CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excuse me, ladies and gentlemen. I know I don't need a mic, but I may, in fact, be recorded. And I just love to hear my voice echoing in the hallowed halls. I just wanted to bring you all to order, get you to take your seats. If you need interpretation, then you will need a headset. You will find English on channel 1, French on channel 2, and I have no idea what's on channel 3. Just explore.

Over to you, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much, Cheryl. So for those who don't know me, I'm Steve Crocker, chair of the ICANN board. To my right, Rod Beckstrom, President and CEO -- cannot hear me. I will eat the mic.

I'm Steve Crocker, chair of the board. To my right is Rod Beckstrom, CEO and President of ICANN. And Sebastien Bachollet, you're appointed representative -- well, you are appointed member of the ICANN board. The empty chair here is for Bruce Tonkin, our vice chair, who has been detained in another meeting. I hope that he comes.

Let me ask very briefly for the other ICANN board members who are here to stand up so we can see where everybody is. I see several sitting in the front row and Gonzalo sitting in back.

Bill Graham.

[Applause]

Great. This is, from my point of view, our opportunity as the board to hear from you. So after Rod makes some brief remarks, I'm going to turn things over to Olivier, and it's your meeting.

ROD BECKSTROM: Thank you, Steve. Thank all of you so much for everything you give to help give the world a voice in ICANN, and special thanks to Olivier,

---

Cheryl, Evan, Carlton and Tijani for your leadership. I want to say it seems to me that ALAC has been tremendous, tremendous progress over these last few years under your collective leadership. And that was certainly shown by the outstanding AFRALO event here two days ago with the recognition of, I think, 17 of your structure leaders out of 24 from Africa and such a beautiful event and such a great trajectory and movement from Nairobi, which was a very nice event and good start. But really showing your commitment, your leadership and all of your participation in moving ALAC forward.

And, also -- and so I think in many ways, you're moving ALAC to ALAC 3.0. It's a real significant evolution of your organization and that's also evidence by the extremely articulate and thoughtful submissions that you're contributing to the board and the community on policy processes. In fact, I think in the last year, the ALAC has submitted an extraordinary 33 different policy statements and resolutions. And I think we all know how hard it is to get that through a consensus-based process with so many At-Large structures and so many individuals and leaders involved. So our hats off to you and maybe we can learn something from you at the board level on that.

The other -- another sign of the maturation and the evolution of ALAC is the recently submitted At-Large improvements project milestone report which was also excellent. And we're also impressed by your moving forward into the future challenges working group, as though the milestones weren't enough. So clearly we have tremendous capacity for more work, so we have to figure out how to ask you to do even more because this is so exceptional. I'm just kidding. I mean, the beauty obviously of ALAC is that it is a voluntary structure. And all joking aside, the seriousness is the importance of what you do to give the people of the world a voice in ICANN. Civil society, Internet users and many different groups, most of whom do not have a specific economic interest except they're using the domain name system to use the Internet to accomplish other things in their life and their society.

Also, a special thank you to Fatimata Seye Sylla --

[Applause]

-- for hosting us here in beautiful Senegal. So I think as Steve and I mentioned yesterday, and I think all of us mentioned on a frequent basis, hearing all the voices is important and it is what makes the ICANN community so rich. So thank you for everything you're doing. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Rod. Very, very kind comments.

We did a little bit of preparation work grabbing topics from both the board and from your group. I've asked Olivier to do the synthesis and orchestration. So without any further formality, Olivier, please lead the session.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steve. Just before we start, just a housekeeping note. It is Olivier Crepin-Leblond. When you take the floor, please say your name because the scribes are going to put it all in words on a piece of paper. And if you do not see your name before what you are saying, it sounds like a very schizophrenic dialogue. Please make sure you say your name. Also speak slowly because we also have interpretation in English, in French and in Spanish, depending on what language you speak. And if, again, you speak too fast, the people who receive this discussion via an interpreter are not going to understand anything because the interpretation will not work.

Before -- well, let's --

(Speaker off microphone).

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. There are four mics around the floor very close to you hopefully. And so if you wish to comment or discuss or ask questions, then the mic will hopefully come to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And they need to be very close to your mouth for them to work. And that was Cheryl for the transcript record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Right, so we have a pretty packed agenda because we've received some suggested items on the agenda from the board. And we've also sent some agenda items to the board. And I thought first thing we would just one through the different items to list them and in no particular order, take them one at a time. The items we've received from the board are the JAS, how would ALAC like the board to consider their advice; the CEO search, what qualities do you think we ought to be seeking for the new CEO; what are the criteria for openness, transparency, et cetera; the ethics guidelines, what are the ALAC's top three concerns and proposals to address them. So ALAC members here, please think about this until we reach that.

And then the -- has ALAC considered developing some principles around topics like WHOIS and consumer trust, similar to what the GAC has developed. Or perhaps I should just tackle this one before we deal with the rest because this one has got a simple answer, and we can probably have a quick win on this.

The ALAC is actually able to comment on virtually everything and anything ICANN and ICANN-related. Not only that, but we also take part in working groups by sending our people in the working groups themselves. Some of the working groups are cross-community working groups and so we are invited to send someone there. Some are not. But at the same time, when we do send someone, because ICANN has got such an open process of accepting people in working groups in general -- and I would say "in general" I would say 99% of the cases we are able to have someone from the ALAC on the working group itself.

And when I say ALAC, I actually mean At-Large because we can actually send ALAC members from the committee or At-Large members from the regions, from At-Large structures, et cetera.

So as far as the WHOIS subject is concerned, we have direct involvement in the WHOIS review team. We have direct involvement in any of the working groups that deal with WHOIS issues. Same with the consumer trust as well. The consumer trust working group, which is a GNSO Council working group -- chartered working group has got a few members from ALAC from the At-Large in there. And the input is directly part of the process that the working group works with. So the GAC works slightly differently. And just to do a quick reminder, the GAC cannot send members into a working group that speak on behalf of the GAC.

Whilst we are able in the ALAC to actually have good communication with a member, tell a member what they are able to do and what they can actually try and say in the working group and, basically, show what our position is.

So this is why we don't have actual policy documents that we would publish separately from the working group itself because our policy document is actually documented in the working group's results themselves. Does this answer your question?

STEVE CROCKER: I think so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Mr. Chairmen, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record, should the board desire us to extract the particulars under those topics, that would be a very easy thing for us to do because of the nature of our recording and transcribing of, basically, everything we say or do wherever we say or do it. So should the board desire a particular briefing board from the ALAC at any time on those topics, the staff would be in a position to do so quite easily and quite promptly.

STEVE CROCKER: So I may be missing some potential consequences of your kind offer, but my immediate reaction is -- this is Steve Crocker speaking -- is that

sounds great. Anything that packages things up and makes it easier for us to navigate will be a big help.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And maybe we can make this an action item. So I'll ask for Heidi to write that down. Thank you.

So I'll also go through the list of the At-Large suggested topics. First one being JAS working group outcomes. The second one being the ATRT phase 2 implementation. The third one being the 2012-2015 strategic plan. And the fourth one being the board view on handling pressure to reform. I realize we only have probably less than 45 minutes to discuss these. It is a very full agenda.

Perhaps may I suggest that the 2012-2015 strategic plan is discussed during our lunch that we will have, I believe, tomorrow as one of the subjects that we will discuss, although I think the format tomorrow will be pretty open. I know that you have a lot of people coming to you to ask for things and to pick your brain and perhaps lunch sometimes is a time when you can eat and not have to constantly, constantly push back on the demands that are put upon you.

So, perhaps, we can start with the JAS working group because I see that is a subject that is shared by both the board's agenda and the ALAC's agenda. And we see it as the JAS working group outcomes, and you seeing it as how would you like the ALAC -- how would the ALAC like the board to consider their advice.

I was just going to answer one question to start the discussion off, and then pass the floor to my colleague Carlton Samuels who is one of the co-chairs of the JAS working group. The question that Steve yesterday, that you asked initially in the list of questions that you had, which was to do with the fee reduction and the fact that the fee is actually a very small part of the amount of funding that you need to run a new gTLD if you are going to do such a thing.

I think that one answer which has not been provided to you regarding that was that in the document -- in the JAS working group final report,

there is a whole section about in-kind support. And definitely in-kind support is one of these things that alleviates the additional costs into running a gTLD. "In-kind support" being sponsorship or reduction of costs with regards to running all of the technical side of running a gTLD. I'm sure there will be some systems that will be built, and we've heard from the community already, from some potential sponsors that they would be willing to offer in-kind support.

Rod?

ROD BECKSTROM: Yes. Just to let you know, that Web site -- or those pages went up last week on the Web site. So if you go to the new gTLD Web site -- I'm not sure which button it is, but there is already a site where you can both apply for assistance or state your request for assistance or state that you want to provide assistance and of what type. It is just a simple structure database that has information about each of the parties.

And it's largely open and waiting for the community. So we hope that parties will dive in and use it. But it is up and running.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to add to Rod, it is already populated with, I guess, something like 10 to 15 requests and proposals of help. It is a good beginning.

ROD BECKSTROM: I'd say it is a very good beginning because I was only looking at it five days ago when it seemed like it was blank. I think it is great that people are responding and getting in. And please do so.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And so we have reviewed this page and we're very happy that it has come up so fast in such a timely manner before this whole meeting has started here in Dakar.

This clearly shows that the fee reduction or any of the other proposals in the JAS working group final report are just a set of measures to take one additional hurdle out of the way for bigger inclusion of applications from all around the world rather than just a smaller subset of the world.

But I shall pass the floor to my colleague Carlton Samuels to perhaps either answer some of your questions which might not have been answered during the session yesterday or engage in a broader dialogue with JAS working group and with the board. Thank you. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, chair. Carlton Samuels for the record. I am going to make an attempt to answer -- to bring together the two sides of the question. It is what is the expectation from the At-Large about the JAS and what we expect -- or what the board wants to hear from us, what we think we need to do.

We have completed the work. A lot of people of goodwill have spent a lot of time and energies in making some recommendations. I guess what we need since we are time compressed is a decision point from the board to the recommendations. So we would like to see it as quickly as possible.

That triggers to some other downstream work. And the first one which we hope is going to start fairly rapidly thereafter, and that is an implementation plan. And, of course, we are going to depend on staff to put together that implementation plan.

At the point of getting the flag to begin the implementation planning, we are also concerned that the possible beneficiaries would need to know about the program and what the board has decided so there is going to have to be a marketing and outreach operation that will spread the word to the global community. And yesterday in talking to Scott

Pinzon, we note that the outreach operations is still in park, principally because the budget situation has not been sorted out.

So we would hope that coincident with the decision by the board, the staff and Scott could get on the road and put the operation marketing and outreach operation in high gear.

This will also send a signal to the community -- and when I say "community," I mean the global community that they could participate in some areas. You heard our friends from the business constituency mention that they would be keen to participate in the outreach to ensure that as many persons who need to have the information get it through their own channels. And that is a challenge and it's also -- to the board, because they are looking for signals to begin to do that in a positive way.

There's one other thing that I would like to probably emphasize. And we cannot underestimate the role that a positive signal from the board will send to the entire community. And we want to ensure that when the signal goes out, everybody sees the flag and start the run.

Even before that, however, there is a sense that some preparatory work on the staff side might be approached and we wish to see something happen there.

One of the most important things in the recommendation is for a guide to be produced by staff. And we're talking about a guide that has the quality and the content which looks like the applicant guidebook. So we're asking for a support guidebook of the same quality and heft and the generic guidebook, new gTLD guidebook. So it is very important for the signal to begin with board action.

We trust that it is going to be positive on all fronts, and then the signal to the global community for action is where it begins. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Carlton. Any questions from the floor? It is difficult to see you. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet. I want to make one point. When we raise this issue, it was a few weeks ago. We are now in a very different situation. You put a lot of effort to produce a final report. You presented to the community yesterday. Very good with answering the question from the floor including a lot of board member. I'm not sure that you will be able to add something before we as board came back to you with some answer or some proposal or some idea or some acceptance or whatever we will do as board.

I suggest that we leave this topic now because you are not outside of the work done by the JAS group. You are really in the heart of that. And we -- I guess the board members know now what is your thinking, where you want ICANN to go with that subject.

And I need to tell you that we are taking that very seriously as the whole board. And we have a team working on that led by Chris Disspain and with some board member on this team to come with some proposal, idea and decision. I can't commit to any decision this week, but decision quick will be taken.

And I suggest that we go ahead to the next subject because this one, it's really very well explained by you yesterday and we understand all your points, I guess. Thank you very much.

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

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. It is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. The reason I am speaking at this point is we need to recognize -- and the

board members need to be aware -- that the JAS work group as we have now found out operated under an error of information. In a particular example of a very long debate on the business constituency's concern on bundling, the JAS work group was informed that it was not GNSO policy to go along those lines. We have had all sorts of people digging in all sorts of records in all sorts of places, and they have assured us that, in fact, this is one of those mythologies that has appeared from someone saying it very positively somewhere and it became enshrined. It is not fact.

So I need to clear the record. Would it have changed the outcome? Probably not. But we did operate under what I would call a misnomer which raises a systemic issue which the board may wish to consider, and that is perhaps the role of staff or someone in work groups of this importance to fact check, to ensure that what is going on the table and is affecting our debate is, in fact, accurate because this is an error that should not have occurred and I trust will never occur in the future. To that end, I do want to apologize for my statement publicly yesterday. Thank you, sir.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl.

                           Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I got the general sense but I'm not sure I followed the specific -- in capsule form, just for to make sure, I guess, what was the error and what are the fact? Without the history.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly. At yesterday's forum, the business constituency came forward and made the point that they had to abstain in the GNSO vote. One of the critical issues was bundling. Bundling with IDNs was not considered positively by the JAS work group. One of the influences on the outcome of that debate was the information we had been given

EN

that that was, in fact, not able to be pursued because of GNSO policy. Those policies have been checked. It is not the case. So we operated under incorrect information.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you for the clarification. Much appreciated.

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

Just a couple more words from Tijani and then we'll move to the next subject.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I will speak in French.

I already heard many times be repeated that the cost of the application is just a very small part of what the candidate would need to have to register. Yes, it is a part but it's not a small part. It's considerable amount and what we propose in the report, the report is not perfect but we -- I think that we thought about everything, we put everything in the report.

Also, we gave requirement limits for the person who's asking for it to be able to help for the one who does not have any help, no support.

So I think that the question that we could ask is that what if this -- if what is in the report is not sufficient, and the person we would help would not just close his register right afterwards. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: -- from Evan Leibovitch, who worked on the drafting team. Very brief, Evan, please.

EN

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Very brief. And the only reason I'm saying this is because there was a request from the board to us to consider the question of how would ALAC like the board to consider their advice, and I wanted to deal with that very specifically and very briefly, and just to let you know and remind you that the concept of applicant support has been something that has been a cornerstone of ALAC and At-Large's advice on the issue of new gTLDs going back to the summit and before.

The communique we had, in fact, out of the summit dealt specifically with this issue. It has been a main part of it, and the question of how do you want us to consider your advice, consider the fact that this has been as important to us in the implementation of the gTLD program as anything else we've been dealing with.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan, and we'll move to the next subject, which is the CEO search.

What qualities does the ALAC think we ought to be seeking in a new CEO?

What we're going to do is to open a wiki page with a new consultation process in At-Large and ask our communities what they think. We will synthesize it and we will get back to you.

Next topic, ethics guidelines. What are your top three concerns and proposals to address them.

[Laughter]

STEVE CROCKER: I was afraid we wouldn't end in time. Now I'm afraid we're going to end early.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Steve, just as a reminder, At-Large collects the views of the Internet users and responding to such a question, as you rightly said, might take hours and hours because there are so many different views, so synthesizing it in a format that you will be able to digest and the board will be able to digest is something that we will do and we will endeavor to have every single voice out there that we can collect and produce a document for you.

So next, ethics guidelines. What are your top three concerns and proposals to address them?

And for this subject, I propose that Jean-Jacques Subrenat, who is here on the table, provide some answers. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. I am Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I was a member of the board and now I am on the board -- on the committee of the users, ALAC.

You know, the work that has been done, you can find it very easily on the Internet site. I would like to limit my comments with logical remarks and heighten the level.

The difficulties is that there are two approaches, two challenges, first of all, for the whole community of the Internet, and in a few years to come, what are the challenges?

Everything that has -- that goes around protection of personal data, what concerns of course the respect of the civil rights, individual rights, et cetera.

It is also our obligation to think and to define the public interest, but when it comes to ICANN, it is a bit different since the duty of ICANN is more limited. ICANN has a technical task that is very defined, and it is then that dichotomy, this separation, this difference between the big plan, the big global idea that is very high in public interest, and on the other side, the task of ICANN.

Cases have been known or could be known in the future that would concern the matter -- or the way -- the way of ethics. A code of conduct could be formulated and mostly implemented within ICANN.

I have a small personal remark. A suggestion that comes from my experience in different roles that I had in the past.

We cannot -- we do not have time to reinvent the wheel. Associations around the world already exist that have defined the public interest, and the notion of public interest needs to be defended. I underline in its conception -- in its largest conception, try to define in the proper vocabulary and pages and pages of description what is or what is not public interest would go against the service that we should give to the public.

I just wanted to make these few comments to maybe start -- launch a discussion, if our president would wish.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: -- for questions or comments from the board or from ALAC members. Katim. And the mic should fly in your direction, so watch out.

KATIM TOURAY: Good afternoon -- or good morning, I should say.

(Speaker is off microphone.)

KATIM TOURAY: I know. No, but thanks very much, Olivier and the -- all of you ALAC members for inviting us. It's great to have this. It's always a pleasure to be amongst you to hear your counsel and your perspectives. And that's precisely the reason for my intervention.

I would -- you know, I heard Sebastien say that we need not discuss the JAS working group report because we've already gone over it, but my

EN

thing is that -- my feeling is that we probably, in that case, should have probably done a better job of coordinating between the GAC and the board on exactly issues that we are going to talk about.

In my opinion, we're here to listen, and so that means that you call the shots and tell us what you want us to talk about. It's not for us to tell you what we want to -- what we want to hear from you.

And so I think I'd just humbly suggest that next time, let's try to coordinate these topics better so that at least we have, a priori, what the issues are and if we have any objections to what it is that you want to talk about, we can gently tell you before we come here, rather than wait until we come here, you tell us this agenda, and we say, "No, no, I think that really doesn't help." Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Katim. Next, Ray?

RAY PLZAK: Ray Plzak for the scribes.

If -- I hope I didn't misunderstand what Katim just said, but yes, we are here to listen. However, we do have interest in things that -- so I certainly see it within our purview to ask you to comment to us about things because there may be things that we are working on that we would like an input from the ALAC and we don't want to wait till you become aware of the fact that we're working on it and then you generate a report.

It is very important that when we are in this dialogue setting, that we are capable of having this interchange.

So -- you know, and I've been an advocate for some time of these kind of formats and so forth, and I'm actually pushing for this to continue in this form.

And I'm also a strong advocate of having a coordinated agenda in advance, where we both have items on there and we have a small number of items so we can carry on a decent conversation.

So if that is agreed -- if that's agreeing with what he said, fine. If it's not, then you now have my opinion.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Ray. My personal opinion -- and perhaps I should -- to answer Katim, in ALAC we're used to dialogue rather than just one-way communication, and so it's very difficult in our DNA to be just speaking and not listening.

In fact, being on the At-Large Advisory Committee you spend more time listening than speaking. And so it's something which you're going to try to do -- well, if I try to do it, it's going to be pretty hard. We're here to listen to the board as well, because we're sure that the board has many very interesting things and things that could help us in the direct face-to-face dialogue.

So...

Any other comments, ALAC members or --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bertrand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Okay. It works. Hello, everyone.

There is a topic on what Jean-Jacques talked about. Jean-Jacques said the public interest, global public interest, there was a debate, an important one in Singapore in one of the workshops on what -- how we can define "public interest" or if we can't.

I would like to share something and see in which -- how you perceive this question.

At a national level, there is no definition of "national public interest." Each country has governance processes, constitution, elaboration of laws. The system publishes this process at a national interest. In each country, even though it's not respected, the system is accepted. The system is the one that produces the laws or the rules. This is the national -- national opinion that's expressed by this process.

When we talk global public interest within ICANN, what defines global public interest is the results of those processes and the actors can trust -- have to trust that the results of the process is in the global interest. And all of the process is transparent.

So I would like to share this opinion is we do not want to go ahead and try to define this "public interest," but just look into the quality of the process.

And lastly, in the debate about the ethics questions and the code of conduct, et cetera, we are all facing a fundamental problem with ICANN in particular.

One of the multistakeholder models is to have everyone participate in every process, not only in workshops but during the board -- on the board. All the people from the community and business. It is one of the bases of that model, multistakeholder model.

The problem that we have, especially on the board, if we go from the fact that the people from the community of the business are present on the board, we can put together a revolving door system, we get into a contradiction because we could be on the board while we work in business with a conflict of interest, but when we leave we cannot work in the business that we were working with while we were on the board.

This becomes complicated.

My question is difficult because it would mean a very important change, should we push the logic all the way, define the independence of the

board, and consider, like for national mediators, actors that have the function of mediators. The board members are completely independent. They should leave their previous jobs and be paid accordingly and have a revolving door afterwards.

I'm asking the question because the answer is very difficult. It would make a very important change. It would represent a different relation between the board and the rest of the community, and I'm asking this question because we need to ask -- I would like to have the feedback on this option and the difficulties or the advantages of this -- that this option would have.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: -- because we're short of time again. We can chew on this tomorrow at lunchtime.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At lunch.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I suggest...

(Speaker is off microphone.)

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ray will be chewing on food, for the record.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Jean-Jacques, do you wish to say a few more words?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Just a few words to expand on what Bertrand mentioned just now.

I think this is very important.

EN

ICANN still has, in its DNA, a large part of the pioneer spirit. And not all the procedures and mechanisms are those of a large worldwide corporation.

So I think one of the challenges is going from here to there, and in that sense, I think that we should underline and insist on the process, as you suggested, as much as on the definition.

I think that definition is not required because it shifts from one place to another.

But the process is very important, and I would like to place this in a wider context, which is un-ICANN and un-Internet.

I mean, even outside of that. The wider scope is what is happening in the world.

What's happening with the "Occupy Wall Street," all that? It's that there is (non-English word or phrase) a realization of the limits, in fact, or the failure of self-regulation. That is the real point, and we -- however limited and technical the remit of ICANN is today, I think it is our duty, both the board and all of us, to define something -- a mechanism and procedures which will allow us to go beyond the failure of the -- sorry?

(Speaker is off microphone.)

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yeah. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques, and with only five minutes remaining into our meeting, the -- let's move to the next agenda item, which is the ATRT Phase 2 implementation. Starting with the ALAC board communication protocols.

And from what Ray and Katim said earlier, it looks as though communication isn't that great yet, certainly on setting an agenda that we can do in one hour.

EN

For the record, we did have a discussion taking place, but only got an agenda from the board two days ago. I'm not sure when the board had decided to have the agenda. What I do suggest is that just as an answer actually to the 2(a), ALAC board communication protocols, in setting an agenda, the board takes one champion for that agenda to liaise with the ALAC. This is what we have done with the GAC, which is our next meeting, and we've got three points to discuss, which is a lot easier to discuss in 20 minutes for each point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So I think this one we can put to the side, since we have answered 2(a).

And so we'll just move for the last five minutes of this discussion with the board view on handling pressure to reform.

And you will have noticed that a piece of paper has landed magically on your table with an article from "the economist" entitled "the play thing of powerful nations."

If we can have the link put into the Adobe Connect room -- it's done? Fantastic.

And for this, shall I just -- Evan, do you wish to -- okay. So Evan. Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. And thanks for the opportunity.

When I read this article that was written by "the economist" at the end of the recently concluded IGF, the bottom two paragraphs in the article caught my specific attention, and this is, of course, "the economist" being a somewhat dispassionate but influential media organ essentially talking about challenges that ICANN faces going forward. And I'll call

attention to a couple of sentences here, and just ask for some board input on how you react to reading these things.

Specifically, "If even ICANN cannot command the respect of its stakeholders, the entire multistakeholder model may be in danger. That is why the American government, long an ardent defender of the model, is expected to put a lot of pressure on ICANN to change its ways when a decision is taken next year whether the group should remain in charge of running the physical infrastructure of the Internet address system."

I skip to the next paragraph: "Yet some experts argue that ICANN, and thus the multistakeholder model itself, can firmly establish itself only when it is underpinned by a proper constitution, complete with a bill of rights for stakeholders and a separate board of review."

And I will leave it at that and just ask for some input from board members on what you think about that kind of comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. And just please note, board members, that At-Large has had no input into that article, for the record.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Comments? Responses? Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: I'm looking around to see if any of my colleagues on the board are bold enough to jump into this. Aha! So Katim and Thomas. Oh, and -- and Judith, who is -- who is so eager to join.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Judith do something about the gender equity of this table, will you? Do something about the gender equity. Sit here.

STEVE CROCKER: And Ray. But -- you haven't -- you haven't tried to control Judith yet.

                        [Laughter]

JUDITH VAZQUEZ: We have to accept that yes, it's time for change. Not just the board. We have to respond to the community that is on the Internet, 2 billion, and there are 4 billion to go.

                        [Applause]

JUDITH VAZQUEZ: How do we, as ICANN, respond to the 4 billion coming in? And I speak as a nation. 2 billion where I am coming from.

STEVE CROCKER: Judith thank you.

JUDITH VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Katim, Thomas, and Ray and then I think we're out of time, if not before.

KATIM TOURAY: Yeah. Thanks. I think this is a very interesting article, and it -- okay. This is a very interesting article, and for me, it's just like the famous saying from Pogo, "We've found the enemy and the enemy is us."

                        I have always been harping at the notion of this issue being an existing self-threat to ICANN and I don't think I could have come with an even greater reason or evidence of this than this article here.

                        The sentiment is there, and I think it has to be addressed, and as I just -- all the time -- also keep saying, "Let's not do this from a perspective of

philanthropy or to make ourselves feel good, but because it will be in the best interest and long-term sustainability of the organization." Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. Thomas, quickly?

THOMAS NARTEN: Yeah. The only thing I was going to really say is, you know, as we all know, be careful about the press, because the press, they like to quote -- they like to highlight controversy and in the name of, quote-unquote, balance they like to give, quote-unquote, both sides of the view. And a lot of times they will quote people that have sort of an extreme view and raise that as the middle ground.

So, you know, as you go out and talk to people about ICANN, be sure that you -- you know, if you believe strongly in the model and you think ICANN works mostly and needs fixing around the edges, make sure you communicate that point at the same time as you focus on the part that you're, you know, currently worried about.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Ray?

RAY PLZAK: Thank you. A couple key phrases in here.

One is "proper consultation," the second one is the "bill of rights," and the third is the "board of review."

"Proper consultation" is something we're trying to do right here, okay? So it is something that's underway.

As you all are aware, in the earlier part of this year, we were striving to work at how we do proper consultation with the GAC.

So it is a problem that we recognize. We all recognize it, and we are all trying and striving to fix it.

So when someone says, "Yes," we'll say, "Yes, that's one of our principles, that's what we're trying to do, that's what we're trying to perfect," so this is one of the edges that Thomas is talking about.

"Bill of rights of stakeholders," yes, we agree there needs to be something there. We don't know exactly how to say it, and so forth. The very existent of the At-Large community the lack speaks to that, okay? We know that we have to do that, and we are trying to find the best way of doing that.

The fact that the At-Large has got a person on the board who they put there who's not representative of the ALAC, like none of the rest of us board members are, but the fact from a diversity standpoint, the different sources of putting people on the board, this is a recognition of the fact that we have to work in this area.

The last one, the "board of review" or Supreme Court, one of the things that could help that along is for the processes in the supporting organizations to become much more stronger and much more independent so the board itself does a lot more review and the board is not immersed in a merits discussions of various policies. So there's a lot of work to be done there. But there's also -- we do have, not an independent board of review but we do have the existence of an ombudsman, okay? And we have the reconsideration process. So we have a number of these things.

So going back to what Thomas said, if this author of this article had done a little research, he probably could have made this a much more broader article just by pointing out some of those things that are there as opposed to saying there's a need to have it as if it doesn't exist.

So the last thought I would have to say is that ICANN, like any other multicultural organization or multicultural society or so forth has got a problem, and ICANN is very quick to adopt ideas. ICANN is very slow to assimilate ideas. Multicultural organizations, multicultural nations exist

only when they use their commonalities as a firm basis and then use their differences to build their strengths. And so I think that's where we have to work towards.

STEVE CROCKER: That's an excellent note to bring this to a close, and thank you very much, Ray. I'm impressed with your eloquence.

We are out of time, and so I -- I think we need to -- let me thank you, on behalf of the ICANN board. As I said at the opening, we came primarily to listen. I think you've provided plenty for us to chew on, as we've been talking, and we will have a full meal.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steve, and we look forward to continuing this discussion tomorrow. So thank you, and thank you all.

[Applause]

[End of Audio]