
DURBAN – ALAC and Regional Leadership
Sunday, July 14, 2013 – 09:00 to 18:30
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning everyone. We're going to start very soon, in about five minutes or so. I gather the next bus is going to arrive just now so we'll have another wave of people arriving. [Pause] We'll be starting in one or two minutes. Okay, could we have the recording on please? Thank you very much.

Okay, good morning everybody. Welcome to Durban.

MATT ASHTIANI: No, I have to... Welcome everyone to the ALAC and Regional Leadership meeting on the 14th of July 2013. May I please remind everyone to state your name before speaking and please speak at a reasonable rate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Matt. Welcome everyone to Durban. You will notice there are a few gaps in our lineup and that's because a few people were not able to make it due to several travel issues, unfortunately. So hopefully some of them will be able to join us later on in the week but others are permanently not able to join us, unfortunately.

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.

Nonetheless, we shall start this session with a quick roll call around the table, with everyone introducing themselves quickly. We'll start over from my left.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Hello, good morning everybody. I'm Sylvia Herlein Leite, LACRALO Secretary.

NATALIA ENCISO: Hello, this is Natalia Enciso, ALAC Member from LACRALO.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Good morning, Eduardo Diaz, NARALO.

DHARMA DAILY: Good morning, Dharma Daily, NARALO.

GARTH BRUEN: Good morning, Garth Bruen, NARALO Chair.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Good morning, Yaovi Atohoun, ALAC from AFRALO.

AZIZ HILALI: Aziz Hilali, Secretary of AFRALO.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ALAC.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer, SSAC Liaison.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, AFRALO.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Hi, I'm Fatimata Seye Sylla from AFRALO.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Evan Leibovitch, North American region, ALAC Vice Chair.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Heidi Ullrich, At-Large ICANN Staff.

CARLOS REYES: Carlos Reyes, ICANN Staff.

MATT ASHTIANI: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN Staff.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco, ICANN Staff.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, ALAC Member from LACRALO.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Good morning. José Arce from LACRALO.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Good morning, Sebastian Bachollet.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon Chung, ISOC Hong Kong, IDN Liaison.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, APRALO, ccNSO Liaison.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this quick roundup around the table. A few housekeeping rules. The first one, as Matt has mentioned earlier, I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond. You have to say your name before you start. Your intervention afterward and that's of course because we have interpretation here and we also have more participants, and when you're on the interpreter channel it is rather hard to follow a discussion when people don't introduce themselves.

Second thing that we would like to introduce at this meeting: you all have name cards, I can see them here, these ones, and in order to request to speak... Well, if you don't have a name card you'll have to put your hand up, I guess, but we'll try to do the UN thing, which is to put your card on the side or to pull your name card up.

And that also means that if you lose your name card it's a big problem. We've found in the past that if name cards remain on tables they disappear. Take them with you. You are in charge of it now. That's yours to keep for the whole week. [laughter] And I've been asked to ask for this so don't blame me. Make sure you keep yours.

We've got a very full week with a lot of sessions that are going to take place. The Ex-Com met last night for a briefing and whilst we all thought we were going to enjoy the food I can't remember what we ate because we had so much discussion about many different subjects. Among the... Yeah, and Evan had a lot of chilies at the same time.

Among the things that we discussed, the more recent advice that the ALAC has provided with regards to .list domains and other SSAC advice that we have really supported, there's another piece of advice which deals with IDNs – internationalized domain names. That is a really hot topic at the moment and there will be additional meetings for select Members of the people around this table, that deals specifically with IDN issues.

We've got some lunches with specific Members involved in Working Group, to discuss things with Staff, with other SOs, other ACs, etc. And of course we've got all of our daytime meetings which are quite full. I hope that you will all be able to take an active part in these discussions.

It's important that we use the face-to-face time we have to get things moving, and certainly things that ICANN are not slowing down, they're speeding up – especially with all of the changes that are currently taking

place; both in the Staff structure but also in the different projects that are being launched.

Apart from this, the Working Groups are going to be meeting up. If you're not part of a Working Group, and I think very few of us aren't, but if you're not, then do go over to these Working Group meetings but also go to meetings outside of this room. It's particularly important. I remind you all that the wrap-up session on Thursday is the only one where we need to have a quorum because that's when we have to vote.

And I know that this clashes with some other sessions that are outside and that some of our Members are involved with. We have made arrangements for those people to be able to vote remotely whilst being in the room next door. If you're aware that you're not going to be able to make it to the Thursday wrap-up meeting, please tell Staff and Matt will arrange with you how you can vote directly.

So that's the current housekeeping on this. Apart from that, Heidi, have I forgotten anything?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Olivier. Just to let everyone know that at your desk you will have the folders with the current information, the current Agendas for all the meetings this week. There are also a lot of informal meetings and we'll be giving you that information shortly as well. In that guide you'll also have the meeting guide, which on the back has a venue map. There's also an additional venue map in there.

You'll also see in there the [audio break] on the ATRT 2 meeting. The questions are in here. So do bring this with you throughout the week. There is information in here that's going to help you. Also, this time we're going to be putting the action items directly on the Wiki page for all of the meetings.

So as action items are stated we're going to make sure that they're restated for the record so we can copy that correctly and we'll put it directly onto a Wiki page that we can review at the end of the week. Olivier, I think that's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Heidi. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to tell you that all the printed material regarding this meeting doesn't include our showcase. That is something that has to be reported.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Of course the showcase is on late Monday afternoon. That will take place in this room? In this room. Fantastic. I always look forward to AFRALO showcases. For those who haven't got one of these I think we might still have a few spare ones. There is an AFRALO brochure with Africa's Internet Users Voice. It's very interesting to see the background and an insight into our different ALSes that are scattered around Africa, a very large continent and a lot of very diverse ALSes.

Without any further ado I see that our guests for this morning session have arrived and so I welcome to the table the Regional Vice Presidents. We have also Duncan Burns, VP of Global Communication and Chris Gift, Vice President for the Online Community Services. I welcome them all to the table. I don't know if we can fit you all... We didn't think you'd all turn up. [laughter]

Okay, so thank you very much. Welcome gentleman. We only have name cards, apparently, for a couple of you, so it would be good if you could each, in turn, introduce yourselves please.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: Christopher Mondini. I am Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement for North America and for global business.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Good morning. My name is Rodrigo de la Parra and I'm Vice President of Latin America and the Caribbean.

DUNCAN BURNS: Good morning. My name's Duncan Burns. I'm the VP of Global Communications, and on behalf of Sally Costerton, she sends her sincere apologies. She had a passport snafu, which meant she wasn't able to arrive when she was supposed to and is actually at the Passport Office at the moment, which is why she wasn't able to dial in. So she sends her sincere apologies and has made sure we're all here to answer your questions.

SAVE VOCEA: Good morning. My name is Save Vocea. I'm the Regional Vice President for Australasia and the Pacific Islands, which is Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands.

BAHER ASMET: Morning. My name is Baher Asmet, I'm the Regional Vice President for the Middle East.

NIGEL HICKSON: Good morning, my name is Nigel Hickson. I'm the Regional Vice President for Europe and it's good to see many of you again.

CHRIS GIFT: Good morning. I'm Chris Gift, responsible for our online services at ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much and I think that we might wish to start perhaps with Duncan Burns, since you are the new face here. We've already seen everyone else in this room. Perhaps you could give us a bit of background and information and it's really your choice as to where you want to take it from here.

DUNCAN BURNS: Well, thank you. Good morning again. Yes, this is my first meeting. I'm glad to be here. You're actually only the second meeting I've been able to talk with. I'm two months into joining ICANN and I joined from a

public relations, public affairs firm, Hill & Knowlton, where I've been running the Washington DC office and also one of their global practices, working on a range of corporate NGO energy issues and clients around the world.

Before working with H & K I worked for the British Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong. I'm based in DC, despite the accent. I'm very happy to take questions. I'm obviously still learning my brief to a certain extent.

I think one of the areas Chris is going to talk about, in terms of digital engagement, that's an area where we've been spending a lot of time, energy and focus in how to reach people in a way that they can be reached and connects with them, in a way that helps drive more engagement and more participation in the multi stakeholder model.

There are some quite interesting tools that we're working on that I hope you'll give us some feedback on. There are some announcements around about something called ICANNLabs, which you'll hear more on shortly; more this afternoon and a bit more from Fadi tomorrow morning.

In terms of the Communications Team, we are in the process of redoubling our efforts in terms of personnel and areas we focus on. So some of you will know Jim Trengrove, who's just sitting behind us. Jim's taking on a bigger remit in terms of content creation, particularly around video. We are also looking to make hires in Montevideo, in Singapore and Istanbul.

We're very close to someone in Montevideo so I hope we'll have a signed contract within the next week or two, which would be excellent and a real start to outreach in Latin America from a comms point of view, which is very important to us.

On the other side, I know we touched a bit on... Digital engagement is... We look at social media. That's obviously a great venue where there are a lot of opportunities for us and where perhaps we've been a little too much broadcast and not enough engagement. But it's certainly something we're looking at and reinvigorating our effort there.

Fadi has also decided he would like to Tweet so you'll start to see him if you follow "@icann_president". That's going to be Fadi. We also have other approaches where we're bringing social media to work and I think it's really trying to look at the full range of channels to help drive engagement and participation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Duncan. I'm sorry, I think these speakers in the middle don't work very well. It would be good to bring them up a little bit, because we can hear the echo from the room but not the speakers in front of us. I do note many of our colleagues here have got their headphones on to try and understand.

Thank you for this great introduction. I think one thing that I do like hearing is this global engagement, the global sense to it and that you're not thinking on a national level but you're covering the whole world.

DUNCAN BURNS: One of the areas in global engagement where I know from [inaudible 00:42:32], very naturally, we're going to be working closely with the Regional Vice Presidents. For example the Latin America person I was just talking with, working very closely with, Rodrigo – and then how do we support and roll out the Latin America strategy, the common strategy that supports what we need to be doing in the region.

And I think that's fairly critical – that we work in partnership together, because engagement and communication and different sides of the same coin in many ways.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Duncan. Any questions? I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm delighted to hear things like two-way and participatory and engagement. That's going to be delightful. I did want to just ask a question – which I'm sure Save has raised, because he does us proud from the Pacific. I am concerned... I'm a big fan of video; visual is fantastic, but we still need to have those things language sub-texted in many ways, so I'd encourage you...

I know Chris has heard me wax lyrical on this and is undoubtedly bored to hear it again, but if we can get the ability to sub-text and have a running ticker in local languages that will make a big difference as we break into this couple of other billion people we need to engage.

The other thing I wanted to raise is do always remember the whole bandwidth issue. Clearly I'd be shocked and horrified if you weren't

thinking mainly mobile, but we also should be having equally good messages coming out in radio and small podcast and the back border stuff as well.

It's very good for example if we can look at almost W3C compliance on some of these messages, because if it's an accessible message it's an accessible message in terms of universality. So lots of vision – fantastic. Don't forget the bandwidth issues. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Duncan?

DUNCAN BURNS: You make some great points. I think language is obviously an area of complexity that needs to be addressed to have proper engagement. I know that's something we're putting a lot of time and attention into. To the bandwidth point, you're right – we shouldn't be building sites that aren't responsive, that don't work in both, and I think video can be a very powerful tool but it's only powerful if you can actually watch it.

So one of the areas Chris and I are working on, is that there are various audio tools; we can use Audioboo and others where we can probably set up a channel – we have already set up a channel that we're trying to experiment with – how do we perhaps utilize video content and then put the audio track on Audioboo, because it's low bandwidth and it's easier to get to.

With podcasts I need to get more up to speed with what we have done. I think the challenge there is that you need to make some subscription

and you need to drive enough of the content. And all of this requires content, from us, from Staff, from the community. And I think that's an area where we want more – the more content we can create, the more voices, the more engagement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Duncan. Next I believe Rinalia wanted to ask a question.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Well, I'm not sure if it qualifies as a question targeted at Duncan. I'm missing the presence of the Vice President from Asia. I understand that one has been appointed, so where is he?

DUNCAN BURNS: [Tuquek? 00:46:20] is physically here but he starts on August the 1st, so he's still technically working for his current employer. He is here and we're happy to make an introduction but he's not really an ICANN Staff so he can't really talk from that seat, but he's very impressive and so I'm very happy to make the introduction.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: It would be nice if you were introduced to us at this meeting because we would like to get some informal discussions on ideas or thoughts on the regional strategy. Asia is lagging behind the other developing regions and half of Internet users are located in Asia Pacific.

DUNCAN BURNS: We'll work with Heidi to make an introduction and I think you'll appreciate his enthusiasm and the energy he'll bring to this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Oh!

MANDY CARVER: I'm sorry. Rinalia, he is aware of how far things are moving and they are starting to put things in place so that he can ramp up very quickly when he starts, with a goal that at the Asia Pacific IGF there could be an announcement of plans and then a presentation of next steps in Buenos Aires. So we will make sure that we connect the two of you today.

MATT ASHTIANI: I apologise for interrupting. May I please request that the guests speak into the microphone and speak a little bit louder as it's not being recorded.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We just managed to find a flying mic. We caught it.

SAVE VOCEA: Because the topic was on Asia Pacific and I'm looking after a sub-regional Pacific Islands, Australia and New Zealand, we've also decided that we will work on our engagement strategy for the Pacific Islands, Australia and New Zealand, and tie it together with the whole AP thing.

We're not splitting it but we'll have a Sub-Working Group for that region because of its special needs.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mandy Carver.

MANDY CARVER: I'm sorry, I'll just repeat it. [Kwak? 00:49:00] is, as Duncan said, is starting on August 1st but we will make sure to connect him with you here because he is putting things in place so that they can ramp up the Asia strategy with an announcement by Fadi at the Asia Pacific IGF in Seoul in September.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Mandy. We're looking forward to him and to see him come over to our meetings. Next we have Yaovi Atohoun.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. Cheryl raised a very important point regarding bandwidth and I have a specific comment regarding the webinar. Currently I'm not sure that even if people can download the webinar after the webinar that they are able to go through it without being online. So I ask you to look at that because I'm not sure. You may need to be connected, after downloading the file, to be able to read the webinar file. Thank you.

DUNCAN BURNS: We'll certainly look into that and come back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Duncan. I can say with our our region being very diverse, some continents have more telecommunication challenges than others do. One of the concerns that this region has had in the past few months, I guess, since parts of the digital strategy are being rolled and being presented to us, is that a lot of these services might involve the need for higher bandwidth or constant, very reliable connectivity.

And certainly, being able to consult documents and podcasts and other material offline is very important because you might be able to download it over a line that's not too good. If you need to be on all the time and the slightest glitch makes your screen flip, that doesn't work at all and that would be totally worthless to some of our regions at that point.

DUNCAN BURNS: I hear you loud and clear and I think bandwidth is obviously one where we can try and shape our content, we'll try and make it work on as many different levels of bandwidth and accessibility as possible. That's something that Chris and I are working closely on and that our Regional Vice Presidents remind us of on a regular basis to make sure that we're creating content in a way that people can actually access it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. We have a queue. Garth Bruen, Dharma Daily and then Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. So first, Garth Bruen, please.

GARTH BRUEN: Actually I believe Dharma was first.

DHARMA DAILY: Hey. How were you thinking about segmentation in terms of your outreach and communications?

DUNCAN BURNS: In terms of audiences there are... Sorry, I'm trying to see if Chris is... We are looking at the... There is the continuum of engagement in terms of how people are engaging with ICANN. They are very engaged – those who are here, those who are paying attention, those who want regular updates.

There's that level of segmentation in terms of need and desire for information and then there's obviously and audience segmentation. In terms of the business community I would let Chris Mondini fill you in on how he's approaching that more holistically. I think from a comms point of view we're really looking at a range of content that allows people to make the journey from, "I don't know anything about ICANN."

So it needs to be very accessible, not too technical, through onto making sure even the more technical things are still accessible. Then, as we drive that into the different markets, really working with community

members to build and tailor content that works for the audiences we're in front of. So if we're giving a speech in a certain fora, that the content is appropriate and accessible.

Working with the Regional Vice Presidents who are driving a lot of our engagement and using them with media and in other fora as the main targets initially and really trying to build segmentation off of the regional plans.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Duncan. Chris Gift?

CHRIS GIFT: Thank you. I just wanted to add to what Duncan was saying and I'll touch some more upon this when I talk about digital engagement. But we are segmenting obviously by region – we want to show data relevant to the region, regionally-relevant data, so that's one segment on the digital side.

The other way is, as he alluded to, it's experience-based – how much knowledge [clears throat] or experience you have with engaging with ICANN. So you self select the content that's most appropriate for you and then navigate inward depending on how much you want to learn. And I'll touch in much more detail about this a little bit later this morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Chris. Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Mr. Chair. We're becoming very, very aware of the need to reach out to the visually impaired community and I was wondering, within ICANN, if there was a specific plan, a comprehensive plan, to reach out to the visually-impaired community?

CHRIS GIFT: Yes, thank you very much for that comment. We are very committed to having all services accessible and that includes making sure that photos and videos are appropriately tagged so that readers can use them. We have just – on a new service that we are rolling out, called LUCID meetings, which I think we'll be discussing this afternoon – helped that vendor go through a major redesign and evaluation for complete accessibility.

I can say that I have a personal commitment to make sure that all services going forward are completely accessible. And I don't just mean for visual issues but that can also relate to bandwidth, device, sometimes even cognitive...

GARTH BRUEN: Do we have a specific representative or any contacts within the visually impaired community? Someone representing them?

CHRIS GIFT: No. The way we're going about it now – although that's probably a good suggestion – the way we're going about it now is we're working with consultants who specialize in accessibility design and so we're suing

their expertise because right now it's more of an art than a science still. The standards are a little bit behind and so that's what we use right now.

GARTH BRUEN: I think you would find that within the visually impaired community there are a lot of people who have worked in this area and spent a lot of time thinking about it. So I think it would be useful actually finding somebody. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Garth. Perhaps even just a contractor to start with, to get things moving, get the ball rolling. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Two things: first of all, Matt, if you would be so kind, it may or may not happen on your screen but if there's a mechanism of you just pulling up the shared space alone, I want to test to see if something happens in this operating system rather... So it's out of the AC room, Matt, and where we would have PowerPoints, etc.

Go back into the AC room and if you were just going to pull up just the shared space, just the PowerPoint screen. It may not happen with Matt's operating system, which actually in itself is telling.

If you're using an Android device; a Linux or Unix-based system, in fact any sort of open-source software, which the majority of those few billion people we mentioned earlier just might be getting access through, you

will find that the configuration in the tools we've all come to love, know and desire are vastly different.

And I'd very much like you to have a little look at how things go across these platforms. I'd also like you to look very carefully about services and standards that we've had – for example, in what I used to think was a great tool: the Adobe Connect – have simply not kept up with each of the updates. So anyone who uses open-source software has had a continuous decline in service with Adobe Connect rooms to the point where they are virtually unusable, in particular in a mobile environment.

So I assume we actually pay for some of these services? I suggest a somewhat more aggressive negotiation tactic on service level agreements is attended too, happy to be a bitch and help if that's going to be of any use. But if I was to be able to show my Android device, when I push a button, which gives me full screen imaging, I get the PowerPoint that says the meeting has ended.

Come on guys! That's an oops, and that's an oops that's been there from Beijing and before. This is basically back-end being checked by people to make sure that prior planning prevents piss-poor performance, and if I'm trying to run that off my phone, let alone my tablet and especially from a remote environment, I'm actually misdirecting my clients. Message received, I trust?

On the matter of accessibility, we do in fact have a number of local communities and some At-Large structures whose purpose in their real world environment, in their nation or regional area, is special needs or various disabilities. So I'm quite sure, without speaking on their behalf,

that it would be very easy for Staff to put you in negotiation or contact with those people.

And that would include, I'll hasten to add, a Member of the Internet Society of Australia who is recognized internationally in accessibility and they'll probably come a tad cheaper than the ones you might have to pay. Thank you.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Thank you. I haven't seen the open-source Android issue before but we can work together and come back to that, and I see Chris is going to. In terms of accessibility, in many ways this is something that we need to perpetually strive for, to make things more accessible. There's no end point where suddenly we've achieved full accessibility.

There are always going to be new tools, there are always going to be new iterations and there are always going to be new ways that people want to interact. So it's a mindset we're really trying to incorporate and encourage the feedback in. If there are services people within your groups, others who aren't part of the At-Large community that we should be talking to, let us know because we welcome all smart thoughts.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Duncan. Bearing in mind that the highest growth in Internet these days is through mobile devices, we might all have laptops and some of us already have moved to the next level, without having a laptop but with a small tablet, as you've seen several of our

members do. There are less laptops out there than there are mobile devices and that certainly would help. Chris Gift?

CHRIS GIFT:

Thank you. Yes, just to close on the accessibility issue. To Duncan's point, it is a journey. It's constantly evolving. We have to keep working on it, there's never an end point. So I agree wholeheartedly with that point. I do think though that if we hadn't made it clear in the past, we are very, very focused on that going forward.

Personally, as I said, I am very, very committed to having accessible services. I agree with you that everybody must be able to participate in ICANN, regardless of any issues around that point. So you have our wholehearted support on that. And we'll definitely reach out to some of these other individuals that could perhaps help us move forward on some of...

With regards to the Adobe Connect, [sighs] unfortunately none of us here own it – I'm not using that as an excuse, I'm just saying [laughs] – but we'll definitely take it back to IT and tell them. And hopefully... We are looking at other tools that are a bit more bandwidth friendly and are more device-friendly as well. So we are looking at that, and I think one of them we'll explore a little bit later on this afternoon.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

As a response to that, I'm not just singling out Adobe. It is absolutely ridiculous that with two Android devices, one I can run a WebEx on and

one I can't. Your tech guys really have to be on top of testing the tools we use. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. I've still got a queue at the moment with Dev Anand Teelucksingh and then Rinalia Abdul Rahim and then there's also a remote participant question that will come immediately afterwards. Dev Anand?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I just wanted to find out... I know there are some recent developments regarding the Caribbean, in terms of the global stakeholder engagement. I don't know if somebody, either Rodrigo or Duncan would want to speak on that?

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you Dev for the question. As Duncan has mentioned, we are going to have one fulltime person dealing with communications for the region and that of course includes the Caribbean. There's one particular project that has been identified to have the highest priority in the Latin American and the Caribbean strategy that has to do with a communications plan.

Of course, this plan is driven by the community – we have participation from the Caribbean and the idea is not only to have the communications plan but also to implement it in a way that all the material that's been produced in different constituency groups of ICANN, it's readily

accessible in the regional languages and also in a very plain and simple language.

Many are components of this communication plan that I'm sure is going to be of the benefit of all the stakeholders in the Caribbean as well. And of course... This is something I wanted to say in the update of the strategy and what we've been doing in the region – as many of you may know, we already hired a manager for the Caribbean. That was actually a request that came up a couple of meetings ago here with the ALAC Leadership.

And I'm happy to announce that we already have Albert Daniels on board and he couldn't be here because actually he's attending two important meetings that are happening now in the Caribbean – one's the CANTO meeting and then there's a LACNIC Caribbean Pacific meeting – but he's here to help you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rodrigo. Next we have Rinalia Abdul Rahim. The queue is closed now. After Rinalia we'll have the remote participant question and then we've actually got lots of questions that were prepared by this community that we'll be able to ask you. Perhaps Rinalia might actually share... I can see that she might be sharing some of these. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Chair. A modified version of the prepared version. I'm curious about the regional strategy development process. Based on

experience, to what extent has it been bottom-up and top-down? What I mean by top-down is, has a frame been introduced or have you just allowed for flexibility and then you take it and put it inside the way that ICANN views the world?

And I'd like to know whether there are differences in terms of regional approaches, based upon the different regions. Thank you.

BAHER ASMET:

I can talk to the Middle East experience, which started six, seven months back when we were at Toronto. We had our follow-up meeting with community members who were attending and back then there was some effort underway on the Africa strategy and members of the Middle East community thought that they would also like to see an ICANN engagement strategy for the Middle East.

We continued discussions online and then we put a call for a Working Group from community members. This call went to mailing lists for groups in the Middle East, to participate not only in ICANN but in the global Internet governance fora. And we got 22 expressions of interests from people willing to join the group and we accepted all of them; we did not exclude anyone.

We had the Working Group set... I think it was the beginning of this year, in January, when we had the first conference call. So the process was bottom-up in the sense that the request came from the community, the Working Group was established from community members.

ICANN's role was to facilitate the work and to also try to provide or inform Members of the Working Group about ICANN's strategic plan, what was in it and what was planned for the coming years.

The Working Group then worked on identifying the priorities for the region and they identified three main strategic areas to work on in the next three years. And as some of you have said, it was meant to be a two-way engagement strategy. It's not only about people coming to ICANN to participate and do work, it's also about ICANN going to the region and working closely with community members.

One important thing to mention is that the Working Group is actually still ongoing and it is composed of Members who represent different stakeholders – from the government, from civil society, from technical community, ccTLD managers, business, academia, some ISOC Chapters and so forth.

Right now we are in the process of announcing the implementation plan for the first year, which is FY 14, and this plan will be announced this week, on Wednesday: we have a session at 10:45 am where Working Group Members will be presenting the plan for the first year. So this is where we are with the Middle East strategy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Baher. Anyone else who wishes to add to this? Rodrigo?

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you very much. I think Baher has already covered it pretty much, during the concepts that you were asking... These are community driven strategies and they are multi-stakeholder and they are of course bottom-up defined. And the role that we are doing as ICANN is to facilitate the discussion and the coordination among the different groups.

In the case of Latin America, now the Working Group has defined the projects and prioritized them. We are in the process of including more people from the community in the implementation of each of the projects. In the case of the LACRALO, we started with two Members of LACRALO working in the Steering Committee to define a strategy and prioritize it and all that.

But now there has been an effort to reach out to more Members in the LACRALO to start implementation on specific projects now that they have been defined. And it has been happening. I think there are about ten more people from the LACRALO working actively at the strategy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rodrigo. We now have a question from a remote participant. Matt Ashtiani, you have the floor.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. We have a question from [Al Haje? 01:11:39]. Al Haje asks Chris: "What do you think about the multi-lingual aspects of the ICANN website? I think it is important to have at least some information in a multi-lingual aspect."

CHRIS GIFT: I absolutely agree that we should have better multi-lingual access to web content. I will be partially addressing this in just a moment. I'll be quite honest and frank – it's a difficult question in the sense that it's a resource issue more than anything.

I think we can certainly do a far better job of presenting the translated content we have. It tends to be translated and then put up in a ghetto, off by itself, rather than having the experience integrated with everything else, which to me is an issue right there that we can resolve. Whenever I start thinking of this issue I start thinking... I automatically go to, how can we add more translated content?

And that's what I struggle with in terms of resources and availability of... Because I rely on the content from everybody else and... So I don't have an answer to how to get more content on there. I will have an answer for you in just a minute on how to get the design better so that access that we do have is better.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Chris. Duncan?

DUNCAN BURNS: Just to follow on from Chris's point, I think one of the... Making sure we have translated content, whether it's on the website or separate. For example, the policy advice for ALAC that's just being completed will be translated into the UN six. We really are trying to translate as much as we can into the UN six languages, as possible.

I know that doesn't cover every community, every aspect of this group but I think it's something we're conscious of and trying to do better.

And it's aspirational. There is always more that we can do. There is positive intent there to try and translate in as timely a fashion, as much as possible, while at the same time also facilitating dialogues that don't just have to happen in English.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Duncan. Chris Gift?

CHRIS GIFT: I did forget to mention one thing. We are... It's early days yet but as we begin to have new tools of digital engagement to allow people to engage in forums and the community to engage, amongst itself, on the website, by having discussions using ICANN.org, which again I'll talk about in just a second. We are in parallel with that, looking at how we can... There are new tools, new techniques for crowd sourcing of translations.

So they are very exciting actually, they're new. They're very new but they're very exciting and we're going to probably experiment... I see a little skepticism here, but we'll put it off to the side and we'll experiment a little in a little place and see if it works or doesn't work. But we should continue to look at those because they evolve and that may be a solution. I'll just stop there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I'm happy to hear we're all guinea pigs. [laughter] Evan Leibovitch, just quickly?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. Chris, I'm delighted to hear this. Somehow I remember there was some community in ICANN that tossed around the idea of community involvement of translations a couple of years ago – oh, yes, I think it was us! – and so I think you'll find a very welcoming environment for that and essentially a main thing of, what took you so long?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Just before we turn over to Chris Gift's presentation – and the upload is currently in progress, that's getting ready for this – a couple more questions regarding past or ongoing projects. There was a time in this community where podcasts were made and were put on the website. And I think the community found it very helpful to be able to download those and listen to them at their ease.

I'm not quite sure whether this has been followed up. The plan was to expand the podcasts into interviews of RALO Leaders, of At-Large structure Leaders as well and to really involve the community with the content that was going to be dispensed.

So I ask for this community to be able to share experiences and not only share experiences in a written manner but also in a more human way, which is the way that we are born to communicate with: voice. Any follow up on this?

DUNCAN BURNS: I don't have some of the history there. I think we want to be as responsive as we can be to the types of content, whether it's podcasts or others that your group, others want to create. So if there is a hunger, a desire to create podcasts, we can help. At the same time we're also looking for other tools, whether it's Audioboo or others that allow content to be accessed and created in different ways.

If there is a real hunger for ongoing podcasts, let's have that discussion. We can start to make sure that we're building those out. I think part of the challenge is that we will need to rely on you in helping to create the podcasts and the updates and that creates a real drive and a need. So we can be as active as you want to be, if that makes sense.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And closing off this small section just a quick, few words from Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. I'll be very brief and then Chris can make his presentation. Three very brief points. First of all, international engagement on Internet governance, we touched on this at our last meeting in Beijing at that point; the WTPF, the ITU WTPF was upcoming.

Some of the community, some of the ALAC Members took part in the WTPF, which was considered to be a fairly successful event that the ITU held, and reinforced, to an extent, the multi stakeholder approach.

There are significant activities underway, both in terms of the review of the WSIS Agenda and the lead-up to the ITU plenipotentiary in 2014 – I

won't talk about them today but perhaps it will be useful to have a webinar in due course of perhaps further discussion in Buenos Aires; we are at your disposal.

The second point is to thank the EURALO participation at the European IGF, the EuroDIG in Lisbon. That was a successful event. You know how important we take the IGF process to be and that was an important stepping stone.

And thirdly, very briefly, not to be outdone in terms of regional strategies, we thought, "Why not Europe?" Okay, why not Europe? So we're putting in some thinking in a very bottom-up way, in that I just go around the bars asking people whether they want a European strategy, and I'm trying to remember what they said to me.

But [laughter] not very successfully. But we do hope to perhaps have a breakfast session later this week and we'll let you know about that if we get around to it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Nigel. You might have to look again at your drinking strategy prior to the digital strategy. [laughter] One last thing, the policy advice in the At-Large Advisory Committee was mentioned a bit earlier. I do have to extend the thanks of this community for this material. Heidi, who are the stars specifically for this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, there are two primary stars and then there's a whole bunch of other ones that are sitting here – all of you. But the primary ones are

actually Matt Ashtiani, who's really developed this. [applause] But equally is Lynn Lipinski, who's there, who really accommodated an extremely tight schedule. [applause]

But also, all of you that helped. I know Matt was working with several of you in detail, on how to get the text, the content correct. So thank you to all of you. This was a very tight schedule and we made it happen so thank you. This morning I've given copies of this to Fadi and to Steve Crocker, so they were the first ones, but you're the second ones to get this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Heidi. It's very, very welcome material. This community always engages new people. It's part of the work that we do as outreach and without this it's very, very difficult to explain what goes on in this mystifying organization. Over directly to Chris Gift on digital engagement. Chris, you have the floor. Oh, Sebastian. The queue was closed but of course a Board Member can always speak whenever they want to. Sebastian Bachollet.

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Now, sorry, but it seems that except you Olivier there are no Europeans around this table from ALAC, so I must take the floor to thank Nigel for his engagement, for the GE of EURALO and with the help of Fadi in Lisbon. Of course, his [thanks? 01:21:23] will go directly to the help of all the Europeans from the ALSes present in Lisbon, but you need to take as much as we get. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sebastian, and yes, European delegates were stuck in Heathrow and some of them cannot come in until the end of the week. Some of them might not come in at all. End of next week, by the way, not this one. Anyway, right, Chris Gift, digital engagement. The floor is yours.

CHRIS GIFT: Thank you very much. I'm going to talk about a digital engagement project that we're launching. I apologise; there are a couple of you that have already heard this presentation so unfortunately you're going to have to sit through it again. Perhaps you'll have fresh questions for me. I'm going to talk about a couple of things.

One is that we can all acknowledge that we need a greater breadth and diversity of participants in ICANN. But it's obviously difficult to get them all to meetings, and we have this discussion quite frequently. So we need another means for people to be able to participate and for the community to be able to have dialogue amongst itself, aside and outside of just physical meetings.

So how do we go about doing that? Well, the first thing... Next slide please. Before I talk about some of that, I want to make sure that we have a shared understanding of the problem, and then I'll talk about two solutions, or two means that are not exactly solutions but two means we're going to have to find solutions. And I want to be very clear about that.

The first... The way we've used some of the issue is that there's a continuum of engagement. People are not either digitally engaged or

they're not engaged at an organization like ICANN. They fall along a spectrum in that they may have some general interest in one topic – for instance IDN, and they may be highly involved in privacy issues or WHOIS issues or any other issue like that.

Engagement as well moves in and out depending on personal and professional circumstances. I may be highly engaged for a year or two and then move out because something happens and home or in my office and then I move back in again. So I'm neither stuck in one place of the other, if you want to use that term.

Then people also move at their own pace. We have this notion sometime of wanting to engage people and move them rapidly into the inner circle of Working Group, and that can be daunting because the language barriers, the terminology that we use and our documents can be very difficult to absorb. So people often move at a pace that's appropriate for them.

And I think that what's very important is that whatever on this continuum of engagement that there are no artificial barriers. Things are hard enough as it is. The topics are difficult and the regional barriers, in terms of distance and so on, can be very difficult that we don't need to put anything else up. And unfortunately we do. Next slide.

In a perfect world, the way we view this digital continuum of engagement is a model that we use certainly in the GSE we're looking at in ICANN. We view this as a series of concentric circles, and some of you may have seen this from Beijing, where we shared this. And what we do

in the different concentric circles represent the people moving in and the size of the community.

Obviously, the people outside just looking in and getting informed is a much larger part of the community than those who are in the middle in terms of being part of the Working Groups. And at each stage we want to do different things for the people. So this is back to the segmentation question of how do we engage with people at different steps.

And the way we view it is that really, on the outer circles, we want to inform people and help them with their awareness of ICANN and the different community structures and how they can participate in those structures, and then we want to support them as they engage. And then, when they are part of the Working Groups we want to support them with the tools that they need to do their Working Groups and do their work within those teams. Next slide.

Unfortunately, when we look at digital engagement at ICANN, instead of this perfect world of these supported concentric circles, what we see is a gap. Yes. We have some people who perhaps come into the website and then they leave, they are generally confused. I think we can all acknowledge that. And there's not much in-between.

There are some tools to help the Working Group, and I think we can also say that there's not a tremendous amount of tools and some are problematic, as we discussed this morning with Adobe Connect. But regardless, there is just nothing in-between. There's no place for anybody to come and have a conversation on WHOIS outside of the Working Group. Next slide.

So what we want to be able to do is again go back to this diagram. We want to be able to support people at all levels. And note that even this image is a little wrong. I don't like that there are arrows. I don't want to suggest that people have to come to the middle. They can stop at any point that's comfortable to them, and we should support that.

We should have a digital framework that allows people to stay and remain at the outer circle and have conversations. And again, I'll get into more detail in the very next slide. So another way to start to begin to view this and to start talking about how we implement this is... What we've done is take these circles and said: "There are a lot of services that need to apply at each of these steps. What are those services that we need to be able to offer and how do they overlap with each other?" Because they do overlap and information flows.

Again, we don't want to provide a digital experience where... On that continuum of engagement, that same individual may be highly engaged in one area and less engaged in another, and our digital experience must accommodate both references and experiences. So we look at it this way, with the different services we want to provide at different areas.

I'm not going to waltz through all of those – I could send this around and everybody can take their time. And by all means chime in and tell me what we're missing and what we should think about adding. But keep in mind that it's a long list already, but we'd certainly like feedback on that.

But what I'd like to do is to just take one moment to think about how this becomes reality and what it means if we have something like this.

The way I do it is I tell a little story, and again, several people heard this story yesterday so read your emails.

The best way to think about it is to walk through an experience of what somebody would join in the future if we had all of this. And the way I think about it is if we just have... I sometimes think about it as a young lady or a young man who is tickled by some sort of information, a Tweet, an email, a newsletter, something on a website about ICANN or Internet governance, and they generate some interest and they come to ICANN.org or one of the SOACs websites.

And they're easily able to find the information that's available to them on that topic. Again, just that alone is a challenge. And then they're able to read relevant information. Again, notice I'm trying to use language around how do we make information relevant to people, how do we make the language in those documents accessible to people so they can read them.

And as they do that they're invited to perhaps participate in a forum where likeminded people are discussing this, so what if it is WHOIS – likeminded people are discussing WHOIS, not Expert Working Group level, not people who have been here for ten years and know WHOIS inside out and all of its intricacies and issues but people on a more general level who are talking about privacy, and it's more of a comfortable experience for people to do that.

So again, we're then supporting people on the outer levels if we do that and it becomes a more engaging experience. And we can then offer them courses on WHOIS. As they become more engaged in these

forums there is a course on WHOIS if you want to learn more. “Here’s another course on how WHOIS has evolved, the historical record of it, why it’s important.”

And people can go ahead and take more classes and more courses and continue to get educated. They can also, perhaps, start to blog on the topic if they have interest or follow anything else that’s going on in participation and polling.

And over time, as these people participate we understand that they’re participating. We have a rich profile of them. They’ve taken these classes, they’ve logged in to post comments and participate, that we then see if there are Working Group starting up that touch on topics of interest and we invite them to these Working Groups.

So what we want to start to do is digitally groom people to... We do want to move them into the circle – again, at their own pace, and they can stop at any time – but not unless we do want to start doing that.

So there are things around expertise, location that we do want to offer so that we can appropriately staff Working Groups from the community and identify individuals and then obviously everything else that we need to support the Working Groups as they do the work. Next slide please.

Even if we paint the model of this perfect world, there are some questions that I certainly have, we all had, and I think you must be thinking at the same time. How do we build this? How do we build this given our multi-stakeholder environment and our bottom-up culture?

We don't want Staff necessarily to go off in a black hole and develop these services and then magically pop them up. We want everybody participating in it.

So these are the questions that we were asking ourselves. What we're going to do... And what I'm here to talk about for the next two minutes, as we wait for Fadi to arrive, is not so much what I'm going to build – because I think you're all going to participate in this discussion – but it's how we're going to get there. And how we're going to get there is the next slide.

The how we're going to get there is ICANNLabs. It's actually up, you can go and look at it. ICANNLabs will become fully functional in about another two and a half weeks or so, three weeks. It's a holding place right now, we're inviting people to just log in and sign up. But what ICANNLabs is is, this is the place where we're going to have the community participate with us in building this digital engagement experience.

What we're going to do is we're going to start posting ideas about what services we need to offer. The community – you – can all start posting ideas about what we need to offer. We're going to have a place where we can have a dialogue about those ideas. We're also then going to be posting up wireframes, so we'll start mocking up these services. We'll post the wireframes so everybody can comment on them.

We'll then post prototypes so people can test the prototypes and tell us whether it's working or not working. And once we get acceptance on the prototypes that yes, this particular service works, then and only then

do we migrate it into production and move it into ICANN.org where people can then use it.

So again, this is going to be a place... And an example of this is public comment. There is a strong desire for us to try new public comment process but also tools. But that's obviously difficult to do that on ICANN.org with a PDP process or anything like that.

But this is a place where we can try that, we can try to experiment with new... And there are lots of new public comment technologies out there; public consultation tools that have been evolving over the last couple of years. And this is a place where we experiment with that.

We can try a couple out and we can see and measure whether it's successful or not. Not just have opinion about it but measure it. To say: "Yes, it generated 'X' more traffic, it generated 'Y' more comments, the dialogue is richer," and then we can say: "Yes, this is..." and then we can put that out to the community and ask, "Working or not working?" Then we can migrate it into a production environment.

So to me, the important thing that I'm here to tell you today is yes, I'm trying to paint a vision that we have this project and we're moving down the line of changing the website itself; ICANN.org should move from being a publications vehicle, which is what it is today; it's very focused on publications, to being a combination of engagement and publications.

What I would like to see is a big "Join Me" button. You're not joining ICANN necessarily, you're joining one of the structures, and that's okay, we'll move you to that structure. But nonetheless, it should be very

clear from the beginning that ICANN is an organization that they should participate in, that they should engage in.

It's not so much... Yes, I'm painting that vision that we want to get there but to me the most important part of what I'm telling you today is that we're going to do this together. We're going to do this on a website where we can all discuss the services, the prototypes, the wireframes, and you can all chime in. And I'm not going to do this in a black box and then just surface these things and hope you like them. [laughs]

If I have two more minutes I have something else I can keep going on about? Okay. He's leaving now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The only person who will kick you out of here will be Fadi Chehadé so that's really up to you.

CHRIS GIFT: When I hear that it sounds like Elvis is leaving the building. [laughter] Or is arriving in the building, or is in the building. Okay. I'll keep going. One more slide, if you don't mind. We will be moving through this in phases. The phases will have four tracks. I think the important part is that we're all taking this journey together, which I think is very, very exciting. Next slide.

So it's launching now, ICANNLabs is launching now. We will have prototypes beginning in August. Ideas will start surfacing in August and we'll start trying the prototypes and things. I understand that August is

an awful month for a lot of people but I didn't want to delay, I want to go. And it's not awful for everybody so we're going.

But again, this is continuous. Just because we're starting it in August doesn't mean we're going to end in September. Labs is where we're going to prototype things going forward. But nonetheless we hope to have some things in production by October and November Next slide please.

Secondly, this... I'm going to do this very rapidly and please take me offline afterwards and ask questions about open ICANN. This is still more in the concept phase so again your feedback is greatly appreciated. I would like to have something more complete to present to you in September, so prior to Buenos Aires I'll start sending some things out. But... Next slide.

Building this is hard. There's a lot of work here. Even if we started in adding to this here's a lot of work. So what we want to do is cherry pick... Next slide. This is going to go fast. This is... What we want to do is cherry pick the things we really want to focus, and I'm not suggesting this is the list; I just randomly highlighted some things.

But I want to focus on the experiences and the services that are core to what we need to do to accomplish our work – ah, he's here, he's going to cut me off. But I still have the mic – and then allow people to use their own tools.

Because in today's world people don't necessarily... They like to use their own online tools. I don't necessarily like to be forced to use whatever the organization is offering me, because it may not work

within my environment. I want to be able to sometimes combine work with play. So we want to support that. One last slide.

So the one last slide is just that we want to have an open ICANN where we have public availability to public data, programmatically available data, so that people can either integrate the services that they want or just that the data sets themselves are available to researchers, to other organizations, so that they can integrate that or do their own analysis on what is occurring at ICANN.

So a lot of this data is available but it's available in PDFs or Word docs. I want to make the same data available programmatically, [daily sets? 01:38:43]. And we can talk more about that later. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Chris. We just have one comment from Evan Leibovitch and then Elvis has... Sorry, Fadi has entered the building. [laughter] It wasn't my ideas! And Chris Gift will be here this afternoon during the Working Group update from the Technology Taskforce. What I suggest is that any questions to Chris Gift may be asked this afternoon when he will be speaking about LUCID but also I guess as a follow up to his presentation this morning. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. I'm going to repeat the same two words I said at the gNSO yesterday: institutional memory, which essentially means two different things, and especially with Fadi here this is an important thing. As you

make a transition to new tools we can't lose as many documents and files and URLs as we did the last time this switchover was made.

And similarly, go back and have a look and see what the other things were that worked; things like the podcast, which was mentioned, but also in prep for your talk to us later, think about how we can address the issues of looking at what worked, rather than just saying: "Okay, this one regime is coming in place."

What worked, and also a strategy for making sure that we don't lose documents, that we don't lose things in the transition to whatever is being envisioned. I guess we'll deal with that later.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Your 30 seconds are up. And thank you very much Chris. We'll see you this afternoon. Again, I'd like to also thanks Duncan Burns very much for joining us and all the Regional VPs. Thank you. [applause] And without any further ado we have Fadi Chehadé, who is joining us for the next 40 minutes or so... Is it? 30 minutes, well, that's still 30 minutes that we can make full use of. Fadi, welcome. Well, the floor is yours.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Good morning. Are you awake? [laughter] I got up at 5:30 this morning and I said this is going to be a long day, week. Yes, they're really marathons, these ICANN meetings, but they're very, very good. We have a lot of good things happening right now so I'm very pleased to be here. This has been a bit of a trimester that was short – 90 days, it was a

quick trimester – but frankly a trimester where I had a few of what I would call epiphanies or revelations.

And one of these that is extremely vivid in my head is an afternoon I spent in Portugal recently. Who was there from the group here, at the EURALO meeting? Olivier, okay, just a couple of you. And I'm sorry that Wolf is not here, he's stuck at Heathrow. But this was so eye opening to me. I was actually supposed to speak and leave, kind of what I'm unfortunately going to have to do here – but I couldn't leave.

I don't know how long I stayed but I was there for several hours. It was remarkable, the EURALO meeting. I had never been to a EURALO meeting and I don't want to miss these meetings, if I can, moving forward. It was so informative. I learned a lot about ICANN and I was so frustrated by the distance between the EURALO Members and me. It just felt terrible. I felt like there was so much distance.

Here are all these people who have tremendous input and very valuable insights and there's just so many steps before I could hear them. Not that it's all about me hearing it but it needs to be part of my conversation with ICANN. It needs to be connected. So I think I told Olivier and Sebastian that I need their help to be more engaged at that level.

I know they do that job. This is what they do and this is what they... But there is something about being there and... I'm going to encourage my team because I have so much time that I can divide all over the planet. Our team, if our Regional VPs are here – I hope you're hearing me – it is so helpful to go to these meetings.

It's the first time where I felt like I'm touching the feet of ICANN – as he calls them, so this is his nomenclature. I felt like I was really listening to the people who are... I want to tell you, after that meeting, thanks to Chris Gift who left... He's here? Chris made the mistake of starting to introduce me to political science literature on transnational organizations. And I don't know why he did that because I now have even less sleep because of the books he gives me.

But one of these books that is a tremendous book, that studies transnational organizations, which is what we are in many ways, had a whole section about the importance of empowering the weakest in an eco-system for that system to maintain legitimacy. And this was not an emotional statement – it was a political science analysis of why this is so important.

And that one way for multi-stakeholder transnational organizations, which is what we are, to reduce their futility, is to increase proactively the participation of the At-Large or the broader user base. So, so many things coming at me confirming the criticality of what to do and the need for us to further empower you and give you the tools and the capabilities to do what you need to do.

Now, Chris, you went through your ICANN Labs presentation and the circles?

CHRIS GIFT: I did.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Right. As Chris shows these circles, as he said – I hope – it is not an absolute requirement that everybody who touches the edge of the circle come to the middle, but today we make people think that if they don't make it all the way to the middle they have no value, which is not true! Because not everybody needs to be an expert on policy.

Some people want to come to the middle and become experts on policy. But some people need to feel engaged and talk to likeminded people; engaging with them on the edge. And if we succeed we're going to have...

If Sally and [Tara? 01:45:55] don't waste their money, I'm giving them enough empowerment and resources with these great VPs that you see here – and we're increasing the number of people we have all over the globe so that we can bring more people to the circles.

But once they come to the circles they need to find a meaningful engagement, and it can't be that the only engagement is that you have to be in the middle and if you can't get in the middle then you have no value here in this community.

So anyway, we have a lot of work to do, but I'm delighted to tell you that a year on – because I started with you in Prague a year ago; I didn't start fulltime at ICANN until September but okay, I started to get to know this community. I met many of you here for the very first time a year ago. I think a year on I continue to have epiphanies, I continue to have revelations.

The EURALO meeting in Portugal was definitely one of these, where I felt firsthand for several hours the value you bring to the edge of this

community and how critical it is that we connect the edge to the middle; in thought, in leadership, in value. You have my commitment on that.

And clearly you guys have been very busy. I mean, 12 policy advice statements? [laughs] You continue to startle us and the value of what comes to the Board from the ALAC now is... I mean, thanks to all of you. With the leadership of this guy here to my right, is day and night. And I am at the Board meeting and when something comes from ALAC now it has a very different gravitas than it did when I started. Really.

So I take my hat off to all of you for this, but it is working. ALAC advice now is taken with equal weight to GAC advice. That is remarkable and that is good and that is our legitimacy. And if we don't do that we become, essentially, a servant to the nation-state model, which is not what we should be doing. Nation-states are stakeholders but they are not the model.

The model is multi-stakeholder and equal, and you have achieved that through the quality of what's coming. Not just the intensity, which is good – the frequency is good, I'm not complaining – but it's also the quality of what's coming. It's very good. So thank you for that. Thank you for that.

ATLAS II is in the budget. Done. So no one should worry about that. This is budgeting and it will happen. [applause] I won't walk you through all the tribulations we went through – and we shouldn't – but I want to really publicly commend Sebastian for his work on the Board and with me. And it's happening. [applause]

And by the way, I'm looking forward to ATLAS II. I want to make sure...
Do you have a date for it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the discussion or...?

FADI CHEHADÉ: No, for the actual ATLAS II? Date set?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The At-Large Summit would be during the June 2014...

FADI CHEHADÉ: During or after or before?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: During. Oh yes, and you're very much invited and encourage to be there. We hope you'll be there in June 2014, in London.

FADI CHEHADÉ: I'll be there. Very good. This is very good, very important, and we need... Sally, if you can hear me, or someone, get Sally... We need to leverage ATLAS II to tell the world also how important it is to bring our users to the table. Let's not focus on the people who show up because again, not everybody can show up, but for those who don't show up, let's use our communications power to get the word out, to get...

This is an event, in my opinion, worthy of a CNN coverage, worthy of that level of coverage, where users come together is far more important than, frankly, government or policy makers. This is now the people who should speak for the Internet. Very, very important. I hope you're very successful in that event and you have my full commitment to do whatever it takes to make that event successful and just like the first one, I heard.

The next thing I wanted to tell you about – and I'm not sure if my colleagues covered this, and if they did, forgive me – you were the instigators of something akin to an education platform. You're the ones you kept saying we needed to educate. So I took that from you and I went to my team and I said: "I need to get them the canvas."

It's not up to us to draw the picture of education but we need to give you a canvas, the paint and the tools and you can run with it. And that's what we did. So all we have done is prepare a first-class, world-class education platform that will be available in less than 30 days. Okay? So we've been working extremely hard on this. This is a major investment that we've put in and a major focus in that area.

Now, all it is is a canvas. Right? I think we're going to throw on the canvas one flower, which is essentially what we came up with. The course that I was given to know about ICANN – because I was actually so stupid about all of this that they said: "Okay, we need to give him a course so he understands what ICANN is."

We took that course and I asked them to put it in as the first course, like an ICANN 101 – what is ICANN? But we need to add a lot more courses and a lot more content and curriculums and all kinds of things.

Now, others will do the same. The GAC once told me, yes, they want to do something where a new GAC Member doesn't just sit on this GAC table and doesn't have a clue what ICANN is and what multi-stakeholders are and how it works. So they're going to do their curricular as well.

Now, you may do two courses that they want to include in their curriculum. That's what the platform will allow. So in fact it's a huge canvas. It's a canvas on which we can all draw, but each of us will draw our own courses and our own curriculum and hopefully we'll pick and choose and share, because everything that ICANN will do in the area of technology, including this, will be open, free and available. Period.

And that's... By the way, Chris went through ICANNLabs with you? You went through ICANNLabs as well? ICANNLabs could be – if he succeeds, and if he doesn't I'll have his head – but if he succeeds, ICANNLabs will produce, possibly, the most advanced participatory system on the planet. Because there isn't one. Just like when I was in IT in the '90s, Oracle and SAP changed the way ERP is and invented Enterprise Resource Planning, we're creating a kind of ERP for participatory engagement.

No one has that. There may be pieces of it but we're trying to put in an actual platform that enables people to engage in a new way that didn't

exist before. So all of that as well will be open. Completely open. Open licenses.

So if a country wants to take it to do multi-stakeholder participatory engagement in their country, they have it. Right? So it's a gift ICANN is building for its community but sharing openly with everybody so people can replicate it and use it.

So the last two things I want to cover with you are about the announcement I made... I now can't remember. I'm getting old. Maybe a month or so I announced that we now have a new division at ICANN called the Generic Domains Division. Do you guys want me to spend two minutes explaining to you really why we did this? Because it's actually very, very critical to where we're heading. Should I do that? [agreement]

I know you read a little bit about it but let me just give you the backstory or what led us to that. ICANN's operations were all under Akram Atallah. He was our Head of Operations, essentially. When we thought you we would scale ICANN we looked at all of what Akram has and we saw that there are really three groupings under that.

One set of operations has to do with what I would call administrative operations or organizational operations. Not corporate operations, as Sebastian would remind me – organizational operations. We're not a company, we're an organization, we're a community.

These administrative functions include HR, include finance, meeting management, facilities, risk management, procurement... All the normal stuff you expect in administrative operations. This was all taken out and

is now reporting into Susanna Bennett. Is Susanna in the room? You meet her? So Susanna is the new Chief Operating Officer responsible for our administrative operations.

Enormous experience, fluent in Chinese, extremely high integrity and really knowledgeable about global operations. In her last company she ran all these things for a company that spanned the US, Israel and Japan. She has incredible experience that she will bring to bear in that area, and as we scale ICANN and matrix our operations globally, you need someone with that level of expertise.

And when we talk risk, global risk, she gets that. She's done it. She understands it. I think this will allow me to go to bed every night and not worry that as we scale...

For example, small things. Somebody asked me yesterday: "What are your goals for the next five years?" And I said: "Like this? You just want me to tell you right here?" "Yeah." Bu one of the first things that came to my mind is that we have to build ICANN in a financial way that is responsible and sustainable.

You need to think through that. You cannot just keep spending. You have to think how we can do that. That's the kind of thing Susanna will focus on. So that's the first area. The second area under Akram was what I would call Technical and Security Operations. And again: operations. I'm not speaking about policy.

So Technical and Security Operations is what? It's IANA, it's DNS Ops and the L-Root and for those of you who don't know, the L-Root managed by ICANN is now the most distributed root on the planet. We

are so far ahead of any other root operator. ICANN is running in massive and first-class operationally. Really, I'm very pleased with our team on that.

Then you add to that all of our security work. And it's not simply. There are a massive amount of things we do on the security front. I'm still learning about many of them. And then finally IT, all of the IT, and IT is growing now in complexity, in operations. So all of that was also lumped together and I announced on our website last week that I'm looking for a new Head of Technical and Security Operations.

Now, the middle and last part that is left is the part that will grow the most and that's what I would call our registry/registrar industrial operations. This is working with registries and registrars; our contracted parties. Akram was promoted to President of a new unit that will focus only on that.

And I will finish on this point by telling you the reason I separated this is because often... I think I can be candid here. I'm on record though. But I can be candid. I want to tell you this just so you know how I think. This is actually very interesting. Someone showed me a Tweet of CEO of a ccTLD in Europe. He was Tweeting an article written in Swedish on a hidden blog somewhere by another ccTLD CEO in Swedish.

So I chased this and I got to the bottom of it and the blog essentially, written by a very prominent Member of our community, the CEO of a major ccTLD, said ICANN is Janus-faced. Now, for those of you who might not know the analogy here, Janus-faced is essentially like ICANN has two faces. We have two faces.

But when you dig into that article, which I did, I learned that actually there were some very valuable insights to what this guy was writing. He basically said on one side of ICANN you're trying to be multi-stakeholder, bottom-up, slower, take your time, listen to everybody, make sure that Staff is not leading from the front but leading from behind, etc., etc.

But then there is another side of ICANN where people are telling me, "Chop chop chop!", get the program out, get gTLD, make it happen, chase the registries and registrar, make sure they do their... That's a very top-down, operational efficiency side.

And the guy was saying ICANN cannot win because if it acted on one side with efficiency and with strength and told registries and registrars, "This is what you should do," people say: "Hey, this is not bottom-up, take your time, slow down, we're all partners, we're community Members." And on the other side, we had two natures in a way.

So of course within ten minutes I called that guy and I said, "I need to meet you." And I called the guy who reTweeted his article and I said, "I need to meet you too." And I spent several hours with them and I learned so much from this. And this is what led me to create this division.

So in Akram's division, the focus is on the registrant. What does that do? That means the relationship with the registries and registrars becomes more of a licensee. They're telling the registry and registrar: "I license you to offer services to this registrant. I will service you, I'm partnering with you, I will work with you, but my goal is to fulfill my

public responsibility to the registrant and therefore I will manage you to that.”

It’s a different relationship. And they don’t do any policy. They’re just implementation guys. They don’t mess with policy. This gives me, in a division, the ability to act in a certain way, and that’s why Akram was promoted. He’s separate. People come at me... Even as I walked into your hall: “I’m an applicant, I want to talk to you!”

“Sorry, I don’t deal with that.” [laughter] “Call Akram.” It’s not my business. I don’t get involved in this. I am here to focus on policy, on engagement, on making sure ICANN, globally, is viewed as a successful organization where business can get done for people around the world, policy can get made.

So this is the separation. I hope it helps you a little bit to see why we got down that path. I have one last item to tell you about. I’m sorry but there’s so much here to share with you and I know you may have many questions. Strategy. You know we started a conversation in Beijing to talk about our strategy.

I hope many of you are engaged and participating in that, and Durban will be another place where we need to hear from you. It’s very, very important. This is not a side exercise, because I’m intent that by the end of this year we ought to have a high-level strategy in place that we’ve all agreed on.

And I have told my team, no more than five pages. In other words, I am seeking a high-level statement of we as a community, who we are and what we do and how we’re going to move forward high-level. Five

pages, that's it. Once that's done we're going to develop a three-year operating plan, so you have a five-year strategic plan leading to a three-year operating plan, leading to one-year budgets and planning.

This is normal. We need to do that so we have continuity, we have cadence, we function like an organization that has a top-down view of who it is and how it will get it's work done. This year we need to finish the five-year plan, next year we need to finish the three-year operating plan. Your participation in this is paramount.

Now, I already have a lot of input to the five-year strategic plan. As a result of that input I have found that there are four or five areas where the community needs to get together to solve some nuts, some difficult things. And I felt that we could leave it to the general process where people just submit input via the web, but we may not solve these nutty areas.

So I've come to the conclusion – and I want your input on that through Durban – that I'd like to create a model similar to something that was done in the past that ICANN called the President's Strategy Committees. I'd like to use that model that was used in the past, sometimes successfully, sometimes unsuccessfully, but at least it's an existing vehicle, to take these four or five complex conversations and to put them into these committees.

So you will hear me on Monday talk about these committees. I will give you a heads-up on them now. We will have a committee focused on technology and I'll announce some more details on Monday but for example, if we are going to talk about technology, identify technology

and innovation as opposed to hush-hush in the background, “search will kill the DNS”, “do we know if the DNS will survive?”

Why? Let’s bring this conversation and have it. And who invented the DNS? Who owns the invention of the DNS? It’s Paul Mockapetris. So I asked Paul to come and lead this committee and he agreed. Right? So we’re going to form these committees with leaders who are thoughtful.

No Board Members, no Staff on the committees. No committee will last more than a year. Everything transparent. Community Members must be engaged with these committees. Committees have no power to make any decisions.

All they can do is give us, not me – even though it’s call President’s I actually wanted to call them Community Advisory Committees, but people told me no, Advisory Committees means something at ICANN. So I ended up using the same name that was used in the past. But really these are for us, not for me. It’s not about informing me, it’s informing all of us.

And then we can take what they give us. It may translate into advice, it may translate into PDP, it may translate into... But it’s not for Fadi to take these recommendations and run with them, it’s for all of us to be informed by them. I will tell you the other four committees and then I’ll stop.

There is one that I’m thinking of for figuring out how we’re going to scale the way we are structured and make policy. How do we do that, really? People run around and say the gNSO is broken and PDP is broken. I

actually totally disagree; I think it's working. Could it do better? Of course.

What I'm more worried about is what happens when we have many, many more people at the table saying: "I want to have a voice in this!" We do not have a scaling mechanism today. So we have a committee that will focus on that and this one will be led by a very capable professor from New York University – Professor Beth Noveck.

The next committee that I'm thinking of is a committee that will think about the role of ICANN in the Internet organizations eco-system. We have a lot of change going on at ICANN. We're bigger, we're faster than all the other iSTARS, ISOC, WC3, the RIRs, etc. And that's not a good thing because in an eco-system if one STAR is moving much faster than the others it's not good.

So how do we align ourselves with them? How do we clarify our role with them? How do we work better with them? And again, who created most of these organizations? Vint Cerf. So I went to Vint. I said: "Could you come and help me with this?" and he agreed to. So these are very important things that I think discussions that will lead us to hopefully better understanding of how we work better with our eco-system.

This is three now, right? So the fourth committee is one that will focus on something dear to your hearts and that's public responsibility. A lot of people run around saying: "Oh, public interest, public responsibility..." What is really our public responsibility framework? Who are we responsible to and how can we fulfill this responsibility? This is a major

area and this is an area where I think, as a community, we need to agree to.

For example, is the education platform part of our public responsibility portfolio and how far do we go with that, right? And I can tell you that I've thought very hard on who should come and lead this and it looks like Nii Quaynor has agreed to lead this. And I think Nii is a very capable, very committed Member of our community so he will lead that dialogue for us and I think it's the right place of it to happen.

And the last committee that I'm thinking of – and if you have several more ideas on this let me know – but the last one is probably the furthest one from starting because I'm still formulating that. But I'm tired of us going to the world and defending ICANN. I'm tired of us going to the work and defending the iSTAR Internet organization eco-system and always looking like we're on the defensive. Why?

We probably have the most powerful model in the world for transnational multi-stakeholders and working. So I would like to create an actual framework that describes how we're going to make this model work and to tell the world why it works. So this last committee is a committee that will focus really on the place of ICANN in the global Internet governance space, our relationship with the nation states, our relationship with international organizations and our place as a transnational organization.

And we are seeking very senior level, multi-stakeholders – not governments – to actually participate on that committee. By the way, all committees will be seven people or less. These are not huge

committees, they're small, they're focused and instead the committees should be reaching out to all of the community, At-Large, and bring people into the dialogue rather than having a huge committee that then isolates itself.

So smaller, more nimble committees. Every committee will have staff. I will build staff under it so the committee is able to reach you and engage with you and be very proactive. Okay. I'll stop here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Fadi for sharing these fascinating things that are going on and things that are moving forward. We're actually eating into our break time but I've seen many people who wish to ask questions. We've got Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Evan Leibovitch and Tijani Ben Jemaa. Rinalia, you have the floor.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. Fadi, a few questions. You didn't name the person who's leading the last... You don't have one yet? Okay. On the committee number four on public responsibility, how does that dovetail with Sally's responsibility for... Requires creation of clear [shared? 02:11:13] definition of the public interest.

FADI CHEHADÉ: These committees do not substitute or replace the continued work going on at ICANN but I think that we need... Because when I ask people: "What is the public interest framework for ICANN?" I get 20 answers.

Right? So I think I'd like us to have a calm dialogue about that and say, okay...

And also, I'm not predicting we will have more money or less money to spend, as if we decide we're going to spend money in the area of public responsibility, I need a framework. I cannot just willy-nilly go: "Right, I'm going to launch these initiatives and programs."

They have to be part of the framework that says is ICANN, as an organization, as a community, going to commit part of its focus and funds to public responsibility and developmental projects? And if so, what is the framework to do? So that's really where we will go. And Sally will of course be informing these committees. I just didn't want Staff to sit on the committees. We can inform them.

Steve Crocker and I will probably have an ex officio presence on the committees as needed but the rest of the Staff will be informing and interacting but not sitting on the committee.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Fadi. Those were questions for clarification. Now my comment on what you've shared with us. It's all very welcome. All very exciting. When you have digital engagement all these initiatives that are happening in ICANN it broadens... The intention is to broaden participation and intensify it.

You have to make sure that we have sufficient capacity to support the different stakeholder groups to actually process that, otherwise we

won't be able to cope and make any sense in order to provide more meaningful and more quality input. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yeah, 100%. Otherwise we bring all these people to the gate and we can't really process their engagement. And that's why we need to find new ways of engagement. Not all engagement has to be at the heart of ICANN. There could be other types of engagement, other ways people can contribute, can understand, become ambassadors of ICANN in certain ways.

So that needs to be developed. I agree with you Rinalia. I can take one more question because unfortunately I was just flagged that I have someone waiting for me in the office.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So it's going to be between Evan, Tijani or Alan, who wishes to...

FADI CHEHADÉ: Ah! We do a draw or how will we do that?

SPEAKER: Auction!

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We could have an auction. Proceeds will go to me. [laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll catch Fadi privately. I give up my spot.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Okay Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So now the contest is between Tijani and Evan.

FADI CHEHADÉ: We'll take both questions. No, no. Please Tijani, you go first and then we'll finish.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Fadi and thank you for the gift which is the online platform. I find it not only interesting but a fantastic tool. But it remains a tool. I felt that there is confusion between people that this is the learning framework. It is not. It is a tool. Yes.

And I want to emphasize the fact that the ICANN Academy must and should be the framework for all learning efforts in ICANN and this platform is one tool. There are a lot of other tools but this is one wonderful tool because it gives a lot of possibilities.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes, you're correct about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Tijani for reminding us of this. It's one brick, I guess, out of many other bricks in this big pyramid that we're building.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes, a big pyramid. Don't bring pyramids into this. It's very personal. [laughs]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Of course it is personal with you. Evan Leibovitch, last question.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. Just a very brief thing. The thing that you said to us at the beginning about the strengthening of the voice of ALAC within the Board, within Staff or whatever; if I could ask you to bring that message out in as many different forms as you can?

One of the things that's occurring to me is that our best form outreach is being able to tell prospective members of At-Large the effect that we're having, the accomplishments that we're having, showing some win, showing some accomplishment is as good as any kind of promotion we can do.

One specific question and it's something that's been nagging on a couple of people as of the Beijing meeting. Do you remember that you said during the public forum that you would respond in writing to everybody that spoke up at the public forum?

There is a concern here that here we are in ALAC and this is... We're at the top of a bottom-up process where there are RALOs an ALSes, very

liberated process and so on and that if things are submitted in writing... And there seemed to be a little bit of a feel when you said that, that this is a, well, the squeaky wheel at the public forum.

Well, they're getting a written response from you and yet there's nothing that insists that when we send something out we get the same kind of response back. So there was a little bit of a feel that the squeaky wheel at the public forum, did they get heard just because they're the ones that can afford to be at the mic?

FADI CHEHADÉ:

And we did answer every single question that came up in the forum in writing and it took quite a bit of effort. But you're right. We talked this morning about this also with the gNSO, with my team working on the gNSO. And we do not yet have a structured process to respond. We don't.

Not even barely in my office, imagine across ICANN. So this is an area of work that I want to take on. Structured ways of expected response and interaction between all of us. It's incumbent on me; it's my issue to work on and I promise you I'll look into that. I'll look into that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Fadi and just as a reminder, some Members of our community, the RALO Chairs will be meeting with you later on. I believe it is tomorrow night? Oh, tonight? 7:30, fantastic.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Frankly this was – to be blunt – but at my request because the EURALO meeting was so special for me that I said I need to... I love him too, but I think I need to spend more time with all the Heads of the RALOs and learn from them and be open to them. So thank you for accepting my invitation. I look forward to it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It will be our pleasure. I'm looking forward to finishing this. Thanks very much. Fadi Chehadé. [applause] And earlier we had the visit of Regional VPs and we happen to have two VPs that were missing and one of them was kindly pointed out as missing by Rinalia, who's now just left the table. In fact, Rinalia, please meet Yu-Chang Kuek, who is not yet with ICANN theoretically but is there physically, which is fantastic.

And we also have Pierre Dandjinou of course, for the African region, who has joined us at the table. And although we are eating into our break, maybe we could have a few minutes with both of you gentlemen? So you have the floor.

PIERRE DANDJINOU: Thank you very much and my apologies – I really wanted to be here but I had a meeting with the hosts and the organizers and then it was so urgent and I couldn't really squeeze myself out of this meeting. And I really apologise for that. But I was also telling Mandy, who was actually sending me notes: "Where are you? Where are you? We need you." Don't worry.

[ALSes? 02:18:59] are my friends, I belong to them so there's no problem – whenever they call I'll be there. So bear with me. And in fact as I'm talking to you I'm supposed to be in another meeting up there but I managed to...

Briefly, I'd just like to tell you that there are things happening as far as we are concerned, in my region, which is Africa, and the centerpiece for us is this Africa strategy that we have now, which really set the tone and we know exactly where we are moving, at least for the next two or three years.

Well, when we met in Addis Ababa in March, that was the first meeting we organized a registry/registrar discussion and business in Africa and there were some promises made, especially by Fadi. Okay, he left. But that he would manage to have... That we have much more stuff to do the job with.

So we are working on hiring more people. I can't say exactly the number but I'll give it to Fadi and the rest. But this is happening. But more importantly we just concluded a DNS forum here in Durban. It was well attended. It was in partnership with afTLD and ISOC.

Many, many [inaudible 02:20:30] came up but we'll share those on Monday at one o'clock. I'll be reporting then briefly on the strategy and we'll have a few things lined up then. So if you are free, please come along. We will be dealing with the DNS award that we are giving for the first time in Africa and also we are having a round-table on the DNS business in Africa.

There are more things to tell you about but we are short on time. Of course, if you have any urgent questions I can't take them but I promise I'll be back if you really need me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Pierre and next is Yu-Chang Kuek – do I have the name right?

YU-CHANG KUEK: Oh, just call me Kuek, please. It's just so much easier

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Kuek.

YU-CHANG KUEK: Well, first and foremost, thank you for having me here. I'm really excited to be here for my first ICANN meeting and I have the disclaimer right here that says "newcomer". [laughs] I think what excited me about the role really – and I start in August – is that Fadi has laid out a vision for global engagement and that includes having an Asian presence that ICANN did not have before.

And the physical manifestation that we're going to see of that will be the Singapore HUB that I am right now trying to put together. And because we're starting on a clean slate I think it really gives us the opportunity to go out there and listen and consult and see what really is needed in the region, what are meaningful things that ICANN can do in the region and we can build something up from that.

So I'm really excited to be here a little bit more on Tuesday as well, to join the APRALO meetings and to have a deeper conversation, but if you see me in the hallways, feel free to just grab me and say: "Look, these are things that have been missing in Asia, we really need to have this or that."

I might not be able to say, "Oh, everything can be done," and everything needs to be done yesterday. [laughs] It might take a little bit more time for things to get done, but let's have this conversation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Kuek. Two questions I guess; one from Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. Thank you Pierre. We are really proud of you. You have been one of the founders of AFRALO and now you are doing very good things. Only one small thing – I didn't hear you talking about the AFRALO showcase here? Adding this to the fact that in the whole printed material of ICANN the AFRALO showcase doesn't appear, it begins to become serious for me. Thank you.

PIERRE DANDJINO: I think it is also serious for me now because I really thought this thing was sorted out between you and the organizers, so if there is anything we can do to address this then let's do it right now. But for me, it was already settled, so... Okay, I'll just talk to who I should talk to and then

we'll see... And it's coming on Monday, right? Okay, I will talk to... I'm very sorry for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Pierre, I have a suggestion that just came up. There must be a photocopier somewhere in this building and there must be a big stack of paper. There are bags, most of which will be given out tomorrow. Maybe photocopy + page + bag = answer. I think Rinalia Abdul Rahim might have a question as well?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Kuek for making the effort to come and say hello to us. You are most welcome. We are impatient for a regional strategy. We are really lagging behind and we look forward to having a good discussion and engagement with you. In the APRALO meeting I may have to attend the TMCH 1, so if we could have a chance for a bilateral discussion, informally, in-between, that would be really good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rinalia, you're dealing with a newcomer. What is TMCH 1?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Trademark Clearinghouse and the issue of IDN variants, which is really complicated. [laughter] But I do have a question though. Are you leading the Singapore office for ICANN? Because I have a follow-up question.

YU-CHANG KUEK:

Yes.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Okay, so the follow-up question is: it's set up as a separate legal entity, right?

YU-CHANG KUEK:

Why don't we do this in the bilateral... With you? Right? But right now, as I said, it's being set up as a clean slate and I am currently thinking through things like, oh, should everything be in Singapore? for example, or should we have a hub and spokes model where we have touch points throughout the region but with Singapore being a hub? What kind of constraints will we have if we do that?

But all these are things that we need to be thoughtful in the approach of and I agree with you that this should have been done yesterday but I think we will have a very good vision in place. If not by the Seoul IGF then definitely before Buenos Aires we will have something concrete.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Kuek. Unfortunately we have run out of time. you did have your two minutes but thank you very much for making it here. It's been really good to see your faces. And of course you're very welcome to come back – not only that, you're *encouraged* to come back. And if you do not come back we will find you. So thank you. [applause]

We will take a five-minute break. Now, five minutes doesn't mean six, it's five. There is coffee in hall 3(d) I believe? 3(a)? Okay, 3(a), it's just

around the corner from here. Please make your way back in five minutes and we will have Maggie Cerrard with a new member of her team speaking to us about compliance. [break]

Good morning. Testing, one two. One two three four five six seven. Can you hear me?

SPEAKER: No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, that's more like it. We didn't have our monitor working here so that works now. Recording on please. Thank you very much. Thank you. We took a short break and the coffee place is a bit further out. We've only got one Staff Member left, Carlos Reyes, at the moment, running everything. We have Maggie Cerrard who has joined us who is the Vice President of Contractual Compliance and also a new Member of Staff as well.

Unfortunately Maggie only has until half past but there will be session on compliance later on in the week that everyone is invited to attend. But over to you Maggie, you have the floor.

MAGGIE CERARD: Good morning everyone. Thank you for requesting compliance to be part of this forum. It's always a pleasure to come and join you. Since we lost 15 minutes of our 30-minute presentation time, and to be efficient, I will leave this deck in your trusted hands, I will fly – I'm going to do the

Concord – I’m going to fly through a few slides that are relevant to this audience because you requested them.

But please, as Olivier mentioned, Wednesday morning we have a two-hour outreach session where we’re going to go in very detailed discussions and a demo of many things we have done, but also our plan. So with that in mind I am going to start with a brief update and still hopefully allow time for our Q & A. As you all know, I’m going to continue even though we don’t have slides, Olivier, is that okay?

Okay. We just completed the year one audit program and also published the year one audit report on our website. The good news from the audit program is that a third of the registrars that were audited, we have about 99% collaboration and remediation and non-compliance issues.

So we started with a few issues that we remediated and worked through. That is a very good set of statistics for this audience because it’s a concern that how much in compliance they are. The other update – we have a couple of slides we’re going to skip through on the audit – is that we are going to be preparing to launch year two audit. Year two audio program is going to be very similar to year one.

As you know, we obtained Board approval to complete a three-year audio program where we are going to baseline and audit all current registrants and registries. And the objective is to... It’s like house cleaning, it’s never been done, we want to baseline it, we want to identify the challenges and address them.

So year two we will be selecting a third of the remaining registrars and registries and we will be following the same process, the same provisions. We will not change the scope. The scope is going to be remaining for 2001, 2009 RAA because we want to be able to do an apple-to-apple comparison.

Slide six please Matt. On the operational accomplishments we have been reporting to you guys on our objectives, what we're working towards, so we did complete the migration of all of the fragmented tools. I'm not sure if this audience sees our monthly updates – we publish monthly updates on our compliance website – where we provide just a summary of the monthly activities.

In that monthly activity report you should have been able to keep up with our news. But we migrated the complaints from IntraNic to ICANN.org. We did the full automation of the compliance process. It's consistent across all complaint types, from prevention to enforcement.

We also added what we call a polls survey. I don't want to call it customer satisfaction survey because the polls survey goes not only to the complaint and order reporter, but it also goes to the contracted parties. We want to be able to deliver a continuous improvement program and the only way to do that is to get feedback from the reporter and from our contracted parties.

Once we completed that we added multiple complaint submission. Multiple complaint submission was, by request, from the community. In the past they were only able to add one complaint at a time. If they had

multiples they would have to come back and reenter everything. On Wednesday we'll show a demo of this.

We also added three registry complaint types online and we launched a pilot for the bulk complaints submission. Next slide please. Due to the time constraint I was going to link on the bottom link to show you what it looks like when you go to ICANN.org compliance. You will note that there are FAQs, which are reported as "learn more".

We want to provide answers. We want people to be able to come and pull information. What is it? Why? Who? What? So we have these to guide the people who are coming onto the website to learn more but also what to do. The ability also is to submit complaints. Slowly and gradually the web team is adding the FAQs in the six UN languages.

Again, we will show a demo of that on Wednesday because of the constraint today. Next slide please. One of the requests from the Chair was a brief update on the bulk submission. What I'd like to do is – again, there is a second slide but you guys can look at it and see the difference from what was and what is.

In the past it was a Beta that was launched years ago and was not really developed to a full production tool, and so now what we've done is we have aligned the bulk to be similar to the process that exists today. But what happens is, we are launching it in what we call a three-month pilot. It started on the 10th of July. We're launching it at a very small scale, gradual roll out, to ensure quality and to ensure consistency, but also to get feedback and be able to assess it at the end.

So limited is three users, where they will be able to submit a file of up to 100 complaints a week. And each of those complaints will go through the same validation of a single complaint. It will go through the process and it will follow through the process, to completion, to closure, like if it was a single complaint.

We did put together a Terms of Use to avoid abuse of the system because now we are increasing the volume but we want to ensure that there is also a structure and validation and a system that's going to address that. So the access... ICANN will assess the pilot at the end of the third month and will collect feedback not only from the contracted parties but also from our pilots. And we will share that feedback with the community and we will decide what is the next step.

There is a slide in the appendix for your review on the Terms of Use; what they are. Today the Terms of Use are applied even for single reporters, so it's nothing new. But this one formalized it because of the volume of this. Next slide please Matt. I'm not going to go through the details but that's the comparison for you to review; to see what happened, what was and what is.

Since our Beijing meeting we were able to initiate a lot of productive activities without Asia Pacific registrars, and it was very constructive. We've seen a very high rate of compliance within our Asia Pacific audience.

The collaboration has been amazing and I think I was having a side conversation with one of the ALAC Members. You have to take into account the cultural differences we have. On Staff now we have two of

Chinese descent and Chinese Staff Members who can relate and talk to the culture, to the language and to the whole environment.

So they led multiple calls and outreach sessions to address specific areas but also address other general areas. And those sessions have been very productive, like I said, and we'll be reporting on those more. Next slide please.

Another activity compliance has launched proactively, which is of relevance to this security and stability of the eco-system – we all know data escrow is the data that contains all the registrant information. In the past, we would only look at data escrow files when there was a renewal or there was a transfer, a termination or an enforcement.

So what we did is, we discovered that there is always some kind of challenge in that space. We launched a proactive exercise where we ran through the exercise with Iron Mountain and revisited all the registrars depositing and looked at the most recent deposit to ensure that they are being deposited per schedule but also per specification.

So that is relevant because it ensure proper formatting and that the correct data is there. Next slide please. I'm going to... I apologise, now that I have more of an audience, I didn't want to introduce my team members until I had a full audience here. With me in the audience, I'm very pleased to announce, I have Victor Oppenheimer – we call him Señor Oppenheimer – [laughs] and we have [inaudible 02:46:50], who's also with me. We have another team member who got delayed because of all the travel challenges.

So I'm going to turn now to Victor, who's leading the New gTLD efforts for compliance, to share with you and address the PIC enforcement that was brought to our attention last time.

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: Thank you Maggie and thank you to ALAC for the invitation. She calls me Señor Oppenheimer because I'm from Puerto Rico so Spanish is my first language. I wanted to provide you with a high-level overview of efforts made in terms of New gTLD readiness. In the interest of time, let me just go straight to the takeaway message of this slide.

And that is that in preparation to the launch of New gTLD, compliance's readiness plan was designed to have proactive, real-time monitoring tools and process leveraging ICANN-wide tools. So this has been a conscious effort to move away from manual processes. That's really the key takeaway of that slide. I invite you to come to our outreach session and I can provide more details on all of the efforts made.

Next slide please. I also wanted to talk a little bit about the enforcement of public interest commitments, because I know that's a hot topic and of the utmost importance. Again, I will brief you on the information, the details of our outreach session but for now, note that compliance will be involved in two ways – in terms of PICs.

There are three sections on specification (11), which, as you know, is the provision within the registry agreement dealing with PICs, and so for sections (1) and (3) that apply to all registry operators, those sections would be subject to enforcement by formal ICANN audit.

And for section (2), which is the provision that deals with those various operators that chose to voluntarily commit to certain PIC actions, there will be a dispute resolution provider in March, like in the UDRP, compliance will be making sure that if we receive any complaints in terms of implementation of the decisions, we will follow up to make sure that those decisions are implemented.

I only had two slides, so... Maggie?

MAGGIE CERRARD:

Again, we are at a disadvantage here; we've got 15 minutes which are at a close here, but there is the ALAC roundtable tomorrow where we will be also sharing more information about this. Next slide please Matt. We will leave you again with what are the initiatives that compliance is working on, and... Back up one please...

So our focus is now readiness – not only for New gTLD but as you all know there's the Expired Registration Recovery Policy that's going to be effective 31st of August. We are preparing the templates, we are looking at the process and the communication as required, to address those. And it's already in the process of being implemented into the systems.

There is also the implementation that's near and dear to many ALAC Members – the 2013 RAA. We're implementing it in phases. As you know, the 2013 RAA is going to have provisions that will become effective upon signature of the contract and some provisions will not become effective until January 1st 2014.

So we have prioritized those, and we have addressed them in defining the requirements, the process, changes, templates, and the team will be implementing those and rolling it out.

Last and not least is the Additional Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice metrics. We have received the ALAC recommendation for the metrics and I was hoping through this forum we could get some clarification. I have a slide that highlights which metrics come from the Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice in which we have also the ALAC ones.

But what I'd like to do and take away from these slides is request ALAC to provide an additional definition to some of those metrics. And I'll take that offline and maybe come back to you guys through the Working Group because we want to ensure that we are really understanding what you are requesting.

For example, when we say "confusion" or "misunderstanding", there are terms that can be interpreted so differently by different audiences. So the more definition you provide us with, we understand your expectations and we can implement those metrics going forward. And those slide metrics can be found in the appendix.

With that Olivier, again, remind the team – we have a roundtable we're participating in tomorrow that Rinalia and Olivier are hosting, and then on Wednesday at 9:30 in the morning, we have a session for compliance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Maggie. We have time for just one, very small question from Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Mr. Chair. In At-Large we value people and we value relationships with people. In Dakar you assigned Khalil Rasheed to work with me on a number of issues and after a brief but very productive working relationship with Khalil, he vanished from the stage and now he's apparently completely vanished from ICANN and I'm wondering what happened to this person and the valuable relationship?

MAGGIE CERRARD: Thank you Garth for your question. At the Beijing meeting when you brought up the resource question, I believe the Chair of the ALAC, Olivier, expressed that personnel questions are not for this audience. We are here to focus on ALAC issues, on the registrants and the community.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Maggie. But would you be able to have maybe a specific link with Compliance or are you the main entry point with Compliance as far as a dialogue is concerned?

MAGGIE CERRARD: There are many ways to get in touch with Compliance. If you are reporting complaints, if you have issues, we have the ICANN.org way, because this is a really structured way of reporting; whether it's a WHOIS inaccuracy or any non-compliance issues. It's tracked, it's monitored, it's automated and there's a follow-up, follow-through every phase of the way.

And if you have specific needs for Compliance engagement I would request you give me the professional courtesy of sharing what that request is about, Olivier, and I will identify the right resources and will work with you, as we have done in the past.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well thank you very much Maggie and as you said, we're seeing you tomorrow again and of course there is the public session later on in the week, which I invite all those interested in these matters to attend. Just one small note regarding the PIC DRP – this community here has said that they're not particularly happy with the process itself, it's just cumbersome and it's not going to work.

But that's not something which you can fix, that's something which we have to work with at other levels of ICANN. So thank you very much for joining us and welcome Señor Oppenheimer. [laughter]

MAGGIE CERRARD: Thank you very much. Have a nice day.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And for the record, of course, we are multi-lingual here so we can have interventions in French and in Spanish as well, if the need be in the future. So we now have Steve Crocker, who is joining us at the table with a little bit of delay. Sorry, Steve. Steve is the Chair of the Board and he was supposed to speak to the Ex-Com on Friday, which he has done last time in Beijing and unfortunately this time it was impossible.

But thankfully he's been able to make some time to come and speak to all of us right now. I guess I can hand the floor over to Steve and we can start with questions and answers and a dialogue. We have until 12:00, I believe, 12:00 sharp.

STEVE CROCKER: I'll just say it's a pleasure to be here and I can feel that this seat is already warmed up, so I'm ready. [laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's because the session on Friday is usually referred to as the "skillet", where we grill our guest. So I guess we're not looking at grilling here but I open the floor for... Do you want to start?

STEVE CROCKER: I'm disappointed, I look forward to that actually.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [laughs] Okay, Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. Steve, I have a request for information. Tomorrow we have an At-Large multi-stakeholder policy roundtable that would focus on New gTLDs, specifically on consumer and public interest concerns and how to address those. And one of the things that will be tabled will be the recommendations of the Working Group on consumer trust, choice and competition, if I'm not mistaken.

It has been said that advice had been sent to the Board but nothing has returned and I was wondering what the status of that was, if you have any information. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

I don't. As you're probably well aware, at the Board level we've divided the functions of the Board, basically, into two parallel things, so there's a New gTLD Program Committee trying to draw super-wide, bright lines of people who might be conflicted or might be viewed as conflicted.

So [Shareen Shelby? 02:58:15] runs that and I suspect that that's where the action on this may be but I'm not 100% sure. I'll take a note and we'll find out. So there was advice from ALAC on...? If I can't find it quickly, can I come back to you or...? Who's the right person to pick up the thread?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I think Rinalia will work with Staff to get you the right information.

STEVE CROCKER:

Feel free to not wait for me to come back, you've got my attention. The next question is just how I pull it up and get access to it.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

A follow up to that, Steve. The issue of conflicted and non-conflicted Board Members in trying to consider really important questions for ICANN. It basically puts... How do I put it? When you have a virus you

have to isolate certain things and you don't benefit from the knowledge of the bigger group, so how do you come to a good decision?

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you for that question. That's something that we actually have thought quite a lot about. I don't know we're all of the same mind but I have a quite firm view of it, which I'll come to in just a second. But we're also conscious that in trying to be very careful about the conflict and set the structure up, that we've also created secondary issues.

Whether or not we're stumbling over ourselves or whether we're depriving ourselves of things and whether we're making more of it than we need to. But in any case, the course that we've set is very, very bright, wide lines that go far beyond anything I've ever seen before in my life. And I've seen a lot of situations.

So we try to avoid actual conflicts, of which there aren't very many potential conflicts, potential appearances of conflicts, etc. And the details get pretty specific. So here's my view of the way this is playing out and it's a little bit interesting, a little bit odd. Roughly three-quarters of the Board is non-conflicted and is involved in the New gTLD Program Committee.

We have a Board that is by any measure far bigger than it needs to be to do the job that a Board ordinarily would do and so the first thing I would commend is that just on pure numbers, three-quarters of us is more than sufficient to generally have the depth and breadth to deal with things. So I don't feel like we're in general weakened in any substantial way.

There are some Board Members, to be fair, who feel that if they are not given the opportunity to contribute then somehow their role is diminished. My view is that's not the right question, the question is, is the community being served? Is the Board operating well enough and not one of us is critical to that process.

So I'm very comfortable that the diminution, if you will, of the Board, is not anywhere close to a threshold. That said, we also ask that question in a more particular ways, and one of the ways that is of a bit of concern is technical depth in topics like IDNs or things like that. There is a higher degree of damage because several of the people who are very good at that are on the conflicted side and so we worry a little more about that.

That Committee is empowered and does invite Board Members or anybody else to give its advice. The line is when a vote is taken do they get... So it's not quite as bad as it might look in terms of being closed off or having no access to things. And so we try to navigate that in a very sensible way.

One of the unintended or unexpected side effects has been to double our capacity. I can tell you as Chair that I am completely busy and having [Shareen? 03:03:17] run this operation is like being duplicated – it makes me twice as powerful, in a way, in terms of the amount of work that's done. So I'm very grateful and in practice it's working out far, far better than if we didn't have this.

The next step I think will be, once we get past the initial delegations, to take another hard look at the way we're organized. So that's a long

answer but it's a very important question and one we're very thoughtful about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Steve. I was looking at the questions that were going to be given over to the Board, and in a few days time the ALAC is meeting with the Board as a whole, and I noticed that the first question was one really aimed at you, and perhaps this is one that we could ask now?

It's to do with how ALAC advice is treated by the Board. Is there a process in place for addressing ALAC advice as well as designated channels for the implementation for the advice? We often send advice and to us it's a little bit like lobbing it over a wall and not really knowing what happens to it afterwards.

There have been concerns in our community that GAC advice receives full attention and yet ALAC advice doesn't get the same amount of attention and sometimes no attention at all.

STEVE CROCKER: Early this morning there was an internal Staff briefing to Fadi and to Bruce Tonkin and myself, giving a quick overview of what's happening in different areas. And with respect to gNSO, it was explained to us that they're very concerned about how they can give advice and maybe they not only want to be able to make policy but they also would like the privilege of creating advice as well. And they don't know how to

communicate with us. So I said: “Just do what ALAC does, we’ve solved that problem with ALAC, right?” [laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we could do policy? Can ALAC do policy at that point? We’re ready to give away some advice and they can give us some policy.

STEVE CROCKER: I’m not trying to be completely facetious here – we have had this conversation before and it was very vivid from my point of view. And it’s got a couple of different pieces, if you break it down. The first was conceptual; the idea is, yeah, ALAC can give the Board advice and the Board will pay attention, just as we would feel obliged to do from anybody, although the wording in the bylaws put the GAC in a special position, at least from my point of view.

I would prefer not to be distracted by that. That advice coming from ALAC is extremely important and we want to pay attention to it. So the next question is one of mechanics and I think to the extent that things are not yet working the way that we want, I would focus on that as opposed to, is there a conceptual problem or a policy problem or something.

So we’re not deliberately ignoring you. I need to apologize that the Board has been under-resourced and we’re in the process of beefing up our support process for the Board. Not quite there in terms of there’s hirings in process and a little bit of reorganization in process. We’re not quite ready to make a formal announcement of that but it’s coming

within a short period of time. Next month, maybe September, before you see it all. And quite a lot of energy has been put into that internally.

So it becomes, I think, fundamentally, a tracking problem, and since I've made my entire career out of the simple device of putting numbers on requests for comments [laughter] and reused that mechanism whenever possible, including when we set up SSAC, having numbered SSAC reports... "Steve, you didn't follow the advice in SSAC 54," and everybody will scramble, "What is SSAC 54?"

Anything that you can do that makes it a concrete object that we can track, we'll track this. And I know it sounds silly to get down to that level of detail but as I say, it's worked disproportionately for me, so...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

We actually have tracking numbers; we have statement numbers and tracking numbers. Maybe we could extend that over to the Board and see if the Board could use some tracking numbers, if they might be of help? I mean, we've put them in a way which actually could be extended to all parts of ICANN, would you believe it? All our statements start with a tracking number AL – for At-Large of course – and...

STEVE CROCKER:

And are those documents accessible? If you know that number can you find that document or are they buried internally in an inaccessible website?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You use this unknown, very obscure search engine called Google. [laughter] That gets you there.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It just does that. That's one technical thing, but more importantly, how does it work at the moment? Let's say I send you a statement on behalf of At-Large, you receive it, how does it work and where would you like to see it go?

STEVE CROCKER: Rather than giving you a detailed flowchart, the answer that I think is more appropriate and real is, who will actually read it and pay attention to it? And then on the basis of that decide what to do? The Board is not an operating agency. We don't have a staff to go and do things. Anything we do is going to be by direction to management or suggestions to SOs or ACs or whatever.

So the basic process flow, if that's the question you're asking, is that we'll look at it, I'll look at it, make a decision about what to do and try to move it along whatever path it is now, that could be: "This is important, go and do that," that would be the shortest one, or: "This is important, we need to look at it. Here's the following set of people that need to be involved."

But one way or another, try to move it around. We have an internal tracking process. It's not... It's related to the resource issue, it's not working as smoothly as I would like, but it is very high priority for me to get this working so that the Board is not in an unresponsive mode. So I apologize. And you get to ask [Vice? 03:10:27] if you haven't heard an answer; it's okay to nag and nudge...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Steve. Well, we don't like to nudge and nag all the time. We already have a bad name. Internet users... Goodness. Any questions from anyone around the table? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi Steve. Just going along the lines of what you were saying and along the lines of a question that was asked to Fadi earlier, there is a concern that I've heard from some people in At-Large about the squeaky wheel getting more attention than those that quietly deliberate and do bottom-up.

For instance, after the Beijing meeting the comment that everyone that spoke at the public forum would get a written response, and there was a feeling that, okay, the people that line up or possibly AstroTurf or whatever, at the public forum, are all going to get written responses.

But the months that we've taken to deliberate on something, putting forth a written report, it gets less response back than somebody that has the ability to go to the public forum.

So there's a concern expressed in some circles that, well, the people that can afford for financial reasons or incentives to go to ICANN meetings and stand up and speak at public forums, did they...

Is there any justifiable concern that they get heard over the deliberations of something that's submitted in writing after months of bottom-up deliberation? Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER:

We'll kill off those written responses to the public forum. [laughter] I can see... I had a job once where I found myself giving responses like that all the time and I went out and got one of those pointy-haired manager hats from Dilbert. [laughter]

It was the development guys who were driving very hard to get the product out, complaining that the marketing guys down the hall were leaving at five o'clock, and I said: "Okay, then I'll put a door in and keep it closed so you can't see them." [laughter]

No, you guys obviously deserve a response commiserate with the work you put in and as I... This is really all part of the same problem that I'm wrestling with, which is the workload and the resources so that we can manage all of that.

And it's true throughout the organization and not that you need to empathize with this, but I've now been in the job as Chair for two years and the first year was totally consumed with the end of Rod's tenure and the recruiting process and then this year started up with Fadi being

announced in Prague a year ago, a summer in which he wasn't quite on board and then he began and a whole lot of transformations and things.

And a couple of months ago... I've been very carefully holding back from being my own squeaky wheel of my little territory, of running the Board, which needs this attention compared to all the other things that are going on, and I shifted my posture a couple of months ago saying: "Okay, now is our time. We really have to do it." So I was pushing harder there.

That doesn't help you at all, I'm just sharing what's going on behind the scenes here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Steve. Any other questions around the table? Wow, it sounds like you've satisfied everyone. Oh, Julie Hammer, very last minute, or second. Go ahead Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: I guess I was hesitating because I didn't want to unnecessarily prolong the topic of the public forum, but something that I often feel in the public forum is that some of the questions or comments that are made could well be responded to on the spot by the Board, or by yourself or by Fadi, but often that doesn't happen.

And I personally feel that I would be better educated about these issues if more response was able to be given on the spot. I know you'd get through fewer questions that way, but...

STEVE CROCKER:

That's exactly what's been on our minds and we've actually been putting a lot of energy into trying to improve the public forum. I have a very strong distaste for pro forma exercises, which are just done for the theatre of it. And so what you've watched is some things that have been successful and some things that have not been successful.

Our evaluation of what we did in Beijing came down very strongly on the side of what you're suggesting, which was in the attempt of trying to not consume the time by giving answers, it didn't play well, it wasn't the right thing and we could even feel it as it was happening and at one point Fadi stepped in to give an answer.

So our plan this time, quite explicitly, having worked with Brad White who's orchestrating this and laying up a plan, is that we will in fact give answers on the spot and it will have the corresponding effect that we may not be able to handle this many but hopefully we'll all feel better served by that.

And we're having a short planning session to get everybody on the Board and Staff tuned up on this on Wednesday and then on Thursday we'll watch it play out and we'll see. But we're keenly interested in having the public forums serve a purpose and be clear about what that purpose is and be effective at doing that. 100% in synch. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Steve and I think we have run out of time but before I thank you for coming to see us, you might have noticed there are a few gaps around the table. That's because some people didn't manage to make it but also, some people who have managed to make it

are actually elsewhere in ICANN, in Expert Working Group and ATRT and a lot of other Working Groups that are taking place.

And I think that's something which we need to acknowledge, because the At-Large community doesn't only stay in its room but goes pretty much across all of ICANN – ccNSO, gNSO and SSAC Members as well, etc. And it's something which we find to be going on more and more every time.

A few years ago that wasn't the case but now it's just expanding a lot more and I think we do have to thank other parts of ICANN for inviting At-Large to be an integral part of this community, rather than being the black sheep of the community.

STEVE CROCKER:

And I want to commend you guys. I have been really thrilled to watch the progress over a long period of time under Cheryl's leadership and others, growing from an idea, really, a wish, to a fully-functioning, vibrant organization.

When I was chairing SSAC and trying to move SSAC through its paces, I took a number of lessons from watching what was happening here. And I'm now seeing the impact that you're having, the effect that you're having, which is both very positive and constructive in the joint work, and a little bit of jitters of all of a sudden ALAC is taking up a lot of attention and it's making other components a bit nervous.

Ultimately, that's good, but it's interesting to watch. The other thing which I want to comment on – and I mentioned this morning; this

internal policy briefing – one of the things that was presented – very few handouts were given to us – but one of the things was the “ALAC explains policy development”.

And I looked at that and said: “Wow, this is really good,” and written in nice, clean, plain English and so forth. So I don’t know which of the people here get the most credit for it but it really is a high impact, very good thing. So I complement you all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. There are quite a few penholders around this room but there are also quite a few more, behind the scenes, who have not managed to make it here because of course only ALAC Members and Regional leaders are funded to come over.

But maybe you might meet them over in June 2014, hopefully, which is the ATLAS II, At-Large number two, which we hope will be taking place.

STEVE CROCKER: With respect to that, I’ve been pelted repeatedly with concerns about whether or not that’s funded and so on and so forth, and I believe, I’m quite certain actually, that the money’s there, it’s in the budget and it’s a done deal.

So I’m looking forward to it and congratulations to you on that too for all the work you’ve put into getting it to this point, getting it organized and then I know that it’s not trivial to get from here to actually putting it together and making it happen but it’s already on the radar screen as a big event.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Steve Crocker, thank you very much. [applause] And now next in our joyful program of the day we have Xavier Calvez, who is going to join us. Xavier is the ICANN Chief Financial Officer and I will also hand the floor over to Tijani Ben Jemaa who will be running this session.

In fact, due to the fact that I need to go... Oh, and Susanna Bennett, okay. I need four eyes, or five eyes. If anybody's got a spare eye please pass it this way. Not glasses – eyes. Although I may need glasses for those eyes as well. So thank you Susanna, thank you Xavier.

Just a matter of housekeeping note, this afternoon I will be taken up on ATRT 2 matters, so you will be in the very capable hands of my Vice Chairs, Carlton Samuels and Evan Leibovitch. So if you don't like what he does just ping me a note and we'll deal with him afterwards.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It won't matter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It won't matter, okay. Susanna Bennett and Xavier Calvez, welcome. Tijani, you have the floor now to run the finance session. Thank you and see you all a bit later.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Since Xavier is French and speaks French, perhaps I will switch to French for one time. Thank you Olivier. This session will deal with finance. We have with us Xavier Calvez, our CFO, and we have also the honor of receiving Susie, who's the new COO of ICANN.

In the first place I'm going to give the floor to Susie for her to tell us... Welcome Susie, this session is about the finance. Thank you. This session will deal with finance and we have the honor of having with us both of COO and our CFO at ICANN.

In the first place I'm going to welcome Susie. She's the new COO of ICANN and I'm going to give her the floor for her to tell us what she wants to tell us.

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Hello everyone. Very nice meeting you. I appreciate this chance of meeting you so soon after I start. I started with ICANN last week, Monday, July 1st. I'm very excited to be joining ICANN at this point of transformation, as described by Steve earlier. Let me just give you a very quick intro of my background so you can get to know me a little bit.

Hopefully over time we will know each other much more and I can understand your views of ICANN and how we can together transform, improve and go on. I was born in Shanghai and went to Hong Kong when I was very young and then to the United States when I was a teenager.

My education and my career was all in the United States, however I worked for international companies and they were all technology companies. I'm very passionate about technology. I believe that technology advances the world in a very positive way and can be the catalyst of peace.

My education was in finance, so very early on in my career, in addition to my finance role, I was able to expand very quickly to the other corporate functions including HR and IT facilities and administration. So it provided me with a good overview of the organization. Also, I attained my MBA in executive training.

From working with international companies I learned a lot about culture and that was able to help me do a better job in the HR world as well. And I truly believe in corporate organization excellence with organization and the excellence in that area, we can enable the organization to operate much more efficiently and with the least cost to achieve the goals and strategy of the organization.

So when I got to learn about ICANN, this part of ICANN transformation as described by Fadi and Steve, I absolutely believe in the vision and I feel very fortunate to join ICANN at this point and can add value to this process. With that, I welcome any questions you may have.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Susie. Shall we continue with Xavier before or do we have any questions for Susie? Since I don't see any hands I'll continue with Xavier. Thank you Susie. Xavier, I'm going to give you the floor now. You're going to speak about the planning process for the operational plan and for the budget, where we have seen things change since last year.

We have a new procedure and I would like you to explain what it is and to tell us what the difference is and why things work this way and what

we'll have next year, because we'll have a new strategic plan, which will be different from the one we had last year. So you have the floor.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I'm going to speak in French this time since last time I didn't manage to. Thank you for that introduction Tijani. The budgetary process I will address in three steps.

I'm going to tell us first where we're at today, what has changed in the budgetary process, as Tijani just announced, and in the third place, where we're at in the framework on the approval of specific budget requests, which were submitted by the whole of At-Large organizations.

So, the budgetary process has changed this year, with the original purpose of having an interaction with the community regarding the elements they would like to include in the budget earlier on in the year, and to have greater interaction.

That was what we decided in October and that was the original purpose, which was a result of a discussion process we had with the community to improve the process and the budgetary procedure we had last year. So you see our purpose was based on our good intentions but we had to follow a number of changes since last year.

We changed our focus with a new approach in order to adapt to the implementation of the management system, which is a management and task system, which we have used in the framework of the budgetary process in order to estimate the cost of the organization according to the format of each program, which has been documented in that task.

Given that this system was implemented between November and February of this year, the production of budgetary information according to each [attask? 3:30:09] program was done between March and April, which didn't allow us to – as we intended originally – produce this information earlier on in the year, share them and discuss them with the community earlier on in the year.

So the same way we did last year and it was the same effect we had last year: the information only arrived a bit late in the fiscal year because this information arrived at the end of March, but all of the information of course was published for public comments at the beginning of May. So the public comments process and period ended on June 20th 2013.

This process just, as last year, didn't allow us to have a level of interaction with the community that we expected to have and it didn't happen as early as we expected, which is the same thing that happened last year.

Our intent is to start once again on an approach where we can produce this budgetary information earlier on and to be able to share it earlier on with the community, so that they can interact with us. This will be facilitated by the strategic plan that we have in place now, and we expect to be able to finish it before the end of the budgetary procedure for this fiscal year.

We expect to start developing the operational plan and to share the development of that operational plan and the development of the budget throughout their development with the community, so we expect to share it throughout the procedure – we expect to have greater

interaction levels between January and June of next year, with the community throughout the development of our budget. Are there any questions?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I know I risk disagreeing with you but I'd say that this year was a step back regarding what we had last year, because last year we had a right to access the budget framework, which was submitted for public comment, and the budget was produced on the basis of the public comments.

This year, you skipped that stage – and I understand why, but the interaction has receded regarding what we had last year.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Yes, I understand and I agree. We are trying to go on changing these processes and the framework stage could not take place. Yes, that's accurate.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Any questions? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi there. Without going into the specifics of any particular submissions from At-Large, could you speak in general about not only the quality of what you received, the appropriateness and going forward, if there is advice that you would like to give to the regions, to the ALSes, who are planning to submit in the future?

Part of the frustration that I find in the process is that people don't even know the criteria – what makes something justified of “this gets picked”, “this doesn't get picked”? Yes, there's a strategic plan but even within that there is no awareness of why say, one project put forward that is within the strategic plan gets approved and the other one doesn't.

So it's a situation rather than telling us what money is available and trying to allow some internal prioritization, everything is tossed over and sometimes they're tossed back and we don't know why some are approved and some are disapproved. If you could give some kind of guidance on the way that you're making decisions, in a way that would be helpful to people who are submitting in the future. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I want to make sure I understand your question first. The question is about the criteria for the SO and AC additional budget requests, or for the rest of the budget? Or for both?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'm thinking right now in terms of the At-Large Members who are submitting At-Large-based requests, because this seems to be a very opaque process where people toss things in and some things get approved. It's like at the end you find out who won the Oscar, who got the approval, without quite knowing who voted, how they voted and why they voted. [laughs]

XAVIER CALVEZ:

As part of the application process that we've developed last year and that we've reconducted this year, this budget year, we've provided in the format of the application or the request, a certain number of criteria, which are the same then that we provided last year.

I think it is clear on the basis of those two exercises that we need to refine and expand the documentation and the communication of those criteria.

So we have produced a document that's been used for the evaluation process and the reviews of those regular track requests that are... So not the fast track ones but the regular ones that have been received until the end of March and reviewed since.

We have used a much more expanded document that helps in defining the criteria of what is acceptable, what is not acceptable, how [inaudible 03:36:49] and so on. We've been using this document internally for now as a pilot. Rob Hogarth has been helping to develop it and our intent is... We think it's pretty complete at this stage.

Our intent is to share it fairly soon, in the next few weeks, so that further input can be provided from the community on whether the criteria formulated are clear or not clear, complete or not complete. And once that interaction is completed then we can use that document as a basis and can be know to everyone.

As the rules of the game, we will help to formulate requests and formulate better requests. As it relates to the review process, the review process will of course use those criteria. It is, as we've done this year, and unless we decide to make changes next year, the review is

done by a panel of ICANN Staff, which include representatives from the Global Stakeholder Engagement Group, led by Sally Costerton, from the Policy Group, led by David Olive and from Finance, me in this case.

And I have tried progressively to remove Finance from the review process in the decision making process, because it shouldn't be a finance decision as to whether an outreach action makes sense or not – it should be evaluated by someone who has an understanding of the activities of outreach and the benefits and complexities of those actions, and so on.

So that's the intent, to address, I think, part of the point that you had, at least.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry, if I could just follow up to that? Since this is being done by a panel with some level of independence from the rest of the process, is it not possible to try and have somebody from the community on that panel and not just Staff?

So this is not just a Staff prioritization but at least somebody in this panel, with an awareness of what's going on directly in At-Large, the grass roots, to be able to help with that.

I'm just suggesting that we don't have a complete separation of the community only goes so far with it and then it's totally removed from the community when the final decisions are made.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Understood. So I don't think that by having the review done by Sally and Sally's team and David's team we have a complete removal from the community, from what the understanding of what the community does. And I think, obviously, this will evolve over time, but Sally's team is further and further involved in notably how it relates to outreach.

She's going to be developing those activities further, so I think it will make even more sense in the future than it has currently. But part of the intent of having this review panel is that there is a better knowledge, a more comprehensive knowledge by the people who review, of what the activities of the communities, generally speaking, are.

Having said that, I think it's a reasonable idea to consider to determine whether we want to involve more people in this panel coming from the community. I understand the offer to provide a person from At-Large into this review panel.

If we would go down that path we would have to consider the composition of that panel because it would have to be represented more from the community than just from ALAC, of course. But I think it's a reasonable idea to consider as an improvement to the process. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Xavier. Thank you Evan. Evan, I don't think that community Members should be on the panel because they are the people who are requesting and they would be the judge also, so would not be fair. Especially because we are not alone. We will have all the community

representatives on this panel and it might turn into a fight because everyone wants to have more to himself.

So I perhaps would suggest that some Board Member, especially the Chair of the Finance Committee, and the Chair of the Global Engagement Committee to be on this panel. This is [inaudible 03:41:50] because those people are involved. This matter is something inside their job and they are not biased.

Thank you. So I have another question now. Sala?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: First of all, congratulations on your additional team member, and I would very quickly just speak to Evan's comments. One suggestion for the ALAC to consider, potentially Finance as well, is to consider looping it into the Capacity Building Working Group where we can discuss with Finance where they could potentially have some kind of training offered.

It doesn't have to be face-to-face; it can be hosted remotely in terms of how to create budget proposals. The second thing that I wanted to ask to speakers was in relation to Form 990. I'll just hand this to you. Noting that Form 990 is a form that ICANN Finance actually submits.

The question that I wanted to point to was with respect to the estimated volunteers. I note that it says 26. Just a point of clarification that I'd like to see from Finance is, in arriving at 26 as the estimate, are those Members or from the various advisory committees?

Because the ALAC is a 15-membered committee, however At-Large comprises of a whole bunch of volunteers, many of whom spend

extraordinary time, energy and effort. So I was quite disturbed to see the estimated number of volunteers is 26 but I wanted to ask you. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. I will have to reverify the criteria that were very specific in the Form 990 to document this information, because the definition of volunteer differs depending on who you're talking to, and when it comes to the IRS it's also a different definition. So I will reverify the definition.

It is clear that the information provided meets just the criteria of the IRS, not necessarily the definition that we would all provide to the notion of volunteers, and you're pointing to At-Large and of course in the other organizations there's a lot of volunteers as well.

So this number is not – to your point – representing a count that ICANN would do as per its own definition of the number of volunteers and therefore it is a tax definition, it's not the definition that we would put together collectively as that's probably more in the 100s of volunteers that ICANN would have.

So I will reverify the criteria that are being used for that and how the count, as a result, is being made. My presumption is that the 26 is probably not very far from a number of formal Working Group Members that have been created and that have been meeting. I'm thinking of the Expert Working Group on the WHOIS, potentially, and possibly of the ATRT 2 Working Group as well.

But the bottom line is that I will verify a response to that more precisely later.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I note that you've mentioned that you will give us the particulars of the definitions of volunteers of filling this form, but for the sake of our transcript and for the record, personally I feel that the number of volunteers far exceeds 26. This is not anywhere close.

The second question I'd like to raise is this – I don't want to ask it at the Finance meeting, I thought it would be better here – the second question is: in relation to the professional fundraising fees for 16(a) and 16(b), I noted that it says "not".

In your view, within the last financial calendar, have these changed marginally to facilitate potentially marginalized or underserved communities where much has been said in relation to capacity building projects, and particularly in reaching out?

And apart from outreach I noted that you mentioned at the last ICANN meeting, in the Financial meeting that you now have...

I'm not sure whether it's a database of some kind or some automated spreadsheet where in real time we can see the level of particulars – but I'm just wondering where the fundraising expenses and professional fundraising fees would be articulated in that matrix, on that budget spreadsheet, whatever it is? Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I think it would be helpful to me that we have a direct conversation on this and make sure I've understood correctly the data that you're referring to and the question that you have on it, because I'm not sure I fully understood that. I apologise.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think you are right, especially because we are running out of time and because we have remote questions. Please, Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi. We have a remote participation question from Wolf Ludwig. Wolf asks: why are there GAC Members in the decision-making committee and no ALAC Members?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Are we talking about the decision committee for the additional budget requests? If we are, there are not GAC Members. If I need to repeat it, the people involved in the review panel currently are Staff Members coming from the departments of Global Stakeholder Engagement, which is led by Sally Costerton, and Policy, led by David Olive, and Finance, led by me.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Second question? Okay. I have a question from Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Tijani. It's a question from both Susanna and you, Xavier. How do we go about securing additional Staff support for the At-Large, should we feel that we need it, and what kind of information would you need to justify that?

And a comment to say a very warm welcome to Susanna Bennett: you are welcome not only because we need competent professionals in ICANN but the fact that you are a woman –we are... It's really wonderful to see that and a great encouragement to what's great gender balance in ICANN. So welcome.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I think that would make sense to me, and I didn't think of it before, so with caution, what I think would make sense to me is that you formulate that request through the channels of the existing supporting Staff and ensuring that it gets to David Olive, who supervises that organization.

I think that... Just from a common sense standpoint, it's about what are the activities or the type of support that you think is not provided and that is needed and what are the activities that are maybe new and that generate that requirement for additional support.

Or, in the existing activities who's completion are impaired by insufficient support, I don't have much more of an answer than just the common sense of what do you think is needed in addition and why do you think it's needed.

Notably, if you can point out the new activities, if that's what justifies the request for more support, I think that would be helpful. Any color around the request and the type of needs and the form of the needs would be, I'm sure, welcome, to be able to assess that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Xavier. Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI: This comment comes from Fouad Bajwa. Fouad says: "If there are no GAC Members, community Members and only Staff Members, then this is not a transparent selection process. This should be raised as an objection from the ALAC."

And Wolf goes onto note that he supports Fouad's point: "We need to have transparency and accountability in the composition of the decision-making committee."

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Xavier, do you want to answer?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I'll give a quick, short answer, and it may be incomplete, which is the extent of the question. But to the discussion that we were having earlier with Evan, the transparency about the criteria that are being used, I think, will help in making this a more transparent process.

I think there is more thinking that we need to do also about more interaction with the communities that have submitted requests prior to the decision and maybe after the decision as well, that we should consider as an improvement to the process.

I'll be very frank as well – out of the, let's say, \$80-and-something million of the budget, this is \$500k that we're talking about and what I want to make sure we do is that we devote the adequate amount of resources to managing this process.

It is clear that we need to spend more time, I think, interacting with the organizations that provide those requests, so that we make sure we understand them fully and then we make sure that they decision process is as clear as possible and that the decisions are as correctly communicated as possible.

And I completely recognize and I agree that we need to continue improving on this. I think we have improved a bit from last year. Last year we improved from the year before and we need to continue improving – notably on the communication and rationale aspect.

I just want to also be conscious into the amount of effort that we put into this because resources are not unlimited.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, next is Evan and the Cheryl, and Cheryl will be the last.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi there. This is totally unrelated to the last comment and unfortunately goes to something else that appears to have slipped back a bit, and that is what I'd call almost an atmosphere of respect regarding volunteers when it comes to things like travel.

I notice that the per diems for people that were travelling here were not released until July 5th. For most people that meant they had to lay out their own money to come here and wait for the transfer to go to their bank accounts while they're here.

Some people in fact get bank charges that are assessed on top of that. So to have to pay for the privilege of receiving wire transfers, it's my understanding that for them that wasn't reimbursed. Again, you're talking about there's a very, very big budget and these are all little nickel and dime things, but they end up being an atmosphere of respect or disrespect or something like that.

And it's not even a matter of spending more or spending less, but just procedures and processes of things that treat people a little better, acknowledge that people don't necessarily have their own funds to lay out when they comes here and... Can you talk to that at all? Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Quickly, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I could, less quickly than if required. What I suggest we do is, I think it's understood. I think that we can find ways to ensure that the payments are made on a day that's more adequate for the people who received

the funds, to effectively receive them on time. And we'll make sure we work with the constituency travel to make sure that happens. There are logistical aspects to it, which I won't bore you with that we need to make.

As it relates to the wire transfer fees, we have also discussed and approached to try and treat that subject, which is just technical, in all honesty, at the end of the day. I agree that it's not fair for someone who receives a per diem of \$80 to pay \$15 or \$20 of wire transfer fees. It makes no sense.

At the same time, I think we have to find logistical ways to pay a small amount of money in the timing that's required, without incurring the fees. It's either cash on the spot, which is what we do already – today we do that – therefore there are no fees, but then it's a payment that will actually happen this afternoon, for those of you that are concerned.

So I think we need to tighten the logistics. From the perspective of principal I agree that anyone should not have to incur the wire fees and what we need to find is a way to have a process where we take on those fees when they are applied.

It's actually relatively complex – it doesn't look like it is, but it is – because we don't always know what fees are being applied, and what we today do is send monies through wires with a request from the bank that we incur the fees. But that's the first step of the fee.

There may be intermediary banks used in the downstream part of the transaction that charge fees and we don't know about it until the recipient tell us: "By the way, I was charged a fee." So anyway, it's a

complicated answer but the principal that I want to express is I agree that the recipient should not incur the fee. The question is how do we make that happen and we can find ways to help with that. So I don't want to take too much time on that answer.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Xavier. I have Cheryl Langdon-Orr but I have Heidi who has a remark to say? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Tijani. I just wanted to jump into one of the earlier comments and questions that was in the Adobe Connect chat, and I always had a little concern with a philosophy – I understand the philosophy but I'm equally concerned with the philosophy – that says: "For the purposes of accountability and transparency, one must be at the table."

I'll be kind to our interpreters and not use my Australian language in response to that but it starts with 'B' and it ends with 'T'. It's not the case. You need to be able to have fair and equitable access to the processes, the proceedings and the mechanisms that are used at the table.

In some cases there may be a valid argument to say that a good accountability and transparency model may allow you to view the table but you don't actually have to be sitting at the table. And I do fear for mega-lifts of process that become opportunity, and these things can be opportunity, for renegotiating the value of a project plan in the first place.

At least in some of our communities – and I would say it’s the case in the gNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups as well – a huge amount of preparation in any of these applications for additional funding projects has gone through. And in fact, what you want is a very lean filter put on at the top.

So I’m 100% endorsing of your very small model. You certainly need to make sure that it’s accountable and transparent, but that does not mean having everybody with vested interest sitting at the table and I’m happy to argue long and hard about that with my community. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. Do you want to comment? Okay, it’s okay. So, thank you very much Xavier, thank you Susie. Olivier, before I close this session I would like to say that for the criteria, last year we worked very well. This year we didn’t work on them at all and we need to work on them; we need to improve them and we need to involve people.

If people were involved in the definition of the criteria then we would not have any complaints. So with this I will close this session. Thank you very much all. Thank you Susanna and thank you Xavier. [applause]

HEIDI ULLRICH:

A quick housekeeping – well, two quick items. First off, now is lunch break, you have until 13:30 for lunch. At 13:30 the expert’s Working Group session will be here and also I’m aware that some of you who are staying at the Elengeni Hotel are being asked to pay a 1% tourist tax?

I've been working with Joseph from constituency travel on that and he said that actually you should not be paying that. I'm just going to read a message that he sent to me to pass onto you:

"If you are a supported traveller of ICANN you do not need to pay the tourist tax during your approved dates of travel. If you have been charged this please let me know, please send me a message before you check out and I'll sort that out."

So again, if you've been charged that tourist tax, please write Joseph a message. Thank you. Have a good lunch.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

[Tape change to alac-regional-2-14jul-13-en.mp2]

MATT ASHTIANI: Hello everyone and welcome to the ALAC Working Session 1. As a reminder, please state your name before speaking. Please speak slowly and calmly into the microphone. Evan, over to you, calmly.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi Matt. Slowly, yes. Calmly? I can't guarantee that. Okay, so moving along, what we're doing right now is – by the way, the reason why I'm doing this is because fearless leader, Olivier, is over doing his ATRT bit

and so I hope he and Alan are having fun. In the meantime we will hold the fort here on their behalf.

So the first thing that we want to do is start getting reviews from At-Large Working Groups. The first one on our plate is the Expert Working Group from which we have Carlton and Holly here to present. And the local time here is 13:35. The timetable is scheduled that this will run for a half hour. So go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks Matt. Can I have the first slide? Technical difficulties. Mr. Chair, am I allowed two extra minutes to allow for technical difficulties? Calmly, he says, calmly!

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Introduce yourself while waiting.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, Member of ALAC, Chair of APRALO. And this is actually a combined report. There was a WHOIS Working Group and an RAA Working Group, however because the two were so intertwined, we decided we would combine the two and really explain what the common issues are.

And in a sense this is, by way of history, because there's a new Expert Working Group that is going to potentially – if what it's recommending comes to fruition – really change the landscape.

So this may be a portrait of an interim solution but there are some issues there that confront us that we will have to deal with until such a time as the Expert Working Group and its proposals, which will be presented tomorrow... The slides are up. Fantastic.

Did we like that? Good. Next slide. What's that? That's not the first slide. Could I have the other one please? Oh. There will be another filibuster while the other one gets loaded. That's it. Okay.

For those of you that haven't been living and breathing the RAA and WHOIS, the background goes back some time. It goes back really to 2009 when a joint Working Group was formed between the gNSO and ALAC to look at the RAA, really two aspects of it.

One was to develop what was called an aspirational charter and that would be looking forward to particularly the rights of end users and registrants. The other part of it was actually making suggestions for amendments to the RAA. We were called Team A and Team B. Cheryl remembers Team A very well. I remember Team B very well.

The next piece of the puzzle is a thing called the Affirmation of Commitments. The relevance of it to the WHOIS and the RAA is that one of the four things in the Affirmation of Commitments is that there must be a review of WHOIS.

And the third piece where all three finally wind up with why Carlton and I felt there should be one report, not two, is that as a result of the Affirmation of Commitments, there was a WHOIS Policy Review Team. It did issue a final report, it had recommendation and in fact most of those recommendations have come to fruition.

Next slide? Thank you Matt. To go back, there was an aspirational charter, and this is... Evan? Evan wants the history, and this is actually an interesting history because if you're looking at what user interests are, this is where... There was a lot of work put out into this and it is not a bad statement for what registrants should be entitled to.

I won't read it out but if you're looking at aspects of public interest in terms of users and registrants this is a good place to start, and I don't want those things lost. Next slide. For the Regulatory Working Group... Oh, I've just become myself again, that's good.

The outcomes of the RAA negotiations, which took a bit of time, there were a lot of documents and a few of us actually spent a lot of time reading a lot of documents, but they're all very important. They were the actual amendments to the Registration Accreditation Agreement, which I hope all of you know about.

There were other documents that were part of this huge package. I won't list them because they are on the slide but there are some that are particularly important for registrants and end users. The first is the amendments themselves, and we made some comments on that.

Something that was particularly important: one of our huge issues in ALAC has been the lack of accuracy of WHOIS data. There is now a program specification on accuracy and it's an extremely important document. There's also a WHOIS SLA.

Specification on proxy privacy services. Now, part of the RAA did include what elements should be included in the privacy proxy services and I note that the last time I saw the RAA all that had been wiped out. All

you've got now in that specification is that there has to be one, but then there's a lot of blank spaces and that would be an issue that I'm going to bring to the table.

There is certainly the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities specification, which is important and a few other documents. The reason I've got those four documents in red is that I really want to... Those are to my mind but I can be corrected by Carlton, of course, and Evan and Garth. [laughs] So if there are any issues that I've left out... But from an ALAC perspective these, to my mind, are the things that are important. Matt?

Okay. Our response... And by the way, ALAC did put in a very lengthy statement. At one point there was comment that it was very lengthy and I had to say: "Well, actually, there are so many documents, you're very lucky that it's not longer." But I was very polite about that.

We did have, in the statement that – and by the way, our final statement is on our web page and I'm sure some of you have read it – we did have concerns that were expressed from the very start, which was we were not party to the negotiations between the registry/registrar on the one hand and ICANN itself. So there was no transparency.

We did not have an opportunity really to know how they were proceeding. At various stages there were draft RAA released and we did comment, but again it's one of those issues where we didn't really know if people were paying attention to what we said or not.

We also said as part of the comments that the RAA and documents were really a significant improvement on a 2009 RAA and we acknowledged that. We also said we need to keep a watching brief on how it's

implemented and how some of the issues that we don't think were resolved are resolved, and indeed whether they were resolved.

And there are some specifics that we mentioned in our comments. We made some comments about particular RAA provisions. We had some concerns with WHOIS requirements, and I'm sure that Garth's going to smile sweetly and say something soon.

And we also pointed out that the provisions that relate to privacy proxy services were absolutely minimal and that indeed we hoped that they would proceed, and not only hoped they would proceed but we hoped we would be part of the development of the ascription as to what would be in them.

Next slide Matt. Okay, the things that we saw as really important improvements in the RAA. First of all, definitely there is a new definition of "reseller" and that really includes everybody in the food chain. You know? So whatever you call yourself, if you are not a registrar and you are actually flogging a domain name you're probably caught, and we think that's a very good thing.

Also there's a requirement that the registrant must be a legal person and on the list somebody had to hide to say basically we're been signing up dogs – but we won't go there. We think that's a good thing but we're surprised it's necessary. There are specific provisions that require compliance with WHOIS and privacy proxy specifications.

So although those are separate documents in themselves, they tie back to the original RAA because the RAA says, "You must comply with the

following...” and that means that they are enforceable as part of a contract and that really is critical.

There is another document called Registrants’ Rights and Responsibilities. We didn’t have any part of drawing that up and we maybe have some comments about it, but at least there’s a requirement that it has to be somewhere on each registrar’s website and that certainly is a step forward.

Something that particularly the law enforcement agencies want EDUARDO DIAZ: registrars must have a 24/7 abuse point of contact that can be reached for any number of problems; most predictably if there’s malware or a virus or whatever. So we see all of those as particular improvements in the RAA.

Okay, in terms of the accuracy specification – and again this is all new; this has not been there before and it is critical, however we did have concerns because of a thing called an “account holder” and we don’t know what is meant by the “account holder”. Is that the person who pays? Is it the person who gets the bills and hands them on? Is it the bank?

So there are some obligations about “account holder” that we don’t know about because we don’t know who that is. There is however a requirement for validation of the WHOIS data within 15 days. That includes the registrant and the account holder, which is probably a good thing if we knew who the account holder is. We don’t know.

It may be the account holder is the person who, for example in a privacy proxy service context is the person who’s actually got the domain name,

but we don't know. Another thing that's pretty important is that the contact information should be complete. Again, it should be complete for the registrant and the account holder and again we think that's a very good thing, if we knew who the account holder was/is. Matt?

For the privacy proxy services there is a requirement that there is one and that there be a specification and then there's silence. Now, if we are to have some kind of meaningful arrangement for privacy proxy services there needs to be some detail filled in and we want to put our hand up and say we want to be there.

Things like accreditation processes for service providers. You should not be able to put your hand up and say, "I'm a privacy proxy service provider," unless you've gone through some hoops and you can establish that you are. That was one of the recommendations that came out of the final WHOIS report and we certainly support that.

There are a lot of issues as to who can actually use the service. Can anybody decide that they want to hide who they are, or not? And that has a lot of... That's a huge issue, it won't go away and with the EWG it's going to be as big an issue as it is in the context of the existing RAA.

What information is protected? We don't know. Is this going to be just a name? Is it going to be an address? Is it going to be a phone number? Is it going to be an email address? What is it that is public and what is it that's private? And all of these things actually take a fair bit of discussion.

It takes a fair bit of understanding as to what people mean about privacy, it takes a fair bit of discussion as to what shouldn't be protected. And who can access the information?

There was a discussion yesterday in the gNSO about the Expert Working Group, which we're going to talk about tomorrow. But you might say that law enforcement agencies ought to have access but then the question is, well, a police person in Syria, are they a law enforcement? And how do you actually define it?

And it is not an easy question to answer. But those are some of the issues that all of us are going to have to grapple with if we are going to see the benefits from many changes from the RAA. Matt?

I didn't feel capable of summarizing what's in the Registrant's Rights and Responsibilities. This is in fact the document that came out of the negotiations between the registry/registrar Working Group on the one hand and ICANN on the other. We've not had any input into this.

I thought it was a final document but I had some chats yesterday with people around the table, the gNSO, and they're concerned with this and they don't think it's good enough but they haven't said that publicly. It perhaps leaves open the possibility of us having a really good look at that document.

Does that encapsulate everything that ought to be on a registrar's website? What other issues are there out there that should be covered? Is that language clear enough for someone that doesn't live and breathe ICANN? So in fact we may have an opportunity to have a really good look at that and make some constructive suggestions.

Matt's smiling. Now, I have left obviously plenty of time for a discussion because I think it's important because we do... Although this is potentially an interim document because the Expert Group has proposed something that is perhaps a better management of registrant information. We're going to live with this for some time.

So we have to work through what we think about it and the issues that I've highlighted are still open for discussion. So with that I welcome any and all discussion.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Holly. Okay, at this point... [Durma? 00:26:19], you had a question in the Adobe Connect. Are you asking about the status about things? Would you like to expand on that?

SPEAKER:

I was just hoping that somebody could clarify for me... Are these recommendations that are on the table now or have any of them been adopted?

HOLLY RAICHE:

We were up to the... I'm sure there is no scope for changing the actual amendments to the RAA. I'm sure there is no scope for the documents themselves with the specifications. The documents where there is some room is the Registrants' Rights and Responsibilities. I thought it was a done deal, I don't think it is.

With the privacy proxy, all that the RAA now says is you've got to comply with it. And there's a bit "it" and I don't know what that "it" is. And I think I would still like some clarification in terms of "account holder" because I don't know what that term means and it's going to determine what we think about the RAA.

Is it as strong as it should be or not? And it's a term that is not explained, it's not in the definitions, it's just a term that's developed in the process of negotiation and I don't know what it means.

So I think it's important to find out what's meant by that because if it's not a term that actually means the actual user of the domain name, if it's something else, then some of the things that all of us would have thought were pluses start to look less like a plus.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. Next I have Salaneita and is there anybody else? And Yaovi. Sala, you have the floor.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO:

Thank you very much for the update. Very quickly I'd just like to relay some observations from the recent aTLD African DNS forum where there were some interesting dimensions to the RAA and the rationale behind all of it.

And in terms of registrars and registries and the mechanisms they're putting in place, personally – and I deliberately use the word personally – I was very happy to observe that a lot of them seem to be... Well, at least the few speakers that spoke up on the issue seemed to be

implementing mechanisms and this seems to be a general culture where they agree that there has to be a lot more social responsibility by them. And contracts aside that's a very positive sign.

They also showed... I won't go into detail but they also very briefly highlighted some of the best practices that they're putting in place and I thought that was really good of them. Thank you Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thanks very much. I suppose that's good news. Could I... Before my time runs out completely, because I do believe in deadlines – I think there is still work to be done on the issues that have highlighted and I think it's a really good opportunity for people around this table to think through how we continue this discussion, who wants to be part of this discussion, because there are issues.

There is the Registrants' Rights and Responsibilities. Somebody, some group should look at it. I'm happy to but others ought to be involved. I think there are some questions about the privacy proxy that are going to spill over into the EWG.

So this is not for me just a presentation. This is me saying these are issues that are going to impact registrants and end users, so I would hope that all of you would find this not only interesting but also find a way to involve yourself in some of these issues. Thanks.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, thanks. Still in the queue I have Yaovi and then Garth, and if there's nobody else I don't see any questions or comments in the Adobe

Connect room so I... Oh, I have somebody who's asked to be in the queue. His name is Olivier. Yes, okay. All right, so I have Yaovi and then Garth and then Olivier you have the last word. Yaovi, you have the floor.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Thank you. Just to follow up on what... [inaudible 00:31:18], you started only responding to my questions, especially regarding the meaning of "account holder" and "registrant", and you clearly explained one option of what could be the meaning of "account holder". As he asked, and you said so, there is work that needs to be done.

So I think that the group is doing a very great job. So clearly, what should be the next step, my hope is that the group will continue the work and then maybe bring out some of the issues for clarification. So the point now is to clearly define the next step. Some of them you can get a quick answer for, from people from ICANN. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I would suggest with the issue of "account holder" it would be an issue that ALAC could actually write to ICANN and say: "Look, we think we've already made an official response but there is a lack of clarity as to what this means and if it means "x" then in fact this is a very positive step forward.

"If it means something else then we have some concerns because it means that the protections that have been written in are not as strong as we think they are."

So I think the step there is a letter. But I thin in terms of some of the privacy proxy things, I think those are... You know, EWG stuff, that's not going to go away and there's a huge issue that I think people with interest in privacy proxy really need to get their head around.

And the other issue that still needs to be addressed is looking at that Registrants' Rights and Responsibilities document. That's supposed to be on every registrar's website.

Now, we've not been asked what we think about it but it appears that it's not written in stone; it appears that there may be some possibility where we could go to the gNSO and say: "Look, we actually think the idea's great, but we weren't consulted. Is there any opportunity for us to talk to you about the language used and to perhaps phrase things differently?"

I think there is still opportunities there for us to make some additional positive statements.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, thanks. Next is Garth.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you very much Mr. Chair. I want to respond to three things that Holly brought up. The first is concerning the question of law enforcement. I've read through all of the Expert Working Group documentation early and there is a lot of mention about law enforcement being able to do this, being able to do that – and it's a bit

of a red herring because law enforcement can always get the information when they want it.

Governments have an authority which supersedes often whatever policy we decide is going to be in place and I think we need to be conscious of the fact that the WHOIS was structured so that anybody who is on the network has to identify themselves because they can pass data to any other node on the network.

And because of that, consumers and consumer groups should be able to get WHOIS information when it's needed, because frankly, even my own government isn't concerned when grandma gets swindled out of \$20 from a website – they don't care. But there are plenty of consumer groups that do and will take action on it, but they need the information. And the fact that law enforcement can get it doesn't help them.

The second thing that concerns me is the transparency of negotiations. And we have a very specific example of when that becomes problematic because a change to the contract was submitted at the last minute by pretty much unidentifiable parties based on unidentifiable documents.

And several requests have been place with Staff go get a hold of those documents and I'm referring to the so-called Economic Studies by ICANN's so-called Economic Advisors, which are never identified by name and the document itself has not been published. And we haven't seen any of this stuff yet.

The third item I want to put out there are some studies that my ALS has produced about compliance data and complaint processing at ICANN. There is a lot in this discussion about the accuracy itself and the

responsibility of certain parties and very little about what happens when something very clearly goes wrong.

And we're at a standstill where data has been presented to ICANN at the highest levels about things not working the way that they're designed to be or explained to be. And we really don't have an answer on that yet.

I'm going to put a link to a specific document in the chat right now so everybody can see what I'm talking about. Compliance only responded to about 11% of complaints submitted to it last year and everybody can see that in a few minutes.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thanks Garth. Look, the comment I made to start off with is we have to live with the RAA and it's changes. We can make some improvements. Obviously we can't make a lot of improvements because in fact the negotiations never involved us. And I can remember arguing back in 2009 that they should and we lost that one.

In terms of compliance we have a compliance regime now... Now, I think the exciting thing about the Expert Working Group – and this is a future solution not a present one, I recognize that – but one of the things that's been looked at in the Expert Working Group is going to be having a separate body.

And that raises it's own problems, which we can talk about tomorrow, but actually another body being responsible for things like verification. I don't know where compliance fits in and I don't think that that's been thought through thoroughly. And that's not a criticism it's just this is the

sort of thing that we need to discuss tomorrow in terms of where the responsibility lies for verification of the data and then handling complaints that relate to inaccuracy. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

I just wanted to follow up on the issue of verification, which has always been believed that verification should happen at the point of capture of the data. That's the traditional way to do it. I would warn you however that there are two issues that converge around the issue of verifiable data and the means to verify compliance to verification.

We've had some challenges and I can tell you that one of the things that the Expert Working Group has been grappling with is how you fix that conundrum and if the compliance matter is relevant to ensuring you have valid data then perhaps the solution is not to do the same things you've been doing all along and there might be some radical proposals there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. Is there anything more that you wanted to add to the response? Okay, then Olivier, you have the last word. Would you like to ask a question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Actually it's not a question it's... Well, it could be a question, I'm not quite sure. I wanted to touch back on the issue of the RAA and linking it with the presentation we had from

Fadi this morning where he basically said that the customers of ICANN were the registrants.

This is also something that he has said over in the gNSO room next door and there was a question that was asked by Members of the BC and Members of the NCUC with regards to the use of the word “registrant” or “customer” being the registrant.

And I think that might be something to look at because the point made to Fadi next door was that the DNS is really affecting users around the world – not only people that register domain names but also people that use the Internet; non registrants as well.

And there might be message that the ALAC wishes to say to Fadi, informal, formal, whichever way, to try and see if users could not be the customers rather than just registrants.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Ah! You have just forecast what’s going to happen in the multi-stakeholder forum because we are going to stand up and say: “This is how in fact we define consumer,” and it’s going to registrant and end user and in fact if you look at the metrics, which Cheryl was going to talk about but which Cheryl, I and others were involved in, absolutely the metrics are for consumers and we’re going to make that point very clear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Cheryl...? All right, then we’ll close off this part of the meeting. I just wanted to make sure, put in a plug for the two meetings that are happening tomorrow. One is the roundtable that we really need

everybody to be at that is going to examining all facets of this, and as well the Regulatory Issues Working Group is also meeting tomorrow afternoon at 4:00 pm I believe.

So if you have an ongoing interest in this, please participate. Feel free to join the Working Group and get more detail on what we're talking about here. Thank you Holly, thanks Carlton.

The next part of our meeting is going to be talking about the Technology Taskforce and about... Originally Nora and Chris were supposed to be here.

Chris Gift apparently was going to come back but he's taken ill so right now the presentation on the Technology Taskforce and the online education platform will be done by Dev Anand Teelucksingh as well as our own Matt Ashtiani. Dev, are you ready? The floor is yours.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Evan. Good afternoon everyone, my name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Chair of the Technology Taskforce. The Technology Taskforce is a standing At-Large Working Group that reviews the appropriateness of available technologies and to train RALOs and At-Large structures.

Part of that is an ongoing review of the various communication and collaboration tools used by At-Large and considered possible improvements.

So the Technology Taskforce was contacted just before the Beijing meeting to say that ICANN was internally beta-testing a new web

conferencing solution and whether the Technology Taskforce would be interested in trying it out and seeing whether it would be appropriate for At-Large to use.

So the tool is something called LUCID Meetings and the website is lucidmeetings.com, which is a software service system where you subscribe. One of the key benefits of LUCID Meetings is that it's a web conferencing solution and similar to what Adobe Connect is. The Technology Taskforce has done several meetings, three or four, with the LUCID Meetings tool and we found it very useful.

What I'd like to do is try and share my screen and see whether... And I'll walk you through the basic features of LUCID Meetings. Matt, can you just share the screen? Great.

Well, what LUCID Meetings allows you to do is schedule meetings, generate invites, create an agenda, and the way it does this is very different to how we normally do for At-Large meetings is that a Wiki page is created with the agenda and then there's a link from the Adobe Connect room.

And we've used the Adobe Connect often enough and it's used for At-Large persons to chat during the meeting, to raise questions, to raise their hands, to signify support for what's being discussed and so forth. LUCID Meetings is different. One of the key differences is that it entirely works in the browser.

There is no need for desktop users... Adobe Connect requires use of Adobe Flash and if you were using netbooks especially that don't have the horsepower to run Adobe Flash you tend to have synchronization

problems where things are happening on Adobe Connect but the end user is not seeing what is happened and it gets garbled or the event has changed completely, and so forth.

So LUCID Meetings works completely in the browser. That means that it will work on any desktop, any mobile platform, a smartphone or tablet. Another feature of LUCID Meetings is that it actually disciplines you into creating an agenda and setting out certain times for each agenda item. I'm going to formally start a meeting here in the LUCID Meetings tool.

Once I have started a meeting – and it will take a few seconds and the screen will go blank – okay, so if you're looking at the screen you'll see there's now, under discussion, agenda item one. A speaker has been assigned and you can see here, on the right hand side, is that it's scheduled for two minutes and I've spent zero minutes so far.

So by putting timings on each agenda item it allows for... You'll see a notice that you've spent one minute on it and then when the time is up you'll start seeing it in red and you're spending too much time on this agenda item and you need to address this properly.

The other neat thing about LUCID Meetings is that it works completely in the browser. I've just uploaded a PDF here as an example and I can now present it. The presentation occurs all within the browser. There are no plug-ins and I can also zoom into it as well.

So all of this happening in the browser without the Adobe. You don't even need to have an Adobe Acrobat plug-in installed or anything like that. And persons can also independently – which is key – scroll through the PDF or any other .doc file that's uploaded. Sometimes with Adobe

Connect you have to follow and once the presentation slide advances that's it, you can't go back. You can go back and look at it here.

I'll just zoom back out. As you'll see now you can see there's some red now which means I've spent more time on this. So I'm going to stop presenting and then proceed to the next agenda item; two. What happens then is that I'm going to change everybody's screens to move over to the next agenda item. Each agenda item can have sub-agenda items and of course you allocate times to them.

At the end of the meeting you'll see that you'll get a transcript of what was said and also there's a group chat on the right hand side, which allows you to do same-group chat, like in Adobe Connect. You type something here and then everybody else connected to the room would see it. And I see people are figuring out how to join this. [laughs]

And of course there is a speaker queue where persons can raise their hands and join the speaker queue. So those are some of the key benefits I think. Some of the downsides have already been identified and posted to Chris Gift and the rest of the LUCID Meetings team.

We note several concerns. One was that because this forces you to work entirely in LUCID Meetings to set your agendas, you could have a discrepancy between what's on the Wiki and what's on the LUCID Meetings tool.

Secondly, the LUCID Meetings tool is not really a public access site. You have to have a username and a password to log in. So none of this information is really publicly available, which is a key requirement of At-Large because you want to make all meetings accessible to the extent

that just a person hearing about the meeting can just go to the Wiki page and read about the Working Group and try to find out what it is and actually get involved.

So some of the concerns we raised was that there should be some sort of exporting of the Wiki, of the LUCID Meetings tool to the Wiki. Other concerns were raised about the accessibility in terms of differently-abled persons able to access the site.

And there's also possibly one key restriction in terms of ICANN is that the LUCID Meetings tool is restricted to about 25 members so when you think of some of the larger ICANN meetings, like the webinars, which go up to 100 then that's an issue. But then again, it's anticipated that the Adobe Connect will still be used for those kinds of large-scale webinars.

So LUCID Meetings has really gone through and gotten a lot of feedback and in fact what they're doing is a second roll out on July 25th, which features a new design overhaul. You'll be able to dock the group chat into a small window on the side so you have more space on your mobile phone, to see the presentations and so forth.

There has been a lot of work done on accessibility and internationalization so that this LUCID Meetings will work in all six UN languages. There is also a Wiki export option so that immediately after the meeting it's exported to Confluence and there's also a private chat option so that chat moderators can communicate privately with other persons in the chat.

I think I'll stop there at this point and open the floor for any questions.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you very much Dev. The floor is open both in the Adobe Connect room and here. Does anybody have any questions? Okay, Eduardo and Sala. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Evan. Dev, is this going to actually happen and if so do you know when?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Eduardo. As far as I'm aware, it's still being internally used by ICANN. It hasn't actually been looked at by all the ACs and SOs as yet, but I should say that the Technology Taskforce is using it right now for all its Working Group meetings and of course, At-Large itself can consider to use this tool.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I have a follow up. So we can actually use it in our meetings now? Is it available for us?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you. Next is Salanieta.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: First I have a comment; excellent work Technology Taskforce and Dev especially. Congratulations. I just wanted to ask, is there a feature like in Adobe when you exit you can enter the meeting room again?

With this particular platform I really like how it can rest in the Confluence thing, the question I have is whether we are able to, even after the meeting is closed, whilst we can't change anything, whether we can have access to it? Because if you can that would be really awesome.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Sala. Indeed, yes you can. When you log in to the tool – I think I'll try and click on that right now – you can see all your meetings that you've done and you can click back to when you had a past meeting and then see the meeting record, the action items captured, a transcript of what happened during the call and attendance – well, that's more for the facilitators – and a chat log of what was said in the chat.

So the answer is yes. Once you log back in, as part of the myICANN LUCID Meetings tool you can then see all your past meetings, click onto it and read it and open the documents and so forth.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sala, did you have a follow up or is this something else?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Second question – I'm excited about that feature – is, you know how in Adobe currently it's usually Staff or whoever is the lead facilitator or Staff especially who either (a) hosts or (b) puts up the main document

that's being discussed. With this particular new platform, would the average facilitator be able to put up a document of their choice?

The second one is, in the event that you have certain meetings where they're actually working meetings and you have documents that need to be worked on, does it have hyper texting features?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Sala. Let me take the first question which was asking about... LUCID Meetings has two types of persons in LUCID Meetings. They have the participant and they have what they call facilitators.

Facilitators are the ones that can adjust the agenda, add a document to the agenda, and you can adjust and add a document immediately to the fly here. Also, the facilitators can also take notes during the meeting and the notes can be tagged as well.

If you could see on the screen you can also take notes of action items. If there is a need to share a screen or share a document you can do that as well and sharing of the screen is also... Well, it apparently works in the browser as well, at least for the desktop versions, so it doesn't need any plug-ins on the end users' computers.

Also there's a system where you can raise motions, so if you wanted to raise a motion for voting you could do it in this type of system. So in general, yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Next in the queue I have Glen.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry, I was just going to answer Sala's second question which I think refers to hyperlinking. In terms of the documents you can point a document via URL, so...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, Glenn, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Really good choice from my perspective of looking and working with different tools. Actually, while you were speaking I was surfing and I found Chris Gift's slideshare that he got from LUCID Meetings and as soon as your slide's down I'll share it with everyone.

On slide 11 they go into detail and comparison of different products; ReadyTalk being one, Live Meeting, Go To Meeting – and I'm curious as to how the Technology Taskforce came to this decision based on looking at and evaluating these different tools.

I assume this is number one. What was your second or third choice? And I know price is not an issue for you because ICANN is rich. [laughter] So I'd be curious; what came close and what were your tools for evaluation? Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Glenn. We are looking at other technology tools, for example Yaovi, who is a Technology Taskforce Member suggested looking at WebEx as an option, which is San Francisco I believe, and I've also been told that...

I can't remember the name of the product right this second, I'll have to go back into the email archives to remember what it was, but the intent is to look at other meeting tools, other web conferencing solutions and see how they would fair. So the Technology Taskforce will probably look at those other tools after Durban.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yaovi, you have the floor.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: As Dev said, we are still testing and evaluating so there is no final decision from the team. Even when we are testing LUCID Meetings, in Adobe for example, in some developing countries where you have a phone line off sometimes, in Adobe you can continue to follow up if you have a good Internet connection.

So LUCID Meetings is not focused on audio yet and this is something we are discussing in the Technology Taskforce. Maybe they have letters about this aspect and you can talk about it. Thank you

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Yaovi and thanks for reminding me of that. Right now we're still using the Adigo Bridge for voice communications during the meeting. LUCID Meetings is looking to introduce VOIP so that you can then use your Internet connection to communicate and speak during the meeting and so forth, but it's not currently implemented at this stage. Possibly after the next roll out of features, after July – I think it's July 25th when the second roll out of this tool is being done.

Also I should mention, going back to what Yaovi was saying about Adobe Connect, the thing is that from my personal experience in running the tool, it's a lot less resource intensive than Adobe Connect because it's all working within the browser.

And I'm thinking that because it's all working within the browser, without any plug-ins, in terms of bandwidth used and so forth, unless there's a heavy multimedia file being shown on the screen I think it's going to work much better than Adobe Connect in certain situations.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thank you, that looks to be the end of the queue. I'm going to toss in one question myself. Although Chris isn't here, I wanted to get the impression of the people that are on the Technology Taskforce about your ongoing engagement with ICANN.

Now that Chris is talking about things like ICANNLabs and so on, you mentioned that they approached the Technology Taskforce about how to beta-test this system. Is there an ongoing relationship that has us working together with them as they try and experiment and roll out all sorts of other, new, shiny toys? Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

I would say yes, although ICANNLabs was not formally disclosed to us much and I think... I would say yes. I'll leave it at that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Any last questions or comments, either from Adobe Connect or from the floor? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: While you're doing the testing of all these things, and I'm delighted that there is an interaction between you and the great planet gods in the sky that are bringing these things down to us from on high, can we keep a really close eye on – and I don't know the answer, I've played a little bit with LUCID Meetings but I don't know the answer to this question – whether or not there are any countries that it is a barrier to entry?

Because if this is one that is absolutely universal, it will be the first one that we've ever found and I don't always believe in finding golden goose eggs lying around.

There might be something here that we're not quite seeing yet, but we've seen it with any number of really good collaborative spaces and things that there seems to always be a: "Ah! You can't get it in this country," or, "You can't access it from here."

So just put that on your checklist as you're doing your checklists. I really appreciate that because we're being challenged more and more by these things and particularly out of Asia Pacific, but I'm sure not uniquely to our region.

And the other thing was with the collaboration capability, I gather this is really not designed to be a collaborative tool but very more about meeting management and capture tool. Is it possible... Sometimes

someone will put something out as a flagship piece of equipment, software, whatever, and they've also got other things coming along?

It might be good to, as the Technology Taskforce moves through that to say are you coming up with another string to your bow? Because what can be a problem is if we have to collaborate in one space and then... I know it doesn't seem complicated, but collaborate in one space and then bringing them across to this, can be a bit of a hassle.

Especially when there's no real time with this, it is in the web browser, we've already got a disconnect from the Wiki. I fear if we get too many disconnects we're going to have version management issues. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Cheryl. With regards to what you said about it being accessible in all countries, I think that's a good question and we'll take that on board and try to figure that out and raise that question with Chris and our contact at LUCID Meetings.

I should mention that the July 25th roll out plan will have support for all the six UN languages so that all of the text and so forth, depending on [inaudible 01:08:40] will be internationalized in that aspect.

I agree with you regarding the potential for disconnect, especially again, LUCID Meetings is not publicly accessible – you have to have your username and password so there has to be a system of exporting the data right back to Confluence for the global At-Large to see it and view it. And that Confluence, Wiki export is also being planned for that roll out on the 25th.

In terms of collaborative note taking, I suppose one way of doing it would be for one person to share this screen and LUCID Meetings allows you to do that. So then everybody could see the screen and collaborate and type in that manner. But I take your point in terms of that. That would be my immediate way of working around it.

I should also say that during the meeting all facilitators can add documents, be that a .doc file, image file, PDF, and so forth.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Rinalia has the floor next but before you ask your question Rinalia I notice that in very, very good timing considering the subject matter, either Adobe Connect is dropping for some people or that people are having a hard time asking their questions.

So if you have access into the Skype chat, feel free to ask your question there and I'll relay it on your behalf. So while anyone is in the Skype chat or in Adobe is entering a question there, Rinalia, you have the floor.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Evan. I wanted to make a comment earlier when Chris Gift was presenting about the digital engagement model that he presented, and since he's not here I think I'll pass the comment over to you because I think you will have more of an interaction with him.

I think that the idea of having more tools to support engagement is a very good thing and the more flexible and more user-friendly the tool is, the better. But I think that you also have to think about what is the

human element that is needed to make this really successful in terms of facilitation or navigation and particularly in terms of context navigation.

I gave a specific example when I first came onto the ALAC; it would have been wonderful to have these tools but without a mentor or someone who is helping me navigate the complexity of the system, it would have been not as effective.

So think along the lines of, yes, great technology tools but what is the human interface or element that is needed to make it a real success? Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Matt, do you want to go ahead?

MATT ASHTIANI: We have a question from Darlene Thompson. Darlene asks: "Did the team consider pricing at all? Do you have any kind of price-value comparison of the products that you reviewed? Thank you."

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Darlene. The short answer is no, we didn't really consider pricing at all, we were just looking at how well this tool could be used by At-Large or not.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, Sala, you have the last word and then we'll end this part of the session.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I thought I would raise this issue in this session as it's a technology session. Recently when we had the meeting with Chris Gift it was a very vibrant meeting and one of the questions that we put to Chris was who was present in terms of the selection of the particular platform that was chosen and whether there was any involvement from the ICANN community generally.

Whilst I am extremely elated that ICANN Staff is pursuing this with great energy and momentum, one of the things I would like for the ALAC, particularly the Ex-Com to note – and also the Technology Taskforce Team and Dev is a Member of the Steering Committee of the Capacity Building Team – is that whichever platform gets chosen it is extremely critical that it meets the needs of the diverse regions, as Cheryl very eloquently put it.

And I'll also put to the ALAC community and the At-Large community in general, that we have regions in the world, countries like Iran, where the governments have literally slowed down bandwidth. So there are serious considerations. There is a country in the Pacific called Solomon Islands. One of them is a fellow at ICANN who is at this particular meeting.

He will tell you that 80MB of Internet bandwidth cost US \$300. So there are diverse challenges and it's very critical that even though we need capacity building, we need technology to perform for us.

But it is extremely critical that we don't rush this too quickly and for the record I'd like ALAC to note my concern about the acceleration of the process without proper community involvement. Particularly in terms of

the considerations, because we would like to have our input into this system as well.

And hopefully, Mr. Chair, that could be noted. Also, congratulations Dev on the excellent work that you're doing. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, I was going to close it except we then had one more late question coming in from Adobe Connect and given the problems that we had with it I'm more inclined to offer the benefit of the doubt. This comes from Oksana who asks whether Russian would be added to the languages supported.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

From what I was told about the internationalization of LUCID Meetings, it would be the six UN languages. So I think that Russian is one of the six UN languages so I would say yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, thank you very much. Thank you Dev. And with that, this part of the session is closed. The next one, which will start momentarily, is going to be on the issue of hot topics.

So while there are a couple of specific ones that can be raised, if anybody here at the floor or anybody in the Adobe Connect room has issues that they think need to be addressed by At-Large, either this week or ongoing, this is a forum in which to raise that.

Right now the floor is open. Based on some of the work we've been doing it appears that amongst the things that we need to deal with, or have dealt with, that have been very controversial or things that At-Large has been heavily involved with – like the issue of IDN variants, the issues of .list domains and more recently ICANN is now engaging in a definition of what is the public interest.

And I think this is something that is very, very core to us. As ICANN starts to delve into the issue of trying to define the public interest, this is something that ICANN has played with for ages and ages. It has had a hard time coming to consensus and now...

I forget – is it the AOC or is it Fadi that's basically saying before we can go further we need to stop using this as an obstacle and we need to start defining what is the public interest.

Does anybody have anything they would like to talk about on this particular issue, the role ALAC has to play and what we can or should be doing and what Working Groups should be doing it? Holly, I see you making motions over there? You have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thanks Evan. For those of you who sometimes read who's on the list, I have a pretty firm view of what the public interest is, and it's not any particular thing. For me, the public interest has always been about the openness, the transparency of the process.

It's also been about making sure that members of the public have an opportunity – particularly those members of the public who are

significantly impacted by what's going on – not only to just lob some comments in and have them ignored but to be listened to, to have their concerns taken into account.

And then if you think back not that long ago, we heard about, “Well, what about countries with no bandwidth?” “What about people with disabilities?” “What about people with...?” “What about...?”

And that's why I find it a bit hard to say the public interest is “X”, because the public interest has always been about listening to, taking seriously, taking account of the people who are significantly impacted by what we do around the table.

And it's about the openness and transparency of that, it's about the accountability of that, and if you try to dig too much further you're bound to leave somebody out. It's about languages, it's about geographical isolation, it's about physical disabilities, it's about the mentally-challenged – it's a whole bunch of things.

So I for one have deep suspicions if you just tie it to something. If you tied it to anything at all you would tie it to what ICANN's remit is. Insofar as what ICANN is and does and that impacts on the public. So that's perhaps the only way I would really confine it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. I had a follow up but... Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree with what Holly says and I've said before, in similar fora, that we need to be very cautious about drawing two particular sets of well-defined, this is what begins and this is what ends the definition of public interest.

But it strikes me, from what we've heard from Fadi today, that we have an opportunity that will allow a small amount of refractory time for us to get prepared and ahead of the game.

And that is that with the force of his President Strategy Committees looking at ICANN's public responsibility, some of that will bring a lot of clarity and focus on what even needs to be discussed about how we define ICANN acting in the public interest. Because we'll have a set of responsibility frameworks already created.

So whilst things like the Affirmation of Commitments, etc., refer specifically to "acting in the public interest" we may find that some of that language is less in need of tight definition. And I happen to be in the camp that says do not tightly define, because you've always drawn a line and someone will find something on the other side of it.

So the fluffier it was, for me, the better. But having now seen that we're going to have responsibilities put into a framework I think that's actually going to take some of the heat out of the issues that are being raised under "the public interest", once we have ICANN's public responsibility better defined. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

So I have a follow up, both to Holly and to Cheryl. Do you see at least in the short-term, medium-term, that there is some action item that ALAC should be assigning a Working Group to watch what's going on with this, to continue to monitor this with the possibility that ALAC will, at a certain point, need to make a comment, statement, advice, something like that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'll jump in just for a moment. I think it's more important than just assigning an option for a Working Group but I think the timing's absolutely perfect. We've already had discourse and discussion in the very early preparation for ATLAS II on an over-reaching topic.

There has been, I think, a very strong and well validated argument that a number of us would support – and I'd count myself amongst those supporters to have something like an over-arching topic of ICANN acting in the public interest as one of the points to discuss that we could look at in ATLAS II.

So if we rather than look at ALAC allocating and chartering a Working Group, if we say ALAC has to have the responsibility of a watching brief on this, and it should see whether it's ATLAS II program committee and an organizing committee can properly integrate that topic in, hopefully as an over-archer, I think you'll actually get a lot more out of that.

It's a bang for your buck that you'll be able to literally have at the end of the London meeting. And that might be a really important time to parachute that in. I don't know when that particular President Strategy

Committee will be starting, but what will be guaranteed is that it won't be finished in its work by June next year.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Holly, did you have something to add?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I'm fine. I guess I would agree with Cheryl. I think the danger is if we assign a Working Group and come up with some definition that confines what we do, I think if we have a sense of the breadth of what public interest is, it's in our own interest to say the narrowing criteria are going to be the remit of ICANN.

And beyond that, to me, the public interest is, as I've said, the openness, the accountability and the taking into account of whoever is significantly impacted by what we do.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Dharma, did you want to be in the queue or not?

DHARMA DAILY: Yes, I actually had it up before those guys spoke.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, sorry. Well, you'll have your chance. Sala, go ahead, and then Dharma.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I'm in complete agreement with what Holly and Cheryl raised. Personally I don't think there is a need for an additional Working Group, however there is a need for existing Working Groups to be very clear in their minds – beyond the Working Groups, in ALAC itself – what public interest is.

And all will need to ensure there is a culture built internally within those Working Groups and within the environment of the At-Large and within the global ICANN, and to put the ICANN community in general, responsible.

With that note I'd also like to add, in terms of things that I think should be considered, particularly in the context of Fadi making the announcement that there will be moves to the development of strategic development plans and that jazz, and I thought I'd like to raise this now.

It's been officially recorded, as far as ICANN is concerned, that \$44,000 was given to Russia, \$7 million to Africa – this is in terms of grant – \$1.19 million in Lebanon, a considerable sum to the European Dialogue and Internet Governance Forum.

By comparison, if you note the regions within the global ICANN communities, which is Asia Pacific, for instance – and I'm not just saying Asia Pacific because I happen to come from that region, but this is just in terms of the current numbers that have been officially recorded –, I note with concern that there are some disparities.

Part of what the ALAC can certainly do, when you're having your discussions with the finance team or with the strategic representatives and staff within ICANN, is to consider how there can be great disparity

and what some of the considerations are in terms of how resources should and could be allocated.

And that is part of ensuring that ICANN commits to a greater culture of the protection of global public interest. With that, Chair, addressed. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I have Dharma and then Rinalia. Dharma, you have the floor.

DHARMA DAILY: I'm going to make a point that goes along with what Holly and Cheryl were saying. [inaudible 01:27:03] you asked [inaudible 01:27:05] policy in the public interest, which I've been a student of for a long time. And I must state, public interest is a dynamic and dialectical concept, more than it is something that fits into a confined framework.

These frameworks are always contentious with each other. So I'd be very surprised... There's a need for clarity but I also think there is a danger of pinning in, as Cheryl and Holly were saying, or as I understood they were saying. So embrace Fadi's desire to create clarity but also be aware that, yes, there may be 20 different frameworks in reality.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Rinalia, go ahead.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I followed Fadi out of the room this morning because I had a very concrete information need and that is to know the status of the project Sally is responsible for, in terms of a clear definition of the public interest, as well as a timeline for the completion of the President's Committee.

And very quickly, six months is an expectation in terms of when Fadi thinks this would be achieved. So I think this definition or articulation or framework, or whatever it is, will be done before the June ATLAS meeting.

So I think that it would be quite important for the ALAC to figure out how we would approach the topic of how we see public interest and to provide our input to whatever process is out there on the cross-community definition or understanding of it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Rinalia, I'm going to put you on the spot and ask if you have a suggestion.

What I'm trying to do is come out of here with one or two action items, where rather than just talking about it and saying: "Okay, in a general sense we need to do something about it," to give some assignment, to charge somebody or some existing Working Group or whatever, to say: "We need to follow this, we need to move quickly."

If we have a timeframe of six months we don't really have a lot of time to move. If you have something or if somebody else can suggest

something... It's just that I don't want to have a conversation that just ends in an: "Well, we should do something."

That's far too general, nothing's going to come of that unless we assign a Working Group or sign individuals to say: "Go ahead, own this and let's do something about it."

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Since you are soliciting for ideas or options, my view is that I think we should have a discussion that is online and open to all of the At-Large community. And I say open rather than tasking to a specific Working Group because there are so many dimensions and aspects of public interest and we would like to be able to capture all of those dimensions.

If you do it online, via email, it would proceed faster, like the ISOC discussion lists, rather than the way we tend to do it. That's just my personal view on it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I've got a queue right now that's got Eduardo, Sala and Cheryl and Holly again. Okay. But I'm really hoping at the end of this to come out with something because I understand what you're saying but I still don't want to leave it in blob of saying, "Let's just leave it to discussion."

At a certain point somebody or some group has to gel that into something that ALAC produces, either as a comment or statement or contributes people to some other thing. I just don't want to leave this discussion as an ephemeral "let's talk about it". Okay.

So in the queue I have Garth, Eduardo, Sala, Cheryl and Holly. Garth, go ahead. Okay, Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is a question for Rinalia and the group. We have been talking for the ATLAS II that we need to come up with a theme and if I hear what you're saying it's that there is a six-month period where we should wait until we start talking about this theme...? I'm interpreting it like that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: May I clarify? What I'm saying is that Fadi is establishing some committees who will come up with an output and this output is expected to come out in six months' time. So if want to provide an input to that – and from what I'm hearing, Cheryl's suggestion is that we have a discussion about public interest at ATLAS, that might be too late.

You can of course have it at ATLAS but I think we need a process now to feed into what the ICANN organization is doing with regards to public interest and public responsibility. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I thank you for the clarification.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sala, you're next in the queue.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: For the record I thought I had entailed action items within my previous comment. I suppose it was vague, but I suppose what I was trying to say was given that ICANN officially is going to be discussing here in Durban... Is it here in Durban? The strategic development plans for the future?

Yes. I think we can't wait for six months. Whoever's participating in that process, we have to ensure that whatever considerations, whatever thematic areas where we see the disparities that contradict what we generally perceive to be going against global public interest, we must speak up now.

But on another note – I hear what you're saying Evan in terms of you want a concrete action item...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: What I'm saying Sala is I don't want the royal "we".

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: The other thing also was that I'm not sure – and I suppose those who've served longer in the ALAC and previous ALAC Members would have a much better understanding – of where the original concept of global public interest has been captured or whether or not it has been captured, noting that it does get mentioned in the Affirmation of Commitments.

As far as ALAC is concerned, what can certainly happen – and I suppose the ALAC has the discretion and particularly the ALAC Chair, to consider the motion necessary to define a global public interest; very generically, very broadly.

I also note Holly's concerns and I agree with Holly's concerns in relation to the problem with that is we interlock ourselves and that's a very serious and very legitimate concern.

So there is a possibility of having an addendum after, if a motion were to succeed, where that would be part of the Rules of Procedure or just an isolated, standing document. I'm not sure how it's supposed to be.

Again, the ALAC and former ALAC Members would have a much better understanding of whether there is a document or interpretation already captured. But as far as where the threat lies, given the current trends – and I think I read the numbers – and there are other instances.

I think it's incumbent on every ALAC Member to ensure that whatever ALAC Working Group that they are currently in to monitor issues where a global public interest is in danger of being violated and to speak up when that arises.

And in terms of responsibility I would think it would be a concern for the ALAC Ex-Com and not a special Working Group. Thank you Mr. Chair.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, that's one idea that we'll follow up. I want... Cheryl, you have the floor next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. Right, who to decide who to disagree with first in what order...? Let me think. Let's assume in a utopian environment that the four groups run in parallel and they all start before the beginning of

August and then they're all finished by February next year. There would probably be too short a time. And that's more than utopian because it doesn't even come into play how the ICANN model requires you even call for people to be assigned... Who you'd have to appoint; there's a lot to happy, but anyway...

Let's assume February, January – finished, in my dream world. There still needs to be a public ICANN meeting-based discussion because it has to be a community-wide discussion on what this from-on-high documentation means, because all these President Strategy Committee creations do is come out with a White Paper.

So still a lot happens. So I still think there is value for ATLAS to come into play here. I would suggest what we should be doing right now is making sure that when the rest of the ICANN community recognize that this very important issue of ICANN's public responsibility is going to be seriously and aggressively dealt with in ICANN.

So that as the cats chase the pigeons around the closed-in room – because that's what it's going to look like – that we have enough planning to perhaps suggest this is an ideal situation for a cross-community Working Group because to have this sort of conversation – this is why I disagree with I think where you were heading Evan, of putting a challenge specifically in ALAC and At-Large.

If we were to have this conversation within our own silo I don't think we'd be doing ourselves either good use of time of a favor.

So I would think if we could get ahead of the game and you propose as one possible action item that when everything becomes obvious on

Monday, as announcement are made, if Olivier has already spoken to other AC and SO leaders and there is a reasonable and concerted effort at least by the ACs, if not the ACs and some of the SOs to propose this as an ideal cross-community Working Group activity, then yes, I think that's got some mileage.

There have been people literally standing up and banging their chests and their drums at public forums and indeed at every opportunity to have an ICANN definition of *the* public interest – and this is to answer you, Sala – since the very inception of ICANN.

And it has been carefully avoided for some very, very good reasons. I will warn you know, there will be a strong pressure to have the public interest in such a narrow field that it is strictly and absolutely limited to within domain name industry matters, and that's a discussion we have to have.

This is far too big a topic, far too important a matter for us to think we, or even we and the GAC, have all we can say about it. So I think it's really smart to get prior planning done, I think it's an ideal, genuine cross-community Working Group discussion.

I think it probably needs to be planned to have something happen at Buenos Aires, have something happen in Singapore have something happen in London and ask leverage of that for a genuine community-wide discourse.

And I hope you all appreciate how incredible polite I was [laughs] with my disagreements because I just think it's really easy to get the rest of

ICANN if we don't do this properly and carefully this time round. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Rinalia, is this directly to what Cheryl said? Go.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I really appreciate that comment from Cheryl. I think there is one clarification that we need to request from Sally and that is when her project starts and how it is connected to the public responsibility one, because they are quite separate – mutually reinforcing but their timelines may not coincide in a way that we'd like.

And it's possible that Sally may trigger her project first, in which case we would then be pressured to figure out how we would engage and then we would have to send out representatives into cross-community Working Groups and have our own internal At-Large consultation to fuel the representatives' input. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm going to give Holly the last word on this moment and then I'm going to suggest a couple of AIs because I would like us to come out with something that is informed by what everyone's said. So I'm going to suggest some plans of action. Holly, go ahead.

My problem is I don't want to let this go with us just talking about "we" rather than "somebody" and without dealing with coming out of this,

about watching this, because there's a real risk of us letting this go by just saying, "Well, somebody ought to do it." Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fully agree. First of all, I was concerned when I first heard of this because we were not informed by the way we want to involve you; it's simply "this is happening". I think we start with a letter from Olivier to Fadi saying... Well, something that says why is it that you were going to define this, and there's no process for us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I disagree with that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, Cheryl and I will disagree on this one, but I think at the very least there has to be something that starts with Olivier saying, at least to us: "By the way, this is what we're going to do," and I think also writing... And maybe it's your action items.

We have to start the conversation amongst ourselves but recognize it's a much bigger conversation than just us, and let ICANN's Senior Executive Staff know that we actually think this is a much bigger issue than something that we will be told, but rather that we will assist them in telling them what we think the public interest is.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sala, if you've got something make it quick.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I volunteer to pen the starting document highlighting the need for global public interest from an At-Large perspective, and if anyone wants to join feel free.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. What I'd like to do at this point, based on and informed by what I've just heard over the last little while I'm going to suggest three action items that I think are going to help out. Again, I don't want to leave with just talking in "we" because that means nobody owns it.

So I'm going to make three suggestions based on what we've talked about. Action item number one: that we recommend to the ATLAS II group that it consider the idea of the global public interest as one of the things that is in play for ATLAS II. We don't have to talk about it further, just ask the group doing the summit to consider this as one of their over-arching topics.

Number two, to ask Olivier to engage with other AC and SO Chairs about the possibility of doing cross-community activity and depending on the success of that, collaborate with the rest of the community and if not, figure out a way for us to do something on our own

Number three, to designate a couple of individuals right now that will own this, watch the situation and try and alert ALAC when other action needs to be done. So far I have Rinalia and Sala who've indicated, and Holly... And I'm interested myself. Is there anybody else here who's interested in being part of that small group who is charged with watching the situation, alerting ALAC when further action is necessary

and if possible drafting something to be done. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not offering myself because I'm a little bit busy, these next 12 months already have been occupied, but I did think that we needed to make sure that perhaps we have some influence from other than the Asia Pacific. You had three Asia Pacific reps and yourself.

So could you open it up and request that someone from AFRALO, someone from LACRALO and someone from Europe also put their hands up? I'm not saying that those wonderful women shouldn't be there with you but your bevy of beauty should actually include more than just AP.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I am so used to complaints that there are not enough women in what we do that my mind is now getting a little frozen here. Okay, can I suggest that the people that I named go offline trying to get a more diverse group? But right now we're coming to the end of this session and I don't want to leave it while leaving some amorphous blob of something.

So we have four people. Anybody who wants to be part of this, speak now. Otherwise we will go forward. Yaovi, did I see you interesting?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Not to answer that question but just to mention that Wolf is volunteering.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Wolf.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay Wolf, I see you online. Thank you for volunteering. Sylvia, you want to speak?

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: I just wanted to ask you to repeat the second action item so I can take it. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I was going to repeat all three at the end. I just wanted to make sure that everyone was okay with those three? Okay, so the first one has to do with recommending to the ATLAS II group. The second one has to do with asking Olivier to investigate with other ACs and SOs the possibility of cross-community activity along these lines.

And then to designate those five individuals to monitor the situation and be ready to alert ALAC if further action is necessary in this field. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: May I add one more AI? It's a very simple one. Can we please ask Olivier to connect with Sally and ask for clarification on a timeline of her project?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: We'll blend that with number two because we're already asking him to engage with the other ACs and SOs, so we can just add, "And appropriate senior staff." Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Darlene Thompson has a question in the Adobe Connect room: "But if we cannot define global public interest then how can ATLAS II embrace it as an over-arching theme?"

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: What I'm hearing murmured in the room is essentially to try and grapple with this. ICANN has to grapple with this. It's in the AOC. It has to deal with something called the public interest, we just want to make sure that we have a role in helping ICANN understand, even if it's not one thing, even if it's a moving target we want to be part of that discussion.

And I just think that having it in ATLAS makes us better prepared to do that. Okay. We are at quarter past the hour, exactly on time. But it means that that was the only topic we covered.

Thankfully, most of the other ones can be covered in things like the Regulatory Working Group, the roundtable that's happening tomorrow, but the good news about that is we get to end on time and we get to invite our guests in on time. So thanks very much and now we will move to the next part of this session. [pause]

I want to welcome everybody who is here and online to the continuation of the ALAC Working Meeting. What we have next is three gentleman from the Domain Name Association who are to talk to us about this new

group that is starting, and I want to then pass over to Adrian Kinderis who will introduce the DNA and invite ALAC to learn and to ask. Adrian, go ahead.

ADRIAN KINDERIS:

Thank you very much. My name's Adrian Kinderis. In this capacity I'm speaking as the Chair of the interim Board of the Domain Name Association. I'm doing this under duress as Australia are currently playing England in the cricket, there's one wicket to go, we're chasing another 19 runs. Cheryl, as you'll understand, it's quite tense.

I've got it on my iPhone too so you can nod me if we get a couple of runs. Thanks Julie, good work. [laughs] Don't tell me if we go out, for crying out loud. I'll move this fairly quickly folks.

I've got a slide deck here that I'll quickly step through... Oh, you do have an interpreter, I'm sorry, I didn't know. Okay, what's the Spanish for "howzzat"? We will just go through this slide deck. Really the purpose of this quick session today is merely to introduce the Domain Name Association to you by doing the rounds this week.

We will be culminating in a session at 5:00 pm until 6:00 pm on Wednesday we'll be doing a formal session where we'll be speaking to the entire community, pretty much running through this slide deck again but opening up for more questions from the community.

In the meantime we'll be seeing yourselves, the ccNSO and the different groups individually. So without further ado I'll get started. Thank you whoever's clicking slides. Perfect. This is the agenda. I'll quickly run

through it. There are a couple of topics we can get through. If we could speed through to the next one that would be great.

How do we size the DNA? How do we define it? This is a diagram that we worked on with ICANN. A group of the CEOs got together with Fadi and we put a bit of work into trying to scope out and define the industry. I know it's really hard to see up on the screen but we do have handouts we'll be handing out throughout the week.

Effectively, the biggest group on the outside is the Internet coordination layer; so ICANN sits in that outside group. The next layer down is the ITC sector, which is the oval shape in the middle. And as a sub-set of the ITC sector we have defined the domain name industry. Not the DNS industry, but we wanted to be very specific and very clear about the value chain that exists within the domain name industry.

The reason I bring that up is because the DNA is for those folks within that industry. So we are open to all that participate within that; that's registries, registrars, resellers, registrants even – wide open to participate within the association. It's probably worth a closer look and I apologise it's in this format and hard to see. We will have handouts to give out later.

Next slide please. What is the mission of the DNA? We'll go back a bit and tell you how we formed. As it says there, a new non-profit, global business association represents the interests of the domain name industry. Importantly we have no formal affiliation with ICANN.

Whilst Fadi and the ICANN Staff support our actions, and we have spoken with them at length, this is an independent body outside of

ICANN that has been established. Its members are groups, businesses and individuals involved in the provision, support and sale of domain names. This includes such organizations as registries, registrars, resellers and service providers.

Our mission is fairly simply: to promote the interests of the domain name industry by advocating the use, adoption and expansion of domain names as the primary tool for users to navigate the Internet. Essentially a group of us got together and thought: “Who’s looking after the global interests of the domain name industry?”

Whilst ICANN plays an important role in governing and developing policy we felt that who’s out there actually making sure the domain names remain the default utility by which we navigate the Internet? Because if Facebook has its way, for example, we may well be living within walled gardens of the Internet and domain names suddenly become irrelevant.

So we wanted to ensure that there was peak body that represented the interests right across the industry to ensure that we have a united voice, and it’s going to be tough, as you’ll soon see.

Our key messages. The DNA aims to play a key role in helping consumers, businesses, public benefit organizations and others understand the benefits and to take advantage of the upcoming expansion of the name space. It’s going to get a hell of a lot more confusing, as we understand, with New gTLDs.

The DNA would like to work with the industry to try to help diffuse some of that confusion. The next one’s pretty much caught up in our mission, but it’s the first ever trade group to represent the interests of the

domain name industry, promote, advance and support the common interests of the industry.

By exercising effective leadership the DNA will advocate for and represent the interests of the industry before policy makers and the public and will inform groups and individuals and the public at large on key issues affecting its members.

So coming together with a united, single voice to speak on behalf of things that are happening within the industry itself. The intent of the DNA is to build trust, exchange ideas, educate and raise awareness of domain name related issues. The DNA will promote and advance practices leading to a more trusted online environment.

When we talk about “single voice” we’d like to think that when the press want an opinion that the domain name industry can come forward with a select opinion rather than having different factions speaking up and not necessarily being aligned. Especially in front of law makers it doesn’t help to have us splintered and fragmented.

If we can pull together enough to get some critical mass here, we think we’ll be effective. Lobbying is by no means the be-all and end-all of what this association is about. Julie, cricket score please? 15 runs to go, very good.

What is the current status of the interim Board? We effectively grabbed a whole lot of folks that were prepared to roll up their sleeves and get some work done. These have not been voted by members, in fact we don’t have a membership structure as yet and we’ll get to that a little later.

Effectively this is from the wider group of folks that were prepared to participate. A small vote was done and these people put their hands up to participate and for my sins I was voted as Chair. As I say, it's only an interim Board at this point in time to ensure that we can get some of the foundation work done.

Of that Board you'll see Jeff Eckhaus, Rob Hall, who's sitting at my left here, Statton Hammock to his left. Next slide. We also have representatives from Google through Job Lawrence. The Donuts guys with Jon Nevett and Elizabeth Sweezey from FairWinds Partners.

Not the diverse group I am striving to get, as yet, however a bunch of people that are prepared to throw some money in and get things done, which you need when you're kicking off an enterprise like this. So we're hoping once the membership structure formulates and coagulates that we'll be able to go through the normal process of Board selection.

So what's our current status? Well, the company was officially incorporated as a Delaware non-profit organization on the 1st of July. It's charter and bylaws have been adopted. The membership structure is currently in development. We're pulling together our budget. We need to do this in conjunction of course with our membership structure to work out what sort of funds we'll be needing.

We are pushing hard for membership and starting through interactions like this at this meeting in Durban. Next slide please. We have developed an education and awareness website, which will be launched on Wednesday of this week, and I must say a fantastic effort by the team at Google to build this site; very interactive, goes onto explain about

what a domain name is, what function it performs and what the different flavors are.

We've also launched our own website which you'll see at www.thedna.org. And importantly, all good projects start with a logo so we've designed our logo. You'll see it in the top right hand corner of the slide deck here. That arrow is indeed called a cursor. That was probably one of the biggest debates we've had so far. [laughter]

So what are the benefits of joining? It's somewhat embryonic and we hope to advance these as we go further. Firstly, especially in this initial stage, leading from the front, solidifying your role as a critical player in your industry, boosting the TLDs, whether you're a cc or indeed a g.

Being able to participate, getting to understand some of the other players in the market and learn from them, we think, is going to be a big positive. Getting information and updates from the industry itself – we anticipate doing a lot of information sharing... Oh no, we lost the cricket. England are one up in the Ashes series, folks. My fault, apparently.

So we really want to see this as a case of a rising tide, raising oar boats. It's not trying to break down a competitive environment, which of course exists in a free market, but working together to make sure that domain names, as I say, stay prominent and worthwhile.

Joining a global movement, I was fortunate to attend the African DNS forum earlier this week and I think that there is a lot to be said if we... We would be successful as an association if we can grab some of these folks that are a little less mature than some of the western markets and

help drive them further forward – that’s certainly one of our goals, to get their interest so they can join a global movement and take what is a very local ccTLD and get a global perspective.

Marketing, clearly, promoting TLDs, domain names and also connection with peers is important – capitalizing on the opportunity to connect with members of the same industry.

Two more to go. Shaping our work so you can currently... Especially getting on now, help influence the direction of the DNA, given that we are in our embryonic phase and multiply your exposure by leveraging our DNAs presence. We’re going to be doing different events and hoping to get up alongside different conferences to ensure that domain names are front and center.

This is that educational website I was talking about earlier, or at least a screen grab of it. It will be available at whatdomain.org a little later. If you go there now you will see the old site. Please do not judge us by that, but yes, the educational website will be up and running on Wednesday. Significant resources have been put into that and I think you’ll see that will pay dividends.

Next steps for the DNA is to finalize our budget and operating expenses. Clearly that dovetails into the membership structure. We want to get that bedded down. We have engaged an organization by the name of Virtual – do you want to give us a quick one-minute spiel on who they are and what they do?

STATTON HAMMOCK:

Sure, thank you Adrian. My name is Statton Hammock for those of you that don't know me. I've been helping out as an interim Board Member. We were very enthusiastic to get this association moving but with all of us having busy day jobs we felt it was a good idea to get an expert trade association consulting firm to help us along and keep us on task.

And we did a little research on such firms and decided to engage a firm called Virtual out of Boston, who've been helping us with a lot of the membership structure thinking, budget thinking and some of the governance thinking as well. So they've been quite helpful in helping us along.

ADRIAN KINDERIS:

Thanks Statton. Good job. As I said earlier, transitioning to a formal Board once that membership structure is in place. We're going to pull the trigger on an education and awareness campaign around the DNA and of course the educational website. We'll have our official launch and continue our membership drive, and as I said then, launch the educational website.

That's the end. So a couple of things – maybe I can preempt some questions as well here. It is my goal as the interim Chair, with my Australian accent, my cricket-loving Australian accent, to create an international body here. And I don't mean to speak disparagingly here of my colleagues but they joined me as well when we don't want to create just another North American body.

We do intend on pushing this out to the ccNSO – and we've had some input from ccs already, infrastructures and so on and so forth – so we do

want to absolutely create a global organization with a global feel and that's certainly where I'm sitting, as the interim Chair, to make sure we push in that direction.

Why are we speaking to you today? Well, we often feel that the ALAC at times can be somewhat disrespected with respect to things that go on. We didn't want you seeing such things as the DNA and to not know about it. So we thought that it was imperative that we got in front of you.

Whilst this may not be speaking directly to any of your particular activities or your day-to-day, we did want to make sure that you at least were kept abreast of our intentions, so that when you did hear about it – whether it was a corridor conversation or more formally – that you're at least briefed in that respect.

So I hope we've come across the right way in this session today. And with that I'm happy to open up for questions. Thank you very, very much for your time.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, I have a queue that's started. I have Rinalia, Eduardo, Cheryl, Sala and Holly and Garth.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Adrian, thank you for the introduction, which I think we all appreciate. A few questions if you don't mind. Why incorporate in Delaware if you would like to have an international association? That's the first question. Second question is when you evolve your membership

structure you would naturally have your membership fee structure as well. Would you have a special consideration for entities from developing countries? That's the second question.

The third question is would you be advocating for IDNs and universal acceptance of IDNs? Thank you.

ADRIAN KINDERIS:

Fantastic. Three questions. The first one, the Delaware, we knew we were going to get some flack on that. Believe me, I was the one that shouted the most about it. There are a couple of reasons as to why and we certainly knew the perception we were creating in doing that.

The first one, that probably doesn't sound so great but it is important, is that we knew that first of all the work that's being done at the moment is somewhat volunteer and we've got access to lawyers who are prepared to do work without fee for the time being, and Statton's done a lot of the heavy lifting for us in that regard. And clearly their jurisdiction of understanding is US.

The second one is we figured our major contributors, at least early on, were going to come from the US and there are benefits to them in putting funding towards non-profit entities that are located in the US, so we felt, especially as a start up, that we want to get that cash and make it as easy as possible because we are going to be asking for some significant cash for the highest level of membership.

Does that cover as to why Delaware? I guess you're saying why the United States rather than why Delaware? Because you could get into...

We did have even state-to-state discussions, believe me, within the US. So it's a little bit beyond me any more than that, but that was the thinking in order to get it done. But believe me, that's why I'm so much out in front at trying to make this a global entity.

Your second question? Yes, creating different membership classes and being able to accommodate everybody and trying to be as inclusive as possible is certainly paramount, and so in order to do that we will be having a structure that facilitates those that are perhaps of a lower economic status to be able to participate.

And thirdly, and I'm happy to say, as the CEO of the company that signed a contract with ICANN last night for the first ever IDN gTLD we will absolutely be driving IDNs through this program and pushing hard. So thank you very much.

We're very excited about it and very conscious of all... This is a very inclusive group of all products; not just gTLDs and not just pushing the new ones. This is about ccns and IDN overlays, all of those.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

We have a queue and I'm cutting it off. Just be aware, keep it short, you are digging into your own coffee break if you go on. I may have got the order wrong but we'll get to all of you. I have Eduardo next.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I have about three questions. The first one is, is this website going to be in English or other languages?

ADRIAN KINDERIS: Good question, thank you sir and I should have picked up on that earlier. Can I cut you off in-between questions because I've got a short-term memory issue. Absolutely, we will be doing different languages. Back on the IDN part before, you can see that the educational website will be in six languages.

I think it's a couple of weeks out of that happening. Google are doing all that. I assume they're not using Google Translate to do that but they have got their experts on that to make sure the educational website is... And this will be following up as well the actual DNAs. So the answer is yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: The other question is, you're going to also be advocating for the membership to have the new or the improved WHOIS thing to be implemented?

ADRIAN KINDERIS: As the association gathers momentum there will be particular items that we will want to pick up and speak out on. If you come to the session on Wednesday there has been a couple of streams of work through the CEO round table sessions that Fadi was doing. And one which I think parallels your question is this notion of a seal of someone that puts their hand up to be a good actor in the industry.

So this may well be something that the DNA picks up and as joining the DNA you get to carry this seal. So we're looking at doing different things like that. And indeed, if there were some issues around the WHOIS that

we particularly, as a DNA wanted to pick up and be vocal on or support then we would do that, if that was in the best interests of our members.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you. My last question is: as part of your mission that's going to be educating and things like that, are you going to get involved with helping with anti-spamming things or sites [I don't like? 02:12:58]...?

ADRIAN KINDERIS:

Anything that is in the interest of our members. And in this case I think ensuring that the utility of domain names isn't compromised and spamming could do that, and other things, infringing marks and so on and so forth. So yeah, we would speak out about that and do what we could do, once again, so long as it was for the benefit of our members.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, next in the queue I have Cheryl. I'll remind everyone, please keep your questions brief.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you and thank you again, particularly for coming to talk to us as early in the process as you are. I wanted to just mention something that the Chair may indeed do, but we're very underrepresented here today, not because... Well, some of us aren't here because some of them are stuck in Heathrow or Mauritius or all sorts of interesting places and they'll be coming in tomorrow night or tonight.

But a number of others are actually out in Expert Working Groups and in other activities today. But all of this is transcribed into three languages and if you're happy for us to disseminate this copy of your slide deck, if that's possible, we can certainly give it out to a wider audience for you.

Thank you also for the ease of graphics that you've got on your DNA site already. They are language limiting, they are easy to understand. I think it's going to be very easy for end users to understand what you are doing. So kudos for that as well. And the fact that you have registrants in there is rather exciting, so again, thank you once more.

I just wanted to take you to what's in the name, or whatdomain.org, and I will forgive you for the fact that you just got a beta of one of your things up there for now.

You said it was going to be an education site. How much of that is going to be material that may in fact be very much of interest to the At-Large and the At-Large structures who are trying to get registrants and end users to have a better understanding of what the domain name system is? Are you pitching it just at industry education or wider registrant and beyond registration?

ADRIAN KINDERIS:

That's a good question, thank you Cheryl. It is tough once you start getting... Especially because of the terminology and everything else. The further you get out of the periphery the harder it is to get a message that's consistent. So by the same token there is no point in preaching to the choir here within the industry – we need to make sure that we step out.

It is our hope that, for example, if a journalist is going to write an article about the industry that they can go to this website and get an understanding of the industry, get an understanding of the value chain and the different players that exist within it. So that's the point.

So when I gave the brief of what I wanted on the website, that was what I hoped. Because as you would do in your day-to-day life and as I do endlessly is standing at a bar trying to explain to someone what you do, what your industry is isn't easy. So we want to try to do that and just be able to point people to that and say: "This is what it is." So that's the level.

How far down we go, as to whether mum and dad can understand in reading this, that's going to be a challenge, but we'd like to think we can at least try to break down some of those barriers and some of the naming conventions and things like that within it. But it is hard to make it a fix-all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, if I may follow on? So consumer organizations you'd be pitching at, that type of thing?

ADRIAN KINDERIS: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, I have Sala in the queue. I remind everyone to please keep it brief.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Firstly, congratulations. Greater things ahead, obviously, and just very quickly I wanted to highlight that the graphics on your website are just pure awesome. For the first time there is something that actually makes sense so it's really great that you guys came up with it, and the fact that it's creative commons and that we'll be able to share it; we'll certainly be using it in our capacity building sessions.

The third thing I wanted to very quickly mention or ask was: do you have some sort of tiny brochure that we can easily take back and hand over to other domain name operators back in our region? If you do...

ADRIAN KINDERIS: In the interest of time, no. [laughs] We don't as yet but that will be something we'll be getting at. Really it was a bit of a mad scramble to get these websites up and about. To get there there is a lot of work going on and we've all got day jobs, as you would appreciate.

So that is certainly something we'll be doing and hopefully ICANN will be including it in the bags upon registration and things like that in the future. So that's where we're aiming.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, I have... Sorry, I have Holly and then Garth. And then the queue is closed.

HOLLY RAICHE: Adrian, just a question: how would you describe to this group, which you represent, the end user and perhaps the registrant and small business, how would you say to us what is the benefit of your organization, to us?

ADRIAN KINDERIS: As members or just as...?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, not as members.

ADRIAN KINDERIS: I think that the investment that folks have made to become registrants needs to be protected and I think that if we've got the interest of ensuring that that asset that they've purchased is going to be the tool by which people will find them, then that's in their interest.

Wow, that's a complicated way of answering, but I guess what I'm saying is that to ensure that as long as domain names are a paramount way of navigating the Internet – and I'll come back to that again: for those that have made the tool, we're up against such things as search, apps and Facebook and walled gardens.

These walled gardens are a way of saying: "My mother gets onto the Internet and from the moment she gets on to the moment she gets off she's in this Facebook world and so she doesn't understand about domain names because she doesn't see the need for them."

If we let that happen all of this goes away here folks, so we think it's in the interest of those who have registered names and are using them on

a daily basis that they have a voice and so we'll do that by carrying it up. I hope that answers your question and probably not very well, but... Rob, please help me out?

ROB HALL:

I'll try it a little bit differently. I think one of the things and one of our main thrusts will be on educating the world – and I know that's a pretty big target to hit – on what domain names are, how they can get them and how they can use them and why they should be concerned about them.

In the industry we talk about things like DNSSEC and ALAC and gNSO and all these acronyms that mean nothing to the mass users out there. I think the goal is to educate users on what a domain name is, how they can get it and how they can use it. I know that's certainly one of our goals with the educational website.

I view the two different websites differently. I view the DNA one as really the one for our industry and the members. I view the educational one as the one that hopefully groups like yours will be pointing the mass community to, saying: "This is where you can go to find out what it is, how you can use it, what a domain name is and why it is important."

And that will be in simply English, not in acronyms and everything else we use day-to-day in these groups.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Garth? You're last in the queue.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Mr. Chair. Looking at your agenda, most of it appears to be outward-facing and I'm just wondering where you see yourself within the stakeholder ecosphere?

ADRIAN KINDERIS: Can you ask the question again in a different way? I'm not sure I understand what you mean about how we position ourselves in the stakeholder ecosphere?

GARTH BRUEN: Go ahead Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, I was going to ask a yes or no question of my own. Is the association considering any kind of membership of its own in the gNSO, as an organization?

ADRIAN KINDERIS: No. This is not an ICANN body. There will be times when we are not aligned with ICANN and we may, if ICANN made a policy decision on something that we didn't agree with we may well, as an association, come out and speak out against it. Did that answer your question? I'm sorry that I missed it. I'm still upset about the cricket. [laughter]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, all right. Thanks very much Adrian, Rob. Thank you all for coming. [applause] This part of the session is closed. We ran a little bit late and you now have 12 minutes for coffee. [break]

Good afternoon everybody. It's five minutes past the hour. We're going to convene this meeting between the At-Large Advisory Committee and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, better known as the SSAC. So what I'd like to do at this point... My name is Evan Leibovitch. Olivier Crépin-Leblond is normally the Chair of ALAC.

He right now is serving ATRT 2 duties so I am chairing this meeting in his stead. Just so you know, for our guests here that may not be used to the ALAC, please speak slowly. What you say is being interpreted into three languages and is being broadcast to a worldwide audience. So without further ado I will pass the floor to Julie Hammer for the SSAC.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks very much. As you know, I have the honor and the pleasure to be the SSAC liaison and I'd like to introduce all the SSAC Members here. Firstly our Chair, Patrik Fältström, who all of you know. Also, Deputy Chair, Jim Galvin, to my left. To my immediate left is [Merrick Kao? 02:40:32] and also on the chair behind is Russ Mundy.

[Merrick?] and Russ may be presenting aspects of the session if we get to those topics. But we also have huge number of SSAC Members here to interact and chat and answer other questions as required. Danny McPherson, Samad Hussain, Don Blumenthal, Andre Phillip, Jaap Akkerhuis and very, very importantly, Julie Hedlund, our Staff support.

Have I missed anyone? Good, thank you. So I'll hand over to Patrik.
Thanks Patrik.

PATRICK FALTSTROM:

Patrik Fältström, Chair of SSAC. Thank you very much for once again allowing us to meet. This time I'm also happy that we have extended the time from 30 to 60 minutes. I would like to thank the support staff in both groups to be able to collaborate so well and find more time.

If you find even more time you can send it just to me because I need some. [laughter] Next slide please. SSAC was initiated in 2001. It began operation in 2002. We provide guidance primarily to the ICANN Board but our recommendations and documents can, of course, be used by anyone, if they so wished.

Our charter says that we exist to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems, which is wider than DNS, even though DNS is, of course, the major task.

We have 39 Members at the moment and they're appointed by the ICANN Board for three-year terms. We produce our results, our documents and do all our activities in things that we call work parties. The work parties we have at the moment you can see on the screen.

There's the membership committee, which looks over our membership. DNSSEC Workshop that works on the agenda for the workshop that we have every Wednesday of an ICANN meeting, [Adam Fairview's metrics?

02:43:30], root key rollover – both of them you will hear about or will see information about in the slides.

We have one work party that work with the collaboration that we have with law enforcement. We have, for a number of years, had a workshop at the Internet governance forum, so also this year. New gTLD success metrics, abuse of the DNS for DDoS attacks.

We also have a work party to comment on the variant TLD report. We work on name space collision issues and also response to the Expert Working Group on gTLD directory services. These are the ones that we currently have up and running. Next slide please.

The latest documents that we've produced are SSAC 53, SSAC Report on .list Domains on February 2012 – some of them, sorry – SSAC 56 on SSAC Advice on Impacts on any Content Blocking – we have the domain name system – SSAC 57, Advice on Internal Name Certificates in March 2013, SSAC 58, SSAC Report on Domain Name Registration Data Validation Taxonomy and SSAC 59, a letter to ICANN Board regarding interdisciplinary studies. That was on the 18th of April 2013.

If you look at some publications per category, which is also something you can find on our website, we have an advisory on the delegation single-character internationalized top-level domains. SSAC 52 from January 2012, and lately two reports that were related to the WHOIS; the SSAC Comment on the WHOIS Review Team Final Report and the Report on the Domain Name Registration Data Model.

Are there any questions on SSAC in general or on how we operate? Then I suggest that we move to slide number ten. I wanted to give an

update on the IDN Variant TLD Work Party. This is a Work Party that is looking at the reports produced by the IDN Variant TLD Programs. It is structured by looking at the user experience report recommendations, but what we found was that we probably have to look at more documents related to IDN Variant Program than only that single document.

So we have been looking at the label generation rules procedure for the root zone, [LUS repertoire? 02:46:54] and variant generation rules, LUR change process, other user experience report recommendations and also various documents related to, for example, Trademark Clearinghouse.

The status of how far we have come with this document is that we have currently lost call within SSAC and hopefully we will be able to reach consensus this week. So on Thursday we can publish the actual results. Normally we do not disclose anything about what we do believe that the contents our report saw until they're published.

But what I mentioned here is one thing that we have watched inside SSAC, so this is what we most certainly would cover in this report, if not something drastic happens. We are commenting on various different issues related to the various variant documents.

We are pointing out for example, like we have been doing several times before, that we are supporting a conservative principle with respect to allowable code points and the number of active variants.

We have been looking at the process to handle situations in which the community disagrees with ICANN's variant calculations. We have been

looking at backward compatibility in the cases where the label generation rules have to change. We have been looking at the label generation rules applicability to also the various layers in the domain name space; for example the root zone compared to the second level domain compared to higher levels.

And we also have looked in general into operation readiness on ICANN's New gTLD functions, with respect to variants. As I said, the Work Party has produced a document that is for full SSAC Review until 17th of July. Already we have enough feedback from SSAC as a whole so a new version of the document is on its way out to SSAC as I am giving this presentation. So it's still moving a little bit.

After this feedback we will finalize the document for publication. So that is how much I was thinking of saying at the moment related to this, but I'm happy to take questions related to IDN variants and similar issues, if you have any.

JULIE HAMMER: Rinalia, I think your hand was up first, and then Sala. Anyone else?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm just watching Adobe Connect, Julie. So far there is nobody raising their hands in Adobe Connect. If there is I will let you know.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Julie. Carlos, can you go back one slide. Patrik, on the root LGR's applicability to second level and higher levels, I know that you said you won't want to disclose SSAC conclusions prior to publication. Is there some more context or information that you can provide?

Because the ALAC is having some critical discussions with ICANN Staff and the Board regarding this topic, that also applies to the Trademark Clearinghouse. Thank you.

CARLOS REYES: Let me give you a generic description on how SSAC view the difference between the root zone and the second level domains. SSAC very closely looks at the stability and consistency of the root zone. And one thing that is special for the root zone compared with the second level domains is that it's only one. That means that for the root zone you can only have one set of rules.

For the second level domain it is possible to still only have one set of rules per domain. But just because there are multiple TLDs it is in theory possible, technically, to have different rules in different TLDs. So that is one of the differences.

Another difference, for example, if you look at the ccTLD fast track IDN tables that exist with IANA, without relating to this document that we're currently working with, we do know that with the TLDs it's possible for each one of them to have certain implied context. For example, a TLD for a certain country might have implications that you're probably moving around in a context that is defined by the majority language of that country.

Compared to the root zone, which is only one, which doesn't have that kind of context – and we already know that for strings in general we have the strings themselves as a number of characters, but we also have bow scripts and language as two other parameters.

And people that have been working with matching and comparison rules do know that comparing strings is difficult, if nothing else already in English, just think about how people spell the word “color” around the world.

JULIE HAMMER:

Sala? Would you like to ask your question?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO:

First of all I'd like to say thank you Patrik for the update. I just have a quick question in relation to DNS filtering. I note that they are members of the SSAC, who have made public comments and have published materials in their individual capacity, taking an active stance against any form of DNSSEC filtering, and have written to the US Government in their individual hats.

The question I have is: is the SSAC finding in recent times – I'm not sure if it's popped up in your discussions and whether you have a cross-constituency group with the ccNSO, noting that most of your discussions, both SSAC and ccNSO closed discussions, for obvious reasons. Has the issue in terms of DNS filtering crept up and some of the challenges from a security perspective?

The reason I raise this is from privacy concerns and that sort of thing, with all that's been in the media lately? Thank you Julie.

JULIE HAMMER:

Before throwing that to Patrik, can I just make the point that we've paused here to take questions on the IDN variant. Patrik has a lot more to brief so this is not the end of the briefing Sala. We've really gone off topic a bit here, but I'll let that question go through to Patrik and he might be able to answer it briefly. But he's got a lot more that he wants to tell us about.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Regarding DNS blocking, for natural reasons I cannot disclose what has been discussed in closed meetings, but from the SSAC perspective, what we have finalized are the various documents that I hear mentioned that are related to blocking, where the short story is that we are saying that before doing any kind of blocking with the help of DNS, you really need to consider the alternatives.

Our findings more or less say that using DNS as a blocking mechanism, specifically the further away from the edge of the network from which you are coming, the higher the risk is that you'll get unwanted side effects. And that is the story that we are telling and that is how we are explaining things. Thank you.

Can we go back to slide number seven please? Thank you. If we go a couple of years back, SSAC asked the Board to please ensure that studies regarding security and stability must be made... It's very important that

the studies made related to security and stability take all different kinds of issues into account.

So what happened was that on the 13th of September 2012 the Board of Directors asked SSAC very explicitly to provide advice on how these interdisciplinary studies of security and stability implications, from [exporting? 02:57:13] the root zone specifically, more than and order and magnitude be carried out and whom else should be consulted.

We worked on that issue and in this document, SSAC 59, we provide advice on the composition of such Interdisciplinary Study Team, broad topics and specific examples the Team may wish to consider, and suggestions on how these studies should be performed.

So the background around this is that SSAC all the time have asked for very careful composition and assignment of tasks to various studies. So that is within what context one should understand that this question was asked, even though the specific question is about root scaling.

So when we then responded, we responded of course with the question regarding root scaling, but we also tried to write the response in such a way so that the same kind of methodology should be possible to apply to other studies. Next slide please.

For SSAC 59 we talk about that the goal of the study should be two-fold: to engage with communities that may not have been fully consulted by previous investigations of the impacts of the New gTLD Program. And there of course...

It's so easy when we do work in the ICANN community that only us who are here at the ICANN meetings; the contracted parties and other interested people and organizations are the ones that are involved – while some of the security and stability issues on the Internet have to do with end users and enterprises, which are not here. So it's very important that we don't forget any of the groups.

And when repeating studies, this is basically what we point out, it's very important to really look at the whole spectrum; everyone involved, and try to detect where there are gaps.

The second thing that we pointed out for the root zone is that what is needed is to explore areas of concern related to expansion of the root zone that either derive from those communities or which have been identified by previous studies that might not have been fully resolved.

When we were looking at various studies that had taken place, there were certain open-ended questions in those. We found sometimes we didn't think the response was really clear, but in other cases the reports themselves actually said that it might need further study. So there are some open-ended issues there.

But it's really important to see these two recommendations as complimentary to each other. That's it. Questions?

JULIE HAMMER:

What I might add to Patrik's briefing is that it was after that receipt of the specific advice on what should be studied that the Board subsequently commissioned the two studies that ALAC is very aware of

and has been commented on. And the SSAC of course is very closely watching what's happening with those studies too. Sala, you had a question on this topic?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I have a question in relation to SACO 59 and I'm noting that law enforcement and Internet crime issues and brief mentions of... Noting that law enforcement Internet crime issues were considerations within SACO 59, and brief mentions of ccTLDs, a question that I'd like to raise, particularly in relation to .pw, who is reported by Symantec this year to be one of the largest spammers – a lot of spamming coming from .pw.

And also noting that the ICANN community generally have very controversial and mixed responses with relation to the re-delegation of ccTLDs when it comes to this, for whatever reason. And noting that many things within SSAC are closed, were there any recommendations coming out of this study?

Because we don't have access to the study so we don't know, but is there anything that speaks on how these sorts of organizations, of TLDs, should be taken to task? And I note that you're limited by confidentiality. That is all.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I am not talking about studies that are closed, I'm talking only about the public studies that ICANN is using as a basis for the various decisions they are making. Also, everything we are commenting on, including SSAC 59, are things that should be the basis of decisions here in ICANN.

The only thing that we in SSAC are not disclosing is our own deliberations that lead up to, for example, SSAC 59. But I think if it's the case that your specific case is about SSAC 59, in that case I'm happy to talk about that and we have other SSAC Members in the room here that... For example, Danny McPherson is the person that... Danny? Raise your hand.

Danny is one of the persons that have been specifically working on the definition of interdisciplinary study, which is the mirror issue that we're talking about here and I'm sure that he'd be happy to answer questions about that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Are there any more questions? I don't mean to cut you off Julie but just to say, a couple of people have noticed that there is an awful lot of jitter on the left hand screen. In order to reset it we need to turn it off for about five minutes, so we'll have about five minutes of not having slides, if that's okay?

It's going to make things a little easier for those bothered by that screen. Can we go ahead with that, for about five minutes? Could you speak without slides or would you prefer to wait? No. The feel I get is that it's going to be too difficult so we'll just muddle through with what we have right now and after the SSAC session we'll reboot the projector.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Can we go to slide 18 please? I'd like to hand over the microphone to the SSAC Member, [Merica Kao? 03:04:49], who will talk about the work we're doing in relation to the abuse of the DNS.

SPEAKER: Hello everybody, my name is [Merica Kao?]. Next slide please? The work on the abuse of the DNS basically has the following objectives. The target audience is primarily for DNS operators and these are both authoritative and recursive DNS operators, and both in the ISP and the enterprise environment.

The goal of this work is to highlight the current ongoing problems and provide the scope of malicious and criminal activities that utilize the DNS infrastructure. For those of you that may have read in the news about the March events when there was a very large DNS amplification attack, this is what this specifically refers to.

It references existing SSAC work, specifically SSAC 004 and SSAC 008, that basically have not been widely implemented, although for many, many years it's been considered best current practice. It also enumerates the irresponsible behavior that are causing Internet instability by not following past SSAC recommendations, and it provides updated recommendations to foster greater DNS infrastructure stability.

The issues that this document concerns itself with are the increased scale and impacts of attacks. The factors that make these amplification attacks possible, the prior work on mitigation techniques and then lastly, it has recommended steps to resolve unresolved issues.

The questions that are under discussion within the Work Party are basically what steps should DNS and network operators take? Number one is to resolve what steps should they take to resolve the issues that make such a large-scale distributed denial of service attacks possible?

What steps should they take to prevent network spoofing to the greatest extent possible? What steps should they take to identify unmanaged and inadvertently open recursive resolvers and close them? And lastly, what steps should operators take to detect networks that deploy spoofable networks and unmanaged open recursive resolvers?

The document and the work is nearing its final stages. The next step is to send it to the entire SSAC for review and then once approved and published to renew efforts to evangelize and socialize the importance of security best current practices for the overall Internet health and stability. And that concludes the presentation part. Questions?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Firstly, thank you very much. That was very informative. Very quickly, are there any studies done by the SSAC on all the issues that you've raised that perhaps could be shared with us, on the economic implications of some of these attacks? Or on the abuse of the DNS specifically?

SPEAKER: From the SSAC perspective we only do technical recommendations so the economic implications or studies are not part of our mandate.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: A question: what are the channels for you to evangelize?

SPEAKER: Members of the SSAC are participants in many global forums, specifically in many of the RIR forums and also with the network operators' forums. So that would be some of the places where we would evangelize them.

JULIE HAMMER: Jim, please.

JIM GALVIN: I just wanted to add with respect to evangelizing – I don't want to speak on behalf of ICANN in any way, but the ICANN Security Team also does a lot of activities in a variety of forums and this would naturally fit into their usual role. They could add topics from this document to include as part of the work that they would ordinarily do. And I apologise, I didn't say that I'm Jim Galvin for the transcript.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I also would like to add – and also, thank you ALAC for yourself including references to SSAC documents in information that you are supplying amongst your Members, because you're one of the groups that do have the best coverage of all groups in ICANN.

So those kinds of communication channels that we in SSAC absolutely include in our path of evangelism. Basically, the ICANN community itself is actually pretty good at spreading the word. Thank you.

SPEAKER: I just want to add one more comment that the SSAC has a presentation that was accepted for the next Internet Governance Forum, that specifically addresses this topic.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Aside from the United States and the United Kingdom, because I heard Lesley Cowley say at the Africa DNS Forum that as a ccTLD they've been invited to participate in the Cyber Security National Working Group, and I'm not sure if she's part of SSAC.

But the question I have is: has the SSAC been invited by various governments from around the world to perhaps participate in the development of some of their cyber security strategies?

The reason why I ask this is that outside of my ALAC hat I'm in the middle of drafting Fiji's cyber security strategy and I'd certainly be needing your assistance, we could definitely discuss that offline, but, yeah... Back to you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: SSAC itself has not been included but many Members of SSAC have participated in the creation of the cyber security agenda and similar documents, both for the country where they happen to have residence or citizenship, but many Members have also helped other countries.

We also have one Member from Mauritius that worked very hard in getting Mauritius to sign the Council of Europe Cyber Security Convention. So the individuals are working...

What SSAC is doing, as I showed briefly, is that we have a Work Party related to cooperation with law enforcement in general where both us and law enforcement are sharing experience, not on the individual issues but on how we can work together locally in a country to produce a document like the one that you are currently working with.

So that is very much what SSAC is trying to do; look at procedures, help law enforcement, how can you be more multi stakeholder. And also explain to non-law enforcement entities, so that they understand, why law enforcement sometimes have to work within closed rooms, etc.

There is an understanding that is needed to be able to create good such documents that [you seem? 03:13:28] to work on. SSAC has not been involved, but Members have. I'll move onto the next presentation now and I'll hand over the microphone to Russ Mundy. He is also an SSAC Member but also the liaison from RSAC to SSAC.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thank you Patrik. I think it's the other way, from SSAC to RSAC. [laughter] The Work Party that has been underway for a while within SSAC is to address information items and issues associated with changes and rollovers of the root key for the signing of the root zone and DNS.

As probably many of you are aware, the root zone has been signed for a bit over three years now. The agreements involved as part of the whole consultation process and other subsequent agreements that were signed said that five years the root key would be replaced – in roughly that time frame of before – so there are a number of things underway at this point to address this.

One of these is the SSAC Work Party for commenting or putting out guidance for the root key rollover itself. As I say, it's been underway for a while.

We have collected a fair bit of information from our membership and this is at this point a completely internal SSAC document that we have called in some experts that are involved in the actual operation of the root zone, to contribute to it, as it is intended to be an SSAC document.

One of the possible things that we're looking at is what are the impacts, what are the potential complications that can occur and what are the set of things that the public needs to be aware of and know about. At the present time, as we walk through this process, the IANA has also held a public consultation on the same topic.

Received comments from a number of folks on whether or not – and issues and timing – they are posted publicly on the ICANN site. So that is a related but separate piece of work. We think there will be further consultations opened up in the near future, though we don't have a timeframe on that.

The process that we're looking at will include documenting the operational aspects of the root zone key rollover and key operation process, describing why and some of the motivations for – besides just the contractual requirement – why you would want to change the root key for the root zone itself and the mechanisms that are available for doing so.

Now, one of the things that I need to point out here is that DNSSEC is used in quite a few zones throughout the Internet now; hundreds,

literally, maybe we're up to the thousands now, I haven't kept that close a count. And many of them are regularly ruling over their root key and you say: "Well, why can't the root zone do that and just do it like everybody else?"

Well, the biggest difference is, as Patrik was talking about earlier in the variants, the root zone is the zone by itself. It is also at the very top of the trust structure for DNSSEC and so the public trust anchor that is used by the vast majority of all DNSSEC participants is the root trust anchor.

So changing the root key have much broader applications and implications, potentially, than any key further down. So that's what we're looking at at this point. Once we complete the document we will have it released to the full SSAC because the Work Party, as Patrik said, is a subset of the SSAC.

The SSAC will look at it, review it, decide whether or not it will be published and at that time, if it's deemed worthy of being published, it will be put out.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you Russ. Any questions?

JULIE HAMMER: That's the end of the formal presentations from the SSAC but perhaps with Patrik's permission I can open up the floor now for any other questions that you might have that are outside those topics that we're touched upon?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: You have my permission. We also have a lot of other SSAC Members here so we're happy to answer any kind of question on any kind of topic. Please throw them out.

JULIE HAMMER: Rinalia, we can always rely on you for a good question.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Out of curiosity, how often do you not publish your reports?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Let me try to remember and look at Julie. I think it's not more than... We have been quite lucky on finding topics actually. Sometimes the end result might not really cover what we thought to begin with because during the work we found what the real issues were. When starting work we guess that this is what we're going to work with. But I would say that it happens very rarely. Jim, maybe you have something to add there?

JIM GALVIN: I was going to say not only does it only happen rarely, I'm trying to think of an example. Certainly not in the... Prior to the four years here while Julie's been... All the years prior to that, so...

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Other SSAC Members come to be and whisper about two Work Parties that we've had during the last four years that we have not published. Two, yes.

MATT ASHTIANI: I apologise for interrupting you but can you please state your names before speaking for the transcription record?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I had SSAC Members coming up to me and in a very nice whisper telling me that just during the last couple of years there have been two of the Work Parties that didn't produce any document. So very rarely but it does happen.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Not a follow on on this one but on what Jim said earlier in terms of what the ICANN Security Team ought to be doing – am I right in understanding that sometimes they are not evangelized on what the SSAC has published or recommended?

JIM GALVIN: No, I didn't mean to suggest what they ought to be doing. I certainly don't want to speak on their behalf but I observe that in fact they do evangelize on behalf of documents that we have and I was simply including them in the group, just as individual SSAC Members, the Security Team does and Patrik added even ALAC Members.

And we appreciate the fact that the folks who are part of this Committee are evangelized on behalf of the documents we produce. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

We have had a study as part of the ATR and other reviews of ICANN itself, we have also been looking at our own process inside SSAC and we have been looking at what kind of measurements we should use to look at our own success; what our own success metrics are.

And one of the things that we are looking at very closely is whether our recommendations are followed. Because as I said from the beginning, even though we primarily issue an advisory body for the ICANN Board, just like all the ACs, not even the Board must follow our advice, because no one in this community really have a veto on anyone else.

So the more our recommendations are implemented and received, well, that is what we are measuring our success on. And we have actually been quite successful according to the metrics that we have been using. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

I have questions from Evan Leibovitch and Sala. Evan first. Thank.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I want to pick up on the evangelism issue. As you know, recently the Chair of ALAC sent a letter addressing the issue of .list domains, saying essentially that you already have information on .list domains, why do you need to do more research?

Your own advisory committee is very specific about it. How often do you find yourself in this situation where sometimes just getting your own advice accepted by the body that charters you to get heard, and can we possibly see more of this kind of thing where ALAC and SSAC are working together to try to get these end user targeted mechanisms in place?

Is there anything where there seemed to be a situation where it worked? Where combining efforts has proved to bear some fruit? Are there other areas specifically where you see that you're putting the word out, it's not being heeded and maybe a little bit of extra help might move it along?

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

The short answer to that is yes. We can always do more things together and that is why we have Julie Hammer here, who is helping with finding what topics there are. And I will pass over the microphone to you to speak a little bit more on you and where you're working, because I think from our perspective in SSAC that has been very successful.

But I would like to mention a little bit about the .list domain issue because it seems to be the case that there are a lot of rumors and interpretation of what actually has happened and is going on there. What we should all remember is that the applicant guidebook, from the beginning, says that .list domains are not to be used unless very specifically they are requested and approved by the applicant. The applicant guidebook already says that.

But we in SSAC did a study and confirmed that the applicant guidebook was correct. What the Board then did, as a result of the SSAC study was ask ICANN Staff to create a study that was to report back what kind of implications would be for a more tough, firmer rejection of .list domains, what kind of implications that would have.

And the Board asked for a pretty quick response from Staff. It took a while but late in the spring the Staff started that study so even though people might feel a little bit surprised that the study was committed, it's still the case that the Board actually asked for some more information on that.

The Internet Architecture Board after that has also given their comments, so that is also how these things fit together. And all of them, more or less, confirm what has already always been in the applicant guidebook. So I don't think people should feel nervous or whatever reaction they have. With that I would like to hand over to Julie to talk a little bit about how she is working.

JULIE HAMMER:

I guess I'll start by saying that my role supplements what already is a close relationship between the two Chairs, and I do know that Patrik and Olivier speak frequently and in depth about a lot of issues, but the way I try and fulfill my role is to be across the issues in both communities that are of concern and importance.

And while I can't share with the ALAC a lot of the detail of SSAC discussions until they are made public in reports, because of my understanding of where ALAC concerns lie, I do volunteer to be on a

number of the SSAC Work Parties where I know there will be a particular interest.

At the moment I'm on both of the SSAC Work Parties that are dealing with abuse with different perspectives in each one. That then allows me to better represent the concerns of the ALAC but also to bring that information back into the ALAC once it's published. That keeps me very, very busy. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

I just want to emphasize to all of you that Julie is coming into SSAC as a liaison, but our internal rules are such that if it is the case that you are an SSAC Member, which Julie is – she's a full SSAC Member –, then there is absolutely no difference between what data or discussion or role or part that she has within SSAC from any other SSAC Member. Just to have that for the record. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Sala, you had a question?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO:

Pardon me Julie, I sent you a Skype message, I've withdrawn. But I just want to say SSAC for the excellent work you guys have been doing. We really appreciate it.

JULIE HAMMER:

Can I ask if there are any more questions for this session?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: There is nothing from Adobe Connect.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Do I have any SSAC Members that would like to say something or add something, maybe? Robert Guerra? Come here.

ROBERT GUERRA: It's Robert Guerra from the SSAC. Just in regards to – maybe not so much from the SSAC perspective – but there was a question that was asked in terms of Internet censorship and Internet filtering, I'll say two things.

SSAC does have an advisory and then some of us on the SSAC as well at a regional level also work on these issues. In my particular organization, The Citizen Lab, we've published a variety of things under our own name and also as a founder of the [Open Ed? 03:30:17] initiative. So if anyone is interested in that topic I'm happy to follow up with them.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: And if you need to follow Robert through other means he also is the Head of an ALS in NARALO.

JULIE HAMMER: If there are no further questions I might bring this session to a close on time and offer the meeting's various sincere thanks to Patrik – I'll quickly acknowledge that yet another SSAC Member has joined us during the session; Mark Seiden, who's one of our Work Party Chairs.

I think you've had a record number of SSAC Members attend this meeting. I think you've got just about every SSAC Member there is in Durban and I very much thank the SSAC for that level of support. So I'll bring that meeting to a close.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

You have about two minutes to stretch your legs and we can continue to be on time for the next portion of our meeting. Thank you. [break]

Okay folks. If we could please move onto the next part of the meeting? It is now 5:00 pm local time; the time of day where people start to go a little funny.

Just in time we're going to try and do some repairs on the projector to stop the jitter on it and it is fortunate that our next speaker, Sebastian Bachollet, does not need a slideshow and in fact is sitting right at the table along with us because you've always been one of us, haven't you?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:

This report, this conversation could also be led by the Member of the Meeting Strategy Working Group from your community. You have five, if I'm not mistaken; we have Sylvia, Eduardo, Tijani and Sandra – but she's not yet here I guess.

But we tried when we set up this Working Group to – well, we succeeded – to have one representative from each of the regions of At-Large. And if you look to the composition of the Working Group – I will say I but we – try very hard to have a gender balance.

It was not possible because some of the organization, even when they have to slot given the same gender as participants, we are a little bit unbalanced but it's quite good, I will say.

We had a few meetings for the overall committee and then we split into three subgroups. One of them was Chaired by Eduardo, very good Chair, and we are now reconvening the full group for a working session tomorrow and we will have an open public session on Thursday morning.

We are still struggling about what could be the objective of having a meeting, what the important topics we have to discuss and the type of session we need during a meeting. What is more important? Is it more important to have the "between yourself" meeting or a meeting with other constituencies, other parts of ICANN, which could be organized?

Because scalability is one of the big issues. Tomorrow we will have a closed session. It's not because we want to be closed but it's because we want this Working Group to be working and it will be organized – I don't know if we know yet – with the help of facilitators and we will split into three subgroups and I hope it will be interesting and also that it will show some new way of – inside ICANN – organizing meetings.

Because I am a little confused with why we just have one way of gathering together. That was not the case at the beginning of ALAC. We tried to be more innovative in the way we organized meetings at the beginning. We need to have this feeling coming back.

I remember one time we had a little piece of paper here and the Chair would tell us to all be on that little piece of paper and we were quite a

lot. We succeeded! No, but here I hope that we will be able to do the same thing on the public session.

The public session will be on Tuesday the 18th between 9:00 am and 10:30 am and you are all welcome to come and to help us to think about... We will also be splitting into subgroups for one part of the meeting and we will try to bring questions that could be useful to discuss in that environment.

Obviously we will not be ready at the end of this year and of course, unfortunately, for Buenos Aires. Our goal now is to have something published before Buenos Aires to allow you to take all that as input and to allow a lot of exchange during the Buenos Aires meeting and hopefully to have a final document for the meeting in 2014, which might be in Singapore.

And it will leave you some time to forget about that and to prepare the ATLAS II in London in June. I guess that's my introduction and I hope you are happy and I'm sure my colleagues of this Working Group will be happy to answer any questions you have.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Are there any questions for Sebastian on this? This is not a shy bunch. Sala, go ahead.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: One quick question Sebastian. I make this comment because I read from something from one of the ccTLD operators and mention this in relation to ICANN meetings on a separate list – not an ICANN list – in relation to

ICANN meetings. One of the comments he made was that he felt that as it stands the meetings happen in silos.

For example, if it's on a topic of different constituencies or different ACs or SOs work on the same thing and then eventually converge – and he was talking about the lag and the delayed process of that. The question I have is is that one of the considerations for the Meeting Strategy Working Group?

Whether that's something that's been discussed and whether in the future you are looking to reexamine some of the current mechanics and processes where there will be more cross-constituency groups on the various themes? Thank you Sebastian.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:

It's really a very important question and yes, it is inside the scope of this Working Group and we are working on that. But I can also say that it is also in the scope of the Public Stakeholder Engagement Committee of the Board that I am also sharing. We try really hard... If you look at the Agenda, my point of view is that we must not have any other meetings on Monday than the main meetings. But a lot of constituencies ask for meetings anyhow and even you have a Working Group on Monday afternoon. So it's very difficult to organize single meetings with one topic and everyone together.

That's a pity because if I take for example Chris Gift, who came to give you one presentation, he gives the same presentation in other rooms and he allows this time and we lose the opportunity to talk with him

because he took the floor for ten minutes and he's not exchanging with you at that point.

So we need to figure out other solutions. Is it to have a webinar before and no presentation during some of the meeting? Is it to have two hours where we have everybody together and all of the presentation and then you can go to discuss in your silo of multi-participant group?

It is something we are already looking at today but we will also look at in the Meeting Strategy Working Group. I am not the Chair. You can take the Chair, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I wanted to ask how much of the problem is cultural? Before I came to ICANN what I thought of a workshop was people sitting around and doing things interactively. When I came to ICANN I found out that a workshop meant a lecture and three questions. And I'm wondering, is that a cultural thing or is that something that is changeable?

The whole concept of... Traditionally when there have been workshops on New gTLDs they have essentially been slide decks and lectures and a couple of questions as opposed to something totally interactive. Now that it sounds like Chris is starting to do things and consider the engagement; the idea of being able to put up a video that says, "Here's our presentation," the way we would normally get it.

You could watch it on the plane, you could do whatever. When you come to the ICANN meeting you've seen the presentation, now let's do the questions and answers. That means we could do an awful lot more

and engage an awful lot more. The technology is getting there. How fast do you see this kind of change coming around?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: First, I really think that if it's a cultural issue we need to change this cultural issue. We need to step in with: "We have a different culture, we have something different," and yes, we need to change that. And there is no reason why we can't. But I will tell you a little story. I hope I have the right to do that.

We get weekly, monthly inputs from the CEO. The first one was a video and I was very happy to have a video because I have, like you, hundreds of pages to read. Sometimes if I can stop to read or watch or listen to something it's a different way of interacting. And culturally, a lot of Board Members say: "We have no time to watch a video! We want the paper."

And I fail because I was maybe only one of few who was really very happy with this type of interaction. We have a long way to go but we need to start now and we will move this organization, I am sure.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. We have one question from the Adobe Connect room and Sala and Tijani, and then we'll close it off.

CARLOS REYES: This is a question from Oksana Prykhodko: do you discuss evisa possibilities?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Hello Oksana, nice to have you online. We are not yet there. I understand your point and the visa was one of the topics of one of the subgroups and we are taking that very seriously. We are not yet there in terms of finding a solution but please send an email to me or to any Member of the Committee with your thoughts on that and we will take that into account. Thank you for your help.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. Sala and Tijani. Sala, go ahead.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you very much for answering that first question and my comments are related to that first question. In relation to the potential evolution of the ICANN meetings, where there will be greater cross-constituency discussions on themes, rather than having someone like Chris Gift repeat a session here, repeat a session there and so forth.

I note that it's going to have significant implications on how ICANN structures throughout the year and also in terms of the development of agendas and getting them agreed by the different ACs, and the impact on the budget.

So the question I have is: in terms of the business development planning that ICANN is currently going to be working on for the next five years, is there an overlap between the ICANN meeting discussions and the business development discussions? I raise this because there are financial implications and potential forecasts that could be affected. Thank you Sebastian.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you Sala. I think you are talking about the strategy planning for the next five years and what we are doing. That's a very good question and it's one of the topics we are working on currently because the two initiatives start almost at the same time.

Yes, we are coordinating but if I can take a parallel situation, we have an African strategy, we have a Latin American and Caribbean strategy in progress. We have one for Arabic countries and we will have from other areas.

And I consider that our input is topic input in comparison with geographical inputs or cultural inputs or... And I don't see any mismatch but we have to take care of that and try to keep that in mind. Really that's a very good point and all the Members of the Committees need to be aware that we need to take that seriously. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Tijani, you have the last question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. It's not a question; it's a comment. Please don't think that the Meeting Strategy Working Group will give you a perfect strategy. It will always be imperfect, but we are trying to do the best. I can assure Oksana that the visa issue will be addressed but I cannot ensure that we will change the culture of people.

So we are working on all aspects of the meetings but don't think that we can change people. Thank you.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I would like to use our interpreters and speak in French. This is one of the topics of the meeting, how are we going to be able to have those possibilities of interpretation, interpreters – which are very important; we have to use them – when we are going to be told this is very expensive? And this is true and it's not worth it is we don't use them, so I want to use them!

That is why I speak in French today. I think if we want to change the culture of the ICANN organization it's very important for us to take the At-Large culture and have it broadcast all over the organization.

I think we have a great culture at At-Large and as a Board Member I'm quite amazed at the fact that some people don't understand sometimes – even at the Board level – how to work with different cultures, with different languages.

When I had more time at At-Large and ALAC it was obvious that in ALAC we do speak different languages and we do have different cultures. But at the highest level of ICANN it's not there yet. That is why you can bring so much to move this organization forward.

Fadi has a new word he uses a lot: transnational organization. This is a word he likes to use now. We can change a lot, we can change the entire culture at ICANN. Thank you very much for your participation. Thank you ALAC Members in this Working Group.

I am at your disposal to answer any questions after this meeting and I'm sure my colleagues will be able to answer questions as well. Thank you very much.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

We're closing off. I just wanted to add in one comment that's been made online from Oksana: thanks Tijani but I disagree with you. We can change culture. I received an evisa from Singapore as everyone but only a few people, including me, received an evisa for Senegal. It's just a comment. Okay. And on that, Sebastian, thank you for coming, thank you for being with us. [applause]

And we will immediately move onto the next part of what we are doing. Cheryl, would you like to come up to the front or present from where you are?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm happy to present from where I am.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. The next part of this, that Cheryl will be chairing, has to do with the whole issue of metrics. Do you have slides to go with this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

No. Thank you. Welcome to a non-report. It's a very simple process. The metrics aspect of our review of the ALAC Rules of Procedure and metrics, which was a macro and a subset Working Group – the getting

the Rules of Procedure took priority up until and including my last report.

I did manage to give you a report at the last meeting in Beijing, and whilst we had “great expectation” of doing some more work at least shortly before this meeting here in Durban, it has not come to pass. So my response to that is – tough. That’s fine. We’ll make good use of the ten or twelve minutes that we’ve got left allocated to us now to actually start doing some work.

The last time the rubber hit the road on the metrics road was in Prague, and I think I like anniversaries and it was about 12 months ago so let’s have a quick look into that space. In Prague we had what I thought was a fairly full and frank feelers discussion, particularly because we had engagement from a number of regional people and not just regional leaders.

And I think that’s part of what I’d like to talk about today. With the upshot of Prague and the couple of meetings that were held and reported on in monthly reports up until but not beyond Beijing, we gathered a group of some 24 or 25 – and perhaps, Matt or Carlos, you might be able to pick up one of the Wiki workspaces?

The one that lists the people? Just to refresh their memories, in case they’ve forgotten their on the Working Group. It’s the At-Large Metrics Sub-Committee, I think we’ve got it listed as. And we can display it up on screen. 24 or 25 might seem like a relatively large group but I wanted to take a moment when Matt brings it up to analyze who’s there and why they’re there.

I'd like to have a little talk around this table as to what sort of expectations we have as we go forward. We'd established a number of very important things out of Prague and beyond. One of those is that we needed to have some form of accountability to our edge communities, the greatest number of people; those who are least engaged with the central activities of ICANN but who are responsible for us being here.

Those members of our At-Large structures or the individual members of the regions and perhaps even far more importantly than that, the Internet end user who is albeit unknowingly relying on us to bring some of their interests to the table in the world of At-Large and the ALAC.

They deserve to know whether we're doing a good job or not. We deserve to know whether or not our regional productivity is benefited by a particular way of doing things. And the only way we can try and get a handle on that is to do some form of measures.

And with the ALAC new Rules of Procedure, which Alan assures me are a hair's breadth away of having their fourth and final adjunct document completed, once that adjunct document is completed and voted upon by the ALAC they will come into force.

So those new Rules of Procedure talk very specifically about a set of expectations on the ALAC Members. But we should be able to use those as benchmarks for our regional leadership as well. So it's a matter of being accountable to the communities that we claim we represent and we do our best to represent in the main.

It needs to be metrics – and when we say metrics, feel free to think just measures – which may not be necessarily just numerical in value. They could very well be a measure of how many meetings are attended by various people.

But if you attend a meeting and do not contribute, that is not an equal measure to someone who is contributing every fourth meeting but is a continuous contributor on a list or on a Wiki and indeed is very much a thought-leader in discussions.

So we need to make sure that what we measure are properly balanced, properly ranked or weighted and then that in many cases – and this is something that the ALAC has decided in their rules and that I would like to consider the regional leadership seriously look at for any they need to implement in their own world – that they are in some way interchangeable.

And this would quite often be at someone’s discretion. The “someone” in the world of ALAC is the Chair. So it is at the Chair of the ALAC’s discretion to say that a person who contributes absolutely online or is perhaps contributing in a highly recognized and high profile outreach capacity, but that is in some way equal to being at every single meeting and ticking a whole bunch of check boxes.

We can’t underestimate as well cultural differences here. And I’m obviously going to grow old and retire before I get to see the list of people who belong to the group so I’ll do a quick search while I’m here. God love you, thanks very much Matt. I apologize for being grumpy then.

The cultural differences are very important and that's why I wanted to look at this list because what we have is a good smattering of Latin American and Caribbean, a less than perhaps equitable number of North Americans and Asia Pacific and AFRALO representatives, and of North American representatives.

I'm not saying we need to have 50/50/50/50 or 5/5/5/5 or 3/3/3/3 or however many the numbers work out, but I would like you, as regional leaders, to have a look at that list and say to yourselves: "Is my region well represented with someone who understands what metrics and measures are and what use they will be to my ALSes or to my end using community?"

The next question I'd like you to ask yourselves and that I'd like to open up for discussion is: if we set up effective metrics and measures, which are applicable to your ALAC representatives – and indeed as is, I think, highly desirable, those same metrics and measures would then be self-imposed on you as regional leaders – do you next need to think how that affects bringing people up through to take leadership roles?

Because as soon as you start measuring things, two things happen. What you measure often gets attention and sometimes that attention might be a fear of failure; that you'll get people who may perhaps not put themselves forward for leadership positions or to take particular roles, because they fear getting a yellow color next to their name instead of a puce of purple one.

And I want you to be really careful that you don't wish for something and then get what you wish for; and that is that metrics should not be

overused or abused and they need to be seen as just one part of a toolkit.

This toolkit will allow you as regional leaders – and eventually the At-Large structure and the individual Internet end users in your space, geographically speaking – to know that they are being well represented in a fair and equitable manner.

Why is it important? Because we all cost. We are cost centers. We are cost centers to ICANN and we are cost centers in less fiduciary terms in as much as if somebody is supposed to be sitting at a discussion table and the seat is marked for your particular geographic region or area and that person does not take up that seat, that is a waste of resource.

Someone else should and could be bringing the voices you represent to those discussions and to that table. That's enough fluffing about from me. I'd like to open for questions now for a very short period of time, but with a warning: the expectation is that our first meetings on metrics... And we will be starting with a relatively light frequency of once a month but we will be ramping up fairly quickly to at least once a week, immediately before Buenos Aires.

So everybody will need to look at – if their name is on that list – if they can still perform at those sorts of levels. So we do need to have not a non-report at the Buenos Aires meeting. Now, anybody who wants to wave at me I'll recognize. Sala, go ahead please.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you Cheryl. I wanted to say that I really appreciate the advice that's been given to the RALO Leadership, particularly in terms of how the metrics are to be applied. And the question or the concern that I have is that in terms of sustainability.

it's all very well to have a discussion and to verbally advise, particularly in terms of how the metrics are to be applied. Is there a way where this is recorded? Where RALOs are... Not so much mandated, that's the wrong word...

And I can't use "regulated", that's the wrong word too; definitely not "regulated", but written somewhere where RALOs can certainly look at that and see that's a consideration?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for your question Sala. I will give you an utterly and absolutely individualized response. The way if I were queen of the world I would be doing this is hopefully what the ALAC may choose to do, and that is having set its standards – and I believe its standards are excellent standards – that it has those standards properly adhered to, publicly measured and highly accountable to you, the regions, as their immediate communities of interest, but also to the At-Large structures.

That will do something called benchmarking. It will allow an example of best practice and of advertising of the results of those best practices, as well as the exceptions to those best practices to be explained.

Once that happens the pressure will be, I trust, from the At-Large structures, who after all are the ones who are left or otherwise, the

leadership in the regions, to say if they can do it we want you to do it as well. And that will help.

The other thing is we need to recognize we are talking about real humans. Not only real humans who can be stressed and can be hormonal and can be tired and can be cranky and can have bad hair days, but that are also volunteers.

And we have to make sure that whoever is watching the metrics and establishing the bona fides or the measures, are constantly aware that we are not talking about their level of corporate experience that they might have; this is all about managing volunteers but not allowing volunteers to exploit a system unfairly, that another volunteer could be doing a better job of. So we need to keep privacy.

There are a number of layers. The best way we've found in the ALAC approach is to give that job to the Chair. And if we don't like how the Chair does it, get rid of the Chair. I see Tijani and then I'll come back to you again Sala. Please, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. You said exactly what I wanted to say. We need metrics. It is necessary. I don't say that we need very tough metrics, very tough measures to punish people – no. But we need metrics. And if we don't have metrics we will have those people that you just named using the facilities of ICANN and wasting it.

We waste a chance, an opportunity. So any kind of metrics can be put in figures. And I know that people don't like figures but you cannot put

into an equation something that is without figures. So we have to discuss about those metrics.

We have to make everyone in the community accept those metrics, but once we decide on those metrics we have to apply them. And we apply them strongly.

Giving this to the Chair to decide on, I would say that we can given the Chair the possibility to prioritize; to say that: "I will consider this during my term but participating in the calls is the principle index," and so on and so forth.

Not only this, but after that, when we have to apply them they must be applied informally without a case-by-case, because it might create some problems if we do that. So I believe that perhaps we will manage to do those metrics because as you know, we had a lot of opposition. People don't want them. They say we are volunteers. How can you say that I have to do that? If you don't do it, why are you here?

People elected you to be here and you don't do what they need you to do? Then you don't need to be here. So this is the problem. I think we need to convince people that the metrics are necessary. We can make them as wide as you want but we need to apply them once we decide on them. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Tijani. It's Cheryl again for the record. I want to pick up on two points that you raised there. The first one is the concept of uniformity. And whilst I absolutely believe... I think it begs belief I

suppose how we could measure something that is so disliked – we have to have uniformity and therefore I would encourage harmonization across the regions as well. So we should be able to expect like-to-like.

We don't want to have a region saying: "But we don't think our ALAC people are working as hard as your ALAC people," and later: "We don't think that our regional leaders are doing as much as these are." But what we need to do is establish what particular level we're going to all agree on. And that might mean a lot of debate between the regions.

So we need to think horizontally as well. But I think a lot will be solved if having established these and agreed to these – and what is at least in the ALAC Rules of Procedure is a darn good place to start –, if we then apply exceptions just like certain issues need to be discussed in-camera but then reported on, exceptions must be reported on.

And my personal style in a similar situation would be something like the following – and this is an example: we assume we are in a Working Group and we have a job to do. We all need to carry equal weight. I have received notification that this person cannot be available for any of our advertised meeting times.

However, as they have agreed to "insert job they've agreed to do" can we all agree that that will equate to...? Then everyone is ticked off and everyone agrees and everyone understands. It's not impossible to still have equitable measure but enough exception and flexibility to bring in the human factor.

We may need to train and help to facilitate some of that at the very beginning, but that's okay. Which is why starting with the ALAC and just

letting those 15 people suffer through it is probably a good thing to begin with. Sala, over to you.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you Cheryl. I noticed that you used the word “benchmarking”, and just from your comments I take it that you were referring to a case-by-case basis where rulings will be made by the ALAC Chair and having that become precedence? Okay. I’m glad that’s a no. I’m very glad to hear that.

The question I’d like to raise is whether the metrics are in the form of some kind of key performance indicators, where things like attending meetings and that...?

And as a follow up to that I wanted to raise also that there have been instances – for instance, noting that it will be the ALAC who’ll be experimented on before anyone else – where ALAC has a call at 2:00 am or 5:00 am for some people.

And I’ve noted that in the past I’ve actually been on record for asking for a rotation, but of course, if it’s only affecting one person the general rationale has always been that: “Oh, one person? It’s okay for one person to suffer, as long as you get a good balance so you can get a quorum; as long as you can get enough people to attend it.”

So for them it’s justifiable that one person can suffer. Having said that it does take it’s toll and would that be an exception under your current metrics?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for the question Sala. I'll answer... I want to be very clear on the "no" to the benchmarking first of all. Perhaps I should use the term "establishing a best practice or best of breed model" for the regions to look to. With regard to your question about... I'll deal with the times first because I can't help myself.

You're probably asking one of the worst persons in the known universe about problems with attending meetings at difficult times, because I'm of the view that when I signed up to be in the At-Large Advisory Committee I knew exactly what I was getting into and I was absolutely aware that living in the Antipodes, as I did, just like everywhere else I'd been involved with in ICANN, that they would be holding meetings at what can only be described as highly unsociable hours.

My view – and one of the reasons I put myself forward from AP region to be your representative in those dim, dark, distant days – was that unless someone does it – and I maintained I was capable of doing it – then our voice isn't heard.

So it comes back to why someone puts themselves forward to take on these roles. And just like any other role you're putting yourself forward to or any job you're looking at taking on, you need to do so with as much information as you possibly can.

It is absolutely predictable, as you said, that if you've got 23 people and only one of them is saying we want to [inaudible 04:20:40], it's not likely to win the debate of the day. But it is always possible to make change. And indeed, another Chair may make change to rotation.

But my guess would be, just as I did when I had my chance to make these changes, when you put it out for a community consensus view and you go with the community consensus outcome – which happens to be what it is at the moment and it hasn't changed since – you just have to go along with that.

If you have – and this comes back to your second question; I was dealing with your third question and no I'm coming back to your second question – clear and unequivocal expectations, and we now do in the Rules of Procedure, it is expected that... And there is a whole lot of things that we expect of our ALAC Members.

I would strongly encourage regions to look at this model and do the same. Look at their regional roles and leadership and say, "It is expected that..." and then we can also do the same for our ALSes, although that it is in fact done in what we expect and what ICANN expects an At-Large structure to do.

If you've read the expectations then you kind of sign onto it, and you can make a choice of trying to pre-negotiate. And if your region or your ALSes go, "We understand, you will not be attending any meeting after midnight. You will compensate representing us by bringing our voice to your tables this other way." We can make that in the exceptions. But we do have to remember the globe is round, time is inconvenient and very few of these things are more than a monthly meeting without rotation.

I am unaware of any standing meeting – and Gisella can correct me so perhaps we might get a check on this fact – but I don't believe I am

aware in ICANN of any standing meeting that does not rotate that has a frequency that is shorter than once a month. And honestly, most of us can stay up late once a month or get up early or whatever.

Are there any other questions? Thank you. Go ahead.

NATALIA ENCISO:

I believe you have already answered this is Sala's question but I just wanted to confirm: are you saying that the metrics are going to be applied for ALS representatives as well in the future?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you for your question. I'm not saying that, I'm saying that at some point it may be that regions will choose to have some sets of expectations for ALS representatives. Many regions already do and if they have expectations they may indeed choose later to measure those.

For example, some regions already choose to have a form of rule or limiting factor that unless an At-Large structure representative has been active to a certain measurable level in debate, discussion or a number of meetings, that they may or may not be able to have a vote in a particular thing.

So we're already doing it but it's a little bit of this and a little bit of that and it's not harmonized, it's not consistent, it's not predictable and that's a debate that has to happen as any of these things do or do not go into the regions.

We're a long way from looking at asking any At-Large structure to do more than it's required to do, which is to ask as a conduit and to take the information from ALAC and ICANN out to its Members, and of course the discussion and deliberative material and opinion from its Members back it.

But when we have five different regional sets of rules and we have 145 different At-Large structure sets of expectations it's a very confusing landscape. Our view at the moment in this Metrics Working Group is that by setting a nice, interesting test of some reasonable and real measures for ALAC, we may be able to look at what works and what doesn't work, and that may encourage a best practice in the regions.

And as the regions discuss – as your regional leaders already are discussing how to ensure that accreditation is an ongoing accreditation of their At-Large structures because we need real, active, actual At-Large structures – somehow that has to be measured.

Now, in some case it might be: “Did the organization put in a not-for-profit claim or return or whatever their government requires?” But that might not translate to another region. So we had to find measures that were either interchangeable or equitable.

But no, that's not the case at the moment, beyond doing whatever you sign up to do when you become an ALS. That's the only impost we have. However, let me put a rider on that – we have another review coming. This time the review will not be looking at the fitness and purpose of the ALAC but rather the fitness and purpose of ALAC regions and the ALSes as the tribe model structure that we are.

So that may... You ask me in three years' time and that might be a very different answer because I can't predict what that may be at that stage. Okay? Waving from... Sorry, I'd love to see what that says. Go ahead Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: I have a question from Fatima Cambrenero: is each RALO going to elaborate on its own metrics?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for the question. My guidance, should they ask me at the time, would be yes and no. Yes indeed they need to be self-determined in what sorts of metrics they have and no, it should not be in isolation; it should be all five RALOs getting together and talking with each other so there is a good deal of equity and harmonization across any such metrics or measures that they choose to put into place.

From an external point of view there would be a great deal of criticism if you had a very much immeasurable versus a highly restricted between two regions, and it would be for cross-regional discussion to try and set that up accurately. But again, that's not now, that's hopefully in the mid future. Is there anything else? Go ahead Yaovi.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: I totally agree with what Cheryl said. And then something that is going to help in the application of the metrics is that we are going to have, once the final adjunct documents are adopted, the Rules of Procedure. That is something very important because when you have a liaison from

a region or a Member come to ALAC, as you said, the person know the expectations before coming to that group.

So the Rules of Procedure –I’m hoping we’ll have the final document very soon – will be something that will help in elaborating even the metrics themselves. So that is a very good point. And talking about meetings – when we have the various groups there is always a good rapport that is helping to try to find the most suitable time for meetings.

And as you said, like for the ALAC meeting, particularly, we may have a situation of negotiation if there is someone in ALAC feeling like they are having a hard time. That’s something that can be discussed from the beginning. So the Rules of Procedure is a point that is really going to help in the application of the metrics. That is the comment I want to make. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Yaovi. It’s a good point to write this up and review any action items that may have come out of our discussion. And that’s what I’ll start to do now. But just before that, it struck me that I could give you all one more closing example whereby a very important set of meetings, which were not just agenda discussion and a vote on a few things but were very deliberative – this was debate over very important outcomes.

And two Members of a 15-person – and it wasn’t the ALAC – Committee were unable to attend, and this was time-critical; there was no opportunity to no make these decisions. And both of these people sent very different but very effective written material because they knew what was going to be on the agenda in advance.

So their prior preparation actually guided and made the discussion and the deliberation of the whole group far more effective, even though what was happening was, as Chair, I was standing and saying: “On behalf of ‘name’ they wanted to make this point.” It actually acted as a very effective focus for that meeting.

So in some cases, not being at a meeting could be more important than being at a meeting. [laughter] And at that point we’ll think about meetings in the not too distant future.

What we need to do is make sure that the people who are on the group want to be on the group, never want to be on the group ever again and would like to put someone else on the group – in other words make up of this Working Group – look at themselves in their diaries and see that they can commit to a monthly meeting, which will be Doodle-polled, ramping up to once per week immediately before Buenos Aires.

Okay? Because that’s a big ask in a short amount of time if any Member of the Working Group wishes to just take a watching brief – in other words they wish to only be a subscriber to the list but not an active participant per se, and they were to let Staff know, I think that would be quite useful and it also means that we won’t be so concerned about your availability when we do the Doodle polls.

The other action item that I believe we have is that we need to look at what the results of the ALAC metrics and measures are once the Rules of Procedure are adopted. And I’m unsure if there will be a lot of material collected between now and Buenos Aires so I’m going to ask you, would

you permit us to report back to you on that not at Buenos Aires but in Singapore?

If you agree that that is a good time to have a snapshot, a reporting back on how the metrics for ALAC is working, then we will need to have an action item to ensure that Staff and the ALAC are collecting material from the moment we have our Rules of Procedure in place.

So whatever metrics and however we're capturing those matrixing of metrics that are going to be happening in the new Rules of Procedure world, we need to make sure we're capturing them from when the new Rules of Procedure come into place. Is there any other item that anyone wants to bring to the table now? If not, I'm 60 seconds over. My apologies. Over to you. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Cheryl. And we are indeed, by ALAC standards, incredible on time. However, this actually doesn't work to our advantage right now because our next speakers are all late. [laughter] We were supposed to receive a presentation from the DSSA however none of the three people who were capable of speaking on that is here.

Unless... Yet. Yes, yet. Based on what Olivier is saying, if we wait for him to come out of the GAC session we could be waiting a long, long, long time. So what I'm going to do then is move the last item on the Agenda up now and see if we can tackle some of these right now. In other words, what is listed as the wrap-up we'll do before we've actually wrapped-up, which is unfortunate.

So we're stalling here. We're not fooling anyone. Now, normally as part of the wrap-up we try and go through the next schedule and try and see who is going where in terms of the non-ALAC meetings. We'll call attention to what's going on tomorrow and try to find out if some of you can go to other meetings and then report back to us at our next sessions.

Is anyone here going to any non-ALAC sessions tomorrow that they would like to indicate and report back to us on? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Evan. I will report on the Meeting Strategy Working Group, meetings on the Budget and Finance, on the Strategy Planning Meeting and that's all for now. I'll try and remember the others.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Is anybody else planning to go to any non-ALAC meetings in the sense that they were...? Dharma, did I see your hand up?

DHARMA DAILY: I'm going to go to some of Tech Day.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Would you be able to give us a very brief account of what you did when we come back in here? Great. Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: I'm planning to be in the meeting of Contracting Process for New gTLD Applicants.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Fatimata?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you Evan. I will be attending the African Strategy Implementation Meeting tomorrow.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Holly? First of all turn the microphone on. Secondly, what you're saying is you'd like to report on a meeting you've already been to that was not an ALAC meeting? Do I have that right?

HOLLY RAICHE: I haven't prepared the report but I'm happy to do that. I was sitting right next to you anyway so we can dream up something.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Matt, did you have something to say?

MATT ASHTIANI: Just a reminder that we have the At-Large Durban meetings report workspace as for all the other meetings, where you can go and list the meeting, the date and time that you went, your name and list your report. I know it looks barebones now but it only looks great once

everybody fills it out. The link has been posted in the AC room. I can also send an email to the ALAC mailing list, if you wish.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: And also please to the At-Large Skype chat?

MATT ASHTIANI: Sure.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I myself are going to be participating on Wednesday on an NCSG sponsored event to do with the wonderful issue of closed generics, which is essentially six people; five of whom are rabidly against it and one doesn't care. Sala?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I'll be going to the New Five-Year Strategic Plan session as well as the African Strategy. And very quickly, I attended the African DNS Forum for two days. I didn't attend fully on the first day because I'd just gotten in but I must say it was excellent and I'll put up the report later. But I certainly was Tweeting and the hash tag is #aftLD.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you Sala for mentioning that. How many people at the table here were at the African DNS Summit besides Sala? Anyone else? Okay. Sala, could you possibly do a small summary of what went on there and let us know what happened?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I'll do a summary and I'll even do one better – if you're on Twitter you can read the storyboard. The hash tag is #afTLD or #AfricanDNSForum or #ISOCDurbanMeeting. And you'll not only see my Tweets, they were live Tweets as the meeting was progressing but you'll also see other people Tweeting on the sessions as well.

And all the presentations are available on the website and I think [Cintra? 04:40:50] had shared it on Skype but I'll certainly put it in the report, Evan, thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, thank you. About the meetings tomorrow, as you all know there are the opening ceremonies. There has already been mention of the Strategic Planning sessions. There will be a number of people in At-Large who will be helping in coordinating sessions so please participate.

If I'm one of the more cynical people about the strategic plan I'm going to participate and that's a high bar for everybody else. [laughter] So I've decided to bite that particular bullet and it will be interesting. In addition please all of you: this is an At-Large event. The At-Large Multi-Stakeholder Policy Roundtable. There are a lot of very good speakers there – and myself – so encourage everybody to come. There are a lot of good things being talked about and they're very important to At-Large.

And I've been stalling for time and they still haven't shown up. He only needs five minutes? The DSSA presentation is only going to be five minutes but we still have to stall? Heidi wants to tell us a story until the DSSA.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I was on the action item page and if we can clarify, Evan, you made some action items. I'm stalling.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The only action items I recall were those that were coming out of the discussion that we had during the hot topics when we were talking on the public interest, right? Action item one is to recommend to the ATLAS II people. Who is recommending? Well, the people in ATLAS II are here at the table so they're hearing the recommendation.

So now it is in the hands of Eduardo, who was here, and the other people that are involved in the ATLAS II group. It was the consensus of this table that they take it to their group. So I'm hoping that that's enough for the ATLAS group to have on their agenda.

We and the people involved in the ATLAS II group are here listening to us at the table so I hoped it wouldn't require more than that.

The second one is that Olivier is to be asked – and I guess it could be anyone who could go up to him and nicely ask – but essentially it was a consensus of the group that Olivier do this. Who asks him to do this? I could do it, you could do it... Okay, so the action item, rather than “to ask” is that Olivier will do such and such. Matt has an important message.

MATT ASHTIANI: The word “important” is tossed around quite a bit these days but... This will be one of those cases. I’m going to put the link to the At-Large Durban documents into the AC and I’ll also put it into the Skype chat. This is the Excel sheet that we usually pass around each meeting, which contains useful links for the meetings this week.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: He’s running now... From where? From room four? Okay. Hi Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi. I’ve been filibustering for a very long time.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Could you please speak slowly?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [laughter] I thought I was starting to slow down. What I wanted to do was just say something about the delight I have – and this is a personal perspective; you asked for a story, well, this is not fiction, this is fact – in watching how so much fresh talent and energy and enthusiasm is coming through into all that the various regions are doing, particularly since more of the successful capacity building sessions have happened in the regions and at these meetings.

And I know it’s easy to keep building on one foundation and keep getting a little bit higher and a little bit higher, but I’ve been watching this metamorphosis of the voice of At-Large – and I know you heard a little bit about how successful this has been today. And I’m now going to

allow Olivier to catch his breath and not to have a coronary before he talks to us.

But you've heard from – and I wanted you to take a moment and just congratulate yourselves, particularly the regional leaders here at the table who've been instrumental in making that magic happen. What an amazing job has happened through your good work over an incredibly short period of time. These are incremental pieces of growth.

It's no longer just a measure of how many policy pieces, public comments and statements of the ALAC are going in, but you're hearing from all the senior levels and from a wide number of people, both new and old, to the organization that we are listened to, our voices respected even when not agreed to, and we are now no longer pulling at the edge of the tablecloth saying, "Please listen to me."

But now we are firmly seated at the table and an equitable partner, or as equitable a partner as is there as well. Have you got your act together, Mr. Chair?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Absolutely. For the benefit of those at the table and all of those that are still sticking around with us online, thank you for your perseverance. It is now fifteen after the hour, fifteen after the hour of 6:00 pm here in Durban. So I want to welcome back Olivier who is more than welcome to take back the chair.

But before that he has a presentation to give us about the DSSA that I'm hoping will be longer than the time it took him to get here from the other room. Go right ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. It might be as short as that actually. I was with the GAC just now. I'm sorry, they do take time on issues. But I'm here to speak to you about the DSSA, the DNS Security and Stability, [inaudible 04:49:26], which is a Working Group that was set up a couple of years ago.

This group worked extremely hard for a year and a half, two years, and then stopped for a while because the Board started a Board DNS Risk Management Framework Program and so there was a question mark as to where everything fitted.

So the DSSA took a bit of a break and waited to see where this was all going and I guess that for the past year the DSSA has not quite met as many times – in fact I think it's probably met once or twice – in the past year.

There is a leadership group in the DSSA because it is a Working Group that is co-chartered with several Chairs; Chairs from the SSAC, one from the gNSO, one from the ALAC, one from the ccNSO and from all parts of ICANN. So the Working Group hasn't really met for the past year and recently the Co-Chairs have had a call that took place. There was supposed to be a follow up call afterwards on the wider DSSA Working Group.

The issue is as follows: the Board basically got a consultancy to design a risk management framework. The consultancy went away for a while, came back with a report, the report had been published – and it will actually be discussed here in Durban. Somehow some of the report is actually very similar to the work of the DSSA.

There are a few issues with the framework that the report has come up with; one of them being that the report mentions the use of a proprietary system to do risk management, which is the ISO system, whilst the DSSA had looked at a much more open source way of dealing with this risk management.

Now, beyond this there is going to be an actual decision that will have to be made by the DSSA Working Group later on this week when it meets, and this decision is whether it should fight back and say: “We have something do about this; we need to be involved, we need to ask the Board to involve us with the DNS risk management framework.”

Or maybe our mandate needs to perhaps be modified so that we fall more in line with what the Board is looking for at the moment. It needs to make a decision. One of the options on the table is to close down the DSSA altogether. So this is why I thought it was important to let you know about this because a community-led bottom-up effort that started out a few years ago and that is shutting itself down, due to a top-down system, is not something that is lightly seen in many parts of ICANN. And I do hope that in our community this is not lightly seen.

So this is why I needed to inform you of this and that perhaps in the next couple of days you might wish to think about this, until the meeting of

the DSSA takes place. I know that unfortunately it takes place on Thursday morning, which is a time when we are all very busy elsewhere as well so it clashes.

But I do hope that we can have a core, small group that will be there and will be able to discuss and share our opinion as to where this joint Working Group should actually go. The floor is open for any questions if you have any. I think it was Rinalia first and then Sala and then maybe some people on the right. Yaovi as well? Okay. Rinalia and then Sala.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Has the DSSA Working Group requested clarification from the Board in terms of why they initiated their own project when there was something that was bottom-up, community-initiated? Was there something that the community did not address to the satisfaction of the Board, for example?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, the DSSA was supposed to deal with the specific analysis of risks to the DNS and to ICANN in general. Both technical risks but also putting together a possible framework of technical risks, non-technical risks, political risks, etc. The Board DNS risk management framework is addressing a slightly different need and is much more dealing with the actual danger to ICANN rather than the danger to the DNS itself.

We have another Member of the Team, Cheryl, who's on there, and Julie has also been on the Team. I'm not sure whether they have another insight to this but that's my understanding of the difference.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Follow up question, Olivier. If that were the case and there is no duplication, perhaps even complementarity, in which case, why would the DSSA decide to shut itself down?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, part of the reason why Members of the DSSA are somehow disgruntled is that when this DNS risk management framework started there were thoughts that there would be extensive collaboration between the DSSA and Staff and the consultants. This doesn't appear to have been the case. Sala?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I note that there was a risk framework that was presented to the ALAC. I'm wondering if that's the same one or if it's a derivative? I'm trying to remember whether it was presented in Prague or the meeting before that? No, there was an illustration, like a...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Was that presented to the ALAC or are you saying it was presented to the community?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I can't remember; my memory is really bad with all the stuff we've all been doing. I can't remember whether it was the ALAC or at an SSAC meeting, but it certainly was presented and it was an open meeting and it was shared. And I remember commenting on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't remember that it was the ALAC but I can see Julie Hammer, who might be able to tell us who it was.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Sorry, the second question related to that. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's answer the first one and then you can ask your second one. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to recap on the presentations that have been made, perhaps you might be thinking of the presentation on the DSSA Phase One report, which [Mika? 04:56:42] gave and which had quite a significant discussion of risk assessment framework and the tool that the DSSA had produced, and that was delivered in Prague – a very large, extensive report.

In Beijing the consultants for the DNSO Board Committee delivered their preliminary report, which was very high-level, and Olivier described quite well the difference between the focus of the two. And if I might also jump in on one of the other points that Olivier was talking about in response to why would the DSSA shut down.

One of the issues that the DSSA has to contend with at the moment is that the next step is actually to get into a great deal of detail and depth to actually do assessments. That was going to be the next step. And the judgment of quite a lot of people was that the group does not currently have the people with the right skillsets to actually do that work.

It would need to try and bring in quite a number of new people with quite specific skillsets to be able to do it. And whether that is achievable or not is something that the group does need to discuss.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, Julie. I think in addition, one must recognize volunteer fatigue that took place also with that. And that's one of the problems when a Working Group ends up working for a very, very long time on a single subject. Sala?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you Julie, I think that was the one I was referring to. The second thing is, just referring to what Julie mentioned and then going back to the second question I had, I note that there were perhaps problems with the experts that have been retained in relation to the facilitation of whatever they've been tasked with.

My question, Olivier, is based on what you just shared in terms of whether ICANN is going to go with the ISO or something more open... and I note that in that regard, by my assumption, that the issues then would not be technical but they are more of a political consideration, and the ramifications on ICANN? Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sala. The issue of going with the ISO methodology rather than the NIST methodology is one of which the reason is unknown. At the moment ICANN has not made any decisions. The report has just been published. I gather that there will be some public

comment that will be possible but the issue at stake today is really for the DSSA to choose what it wants to do.

There is not consensus yet of what to do. Of course, the whole group hasn't met yet since the announcement of the report but it really is for the member organizations that chartered the group to also decide. One of the questions was: "Well, let's all go back to our member organizations and find out what the thought is in their part of the world." Sala?

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: It's most likely that this question is unrelated to your presentation but I thought since it's the closest thematic area, that perhaps I should ask it in this session.

On the issue of patenting of the Internet, particularly in the DNS, we are noting that there have been instances where RFCs were created in relation to certain standards. For the life of me I can't remember which RFC, but noting entities like VeriSign, who've attempted to patent it at the US PTO, and I remember raising the questions on the At-Large list.

But the connotations, the eco-system within which that is occurring, would that have some bearing in discussions in the DSSA? Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for that very good question. I do not think that it would have any political bearing to the DSSA as far as ICANN is concerned. However it would prevent the communities of ICANN from

using the same methodology in their part of ICANN. The methodology is something that might be used for other things than just the DNS or just ICANN as in ICANN the organization or ICANN Staff.

Some SOs and ACs might wish to use it internally. At that point they would need to bear an additional cost because of the licensing that would be needed. The aim of the DSSA, which was initially not quite certain but as time went on, the methodology that the DSSA but together was one that was open enough that it could actually be used across all of ICANN and across the different SOs and ACs, if they wanted to.

If the ccNSO wanted to do this on the ccs specifically or the gNSO on the gs, etc., etc. And that's one which might not be possible. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Olivier. I'm not going to be at this meeting on Thursday and I'm rather saddened by the fact that I'm not going to be at the meeting because I'd have liked to have made my usual jumping up and down and grumbling noises because this is one of those "how very unhappy I am" points in time. So much of this was unnecessary.

We had opportunity when we took out hiatus. If the ICANN Board had been clear and unequivocal about what the expectations were of their consultants, how their work would or would not have fitted with our own, we would be in a very different situation than we are now.

And that goes back to what Olivier may have suggested, which was volunteer fatigue. But I would refer to it as being right royally pissed-off. Because I can spell that if that would be easier for all the languages?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I noticed that one of the interpreters passed that over to a colleague.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [laughs] It's a very shabby thing that we find ourselves having to deal with now because we've had some extraordinary talent offer and an amazing amount of their time. And by amazing I am talking weekly meetings and for those in the leadership team, twice-weekly meetings. Very few of which were less than 90 minutes in length.

The man hours spent on this from some of the most amazing minds in security and stability and with so much business acumen, I think this is bordering on a crying shame. So if any of you feel you want to channel me at the meeting, feel free. I've given you some appropriately colorful language to use.

And basically I am not amused and I think we need to look at what this says systemically for what I thought was from the moment of its first concept through the chartering of its own rules and its – certainly up until Prague – conduct, productivity and outcomes, was going to be a shining example of what a really good cross-community Working Group could be. And at that point I should say thank you ICANN Board for ***** that up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl and this closes the DSSA session. And I now hand the floor back to Evan Leibovitch. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. Boy, we've been able to finish off by challenging our interpreters in a number of ways. As we close off I have a couple of thank yous; first of which is to the interpreters. They've been with us, they've been doing a bang-good job. They have been translating our profanities and our frustrations and everything else. [applause]

I want to thank the 11 people from four continents that managed to stick through being with us on the Adobe Connect room. You've got an awful lot more perseverance than I probably would so thank you. [applause]

And I also want to thank our five Staff; Sylvia, Carlos, Heidi, Matt and Gisella, wherever you are virtually. Hello from us. [applause] And also the AV guys for making this all worthwhile. [applause] It is Sunday night, we are four minutes over time. Thank you and good night.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And bravo Evan for sticking to the time. Well done.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]