

ICANN Dakar Meeting
Geographic Regions- TRANSCRIPTION
Thursday 27 October 2011 at 12:30 local

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

(Dave): We tried to overcome some of these disadvantages with the bottom-up special interest groups which may be temporary or long term.

We do not see them as being part of ICANN's decision making structures but of course they may lobby for support from the official representatives.

It may be sensible to require a minimum number of members within a special interest group before ICANN recognition is granted but otherwise every country may have its own special interest group which clearly doesn't make sense.

And the amount of support from ICANN will have to be subject to finances available. And we see these being primarily directed at helping with communication between members such as assisting with mailing lists, Web site pages and maybe even teleconference bridges.

And that's all I'm going to say because the rest at this stage because the rest was specific to ccNSO when I gave a similar presentation.

I would like to now just turn this over to the floor if there are any questions, comments. And please give your name for the record before you say anything. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Rob Hoggarth, ICANN staff for the record.

(Dave), did you want to review for the participants just where we are procedurally with these recommendations? Would you like?

(Dave): Thank you for volunteering Rob.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you. From a procedure a standpoint it's important to note that the proposals and recommendations that (Dave) has outlined are in draft form.

That document that is now out on public comment is a draft final report. On the ICANN Web site's public comment page there's a link to the public comment forum which is open through mid-December.

Members of the community have already begun to comment on the final report and that comment period will be remaining open until that time.

After that time members of the working group will then read and review the comments. And these proposals may be further modified.

The time frame I think somewhere in - and this is subject to your leadership (Dave), would be in early 2012 that the Working Group would finish its work, produce the formal final report.

And at that time the supporting organizations and advisory committees of ICANN would have an opportunity to make formal comments that the board would review in evaluating these recommendations.

Then of course the responsibility would be with the board whether to accept the recommendations or to just leave things the way we they are or to do something in-between. Thank you.

(Dave): From a procedure point if you might like to add at the end of that that will be the end of the - this working group's work. But it might be just the beginning of the work for some of the SOs and ACs.

Because what we strongly recommend is they then look at their bylaws and their diversity rules and regulations and make sure that we bring these up to date and make them consistent with whatever recommendations the board then accepts. So that would be the next stage after that.

And I keep mentioning, I mentioned particularly to the ccNSO, the faults that we have had in our bylaws right from the outset where the set up for the board was talking about individual's nationality.

And then many of the SOs and ACs started talking about countries. And the two are different and the properties are different. And they actually got for you to come up with a question, got their knickers in a twist in a few areas because of that.

So that's one thing in particular I would strongly recommend that they look at before moving on.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. I want first to thank the Working Group for the work he did. Tijani Ben Jemaa the record so first of all a big thanks to the Working Group.

Second, I would like to remind you that the geographic regions were introduced in ICANN to ensure diversity inside the board, diversity, cultural diversity and language diversity. And the proposal you make is not ensuring that.

Second, geographic regions have to be - have something to do with geographic regions, geographic. That means continuity. That means proximity at least.

We will not make - we will not add countries to make a region. We have to get a geographic region.

I know that this review was initiated by a request from the Arab countries to create an Arab region.

I personally don't agree on this because I don't want my region which is Africa to be fragmented.

But I don't think that the solution which is presented now will ensure anything from all the goals of the - the values of this geographic region's concept.

So any solution that doesn't ensure a diversity, a cultural diversity, linguistic diversity inside the board and inside the SO and AC wouldn't be acceptable in my point of view.

And also to create region made of parts of the world that aren't very far or very different, very conservative linguistically or geographically, this different is not a solution and it wouldn't ensure the diversity required. Thank you.

(Dave): I hear what you say. I don't understand where you get some of your reasoning from. I agree with the fundamentals that we should be looking at a geographic diversity that one thinks in terms of countries next to each other et cetera.

In my view of these proposals are much closer to having meeting that optimal scenario than the present one.

I mean if I can quote you the example of my own territory, Cayman Islands is in the European region. This makes no sense whereas under our new proposals it would be in North American region which is the first stop of an aircraft from - if I need to get an island.

So I don't understand quite where you're saying that we are diluting that. I think we are increasing the close location of many of the countries.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I explain if you put Kuwait in Europe I don't think you are making the (thing) closer. When you make - you put Iran and Europe what is the common culture or common language? What is the common geographic continuity between those regions?

(Dave): Fine. But they are next door to each other which is - so they're close. And we have said we know this is not perfect so if the local community wants to stay where it is that's fine. So we've tried to I believe accommodate that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And I hear what you say Tijani and I've been hearing what they've said on both sides of this debate for quite some time.

And it is perhaps to the question that we have not in my view probably asked ourselves what is the net benefit to ICANN and its structures and its diversity desires to changing from a five geographic region model that we have to a five geographic region model that is understood by ICANN as - is the RIRs right? What's the gain there?

The way we've said if we shift to RIR we will allow for people to self-select providing governments agree and later on. Is there a reason -- this question I'm unable to answer because it's not something we explored, is there a reason that that model is better than taking the self-selection and future planning full reviewer self-selection opportunities and only imposing that on the existing five geo model?

I mean I've been asked that question gentlemen since there's only gentlemen from the workgroup here.

I'm afraid I've coming to this table to declare publicly I'm unable to ask it - answer it.

I - we did not unless I was asleep at the wheel, explored that, that it was a valid question to be asked. I think it goes to the sorts of questions Tijani has raised and I believe we will hear (about) elsewhere around the table. And I found myself unable to answer that question.

Now it wasn't a (walks) moment, don't get me wrong. But it's perhaps as we are in draft final I admit, something well worthwhile chewing over. Thank you.

(Dave): I mean I don't have strong feelings on it. But I do have one come back. And that is keeping the present organization but allowing a self-selection out of that once, yes once.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Reshuffle.

(Dave): Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Everyone (unintelligible).

(Dave): Fine, that works. And perhaps and sorts out those countries that are currently that fit within ICANN and know that this is going on.

It doesn't do anything to sort out those that are not presently active in ICANN. And some of the reasons for their not being active may be because they're in the wrong region.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Quite possibly. But when one calls - Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. When one calls the moratorium on something which is what we - one would do, we have a defined time and a bit of publicity that goes with it.

And it may be because I'm always looking for the leverage in any opportunity be it disaster or delight, a great time to find out those very questions.

We also have the fact that we've got, you know, only half the countries of the world represented in ICANN by the GAC. That's a few more if we huddled together the GAC, the ALAC and the ccNSO.

But we're still only batting 3/4 if we're really looking optimistically and I doubt we'd even get that far.

So there's a whole lot of people who don't know what they don't know because they don't know what they don't know yet because they're not even engaged.

And you're going to have to have opportunity for either self-selection at the point of entry or review. So we've got - there's more to build. But we've already recognized there's more to build.

And as I say, if I'm asked the question what is the difference between taking the individual modifier capability that we have buildings through our proposal and just putting that with the existing five, where is the net difference there on our objective? I'm unable to answer that.

And if we are going to argue strongly for it we need to be able to answer that all of alternatives. And I don't know which way to go, simply I'm unable. And I don't like not being able to answer something.

I notice Mandy Carver looking in the room. Don't you have a geographic regional relationship with your part of the organization Mandy?

Robert Hoggarth: This is Rob for the - Rob Hoggarth for the record before Mandy speaks. We did consider the operational as you'll recall in the initial report and discussed the operational breakdown that the ICANN staff uses for - from a geographic perspective. So maybe that's what you're asking?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No it's not.

I did have a particular question for Mandy. You had looked at the net gains, net losses shuffling of the six (formats) together.

Is there any impact on the people that you're already engaging with our in a model that you might be moving to? If there's not that's not a problem. But if there is we probably need to think about it.

Mandy Carver: Mandy Carver, Global Partnerships for the record. And I was listening, not lurking. But you're right Cheryl, I should know better to come into a room without expecting to answer a question.

From Global Partnership's perspective as a department we don't actually...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You are regionalized.

Mandy Carver: We are regionalized. And we assign work on the basis often of linguistic and cultural skills. We actually see them in more regions to ICANN than ICANN has ever used in any of the settings.

And so we also have a very keen approach because it has geographic responsibilities, linguistic skills and also subject matter expertise.

We often end up with things like the person has the Caribbean and the person's got also (and in) the Pacific islands working together because of the

challenges for those island nations are the same even though geographically they're in very different places.

And so we're looking at things not only - and we're looking at Latin America versus the Caribbean. There are a couple of countries that are in the mainland if you will who have more linguistically in common with the island.

And so in some instances one rep might be handling something in a place rather than the other and they all work together.

So we would - we don't bar them from going next door. They are often asked by their colleagues to cover.

It wouldn't - given when we were currently set up and how few staff we have it would not have an impact. As we staff up in certain regions and also depending on how this sort of a concept of regional vice presidents is played out which is sort of following perhaps more along the RIR model, that may impact the allocation of the region...

((Crosstalk))

Mandy Carver: ...the managers like those resources underneath. And that has to be played out depending on which new (unintelligible) get hired and a decision about allocating.

But again, for instance for us we would see subdivisions within Asia optimally in a placement of staff and because of language and other kinds of things.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I'm hearing two - well I'm hearing one thing that's very important to me and I'm thinking that there's something that we might want to make very clear in our reporting. And I want you all to listen very carefully to see if it helps some of the problems you're bringing to the table.

What I'm hearing is a really strong argument based on your field experience. This is not theory. This is practice of why the bottom-up stuff regarding this report is so darn important because there are needs for language and culture and various other (unintelligible) ways to get out.

I think we want to make sure that perhaps there's a bottom line in our writing somewhere that makes it really clear that that is - this is not just an add-on. This is an integral part of the proposal that may (aid) some of your fears. I just wonder about that.

The other thing is that I - from what I've - what I just heard you said there was an RIR-like model. Are you suggesting that the way you may be naturally shuffling your areas around could be more then lined with the RIR just because it's one of the areas you work with a lot or...

Mandy Carver: No. What I meant was my understanding of the vice presidencies that have been listed is that there is - because we currently have someone who is the vice president for the Americas. But we have posted for a vice president of Latin America, one for Asia, one for Africa and one for Europe.

So if you already have what would by definition then become North America and you've got Latin America, Europe, Africa and Asia I sort of think of that as ARIN LACNIC.

Now there are subdivisions within that and also to go to Tijani's point, so (Baharsmad) represents the Middle East for us and he is an Arabic speaker.

He actually lives in Cairo. And (Michelle Enay) who handles Africa always teases him that he lives in her region. But it's not going to change the countries he's working with depending on where they're assigned any more than it would change (Michelle)'s.

The shifts might be around the Caribbean. But again, that's not going to impact our staff. And...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Mandy Carver: We might one day resources and hiring speed allowing have ten people who have a global partnerships affiliation.

But three or four of them might be under the vice president for Asia because - sub region because, you know, you might say well there's (Atian) and there's northeast and there's, you know, so even if - as you're all aware how huge the AP is but you might end up with three or four people working within that, all working together collegially and with all the other regions but they would then be able to drill down a bit more on a subset within that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) and then I will do my very best to be quiet for a short amount of time but it be (controlled only) the following points.

And I think we also might need to look very seriously at making more of that self-determination choice of if we move into a model at all. The self-determination choice might need to be bumped up because I have a feeling that a lot of people are only reading so (if we move to where), not the fact that you don't have to.

I'm not sure that in the document we've got some reading far enough down the paperwork. Now at that we probably should go to some of the people who obviously Tijani has read the document very thoroughly.

And but I just - just talking about the questions I'm getting makes me feel like you're not getting to the end of the details so maybe if we can find a way of teaching it differently that might be good.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa for the record. I think that Cheryl made a very important point. How will the region official of ICANN deal with the (open) regions?

Because why we have a regional official it is because he understands the language and the culture and it's better to - and he's the best one to interact with the region.

So the one who would be appointed to (Opah) will deal with (Iraq) and with Kuwait and with the German, Spanish, the (need) - what is the need link between.

So I think that the best for ICANN and its community, especially for the community is that we don't change something if we don't improve the values. We put the geographic regions in ICANN, I mean the diversity -- very important, the diversity.

And second we have to make the regions closer if possible. You will say Caribbean are closer to Latin America. But perhaps they are better to be in North America. It's their problem.

And I agree with Cheryl that if we don't have a better system let's keep ours and let people choose to change. Don't (propose) them to change.

If I am - if for example suppose the most people by the - there are - I don't know, they're had some material from (Europa), shall we say in the - or in essence the World Health Organization we have to make them in the region of Europe because they are buying their material from there?

The (real) it's only a facility. And it cannot be based from a region. So please don't change if we don't have better.

(Dave): Yes but then it becomes an opinion of does it get better or not?

John Curran: John Curran, President and CEO of ARIN, the American Registry for Internet Numbers.

I just want to say I thank the group for its work. I wanted to reiterate an important point. The RIRs are strongly committed to ICANN and we're strongly committed to ICANN regardless of what structure IPN operates in, whether you have no regions, two regions or ten regions, regions that align or don't, we will happily work with ICANN and make things happen.

We do have cases now where regions don't line up. An example, I work very strongly as does (Raul) with LACNIC. We work very strongly in the Caribbean where there are Caribbean organizations that have meetings.

And both LACNIC and (Agerman) have members in the Caribbean. You'll find one or both of us depending on how many members are there from what mix. We cross share and cross represent as needed.

So we will, the RIRs will certainly work with any regional structure that this group comes up with and ICANN decides to adopt. And we just welcome you on your work.

We don't want you to be concerned one way or another. We're just here to support you no matter what comes up. Okay? Thank you.

(Dave): Yes thank you for that comment. And it is in fact as we understood. Thank you.

(Santi Porta): Thank you. My name is (Santi Porta) for records. I - my speaking is just (unintelligible) because my colleagues (Celia) project my thought.

((Foreign Language Spoken)).

((Crosstalk))

(Celia): ...congratulates you for your work.

((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): I say again - before.

(Santi Porta): Sorry.

((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): I have some doubts about the treatment.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): ((Foreign Language Spoken)) yes.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): I have some doubts about the meeting we have with ALAC and I would like to say it again.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): The point.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

((Crosstalk))

(Celia): That we - that you have mentioned.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): That you mentioned as (unintelligible) like a territory or estate.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

((Crosstalk))

(Celia): ...people believes.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): And (unintelligible) believes that (unintelligible) are part of their country, their territory.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): We speak of our territories (unintelligible).

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): He's talking about the names, they all of south island near (unintelligible).

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): He's spoken about ccTLDs in that region.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): Talking about this he would like to be on the record in that special group.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): That the position about (unintelligible) from Argentina Latin American.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): He wants to talk about another point. It's about the document, this payment.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): You speak about (Malvina).

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): I would like to say if you can put the - both names (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) Island.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): And in the English statement...

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): To put the same, the both names.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): As one of the solutions for in the United States is (unintelligible).

(Santi Porta): 3160.25 United States - United Union. Yes that's it?

(Celia): Yes.

(Santi Porta): Okay.

((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): And take off in any document the statement that is a part (territory) from Argentina.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): I know that ICANN...

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): ...intend to do that.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): ICANN a big part of political issues.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): Take part from one part or another...

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): ...to be part.

(Santi Porta): ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Celia): (Unintelligible) thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

If you - and I will go first. It is so important that statements like yours clear and articulate outlining the concerns you have with the specifics of our drafting come to us now.

This (social) is a perfect example of where you and your community have read the documentation, have realized that there may be issue, political issue that we as ICANN we're not intending.

And this is a modest take on the model in perfect working order right here right now with the (unintelligible) listening to the statements that are being made and we actually go forward in better understanding okay?

So thank you for your time. And I know it has been considerable time and that this is a great effort that is going in to be involved with this part of the policies that you and your region are looking at right now.

And it's part of the difficulty of how ICANN works with so many things happening over so short a time. But the fact that you caught this I suspect will earn you the gratitude of many, not just those around this table.

((Foreign Language Spoken)).

(Dave): Thank you. And this is another reason that we don't have to change the regions but we have to ask countries to choose where they want to be.

We may create such a problem, such political problem that you don't want to create. I can have it to go inside any kind of political problem.

So let people choose. And don't propose something that can raise such a problem.

Have we got any other comments or questions?

Man: There's nothing on the line.

(Dave): Okay. Well in that case thank you very much, some very useful comments and discussions.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Dave): Yes. Yes.

Man: You're entering report was put for the comments. And there was a lot of comments in this direction. But I think that you continue to consider the RIR - RI - IRR as the best solution.

I think that the comments have to be taken into account.

Woman: Yes (unintelligible) and this is my just personal question about one of your findings. Because according to your findings you said there is no single independent or politic (based) of the countries.

So I wonder whether how many kind of the list you have of sort of found? Like can't we - because I didn't read that report so I wanted to know whether you have listed all those kinds of (the list) that you have studied in the report?

(Dave): Yes we have listed a large number, primarily UN organizations. And in the report we show what their groupings are. And they are all different. Every UN organization has got a different rate down.

Man: Now as for the existing geographic regions, we have some international organizations that have two or even more than two geographic regions different. And it's normal.

For example, what I know very well, ITO is using more than one geographic region. And this - there is a reason for that.

For example, for the (frequencies) we have a distribution absolutely different from the others.

They don't have anything to do with diversity, culture, linguistic -- nothing. It is only for the frequency distribution then the best way to do it is with this distribution so any geographic regions have (gone) for a name, a target.

And the target of ICANN is the diversity, linguistic and cultural diversity.
Thank you.

(Olivier): Yes (Olivier) here. Everyone that we looked at had a purpose which was different from the next organization's purpose. We even looked at the Football World Cup (unintelligible) but, you know, okay (unintelligible) sorry.

John Curran: So John Curran, CEO of ARIN. I've got to actually share a little more for background because I founded ARIN in 1997 to get the Internet number system outside of the US government control.

At that time APNIC and (WIP) were operational and ARIN was the RIR which was the rest of the world. Region was everything else out of APNIC and everything outside of (WIP).

And when LATNIC was being formed we had to figure out what was in LATNIC and what was in ARIN and same thing with AfriNIC.

And because the question was raised sort of indirectly, the RIRs have a regional structure, what is its breakdown?

I know Paul Wilson spoke a little bit with this group. And I guess I'll say the breakdown has been predominantly on language issue and ability to work together. It's truly a structure designed to make it convenient for technical coordination.

It - it's not necessarily convenient politically. It's not necessarily convenient with respect to other governance organizations. We went into those situations.

And so I guess I will need to say I just want to be clear, the structure we came up with we don't think is the end all be all structure of how regions should be aligned. But it's one that's been proved workable by the people who've participated in it.

It is also true though that that participation has been predominantly people focused entirely on getting the coordination job done and very little to do with governance beyond that and very little to do with politics beyond that.

(Dave): Thank you for the comment. We said we have never said that the R or IR structure was a be all and end all.

Neither with that it was a little bit better than what we have at the moment. Now that is a matter of opinion. I accept that. But that's where we are.

We're obviously going to be doing some more talking about that. Any more comments ladies and gentlemen because if not I will thank you all very much and close the meeting. Thank you.

END