to do, I mean it's not an easy thing – the duties that they have – but we can certainly make their work easier by assembling the information ourselves. And as Olivier had mentioned, the Wikis are in the Review so this should be addressed. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Sala. Yaovi?

Yaovi Atohoun: Thank you very much, it's Yaovi. I just want to add that in all the working groups, it's very important that we get in touch with the staff. I think the Wiki, they are working on improving it, and I want to emphasize on ease of use – it's very important. So all the working groups, we have to be in touch with the staff to see which information we want to get to the members because I can be on many websites. I may not even go to the Wiki, but email – I have to look in my email at every minute I'm getting the email. So my call is for the working group to make sure that we send this request to the staff members who can help us so that all the most important information may reach the member by email – that's very important. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter:

Can I make an announcement please? Of course we are running out of time, and there is still one agenda item – item G. And I would like to make a proposal that the next, after the coffee break with the ICANN Academy where I am going to be the moderator, I will be ready to take five or ten minutes away from that session and give it to Agenda Item G if this is okay with the Chair, with the moderator.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Sandra, that would be most appreciated. Can we move quickly to G? And we are going to have a break here before we go to coffee break, right? That's it.

So is Avri here? Avri, you're ready to go. Avri, do you understand what we're saying here? What we're saying here is you have the break and then come back.

Avri Doria:

Okay, first I apologize – I didn't know I was G. [laughter] I knew I was going to talk about the At-Large New gTLD Working Group, and of course that has a G in it. Okay, so you say I'm starting now and then you'll stop me, we'll drink coffee and then I'll come back even more hyper? Cool, okay.

So first of all thank you, and I also want to thank At-Large with sort of trusting me with this working group. It's been a very active working group that has met pretty much every week since it got chartered to try and complete its tasks. You chartered it with three essential tasks: one is basically monitoring and helping where possible with the JAS', the Joint Applicant Support Working Group's ASP – Applicant Support Program. So we have been doing that and I'll get back to that in a second.

The second thing, and the one that has consumed the most time in the group and the most time of one of its volunteers – Dev – has been creating an objection process because the New gTLD Program has made room for At-Large and ALAC to make funded objections. And I'll get more into that. And then the third of the ones that we've sort of started but that still has less immediacy is

monitoring the New gTLD Application Process roll-out which Cintra has started taking a role in, starting to organize for us. When I get back to that I'll ask her to make a couple comments on it.

So getting to the first thing... And by the way, let me know when I'm getting close to my break thing because I have no idea when that is. On the Applicant Support Program, I'd say that our success in that has been moderate in that we have gotten to put together a committee of members who are members of the At-Large New gTLD Working Group who are also members of the JAS Group, who have basically served as sort of a consultation group with the staff who is implementing the Application Support Program and with the Board Committee that basically set the structure for it.

So when they were putting out the original document on how to do it, they consulted with this group and that went back and forth with the At-Large New gTLD Working Group or the ANG Working Group – it's really a mouthful. So that went fairly well. Since then we've sort of been pushing them on "Tell us about the outreach, tell us about the outreach." We've talked to people in the various ALSes. I've talked to people, even ICANN regional representatives, and have said "So, have you heard about it? Is anybody outreaching to you, and has anybody asked you to outreach to the people you know?" And it's sort of like "Umm, well, we're kind of working on it."

So my personal feeling is that outreach has been, to put it politely and at best, limited. There's a lot of other adjectives one could use that would be a lot less polite and a lot less soft spoken. So that's still a concern, that's still a push – that's almost something that I come to the people in this room about and say "Beyond the ANGWG, the At-Large New gTLD Working Group, is for all of you that are involved in the regions, that are involved in ALSes, to be approaching the ICANN staff and such and say "What about outreach to my area? What have you done? When can you come? Can somebody send somebody?"

Now, at the moment when we leave this meeting, there are four weeks left in the application process. There are two weeks left for someone to spend \$5000, and all these applicants have to spend that \$5000, to get a TAS spot – a whatever it is. It's the Application System something... TAS, thank you, TAS, so to get a membership in that. So there's two weeks left to do that, and then after that there's two weeks left to get an application in.

Now with lots of help, and there's a lot of experience out there right now writing applications. I know some friends that are actually robo application writers; they can crank out one in two days. So it's not impossible with help to still do it if the outreach happens, but the outreach needs to happen. And all of you hopefully are doing outreach to people you know in your communities who would be really good at having a gTLD, have a reason for a community to have a gTLD and are bringing them in because it's the only way it's going to happen. To wait for ICANN to do an adequate outreach program is a lot like waiting for Godot.

The other thing that we're supposedly working with them on is the SARP criteria – the Support Application... Review Process, thank you – I keep losing these words. So that's another thing that they've got the original top-level instructions but there was some intent from JAS, and this group is really largely composed of JAS, to help them flesh that out more. And I don't know what's happening with that one, it keeps pushing, but an interesting tidbit I caught in the GAC meeting yesterday is that the staff reported to GAC that they will be working with JAS to find the SARP members. That was the first I had heard of that one but it was a good thing to hear of, so it's something we need to follow up.

So that's the ASP. I don't know if you want me to stop on questions on a topic-by-topic? Okay, so stop for questions on the ASP?

[background conversation]

Carlton Samuels: Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: It is not a question; it'll be more comments I make, not so much a question. It's about outreach because in spite of everything we've asked the implementation group, and we've asked them for a new Applicant Support Program as regards outreach – they've done barely anything, almost nothing in spite of all our initiatives with the ALSes. And we held a meeting in Tunisia as regards gTLDs and support programs for the outreach, and Cintra had done the same in Trinidad & Tobago. But in terms of ICANN and ICANN staff, I see that they are working somewhat but not where they should be working.

And so we have applicants who need support but they haven't done anything there, and this is a pity because we do have a program which will serve to help program who don't need help – see what I mean? Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Tijani. Any other comment? Okay, I'm going to cede the floor to Olivier for one minute and then we'll take the break and come back. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton – this is Olivier for the transcript. Just one thing with regards to the ASP and with regards to the SARP people. There are some people actively looking out there. I know that I've been contacted already to be on the SARP and I've been asked to also ask if any members here would like to be on it. So this is really something that's very important since it's a follow up to something that we've been very, very supportive of.

Carlton Samuels: Do you want to go again? Tijani wants a follow up and then we'll take the break, and can we kind of compress the coffee time to about twenty minutes and then we come back? Thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: As regards the ASP, this ASP – Applicant Support Program – will be the panel which will take these requests. And so regarding the ASP, we've also asked for there to be experts other than the community but this wasn't accepted and we were told that within the community we do have experts. Still, as a group, as a community group that is, we have the impression, we're under the impression that an input from outside the community would be good. We do not need a half and half input but a combination of outside expression and from within the community would be a good thing. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Tijani. I now invite you to take the coffee break, and then we will come back and Olivier will assume the Chair afterwards.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Actually, I might sit in the Chair right now just before we break off. Thank you very much, Carlton, for chairing this first session. It's been very good so I thank you for an excellent chairing.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But one thing I did want to add, though – you will notice we spent a significant amount of time reporting from the working groups and this is all as part of our “Working smarter, not harder” part of what we're trying to do. Being involved in a working group is particularly important, and in fact it's one outreach tool that we can use with our communities. In fact, the way that I initially joined At-

Large was to get involved in a working group specifically only with IPv6 issues back quite a few years ago, and I think it is a good way to involve new members, bring them to working groups, send them on there. They can do as much or as little work as they want but at least they will start being involved in one way or another. And they don't need to be aware of everything that takes place in At-Large but only of the subjects that they are interested in.

So I really hope that you can go back to your communities and ask them to join actively the working groups. And I have noticed some people who don't hold any specific position in ALAC or in the RALO leadership that have taken a very good active part in working groups and that are actually here now, as well, because they've also been able to become Fellows, etc., to take the active part in there.

And now I think we all want to have some coffee because we need to wake up again. Thanks very much and see you in twenty minutes.

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, everyone, take your seats please! Evan, could you please stop playing with a soft toy?

Evan Leibovitch: No, no – this is educational.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alright, well thank you very much. Thanks, welcome back. After this coffee break I hope that everyone has had enough caffeine for the next couple of hours.

And I think we can go straight back to Avri to continue with the New gTLD Working Group topic. So Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria:

Thank you, and I will start now with the objection process. One last thing I did is I talked to a couple of people in the break who were thinking of getting in their applications by March 31st for the SARP. I encouraged them, especially if they weren't on the JAS.

Okay, coming to the objection process. So the Working Group has been working quite hard on it, and as I said, Dev has been working extremely hard on it – constantly putting out. It went out for a review to the RALOs. We got back a few comments. The changes have been made. The Working Group had a chance to review the draft with the changes made and one last change is being made to it; changing it from “draft proposal” to “proposal,” and that proposal is going to be passed on or is passed on to the Chair of ALAC for further processing. And it will be sent to him as soon as the words “draft proposal” are changed to “proposal..”

So for the ALAC members who are now going to review it and see whether this is something they want to review, I just want to briefly go over what's in the document. I won't go into deep detail on it. There is an At-Large New gTLD Working Group meeting on Monday where much of the hour will be spent on the details of the proposal for anyone that's interested. So the proposal, so the document – this is it and it's double-sided, so it's quite a complete process for the objection process. It starts out with an intro for the reasons for doing this, and those basically come out of the Application Guidebook that sort of support the notion that ALAC has standing to make objections in two areas: in terms of the limited public interest and in terms of community objections.

So given that, but they also say that in order to make those – and the way the Applicant Guidebook is set up, it basically says that those have to be paid for. But ALAC doesn't have to pay for them. ICANN will pay for them as long as ALAC has accepted a structured process for deriving these, for coming up with

these. So that was the reason for this process. So the next part of the document includes a summary of the process, and then there's basically a week-by-week description of the process.

Now briefly, the process divides into two sub-processes. One is for the first sixty days after applications come out – ALAC and anyone else in the world can file comments on the objections. And a comment can be on any grounds; not just the two that I've mentioned. For ALAC of course to file a comment, that comment needs to be written, that comment needs to be reviewed; the RALOs have to each have a chance to look at it and then it has to come to ALAC for a vote. So there's a task-by-task breakdown, and in fact you'll notice that not only are they described but for anybody that's into it they're actually flowcharted on a step-by-step basis of how this will be run.

So that's the first part of the document and that describes that. The second part is there are seven months altogether for producing objections. Now, objections are a much more formal document so there's a process. There's a sub-team, a group set up for managing that process. There'll be ad-hoc groups set up for writing those objections. Then those objections will be sent to the RALOs for review. If an objection gets approved by, I guess it's three RALOs then it can go to the ALAC for an ALAC approval to actually file an objection.

So it's basically a seven-month process, although it's really a five-month process for that because it starts really at the end of the comment period. One would also assume parallel to the structure that the GAC has of early warning which parallels comments, and advice which parallels paid-for objections, that one will probably object on things one has commented on. Though that's not necessarily the case there's sort of an assumption there; but as I say, it's not necessary.

So this document has this process week-by-week described, has a flowchart for it. It then has an appendix that takes the documentation from the Applicant Guidebook describing the standing for an objection, and ALAC is specifically mentioned as having two standings – one for the limited public interest and one

for community objections. It will be up to At-Large, the RALOs and ALAC at the time of those objections to decide exactly how far the community of ALAC extends in terms of their objections. Is it ALAC only? Is it pertinent to the RALOs? Is it pertinent to an ALS? Is it pertinent to someone else? So the community objections will require a certain amount of discussion during the time to make sure that these really are things that ALAC feels are within its community and thus they have the standing to object.

So that's pretty much the objection process in a very quick nutshell, not going through the process. We'll walk you through the process, we'll walk through the process much more carefully Monday when there's a full hour to talk about it. But I don't know if there are any quick questions about it now...

Okay, the third task that the group has chartered, that I mentioned before, is the gTLD roll-out concerns. And Cintra, who's the Vice-Chair of the group, has taken responsibility for that so I'd actually like to turn the microphone over to... See, it was the coffee. I knew it would make me speak—

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

The interpreters also took coffee but they can't catch up.

Avri Doria:

Okay, I'm so sorry. Do I need to repeat anything or am I... I apologize. Anyway, moving on, as I said Cintra is the Vice-Chair of the group and has taken responsibility for the gTLD roll-out concerns, so I'd like to turn the mic over to her for that.

Cintra Sooknanan:

Thank you very much, Avri. This is Cintra Sooknanan. I have posted a link in the Adobe Connect chat which lists the tracking workspace, and on that workspace there's also a summary of the Working Group's objectives which Avri summarized before the coffee break. I just want to go through some of the issues identified so far. This is a draft document and your comments are much

appreciated. If you have any other issues that you think you'd like to flag for this Working Group please feel free to do so.

Okay, so the first issue we found was an evaluation of the updated Applicant Guidebook based on areas of concern that ALAC and At-Large highlighted previously, such areas being fees – more categories needed; and then community and other for objection; trademark protections; gTLD objections on morality and public order..

[break in audio]

Sandra Hoferichter:

...and thirdly I want to hand over to Tijani to speak about the potential, the first step that the ICANN Academy has. And then the floor is open to questions. This should be the main part of this update, to answer your questions.

Where we came from: I was told before my time with the ALAC that discussion on how to develop the capacity building within ICANN was always an issue. I was told there was a big discussion during the Mexico Summit and somewhere else, however the first concrete proposal was made in Cartagena which was actually my first ICANN meeting. And I had the same experience as many others or maybe everybody in the room that got very confused about the ICANN structure, about ICANN policy development processes; about the issues to discuss and everything.

So I made within the Work Team B of the At-Large Improvements, I made a proposal to establish a sort of Academy just as other international organizations have sort of a level system to get into the process on sort of specific levels. The first concrete proposal was developed in August, 2011, and this was done in close collaboration with staff already. And this proposal was opened in August for comments, and taking the comments into account and the demand from ICANN staff to concentrate on a Point B in this very inclusive proposal, a Working Group was formed during the Dakar meeting in Autumn, 2011.

Again, I'd like to underline that the first proposal and the first initiative to develop an ICANN Academy was a very wide proposal. We proposed to include e-learning; we proposed to have a face-to-face meeting for new elected officers; and we also proposed to include existing capacity building provisions into this broad ICANN Academy. However, we were asked to concentrate on the Point B, the specific Point B only – to work on a face-to-face meeting for new elected ICANN officers only.

And this was the point where we started from in Autumn, 2011, and I'm quite happy to tell you that members of our Working Group, well, we have over 40 members on the Working Group list and the beauty of this Working Group is truly that we are not having a Chair or a Co-Chair but we're having sort of a Program Committee. The Program Committee consists of one member of each region, so this was me as a so-called Chair and the representative for Europe. It was Avri for NARALO, it was Carlos for LACRALO, it was Tijani for AFRALO and Sala for APRALO. And the work was conducted the way that the Program Committee did sort of the ground, basic work and it was then presented to the working list and open for comments.

And I think and I'm convinced that this procedure was working out very well, and so I can really resonate that the proposal which has developed so far has truly been an inclusive process considering the ideas and input of all five At-Large Regions within ALAC. However, due to the time constraints of the budget submissions for the financial year 2013, we had to start with the budget or develop the budget first which was not the best thing to do but we had no other choice. So we started with the budget before we discussed the input, the curriculum and outreach and all the other things. However, the budget is posted on the At-Large working space as well as the curriculum which was developed afterwards, and I think Olivier will speak later about the outreach possibilities within this ICANN meeting which will happen during the next few days.

And on this point I want to hand over to Avri. She is the Academic Representative in our Working Group next to Tijani and to Carlos, and I will

hand it over to her to introduce the curriculum which is planned to be held during that face-to-face meeting for elected ICANN officers.

Avri Doria:

Thank you, and I will try to speak slowly. The curriculum is basically a three-day curriculum with a half-day follow up. The curriculum is meant to be given before a major ICANN meeting. I think it's the Toronto meeting that is being targeted for – it's before the annual meeting when new officers, new leaders take their roles.

So there's three essential topics that go through the three days. The first is basically core topics. They're sort of things like the history of ICANN, milestones/achievements; DNS basics, role of IANA, multi-stakeholder model – the concepts, the practice, the role of the stakeholders; an overview of ICANN operations, definitions of internet governance, balancing rights and obligations – privacy rights, human rights, property rights and trademarks; interplay between conflicting rights. And hopefully no one comes out of that sort of not understanding that there's different rights that need to be dealt with.

Basically competition, consumer choice and global public interests – one hope that we have is that no one comes out of that class sort of saying “Global public interest? What's that?” which we hear so often: “Global public interest? Could you please define that for me?” We would think that hopefully all the leaders that come through this at least have an idea of what people are talking about when that's being talked about.

So those are the core topics largely being taught by not necessarily academics but teacher-types that have covered these topics in various venues. Then the second part of it is specific ICANN training: the organizational architecture of ICANN, the structures of an ICANN meeting; bylaws, strategic planning, the development processes that we have; operational and budget planning which is a mystery to almost everyone that comes into ICANN, and even for those that have been here for a while – I just started to understand it last year; how the policy development processes work; working group functions. Working groups

have become the foundation for getting work done here – how do they function?
How do they work?

Also compliance or lack thereof, but no – basically how does compliance work within ICANN; the introduction to the various advisory committees and supporting organizations, their operations, their dynamics; introduction to the Board’s role and function; and cross-constituency work to the extent that that is occurring. But how is that met? So these are basically thought to be taught by people who are actually functioning within some of the current leadership – some of the senior staff, people like that would basically be the ones who would be looked on as the teachers of this.

And then the final piece of the thread is specific ICANN topics. Now, if you look at the curriculum, some of the stuff is fairly static. The core topics are somewhat static. ICANN’s structures and ICANN-specific training – it changes but it changes on a slower process. And then there’s the ICANN topics that if this is ever repeated would be very changeable, and it’s looking at recently-terminated public comments – what were people talking about? What were people concerned about? What were the topics that decisions are being made on now?

Also issues that are seen as coming before the Board in the next twelve months. Using that Board 12-month timetable gives you the issues that are in front of the supporting organizations now that are still in working group progress – so a view of what’s coming up over the next year; ongoing policy development processes that are further out than that perhaps; the AOC Reviews – which ones are in progress, which ones happened, what’s been the result from them? How do they fit into what’s happening?

And then certainly for the next couple years the New TLD Programs. The gTLD Program will be ongoing probably for the rest of our lives, and then there’s the IDN ccTLD Program where they’re just going to be migrating from the Fast Track to their full policy development process and program, so basically getting into the specifics of those.

Then the last thing I mentioned is there's a half-day wrap-up after they've basically had the class, then they've gone into the meetings; now they've just been, they've become the leaders and then basically gathering with them for a half day at the end of it all to sort of "What was appropriate, what wasn't? What did they learn on top of that?" etc., just sort of working it out – not so much of a structured thing as a sharing. And it's almost as much for the people who are teaching the courses to learn how to make it better in the future; but also for them to share with each other and sort of avoid a little bit of the siloing that we have in this organization. So that's about it.

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you, Avri. I just want to emphasize before I hand over to Tijani the two key elements of this Academy is knowledge transfer on the one hand and taking the advantages of the face-to-face meeting into account – a socializing aspect on the other end. So even for participants who are elected for the second time, it's definitely an Academy to participate in because it's not only about the knowledge transfer but also to get contact with the other silos and to be ready and be prepared to work with them and to collaborate with them during their respective terms.

And on this note I'll hand it over to Tijani to talk about the potential which this Academy can have for the ongoing capacity building provisions within ICANN.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Let me just interject, sorry, in the middle – it's Olivier here. There were a couple of questions that were asked and I've seen a few hands go up. First, Tijani Ben Jemaa has a couple of questions.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

I'm going to address you in French, so thank you, Olivier. I would like to commend Cintra and Avri in the first place, and Sandra and everyone who's worked with them for the implementation of this program, this curriculum. I

think it's one of the most useful things we've worked on in the long run and it's one of the best things [the Academy] has done so far.

This is one of the comments I would like to offer you: in the first place, even in the domain of the Academy I think we're entering a world of competition. A couple of years ago ICANN was almost alone and the only one proposing for a training program, and it's no longer the case. Last week I was invited to a conference in one of the big universities in Beijing, and I had to talk about internet governance. And I saw that there was a billboard announcing that in a couple of months there would be some sort of academy created and there was a training in order to train the leaders for internet, not only for Chinese people but also for people from all over the world.

And I know that these equivalence programs have already been set up in Brazil, in India, etc., and so it's interesting to notice which are the countries that have already undertaken the initiative of creating such a program. That is to say they are exactly the same countries [which some would challenge our multi-stakeholder model]. I would like to catch your attention with this point: I think it's not chance here. I think we should be more aware than ever about the competition we're facing.

I'd like you to take my analysis and see what the practical consequences may be. In the first place I think one of the consequences will be that our syllabus, our curriculum, should be inclusive and take into account the offer that the other stakeholders – if they are in China, India or elsewhere, wherever they might be – and we should avoid offering the same curriculum simply with the ICANN label on it. I think we should choose more and more what the way to do this should be, what aspects we would like to pursue; and I think ICANN has two strong points which we should be underlining.

In the first place, its idea of the general interests, of global public interests, because I think we're in a better position than others to propose one or more definitions of what this global public interest may be and also to orient or to start a debate on the quality of these subjects, because I think we've already seen in

the United States, in Australia, etc., different attacks on the principle of global public interest such as the SOPA draft law which is a challenge to the global public interest and its responses to particular interests. What I'm saying is, what I mean – I'm not suggesting that this is illegitimate. I'm just saying that they are particular interests, individual maybe.

And the second consequence that I would like you to observe is that your working group should quickly create a catalog of emerging, competing offerings, and so you should know what's being offered in different institutions and different countries such as the ITU to know what our horizons are, what the prospects are one year from now, two years from now, etc., so that we can adapt At-Large's and ICANN's offer to this reality. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Tijani. After you is Siva and then we'll have Yaovi, and then we'll have to close the queue because we are running behind. Siva.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy:

Yeah, this is Sivasubramanian for the record. The proposal for the ICANN Academy for a start as a three-day program for newly elected officers of ICANN is an excellent proposal and quite a meaningful proposal. But in the global public interest we could think of expanding it as large as possible. So the challenges to the multi-stakeholder model, for example the SOPA Act that Tijani has mentioned, that basically arose from insufficient understanding of internet governance and policy issues by stakeholders, especially the government; and that raises a need for education.

So ICANN, being a very responsible organization on the internet should consider it its responsibility to take up this position, and the details such as not copying or not imitating the [catacomb] of others could be looked at later. And initially the idea can be expanded and then we can look at the base by which we can offer a structure to run for various stakeholders, just to strengthen the multi-stakeholder model. It's not going to cost much to expand. There are various

ways that we can do it and I think we should seriously think about it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Siva. In fact, before running you have to walk and I guess we're just looking at the version 1 and we'll see how this will be able to go. "Or crawl" says Carlton. Yaovi next.

Yaovi Atohou:

Thank you, this is Yaovi. I completely agree with what Tijani just said about this ongoing aspect which should be evolving and which should take into account our present reality. In the same breath I'd also like to make sure that I understood properly because this regards the specificity of this program, of this curriculum for the ICANN Academy. Even if we do have curriculums or the workings which are being implemented, I think our target for this ICANN Academy curriculum is a specific public audience and I think this is what will always make the specificity of this program. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Yaovi. Jean-Jacques, do you wish to... Okay, so we can move straight over to Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you, Olivier. I will speak in English for my Chair. So first of all, first of all we want to emphasize on the fact that this program, this initiative is an At-Large initiative but the program is a community program. It's an ICANN community program since it concerns all the constituencies of ICANN. The first proposal, as Sandra said, was very inclusive – it was very broad, I mean, where it proposed a lot of kinds of learning and a lot of kinds of programs inside the Academy. But the staff had an urgent need, and they asked us to focus on this activity, on this program; and this program was prepared for the staff on the request of the staff.

But the Academy is conceived as a big tool in which all kinds of learning inside ICANN must be included. It must include all the actual activities of ICANN in the learning domain, but also it will include other kinds of learning, such as the virtual learning which is very important. By virtual I mean e-learning, I mean also webinars, etc. So the Academy is not only for the future leaders of ICANN as it is now, as the program is now. The program is a small part of the whole Academy that is conceived. So it hasn't been seen as the final project. It is not the final project; it is part of the final project. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Back to Sandra, if you could wrap up, please.

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you. I think Tijani mentioned a very important thing. We have to move forward not slowly but step by step, and I think we are on a very good track for the moment. We have the attention of the entire ICANN community. This will be proven during this upcoming ICANN meeting because we have also a speaking slot on the Public Participation Committee where Olivier will introduce the idea of the broad Academy. I think it will also be a topic during tomorrow's meeting with NCUC, and I know from other constituencies this proposal was received already.

However, we are now working to get the first pilot ready for Toronto, which is a great challenge, too, because it has to pass the budget or it has to get the budget approval and then we have to prepare the project for Toronto. The development, as Tijani just mentioned, is going to be a mid-term or even a longer-term process and this could be something for the subgroup which will be proposed by Sala today later on, or in other subgroups – please correct me, Sala, if I'm wrong about outreach and all the things...

So I think we have more time to discuss this proposal with other constituencies but for the Costa Rica meeting it's absolutely demanded and absolutely important that the whole ALAC stands behind this current proposal and does not

question this at the moment. I know there are different approaches within ALAC but this can be only taken into account on a mid- or longer-term basis; and I think we are in a very good position now. We should use this opportunity and promote this proposal within the whole upcoming ICANN meeting. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Sandra, and thank you for this very mature step-by-step procedure. And speaking about steps, having already spoken to the GNSO Council very briefly about the ICANN Academy very briefly, and having also spoken this morning whilst I walked about to the PPC Public Partnership Subcommittee of the Board Subcommittee, in preparation of this PPC meeting that will take place on Thursday – I believe it's Thursday at 9:00. I have proposed this this morning; I've gone through the slides – there's a good reception. It is not a done deal.

We have to act as ambassadors of this with the contacts that we all have at ICANN and make sure that there is an understanding that this is an ICANN-wide thing. It's not an At-Large or an ALAC thing anymore. There is certainly some, I wouldn't stay pushback but certainly some concern that this is an ALAC thing and that we are trying to rewrite ICANN's history the way that we see it. And as we all know the politics of it makes it a little bit of a concern for others, and so the first thing that we need to do now – and that's what I suggest – is to actually go and find those people that will join the Working Group.

And maybe that's something that you need to think about – join the Working Group to build the next stage, which is building the curriculum, building the procedure by which the faculty will be selected. There's, I will tell you right away there is a concern with regards to the choice of faculty members because they will be teaching a certain point of view of what ICANN is. There is a concern of it being captured, and that is a very valid concern; and so this needs to be looked at very carefully but not only by us. It needs to be looked at by everyone because if we do not involve everyone into this then this will not be

adopted and we will see serious kickback from other SOs and ACs. So the outreach is really very, very important.

Okay, let's close this. Thank you very much for this amazing amount of work, Sandra, it's really great and with your team you've done a really excellent job.

[Applause]

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thanks to the team.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And since we're still with At-Large capacity building, you'll notice we've spent a serious amount of time today – both this morning and this afternoon. We're now going to move on to the wider capacity building within At-Large, and I will ask for Salanieta to take us through what we can see really as a next stage but for us to bring in more people to At-Large and make them active members rather than just people who are on our lists but that we never hear of. So Sala, you have the floor.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:

Thank you, Olivier. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the record, and I'd like to start off by saying warm greetings to all participants who are streaming in remotely; and also warm greetings all around the room. It's an absolute privilege to be able to speak a little bit on capacity building, but I would like to first make a distinction between what was just shared with us. The ICANN Academy again, as Olivier had mentioned, is for the whole of ICANN. It includes all the other constituencies but where I will be coming from this morning will be restricted to capacity building within the At-Large community.

And with that I'd like to thank Jean-Jacques and Siva for helping by laying out some of the things that I'll be speaking on in the first place. First of all, it's

critical to set some sort of parameter in terms of “Capacity building for what?” and I think Heidi has put up the link and you have it up there on your screen – the draft proposal that I sort of initiated was sort of posted straight after Dakar. And you will see that ICANN’s core functions have a limited and are restricted to those six core themes, one of which is the allocation and assignments of three sets of unique identifiers of the internet and that sort of thing.

So basically when I say capacity building within At-Large I’m referring to this parameter, and the other thing is why should we have capacity building? I think it’s important that we ask the question and I know Sandra has mentioned before that there have been talks about why there should be capacity building of course well before I came onto the scene. But I think it’s critical for us to ask that question, and Jean-Jacques’ raised quite eloquently that there is a need to engage in meaningful participation – to understand the issues and engage in constructive and robust dialog.

And as you can appreciate, the At-Large community of course is a global, diverse community and we all have various complex issues, complex politics within our regions and that sort of thing. And so in terms of contributions through the At-Large forum in terms of things like policies emerging, in terms of things like Rules of Procedures in-house, this is something that I suppose that we could sort of consider. And in no way would I like to impose what I think should be developed, but this is something for the community at-large to decide what in fact they would like to have built within the [runners] and to be properly teased out so that we can have a more cohesive and strategic input. And I’m sure most of you recognize within your various working groups when you’re asking for policy consultations from within your own RALOs, some of the challenges that exist, whether it’s language or whether it’s understanding of technical components and that sort of thing.

And so I’ll move on to the next theme in terms of mode of capacity building. And you know, the thing is it’s not something new – it’s something that’s already been done. Even here within ICANN, if you look at the Global Partnerships, they’ve been doing a tremendous and most excellent job in

working with the network operating groups, otherwise known as [NOGs] around the region – and with PAC NOG, with Southeast Asian NOG, with EURO NOG, AFRO NOG and that sort of thing. And so those trainings are usually technical trainings in terms of DNSSEC, in terms of things like IPv6 and IP addressing issues and that sort of thing.

So there's a need to sort of step back and sort of reflect on how we can better coordinate and perhaps work better together with the good work that Global Partnerships is doing, and see how within our various regions we sort of can coordinate together and sort of perhaps organize for ALSes to be able to attend, whether it's from EURALO, whether it's from AFRALO, whether it's from APRALO. So that's the face-to-face component in terms of encouraging capacity building within our existing ALS members, and also potentially encouraging new ALS entrants through using these mechanisms. And Jean-Jacques had sort of mentioned that there are some existing trainings that are already being done around the world, and it's something for the RALOs to be able to map out and not wait for anyone to tell them to map it; and sort of discuss how we can better coordinate within our regions.

And in terms of utilization of internet, a critical issue that's often forgotten is the issue of access. Take for example a country that's not yet within the At-Large community but I hope that they will join soon, as Nepal. Nepal is a country well in the Himalayans and some of them have internet access for only about four hours a day, only because of a very poor energy grid and the changing weather patterns. And of course there's complex issues all around the world, and it could be because of a number of other reasons that restrict access. So in essence, I'm talking about bridging the digital divide in our regions.

So in terms of methodology, I won't go into the actual methodology itself in the proposal – you can take your time and have a read, and sort of comment. There's possible delivery systems, a web-based platform; and I know Siva and Glenn McKnight have sort of suggested on the Wiki about using [Scome] and that sort of thing. There are mechanisms and systems available to us to be able to develop, and if I could just point to a few: for example, [Octet], they use web-

based platforms to deliver web-based learning; ITU, they use web-based platform to develop trainings on ICT issues; DiploFoundation, they have internet governance programs; and various other organizations.

And now, just to be sure, or just so you know that it's not something I'm pulling from the air, I actually ran the numbers and when I ran the numbers to sort of see what the RALO penetration rate was – and this is my only caveat: this was done straight after Dakar and of course some of the dashboards had yet to be updated, and of course we have new ALS members like Armenia who just joined and that sort of thing. But I would like to give you just a brief indication of what the penetration rates are.

In terms of the number of ALSes within APRALO, there's a 21.92% penetration rate into the APRALO region. In AFRALO there's a 27.78% penetration rate; LACRALO, 45.45% penetration rate – they're doing quite well; NARALO, there's a 5.66% penetration rate – again, this is post-Dakar; and EURALO, 18.42% penetration rate.

Now, it's important to understand that even within that margin of penetration rate, the capacity to extract qualitative input into the policy, into WHOIS Review, into IDNs, into you know, domain names, into registrars and registrants – it is critical, and I can't begin to emphasize the importance of RALOs taking the initiative to encourage means of outreaching within your own RALO and not waiting for someone to come and hold your hand and do it. And if we can all do that together and collectively together coordinate and discuss how best we can do this... And you know, of course you have regions in the world that are at the crossroads.

Like take for example Armenia – on one hand they are dealing with Europe, and on the other hand it's Asia. But the ability to bridge... And it's not a disadvantage, it's an advantage to powerfully bridge and share resources. And our greatest strength is our diversity, our capacity to be able to share resources, share lessons, draw from the skillsets, the rich skillsets available to us within the At-Large community. You have engineers, you have IPv6 experts; you have

lawyers, you have people from diverse jurisdictional backgrounds and that sort of thing.

So bottom line, fellow colleagues, is capacity building for At-Large. So with that, Mr. Chair, I'll rest.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Salanieta. Do we have any questions around the table? I see one hand – Siva, please.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Okay, Sivasubramanian again. And I had a talk with Sala during teatime, and Sala was telling me about this capacity building. And one of the ideas that she was saying is that we could provide capacity building sessions to those who have completed a foundation course from Diplo or some of the other academies, and that is one point that I wanted to differ to her and say that if we do capacity building we could start from an ICANN curriculum so that they get the right education. If we were to start targeting we'll give them the right orientation about internet governance and the multi-stakeholder model. And thank you, Sala, for taking note of the online capabilities. Thank you.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiamaro: Just a brief comment to Siva: I think if you remember, when I started I noted that within ICANN we have a restricted parameter, and so that's in terms of the capacity building that I was sort of alluding to. It would be restricted to that, but of course we have members who have absolutely diverse ranges of knowledge on various issues; and also the ability to understand the intersections within the various sectors is also critical, because take for example with domain names – you have the competition aspect and at the same time you have the legal aspect, and then of course you have the engineering and technical aspects. So again, that's open to the members within At-Large to sort of decide.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sala. Any other questions or comments? Yes, Sandra, Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Olivier. I just want to have not a question, more a comment. I think what we are exercising here is a very good example of how all the things can go together. I mean we have the ICANN Academy Working Group on the one hand where Sala was a member of the Program Committee, and I think to develop out of this working group the next step – taking into account what Siva and Glenn developed, the Moodle – is a very good way. And I will really propose and underline that we should go this way.

The Moodle in my point of view is a very, very great tool – it's a tool. It's a learning tool on one hand and it is a very good tool to go into the next step. So the aim is we implement the Moodle already for the Academy, even if it's not the type of tool where it is designed for our face-to-face meeting; but this could be the next step – to go the way along what Sala is proposing in her document which was shared with all of you. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sandra. Any other questions? Can I just ask you, Sala, what are the next steps that you foresee that need to be done now from here until the next meeting?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: I agree with Sandra. It's not something that we should immediately jump to, but it's certainly something that from Costa Rica what I foresee is from Costa Rica onwards, now that it's open to everyone, to begin to sort of map out what sort of things that are happening within our region and sort of assess what sort of needs are within our region; and if I could suggest, Mr. Chair, if I could suggest that there could be, I don't know – a group of people who are volunteers perhaps to be able to bring this information together and sort of put together a way forward? So it's sort of like...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So perhaps we should have it as an action item I understand. So getting a group of people together, volunteers. Well, I think nobody is professional in this here, but a group of volunteers to take this to the next step. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: What about the proposal of Cheryl, about outreach? Is this part of it?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The establishment of a standing subcommittee on outreach and next steps – that’s the next thing we will be speaking about, and in fact it may well fall within this. But unfortunately Cheryl hasn’t reached us yet because horror, we’re 15 minutes early which doesn’t often happen.

Yes, Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: There’s something that I forgot to touch on, sorry, if I could. One of the challenges I suppose within a global community like ours, of course we’ve heard of the problems of language, you know? And so I think this is also something that we should consider and discuss. And if RALOs, especially those – and I think it’s probably all the RALOs, I’m not sure, where you have challenges to do with language, perhaps deciding amongst ourselves how we can take it back to our RALOs and also encourage different workshops, even within existing workshops or conferences within our regions.

And you know, and do it in the language. And if there’s help required or if there’s a level of training required we can draw from the At-Large community. We can ask staff for assistance or we can draw from the ICANN Global Partnership representatives from within the region. For example, when preparing for the Arab IGF we contacted the APRALO Chair, Charles, who contacted Baher Esmat who’s a Global Partnership officer within that region and

sort of just connected – so things like that, and making sure that resources trickle down to the ALSes.

So it's critical that we develop enough critical mass, not only within the RALO but within the ALSes and that sort of thing. And that's something that RALO leadership, again, I humbly suggest for RALO leaderships across the room to consider, particularly those who have challenges with language. So for us, for example, even in terms of the IDN policy consultations, we thank staff for the awesome work that they continue to do in terms of translating the documents. And they've done their part – they've translated the documents but it's us, the RALO within At-Large, who should be getting input. And for us, take for example the extractions – whether it's from Korea, whether it's from Japan, whether it's from China or whether it's from the Pacific. The level of extraction is up to the RALOs. And if the ALSes say that they want to understand it better then it's for us to sort of take the initiative and coordinate how we're going to put it across better. That's it for me, Chair.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Sala. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you, Olivier. I've a comment. I'm not sure whether it was Sandra who mentioned this, but I suppose throughout this work to incorporate the Academy – I think she was in touch with ICANN staff such as David Olive, mainly, and Filiz Yilmaz on the one hand; and then with the Public Participation Committee led by Mike Silber. If this were not the case I would encourage you to do this, not ongoing or continuously but for the main stages, sort of every three to six months. And I think we need the same tools in both cases; that is to say, language services such as translation or interpreting but also tech support for transmission, for tele-participation and these are aspects which we should not reproduce ourselves each time. We do have the tools so we should seize them.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques, and I can say what I mentioned earlier: the Academy will be presented to the wider ICANN audience as part of the Public Participation Subcommittee. And this is what I've basically presented this morning whilst the first session took place and whilst I was away so they are aware. They have had the documents in their hands for at least a while already and the reception has been very good in this. There is also a second aspect of it which will be presented by ICANN staff, which looks at a broader context of enabling participants in ICANN to go up the ICANN ladder as one would say, to actually be active members and take on positions of leadership across all SOs and ACs.

It is something that is really taken up at the highest level, and the great thing is that the Public Participation Subcommittee has really worked quite a lot on that already. Any other comments or questions on this?

Now, there was a discussion on a presentation of Moodle at some point, which would have been undertaken by Glenn McKnight. I just wonder... So he'll be in the wrap-up session. I understand Cheryl is on her way. I wonder if I should fill in in the meantime depending on how far she's coming from?

Evan Leibovitch:

We're not used to being ahead of time. This is extremely irregular and we don't know what to do about it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I must say I'm rather speechless now. Usually we have to say "Let's go quickly," "Can you make it brief?" Can you not make it brief, please? Yes, Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan:

Thank you, Olivier. I thank Sala for her really in-depth presentation. I do believe this is one of the crucial working groups to At-Large. I know you quoted some statistics, Sala – I'd like to know what is your ideal mechanism for

really gathering and quoting these kinds of statistics? Does it fall into the Metrics Working Group, because a reflection on numbers is not necessarily participation? Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cintra, that's a very good point. Sala, I see you're waving frantically.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Sorry, yes. In terms of the statistics that I used in the proposal, I think if you go through the proposal you'll see that I used the countries as a benchmark – like how many ALSes per country and how many countries? And I also agree with Cintra: just because someone has a high penetration rate does not necessarily equate to policy emerging efficiency. And I think one of the potential things that could be added I suppose to the Metrics side as well as productivity is policy efficiency metrics.

But I think on the other hand, and it is critical – I underscore it is critical for us as a community before we start regulating and benchmarking policy emerging that we also consider the efficiency of the systems and also have that as a metric. How efficiently is information being brought down to the grass roots? So again, it's knowledge management. Thank you, Cintra.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Sala, you were saying 5% from North America...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Siva, you have to introduce yourself first and I have to give you the floor before that. [laughter] You've been bored for five minutes. No, I'm kidding – go ahead, Siva.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Okay, Sivasubramanian for the record. And Sala, you were saying 5% is the figure for North America. How did you arrive at that figure? Maybe you assigned a country for each American state or something?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: I must say with NARALO, that was the most difficult of course for obvious reasons. But in terms of arrival at the figure, I think the original proposal that I sent out actually has footnotes, footnotes linking it to the dashboards. And the existing dashboards will show you the raw statistics that are available. And again, critical to underscore that the caveat is those statistics were as of post-Dakar. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, thanks Sala. And those statistics as far as I understand from what you were looking for at the time are compiled by the RALOs themselves. Are any of them not up to date?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: This is a very good question, Olivier. In fact, I made two calls on the At-Large list. The first call was for the dashboards, and if you notice the responses that came in, the only RALO that was up to date was the LACRALO region. And I must say that the other RALOs had indicated that they wanted assistance in terms of updating their dashboards.

The second call I made on the lists was a request for fresh statistics and also for confirmation about whether that had been updated. I am sad to say that I didn't receive any email but I suppose people were travelling or perhaps they were busy with lots of emails coming in. But again, if I could encourage the different RALOs to please update the RALO dashboard because that helps us to give an indication of where we are.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sala, and if I could perhaps suggest an action item then, to have this question asked during the RALO Leadership Meeting which could then be discussed at the time. I see Matt is waving his hand.... I have to state it how I'd like it recorded. So RALO leaders to discuss the possibility of updating their dashboards. That's short enough.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Sorry, sorry, one last comment.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And Sala, please?

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: If we could also add to that action item, quite aside from updating the dashboard; if we could have consistency in how the information is received. I noticed that there were variations with the dashboard so it would be good.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sala. May I suggest that you then speak because the meeting is open, so if you are there at the time you might wish to suggest this at the time. It's not something for the ALAC to ask the RALOs but if a member of one of the RALOs is insistent on something like this, who knows?

Anyway, we see that Cheryl Langdon-Orr has made it back into the room so we can proceed forward. Following up on all of what we've been discussing in the past hour, it looks as though there would be... It would be a good idea, let's say, to have some form of subcommittee on outreach. And I therefore hand the floor over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr for this part of the discussion. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I do apologize but we are not the only meetings to occasionally run a tiny bit over. So might I also mention that you should be

delighted that you're in this room without windows – I just spent the last two hours in a tent. Hmm.... There's a lot I could say but none of it could be transcribed or at least not legally in many countries.

Okay, so moving on, did you have a speaking order? Do I have people already lined up for wanting to speak to this matter? If... I'm sorry, I did not hear a word.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, I understand because you're very far away, we also need to have a quorum here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A quorum? That's up to you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well if we wish to establish this then we will need to vote on it and to say yes or no, so we need to calculate a quorum. So I would like to ask staff, please, to forget about Rodrigo or whoever is not in the room and start counting the people whilst at the same time Cheryl proceeds with discussing or proposing what she is going to propose. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I am indeed, but before that I did see Dev raising his hand earlier when Sala was speaking. So I'm not as sure as I was that we had a full speaking order, so Dev, I'm going to put your name – you've got the top of the list as far as I'm concerned so if you wanted to respond to Sala's points please do so now.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Well, the dashboards were created as a concept, based on my experience in creating the LACRALO dashboards, so just

to say I'd be happy to work with the RALOs and look into updating it, and of course helping to transition it so that other persons can maintain it. So that's it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay. Again, my apologies – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I'm not apologizing for being Cheryl Langdon-Orr; let me start again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record and I apologize for now having to ask the Chair have you posted the motion or is that what you would like me to do now? Do you have a quorum to do so? Thank you.

In which case it is a proposal of this meeting of ALAC Regional Leaders and At-Large that a motion be put to the ALAC for vote at this meeting to form a standing subcommittee tasked with the topic of outreach. Does anyone wish to modify the motion as read? If not I would ask for an ALAC person to put the motion and another to second that, please. I see Sala putting the motion and I see Olivier seconding; Sergio is also supporting, and look it – we're not taking the vote just yet.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

No, we're just getting the regions. All the regions are saying yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Excellent, well I'm delighted to hear that. We can in fact list all the regional leads, that's fine, as being supported across all the regions. Mr. Chairman, do you wish to run the vote seeing as it is your pet?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, so first we will ask for comments before the vote takes place. So are there any comments? I see Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi there. Is the intent of the working group to work specifically in an At-Large context or is there a specific desire to try and work together with other ICANN constituencies on some kind of a shared outreach vision? One of the things that I've come across is that there's other constituencies within ICANN that are having as much grief in their outreach efforts as we are and I'm just wondering if there's a possibility to extend this just beyond our own scope and see what we can do with other stakeholder groups. Maybe some kind of joint effort would be useful here, because it seems like we are all having challenges working in our own silos.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you for that, Evan – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. If I may speak to that, if the ALAC votes in the affirmative to form this standing subcommittee then it needs to be chartered. If the ALAC so desires to give cross-constituency opportunity for this work group then that goes into the charter.

Evan Leibovitch:

As the proposer of this are you okay, do you have that in mind with this? Or did you have a more limited scope intended as you're raising the issue?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Certainly, Cheryl again for the transcript record. Thank you, Evan. I would suggest that I would be somewhat selfish in the first twelve to 18 months. For the budget cycle that we have already established within ICANN, I would be very, very selfish and want to be looking at our own ALAC, At-Large and regional development. As we come to the next budget cycle, that is the perfect opportunity because that is when the other groups start to focus on these needs. We probably will work more throughout a year's cycle than some of the other ACs and SOs, so I would suggest that eight to twelve months out would be when the answer would be yes to that second one.

Go ahead, Sala.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Any other comments or questions before... Tijani and then we'll have Sala. First, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. I apologize, Evan, but I do think that it must be an At-Large subcommittee because we have our own need for outreach. And if we need a common outreach with the other constituencies we can constitute or we can merge.... No, we can constitute something which is a cross-constituency working group. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Tijani. Sala next.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. I agree with Tijani and Cheryl in terms of starting off with the At-Large purely, but I hope that won't stop of us course with say working with Global Partnerships, for example. The other thing that I would like to comment on is that having spoken to at least three RIRs' directors of trainings with the RIRs – AP NIC, RIPE NCC and that sort of thing – they're keen also and they're very keen to work with us in terms of trainings on the ground during the NOGs. So I think it's something potentially if the vote were affirmative that the subcommittee could consider. Thank you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I thank you, and if I may – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Mr. Chairman, it's important that scope is not too limited for the charter of this work group. I think that will pick up the desires that Evan has for the longer-term plan and the necessity that we're seeing from the regions.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Cheryl. Any other questions? Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter:

Sandra Hoferichter for the transcript record. Cheryl, one question: is this separate working group comparable to the Future Challenges Working Group which gives us sort of an overarching look into the issues? Or is it also going to be the place to develop, for instance, the capacity building programs?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I would suggest it needs to be the second of those two, not the first. One would go to what would be a community-wide cross-community work group to do those overarching helicopter views because that would be where the benefits would be seen to the whole of the ICANN community. Now we actually need to focus very much on the regional needs and we will have to do that: seeing capacity building necessities and then follow up on capacity building necessities. There's opportunities as we're hearing that will involve other parts of the ICANN community and the internet ecosystem. Sala's examples of the ASOs is a perfect one; the Tech Days that are run by the ccTLD communities and indeed outside of ICANN, in ISOC, etc., are more and that's probably where we need to focus on at the moment.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. And I was just looking at the minutes at the moment. Any other questions or comments before we move to the next process? Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan:

Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl, your view of outreach, does it also include inreach to fill the gaps in the RALOs in terms of participation and that level of capacity building? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My personal opinion, and remember that it would be up to the proposed work group to actually chew that particular topic over and respond, is that its focus should be what it says, which is outreach. There may be correlated benefits to inreach that happen in parallel but I think we do need to perhaps separate church and state there even though there would be an overlap from time to time. My reasoning is they need to be separate budget items and we may underserve our community if we don't design it properly.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. We have a question from remote participants and then we'll go to Siva right after that.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. We have a question from [Fizal Hassan]. He asks.... Actually can you come back to me? [Fizal], if you can hear this, you said that you have asked a previous question. I only see one comment from you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think that this was actually to do with Sandra Hoferichter's discussion a bit earlier; we kind of missed this one. Okay, Siva?

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Sivasubramanian for the record. Earlier we were talking about relating it to other constituencies, consulting other constituencies on capacity building. In At-Large we've been talking about capacity building but do other ACs and SOs talk about capacity building or have they considered that? And if we think about capacity building for each AC, SO or each constituency, that would strengthen ICANN in a very big way. So for example, if you talk about GAC it could result in inclusion of countries that are not represented in GAC. It could include registrars who are not registered and are not part of the Registrar Constituency.

And on the whole it would bring in greater diversity on one aspect and the other aspect is that each participant, each new participant will understand the multi-stakeholder model better and understand the ICANN process better if we talk about capacity building for each AC and SO. Each could be customized; each could be customized and so can you take a serious look at that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Siva, I and the work group, should it be formed, can certainly take a serious look at that. But to answer the first part of your question, yes – all of the ACs and SOs have some form of work plan, subcommittee, work group, drafting team or whatever on this topic. Capacity building and effective outreach to maximize their community is on everyone’s agenda. That said, having spent some time in just about every one of those spaces as I do, the maturity of each of those processes is very different.

So I am not in any way thinking that what we may do now will be a disservice to an ICANN-wide. I think what it will be is building one of the foundations when we’re ready for an ICANN-wide approach. That shouldn’t be in the distant future; I would consider that would be in the near future, but right now the answer is yes – they all do.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments from the floor? And I see none online, either, specifically on the Academy. With regards to [Fizal] Hassan’s question earlier I’ve asked Sandra to look at her screen and answer him online.

So, we’re now ready for the vote and so the proposal as recorded, and Cheryl, if you could tell us if this is correct. Could I ask Heidi to read it please?

Heidi Ullrich:

Yes, the motion as recorded is “ALAC is to vote to form a standing At-Large subcommittee on outreach to discuss the topic of outreach.”

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That will go, that's fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. And it was seconded by Sergio, Sala, and Tijani as well – we can add this to the motion. And it is on the screen although it's a bit difficult to see it when you're one kilometer away from the screen.

Right, so we have quorum and we can then therefore put a vote. All those who are for the motion, can you put your hand up please? Only ALAC.

Heidi Ullrich: 13, we have 13.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Count a second time. Can we have two members please, two members of staff count independently please and then you compare your notes?

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Carlton is missing so that's why we're 14. Anybody... Okay, well with only one person missing I guess there's no against and no abstentions, so thank you, well done – the motion is passed.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well we will have the next steps, Cheryl, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Heidi, can we just check that we haven't lost the audio line, that it is still up? Because one of the next steps... In fact we have Rodrigo; Mandy is also from Global Partnerships on the line but we already have poised in the wings coming onstage as we speak Rodrigo to discuss with us how [the ACs] can interact with Global Partnerships. Grab a microphone, sit down, and if you don't speak French, Spanish and English at the same time please use your headsets. Thank you, sir. And I'm sorry, you do have to say your name before you start to actually speak.

Rodrigo de la Parra:

My name is Rodrigo de la Parra and first of all I would like to thank you for the invitation. And for those of you who are not aware of who I am or what department I work for in ICANN staff, my position is the Vice President for Latin America. And there's a department in ICANN that's called Global Partnerships, and we have vice presidents for different regions, too, and also some managers on our staff. And one of the things that we do is outreach, not only for the internet users associations or organizations that might be interested in working for the At-Large, but also we work closely with governments, business, etc. So it's an effort of outreach to all constituencies and stakeholders that can work with ICANN.

I'm happy to note that the At-Large has set up this subcommittee and I do see that we have plenty of room for cooperation between the subcommittee and the work that we do in ICANN staff, so I don't know... I think we won't have time at this meeting to address the next steps but let's schedule a time to have the time and do it.

I also believe that we have Mandy Carver who helps us at the office and she might be also happy to address here, so thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Rodrigo. We appreciate the interaction with Global Partnerships. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record because she forgot to take her own rules seriously and say who I was before I started to speak.

[Gasps]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mandy, are you there in some goddess-like way coming through the airwaves to us? Would you like to- I mean we can't have a meeting without you addressing us, Mandy. This is a long-standing and established rule of the ALAC. Come on down, wherever you are!

Mandy Carver: Well can you hear me? I am online; I am evidently one of the three people on the Adigo bridge and I am in the Adobe Connect room so I can follow chat questions, although I don't see that any particular screens are being shared. I share with Rodrigo the welcome to the working group on outreach. I did catch a little bit of the discussion on the formation and the dialog about outreach versus capacity building, and this is an ongoing set of discussions that are taking place right across ICANN about the kinds of outreach, because some outreach is about improvement, about bringing more people into specific constituencies. Some of the outreach is about carrying the multi-stakeholder message and awareness of the work of ICANN; and some outreach in some destinations is also about capacity building.

And I heard you all discuss that you're looking both at capacity building for those who are currently involved and then capacity building also as you are recruiting new ones in. So I welcome both dialog and collaboration going forward, and I know that there's a great deal of interest in many of the constituencies around the concept of outreach. And I believe that the Participation and Engagement session that Kurt may be talking a little bit about

some of the dialog that's taken place around outreach amongst staff. But I'm happy to listen and learn from all of you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Mandy – Cheryl for the transcript record. I'm wondering before we go too far if anyone has questions? I see Olivier. Is there anyone else who wants to put up their hand now? If not please go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Just I wished to speak for the record that this afternoon the session will be between 16:00 and 16:30 with Kurt speaking to us about this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. If there is no further discussion on this we need to actually get some actionables out of it. It's all very good setting things up but we now need to do something like gee, populate it? That would be good.

It's an ALAC standing subcommittee. By definition, the ALAC will appoint a number of people including the liaison to it, and the Chair or his delegated Vice-Chairs can be ex-officio at any time. So that's the ground rules of what a standing subcommittee is all about.

That said, it's a little bit like a repeat of what I may have said earlier in the day – it's absolutely essential that regional leadership now appoint one or two people to in fact be part of this subcommittee. The reasoning for that is most of the effective work and the collaborative work such as is looking to be offered with Global Partnerships will be happening at a regional or local level. So in fact, it's what's happening on the field in the regions that's going to be vital for this particular work group.

I assume that staff will put out an announce on this and ask the regions to get some sort of interest from their lists, and if it is at all possible, I wonder – is Darlene? I can't see... No, she's not. Alright, whoever can get the Secretariat for the Secretariats' gathering, if that's also something that they can take up while they're all here because it really is up to the regions to put their people forward.

Once we're constituted in terms of the number of people we have, which would I would suggest be at least somewhere between 12 and 15, mailing lists will be produced during this coming week after the ICANN meeting when staff have almost a moment to think about things; Wiki pages will be put up. It will be public – comment of course is always welcome from everyone, rank and file members, but we should convene, Mandy, if at all possible at least an introductory call between this new subcommittee and your VPs of the various regions or their representatives. I think that's probably the single most important starting point.

So Mandy, your diary could be accessed by Heidi and Gisella and you can work with your VPs, and we can find something probably in the next three to six weeks that would work at undoubtedly a rather inhumane time for some of us. But we'll just have to do our best under those circumstances.

Like any of the work groups, the Wiki would be the basis for our archives and our materials, but I wonder whether or not, Mr. Chairman, that the ALAC would like to have a part of this space in fact not open to the public; that there may in fact be some concept discussions going on that one might not want necessarily picked up by all and sundry. That might be something that we can discuss at our first meeting, and if that's the case I would very much appreciate if either the Chair of the ALAC or at least a representative of their ExCom could be on that call to instruct us on that way forward. It's easy enough to set up those private spaces but this is one of those times where I think there may in fact need to be an enclave for discussion, particularly if we're going to start working with other parts of the ICANN community informally. There's nothing worse than an

informal chat suddenly looking like a piece of out-of-protocol correspondence going on, so I think we need to be a little bit careful there.

The other thing that might be useful is for us to reach out if we may via the regions, or perhaps even directly if we have the capacity to do so, to each of the At-Large Structures just to let them know that the sandbox is being set up and if they have any good ideas or concepts that that sandbox is there for them to work with. So that would become a subcommittee resource rather than an active involvement, because too many cooks actually do spoil the broth on this one.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that we need to do anything other than to get this going at this time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl – it's Olivier for the transcript. Yes, you're absolutely correct. I think if there are any other questions around the floor... I don't see anyone having any questions. Rodrigo, a few more words?

Rodrigo de la Parra:

Rodrigo de la Parra. I just want to thank you for having generated this cooperation space between the ICANN staff and At-Large, and I think that I do agree with the following up, that in the following weeks we can schedule this first call, this first [exit] call for the project. Thank you very much again.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes, and thank you for visiting us for the second time today since this morning. You've been spending a lot of time with us and it's very much appreciated.

Okay, and with this it looks as though our morning's program is finished for the time being, and oh! We are on time!

[Applause]

Heidi Ullrich:

Okay, we have 30 minutes for lunch now. Please be back in those 30 minutes. There are several options for food. The first one is just when you step out of the door to your right there should be another opening, another room and there should be sandwiches for sale there. Okay, and then there's also a footbridge just outside of the hotel that takes you to a mall that has a lot of food options, fast food options – a food court I believe. So you can go over there as well. There's a footbridge that just goes across the highway here. And one member of staff will be here at all times so you can leave your computers here.

Evan Leibovitch:

Sorry, just a little bit more on that. There's a couple of restaurants just as you go over the footbridge. There's a McDonald's right there; to your right there's a number of sit-down restaurants but that may take more than half an hour. If you keep going into the shopping plaza there's a whole bunch of fast food places right in there, including unfortunately a Taco Bell.

[Laughter]

Heidi Ullrich:

But again, there are sandwiches for sale-

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Can we start the recording please? Thank you. Well, welcome back; good afternoon, everybody. This is still the first day of the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session 1. We've had a very short lunch which looked a little bit more like a marathon to try and get the food and come back; that's why we're a little bit late, so apologies to those people who are listening to us remotely.

We have the honor of having with us Maguy Serad, Senior Director of Contractual Compliance; and next to her is Pam Little. And both of them will be able to answer our questions with regards to anything to do with Compliance-wise. There is a presentation on the screen which I guess Maguy will be taking us through, and so Maguy, the floor is yours.

Maguy Serad:

Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for this opportunity. Actually, you are our first presentation for the week. [laughing] So with me in the room as Olivier mentioned I have Pam Little. We also have a new team member with us who joined us recently sitting in the back – it's [Jack Kawaga]. On the phone we should have Khalil Rasheed whom many of you have worked with over the past few years. We also have many other team members participating because we consider this as one of the forums that is very critical to our success. You represent a stakeholder group that is very critical to the success of our mission and vision.

So let me walk you through a little bit of how we are going to present. We have very general updates based on the interests that you have shared with us in the past, but we also have received questions. So the first thing, I would like to thank the ALAC community for providing us your question in a professional, timely manner. It allowed us to address them and we have some slides that will address those. We also have a very extensive list of questions from tickets or complaints that were submitted to us, and I have prepared a summary to kind of give you an idea of what it is we're looking at. Next slide, please.

So gosh, this is too far – I can't see. [laughter] Alright, so the questions for the audience: the first one was about the organization. The second one was about updates on our website that concerned notices, and the third is a category of 177 questions received; and we grouped them in what we called bulk submitted complaints and the same question regarding updates to notices.

So we are on Side 4. So question one regarding the Compliance organization, I'm very happy to announce to the ALAC community we are four new team members' stronger than when we saw you in Dakar.

[Applause]

Maguy Serad:

Listen, I'm dancing, not just clapping. So it takes a while. If you've ever worked in the Compliance world, finding the right talent is very important. But if you've ever worked in the Compliance world at ICANN that's a double whammy – finding the role, finding the diversity, finding the right skillsets to be able to work in this environment and address the concerns. The internet is moving a lot faster than any one of us could have ever imagined, so four new team members. And combined now we can cover seven languages so we're very pleased.

The way we're building our organization, this is not the end, please – do not think so. I have additional headcounts approved and we are still pursuing to grow the team farther. The way we are pursuing our growth is based on the volume of the growth and the concerns in the community and the areas. So our organization, I'm the Head of the Department and we have a core team we refer to as our Core Registrar/Registry Compliance Team. We are building our staff to be able to address and to be cross-functional and working in any venue as needed based on the volume, based on the urgency, based on the demand.

We also have hired Jack whom we introduced to you earlier. He is coming to us with years of experience in risk and audit management, which is very important.

We don't want to just say we're running audits – why are we doing the audits? Which risks are we addressing? What are we going to do with them? So over the next few months, and we'll keep you updated in the future on how we progress and what's our strategy; but most important is our commitment to keep it going – momentum and delivery.

The fourth category is a gentleman by the name of Paul, and Paul joins us with years of experience not only in performance management and reporting, and dashboard and KPIs, and metrics, you name it he's done it. And so today I can strongly stand here and assure you the team is much stronger and much more capable than it had been since I joined. So we are growing and we continue to deliver to that commitment of growth from the resources. Resources alone are not enough so we have got a lot more things we'll update you on.

The second question that came to us was about updates. If you've ever looked at our Compliance webpage, I don't know how you could have traversed it. It was good, it has good, valuable information – we've worked hard to turn it into a more user-friendly webpage where you can traverse it based on the importance, based on it from a consumer community perspective, not from an ICANN staff perspective. So we've attached the link here and I don't know who's running the show, but if you click on the link, not necessarily today, but you will go to the Compliance webpage. You'll notice we've added lots and lots of information and you have our commitment to keep it updated, up to date.

We also started to deliver a brief – I don't want to call it a newsletter, guys. I want to call them updates even though they fall in the newsletter section. They are very brief today but we are finalizing on some of our reports, because we don't want to just report volume – we want to bring some more valuable data to you and you'll see that in the future.

Now for the next question, Q3 which is Slide 6 and a couple of slides from there, I would like to turn the mic over to Khalil who is the Senior Manager for the WHOIS area and the UDRP. Khalil's been with us for many years; has

worked within the community and knows about it and is leading it, so I'll give him that courtesy. Khalil, are you on the phone?

[background conversation]

Maguy Serad: Okay. So the questions in this space, while Khalil's on mute, are based on the different complaints we received in the 177 category of questions. So we have some updates; some of you who participated in the pre-meeting may have seen a slide or two but we want to dive into some of the areas to give you an update. Khalil?

Khalil Rasheed: Hello, can you hear me now?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We can hear you. Go ahead, Khalil.

Khalil Rasheed: Sorry about that. Thank you, Maguy, and welcome everyone in Costa Rica. One of the things I want to do today in addition to addressing the particular complaints is give a broad overview of Compliance activities during the last trimester as it relates toward accuracy, WHOIS access, and the UDRP. The UDRP doesn't so much touch your group but still it's important to understand what we've been doing.

So with respect to WHOIS accuracy, that's one of primary WHOIS compliance functions – determining whether registrars are actually compliant with their responsibility to take reasonable steps to investigate WHOIS inaccuracies. So if you look at this slide, during the last trimester we received about roughly 9000 or so WHOIS inaccuracy complaints in total. We resolved about 6445 through

the automated compliance processes. This is where complaints are resolved without actual interaction with Compliance staff, so the registrars receive the complaint and the registrars take action in a timeframe where we don't have to be involved, which is the ideal way it should work.

As you may or may not know, when WHOIS accuracy complaints are filed, registrars do not have an obligation to actually contact the complainant and in some cases they can't because we allow through our system some WHOIS inaccuracy complaints to be filed anonymously. It's actually the choice of the complainant. So sometimes or actually most times you will never hear back from a registrar when you file a WHOIS inaccuracy complaint. That's not to say that the registrar has not taken the responsibility and actually resolved it.

In addition, what we're doing is actually [obliging] our WHOIS inaccuracy complaint process to make it more efficient and to streamline our efforts. So what we want to know is whether or not registrars are taking reasonable steps at the front end and not just when Compliance gets involved. This is that less than 25% to 30% where they're not resolved through the system. We want them to show us upfront what steps they're taking to resolve WHOIS inaccuracies, and if you can all go to the next slide, please – I don't think I can.

Another thing that we're doing in our compliance is looking at the volume of WHOIS registrar inaccuracy complaints and where they come from. So we want to address now more the systematic issues related to WHOIS inaccuracy. For years we've sort of just seen them come in, looked at where the registrars have taken their responsibilities and doing what they need to do; but now we're actually trying to find out okay, where is the systematic WHOIS problem located? Which registrar is it and how can we work directly and more effectively with those registrars to address these issues?

Now with respect to complaints and registrars by location, as you can see most complaints still arise in North America and Europe, and that should be no surprise because they have the bulk of the share of domain name registrations. So it may not be totally indicative of registrar WHOIS inaccuracy particularly

since the domain name system is global but we are trying to take a more systematic look and see how we can address this at a core foundation.

Another thing we actually do is look into WHOIS access, if we can go to the next slide, please. So one of the things registrars are required to do, or among the many, is provide access to WHOIS data. There's two primary ways: one is through a Port 43 WHOIS service and another is interactive webpage. What we've tried to do in compliance is determine whether or not registrars are providing this access, and we've tried to get a little bit more creative with how to do it. In 2009 we actually revamped our system and started [pinging] and querying registrar WHOIS service on a daily basis. Since that time we've actually taken them off of standard ICANN-related IP addresses and now we run those queries automatically [to find registrar gaming], etc.

So within this slide what you can see is during this past trimester we detected 29 cases of registrars who appear to not be providing that access through their Port 43 service. And so when we do that we actually have a process which we use to make that determination. If we actually receive a notification that a WHOIS access is down we may not act right away because there may be some other issues that we're [tracking], etc. In fact the next slide sort of speaks to that. But of those 29 cases where we determined there was reason for Compliance to get involved, seven resolved before we even had the opportunity to get involved – meaning WHOIS access was restored via Port 43. Nineteen actually were resolved during our contention process which we've streamlined to make more effective and to thwart registrar gaming.

We still have a few issues that we're working through with registrars but on par and overall we've been pretty impressed with how registrars have provided WHOIS access in light of our enhanced Compliance procedures in this area. If we can go to the next slide it actually explains why sometimes it may appear that registrars are not providing WHOIS access when in fact they actually are. I won't read the slide off but for the benefit of those who are there you can see. So there are several reasons why we won't necessarily get immediately involved

when a registrar appears to not be providing WHOIS access and some of those reasons are listed there.

Moving right along, we also do our UDRP compliance. The UDRP is a policy that registrars must comply with to [forget] trademark infringements. So when an arbitration panel, and there's four of them, have adjudged that a domain name violates or infringes a trademark, the registrar must implement that decision and either transfer the domain name to the trademark holder or cancel the domain name. So we have a specific application set up where when complainants have received favorable decisions that have not been implemented by the registrar, the complainant can come to ICANN and ICANN Compliance will actually take compliance prevention process steps to make sure that the registrar implements the decision or ultimately if they do not issue a breach notice.

I think since I've been in ICANN we have issued two notices of breach for a registrar's failure to comply with the UDRP. During this past trimester we only had 16 cases. Most of those were able to be resolved once we commenced our prevention process and the registrar ultimately implemented the decision. There's also a clause in the UDRP 4K which is designed to respect the jurisdiction of courts throughout the world to the respondents or the alleged infringer: if they receive a non-favorable decision, they can challenge that decision in a court pursuant to the UDRP process. We found in one case that actually did occur where the respondent decides to invoke their right to challenge the UDRP and so that is no longer a Compliance issue when we find that out.

In addition to that we also receive UDRP complaints through our general complaint ticketing system. And 95% of these do not actually relate to UDRP compliance in terms of ICANN-related responsibilities. In fact, our UDRP compliance is very limited to registrars not implementing decisions or registrars not complying with the process. ICANN particularly does not and should not be involved in determining whether trademarks are being violated by domain owners.

So with that said there's one additional thing that I wanted to address and then we can open up for questions now or later depending on what you guys see fit, and that is the registrar website obligation. Under the 2001 and 2009 RAA registrars are required to provide interactive access to WHOIS data via website. However, they can actually subcontract that responsibility but they remain fully liable for fulfilling the obligation to do so. So sometimes if a registrar does not have a direct website that links to another website we've determined that that is actually compliant with the contractual process.

However, registrars under the 2009 RAA, accredited under that one, are actually required to provide a mailing address and an email address on their website. So sometimes you may have to look through which accreditation agreement the registrar is accredited under to understand their responsibilities when it comes to websites. So with that said if there's questions we can address them now or later. I'm out of the room so it's kind of hard.

Maguy Serad:

Khalil, we'd like to hold the questions to the end please?

Khalil Rasheed:

Sure.

Maguy Serad:

So continuing with our general update based on the previous meetings, to keep you informed about our activities. So we talked about additional resources... Now on Slide 13 we want to update the audience about, this slide you've seen in the past but what does it mean to us as a community? I'm not saying ICANN staff – ICANN community. It's basically we're trying to roll out what we call the culture of compliance to everybody. We are all important in this culture of compliance and we are in the phase of doing what we call a pilot phase for self-assessments.

What does that mean? Basically based on the contractual obligations of the different contracted parties we've created a self-assessment questionnaire where we've now finished piloting the registrars', we're closing on the registries' self-assessment. Well, we hope to learn from this self-assessment many things: is the tool doable? Are the questions and the facts being requested clear, understood by all? But also we want to look at it from a Compliance perspective. What kind of data are we getting? What does it look like? How consistent is it? How valuable is it for us to deal with it?

So all this would fall into what we refer to as our audit strategy and our risk strategy, but we're pilot testing this trimester; and before the next meeting, the June meeting, we hope to have a summary to this audience about what was it, what did we learn – lessons learned from this pilot and what are the steps we're taking? Along this line, now slide 14 – again, resources is many things: people, systems, processes, tools.

We are very proud to announce to this audience and across all the different presentations that we're doing this week we have successfully completed a review of our processes across all the different areas of Compliance. This today, if you are familiar with process mapping, it doesn't look like a swim lane and all this – but this is the overall Compliance process. What that means is that no matter what contracted party we're looking at, no matter what provision – WHOIS, UDRP, accuracy – no matter what, the process will follow the same.

We receive through the intake system: it could be a tool, it could be the current systems we have – it could be emails, phone calls. No matter how an inquiry, a notice or a complaint is sent our way it comes through what we call the preventive phase. Again, the preventive phase is about monitoring, audit – looking at what is being reported to us. If it's clear and it's according to the contractual obligations, we follow with what we call the three-step rule. The first step is an inquiry where we ask or we send a notice. Again, it depends on if there's clarity or not. If there's no clarity we send an inquiry for proof and then we pursue it.

The point is that these three steps are clearly defined across all and has been communicated to the contracted parties: We send them an email. We don't hear from them or there's not enough valid response we follow up within that timeframe based on the contractual agreement but sometimes also based on the complexity of the area we're addressing. We follow up with an email and a phone call. We are all bombarded with emails – we don't want to just take that for granted. If by that date we still have not heard, we follow with an email, phone call and a fax.

So we've really addressed the different means of communication with the contracted party. If by the third notice we have not heard we turn this hot potato around in two business days. The team is internally challenging ourselves now on how can we turn this hot item into a breach notice so we can inform the community immediately about what's going on? And our commitment to this community, and it's one of the many questions that came our way, is publishing on the website is one thing but how do you keep it updated? So we've figured it out and we've got the resources focused on maintaining that update.

What you're going to notice in this is under enforcement now, once a breach notice has been issued and the period expired there is no proof of curing the breach or a very minimum effort was done. We have a process that has been developed this past trimester, leveraging a provision in the 2009 RAA where we now do suspension process. Currently there is a registrar to date under suspension and they have a certain very specific timeframe they have to cure the breach by; if not then it will be suspension to termination.

So the idea of this process again, it doesn't matter what area you're coming from, which contracted party – it's following clearly and consistently across. We've standardized all the templates, all the communication – all the things that were asked for. So before we go to the next slide, this area of improvement is going to be most effective in the upcoming meetings where we start reporting to you and we're asking in the process, as Khalil said on the call, for more facts. We looked at our processes: are we being efficient and effective in what we're asking? How many times do we look back and forth before we have facts to

... speak to and make decisions based on? We've moved it all to the frontline and we hope to start reporting and communicating back to the community on this effort.

Pam Little:

Okay, so in this slide I would like to share with the ALAC community how Compliance also plays an important role in policy development and the whole policy process. As many of you who are participating are making policies, basically Compliance's role is implementing or enforcing those policies. So that's a kind of full circle but we are very much involved in the policy development processes as well. For example, many of you might have noticed the IRTP Part B Working Group has actually worked very hard for a long time implementing all the recommended changes.

The changes are going to become effective from June 1st, 2012, in about three months. There are substantial changes there and we have been very involved in that process. We provided the Compliance data to the Working Group, informing them and training on where the problems lie. We were even involved in proposing drafting commenting on proposed policy changes, so that sort of is what, as I said, closes the whole policy cycle. We are very involved from policy development as well as policy change, and then we enforce the policy.

We also were involved in the Fake Renewal Notices Drafting Team's work. Many of you probably will be following that work as well because this was a recommendation coming out of the RAP Working Group. The Registration Abuse Policy Working Group's identified this issue as a threat to the community so the Drafting Team was formed to report to the GNSO on how to address this problem, and we have been working quite closely with the Drafting Team. We responded to their questions, we provided feedback to the options they proposed; we even recommended other options they didn't consider.

The other thing we were involved with was the GNSO's response to the RAP Working Group's recommendation on a meta issue, which is the uniformity of reporting. I think the RAP Working Group recognized different stakeholder

groups, different community groups have different methods of tracking violation or abuse and was trying to explore the need to have some sort of uniformity in that area. And so their recommendation to the GNSO was firstly to request some information from the Compliance Team to find out how the Compliance Team tack and report on contract violation and abuses. So these are just examples to show you we are not only involved in the enforcement of policy but also the policy development process. Next slide, please.

On this slide I would like to share with the community about registry compliance activities. From the demographic there you can see most registries are in North America and in Europe; there's one in Asia. We have contractual requirements for a registry to provide monthly reports and from those reports they provided, you can see in those areas they are all compliant with the DNS availability requirement, the WHOIS availability requirement and providing equal access to all registrars to their shared registration system. And we also have now received during the reporting period, which was September to November 2011 any incident of problem regarding denial of access to a zone file. Next slide, please.

On this slide I would like to share with you the geographic or demographic locations of the source of complaints we received. From October 2011 through February 2012 Compliance received a total of 16,741 complaints and this is the geographic distribution. 1% of complaints we could not really track where they came from. When I say "where they came from" means the complaints were against registrars located in that geographic location/region. Next slide, please.

And this is to give you an overview of the different types of complaints we get. These are really sort of the major buckets of complaints we receive. From this chart you can see out of those 16,000, WHOIS has the most volume of complaints. You can see it has 9500. But we also received a large number of complaints that concerned customer service issues provided by registrars. Those complaints usually we really don't have authority to address, but they are, as you can see over 4000 complaints concerning those issues.

The next biggest item is transfer problems, transfer issues, and as many of you know we spend an enormous amount of time trying to address this area. And there are other areas such as data escrow, UDRP which Khalil touched upon. We also received three complaints from the law enforcement community as well. Out of those complaints in different areas, as Khalil mentioned a lot of them would resolve without Compliance intervention, but sometimes they do require Compliance intervention. And Maguy just introduced to you the three-strike rule.

If we see a potential compliance issue in that complaint we will send the first notice or first inquiry to the registrar, and then gradually move to second and third. And if that doesn't get resolved we have an internal process from preventative unit to the enforcement unit where the enforcement unit will be issuing a breach notice to the contracted party concerned. So we have issued two breach notices in T2, Trimester 2, and one notice of suspension. And you'll see those on our website. We had no termination or non-renewal.

These slides actually sort of go deeper in to show the data about the registrar demographics versus complaints and volumes and where registrars are. There is a detailed description of what this chart means. You will see the first one, let's take for example North America as a region. You can see that region has 95.6 million domain registrations and it received 3939 complaints. The 3939 complaints actually concern registrars in that region and they are, as you will see at the bottom there are 683 registrars in that region but there are 117 complaints concerning those registrars.

So from those percentages you can probably see some sort of trending – where are the most customer complaints, consumer complaints, all those complaints we get most prevalent? And this is one of the things Maguy mentioned – we try to be more creative and more smart in what we do so we can actually identify problem areas or address problems more effectively. Next slide, please.

Again, this is what we just said earlier. I mentioned earlier about transfer being one of the biggest items we receive. So we just aggregate all the complaints into

a tool, we come up with the top five registrars that have the most transfer complaints against them. And we know who they are, we know where they are, and we are doing this so that we can address the problem more effectively – the jargon is like these are the low-hanging fruit. If we can tackle those registrars, help them to understand the transfer policy, their obligations, how to make changes to become compliant, we could reduce the number of complaints and hopefully that would make the consumer or the user experience better. This is what we're doing in terms of transfer.

The next one is about WHOIS. Again, we do a similar thing – we identify who are the top ten registrars where WHOIS inaccuracy complaints are concerned, so these are the registrars. And you can see in T2 the number one received over 1200 complaints. Again, we are addressing this so we can work with these registrars more directly and proactively to identify root causes and address the problem.

So that was just a high level about the key areas we are working on or new initiatives, doing it differently and doing it more effectively. So I'll turn to questions?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much and the floor is open. And I can see many hands coming out, so we'll start with Beau and then we'll have Holly, then Evan and then Garth. So first Beau, and oh, you have to wave it, Cheryl. Go ahead, Beau.

Beau Brendler:

I have three questions; I'll make them brief. I'm guessing, it looks like you do but do you keep historical data and do you use it? And by that I mean what patterns have you identified? I think you may have been alluding to that by that slide where all the names were blocked out by that yellow box. If you could go back to that so we can actually see those names? Next... Yeah. Who are they? Can you take the yellow thing off that slide?

Maguy Serad:

No we cannot because as we shared with you the high-level process, communicating to the public does not happen unless it's an enforcement phase. But to answer your previous question now, as I mentioned at the beginning with the additional staff member [with expertise in this area] we have historical data and we're looking at them.

Beau Brendler:

I still have one more question and that is, it occurs to me that a lot of this stuff – and it looks like what you're trying to do here is very similar to the US Better Business Bureau and how it groups numbers of complaints and analyzes them based on how many have been resolved or whatever. I mean do you do any of that or do you just log numbers? I mean it seems to me that you're talking about a lot of pie in the sky about what kind of data that you're going to collect or that you're hoping to collect, or that you have collected; but not a lot that I hear that talks about what you're going to do with it in a way that makes sense to consumers.

So if you can help or you can suggest any sort of way that we can get some information that looks like “Here are the ten worst registrars for complaints.” That information should be publicly available if it's not. It needs to be publicly available right now.

Maguy Serad:

So I can take the first part of your question, Beau – what do we do with this data? We put the objective of what is it we are doing with the data. Internally we are taking it directly to the contracted party. We are addressing root causes and based on each root cause, whether it's education or it's what is truly a noncompliance behavior we follow the process. And publishing will happen when it's in the enforcement phase. So we are not just reporting... You know, in the past we used to report volume. Now we're looking at the data differently.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. Next is Holly.

Holly Raiche:

I've got two questions. The first is really a clarification of what Maguy said, and that was an intimation that there are sanctions, that the sanctions start with or perhaps almost end with suspension and possible termination. And the reason I'm asking for a clarification is that it's not clear that in the RAA such a sanction as suspension for inaccurate WHOIS data is possible.

The second question I'm really interested in your complaints, because I'm not sure what your actual process is for handling complaints. How would people know to complain directly to you or do they? So where do the complaints come from? Are these complaints made to registrars that you are gathering or is it complaints made directly to ICANN?

Maguy Serad:

So Holly, if I may take your first question; and Matt, Slide 14, please. Complaints come to us in different ways. Usually today we have three systems that people are familiar with. We refer to them as the C Ticket; we have the W Ticket and the UDRP and they each serve a different purpose. Then we also receive emails or phone calls so that's why we call them intake, because this is the current state. And again, it wasn't a question asked of us but we're just trying to bring to this forum but we have short-, mid-, and long-term plans on consolidating the complaints system so we have one tool, one [mean].

Now, regarding the suspension process, the suspension process relates to a breach notice, and I'd like to turn it to Pam to address it in a little bit more detail.

Pam Little:

Sure. So Holly, if I understand you correctly you are asking whether WHOIS inaccuracy, if a registrar is not complying with their WHOIS obligation, would that amount to a suspension as a penalty? As you can see in this chart, all noncompliance follow-up process is the same as for WHOIS inaccuracy. Those tickets will usually come through the WHOIS data problem reporting system –

we call it a W Ticket here, you can see – and then we follow through the three prevention steps here: first notice, second notice and third notice. If the registrar fails to become compliant, you know, in terms of a WHOIS inaccuracy claim every registrar is required to take reasonable steps to investigate the reported claim. So their obligation is just that – to take reasonable steps to investigate.

So if by the third step they still fail to demonstrate that then a notice of breach will follow, and then suspension. So it is not just because it is a WHOIS inaccuracy that we would depart from this process. Does that answer your question?

Holly Raiche:

If the problem is not the inaccuracy; it's that has the registrar taken reasonable steps? And that's the question you ask; and if they fail to then there is suspension is the way it works under the RAA right now.

Pam Little:

Yes, so that's the process. Holly, at the moment we are reviewing the current WHOIS inaccuracy follow-up process. The current process and the cycle we feel is too long so we are in the process of shortening up that follow-up process; and also a very important step we're trying to change is in our first notice to the registrar concerned we will be asking for proof. We are not waiting for the first step of them not talking to us, not telling us what to do. And we are making reference to the contract, the RAA – it's RAA 342 I believe, the registrar data retention obligation; and 343 will be providing such data to ICANN upon request. We're making express reference in the first notice of inquiry to a registrar.

If the registrar then doesn't come back with proof it will be a breach of those provisions as well as a WHOIS inaccuracy, likely. So we want to make it sort of stronger, tighter, to tighten up the process to make sure that we have a more effective follow-up process.

Holly Raiche:

Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. We have a queue in operation since there's so many questions, and yes, Siva, you will be in the queue. It starts with Evan then Garth, Cheryl, Siva, and Beau. So Evan first, please.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi there. This is Evan Leibovitch. I've got a math question, a clarity question and a transparency question. The math question first is on Slide 10 and there's some numbers there, and I'm curious to know how $1 + 15$ adds up to 205.

Khalil Rasheed:

Can I jump in and answer that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes, go ahead, Khalil.

Khalil Rasheed:

The 16 are complaints actually received through a particular application we have for registrars who do not implement UDRP decisions. That's a very specific thing. Now, we also have another general complaint system where a complainant can lodge a complaint about almost anything, and we received 200 plus complaints concerning the UDRP that were categorized by the complainant as UDRP. Now, most of those – of that, probably 95% of that – are actually non-Compliance issues and so that's why they don't appear as the 16 in the chart. But with respect to registrars' obligations under the UDRP we have that application because that's a specific registrar application with the contract. And we monitor that even more closely even though we receive complaints about general things through the other system. Is that clearer now?

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, and it actually leads me into the clarity question which goes on to page 10, Slide 10... or sorry, Slide 6. And I have a question about the noting of 24% being invalid. That bothers me because it doesn't tell me what it's about. Is it irrelevant to Compliance? Was it rejected on technicalities? Was the form not filled out right? 24% is an awfully high amount of complaints to be rejected and I'd like to have a little bit more clarity on what that means about being invalid. Is it out of scope or like what are the reasons under which something is rejected as invalid?

Khalil Rasheed:

So there could be several reasons. One is through our system, when you actually file a WHOIS inaccuracy complaint, the complainant is required to confirm that complaint within a specific amount of time. When that does not happen those complaints are rejected. Also under the RAA there are certain categories of which the registrar must make the data available to the public, it's 3.3.1, and sometimes the alleged inaccurate information is not required to be provided by the registrar under the RAA. Also there are categories of complaints related to WHOIS inaccuracy which actually don't relate to WHOIS inaccuracy but relate to website content, spamming and other things which are not technically WHOIS inaccuracy complaints under the contract.

Our Compliance program is based on the contract which is why it's called the Contractual Compliance Program, so everything we do has to relate back to the contract. And when it doesn't, particularly with respect to WHOIS obligations, it's rejected.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, I'm going to make a suggestion that you break this down a little better because it is an important thing for the community to know that. If there are complaints that may be valid to the community but are outside the exact scope of what you're doing, that's something that ICANN needs to tackle. Maybe it's not within your scope to tackle but ICANN still needs to address it somehow, and if this is something falling through the cracks we need to know about it.

Khalil Rasheed:

We appreciate the feedback, and one of the things that we've done later in this slide deck is offered an email address where people who also have additional feedback in addition to what you've provided can actually send us their thoughts about how we can do things better or maybe we're doing a great job, etc. So please, thank you and again, if before this ends if that email address can be referred to again that'd be good. Thank you for your suggestions.

Evan Leibovitch:

And my last thing has to do with that chart on Slide 16 that has the various stages of compliance; yeah, that one. I'm hoping that you might actually formalize this and say when something is in Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3, Stage 4, Stage 5 and so on so that when you show us those other charts that have the yellow boxes on them where you're not disclosing to us what the problem is, you're also telling us where along – are they on first notice, are they on second notice? Are they on third notice?

And it's not just enough to say "Okay, we can't tell you anything." At least also tell us how far along you are with each of these: have you just discovered it? Have you been around the block with them for five years? These are also important things to know – where in the process is it? And since you've laid this out very well in terms of the procedure and the progress it's important to think also for the community to know that if there is a complaint and if you're actively going to, you know... If you're going to block stuff out with yellow boxes there's also an obligation to try and be as clear to us as possible about this.

And the last thing is just to echo what Beau was saying, that considering the Affirmation of Commitments ICANN to me has a responsibility to err on the side of transparency and frankly, I don't know why you have to wait until breach to publish names. There's a valuable consumer benefit to being able to say "Somebody has received a lot of complaints. They're not yet in breach but it is not a matter of opinion." It is a matter of actual fact that a registrar has

received complaints, and I don't know why ICANN believes that it is in the public interest to withhold that.

[background conversation]

Evan Leibovitch: Instead of having yellow blocks on data.

Pam Little: Okay, yep. So actually we do track what process step we are in in terms of each complainant follow-up ticket. The thinking for us is this: we consider this a self-regulatory model like everyone in this room would recognize that. We feel that it is important for registrars to work with us or for us to work with registrars and give them an opportunity to fix the problems. And in the past, as I just mentioned we are revising the WHOIS data inaccuracy follow-up process, but we have many cases where we don't have communication from the registrar or the complained-against party – we just have the complaint from whoever alleging there's a wrongdoing or whatever. So just for procedural fairness you need to allow the other party to come back to us, tell us their side of the story.

Sometimes we don't have that opportunity yet, and that's why we're revising our process. To say "You might be in breach of IRTP or in breach of WHOIS," but we also want you to provide data under the contract so now we have better clarity. If they don't even communicate to us that is service of breach. So we are trying to tighten up the process. So it's in the spirit of collaboration we feel it's appropriate that we do not disclose the register ID or the identity or registry identity during the preventative informal resolution process. If the community feels that there is a need we'll have to sort of talk about how to address that. There is sensitivity and also consideration about collaboration and the best outcome for all of us.

Evan Leibovitch:

Just a suggestion: even the idea of publishing during phase 3 could be a powerful tool before you engage in breach. Disclosure tends to be a very powerful incentive for people to clean up before you have to go as far as a breach. I'll leave it at that, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, and I think that with regards to the second point that Evan was making, if there is a part of the mission of compliance that needs to be done, that the community feels needs to be done, it might be something that Compliance is not mandated with. And if the mandate needs to be changed then the community might wish to write a statement to ask for that mandate to be changed but we'll cross that bridge when we have to.

Okay, we have a very long list. In fact, I think I'll stop the line here because I see that we've had three people so far asking questions and we've spent 45 minutes already. We've got Garth, Cheryl, Siva, Beau, and Alan. So Garth. Sorry, Holly, you've already had your... Edmon, it's (inaudible).

Garth Bruen:

Thank you, Olivier. So far I like the direction of this. I'd like to see more staff and more process in this area. I just have two questions and I'll ask the first question and wait for the answer, and then ask the second question – and this is Garth Bruen if I didn't say that before.

I have a letter from ICANN Compliance to me from December 2010 and in part this letter says that ICANN will check the websites of registrars before accrediting them under the 2009 contract; and as part of its regular audit schedule will check the websites for compliance. Last night I found ten registrars, all accredited recently who do not have terms, WHOIS address or other contact information on the website. And my question is, is this process actually in effect and how do these registrars keep getting accredited without having a compliant website? And then I'll wait for the second question.

Khalil Rasheed:

So I'll jump in. Two things: the ICANN Compliance Team does not accredit registrars – it's a different team within ICANN so I'm not comfortable if the other teams may not be speaking to that. With respect to the registrars who are failing to provide a website under the 2009 RAA, part of what we do is collaboration. And we receive complaints from community members and that's usually how we take action because sometimes you see things that we don't. So I would encourage you to forward that information to us because I think as you've seen recently we do actually take steps when you send us things.

Garth Bruen:

Okay, thank you. I will of course send these to you but just in reference to the letter, this falls into the proactive area. It seems that it was a proactive program. Anyway, my second question is clarifying Holly's question because it is probably the most important question that's going to be asked maybe at this conference, and I'm going to phrase it very, very clearly. In reference to 3.7.8 of the RAA, is it a breach of the registrar's contract to fail to delete a domain with false WHOIS? And I'm asking this question in the context irrespective of their process for actually conducting an investigation – a simple yes or no would be fine.

Khalil Rasheed:

So although I'd like to give you a yes or no it's not possible for me to engage in a compliance analysis in this particular forum and I'd have to see the specific case, or we'd have to see the specific case to know. As you know, there are now at least two advisories that ICANN issued on the 3.7.8 which is the registrar obligation to investigate inaccuracies, and I would encourage everyone to go and read those closely because it provides a great deal of data on this. So unfortunately it's not possible to answer that question.

Garth Bruen:

The advisory, I've read it thoroughly and it seems to indicate that deletion is completely at the discretion of the registrar and therefore not a requirement or

something that can be issued a breach notice for. And more clarification on that specific question would be appreciated. Thank you.

Khalil Rasheed: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. We'll go down our queue – hopefully shorter questions, shorter answers. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record, and I can't predict the answer but I can assure you the question is short. To the all-popular Slide 14 which is still on the screen, going to the red suspension box – and believe me, I'm a perfect fan of suspension, and anyone who looks at the .au ccTLD will know we have a fairly proactive and public and transparent mechanism for dealing with issues in a ccTLD.

Can I ask, however, as suspension in my knowledge of what's happened before is a relative new thing, what is happening in terms of consumer protection – the registrants who are with the suspended entity during that suspension period? Are names locked? How much risk are we exposing ourselves to with what I think is a very good model, but I'm just a little worried that I might be able to drive a truck through something.

Pam Little: Thank you. Great question, Cheryl. Just before the suspension or soon after the suspension notice is issued we also publish a FAQ for the general public about registrar suspension, explaining what it is about, why the registrar is suspended, and how they will be affected – the consumer. The suspension only prohibits two things: one is the registrar cannot add new names, cannot create new names.

The other thing is they cannot initiate inbound transfers. So all other services and activities will be business as usual.

So existing registrants can still transfer their names, renew their names, and apart from those two activities I described about. So it's effecting really, probably new customers who are likely to be effected. We also require the registrar suspended to publish on their website that they cannot accept any new names on their website, so basically kind of alert to whoever visits their website, like "Hey, we're under suspension – you might want to think twice about registering a name with us." So we are taking measures to make sure we inform the public and the registrar also has that publication on their website, a notice on their website.

If you consider there are other measures that we haven't considered or should consider please come up with suggestions or recommendations and we'll duly consider them carefully.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I think this might be something that the community would like to engage in a conversation amongst ourselves and then get back to you on, but just off the top of my head the concern that in that 30 days, once it's public that the suspension is on and for all the right reasons a registrant wants to move away from the suspended party there is nothing in what I can see that would stop the suspended party from making that transfer extremely difficult. So I think we might need to just be very careful that things can't for example be moved to a sister organization. There's all sorts of clever things that bad actors may be able to do and we might need to have that as a discussion specifically on topic at a future meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Cheryl. We still have three people – I don't know if we can do that, we've got five minutes left. So a very short question and very short answers as well, please. Siva first, then Beau and then Alan.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Sivasubramanian for the record, and the number of complaints issues that ICANN comes to know, is it a true indication of the total magnitude of complaints from customers and the total magnitude of consumer issues? Is there any way by which ICANN could make it possible for a consumer to be directly in touch with ICANN either by integrating an API – a contact API on the registrar’s website so that the consumer could directly file a complaint with ICANN in case his problems are not solved by the registrar?

The other thing is you were talking about in case of suspension making it an obligation for the registrars to display a notice on their websites. But most registrations are done not by the registrar but by the reseller, so are you also making it mandatory for the reseller and that particular registrar to display that their domain name will be registered by a suspended registrar.

Pam Little: No, ICANN doesn’t have a contract with the resellers so we cannot mandate the resellers to do X, Y, Z.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: No, but you could mandate the registrar to say that any domain name registered under the registrar either through the reseller or the direct consent or purview of the RAA.

Pam Little: Sure, but a lot of resellers are actually working with a number of registrars so they might be working with one that’s suspended but others that are not suspended. So it’s kind of a complex ecology there, so at the moment we are not doing that in the reseller space.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, two more questions, one from Beau and one from Alan and then you can go. But make it very quick please.

Beau Brendler: I'll make it as fast as I can. Just in general I'll say that while I see some strides being made here I think that this presentation is unsatisfactory, the answers evasive and clearly outside of the spirit of the Affirmation of Commitments. My question is the Registrar Advisory concerning WHOIS data accuracy, that seems to be referred to a fair amount. We are referring to the document that's ten years old, is that correct? Is that why there are plans in the works to take a look at this particular document and perhaps update it?

Khalil Rasheed: So there are two registrar advisories. One was issued in 2002 and one was 2003. I'm not aware currently of plans to update those documents but I am aware of the WHOIS review team and other efforts within ICANN to address the WHOIS ecology and total scope. So no, there are none. I'm not aware of those.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Khalil. Last question, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. They're not actually questions. Two points: one is a pet peeve of mine which came up when I was working on the PEDNR PDP and I suggested it numerous times. I'm sure there are good technical reasons why you can't do it and I'm sure there's a time lag but I'll say it again anyway: on your complaint form you have a long laundry list of complaints. The software, the web form only lets you select one. That skews your statistics badly because the person submitting the form may not pick the one that you think it fits under, and if they have multiple complaints or they can't categorize it well they may pick the wrong one. Your results are skewed and therefore the decisions you take based on them are skewed.

Figure out how to fix it. I don't know if it's simple or not but figure it out please. That's one, I have another one but I'll let Maguy answer if she wants to.

Maguy Serad:

I'm not going to say we're working on it but I do have the details of the short-term, long-term and the future plans for our systems and that is one of my pet peeves, too.

Alan Greenberg:

I'll continue saying it every meeting until I see it fixed.

Maguy Serad:

Okay, so we'll bring you updates at the next meeting of where we are on that process.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And of course there are ways to ask more questions or have more comments sent over to Compliance, but Evan has a way to do that?

Alan Greenberg:

I just want to add one more that I didn't have on my list until Pam answered a previous question. Can we please never, ever glibly say "We don't have a contract with resellers" when there are often... I mean I understand your issue with multiple registrars who are resellers and all those other issues, but you don't have contracts with resellers – you have contracts with registrars. And you can put in those contracts that they must do things. So that answer just turns the hair up on some of our backs; occasionally it's even valid, I understand.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

We'll organize how the questions will be taken. I just want to close so that we can let Maguy and Pam go. One last quick thing: using the usual Father Christmas story. I'm Father Christmas and my domain name was stolen from

me for various reasons and so on. I go over to the Compliance page and I find out things which mean absolutely nothing to me. I'm an old person having to distribute presents to kids once a year, and when I read things like "If you have a problem with one of the ICANN-accredited registrars you should first write to resolve it with that registrar using the list of all accredited registrars" and the list is darn long. "If you cannot resolve your complaint with the registrar you can address it to private sector agencies involved in addressing customer complaints or governmental consumer protection agencies, or you can click here for more information about ICANN's complaints options," and you see a huge list of things which mean absolutely nothing to me. This needs to be changed, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch:

My last question is an omnibus that will take care of other things: if we as a group collect a series of points and questions of things that have been unasked, because there's a still long list of things yet unasked, will you commit to us here to respond to them in a timely manner in a way that can be redistributed to the community? There is a long list and we can't take care of it now, but we can put it in writing to you.

Maguy Serad:

I think we've had that discussion before in Singapore and Dakar, you sent it to me two days in advance. The Wiki's been open for weeks. We received three questions and 177 from Garth. [laughter] So I think I'm challenging the audience, if I have not responded to your questions it means I have not received it. My pet peeve is the same as Alan's, the same as yours – we still have to work on the content. Please send us your questions but please, no complaining. The complaining window is 8:00 AM to 8:05 AM. [laughter]

We want feedback with facts so we can measure what we're doing. Put yourselves in our shoes. I don't want sympathy; I love what I do. I'm passionate in what I am but please give us specifics so we can work on it. Garth gave me specifics. Now, I'm not committing to answer every letter Garth sends

me with all the bulk complaints because our system cannot handle that today, but I've taken that as a feedback for the new tool so we can keep the complainant up to speed on where we are. So to answer you, send me your question with facts please so we can get to you with an answer.

Thank you very much; always a pleasure to be with you. I know it's hard to please everyone, I'm not here to please – it's not a competition of pleasing. It's a competition of the ICANN community, and I really welcome your feedback. I'm passionate like I said but just help us get better. Help us to serve this community. We're on the same team. Thank you again and good luck for the rest of the week.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Pam, Khalil, Maguy – thanks very much.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And so the Wiki page will remain open but what Evan has just suggested is that we might have a shepherd that will remind people on filling this. How would you envisage this, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch:

Well, as of right now everybody's got questions that are fresh in your mind right now. Having seen the slide show, having seen some of the discussion, while you have these questions fresh in your mind we need a way to collect these, to summarize these and to be able to submit them in writing after the fact so that they get dealt with. So rather than waiting and saying "Go for the Wiki" or whatever, I'm suggesting right now in real time while you are thinking about it at this moment collect your thoughts and questions and send them to...what? If my mailbox is the answer to this that's fine – I just think it's something.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. There's actually a page already up right now where members were supposed to have posted their questions in advance. Rather than do that we can use it right now for members to post their thoughts and their questions right now. And then for the next meeting we already have it written down and I can do the hyperlink and it's already done.

Evan Leibovitch: So picking up on what Matt said, please, if you've got things right now that are fresh in your mind having just heard the discussion, we've still got the slides up here – if you want to make reference to them – put them on the Wiki and I'll commit to assembling them and getting them off to Maguy.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so we are now running late which is quite customary. We have to move on to the next thing on our agenda and that is the At-Large Events Roadmap with a quick discussion and next steps. Can I ask, Matt, do you have this in the machine? Can you put this on the screen please?

Okay so whilst the page loads just a quick background on this. I refer everyone of course to the events roadmap being the roadmap that was put together in order to somehow show how we were going to organize ourselves in the next few years and basically provide a forecast to ICANN Finance as to what our future needs are going to be, because it seems that every year we go to them and show them what we are going to require – whether we're speaking about capacity building or general assemblies or other things such as the Summits, like the Mexico one. They look and say "Oh, but we don't know how to forecast these things."

So basically we put together a roadmap and if we can scroll down... Do I have control of this? Oh, I do. So I'm not sure if all of you have seen this roadmap – I know that members of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee have. And it basically looks at the next four years, five years – and when I say years it's fiscal years, and you have to remember a fiscal year is from July to July? Thank you, Tijani – it's from July to July. And you then see the forecast of when we would be requiring or we would be asking, rather, for funding for General Assemblies and looking at the different cycles of the regions and where the ICANN meetings are bearing in mind that it has been agreed that it would be best to conduct General Assemblies in the ICANN meeting taking place in that region.

So I realize that looking at the screen it is very small for people to see. I do hope that you've got the link, that you've clicked on the link and you've been able to look at this. The forecast is that we would be having a General Assembly, so let's see... There was Africa and there's been one asked for in North America. There is also one which is asked for in Europe I believe. Anyway, the Roadmap itself is a document which has been put together to discuss the future with ICANN Finance. So I don't know if anyone wishes to discuss this in detail or if there is any worth in looking at specific points on there. I know that Tijani had a few suggestions on this. Of course we're basically just putting on an Excel work document the discussions which we have had in the past of having a General Assembly is it once every two times in a region?

So each region would basically get a General Assembly, a face-to-face General Assembly once every five years; and there would also be a Summit once every seven years. And that was something which was discussed a very long time ago on this. It was just a way to map this on the Roadmap. The floor is open for discussion... It looks as though there are less volunteers to discuss this than for the Compliance part which is always a very successful session and always very close to heart with people. I see Tijani wishes to comment. Go ahead, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you, Olivier. The prediction that Olivier talked about now seems to be really feasible, but if you make the count you will have in seven years one General Assembly per region plus one Summit. That means two Summits since one General Assembly per region is one Summit in terms of the cost. So we may think about a periodic Summit of three or four years. It is less complicated to implement but as Olivier said, perhaps they will not accept this kind of proposal because they will look at it as very costly – each operation is very costly. So if you give them only one General Assembly per year it will not be as costly as one Summit each three or four years. So it is another way to look at it, and I think both are feasible but the most simple is to work with Summits, periodic Summits for a period of four years, for example.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Tijani. Any thoughts about this? Sergio?

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Thank you, Olivier – Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. I was thinking about Tijani's proposal. I think it is important to make a sustainable proposal within each region, and this three- to four-year period is okay because if not we will have a seven-year span in between and many of us will not be able to participate. I look at myself in seven years and probably I may be working on these processes, but maybe a colleague of mine is going to take my place and I would like to see all of you more often. So I believe this three-year span is important and it is also important for us to propose something to ICANN that is feasible for them, that ICANN finds doable – otherwise, we always put them between a rock and a hard place and on the other hand, we will be aggravated because we also have the right and they also believe that they have their own rights.

So I believe that this three- to four-year period for a Summit is feasible. It's an opportunity for us to meet face-to-face and get together to have all the RALOs have this common synergy, and that is really important. Thank you, Chair.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Sergio. I see Alan having put his hand up. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

If you go back in history long enough, and some of us unfortunately go through the history, the concept that we came up with several years ago was that we would try to do five Assemblies in three years and that the following three years we would have no Assemblies but have a Summit somewhere in that period, perhaps picking it to minimize the travel costs which of course are significantly higher than regional Assemblies because four-fifths of the people come from some other region.

That was a nice plan except up until this year or maybe not yet we were so unsuccessful in getting money even for regional Assemblies on a predictable basis that it was hard to try to set in long range plans. We're still not in the position until we see the results in this coming budget year to know whether we're anywhere close to having five regional Assemblies in three years at the current rate; it looks like the best we'll do is five regional Assemblies in five years unless we have been successful in our application.

So I think first we have to establish the regular annual funding at a reasonable level that is enough for what is it, one and two-thirds Assemblies per year on the average; and then we're in a position to say "Let's bank the money" which ICANN tells us they're going to get all the principles for to do the Summits. Otherwise if we try to do a Summit right now I think we're going to have to put all our eggs in one basket and get... Getting that approval will almost cut off our money for an untold number of years afterwards, and I think we have to be careful we don't do that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Alan; so I hear it will take some time for the cultural shift to take place. Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the record. Just a few comments in terms of future planning and that sort of thing. I have a suggestion: in terms of the RALO Summit in terms of RALO Summits, if it were possible in terms of future planning to coordinate with if it's the regional NOGs or the regional IGFs or regional ISOC meetings or something like that, to have things back-to-back only in terms of convenience, shared costs, everyone's converging; and at the end of the day we'll all benefit. And it's also outreach as well from an At-Large perspective.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sala. It's a very laudable suggestion. Such suggestions have been made in the past. If you wish to have even less of a chance of having Assemblies taking place that's the path to take, I'm afraid, because it's been frowned upon for some reason by ICANN. And it's a bit of a religious thing rather than anything else. And by "religious" of course, there are things that are unexplainable and this one is totally unexplainable but there you are. The world is sometimes unfortunate. Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter: Sandra Hoferichter for the transcript record. It's really a pity to hear that, Olivier, that there are religion constructions about this because in Europe we are quite successful combining the General Assembly with the European dialog on internet governance. And it could be as Sala mentioned really, really cost saving; and it's a great outreach tool. And Wolf and I... It's not? I thought he was going to agree with me. It could be a thing to develop, and maybe we should try to go on with this effort and to overcome the hurdles.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sandra. Wolf and then Sala.

Wolf Ludwig:

A direct comment. Maybe most of you realize that I hate to contradict Sandra, but in this case I have to because there are two aspects involved. EuroDIG, as Sandra rightly said, is a perfect outreach opportunity for EURALO, and it has strengthened EURALO's credibility, the reputation of EURALO considerably because EURALO was one of the founding members of the success story of EuroDIG. But it was a necessity that we used the EuroDIG as an opportunity.

According to our bylaws we are forced to organize one General Assembly per year and as we hadn't had any support from the ICANN side since 2009 we used once an IGF in Europe in Vilnius in 2010 and last year we used the EuroDIG in Belgrade. And this year we will use EuroDIG in Stockholm for our General Assembly but only a small portion of members can afford it. So this is not a real face-to-face meeting, and sorry to say or to insist but it leaves ICANN a little bit out of its responsibility and as we couldn't convince Microsoft or any major donor in the world to give us \$20,000 so it's on a volunteer level for only the few people among our ALSes who can afford it.

And I would wish that next year, at least 2013 we might have a chance to organize our first face-to-face General Assembly four years later after Mexico. And I can tell you the motivation among our members decreased considerably. There is a lot of frustration in the community, and it's one thing to inject new members but very challenging for the EURALO at the moment is keep the old members active and involved. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Wolf. I think you're preaching to the converted. We all agree but others don't seem to. Thanks for repeating it; it's good to get it on the record. Sala and then we'll have Tijani and Fatima. But first Sala.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. We had this discussion within our RALO, within APRALO, and we acknowledged that for this particular budget, well, it's impossible. But I was making the comment in terms of future preparations and

that sort of thing. Having said that, one of the things we're discussing in APRALO is that we would want to host it alongside an Asia-Pacific regional IGF and I'm happy also to report that there's very good support – good support from various people from the private sector and that sort of thing, even in terms of the Pacific. And I'd just like to welcome Maureen who's sitting in the back there from Cooke Islands, who's the Chair of PIC ISOC and the Chair of an ALS within APRALO. She struggled a really long way to get here.

And the good news is even within the Pacific we're actively planning a meeting, and this was actually initiated, believe it or not, in the ccNSO, by some of our members in the ccNSO within our region who are supporting capacity development; and that's scheduled to happen sometime in May. And so the At-Large community, or the reps from APRALO who live in the region will gather and converge and we're looking at 22 countries and territories within the Pacific. And whilst at the moment there's technically one ALS we're hoping to develop the capacity. Yes, and so with that thank you, Mr. Chair.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Sala, and next is Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you; Tijani speaking. The disadvantage of holding General Assemblies outside ICANN meetings besides those enumerated by Wolf and the others – there is also the fact that we will not make use of the facilities of ICANN meetings such as interpretation and other things. Another thing that we need to think about is it is a pity that when we do a General Assembly people may not have the opportunity to attend an ICANN meeting at the same time. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Tijani. Next on the list is Fatima Cambronero.

Fatima Cambroneró:

I'm going to be brief because everybody said what I meant. Last year when the IGF was organized in the Caribbean Region we requested ICANN funds for an outreach event together with a pre-IGF, and we couldn't get the funds from certain members of LACRALO. So this year we are planning as a Plan B to somehow celebrate our LACRALO GA together with our regional IGF but we don't know which venue we'll have. But I don't know the reasons for this; somehow it seems to be a resistance in joining us or in joining ICANN and the organizers of the IGF and I don't understand why because we are all the same people working and participating for the same purposes. So perhaps we might be able to articulate all this so that we come out with certain results. That's all; thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Fatima, and perhaps that would be as an action item a question that the ExCom could ask the high authorities that come and visit it on the Friday afternoon after the meeting because it is a question which I haven't had any answer for and goodness knows how many times we've asked it from various people in ICANN and maybe it's time to ask it again – why? Why can we not do outreach the way outreach should be done? So do you wish... So the action item is to ask whoever will come and visit us on Friday afternoon, everyone who will come and visit us why is outreach not possible or funded outreach not possible in places outside of ICANN? And I guess outreach can only be done anyway in places outside of ICANN so the question doesn't make sense, but I'm sure you can design a question that will work in this way. Do you wish to add anything? Go ahead, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

I don't agree with this action item because it is not preferable to make General Assemblies outside of the ICANN meetings.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Tijani, it doesn't relate only to the General Assembly. It relates to the actual funding of anything that takes place outside of ICANN walls that we could use for outreach. And I think that you do agree with this since you have made requests in the past several times and have ended up paying with your own pockets. Okay, so now that this is clear I think we can move to the next part of our agenda, and we're only slightly – 50 minutes – late. It's Carlton who's going to be able to provide us with a quick feedback on the WHOIS process.

I can't even use the right name for this... At-Large Perspective on WHOIS. So Carlton, you have the floor.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Chair. Tijani, you will recall in speaking to WHOIS this morning, when asking for your attention to the draft statement on this WHOIS Review Team report, I mentioned that there are several aspects to WHOIS that we have been tracking in our own interests. There is the issue of the WHOIS dataset itself, which is to say what are the pieces of data that is required of the registrars to collect for WHOIS compliance? And secondly, there is an issue of access to that data; and the third is of course really the nexus of access and compliance of data, which is to say the privacy and the proxy issues.

I have been looking at this deeply since about 2008 but my colleague, Alan Greenberg, has been at it probably longer than anybody else. And Alan is our liaison to the GNSO. The GNSO as you know sees itself as being the predominant player in policy development in the ICANN world, and as GNSO Liaison they have been looking at some of the WHOIS issues, which tends to form part of our perspective. I have asked Alan to speak to you on the issue of the At-Large perspective to the WHOIS particularly in terms of what is happening on the GNSO side. Alan, you have the floor, sir.

Alan Greenberg:

Just a correction: the GNSO sees itself as the predominant player. The GNSO is the player according to ICANN bylaws of establishing gTLD policy, so that's

not subject to debate. I should point out that is not, despite what some people on the GNSO Council think, that is not the only thing the GNSO can do but it has sole domain over that because to establish policy there are certain implications of under what conditions the Board can approve something or not approve something, and some policy issues do have to go through the GNSO – gTLD policy issues.

Now, on WHOIS, there is a long history of not being able to come to closure. There was a PDP a couple years ago which failed abysmally to be blunt. There are a whole bunch of other efforts going on. Some of them are going on because various players in the game felt that there was no way to come to closure eventually without for instance having hard data, so there are a number of studies going on, some initiated by the GNSO. The GAC itself made a request for a long list of studies which were incorporated into that list. The studies that the GNSO is involved in right now or has sponsored, we're talking about a half a million dollars in study work so it's not inconsequential. The WHOIS Review Team has also done a study of its own, of course independently.

One of the issues that comes out is an intriguing one, and it's actually something that was going to be discussed at the GNSO/Board meeting that I had to walk out of to be here so I don't quite know how that one – I don't think it was finished but I don't know how it went. The Affirmation of Commitments says that there must be review teams and the Board must implement the results within a year or something like that. That's fine on the transparency one because that's wholly within the Board's domain. On WHOIS, under our bylaws the Board cannot unilaterally take action on some of those issues so it's not clear how the Review Team's results are going to get implemented in some cases and there's a lot of process we need to think about. The AOC I don't believe was written in full cognizance of what our bylaws say for we do things.

All of that says... Does Mikey want to speak or is he just waving? Okay. All of that says that there's a lot of things going on right now in parallel. One would like to think that within a year or so from now it will all have coalesced into a nice, simple pattern which will result in good stuff. I'm not quite sure I or

anyone else understands exactly how we're going to get from here to there. I also know that very few of us have a stomach for having this continue for the rest of our lives so somehow we're going to have to fix this, and there are enough external influences – the fact that there was a WHOIS Review Team included in the AOC gives you some indication of the belief from the outside world that this is a problem which ICANN better fix if ICANN is going to continue to survive and either pretend or actually be in control of the things that it has scope over.

I'm not sure I can say anything clearer than that. The whole situation is about as clear as a very muddy river right now. It will hopefully get better. There's a lot going on. I sent I think to the At-Large list and the ALAC list the other day a list of GNSO projects, which lists some of them. You're clearly aware of the WHOIS Review Team and all you have to do is go to the ICANN homepage or listen to our Compliance discussion from our previous session and know that WHOIS accuracy is not something which is going to be ignored. Heaven knows whether we're going to fix it properly but it's not going to be ignored. So does that give you the summary you wanted? I'm not sure there's a lot of clarity there, and if you're confused that means you're starting to understand.
[laughter]

Carlton Samuels:

I was about to say that that is exactly what it is because it's confusing everywhere. But there are two things that come out of this. The WHOIS Review Team is proposing that what we should have first and foremost is a comprehensive WHOIS policy, and when they say policy it means that it goes through the GNSO wringer to come out a policy on the other side. There's a whole set of issues that they feel that could be addressed within the RAA itself, a contract; and there are some that they feel will require PDPs to be developed.

We tell you this because the complexity of the WHOIS issue and where it breaks down along [whether or not its policy gets along] is a contractual situation. It's still in play and there is no general agreement, and even where those two things

kind of begin and end. So the At-Large, in defining an At-Large perspective there are a couple of things that we in At-Large have come to agree on, and I'll talk about them after I go back to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I have a question for Mikey first. The current UDRP sets of PDPs, when did that start? My recollection is that it's close to 2004 or 2005 that the process started which is triggering as we speak new PDPs – the initial review of the UDRP.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey O'Connor from the IRTP.

Alan Greenberg: Not the UDRP, sorry – the IRTP.

Mikey O'Connor: I figured that's what you were talking about. I think it started in 2006 or '07.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I started in '06 and it was already on the way, so it was at least '06. The point I'm making is these things take a long time. On IRTP we had the wisdom – I say “we” because I really wasn't part of the decision – to break things up into the multiple pieces, and I think we're going to see the same in WHOIS. I was part of a discussion just before we came into this meeting on another issue related to policy, and Bruce Tonkin who used to Chair the GNSO before he went on to the Board pointed out that a policy can be simple or a policy can be detailed. In IRTP the policy can say “Registrants should have the right to transfer domains.” That's it – we now have a policy, or it can be in excruciating detail and it takes a long time to work out the detail.

I suspect what we're going to find in WHOIS is we're going to come up with a policy that's simple and then start working on the details, and hopefully not in a single piece because we'd never finish that. So that's how I see it coming out – whether that's the way the world will unfold I don't know; but just like IRTP, which is a subset of a subset of things, has taken a huge amount of effort to try to get right and fix the problems that we see, I don't think WHOIS is going to disappear overnight. But we need a road plan, a route map of how to get there and that's what I'm optimistic will come out of this current process.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you. Let me say that is a good segue into what I wanted to say, because I believe that if you look at it from a policy perspective, from an ALAC perspective, the simple policy statement that I believe we should support is to say that the objective of the WHOIS still remains and we should have it – that's the first statement. If you look at what the objective was it was simply this: registrars are supposed to collect certain pieces of information from registrants. And that information, once collected, must be kept in a specific place and it must be available freely – that's what it says, period.

If you're going to articulate policy along there and give them the whole conundrum about a dataset and access and all these things, then if you start with a simple policy and then allow over time to develop the more detailed set connected to that I think that'd be a reasonable and rationale way to go about it and I suspect that that would be what the ALAC would wish to support in terms of policy.

Fatima, you wanted to say something? You have the floor.

Fatima Cambronero:

Thank you, Carlton – a question. It is something that I am not understanding. The WHOIS Review Team, when they carried out their function they determined that throughout all their documentations where revised they didn't have a policy related to WHOIS on the part of ICANN. So what I don't

understand is the At-Large position, if there is a position; or do you recommend a PDP for WHOIS, or how are you going to manage this issue? What is ALAC's position about this issue? Thank you very much.

Carlton Samuels:

...agrees with the Review Team's perspective that there should be a defined ICANN policy on WHOIS. We're making it one step further here and saying that our approach to defining that policy is let us recommend starting with a simple one, and then move through that – so a simple policy statement that says “WHOIS is required, period,” and then we move through it. Alan is next in line; he wants to say something.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah, I think we have to be careful with the pronouncement from the Review Team that there is no policy. What they're saying is that there is no centrally-located, easily-findable policy all in a single place. There's lots of policy: some of it is in the form of terms of contracts which de fact become policy because they have to be followed by the various contractors. There is various pieces of consensus policy that has been written, but it's not all unified in a central place where we can say “WHOIS policy.” So it's a little bit of a confusing statement in that we have plenty of WHOIS policy; it's just not all easily located and findable, and some of it is not well-defined – there's no doubt about that part.

So I think part of it is going to be to gather together the various documents and put them in a central depository organized in some reasonable way so that we can at least understand what we do have and what we don't have. We shouldn't get too carried away by saying “We don't have a WHOIS policy” – we have many WHOIS policies, many bits of WHOIS policies.

Carlton Samuels:

What I read them to mean is like you say, there is no single, overarching document that says “Here is a perspective that we are defending and we are pushing forward – that's what we really mean.” As I pointed out, we are happy

with, if you look at the statement that we wrote, we're happy with the fact that the contract: WHOIS right now, most of it is contractually obliged. And we're happy with that because as far as we're concerned the contracts themselves ought to be within the purview of the entire community agreeing on what those should be.

So that's how we backed into that. We said "Fine, we see them. The WHOIS is in contracts right now in the RAA – most of the elements that we will be concerned with are subject to RAA compliance. But we ourselves don't necessarily believe that there is a policy." What we're always saying is that if we agree that the contracts themselves are to come from this consensus policy position that is ICANN, then it's fine. Holly, can I ask Holly first?

Holly Raiche:

Can I first add that I think we've got to be careful in stopping equating WHOIS with just the GNSO because there's a whole big issue with some of the ccNSOs as well. So it will be useful to say "There is an overarching ICANN policy about WHOIS data, and although ICANN has contractual obligations and responsibilities in relation to the GNSO, it would be nice to think that the ccNSO took some note of it because I think it's a much larger issue. And I think the other piece that's missing is the debate that we had today, and I know it was in the conference call yesterday – and that is the issue of compliance. What do we mean by compliance and how do we actually enforce it?"

Carlton Samuels:

Alan and then Evan.

Alan Greenberg:

Just in relation to Holly, I think when we're talking about WHOIS right now we are talking about gTLD WHOIS. Now, whether or not we should be talking about the wider one and to what extent ICANN has any ability to enforce it or even recommend it – interesting questions. I think it's useful to think about how we got to where we are today, okay. We have all sorts of things related to

WHOIS that are in contracts; we have other things where WHOIS is silent, where we have never put it into words. We have the major problem as discussed in our previous session or a session or two ago of there are aspects of WHOIS that are well defined and totally ignored – compliance is one of those actually. And really, the challenge is to put it all together in a way that makes some sense. We have to unify and bring together the parts we have, we have to fill in the gaps and then we have to make sure we actually follow the rules that we’ve just written.

And lastly, remember as we’re writing rules there are competing issues here. We have privacy versus access to information that are just butting heads, and we are going to have to make compromises in some cases; in other cases we’ll have to have convoluted rules because we do have competing issues that cannot be ignored. All of the issues are important to ask parts of our community.

Carlton Samuels:

Yes, sir. I’m going to again remind you that the draft statement of the WHOIS Review Team is up there, and if you notice, most of those issues were taken up in that draft statement. Holly has made one recommendation that was missing and I thought it would be useful to add to it. Holly, please add it so that everybody can see what you’re talking about – I think it makes sense to have that there.

And we have to finalize the statement this week for voting, so in the event that you look at the statement and you think that it does not pretty much cover everything that we should say please make sure that you put it up there and then we will try our best to incorporate it into the statement before it gets to ALAC. Evan, you want to say something and then I think the Chair wants back his gavel.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, I just wanted to expand on what Holly had said earlier. This is not the G-ALAC, this is the ALAC. We have an oversight over everything that ICANN

does and although it doesn't have authority over every ccTLD at least perhaps it has an obligation to publish standards; and even if they can only be optional standards, something that would make at least a best attempt to keep everything in line.

Carlton, as Chair and producer of the statement, right now if I recall correctly it doesn't go into cc's – it basically deals with generics at this point, am I correct?

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: In the short term is it worth examining the [high ratio] or is that just something we should keep going as a higher goal? There's an immediate issue of this statement to go out but I also want to make sure that we don't lose track of the fact that ALAC has a bylaw mandate to look over all of ICANN and not just the g's.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I think it's perfectly reasonable for us to aspire to the higher level goals. This statement was really in response to the ATRT report. It might be useful for us to add a paragraph or something to talk about the aspirational objectives.

Holly Raiche: I'm happy to do that. It can only be high level but it should be that this should be an ICANN policy and there should be some kind of encouragement for ccTLDs to actually look at, well country codes often look at the possibility of their own policies in relation to WHOIS accuracy. I mean I don't think there's anything more we can say at this point but at least to flag that down the track we're looking at it.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Holly, thank you – that’s exactly what I was referring to in this statement that we had a conversation about. We have to pass it back to the Chair; Chair, you have the gavel.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton, for running this part of the session, and I gather that the follow-up will be for the statement to be finalized and voted on by the ALAC at the end of this meeting during our wrap-up session. Is that correct? Yes? Okay.

Right, well thanks very much. We are actually on time or we are just seven minutes behind. We are closing this session and we will start again in thirty minutes, at 16:00 or just less than thirty minutes – so 16:00. Please don’t be late because we still have so many things to go through and Kurt will be coming so we don’t want him to wait. He has very little time as well so.... Okay, thanks very much. We can stop the recording.

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...The time is pretty late or pretty early depending on whether you’ve just woken up or not. It’s 16:06 at the moment and we have the blessing of having the part of ICANN At-Large Capacity Building, Participation and Engagement Part II to deal with. And first is the ICANN Outreach Initiative and the role of At-Large by Kurt Pritz, the Vice President of Stakeholder Relations who is with us. And next to him is Janice Douma Lange who is going to also speak to us. But first we’ll start with Kurt, and Kurt, you have the floor.

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, Olivier. On behalf of Janice and I thanks very much for having us to talk about this. This is a... Let me just get set up here. So this approach to

outreach is an attempt at providing one way of looking at outreach for ICANN, to help ICANN participants identify initiatives and if they want to get funding support for them, get funding support; and quantify the benefits that are coming out of these activities. So it's meant to be a tool for you to use in order to identify activities that you might want to undertake to further the goals of ICANN.

So first, the first slide – so is that as big as it gets, Matt? So for those of you not here the slide is far. It's not far away from Cheryl...

[background conversation]

Kurt Pritz:

Thanks. So outreach fundamentals: first, we all know the reason we're all here is that ICANN's success depends on a robust multi-stakeholder model which succeeds through robust and increased participation and the ability of those participants to contribute to ICANN in a meaningful way. And so what's outreach? Outreach means so many things to so many different people, but maybe we shouldn't try to define the term "outreach" – I'll slow down for the interpreters. We shouldn't try to define the term "outreach" but rather define what we hope the outcomes of outreach will be, and that is encourage participation in the ICANN model; encourage more effective participation in the ICANN model by building capacity. Outreach initiatives should be measurable in some way and if you do all those things it will contribute to ICANN's success and the multi-stakeholder's model success. Next slide, please.

So like I said, instead of trying to define the term "outreach" itself we seek to identify it through its objectives. And then what's hard for ICANN and all of ICANN's different organizations is to coordinate all these different activities and requests for activities in a way that's effective and economical. So one of the objectives of this outreach tool is to provide a way to measure investment decisions, so what activities should be undertaken by ICANN staff; what

activities are better placed with ALAC; what activities are better placed with other organizations within ICANN? So that is what this is meant to do.

So what's the definition of "outreach?" We're going to try to define it through its objectives, and so these are going to go really fast, ready? It's going to make it snappy. [laughter] Next one.

So ICANN's all about the people. It's the people here and the people sitting on the phone and those that participate in ICANN that make the ICANN model work, and they make it work by participating in different ways. They can be observers – that was too fast but just leave it there. They can be observers, they can come to ICANN meetings and contribute by speaking in the microphone; they could be leaders or facilitators like chairing an advisory committee, chairing a working group, facilitating a working group discussion; or we've kind of coined this term, they can be "ambassadors" – they can on their own go out into the community and solicit the participation of others in ICANN and proselytize others to the ICANN model.

And so what's the outcome? One outcome of ICANN is increasing participation in the model, so an outreach activity should get people into the model – whether they get them in as observers say through the Newcomer's Lounge or the Fellowship Program, or are contributors such as experts. We recruit some leaders through our solicitation for people to be on, say, the GNSO Council or even ambassadors. And then another outcome of outreach should be to make those participants more effective, so we call that kind of moving people up from being observers to being more effective contributors or becoming leaders and so on.

So one outcome of outreach is to get people in; another is to move them up, to make them more effective. And there's many different avenues to participate in ICANN. So each one of these organizations across ICANN, whether it's ALAC or the ccNSO or a GNSO stakeholder group provides an opportunity for participation; and not only do we want to get people into these organizations but we want to move people to participate in all regions so we want to solicit

contributions in all regions. So if you combine those two you come up with this fairly big matrix of opportunities that there are to participate in the ICANN model. But it's also necessary for ICANN to populate each one of these little columns, whatever you want to call them, and so...

So it's about moving the right number of people into each one of these columns. It's not getting a lot of people in – what's the right amount of people for each one of these columns, and then moving people up; the up arrows are really tough to see but moving people up in each one of these. So when you have each one of these columns percolating in the right sort of way I think you have a really vibrant multi-stakeholder model. The purpose of outreach we think is to move people in and move people up.

But moving up is a good thing but not necessary. Any vibrant organization needs people at all levels, so we need people who observe, we need contributors. So we're not trying to attach a stigma with not moving up; we want to enable those who want to move up and become more effective contributors or leaders to be able to do that – we want to facilitate that. And so we want to make sure that this model is tempered with that sort of thinking. Nothing blocks you from achieving as much as you want in ICANN.

So that's kind of the model for outreach, so what the heck do we do with it? Well first I think we should develop an activities inventory – so what are all the activities in ICANN? And I'll tell you from an ICANN budgeting standpoint when we budget internally, a lot of department heads come in with their budget for the year and they say "This much money for outreach." So we face the same issue as the broad community – we need to inventory our activities and then test each one to see if we're going to label this activity outreach does it get more people into ICANN participating? Does it make them more effective contributors?

And then I think it's for all of us to coordinate all those activities once we have an inventory. We want to eliminate redundancies and we want to find the best home for them – who's the best, where's the best home for conducting this

activity? And then finally, very importantly, in that great big set of columns where are the blanks? Where are we not doing a good job of moving people in or where are we not training our future contributors and leaders?

So I want to give you some examples. I think one of the outcomes of recent ATRT – Accountability and Transparency Review Team – suggested improvements was to change our comment form, so if we did a good job of that we’ll turn observers into contributors because people will not only read our stuff but they’ll say “Oh, it’s easier to contribute now because I have this comment form, I understand how it works.” So that new comment form if effective will turn observers into contributors. Increased translation, or maybe not increased but more effective translation or use of plain English and avoidance of acronyms will welcome new observers. People won’t read the ICANN website and say “I can’t understand any of that,” either because they don’t speak the English that the writing is in or because the acronyms are in no known language.

The Fellowship Program I think turns observers into contributors because it provides training and education, gives them a broad exposure to the different available channels in ICANN in which to participate; and it targets various SOs and ACs. And I’ll confess this – this is kind of a dated presentation a little bit but it begs the question how are we training our leaders? There’s some limited effort into this but ICANN’s outreach activities I think, other than what I briefly described in Fellowship, really tries to welcome people into ICANN but we haven’t done much yet as far as growing new leaders or making people more effective contributors. It’s those that are good at it sort of rise, but we don’t really facilitate that rising in any way through a specific activity.

So where do we go from here? I think staff certainly needs to, in its budgeting exercise needs to complete its activities inventory but we also want to try to complete one across the company – what is our outreach of inventory activities – and get them into one list, and that’ll enable us to do some coordination among the different ICANN operations and the different community groups in order to determine where that should be done. And finally we hope this will be used as a tool to make proposals for outreach activities. It’s not meant to be a roadblock

to stop proposals for activities; it's meant to be a roadmap to provide a guide for entities when they want a budgeted activity or an unbudgeted activity – a way to propose it to say that “We think this is helping ICANN accomplish its mission because it's moving people in and moving people up and providing some metrics to that – what kind of new people do we describe?” Where on that big complicated matrix are we filling blanks that haven't been filled in? That would be really attractive I think, and what's the right amount of participation there.

So that's the sort of tool we've developed and thanks for listening to me for 13 minutes. And I welcome any questions.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Kurt, and I immediately see hands waving around. And I see one very far away and that looks like it's Cheryl all the way down the table. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Kurt, I like the graphics and I think they're very friendly and we're able to... I can take this into any language and it's meaningful work. I'd love to see, so this is more of a comment than a question: I would love to see another slide in that deck that indicates that percolation through all of that is okay, too – that there is not always upward movement; that an ambassador indeed can fit into some other, and it might be in another part of ICANN. I've dealt with volunteers for...Well, that's an awful lot of years that I'm not even going to put into the transcript record, and some organizations manage valuing experience at all levels and getting people to move horizontally as well as vertically better than others.

And with ICANN's multi-stakeholder model we have both challenges and opportunities, and I think if you can get another graphic that says that's okay and in fact is encouraged that would be a good thing. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: This is Kurt. So we have Janice to thank for the graphics, and so that's a very good suggestion and we have actually discussed that. We thought that might make it a little unpretty, the graphics, but no – I've got your point exactly, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Kurt. Next we have Andrew Mack.

Andrew Mack: Thank you, Andrew Mack for the record. Thank you very much. I wanted to echo something that Cheryl kind of alluded to, which is that one of the things that I'm noticing in the community and how we participated in the JAS is this kind of sense of volunteer burnout – yeah, right. It is a real challenge and especially for some of these longer-term programs that require a lot of time to get into and a lot of detailed knowledge. I think it is a risk of our community that when people reach a higher level of usefulness we don't want them to burn out.

And beyond that I wanted to ask for more detail, Kurt, about something you mentioned earlier on in the slideshow which is about measuring impact of a lot of this. One of our big challenges is in measuring how well and being accountable for how well we're not only spending resources but also just are we accomplishing what we're trying to do. With that in mind can you give us some of your thoughts on how we manage the effectiveness of this kind of outreach? I think we want more and part of getting more is being able to track it. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: This is Kurt; thanks for the question. So at the most simplistic level it's how many people are we getting to join ICANN or how many leaders are we

training, but I have two elaborations on that. One is that it's still very qualitative...

[background conversation]

Kurt Pritz:

Okay, so but rather than just numbers it's qualitative, right? So you want to try to describe how the increased participation will improve our policy discussions. And second, I think that the metrics provided aren't to be strictly measured. Everybody's trying as hard as they can, so we want to estimate what the benefit is but at the end of the day we want to see improvement and I don't think we should be afraid of defining a goal because we might not reach the goal; and we have to make sure when we use this it's not used in a punitive way at all but it's meant to reward positive outcomes, whether or not they meet a specific target or not. They should be used in a very positive way and we shouldn't be afraid, and we should agree on that going in.

Andrew Mack:

If I could, I would just suggest that the more we can actually put, even if there are somewhat heroic attempts at putting something down that we can measure ourselves to; and even if we recognize that it may be difficult for us to get there I still think that's very, very valuable. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Andrew. Next on the list is Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you, Olivier, it's Sandra Hoferichter for the transcript record. Thank you very much for this wonderful presentation. You're just touching our heart, I think. We were discussing a lot of these things today, especially today what you just mentioned, and you are here and running through open doors actually. And

I'm convinced personally that a good outreach work for ICANN is the best tool for the upcoming challenges in the global internet governance environment to protect the multi-stakeholder model, which I see ICANN as the most advanced model of.

One concrete thing: you might have heard that we are working on the ICANN Academy which is currently a proposal which looks into how elected, newly-elected ICANN officers can be trained in a three-day program. But there is also a discussion within ALAC and it is one of the recommendations of ALAC to develop the ICANN Academy as an overarching, all the capacity building provisions within ICANN. This should include also the already-existing provisions because we are all convinced there are a lot of things that are already in place, like the Fellowship Program or the capacity building programs for the region – for LACRALO this time, AFRALO last time in Dakar. But I think compared to other international organizations this could be done in a more structured and more harmonized level system which brings the participant from observer step-by-step to contributor – a sort of a level system which can also be measured by receiving certificates or something.

I think there are lots of ideas within the At-Large and we are looking really forward to collaborating with ICANN staff in this turn further. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz:

So thank you very much for the kind comment and so all those things you describe are the makings of good planning, and so by inserting those activities into a plan, that's what makes the plan strong I think. But anyway, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Kurt, and thank you, Sandra. The next person on my list is Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Kurt, for the presentation and Janice, for the nice graphics. In terms of the conceptualization of the various roles that actors can play within the ICANN world, these are not mutually exclusive. And also if you look at the range of issues, I would imagine that one individual could be wearing several hats – on one issue it could be an observer, on another issue it could be a contributor, on another issue it could be a leader. It's just an observation or a comment.

The curiosity that I find is on the ambassadorial level – it seems like an elite category, and actually I think at the lower levels, although I don't like the hierarchy, it's that they could all potentially be ambassadors for ICANN. And I think for the outreach group it's important to think about what is it that you need to equip these actors with to make them effective ambassadors for ICANN? That's one point, and then to connect with what Sandra was mentioning before, is that when these actors are representing ICANN to the external world it's important that they have the necessary tools to be effective and it would be nice that we could associate the kinds of skills and capacity and resources that are being provided at each level that you've identified. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz:

Thank you for those comments. Actually, Janice did the words, too, but that wouldn't leave me much. So there's a little problem with the graphic in that it's hierarchical and you get that one place to be is better than another place because it's higher but that's certainly not the case; and certainly people can occupy multiple places in the not-hierarchy. But what's very important is that that ecosystem is kind of moving – that people are learning and they're growing either horizontally or into some other sphere because that sort of growth is what keeps people interested I think and participating.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. The next person on the list, and I think I will close the list after Tijani, the next person is Edmon Chung. So I've got Edmon, Sala, Cheryl, and Tijani. Ooh – sorry, I didn't see you. I'm always looking further out and you

have to nudge me. So we'll close with Evan at the end, so next is Edmon Chung.

Edmon Chung:

Thank you, Olivier – Edmon Chung speaking here from ISOC Hong Kong just to make sure. I think I've always been a fan of the Fellowship Program. I think a number of people from ISOC Hong Kong have participated in that and have gained quite a bit from that. One question: Kurt, you mentioned that the approach could be used for sort of evaluating outreach projects and outreach activities. I was wondering how you see that working. Is it going to be that eventually there might be some kind of mechanism where the community can work on outreach projects and go through a process of evaluation to – to be more direct – get some funding to do that? Is that a possibility?

And on the flipside of that, even with the framework how do you see that evaluation? And I should say, would you see participation from ALSes and ALAC on the evaluation processes for these outreach projects?

Kurt Pritz:

I think I'll get to your answer in a minute. So last year for the first time we asked, and Janice actually works on the budget, too, but it was last year for the first time we solicited budget funding requests from the community. And it was really good that we did that. The process for evaluating them didn't work so well but we didn't know what we didn't know going into it. So this is a continual improvement process. So I think the next step, this year, is to attempt to align funding requests and get them aligned in certain ways so they're measurable.

So there could be community requests for outreach, which is this; or there's other activities besides outreach that could be funded, so not every funding request needs to be outreach. I think the first step is – and like I said, Janice is on part of the Finance Management Team that's putting the funding together – but first we want to evaluate these requests somewhat transparently, so say

“Here’s how these requests were evaluated”; get feedback from the community on that evaluation process and possibly give those people seeking funding an opportunity to improve their application. But because of the timing of the budget and that it has to get done, we’re going to make significant improvement this year in the transparency of it and then perhaps getting to where you’re talking about – building time for some of that community evaluation next year. So I don’t know if we can do it this year but it’s a very good idea I think.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. Next on the list is Salanieta.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro:

Thank you, it’s Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the record. I’d like to thank you, Kurt and Janice, for the excellent presentation and I wholeheartedly agree with you, with your presentation; and actually welcome the wisdom, and also as you were sharing I could see the tangible lessons that we can actually draw from what you’ve experienced, especially within your unit in terms of how you try to immerse people into processes. And as you were speaking I also felt the spirit behind it, you know? Those things are not always letter and code, and that sort of thing.

And it reminded me of a critical thing that sometimes we overlook and sometimes we forget in the midst of our heated debates and whatnot, that at the end of the day it’s collaboration and shared lessons. And really what really struck me with your presentation was how you asked the first question when we were talking about outreach. I can’t remember how you phrased it but it was something like “We need to define what we want to get out of it, “ and that sort of thing; and one of the things you alluded to in terms of policy was immersion – preparing people to participate better. And I think Rinalia sort of touched on how that was supposed to happen, and I really like how you put in your presentation the different horizontal and vertical streamings. And I think there’s much to learn from that.

And hopefully we'll be able to, because it's something also we're developing within the various regions in terms of trying to build outreach, trying to build capacity within our regions in terms of greater and increased partnerships with various stakeholders – not only within the ICANN community, but also externally, so that people can at the end of the day participate better. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz:

Thank you for that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, and for your information, Sala is actually leading our work on capacity building not only within At-Large but proposals of capacity building for all of ICANN. Okay, next in the queue is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I just wanted to pick up a couple of points, and to some extent it's complementary to what Sala was saying but it's very much building on the comment that Rinalia made – her concern about whether the perceived hierarchy of the ambassadorial space. And yet the value of the verticals and horizontals for us to all understand how it goes, and I'd like to share a possibility using some ICANN examples of how to get around that. I'm thinking, Scott, you're listening?

There's an opportunity here for a simple little show thingie, some description – it could be a video, you can make it look gorgeous – which does a “How can *YOU* be an ambassador for ICANN?” And you pitch it as simple as this business card with nothing more than the ICANN logo and the ICANN URL – have a few with them; all the way up to a set of graded opportunities which are supported and resourced to something as far as we could even do a speaker's bureau – actually train people for public speaking on topics.

It's a huge spectrum there, and that gives everybody a what's comfortable for them and allows for their volunteer capacities to be met because it's sometimes pretty hard to do everything you want to do for a good cause.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl, and I gather you will not require any education on public speaking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To be honest, Chairman, I actually had to go through formal training despite the fact that at ICANN I can talk under wet cement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic. Next is Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you; Tijani for the record. Thank you very much, Kurt, for bringing this subject to the table. I will speak only about the ambassadors. I am so happy that you realize that it is necessary to have ambassadors, especially in the internet governance fora, and the most important of them the IGF and the [WYSIS] forum. I don't think that the best ambassador is the one who will go there and make a very beautiful speech saying that ICANN is the best entity with a multi-stakeholder model, etc., etc. He will not be heard at all and it will be negative.

I think that the best ambassador is the one who goes there and does not speak about ICANN, but goes there in the name of ICANN and participates in the substance in very good subjects that bring people to attend the event that he is organizing; and who proves to those people that the multi-stakeholder model is there, the community it doing the event – it's not the staff. The community is giving proposals; the community is giving a critical point of view. And this is a very, very good message to give to those people.

You know those fora. We don't have only friends; we have more enemies than friends, and we need to convince them and to convince them with real, practical activities that make them feel that ICANN is really multi-stakeholder, that the community is really participating and that the community is really giving and participating in the decision making. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz:

So we agree because we're both after the same goal, right? We're both after extending this multi-stakeholder model... The extent this multi-stakeholder model is successful means the extent to which it will stay around, and that's what we both want. I don't have any trouble agreeing with what you said.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I was going to say "Then fund it." [laughter] Okay, and then last but not least we have Evan in the queue and then we'll let you off after that. So Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi there. Hi, Kurt. I've got three things: words of praise, a comment, and a question. The words of praise are for Mr. Pinzon and the work that he's done in what I think has been a single-handedly almost the biggest benefit to the work that you're trying to do in trying to simplify ICANN, make it accessible to people and encourage the kind of participation that you want. Please encourage Scott; please get him to do more of what he's doing. This is exactly the kind of thing that is necessary.

[Applause]

Evan Leibovitch:

You won't be applauding the rest. [laughter] No, it's not... Okay. The comment has to do with what might be a matter of mixed messages. Maguy was here

before you came in talking about Compliance, and as we were talking about Compliance and just the approach – for instance, do you publish information on complaints about registrars? Without getting into the details, she used the term “self-regulation” to describe ICANN’s activity towards that. If you have certain corners of ICANN that are saying that this is a self-regulation regime, then that sort of implies almost that this is an industry that is regulating itself and the rest of us are just watching from the sidelines.

If you’re trying to put across that this is truly a participatory multi-stakeholder thing that’s a stronger message and a different message, and it has to filter through ICANN almost at a corporate level as opposed to just one corner that’s trying to get participation while you have another one that’s almost implying that it’s an industry association that’s regulating itself. I’m just saying this is something worth coordinating and something to watch out for as you’re trying to say what are the messages that you’re sending out to the public in order to convince them and bring them in, and get them engaged and give them a reason to be engaged?

And the question I have has to do with the particular needs of At-Large. Almost uniquely here we come to this table and we don’t have a vested interest here. We don’t have a career to make; we don’t have revenue to make by our being at ICANN meetings and putting comments into the ICANN processes. What do you consider to be the special challenges needed to try to draw people from the billions of internet users and try to get them engaged, try and convince them to engage? For many people the internet works and it’s just this cloud, literally out there, and what can we do? And I’m not using the “F” word – I’m talking about other approaches, both educational and attitudinal. What are the kinds of things that you can see at a strategic level that ICANN needs to do to draw more of that into the model? Thanks.

Sorry: the question wasn’t about Compliance. The question was about mixed messages. The second part of it was do you see any specific strategic challenges to ICANN in bringing in the otherwise non-interested end users into the process?

Kurt Pritz:

So I don't know if I'm qualified to answer this question and I'll tell you why. Contractual relationships are bound up in some kind of law, and there's rules about, common law rules about when information about contracted parties is published. So I'll talk to Maguy and see what her take on your comments, on ALAC's comments were about sharing that sort of information and to ask under what sort of circumstances we should publish information and when we shouldn't. We certainly want to, as a best practice, shine a bright light on any activities that are not in compliance with the contracts – we want to shine a bright light on that, but I'm not sure how we're constricted or constrained.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, and I think we've reached the end of this session. So I'd like to thank very much Kurt and Janice for joining us.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And thank you for this which I think has received a lot of positive feedback from here. So it's a big "Yes" from this room.

And next in our afternoon of happiness and excitement, we have the happiness and excitement coming up in the person of Scott Pinzon!!

[Applause]

Scott Pinzon:

Hello everybody! What a happy Sunday we're having.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Scott, you can see you're pretty popular in this location – perhaps not everywhere in ICANN but certainly in At-Large you are. So we have an update from the Communications Department from you, and you're going to speak to us about the new ICANN website and the *Beginner's Guide*, or the *Beginner's Guides* I guess – but we're only interested in one, aren't we? So the floor is yours, Scott.

Scott Pinzon: Gracias. I'm learning Spanish but I speak like a child, like a three-year-old or a two-year-old, you know? That's my Spanish. But English is far more better for me. Thank you for that very warm welcome.

I wanted to point out a couple things on the new ICANN.org that I think will be relevant to people interested in At-Large. So Matt has gone there for me – thank you. So you're probably already aware of this, if you'll scroll down a little bit, Matt – on the right, it's a little higher where the orange text is. On the right column there is a list of all the SOs and ACs, and so for the first time we have At-Large right on the homepage. Anyone who can find their way to ICANN.org can in one click find their way to At-Large, so we're very pleased about that.

[Applause]

Scott Pinzon: But it's even easier than you may know. So at the very bottom of the screen, you may not be able to make it out but there's a little black bar, and it is a sticky bar. So like if Matt scrolls up right now that bar will remain at the bottom of his screen – you see that it doesn't go away. Now, in the lower left corner there's a little label that says "ICANN Network," and if you'll click on that you'll notice that there again are all the advisory committees, and there is At-Large. So that bar is everywhere you go on ICANN.org, the literal URL ICANN.org. So anywhere from our whole flagship website you can get to At-Large with one click. So I thought you might like to know that.

The other thing I would like to show you is down a little lower, Matt. On many of the pages you'll see a gray bar that says "Stay Connected" – there you go. That expands if you click on it and so there are easy ways to get to our Twitter feeds, to subscribe to policy updates. But the one thing that you may not have seen before, you'll see a choice there called Planet ICANN – which is kind of unusual. Please click, Matt, yeah. And what that is is we have taken all the feeds – the RSS feeds that come from ICANN and the Twitter feed from the main ICANN account – and they all update to this page. So if you are a hardcore ICANN aficionado like Olivier and Cheryl you can keep an eye on just about everything that's going on by checking this page once in a while.

So those are features that not everyone knows about – thank you. I just wanted to make sure you were aware of them. I also have a question I will throw out to the group. I don't think you want to answer it right now but it's for further thought and rumination. If you go from here to the At-Large website of course you see a startling difference in the look and feel and style, and what I would like to offer you if it is of interest is we would be happy to redo At-Large's page to change navigation, bring it closer to the look of the main ICANN site if you want to. There's no obligation; we're not at all interested in forcing you. If you would like that I would love to work with you to jazz up your website in any way you would feel is helpful.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I was just asking that you turn your mic off because of the sound for people, but then we'll take questions at the end.

[background conversation]

Scott Pinzon:

Okay, so that is my little spiel on the website so I'm going to move to *Beginner's Guides* next. Should I take website questions now? Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So we have Siva and we also have Sergio. So Siva first.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Sivasubramanian for the record. Scott, one of the basic problems that we were discussing in the morning is that the user interface design of many parts of the ICANN website has to be scientifically improved. And at this point you are talking about working with somebody from ALAC with you on changing the look and feel of At-Large, and maybe I would volunteer to share some ideas with you. So that's what I wanted to say.

Scott Pinzon: Excellent.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Siva. Sergio?

Sergio Salinas Porto: I'm going to speak in Spanish – my name is Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Scott, I am very surprised for your work – it's a great job. It's much more accessible, but I found something that worries me. I know it's perhaps something very small but when I open the Spanish content I see a menu, an ICANN menu in my language, which is Spanish; but except for one document which appears published and dated on March 6th the rest are dated on February 25th. So I am worried about this because I was looking for content, and when I look for the document classified with a different date I see this. So perhaps if you could modify the database during the migration we might be able to see the exact content and the time it was put, posted originally. This is just an input or a contribution for you.

Scott Pinzon:

Okay, gracias.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Sergio. Next is Evan.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi, Scott. Thanks for being here and I'm not going to repeat what I said to Kurt, but it was deliberately said in a way that I hope he knows that we want you to do as much as you can with this. It's been good work, it's been necessary work and there's an awful lot more of ICANN that needs that kind of treatment. And in fact we need to go no further than not very long ago in this very room talking about Compliance, and shall we say the customer support corner of the ICANN website where somebody says "I have a problem; I'm just lost my domain," or something else like that has happened, "What do I do?" And the webpage that describes what your options are is very, I think obtuse is probably being kind to it.

And so I'm hoping that you can give this kind of treatment to "Where do I go if something goes wrong?" There's so many corners of ICANN that if somebody had a domain and something went wrong, something that's clear within ICANN, like the fact that a generic and a country code domain aren't treated the same way from a point of view of regulation, to an ordinary end user and even probably to most registrants – they don't know that. And so if somebody's got a complaint about how their domain was handled they don't know why they get the strange response they do.

And so I'm wondering if again, this is just one corner of some of the many things that need the kind of treatment you bring but I'm wondering what can be done in this part of it that, for lack of a better term, I'm calling "ICANN's customer support" – what do you do if something goes wrong? Yes, we don't provide a help desk but at least some reasonable explanation of what happens to your complaint, why are 24% of the complaints coming in deemed invalid; and if there were better explanation maybe there wouldn't be a problem with 24% of

the complaints being invalid or falling through the cracks or something like that. Is this something that has been on your radar; if not, could it be? And could you tell us what some of your new priorities are going forward in humanizing ICANN?

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you, Evan. You have a habit of asking big questions. I have actually tried to tackle humanizing some of the Compliance jargon, and I actually recorded a podcast with Maguy; and basically things are getting stuck because there's so many legal ramifications to how those items are expressed, which is something Kurt alluded to. So far I've not been successful in getting customer-friendly language through the processes, so I frankly don't have an answer yet but I have not stopped trying.

Evan Leibovitch:

So you're recognizing it's needed.

Scott Pinzon:

Oh yeah. And one thing that maybe we in this room can start to solve it because we have an excellent track record together now of creating *Beginner's Guides* to different topics, and maybe one we need to do is *What if Your Domain Goes Wrong?* or a *Beginner's Guide to Solving Domain Disputes* or something.

Evan Leibovitch:

That's why I'm saying if you're stuck and there's a political reason why you're stuck, maybe there's something we can do to help nudge things along. If that can be any help to what you're trying to do, just tell us.

Scott Pinzon:

Oh, excellent. Well, if you don't mind I will use that as a segue to the next topic. Matt, on the homepage there would you click the "About Us" tab? It was up at the top in the horizontal nav. There you go, and then right below that you

can see “Learning” – it’s the second choice in the left nav. Yeah, that’ll work. Can you click that, please?

Alright, so then there’s an e-learning section, and in the left nav if you look there is a new page for *Beginner’s Guides* – right there. And so these are the *Beginner’s Guides* that you and I have done together, and they’re all there in English, French and Spanish. Having a page for the *Beginner’s Guides* is a new thing and we’re very excited to be doing this together with you because we believe they’re effective. So to resume the discussion of we’re trying to do our best to deliver one for you at each ICANN meeting, and so the *Beginner’s Guide to Participating in At-Large* is the one we delivered for this meeting, and so I wonder how you like it? Excellent – that’s up to you.

[Applause]

Scott Pinzon:

So for a moment let’s discuss what’s next. Back in San Francisco we talked about creating one called the *Beginner’s Guide to Being Cyber Savvy*. And I want to point out one thing about that, is that since then I’ve talked with my staff a little bit about beginning on that and their response was “What does that mean?” So I don’t know if “cyber savvy” is language you want to stick with or not – it doesn’t seem to be reaching the beginner that we hoped to reach. So I don’t know if that’s a discussion for now but the message here is we’re happy to try to deliver another *Beginner’s Guide* for the Prague meeting this June. We would look to you for some definition of what you would like it to be about and then we’ll just begin the process of outlining and determining the scope.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Sounds like it might be for later. Okay, next on the list is Sandra and then we’ll have Carlton afterwards. So Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you, Chair. It's Sandra Hoferichter for the transcript record. First of all, I'd really like to make a compliment: I really like the new entry page. It makes it much more easier for me to access the various content within ICANN; it's just enjoyable.

A proposal I would like to make is I would be very happy if documents which were translated in other languages than English, French and Spanish – I know there are some in Russian or even in German for some outreach purposes – if they could be easily accessible. I don't know how this would look – maybe if we put in the languages and put all the documents underneath which are available in the special language because sometimes as a volunteer you know, I'm doing the work on top of my job, the At-Large work on top of my job, and sometimes I just need information or I just need a material for distribution in outreach in German – because I'm German. And it would be easy just to find it easily on the ICANN page if this document I'm just looking for is available.

And if not – though I think this is something for another forum than for this one – I could make a request if a special document could be translated. For instance, I realized in Dakar that there are already documents about new gTLDs existing in German which is great, but they were not distributed to the At-Large community which would be great. I think this was distributed but we were not aware of it – this was not done on purpose, it was just we had to ask for it and then we were told “Oh yeah, there is something.” And it would be good to have some sort of automatism that we can automatically access what we need late at night or early in the morning wherever because sometimes it's very helpful to read about a topic in the mother tongue. Thank you very much.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you for your very constructive comment. I would like to point out another secret of the ICANN website. Matt, if we can go back to the homepage for just a moment – there you go. At the very top in the upper right there is a language bar. I'm sorry to say this will not help you with German, but the feature you requested – “Could all the documents just show up in my

language?” – is there on the top of the homepage, and click any one you want to, Matt: French, Russian, whatever. So there they all are.

And at first we wanted to try to take this navigation of the English ICANN.org and reproduce it in the other languages, but the problem was bigger than the scope of the ICANN website redesign in that at the time we migrated ICANN.org to its new look there were 38,000 English files on it but in any given non-English language there were no more than 300 files. So when you’ve only got a tiny percentage of items begin translated I can’t reproduce the navigation, but this is a problem that we are still intent on solving; and in fact, I’m meeting with people at this meeting to try to create a strategy for moving towards better multi-lingual support. So that’s what I can say for now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Scott. We still have a long queue which I’m going to close now, so we still have Carlton Samuels, Oksana Prykhodko, Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Salanieta – and I’m not going to say your second name, I’m sorry. Oh, and Yrjö as well. Sorry, I didn’t see you, Yrjö, earlier. Okay, so let’s do first Carlton.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Chair. Scott, I just wanted to say that these *Beginner’s Guides* are some really good stuff and congratulations, too. Here’s one of the challenges that we might have: the way to make these really useful is to get these distributed like this. If you send me 1000 of these I can get them in the library systems in Jamaica just like that. I know that – they’re always looking for content. I’m also actually a member of the Library Information Association so it’s very important as we think about producing more guides we also go a little bit further downstream to think about how we might get them in the hands of people who really need them. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Carlton. Next is Oksana Prykhodko.

Oksana Prykhodko:

Thank you, Mr. Chair – Oksana Prykhodko for the record. I would like to continue my favorite topic about translation, and I think that it's really necessary to have more materials in different languages. But actually I am against whole translations. It seems to me that we need some bridges between the non-English-speaking community and the ICANN community. For example, a very short briefing on the most important themes, not to involve a lot of people outside and to show where they can find more information in English. They have to understand English.

And another point: I receive the policy update, (inaudible) – I don't remember the exact name in Russian. And actually it's absolutely confusing for me because the translation of abbreviations – it does not help me to find this information later on the site because to understand what is ALAC in Russian? It's impossible, really. And then I cannot find this information later. Thank you.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you, Oksana. I have made some notes there; that's very good feedback. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you, Chair. Scott, I find that really the result of all this is extremely good. I'd like to congratulate you and all the people who worked on this with you, but I say this as a former Chair of the Public Participation Committee so it was something that I'm really interested in. A comment if I may: I think that we all know that a podcast or a video is worth hundreds of lines, so I would encourage you to develop that even more. I was looking at the available podcasts right now; for instance, #11 *What Are New gTLDs?*, and that's an area

where typically you can use the resources of ICANN such as newcomers, people who are on an ICANN scholarship and make it conversational, not only an expose by an expert but rather a conversation for instance by a newcomer who's attending the San José meeting as a first instance of attending an ICANN meeting; and putting questions in his or her language and having a response. And that would make it much more I think lively for the general community member.

Now, that doesn't mean that that has to be translated or interpreted, etc., into the UN languages. I think that it's acceptable for all of us if a certain subject is treated mainly let's say in Arabic; another one would be mainly in Chinese, etc. The point here would be participation. It's not to be encyclopedically complete.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I have tremendous respect for you so I'm very honored that you are pleased with how the site is going and I really like the suggestion a lot about doing videos or podcasts where newcomers can ask the questions in their own language. I will follow up on that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thanks very much. Next on the list is Salanieta and then we'll have Yrjö and we'll close this particular part of the session. Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:

Thank you. I thank you for your presentation and also for sending, I'm not sure whether it was you who sent it – the [tree] and you're requesting for comments and that sort of thing, sometime ago? I'm sorry, the tree of the website improvements?

Scott Pinzon:

Oh yes, yes.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: And you also requested for the web tree and whatnot. And I mean it's easy for us to see that website but we recognize the complexity of the work and the level of work that it took to assemble the information into what for me is very coherent, very easy to navigate and that sort of thing. So congratulations.

And I'd just like to make a suggestion if I could. I understand that you have volumes and volumes of things – I think you mentioned 30,000 documents or something? But and I think it's not feasible, practically it's not feasible to have all of it translated. And I think with something like website designing and whatnot, and I suppose you probably already have a plan – a short-term, medium- and long-term plan – but the suggestion from me would be if you sort of had a cut-off date by which certain things that need translations – and of course that's not your department, that's something for the working groups to organize themselves.

But the thing that I would like to point to is an existing language, an existing model that I find very easy to work with. Take for example the Council of Europe's website. You know when you're trying to pull their laws or their documents, and then it gives you a wide variety of – I'm not sure if the correct word is "hyperlinks" – but you know, English, French and that sort of thing. So if something like that could be done for whatever's already been translated that would really be useful. And it's not messy, you know? It's not like the Wiki where you have English and then you're loading another frame but something very simple so it's not busy. So that's just a little suggestion from me, thank you.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you; I take that very constructively. There are some places on the site right now where the translated documents are correlated to the English one. An example that comes to mind is the policy update. If you find the English edition of the latest policy update, for example, in tabs right next to it are the French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Chinese. So as we move forward everything as you say that has been translated, the documents will be correlated right next to it

which is easier for us to do now that we're in a dynamic database website. So we'll just try to keep going with that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, and last on the list is Yrjö Länispuro.

Yrjö Länispuro: Yeah, thank you – Yrjö Länispuro from ISOC Finland. Congratulations for the improvements on the website, first of all. For many years of course ICANN was like the proverbial shoemaker whose children have no shoes or bad shoes, whatever – so this is good. And I think the challenge in the future development is that this should serve so many different target audiences whose needs are different because of course we have this more general server who comes to this website and it begins in a very nice way, now of course flashy and so on and so forth. But then what we have are the learners, the newcomers; then we have this sort of consumer help aspect that Evan was talking about – a manual on what to do when things go wrong.

And finally we have the ICANN communities, and I'm talking about not too many thousands of people in the world who need this website as a research tool; and there, of course, how to organize information – how to make it possible to go back ten years and track the development of some policy line or whatever. It's one more challenge to you. But good information so far and good luck.

Scott Pinzon: Well thank you, and once again my heart is strongly encouraged by your warm reception of the site. I do want to emphasize that this is something that we did together. A year ago, as we were gathering the requirements for the site we had a cross-departmental committee inside of ICANN and we realized we don't have enough At-Large input on this. And we kind of stopped at that point and we conducted in-depth interviews with more than half a dozen At-Large people spending anywhere from 40 minutes to an hour asking about how they use the

site and what they would need to see. And the reason I'm thrilled with your response is it means that our research worked out in reality.

So again, thanks so much for the warm reception but you had a strong role in this. So I really like this combination of staff and At-Large working together. I think it benefits everyone.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, thank you very much, Scott. Sorry, I'm trying to do a number of things. I understand the remote participants are having trouble understanding us so we're asking for the sound levels to be brought up a little bit.

Right, I think we've gone through the full list of questions. I had just one small point with regards to the webpage. Where it says "What is ICANN?" on the front page, I think I have mentioned in the past but I have not received a reply from you: it says "Formed in 1998, ICANN is a not-for-profit partnership of people from all over the world." Partnership is a very dangerous word in some parts of the world, so I'm not quite sure what is the intent here.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you for that input and that is completely my fault that I failed to respond. I looked at your email and I thought "Well, maybe what we should put there is 'community' – I should ask Olivier about that." And with all the multitasking I forgot to get to it but I did note your input.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well shall we then ask the question here? Is "community" better than "partnership?" Yes? Yes.

Scott Pinzon:

Okay, we will make it happen.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Now is there anything else that you need to speak to us about quickly because we are running way over time now. We do love you and you can spend your other couple of hours but we do need to go. And I'm sorry, Eduardo, we will need to cut this one short now.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so the social media piece? Yeah, it's right now.

Scott Pinzon: Alright, we are now migrating to the next topic which I guess is the social media part. Do you want to go first, Matt? Okay, he has a report.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And just for the record, it is 18 minutes past 5:00 and the social media should have finished at 17:00, 5:00. So we do have to rush through this one because we do have three other things to do, one of which is the Consumer Metrics, the DSSA Update and the signing of reports. And then I understand that a little later the room will have to be freed up so we need to get a move on.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi everyone, Matt Ashtiani for the record. I will be brief as I know we're behind in our schedule. So I'm going to give my usual update on social media, however this time I'll be presenting the next steps in our social media campaign and hopefully you all will agree.

So where do we stand currently? Eight months ago when I first started working with At-Large we had 118 friends on Facebook; we now have over 800. We actually didn't even have a Twitter account; we had 18 at first but now we have over 350. We also have a YouTube account which I think has approximately 10

to 15 videos, many of which include regional leaders and the ExCom members as well as previous ExCom members.

So going forward, these are questions that I've asked since Singapore which I think we really haven't been able to come to a conclusion on; specifically should At-Large expand into new areas of social media? Should we use new services such as Posterous? Or more generally, how should we use social media? Should we use it to announce ALS applicants? Should we use it every time a statement is drafted? What are the rules that the group as a whole wishes to agree upon?

And then I started working on the At-Large Improvements project, and while creating the tables I found out that this question has already been answered by the At-Large itself. And it was the development of the Technology Taskforce – many of its duties specifically relate to this such as reviewing the technologies, reviewing the communication and collaboration; making recommendations on which forms of social media to use. So I'd like to officially recommend that social media, how it's to be used, where it's going to go in the future be handed over to the Technology Taskforce which is led by Dev; and that once it's officially handed over, hopefully by Prague, the Taskforce can work together and develop some standards of how we wish to use social media and how to move forward. And I'm done.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

That's great; thank you, Matt. Any questions or comments? Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thanks, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. To follow up on what Matt just said, this is truly an area where multi-linguism can have a fantastic impact. Just one example: it would take me more than 160 characters or spaces to say half of what I feel like saying just now on any one of these subjects, but in certain languages such as Korean, Chinese, Japanese – or at least Korean and Chinese – with 160 characters you can almost relate a whole story. So the difficulty then is

that you cannot translate because it takes too much time and expenditure, so you have to aim at having a sort of head of rank per language to make the most of it. For instance, you want to use in Chinese a discussion about a certain aspect of public participation; so unfortunately, you can't go from one language to another. But that has to be done.

It's one of the rare areas where censorship is not systematic enough to exclude a real discussion on ICANN topics, so it's worth looking into the possibility for ICANN or for At-Large to take what's, not a membership – what's the word? An account, to open an account on [Wabel], the Chinese site for instance – you should try that.

Matt Ashtiani:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I'll take note of that and the Technology Taskforce can take a look at it and try to develop it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, thank you. Now, do we have any more questions? No more questions, okay. Back to you, Scott.

Scott Pinzon:

I have a couple of social media items that do tie in with At-Large. Matt, would you be able to put the website back up again? And this time we'd like to go to ICANN.org or newgtlds.icann.org? There we go. So if you see on the homepage there's a big button that says "New Top-Level Domains" – that green button? There you go, click that.

So this is the homepage of the new gTLD section of the site, and the reason I'm bringing this up is because I had the pleasure of working with the At-Large New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group and was able to act on some of their suggestions. So if you scroll down a little more, Matt, in that first quadrant that says "What's new with the new gTLDs?" the bottom link there says "Learn

about the Applicant Support Program.” Does everybody here know what I mean when I say Applicant Support Program? That’s generally understood? Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Did you say new gTLDs? There are *new* gTLDs? [laughter] Sorry, back to you, Scott.

Scott Pinzon:

Can I have the website back? There you go. So this is the page where you can learn about the Applicant Support Program – that has been there for months. What’s new is in the little left-hand nav, one of the choices is “Spread the Word.” Can you click on that choice, Matt, in the left navigation column? There we go.

So this highlights two campaigns that we’re asking you to participate in in order to raise awareness in developing economies. First is the [Twibin] campaign. We have this emblem that shows someone helping another person up to be on the same level and if you will change your Twitter and Facebook accounts to wear the little emblem and tweet about the location of this Applicant Support page then any followers you have in developing economies can become aware of the program.

We rolled this out because time is short. The last day you can register to apply for a new gTLD is March 29th, so this is just one extra push on top of many other things we’ve done. And then we had two great suggestions that came from this group: one is that we should create lapel pins so that if you want to start a conversation about it you can wear a little badge, and perhaps someone will ask you and you can tell them that “Hey, a new gTLD might indeed be affordable for your organization if it qualifies.” So Olivier had the bright idea of lapel pins – here they are! So we’re looking to you to help distribute them. There’s 50 to start you off.

I’m wearing mine on my badge. It’s the same emblem as the [Twiblin] so what I’d like you to do is if you talk to people about applicant support, extract a

promise from them to apply the [Twibin] to their Twitter or Facebook account and they can have a lapel pin; and we have a little visual reminder that we hope will help spread the word. So that's what that is.

And then one last suggestion, if you'll scroll down a little farther, Matt, to the bottom of the text you should see a link that says "Here." Cheryl had suggested that we create a QR code so that if you want to print something out you can print this. If you have a friend who needs to know about it and they have a smartphone they can scan that little thing and without having to type or remember a URL or anything they will be taken to the Applicant Support website. So there's another tool you can use if you would like to help raise awareness in these last few weeks of the New gTLD Program. So thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Scott. This is much appreciated, and we now have to close this specific session because we have a few more and we're running very late. So thanks for joining us, Scott, and you're always welcome here.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And now with apologies for those people who are eagerly waiting to deliver their presentations, the next presentation is about the Consumer Metrics – an update from Cheryl Langdon-Orr who will be able to speak to us about the draft advice letter on consumer trust, consumer choice and competition. Several of us were on the Working Group while I wait for Cheryl to make her way to the other part of the room, and while the presentation downloads itself as well. But this was an effort which was led by a number of people in the community. It is not a cross-community working group; it was a GNSO working group which accepted members of At-Large and several of us were in that working group so as to provide a set of metrics that will be used with the New gTLD Program to find

out if the program is successful or not, or is delivering on what it should be. But I had the floor over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Olivier, and as you take a breath of air and a few well-earned seconds to yourself, because Olivier will be back to play tag team with the next section. I have absolutely no ability to see what is on the screen from this end of the room so what I'm going to do is ask Matt to pop up the first slide and make it as large as possible, and I'm going to steal access to Olivier's computer and watch what happens closely. So I'm not ignoring the room when I turn to look at the computer and I'm certainly not doing my emails or banking.

Okay, now this presentation you will be seeing if you are able to attend the session that is through the week on Wednesday. I would encourage all of the regional leaders, so LACRALO, make notes now please to ensure that your community members – your ALS reps, your men and women in the street who are here – attend this main session that will run because it's 90 minutes and we are able to go into far greater depth. It's designed to be half the time Q&A. So what I'm going to do now, not only to get us hopefully closer to back on time and track but also because I don't want you hearing the same stuff again when you turn up to this workshop, is just take you through as a helicopter and fairly fast view; and pitch it very much on the how we as ALAC reps on this have contributed. So can I have the next slide, please?

What we're going to do in the workshop: we're going to bore you for a small amount of time on the background, and this is where even if you don't know what the Affirmation of Commitments has said and you're not aware of what the issues on definitions of things like the word "consumer" or what a trust value linked to consumer might be, and why we do or do not need metrics – this will be explained in the workshop.

We have done a huge amount of work since Dakar, and for those of you who attended the Dakar presentation from this Work Group I hope you'll be pleased to note the tangible evidence in our presentation to show we heard you then,

alright? There are a number of absolute, directly-attributed-to-people-in-this-room changes. We're going to review the Draft Advice, and the Draft Advice is something that the ALAC must pay attention to. Why ALAC? Because ALAC, when this piece of advice, this letter is finalized after the public comments – which is on now – and then becomes a piece of final advice, you as an Advisory Committee, will be debating whether you accept this or wish to modify it as your own policy and respond to the Board resolution. And all ACs and SOs have to do that.

So it really is important if there's anything that you feel is an issue that we hear about it either in the workshop, directly to Oliver or I, or of course you can also – and I would encourage the regions to do this and the ALSes – put something into the public comments period that's currently on. Three opportunities that ALAC don't start back at the beginning in three months' time when this is final because it will be too late for you as an entity to respond to the Board and that won't look good. And obviously we'd like to pretend to talk to the community. Next slide, thank you. [laughing]

Yadda, yadda, yadda – this is the Affirmation of Commitments and it's all very cute. The red bit is the bit we will be paying attention to. In the Affirmation of Commitments it said a whole bunch of stuff but it also says that it is to promote consumer trust, consumer choice, and competition in the DNS marketplace. Now those words are linked. It's not competition in general; it's competition in the DNS marketplace. And it's consumer trust and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace. So it's a very particular set of things we've had to look at. Next slide, thank you.

The part that you see on your screens now is Section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments. What it does as you are all aware are a number of things called Review Teams, which are independent community-based review teams as formed out of the Affirmation of Commitments. This one is linked specifically to twelve months after new gTLDs go into the root. So there will be an Affirmation of Commitments' required Review Team – just like we had the

ATRT and the WHOIS Review Team, there will be a review team just on these metrics.

If we get them to start work then without material methodologies, definitions and bench line metrics now that process would falter, and it was the Board's recognition of the need for definition and advice from its component parts of ICANN – the ACs and the SOs – that ended up saying “Whoops! We need to actually establish what measures we need to look at. We want to establish what the definitions are,” and that's what this piece of advice coming to you in the near future and out for public comment now is all about. Next slide; thank you, Matt.

Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah – told you all of that. Next slide; thank you, Matt.

Okay, what we did, aren't we wonderful. We defined, we measured, we set three-year targets and we did this for “consumer” because we didn't actually have a definition of “consumer” for the ICANN world. It doesn't mean when I buy chocolate but what does it mean? Consumer trust – those terms linked; consumer choice – those terms linked; and competition in the DNS. Next.

I've covered that, next. [laughing]

Okay, right. This is how we worked long, hard, into the mornings or nights depending on where you were in the world. We gained consensus, and we did gain consensus on the proposed definitions and it was not an easy gaining of consensus let me assure you. We gained close consensus. In fact, there was one dissenting voice, just one dissenting voice whose name I won't put to the record on the proposed metrics. We gained consensus on the three-year targets. We have created seven iterations of the draft advice, all of which is publicly available for you to peruse. We have got the English version out and the dates are there. The other translations are in progress for the draft advice, but the public comment period end date won't start till the last language translation is posted. Okay, so you English speakers get a little bit more time, but Spanish and French – whichever comes in last won't be a shorter time; it will be the standard minimum time. Next, thank you.

I'd like to take you back now to look at how we have made these definitions. Let's not discuss them but think about them because your discussion during the workshop is essential. We have still maintained our existing definition of "consumer" in the DNS space as a definition as "actual and potential internet users and registrants." It's not just registrants. It's not just those who are already on the good side of the digital divide – it is a bigger picture.

We have defined "consumer trust" as "the confidence registrants and users" – please note that separation there – "have in consistency of name resolution and" – no 'or,' just 'and' – "the degree of confidence among registrants and users that a TLD registry operator is fulfilling its proposed purpose and is complying with ICANN policies and applicable national laws." We think we've got the picket fence fairly high and with about 30,000 electrical volts running through it but if any of you can find a hole in that definition now is the time to bring that forward. Next slide, thank you.

Proposed metrics: there are a list of them there. We will be going through them in detail in the workshop but we're talking about actual registry uptime; we're talking about surveys done in the consumer and end user spectrum, both at go live and two and three years down the track. We're talking about measurements of UDRP and URS and looking for an improvement and change in value over those three years. We're also looking at actual instances of domain takedowns – all of these things are measurable. Some of them are harder to get than others and in the table you will be seeing in the document when you look at it and in the presentation in the workshop, you will see that we have allocated how difficult and at what cost we think it will be to get all of these measures. But they are all achievable. Let's go for the next one because the rest is WHOIS and we don't want to go there.

The consumer choice, again, we are trying to make it drummed into all of our heads. We've repeated the definition of consumer, and with that definition of consumer, "consumer choice" is defined as "the range of options available to registrants and users for domain scripts and languages" – that's one you probably have to think over, chat over breakfast; we think we've got it right but

it's your job to tell us if that's the case – “and” – not ‘or ‘ but ‘and’ – “that the TLDs that offer choices as to the proposed purpose and integrity of their domain name registrants.” So we need to see that there is what they claim you will be getting as a registrant in that domain new gTLD is improving the choice, because having just more of the same does not improve our choices. Next one, please.

Consumer choice here, we've gone into a great deal of detail but we've looked... On the metrics we've recognized that there are the script and language issues, there is the choice of where one can get the registered name from – the choice of registries and registrars but we also have looked at what we believe will happen over the three years, that there will be a different pattern in for example defensive registrations in the beginning of the new gTLD launching than there will be in twelve months, two years, three years down the track.

So we think we've picked out the necessary metrics. We also have the geographic diversity of registrants, because unless we see the other couple of billion people who are not actually utilizing the web well yet are starting to pick up on some aspect of being registrants, especially if it's in scripts that are uniquely to their part of the world – if it's all still owned out of Minnesota than we really do have a problem. [laughing] Next slide, thank you.

“Competition,” we're talking about here that it is defined as “the quantity, diversity and potential for market rivalry of TLDs, TLD registry operators and registrars.” Please note the letter “G” is not there. Next slide, please.

Our metrics here, we're looking at the total number of TLD operators and notice now we see a “G” – the growth in the number of gTLD operators in operation. Looking at suppliers – that's the full range: the registries, the registrar service providers and registrars; looking at the market share, looking to see new entrants as opposed to just old entrants doing more; and gathering data on wholesale and retail registration prices where we have declared there will be no targets ever set. And why we have declared that is that we have conflicting advice. We have the advice of our own experience in some of the regional and national arenas, at

least in the telco industry, that says that we can in fact – although it may not be easy – get access to these prices and there is no perceived conflict in doing so. But we have ICANN Legal’s advice that is most concerned on the possibility of collusion being set and so we’re avoiding that risk by having their letter published without our advice and by saying “We’re not setting targets but it is a valuable metric should we secure it.” Next slide, thank you.

We then go into what’s going to happen and when. Basically watch this channel – we’ll let you know. Next slide, please.

And that’s the important piece – the timeline. As you’ll see, we will be looking for the advice to be considered by the ALAC by May, 2012. So this is not a piece of information that you can put for your next holiday to look over; this really is a here and now issue. I think that’ll be our last slide unless there may be one of these to take questions or comments. I’m not going to take questions or comments; I’m going to say bring them along, have them written down. Talk to each other and make positive contributions to the workshop. If you cannot attend the workshop you know where Olivier and I live. Thank you, over to you, Mr. Chairman. Or not – over to you Mr. Vice-Chairman.

Evan Leibovitch:

Actually I had one comment and I think, I don’t know if I’m the one that you mentioned as being the one dissenter at the beginning?

[background conversation]

Evan Leibovitch:

Well, I was on the Committee. I have not put in anywhere near the amount of time that Cheryl and Olivier have. Essentially having gone through the Committee and worked with it I’ve come to the conclusion that it is an incredibly detailed and well thought-out answer to the wrong question. And in fact there’s one paragraph that’s been added to the report and I don’t think it’s

on this slide in which the Working Group acknowledges that its scope is limited such that it's missing out on a lot of the large issues of consumer trust – not just... My point is you don't measure consumer trust in the gTLD program by saying "We have this many registries and this many registrars effectively offering the same thing." For consumers to show trust in ICANN and in the domain name system, are they using the domain name system? Are they taking advantage of it or are they using workarounds?

Arguably we had a perfect example just the session before this of "Oh, here's a QR code – if you want to find us, use our QR code" – not "Here's our domain name." "Here's our QR code?" Every time you see a QR code, every time you see a URL shortening service; every time somebody searches for something in Google instead of typing its domain name they're bypassing the main component of the DNS. Yes, at a certain point [the low down] domain names are being used but when the issue of consumer trust and consumer choice is being considered in how does somebody get internet information domain names are just one part of the puzzle. And if people are bypassing some of the domain name system by using QR codes or URL shortening services or social media portals then that's a component of consumer choice that this document doesn't even touch.

And I think that's a bigger question that has to be answered. My own premise behind this is that in ruling out the gTLD program that there is a conclusion that ICANN wants to come up with that yes, we have this certain amount of diversity in registries and registrars and so on and that means we've increased choice and confidence. And I think that doesn't answer the entire question. The group has done a really, really good job answering the question it was given. It was given a very specific mandate by the Board to say "Measure these things." I think it made a mistake in limiting the question and not giving the working group the leeway to actually measure all components of consumer choice and trust. And by that, the document is good but it is only a very, very small part of the problem.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, thank you, Evan, and we're going to have to plow on with the next part of our program which is the DSSA Update, which is the DNS Stability and Security Analysis Working Group update. Such fantastic fun! Joining us we have Mikey O'Connor, one of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group. I'm another Co-Chair and in the audience behind us we have [Yorg Sheiger] who's also one of the Co-Chairs. So you've got three Co-Chairs present here, and this is very funny because what's actually onscreen is very different from what comes up on my computer.

But never mind. Okay, so if we move on over to the first slide, please. The goals for today are just to update you on the progress of the Working Group and to raise awareness about what the Working Group is doing, and also to get your input if we do have time. And I understand we are running out of time today because of the long sessions that we've had.

The charter has a number of goals and objectives. The first one was to report to participating supporting organizations and advisory committees because they are all participating in this, so it's to basically provide a report on the actual level, frequency and severity of threats to the DNS. And this is something which is particularly important, also current efforts and activities to mitigate those threats, any gaps in the current response to DNS issues – and it's really to find those; and also the possible additional risk mitigation activities that could exist in closing those gaps if indeed there are gaps. And you can see why a PDF is probably better than a PowerPoint because the PowerPoint overruns the bottom of the slide and I just wonder what it's going to look like with graphics. But we'll see – that will make it interesting.

So if we go to the next slide yes, unpacking those terms – what are threats? That was the first thing we really had to look at, the threat events. And so threat events should not be confused with adverse impacts that may result as a sort of snowball effect if you want; vulnerabilities that allow them to happen, predisposing conditions that would help prevent whatever threat might happen; and the threat sources that initiate them, the controls and mitigation that reduce the likelihood and impact. The problem with this whole analysis is that you

could go ad infinitum from one thing to another and end up analyzing something that is totally un-analyzable altogether, and we have somehow found this the hard way in trying to look at everything first and then really having to start honing down on what we were really looking for. Next.

So since Singapore there's been a lot of work done. The first thing was to try to develop a protocol for handling confidential information because we are looking at analysis of real facts out there, and some of the information out there about real threats that might be threats to the DNS are often confidential and cannot be shared either for commercial reasons or because it's dangerous to actually make those threats known because it would give an actual roadmap of how to attack the DNS. We've also selected and looked at a methodology to be able to structure the rest of the work we had to do and that's taken quite a while to put together as well, but a methodology was required because otherwise we'd have to go in all directions and probably not reach an answer after two, three, four, five years – although I do hope we will be able to hone down on that. And then we've begun also the detailed analysis of the risk assessment, and that's the point where we're at now. Next slide, please.

So the methodology that we've isolated was the [NIST 830] methodology which is a predefined, I wouldn't say well-proven because it is still pretty new but it is something which has been already set. We didn't reinvent the wheel in our methodology, thankfully. And we reviewed other alternatives but this one was available at no cost; it was actively supported and maintained already and it was already endorsed by the community as opposed to others which might have not been filling all of these different subcategories. And it was also something that could be reusable elsewhere in ICANN once we would have, I wouldn't say played around with it but once we would have actually worked with it. Next?

So the [NIST 830] model, I'm not quite sure if you can see the screen out there. It's a little complex – I'm not sure if we have so much time to go through it. I wonder whether... You wouldn't go through it, okay. So that's the methodology. If you are interested of course you'll be able to access this presentation, the PowerPoint slides and have a look at it in your own time; and

perhaps ask questions either by emailing one of us in the Working Group or by attending the session – there's a DSSA session that will take place later on this week. So you have a few days to digest this. If we can go to the next slide, please...

So where are we today because it's been quite a while since we started. Well, there's been the launch of it which was the defining of what we were going to do, and then the first thing that we defined was to find what the threats were – what were the threats, vulnerabilities, actually define what those were to be and then identify them by going through a rather interesting way of work using mind map. Some of you might be aware of this and it actually organized the work quite well.

And then after that, once we had a full list that was somehow organized in a mind map we managed to move those over to a table and analyze the various threats and vulnerabilities in there; in fact, even weeding off some of the threats and vulnerabilities which we thought were not going to be core to what we were looking for. As I said earlier this is something where you have to try and converge on something; it has unfortunately the tendency to go into divergence way too easily.

So we're starting on the analysis now, getting started with this and we're hoping pretty soon – by Prague hopefully – to have a first high-level version of this analysis done. And once this is done we will be able to have a report but that's still a lot further away. Next slide, please.

So as I said earlier, it's been 43 weeks or 43 hours since it was one hour a week, except for the Chairs that actually met also for a second hour in the week to prepare the work for the wider Working Group. The Working Group itself has got several dozen people; I haven't done an exact count of how many people are in there but it actually has registrars, registries, commercial, non-commercial – people from all over ICANN that are well-knowledgeable in the art, and of course the technical community as well.

So we've developed substantial data and methods, and given our resources which aren't that huge we've managed to pick two or three specific directions to go into specifically with regards to the detail: identifying and analyzing the high risk scenarios only, because believe me there are hundreds of lower risk scenarios out there and thankfully we're not going to treat all of them. And also we have a problem with speed – it's taken 43 weeks to get to this point; we're not going to spend another 36 months to continue on this. We have another six months and then we'll see. And of course the more you weed things off the less accuracy you might have, so there's been this need to balance those three factors: details, speed, and accuracy.

Where we are as far as the threat events and the level of impact: well, let's look at the level of impact first.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, I'm looking at a different screen; that's why, so thankfully I've got another set of eyes next to me who can... Right, so the level of impact. Well, in the worst case scenario this would be the sort of broad harm to consumers, to operations, to users of the internet that would basically turn the whole system down – oh, and the electricity has gone off again, yes. And in all cases there would be significant problems for registrants and users, internet users in the zone itself. You'd type in the address, the website address and it would come back as "Sorry, can't reach that."

So the threat events there would be zone does not resolve or the zone is incorrect. For those who don't know what a zone is, every TLD, every top-level domain is arranged into a file which is a zone file; and if that zone file does not resolve or is incorrect, or somehow has security that is compromised that would really affect, that would have a very high level of impact. Next slide, please.

And then the nature of impact, and the nature of impact again derived from the [NIST] system would be damage to critical infrastructure sector, damage to trust relationships or expectations because you don't need to damage something absolutely huge. If it's going to be related in the press it's going to be huge anyway. If something appears not to work correctly and to be not resistant to threats then immediately reputation-wise it's going to suffer. And then of course harm to individuals or to assets or to operations – this is the harm that is produced when things don't work and you effectively end up with harm in your daily life.

So where are we going from here? Well, we still have to work on the vulnerabilities, severe and widespread. The predisposing conditions – are they pervasive? The controls and mitigation – are they effective, are they currently deployed? And this is where things start becoming particularly interesting but also very tricky as a subject and hence the requirement for confidentiality in some of those cases. The threat sources have to be again looked at: how broad is the range of impact? What are their capabilities? How strong is their intent and are they targeting the DNS? And there might be instances of this coming up, who knows; and then finally the initiation – what is the likelihood that a threat event will happen because there are some cases where it's very unlikely that something, an event would actually take place.

And so given the above, if you do have high threat sources and well if all of these are high you end up with a pretty high-risk scenario. And I think that this is the last slide so do you have any questions? Or just prior to the questions I'll turn over to Mikey O'Connor next to me if I've missed anything and you'd like to add anything to this... Okay, we'll go for questions then directly. So Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Well, actually it's not a question – it's a remark. I've been listening all afternoon, all day actually to the interpretation on the French channel. I think we're making life extremely difficult for the interpreters by speaking too fast

and also sometimes the structure of our sentences so they have to imagine what we're trying to say as well as interpreting. So as it's 18:00 now which is theoretically closing time of this discussion, and before I forget because I'm not caffeinated enough, I'd like to suggest that we give a huge round of applause to the interpreters.

[Applause]

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

And for the remaining part of this session, Mr. Chair, I would suggest that you put in a reminder to all speakers about rhythm. We have to slow down just a bit.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Jean Jacques, and I should put up a mea culpa on this but I guess that the threat of closing time approaching is something that has produced some kind of problem in my head, definitely on this. So coming back to this specifically, are there any questions with regards to the work that is currently being undertaken by the DSSA? And I do realize we've been here for, is it six, seven hours?

Okay, Mikey, do you wish to add anything to this?

Mikey O'Connor:

I need to mumble at least once every time I'm in a meeting with Cheryl Langdon-Orr; otherwise, I haven't met my mumbling quota. So I'll think about something to mumble. I think it's, my main comment is just to say what an important contribution the members of the At-Large constituency have made to this project and I guess I ought to mention Cheryl, huh? She did okay. She gets to be on these calls at 1:00 AM every week, every week. And I don't either; and she has the most amazing energy and will and contribution along with Olivier and the other members. So I've got nothing from a content standpoint but just a

hearty thank you from the rest of us in the leadership group for all that you've contributed to this group.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Mikey. And I understand that because we've been here for so many hours it's starting to reach the point of being hard to produce sentences; the "must get caffeine" part of the day for everyone, so we're reaching the end of this session. But just before we finish this session – and thanks, Mikey, for passing by and thanks to [Yorg] as well. Before we finish this we have one last item of business that we need to look at, and that's the assigning of reports of non-At-Large meetings and review of posting instructions.

Yes, I remind you yet again that there is a page that is there on our Confluence, and this page has got a meetings schedule over here in San José. And I know that you spend a lot of time in this room but we also have to go to other meetings out there and to produce reports from what is going on outside of our own concrete box. And so this year, this time around we've put this on a Google Doc and it would be I'd say heavily encouraged, in fact it's something that we need to do is to be able to assign and put our names down to say "I'm just going to write five lines about this session there that I'm going to attend."

Five lines! Why am I saying only five lines? Because in previous times, we've all said "Yes, I'll do it!" and there was not one line in the majority of cases. [laughter] So five is better than one, possibly in English. You might pick another language and we'll try to use Google Translation to put it back to some kind of gibberish of some sort. 160 characters? Yep, why not – you can Twitter it. But if you can tweet it it's better than nothing.

So I would really urge everyone here. I know we're all tired and we will probably be even more tired by the end of the week, but please, please, please do. If you go to another session consider writing a few things, and I see Cheryl has her sign up so please, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I was just going through the requirements, knowing that both Alan and I normally do our work through our liaison and don't pick up all these other little meetings and things so we already have our assignments. But I did note, and I wanted to check with you, is it your intention to not have your liaisons reporting to this meeting in your wrap-up session? Because that is what your agenda is showing. If you don't want it, believe me we are delighted, because you know where to get it but we just wanted to make sure that that is your intention.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Yes, we have had some scheduling problems with our wrap-up session, because the wrap-up session is of course where we all conclude on all of the business that we've done this week. Unfortunately there was a room booking problem and so we had to compress our two sessions – session one and two – to be one after the other and have slightly less time for the work. So those reports would do very well online, and if you can do that please do so. It doesn't mean that there shouldn't be any report, but knowing you and Alan and Edmon and all of our liaisons I think that we will have those anyway. So thanks very much.

And with this I realize we're all very, very tired, so thank you very much for having spent the whole day here with no pay whatsoever. Thanks very much to the people doing the audio and the recording, and all of the IT and making sure things work here. And thanks, a big thanks and round of applause to the interpreters as well.

[Applause and Cheering]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And this concludes today, the longest day of the week. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]