
CR – BOARD / At-Large
Tuesday, March 13, 2012 – 08:30 to 09:30
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica.

STEVE CROCKER:

Good morning, everybody. In what has become the standard style, we have meetings backed up, you know, just one after another, so it's probably best to get started because we will indeed have to stop at the appointed time.

Olivier and I were just discussing as to who's hosting this meeting, whether the board has invited ALAC or vice versa. In my view, we are in your house and pleased to be here.

In the past few meetings, we've adopted this style of having -- rather than pro forma lunches or breakfasts or whatever, to try to have some pointed discussions, substantive, and dive right into things, and even, amazingly, a little bit of preparation in advance, which is a whole new world for many of us.

So let's see. Who's here? We've got ALAC over here, and some guy on the end who I never know whether he's on the board or he's ALAC.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

He's obviously on the ALAC side of the table at the moment.

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.

STEVE CROCKER:

I see some board members who are hiding in the -- oh, there's one -- a couple in the back row.

Anyway, I think we should dispense with the formalities of introductions. Almost all of us know each other pretty well, I hope, and if anybody doesn't know me, that's great. I'll be happy to --

[Laughter]

So let's get into the substance of things. We've got some prepared questions and I don't have a screen in front of me, but do we -- do we have any -- do we have -- we don't have this projected, do we. That's awkward a bit.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

We don't. And what's on the screen at the moment I understand is not what should be there, so that's why it's not being projected at the moment. And I'm not sure who is supposed to --

STEVE CROCKER:

Is there a way to fix this?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Otherwise, we'll just have to read through it, I guess. It's not long.

STEVE CROCKER:

All right. So you're in charge. Take it away.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Steve, and welcome, everyone, to this session of the board with the ALAC or the ALAC with the board, whichever way you see it. Welcome to our modest shack, a little bit cramped today, but it's great to see such a good turnout.

There are three subjects that have come up on the agenda after a discussion between myself and Steve.

The first one -- well, there are two questions from the ALAC to the board and one from the board to the ALAC.

The two from the ALAC to the board, the first one is the views on the cross-community working groups, so that's a question to the board about this.

The second one, views on the new gTLD program and objections procedure, and this, I guess, is something we'll be able to exchange on.

And the third one, which unfortunately is not on the agenda but which I have received by e-mail, is the question from the board to the ALAC, and the question is: What will be, in your view, the medium-term impact of the new gTLD program on the structure of ICANN in general, and challenges it brings to the ALAC.

And that's a question which I have sent to the ALAC mailing list yesterday, so I hope that our members have spent the night awake thinking about this.

We'll move straight to the first question: Views on cross-community working groups.

And just as a quick introduction, I think we have, in the ALAC, been very clear on the fact that we absolutely hate the problem of silos in all of ICANN, certainly a subject being discussed in parallel in many different rooms.

And having to get the board finally to hear conflicting views or sometimes exactly the same thing from many different communities is something that just delays the process, in our view. Certainly delays the multistakeholder process.

So we're very for cross-community working groups. As you know, the GNSO Council is currently working on a new set of rules or processes of how to run that, and so the -- the -- well, the idea here is to have a frank discussion with the board, and certainly I hope that all board members will take part in finding out what your views are on the cross-community working groups.

So the floor is open. It's a pretty open-ended question and I see Ray having put his hand up. Do we have a flying mic anywhere?

Oh, there is a mic on all the table. Okay.

[Laughter]

STEVE CROCKER: That was Mike Silber, the flying Mike.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Mike Silber the flying Mike, yes. Okay. Great. Ray.

RAY PLZAK: I can very easily project without this. Actually, this is related to this and this will not be unfamiliar to you, Olivier, because you and Louie and I had a discussion about this in Dakar.

And it has to do with the interaction of ALAC with the three policymaking supporting organizations, because all the policies are developed in those three places.

And the most influence that you can have in any policy process is to get in at the front end, because there your voice does not have to be loud, it could be soft, and it could have much more influence in shaping the way things are worded and so forth.

The longer you wait, the higher and louder you have to scream, and the less chance you have of succeeding.

So to that end, Louie and Olivier and I got together in Dakar for a brief moment and talked about ways that -- in the addressing world for the ALAC to participate in the regional registry meetings.

Because as all you know, all the work in the ASO is done in these regional registry policy fora. And so I suggested at that time for

consideration was that somehow or other there could be relationships established between the RALOs in the various regions and the regional registries in the various regions, so that RALO members would come to those forums and would actually participate and they could also very freely get on the mailing list and discuss things.

So that is another way that you can get the influence and the word through.

And it actually helps when there's a global policy proposal, because one of the things that gets evaluated by the address council before it goes to the board, have all voices been heard and what has been done.

And so it makes it even that much stronger when the address registries can show that there's been participation, active participation, from ALAC members and participants in the process.

And in addition, most of these meetings are held in places where there's a chapter of the ISOC/ALS nearby, and so there's also an opportunity, in most cases, to perhaps put together a little information booth, pass out some information, and so forth.

So there's a lot of opportunities there for -- for cross-pollination of ideas and thoughts.

So thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: You want to -- yeah.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Olivier.

This is Bertrand de la Chapelle. Hello to you all.

Thanks for raising this topic.

Actually, the cross-community working group concept has emerged almost spontaneously and a bit ad hoc, because in certain cases, we were in the middle of a process, there was a need to get the community together to solve one specific issue - particularly in the new gTLD program -- so there is no framework established in the bylaws, and it usually came late in the process.

It was useful because it demonstrated, as you said, the benefit of getting all the actors around the table and avoiding this notion of the silos, and we know that the silo approach has a danger, which is, once you have formalized your position within your own small community, your hands are tied when you go to the broader environment to negotiate what the positions of your group are.

And so there is a benefit to get everybody around the table and have a more free-flowing discussion.

However, the fact that it emerged in the course of the new gTLD program and at a relatively later stage, led the GNSO to be extremely worried about the question of whether it is circumventing the policy development process.

And it was either circumventing or replacing or superseding or overseeing.

And so I think the sound way to address this question of the cross-community groups is to go along the lines that Ray was highlighting.

The main purpose is to strengthen, I think -- or the main benefit -- and I'm just speaking personally here. The main benefit is to strengthen the early stages in whatever discussion we have in this organization.

One of the problems we have is that there is no intermediary step between loose discussions, ideas that are thrown during meetings and interactions, and formal PDPs, for instance. And in many cases, it is extremely important, if we want to anticipate problems, to launch the discussions in a somewhat structured manner -- wow, there's an echo -- in a somewhat structured manner as early as possible, and as you know, this is part of the ATRT report also regarding the participation of the Governmental Advisory Committee members early in the process.

It goes to involve ALAC much better in the discussions early on. And my personal conviction since I joined ICANN in any capacity

is that any issue that becomes sufficiently relevant or interesting for the community should go through a natural process which is using the birds of a feather concept like if there is a small group of actors that are interested enough that request to have the possibility of having a meeting room at one of the meetings to just raise the question and discuss whether it's interesting to move forward on that topic. And if there is sufficient interest, I believe the cross-community contact group or working groups would be a wonderful tool to do the first overall scanning of the topic and framing of the issue, and then it can go more easily into the processes of policy development process and so on.

That's at least one way to introduce this method and this way of practicing interaction between the different constituencies and groups that is less confrontational, that doesn't raise the problems we have with the GNSO discussion, and we may come back to that later because I think it's -- it could be an element to think about when we're talking about the evolution of the GNSO as the impact of the new gTLDs take place. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Bertrand, and I think your points will resonate with quite a few members of our community.

Just to respond quickly, or add onto what Ray has said earlier, the ALAC will be meeting with the ASO for the first time in certainly my living memory, and will definitely be touching on this.

So it's really good.

And especially in this region, LACRALO. As you might know, our ex-LACRALO chair has been poached by LACNIC, so that's already a first bridge, I guess, between the LACNIC and the LACRALO in this region.

Of course I wouldn't want all of our LACRALO members to end up in LACNIC, but -- well, good for him, and I guess, you know, great for the community.

And I know Raul very well as well and have asked him to fire Andreas, but unfortunately he's too good, so can't do it.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Garth has put his hand up, but just before that, I also noticed that Matt had his hand up. Matt Ashtiani. Oh, he's put it down. Great. So Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. Garth Bruen, At-Large NARALO.

I have kind of a delicate question. I don't expect there to be a quick answer to it. But it's been revealed over the last few days that the RAA is not enforceable on a fundamental level, in terms of registrar enforcement of WHOIS inaccuracy. For many of us, this was the last tool keeping rampant domain abuse at bay. Now it seems that there are no limits to what a rogue registrar

can do. In fact, a report was just published yesterday indicating

--

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Garth, I'm really sorry. There's an agenda. We have to stick to the agenda. Has this got to do with CWGs?

Sorry, but I really apologize, but --

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me address this very quickly.

I know it's a serious point and I want to -- and we're not going to go in-depth in it, but I'll just respond very briefly.

And I realize you were reading from a prepared thing, and I was listening as you were doing it.

There are statements in there that are sort of categorical in nature, and in order to have a useful dialogue on that, it would be helpful to have the specifics underneath that to unpack that a bit.

Another time, another place. But just I think it's important to engage on that, and when we do, that's the direction I'd like to go.

GARTH BRUEN:

My apologies. Olivier, you said it was open -- open discussion, but thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. Thank you for your understanding, Garth.

In fact, I think you know that it seems that there is some interest in this so perhaps in the Prague meeting, we'll be able to address this question.

STEVE CROCKER:

No. By the Prague meeting, we'll have it completely solved.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

And pigs might fly. Okay.

[Laughter]

Anything else on -- oh, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi, Olivier.

One of the things that strikes me as a little bit odd about the CWG process is that even the -- even the process to deal with it is still beholden to silos, in that we have the GNSO in its corner saying, "How do we approach CWGs," we have ALAC in our corner doing, "How do we approach CWGs." And even the methods of how do we attack this are still being used in the old silo methods.

I guess I'm asking if there is a role to be played, and I'm -- where's Bruce? Okay. Because I'm thinking this is something that the Board Governance Committee might want to have a piece of, because to me, this is a governance issue. This is an idea of having ideas baked in at the beginning, as opposed to tacked on at the end, where you have a process where you have different people going into silos and coming out and asking people to comment on them, and you have this hamster wheel of a cycle of stimulus and response, make something and then respond.

And so you have important points of view that aren't being seen at the beginning, and that always means that there's problems afterwards when other parts of the community are seeing what happened.

This is -- was the cause of the Rec6 stuff. It was the cause of other -- all sorts of other problems that would have been solved, had things like this been baked in at the beginning as opposed to tacked on at the end. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. And I have a queue in operation already. There's Sala and Alan, but I think Alan just wanted to respond quickly to -- or add to something that Evan said? Is this -- it's not directly related to that, so you'll have to join the queue afterwards. So Sala.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you, Olivier. Salaneita Tamanikaiwaimaro, for the record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Speak a bit loud because it's a big room.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Right. I'll speak up. Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Barely, but yes.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Yes. I speak in my own personal capacity. In terms of -- because this is something I have not raised with AP RALO. However, in relation to the -- in relation to the initiative or to what's being discussed, I actually welcome it. I think it's efficient in relation to unraveling something at seed stage and having diverse perspectives on it from various communities.

However, having said that, a caveat to that would be, it would perhaps have to be limited to issues that are common for the constituencies that are non-conflict zones.

For example, things like capacity building, how we can better integrate, better coordinate, and better improve levels of cohesion, because there will be issues, of course, that are raised that may not necessarily be palatable for other communities, and so there is -- I suppose that we will have to examine what sort of categories or what sort of themes could sort of be

relegated to that particular working group, the cross-community working group.

So that, you know -- so that it doesn't take away from -- it doesn't totally take away or dilute issues that the At-Large community, for instance, would raise, which may not necessarily be palatable to other communities who perhaps may have other interests.

However, from a broader and from a macro perspective, in terms of levels of integration, there is a need for cross-immersion and cross-pollination in terms of efficiency, utilization of resources, and that sort of thing.

Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Sala.

Bertrand, you wanted to follow up on this or -- okay. So thanks for these views. I think they are echoed by quite a few people in our ranks.

Alan.

We have a queue and we've closed the queue for this specific topic, because otherwise, we'll just speak about one thing, so we've got Alan, then Chris, and then Carlton.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alan Greenberg. So I support the concept of earlier is better than later, and I do note that most of the more interesting CWGs we've had recently were formed in crisis mode at the very end, but there's a problem in the other direction also.

You've heard from us before many times about the difficulty of getting at-large people involved and heavily involved in working groups and other activities when they don't have any money in the game, it's not what they do for their day job, and so on and so forth.

Doing that early, when an issue is not a really hot topic, when it's something that they probably don't know anything about to begin with -- because you only typically learn about any issue after it's been discussed a while -- is going to be devilishly more difficult to do well.

So I don't have the answer, and the answer isn't to pay every At-Large person \$20,000 a year. It's -- but, you know, the kinds of things At-Large has been saying for years of "get other people other than ALAC members to meetings so they're at least familiar with the context" I think is going to play more and more important to make sure that we have people to participate intelligently in these discussions before they're crisis mode.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Alan. Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

Two points, briefly.

The first thing is, behind the concept of cross-community groups, there are different layers. I don't want to get into the detail, but it can be late-stage problem solving. It can be very early issue framing.

It can even go, if we think about it, to the question of whether ICANN as a process -- as a structure and as an organization needs another type of PDP that would be a community-wide PDP for certain topics. I don't know.

The question I just want to -- to mention is -- or the answer that I want to give to Evan is that it is not so much, I believe, an issue for the Board Governance Committee, because the board -- and I don't want to speak on behalf of Bruce, but I think the Board Governance Committee is more oriented towards board governance issues.

What is at stake here is more something that is relevant both to the SIC, the Structural Improvements Committee, and the Public Participation Committee that are chaired respectively by Ray and Sebastien, and without getting into detail, we are discussing and we are thinking about how at least the SIC -- and I don't know if it's going to be also the case for the PPC -- will potentially use the Prague meeting to facilitate open discussions.

And I fully agree that it is an irony if the discussion on the CWG format is happening in silos.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Bertrand.

Next in the queue is Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Good morning, everyone. Thanks, Olivier.

I just wanted to remind everyone -- cross-constituency working groups are a really good idea.

I just wanted to remind everyone of two things.

One, we have had a number of fairly successful cross-constituency working groups, even if they're not necessarily labeled as such. The IDN fast track was probably the first of -- of those, with the GAC, et cetera.

But we currently have one running which is the DSSA working group, which is -- which is -- which has in it closed sections, because it has to, because it's dealing with security and registries don't necessarily want to have discussions in an open environment about that. But fundamentally, it's a cross-constituency working group.

So they do exist, they do work, and we should do more of them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chris. And closing words on this topic by Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Olivier. Carlton Samuels, for the record. There's three things.

First of all, I favor them. I think they are very useful, and this is probably where it comes in for early stage framing of the issues it is also very important, because I think eventually we are going to evolve to community-wide PDP processes. I think it is going to happen if we are going to move ahead with this multistakeholder model of governance.

And I hate to be on the other side of my friend Sala on this, but I actually do believe that the thorniest issues are best positioned in CWGs. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. And now we can move on to the second topic on our agenda. That's the views on the new gTLD program and objection procedure in ALAC.

As you might know -- in fact, I think the board would know, since it is the board that mandated ALAC with this -- the board has asked ALAC to develop an objections procedure because we have been asking for this for so long, and there are times when we ask for things and suddenly, by miracle, they are granted to us and we have to do something about it.

So this is the first time the ALAC has actually been granted the possibility -- or at least the ability -- to have an operational part in an ICANN process, because it is operational with the new gTLD process. It is inherently linked to the number of applications and to the whole process of new -- new gTLDs.

So effectively, I think we wanted to exchange a few views on this, how did the board see the ALAC do this, and also perhaps bring you up-to-date, board members, about what the ALAC has been doing since the -- since the opportunity was given to it.

So I don't know who wishes to start. I see everyone jumping up and down.

Perhaps shall I call on an unsuspecting victim to very briefly explain the procedure that we've been working on. I see she's hiding away at the back. Yes, it's Avri Doria.

Could you please --

[Laughter]

Avri is the chair of our new gTLD working group in at-large. She's done a fantastic job, and she has -- primarily her group has worked on two things. The follow-up to the joint applicant support, but also what landed on her table was, "Hey, this objections procedure, do something about it."

Could you just take a couple of minutes to take us through it, please?

And there's a flying mic behind you. Watch out.

Run up front to a mic. Yeah.

AVRI DORIA:

Sorry. There's a mic right here.

Okay. Thank you. I'm totally surprised.

Yes, the working group has been working basically meeting weekly and doing a lot of intermediate work, and the end of the story is a proposal is in front of the ALAC at the moment on a process -- on a process.

The process is very detailed. It's a week-by-week breakdown of how -- first starting with comments and how comments would come into At-Large, be processed by a working group, and then go before ALAC to see if there was ALAC approval for actually filing them as formal ALAC comments.

And this is essentially a process that takes up almost the whole 60 days of the initial comment period that's been prescribed in the applicant guidebook.

After that, there's basically an involved process of taking those comments and others, building upon a certain set of tools in a wiki, and creating pages where, where someone believes they may have an objection that At-Large should follow up on and file, they can discuss that. Other people can discuss that. Over time, that gets richer and richer with discussion. Then at some point, the working group gets together, reads through those,

decides which ones merit actually taking forward towards an ALAC objection.

At that point, a group is put together to actually craft the writing of the objection, it's sent off to all the RALOs.

If three out of five RALOs say, "Yes, we want to proceed with this objection," then that goes to ALAC, where they would have a vote on whether to proceed with that objection, any problems they have with it, edits for it.

And then at that point, then they would work with ICANN to deal with the technical issues of fees and such to the dispute resolution provider, the appropriate dispute --

And I'll point out that this is only being done on the two cases where the application guidebook has indicated that ALAC has standing, the community ones and the limited public interest objections.

So that's a very quick nutshell of 20 pages worth of process document -- diagrams.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Avri. And for -- just to complete your explanation, we are aware that the GAC has been working with IT for a tool, a software tool or set of pages, to help in their process, and this is the same thing, as well, for -- as far as we're concerned, we have had meetings with the IT department so as to be able to automate, at least, some of these tasks and to

perhaps lighten the load on our staff, if all of this had to be done by hand.

So I open the floor, if there are any questions or any points that anyone would like to add.

Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

This isn't so much a question, but addressing the question that was put on the agenda.

At the meeting that we had that Avri chaired yesterday of the gTLD working group, we noticed that about half the room were people that we'd never seen before, and it was quite interesting. And we've finally started to be on the radar of the applicant community that has started to see, "Oh, my, is it possible I could put in an application and these folks are going to get in the way."

And there was a concern that there might be instant ALSs that would come up and try and game the system.

Now, thankfully we've got a very good due diligence process in place and that's unlikely to happen, especially given the compressed time frame, but this is just sort of a heads-up that people are starting to notice this, it is getting on the radar of the applicants community, and that they're starting to get concerned about this.

Thankfully, if the question does come up in front of any of you, please be comfortable and confident that the due diligence process that we have ensures that you're not going to get a hundred new ALSs that are going to try and come up and push through objections on behalf of -- of friends of theirs.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Evan.

And just as a reminder, all of our processes are open, so if there is any question as to how the due diligence takes place, but also as to how our process for the objections takes place, this is fully documented, and if board members are interested in more on this, we can make that document available to you. In fact, I think it can be freely downloaded from the working group's Web page.

Any questions from the board? I see it might not be a subject you're particularly excited about, so maybe we can move on.

Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

I remember trying to read through all of that, and I was thinking, "Oh, my goodness, what a -- what a heavily loaded process with all these different pieces in it."

Where my mind goes when I look at something like that is trying to understand which pieces are the substantive ones and which ones are the pro forma. Where is the real discussion going to

take place, where's the real decision, and which ones are sort of just checking the boxes and so forth.

Another aspect of something like that that goes through my mind is, "Okay, and so how long will it actually take? Where's the workload?" And so forth. Just the kind of engineering approach to that.

And the larger question is, does all of this actually make sense in the end or was it just a reasonable thought of putting this together but when you stand back and look at it, the process gets in the way of actually getting the right answers.

This is probably as good as we're going to have at the moment, but I would counsel that it's reasonable to take a retrospective look, after we've run the process a couple of times and raised those questions, and that's why I wanted to kind of read it into the record here.

And I think that we do an awful lot of process invention and I think we need to do process debugging, just like we debug software as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Steve. And in fact the review process is constant and in At-Large, we look in the mirror and think are we doing things right, how can we improve it, and certainly this process is particularly important. It might appear to be a complex process, but that is because a lot of the intermediate parts are to do with trying to stop any attempt to capture the

process. It is a vital part of ICANN. It's important that it cannot be captured. And, of course, we have a very open community on our side, so we cannot put the barriers in the community but the barriers in the process are there to safeguard it.

STEVE CROCKER:

So just to take your point, the idea of preventing capture is, in my lingo, you know, one part of the specifications or at least the intended effect and that, too, is something that retrospectively you can look at and say so, what do we know about whether there was an attempt to capture or was it captured and, you know, was this effective. Or conversely, those issues just don't come up and we've got a lot of extra mechanism in there that hasn't served any real purpose. I once made up a pink elephant rule which is we should not try to pass laws against pink elephants in the halls unless we actually had observed that such things were occurring.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Steve. And that's appreciated. You've been in ICANN long enough to know that I think every single part of ICANN has been subject to attempts at capturing it. Certainly we're no different in At-Large. And you know the history. There was a moment when it happened. We're making sure that it's not going to happen. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just a quick comment. A -- an early quick comment is pink elephants are, you know, often generated by excessive drinking so there's probably a lot of them around ICANN.

[Laughter]

On this specific subject, we've been handed a structure for At-Large involving ALSs and RALOs and ALAC which is inherently exceedingly complex. If we really want to make it effective and get input from the periphery and get involvement from the periphery almost any procedure we're going to come up with which is going to meet the test of are we really involving At-Large, not just a few people in a room in an ICANN meeting, is going to be complex, I'm afraid.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Well, we are now on the half hour mark from the time we started. We still have 15 minutes. It probably is time to go to the third question on the agenda, and that's the "What will be, in your view, the medium term impact of the new gTLD program on the structure of ICANN in general and challenges it brings to the ALAC."

Well, we've already spoken about one of the challenges at length. There might be other challenges as well. I open the floor to my colleagues if they wish to take on the question. And I see Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Chair. I think one of the realities of the new gTLD is that it will open up new opportunities for business but also internally for ICANN it will bring revenue. There was some discussion about whether this revenue should be managed by an independent fund or foundation or by the establishment itself. I'm not going into that avenue. What I want to say is that, there will be a temptation, quite naturally, to care more for oncoming constituents in the multistakeholder model and there will be, therefore, a tendency to neglect perhaps or to provide insufficient staffing and various means to support existing elements of our community. And I'm speaking on -- with a special preoccupation for At-Large and the ALAC. We are well-staffed with very good people, but in order to have the multistakeholder function really well, I think we have to look forward and to accept the fact that there will probably be many more activities from the At-Large community and that has to be staffed and properly provided for, including travel, et cetera, et cetera. So I just want to flag this to your attention, that there is an opportunity. Don't miss the opportunity of also including in your calculations for the future the At-Large. I think this is really one of the strong points of the whole ICANN ecosystem. It is that we are represented and we represent people really from all areas of the world and all walks of life. So they require proper representation and staff support. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques, and if I can just add to what you've rightly said here, and linking it to the objections process.

There has been a discussion as to whether one needed to have a shepherd in order to make sure the process works correctly. And the consensus was that yes, there might -- there definitely would be a need for that. We'll work with Heidi to find out if there is a requirement for maybe an additional staff member for the duration of the process.

Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I think it is very important that what was just said, it is not just what are the consequences on the organization but also the consequences on the process and how we can fulfill and help this process to be done. And that's require time, people, money, and I am not sure that for the moment it was really taking into account both by at-large and by staff and by the Board. And it's -- it's time to have this reflection prior to have a final budget for next year. And then it's -- it's important time.

My second point is that there are risks and possibility, new possibilities. The risk is that the new gTLD will put the end user into much more trouble than today because of confusion, because of difficulty to reach certain Web sites with new gTLDs, new language and so on and so forth. And it's important that this organization At-Large takes that as a duty to get back to the community and to ICANN this difficulties and this trouble. That means that it's maybe also the time to take that as an opportunity to spread the At-Large around the world. We need

you to have one At-Large structure in each country. From my point of view, it's very important. Not just because we want you to grow, but because we want you to be more efficient and one way to be more efficient, it's to have a voice from everywhere in this world. And I know that you are supportive of that and -- but it needs some help, some tools, some money, some people again. And that's -- you need to push that, from my point of view, now also because it is a time and we will not go again to this large amount of new gTLD at once. The next round hopefully will come soon, but it will not come soon with as much as I think gTLD today. And it's important to do that at the right time. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Sebastien. Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me pick up on Sebastien's point and just ask a question. Do you have a sense of how far along you are toward reaching what you would consider to be a mature or steady state in which you've fleshed out the organization and have the degree of coverage that Sebastien is suggesting?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

That's a question that's very difficult to answer because we -- we would of course -- we're never mature enough. We need more -- one ALS per country is the aim, but that aim is

sometimes pretty hard to achieve. I see Sala's put her hand up. Is this specifically on this, Sala? Okay. Sala.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you, just to let you know last year after Dakar I did a study, I ran the numbers from the RALO dashboards -- sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Closer to the mic.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I ran the numbers from the RALO dashboards to sort of try to analyze the penetration rates and it's actually on the wiki space, and I would like to ask Heidi if she could perhaps forward the proposal of the paper I did to the Board. And what it actually shows -- and I also concur fully with Sebastien -- is that the RALO penetration's quite low and there's a need to increase, there's a need to increase capacity building in order to glean participation into the policy processes in terms of immersion. And I think the paper says it also. Heidi, please. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sala. And I see Cheryl next to you wishes to add to this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR. Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I concur with what Sala has done and certainly endorse

the paper she did. But I think we need to remember there's regional diversity in this answer as well. When we have Canada and America forming one RALO, that's two countries. They're well-covered. Trust me, they're very well-covered.

The Latin American and Caribbean, we have about 50% of the countries with ALSs and many countries with several ALSs. That's a very different view. And in Asia Pacific where Sala's paper is particularly worthy of noting, we have a lot of work to do. So it is varying, but it is also a regional analysis that needs to be done. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Cheryl. Next in the queue is Bertrand de la Chapelle.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

So Bertrand. A few points. What is very interesting is when things are lost in translation the topic and the formulation of the topic that I had suggested to put actually in the discussion of each of the interactions that the Board has today with the different structures was the impact of the new gTLD program on the structure of the GNSO and the structure of ICANN in general and so on. And because we asked that it be handled in each structure, it has very smartly translated -- been translated by the staff as in this case what is the impact on At-Large. And actually, my initial thought was, it is important that the other structures than the GNSO think about the impact that it has on the GNSO. But because of the change in the question, we are

suddenly bringing up very interesting different questions which is, exactly the weight of the different structure, the allocation of resources, the transformation, what it will enable us to do as much as the problems that it will bring. So it's another illustration of the fact that asking the same question or slightly different question to the whole range of actors is actually bringing a fuller picture.

The second thing is, the reason why I believe this topic is important to address right now is because we all know the new gTLD program is going to impact the organization. But there are cases where changes are not simply linear. They are not just more of the same. Changes beyond a certain threshold transform the nature of the -- of the entity. It is not the exactly the same thing to have a registry constituency with a few 10s of registries or with 600. It is not the same if those registries are very different nature, some of them are closer to ccTLDs and others are brand TLDs. Those -- all those impacts without making the list right now are very important. There's the question of the balance between the stakeholder groups. What is the impact on the policymaking process. Regarding At-Large, what is the impact on the participation of At-Large and so on.

What we're trying to do, and the reason why we raise that point, is because it is necessary, as we said on the discussion of cross-community groups, to have an early discussion in this. To avoid the situation, let me be very frank, this is purely personal but in a discussion yesterday or the day before yesterday there was a comment that when ICANN transitioned from ICANN 1.0

to ICANN 2.0, it was because ICANN 1.0 was really not working and it was a crisis that forced the change. We have the unique opportunity of having time enough to anticipate the changes that will necessarily be required from this organization to scale up. And it is our duty to collectively think about it and the structure and improvement community has discussed that yesterday and we will come back and try to organize or see how some common discussion could be organized in Prague. But I would really encourage the members of At-Large and ALAC to contribute to one exercise which is not to try to find solutions. At this moment we're at the stage where we need to make a clear common list of the trends, of the impacts. What are the factors that are going to work together? And once we have a clear common list, then people can get in their silos and discuss it and come back and discuss on the common list. But otherwise, we will approach the problems from very different angles.

And the final point is maybe a note of caution because we're beginning to see the discussion around the new gTLD program. I would hate -- and again I'm speaking personally -- I would hate to see ICANN getting a Dutch Syndrome fever. You know, the Dutch Syndrome is what happened to Portugal which a lot of money was coming from the colonies or the Dutch Syndrome was a moment of great wealth for the Dutch where the whole community would then be concerned mostly about what do we do with the windfall. And this is another topic, but it is extremely important that we are extremely careful about -- and

maybe Steve can speak about that, if he wants -- extremely careful about distinguishing the different flows of resources and in the new gTLD program being faithful to what the community has promised, that is to handle the revenues from those sources in the most careful and transparent manner. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Bertrand. I think you covered the ground. There's been a lot of emphasis on making sure that we treat the revenue carefully and separately and account for it, and I can assure you that that's definitely something on my mind and I know on several other Board members' minds and will be a focus of attention going forward.

The -- the syndrome of getting distracted by windfall and having everybody eager to spend the money and so forth and not look at what happens after that is something for which there's a lot of historical precedence and I think we want to be very, very careful about that so that after the -- the influx of all this cash we are focused on what the tax will be on the system, not in a financial sense but in the other kinds of stresses, personnel stresses, issues that come in that we have to deal with, a whole series of the kinds of things that happen when you scale up an organization. I saw Cherine's hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Steve. Unfortunately, it's kind of tough because we only have got two minutes left and we have a hard stop at half

past. There is a queue. I just want to let a couple of people have a word quickly. Carlton, if you have -- 30 seconds.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you, just two things. One, we know the expansion in the name space is going to require lots of different approaches. First of all, I don't think there's going to be any linearity between what happens after expanse and how you deal with it. So I quite agree with Bertrand that you will have to adopt a different model for resource allocation. That's the first thing.

Secondly, it's going to bring compliance pressures that will require a lot of change in the compliance regime. We've been talking about a new philosophy of compliance here. The risk profile is going to change significantly. And it requires what -- what's happening now in compliance will not work, so this is the heads up, that funding of compliance, the approach to compliance, all of these things that I call a philosophy of compliance will have to change. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Carlton. And closing, Antonio Medina wishes to speak in Spanish, so Antonio is from one of our LACRALO ALSs that has been coming here to have -- you know the range of things that have taken place, working extremely hard. So Antonio, the floor is yours.

ANTONIO MEDINA:

Thank you Olivier. I would like to take this opportunity to make a comment on the different perspectives that you are using to analyze the new gTLD program and I would like to draw your attention to the fact that you, sirs, have trust in the traditional use of the web. The use that exists today. So I would like you to include that.

We are working in Colombia in order to determine what is the actual, the real impact on users' trust in the web. So please consider this in your new perspectives. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. This may be something where we need to have -- this is something where we may need to have further discussion on because it's quite a big question so maybe we'll put it on our wiki and build on this and then relate with the Board on this. You okay with this, Steve?

STEVE CROCKER:

Yes. Yes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Perfect. Alan, you just wanted -- you have about ten seconds and then we all have to all go.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have had feet in both camps for many years now. So I have also the substantive comments. I have only one short one to say

here. This is an absolutely perfect topic to have a public comment period on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. And Gonzalo.

GONZALO NAVARRO:

Thank you. I'm going to speak in Spanish. So I'm going to be really brief. Just let you know -- I just wanted to remind you or to draw your attention to the fact that probably the BOC of the Board this week will make available to the community a survey, maybe the most important survey on -- survey that seems to be long at first sight but it was created with a purpose of covering as many topics as possible. Based on the discussions that I have had with you, especially with this community, I know that this survey will be very helpful to give guidance to orient our work, the work that we are doing internationally. As Bertrand said, many of the things in the new gTLD program will present new challenges and we should be fully aware of the direction that we are heading to. So once that document, once that survey is made available to you, please take the time to fill it out because this will be for the benefit of the entire organization. And we will appreciate your comments. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you all. Olivier has asked me to close the meeting here. When we do this again in Prague, which I sincerely hope will be normal practice, I don't know what the opportunity is for a

different configuration of us in a room. There's a lot of us, so there may be a limitation, but I wouldn't -- if you -- Heidi, is this the arrangements, is this something that you filter in to the meetings? No?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

This is exactly what we don't like. We are sit in a circle -- well, U-shaped place and, in fact, could have had it in another room, but strange enough.

STEVE CROCKER:

So just -- let me just understand, what is the process flow of getting the request in to the system?

[Speaker off microphone.]

[Laughter]

STEVE CROCKER:

We did this to ourselves?

[Laughter]

[Speaker off microphone.]

STEVE CROCKER:

I didn't do it.

[Laughter]

[Speaker off microphone.]

STEVE CROCKER:

Well, let's -- let's stop doing it.

[Laughter]

So one way or the other, if we can figure a way not to do that. You know, this isn't bad. I mean, we've made it work, but it would be better if we were round. So let's raise that up and -- and given the short period between now and Prague, the inter-time, the time between meetings varies between three and five months, depending upon -- and this will be one of the shorter times, so become sensitized over time to how fast things happen, particularly when there's a short period. So let's not wait very long and get that in to the process. Thank you all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Steve.

[Applause]