
PRAGUE – ALAC & Regional Leadership Working Session

Sunday, June 24, 2012 – 09:00 to 18:00

ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Hello, hello – one, two. Good morning, everybody. We're going to start in a couple of minutes. We're still setting up a few more things and then we'll be on our way. For those people listening to us remotely, welcome. Just a few more minutes.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well good morning, everybody, and welcome to this long ICANN week here in Prague. I hope you've all had some good traveling over to here; I know a few of you have had some problems getting here but at least we are here for the time being. A few more people are still on their way to try and reach us.

We have a room that has a few constraints as you will notice with a few walls that block part of the room. I've had all the doors actually unlocked so you are able to go from one part of the room to another if you need to. Instead of having to squeeze through you can come in and out via the doors outside and you won't be locked out. So that's one thing that actually works. We are an open place so we have to make sure our doors are unlocked and always ready to accept more people into At-Large.

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.

A few housekeeping items: the first one is the fact that we have a full week with a number of important events and activities taking place. Today we have a full day as per usual. Then tomorrow we'll have... [echoing] Perhaps that's the first housekeeping item I should ask for, to turn off, yeah, mute your computers. It's nice to hear ourselves on the echo and finding out what we sound like from a tiny, little one-inch speaker, but it sometimes is a little bit irritating; the other one being the Skypeing that sometimes takes place. So the recording is filled with some "bloop, bloop, bloop" which doesn't quite help.

So now that we're all muted that's fine. So the week's activities are quite bus. We actually have tomorrow the ten years of ALAC – the ten years event taking place in the afternoon, it's going to be really exciting. On Tuesday I believe we're meeting both with the Board and also with the GAC – first with the Board very early on in the morning, or early-ish; and then half an hour later with the GAC. And there are many, many issues that we're going to bring over to the Board and the GAC.

We have Heidi giving me the full list of this. Well, that's something I was going to touch on afterwards... Stating the names, of course – I think we all know the standard housekeeping note which is when we all speak we have to introduce ourselves before speaking, so state your name even if you've just spoken. That's of course because we both have people listening to us remotely but we also have people on the language channels, and therefore it's difficult sometimes to follow when the same person interprets both people. So we know about that; that's one thing which we might need to remind each other of from time to time.

The other thing that I'd like to ask is there's a Gala evening that is taking place on the Wednesday night. I know that some of you have come with your partners. Gisella is dealing with the tickets so we need to find out how many of you would like to bring your partners along. If you could please let Gisella know so she can add more tickets?

I think I've gone through the main list of what we have here. Anything else that I might have forgotten, Heidi? Nope? Okay, so the first thing we're going to do to start is just to go through a quick intro around the table to remind ourselves what our names are – sometimes remind our own selves what our names are – and what are affiliations are. And I think we'll start with the person really far away, yes, Eduardo?

Eduardo Diaz: I am Eduardo Diaz from Puerto Rico.

Wolf Ludwig: Wolf Ludwig, Europe.

Sandra Hoferichter: Sandra Hoferichter, EURALO.

Sylvia Herlein Leite: Sylvia Herlein, LACRALO Secretariat.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Sergio Salinas Porto, ALAC member, LACRALO.

Male: (Inaudible).

Darlene Thompson: Darlene Thompson, Secretariat, North American RALO.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro, APRALO.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Trinidad & Tobago.

Carlton Samuels: Carlton Samuels, ALAC member, Caribbean Jamaica.

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche, APRALO.

Evan Leibovitch: Evan Leibovitch, NARALO elected rep to ALAC.

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

Heidi Ullrich: Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

Silvia Vivanco: Silvia Vivanco, ICANN staff.

Gisella Gruber: Gisella Gruber, ICANN staff.

Matt Ashtiani: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

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

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ALAC member from Asia-Pacific.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung, ALAC member, APRALO.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Fatimata Seye Sylla, AFRALO from Senegal.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record [laughter] from APRALO, because it is now my name after this many years. I'm having my business cards printed up that say "Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record." Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC representative or should I say Liaison to the ccNSO.

Hong Xue: Hong Xue, APRALO.

Aziz Hilali: Aziz Hilali, Secretariat of AFRALO.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Europe from France.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi Atohoun, AFRALO, ALAC.

Oksana Prykhodko: Oksana Prykhodko, EURALO Secretariat, Ukraine.

Ron Sherwood: Good morning – Ron Sherwood, ccNSO Liaison to ALAC.

Female: (Inaudible), AFRALO.

Avri Doria: Avri Doria, hiding – EURALO and NARALO. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I just have a question for Avri: is that your full name? Avri Doria Hiding? [laughter] Perfect. Okay, now just one last bit of housekeeping is to of course speak loudly into the mic and also take care of not speaking too fast, because our interpreters of course are working and unfortunately they're quite far away from us, totally behind. If you see

them waving frantically or knocking on the door or about to shoot me from behind please, please, please let me know so I can duck; or you might slow down.

And well I think we can start the day's work. I just wanted to ask also if we have anybody who is on the remote that might not have been accounted for so far? I see on the bridge Gordon Chillcott. I see Fatimata – she's in the room, yes, some of us are in the room as well. I see Hong is in the room as well. Fatima Cambronero, yes. Okay, I've just heard the feedback, and I think we haven't missed anyone here. Well anyway, welcome to those people listening to us on the bridge who might not appear in the Adobe Connect room.

And I think we can start with our day's work, and the first thing we're going to do is to have some feedback and some updates on the At-Large Working Groups and find out what we are going to do next afterwards. And the opening working group is the At-Large Improvements Taskforce. As you all know, this is a very long process which has taken place and it appears that it has reached a final countdown or a final straight line? I'll pass the floor on to Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Ladies and gentlemen, with the efficiencies that I trust the Chairman might support me, and as I have the next two speaking slots I might compress those into one and make it as short as possible with the intention of getting us back on schedule. So if at all possible I'm going to take these two interrelated reports and have them compressed into one.

And as much as I like hearing myself in quadruple there is an issue with the feedback, especially through the earphones... Thank you very much. So I do apologize to anyone on the audio bridge.

Ladies and gentlemen, where to begin? Four score and twenty years ago – no, it was only in fact 2007, '08 and '09 that the ALAC was reviewed. Its purpose was reviewed in the same manner as all parts of ICANN have now been reviewed. The component parts of the organization have been looked at by external bodies and up until recently then those external review processes have gone through an internal management process which in the most recent times has been managed by what was at one stage a Board Governance Committee and is now a Structural Improvements Committee which is a part of the ICANN Board. So it is Board members working in a subcommittee.

In the days when the ALAC and by definition At-Large was reviewed, and with the report that was adopted in June, 2009, by the ICANN Board we also had what was an appointed group of people by the Board – some of whom I am delighted to recognize still sit on this table in a different guise and are now members of the ALAC. But it was a broad community interest group that included Board members, previous individuals who had experience in ALAC and At-Large and other ICANN stakeholders; and they took what was some, if memory serves, 26 or 27 recommendations from what was called the Westlake Report and resulted in 13 recommendations which were implementables for ALAC to improve by.

Our purpose was reassured. We had 13 particular issues which we needed to address, and with the exception of the first which was the

recommendation by the ALAC Review Committee, the Board committee reporting to then the Board Governance Committee was to have two dual voting seats on the ICANN Board. That recommendation was altered and then ended up in the June Sydney meeting by resolution being one which was of course our Seat #15. So we've had a Review Process which has been transparent and I believe quite accountable. We were then given a bunch of recommendations – 13 recommendations all of which needed to be implemented.

The process as is I think the very good system that the At-Large community and ALAC in particular took was to then have an implementation program discussed and recommendations on how we make those 13 things happen by our communities. We had work teams – Work Teams A, B, C and D – who carved up the work plan of all the subset implementables and then put actions, specific actions to ensure each and every one of those things we were mandated to do were done. That's your background.

In the Senegal meeting it was seen that with a deadline of this meeting – the mid-summer or mid-solstice or the solstice meeting, the June meeting in 2012 – we needed to have finalized all of our implementation. We needed to have in the hands of the Board's Structural Improvements Committee a report, having done updates and reports throughout the whole program. And in your folder, and I expect you to all take it as bedtime reading, a mantra to sing to yourself in quiet moments because I will do pop quizzes later – you have a mere four pages of "We've done it." And I would like to take a moment to recognize what is fairly heroic work by the regionally balanced

representative grouping that is the Implementation Taskforce and Team.

Many of you are sitting around this table but those of you who are not, those of you who are only going to perhaps be listening to this in record or archive or reading in your own local language later need to recognize the amazing work – how much you all did in an extraordinarily short period of time. This is one for the books: a huge amount of implementation actually done. And that was actually over some – I think we had something like weekly meetings from February this year and meeting at least twice a month from October. So it was a huge, huge man hour commitment but it worked, it paid off.

I draw your attention to the pretty diagram on the top of Page 3, and Matt's going to make the magic happen of zipping down to Page 3. Those of you who are fans of these reports and updates will have seen previously some interesting colors coming along. It's all purple because it's all done. That is huge. Yay team yet again! I would like to address that whilst the Addressing Support Organization was able to do all the implementation and final reporting from their recommendations, their recommendations were nowhere near as numerous, nowhere near as deep and nowhere near as affective – not "effective," affective – on the community as these ones were.

We have done a great job in a very short period of time. However, there are a number of footnotes underneath. And interestingly enough, and I don't know whether other people in the remote are finding this but my Adobe Connect room hasn't updated as equally to the screen. So ladies and gentlemen, if you're on the remote Adobe Connect room...

Ah thank you, it seems to have done so now. It's exciting to see all purple, but there is ongoing responsibility and allocations of where that responsibility is; and I draw your attention to the detailed footnotes that go below that panel of purple.

A great deal of what is also required in terms of our own accountability and indeed our metrics has been cleaved off to what is a sub-team or a subcommittee of the ALAC Improvements Implementation Taskforce whose work is done, and that will now take me to what would be the report on the second subcommittee unless you do want to take questions, Mr. Chairman, please.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. It's Olivier for the transcript. I must be your cousin I guess, being "for the transcript" as well. Just one thing: I just wanted to have a round of applause for those people around the table and also who are not with us for all this work that was done.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

As you said it was an incredible amount of work and some people have spent days and nights on that, working really overtime for no pay whatsoever. I always have to remind us – we are volunteers. We just do this because we care, because it's really important. Back to you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and on that note if we're going to be kind and caring to each other, and I do think the Wiki record will show how hard the Team worked. I would also like to put to the public record a heartfelt vote of thanks, which I'm sure Mr. Chairman also joins me in, with how the leadership team meeting with the key staff and those who own the staff support of the community implementation *every single week*. So they've actually done double the work with us.

We could not have done it without that support, and I know the community would have appreciated your vote of applause but I'd like to see the formal vote of thanks if you'd be so kind to put it to your ALAC at the appropriate time; but also a "We are nothing without you; you really are the wind between our wings" to our amazing at large staff: Heidi and her team – rare, wonderful, valued and certainly have our undying appreciation. Bravo.

[Applause]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

So just when you thought it was safe to think it was over, one of the big lumps of work passed on was to look then at the Rules of Procedure which the ALAC and indeed the layers, which ALAC interact with – the regions and indeed the ALSes – operate under. It's time for this to be looked at. It's certainly time, before we move to the next review – and the next Review of ALAC is going to start somewhere between 12 and 15 months from this date here today. And the focus will be on the purpose and continuing purpose of the regions. We have got the

continuing purpose of the ALAC – “tick,” done. Now, this next round will be looking at the purpose and possible continuation, modification or recommendations of improvement for this middle layer. And by definition I would assume some of the At-Large Structures.

There is a great deal of course of advances to get ahead of this curve... [bleeping and blooping sounds] And I think we’re being invaded by aliens but I’m going to be brave and just continue on whilst the Martians speak to us. That’s okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Cheryl, this is Klingon language from our outreach program. [laughter]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Ah, well I’m happy to go into extraterrestrial and I think At-Large would be out there, we should be out there, but we do need to get the Language Services support for the Klingon to work successfully. [laughter] Okay, I think the Martians have left the building which is a good thing, well, not necessarily perhaps – welcome back.

So we need to get ahead of that curve. We need to be not told at the end of that Review Process that we need to harmonize our rules and regulations. We need to get that done now while we are in control and we have a self-destiny. So we can say “We recognize what needs to be done; this is what we are doing.”

Before that can happen, however, there are some critical issues in the existing ALAC Rules of Procedure. We know it’s faulted; we know it has holes you could drive a truck through. We know it was put together

with a best-effort-at-the-time outcome. We also know that it was based on the full UNGA Assembly Rules – that they are in some cases not particularly applicable to our cases; we have historical artifact-y type things like the Rapporteur. When we first started, and I was at that first meeting in the first group, we had no staff support and we actually needed somebody to hold the role of Rapporteur. But with the advent of a Director of At-Large and the team that came with then the Director of At-Large, we certainly do not need that.

And I have no problem with me in triplicate... I could listen to myself all day but it may be disturbing for the audio bridge. I *do* listen to myself all day. [laughter] There's this thing called "mute," right. There we go, well done.

Now, the Rules then we have modified some 15 times. We are actually up to Version 11 but there were two earlier versions that didn't even get a number, so we have been tweaking them. But the Rules of Procedure Review Committee, which again is a regionally-balanced, edge community-represented group and some vested interest from some ALAC individuals is not committed to just tidying up the existing Rules. Between now and the Toronto meeting we are starting fresh. We are work-shopping a method that says what we have to say and know about, what we could say and know about and what we should say and know about – and we're having a three-layer approach: descriptive stuff, aspirational stuff, expectation stuff; details – which is where some of the metrics and definitions will come in.

And when we talk about metrics there is a sub-team of the Rules of Procedure Work Group who are focused specifically on the measurables

– what we expect our representatives to do, how we are going to “measure” that. But they’re only looking at the metrics; they are not looking at the consequences. The consequences to whatever we are measuring belong back in the Rules of Procedure. So we have a little side group that is working and working very hard, and as we speak putting excellent, excellent proposals together.

It’s all done on a Wiki. You, your aunty, the cleaner and your great-grandmother are welcome to put your comments in there in any language you choose because we will do our best to have them machine translated – it’s not a problem. But it works in English. We do have, as much as we can both French and Spanish done but I don’t care if it comes in in Swahili – we will do our best to try and find out what it says. Watch those spaces, make your comments because by Toronto we’re expecting the ALAC – the 15-person ALAC – to adopt a new set of rules and then live by them.

It’s a very short period of time so it’s important for the regional leaders and the ALSes that you represent in your meetings, in your regional meetings perhaps to ask for a staff or a member report back from these subcommittees so that your edge communities are having their say as we build this because we do not have the luxury of time to do it any other way. This is not an exercise of “We’re going to put out a draft or a straw man.” This is “We are building it as we go.” Every region has two representatives on this committee. They are your voice. Feel free to influence them but you have a direct opportunity as well.

So this is an advertisement as far as I’m concerned. Come one, come all. We’ve built it, you need to come. And by Toronto there will be the

Rules of Procedure for ALAC version 3.0. They're going to be good, they're going to be binding, and they're going to be a whole new foundation for us to build on. And certainly then look at regional harmonization, ALS metrics and a whole lot of other things. That's it for me, Mr. Chairman. I'm open to any questions and I do apologize if I took us a tad over the necessary time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this full account. Certainly a lot of work has taken place a lot of other work still is taking place, so well done. And well done to you, actually, for leading all of this great effort, which you as Queen of Procedure are thriving in. So thanks, Cheryl.

[Applause]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It really is the team that made the difference.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I do know that sometimes these procedural things are dragging on because they are complex. They do tend to be sometimes a little tiresome after a while but I do hope that we continue all working towards improving At-Large and towards improving the RALOs, improving our whole community and improving the way that we bring the end user input into the ICANN processes. ICANN is changing, the internet changes fast as well and of course we have to continue changing at the same rate or even faster.

Okay, we will continue now on our list. The next agenda item is going to be introduced by Avri Doria. Just one more housekeeping note: a photographer is going to be here this morning. I understand they're setting up at the moment. They will take formal pictures of all of us around the table and Gisella will be coordinating along with other At-Large staff to get us whisked over to the photographer, have the picture taken and come on back. For those of you that require a full facial, hair, nails, etc., done I'm afraid we do not have the budget for that so you'll just have to come as you are. [laughter] Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to know if you would entertain questions or remarks after each exposé or not?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think we can actually. I think we have just a couple of minutes if you do have questions. Please go ahead, Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you so much. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Two remarks on what has just been presented: the first is to say that as a member of the Board at the time that the ALAC Review was conducted I can confirm that this is a very substantial amount of work and it has been very well conducted. The title of this song is "Deep Purple,"[laughter] so congratulations to those who changed the color that way.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Are you going to sing it, Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: No, I'll leave that to you or of course to Avri Doria or to Cheryl-for-the-transcript-record. The second thing that I wanted to say is that there is a relationship between this work that has just been achieved and other types of work which are ongoing now – for instance, what we are attempting to do in the R3 document which is looking at a wider view. So I'd say in addition to what Cheryl suggested as perhaps ALAC 3.0 we're already looking at ALAC 4.0 which is the articulation between the ALAC and At-Large and all the rest of ICANN; and also to arrive at a better balance between the powers, the responsibilities of the various components of ALAC. So we should not stop at procedure however important it is and was.

My third remark is to say that I am perfectly cognizant of the purpose of procedure. This is in fact one of the ways in which the ALAC has managed to impose itself. I have seen over the past three, four years especially a huge difference in style and also in the degree of acceptance of the ALAC by other parts of ICANN. So we certainly must continue along that road. But my message to you this morning is yes, certainly let's do that but there's another step ahead which is even more important. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Any other questions or comments from around the table? I see no one putting their hand up. Just on the matter of procedure, yes, you're absolutely correct. I think one of the things that the Board and others have really appreciated is the way in which we conduct our public, our own input for comments in At-Large:

the use of the Wiki, the call for comments, etc. Sometimes we are being pushed to our limit because the public comment periods are too short and we have to get our users, our communities to engage at very, very short notice. This will be eased with time.

But it is important that we try and respect those minimum timings to be able to engage our communities because it's important for them to be able to know what's going on and to be able to voice whatever concerns they have in our processes – the problem being, of course, that sometimes it's nearly impossible for it to happen. So I appreciate that you're all trying your best and we are working to try and have as much time possible to be able to reply in those comment periods and also bring the input. Yaovi?

Yaovi Atohoun:

Thank you, this is Yaovi speaking. I'd like to make a comment regarding what Cheryl said. [The real period on the comments, the opening comment period. That's a short period.]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Yaovi.

Yaovi Atohoun:

I'm going to slow down so that you can all put your headphones on. So in fact the work of the Procedures Group is very special in the way it affects our group. Very often the calls for comments have been launched but sometimes they don't concern ALAC life as such. So I'd like to go back on the period which is very short and which won't work

for the community because we have to represent the community. So it's very important to do it in such a way that the community can participate. So what I would like to say is that in my opinion each region should allow for a supplementary meeting to be organized online every month with a participation of all members so that we can all contribute, so that we can all be linked by this contribution and so that we can all agree on it. So the implication is that the contributions that the members wish to do should be done through a meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Yaovi, for your comments and indeed, I have also heard other regions mention that perhaps they would need to have two monthly calls so as to be able to keep informed about what is going on and discuss those statements online. And that's something which each region is very free to choose. Of course if you want to have three calls a week our staff might not be able to sustain this but certainly twice a month is something that would be able to work I hope. I see Heidi shaking her head; I'm not quite sure whether she's happy or not happy but I heard a sigh as well – “ahhh.” Okay, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Yaovi, you've raised a very important point but what I do need to just make sure is also in the record and for your regional leaders to remind your At-Large Structures and your edge communities: we gave you a four-page report but there's 27 pages of Appendix. And in the 27 pages of Appendix are the flowcharts and diagrams that the Design Team looking at those particular public comments implementation

aspects worked on. You've had the opportunity as an ALAC to look at and endorse in principle in the past, but we really need the regions to make that happen now. You've got the picture. It's paint-by-numbers; follow it.

But that's not the ALAC's business to make that happen. It is a mechanism which will best feed into ALAC in its mandated role as Advisory Committee to the Board, to ALAC as an interactive and equitable party in ICANN stakeholder world – which is where we put things into the public comment periods where they're relevant. But the model did go as far as helping the flowchart show how regions and indeed individual ALSes or individuals can insert or contribute their points of interest, their points of view, their values on each of these things.

But there does need to be the separation there of church and state. ALAC can't make the ALSes do this. ALAC can't state "The RALOs shalt." But if the ALSes or RALOs want to have the best input, greatest advantage, most effective outcomes that flowchart shows you where to do things, how to do things and the best timing for it to be inserted. Sorry to be chapter and verse but we must remember the pages of the report to the SIC are designed for busy people to read a little bit more than an executive summary. The foundation it's built on is extensive, it's valuable, it's in all the languages we are working in but you do need to read it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and we have to move down, well move on because time is ticking. Just one note in response to Yaovi's suggestion:

perhaps the Secretariats could discuss this during their meeting. Certainly one suggestion that was made to me was that the Secretariats would have a monthly call to discuss policy matters and share views across their RALOs.

But anyway, we have to move on now and the next part of our agenda is agenda Item #2C, and that's the At-Large New gTLD Working Group and also the New gTLD Review Group. And so we have Avri Doria who chairs the Working Group to be able to give us an update on that. Avri?

Avri Doria:

Yes, thank you – Avri Doria speaking. Okay, in terms of the group, just to reiterate this group has three items that it's chartered on by you all to work on. The first one is the objection process. Now, the objection process, the actual token for leading that particular work item is Cintra mostly because of my employment with .gay and my consultancy with .ngo, making me a poor person to be very involved with objection processes. One would not want me objecting to things that oppose my clients nor stopping people from objecting to things that I was involved with. So I just wanted to make that point clear upfront.

The objection process has been established; the Review Group has been established. Dev is serving as its Interim Chair and we'll be going through that more later at this meeting. From what I understand, I did not participate but those serving in the Review Group have gone through two bits of training and are all ready to go with the nearly 2000 applications that they need to look at. And so I think that the group is ready to go, and beyond the training that they had they'll be having their first group meeting at this meeting.

On the second item, the Applicant Support Program, obviously I think all of you know what pathetic results we've had in the Applicant Support Program. I think one of the things we're going to need to look at at this meeting is to talk to the staff members about them sort of streamlining the SARP process. We had talked about multiple committees and multiple CMRs and lots of complexity to handle the hundreds of applications we were hoping to see. With three applications I think this group can sort of come up with a streamlined way to handle it.

So those two are basically one is rolling and one is pretty much over, and actually feeds into the third one of the items which is probably the major item going forward and it looks like it's going to be a busy one, which is the New gTLD rollout and issues, comments, worries, fears, what have you that deal particularly with the rollout. We started to collect issues that the group will need to talk about. Part of the way that I'm trying to get that organized is that each one of these issues that is important enough will find someone to hold the token for organizing that issue and taking it forward, whether it's just a discussion or it becomes a comment paper, or it becomes a recommendation to ALAC to try and do something; or it's just comments leading into the review of the New gTLD Process for the next round, assuming that there is a next round.

So pretty much the last thing I wanted to say is that we do have two meetings in Prague. One of them is of the At-Large New gTLD Working Group going into each of these things in more detail; and then there's a Joint At-Large New gTLD Working Group and the At-Large New gTLD Review Group – and really it's mostly an At-Large New gTLD Review Group meeting but the Working Group is going to sort of kick it off and

get it going. So that's my report at the moment. I want to thank the people in the group that did so much work to get the objection process up, running and ready to do its thing. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Avri.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Certainly an incredible amount of work done again in a very short span of time. Certainly a few months ago I and many others were concerned about the task at hand. This is the first time that At-Large has actually been provided with the ability to do an operational task, and so we had the light shining on us and saying "Can you do it? Can you do it in time?" and it was done in time. So that's really, really great news.

One thing that has happened whilst the Review Group was created is that the reveal day of the new list of gTLDs was provided. The list was absolutely huge, and the first concern of the Review Group members – and I see Dev shaking his head at the moment. The first thing was "Oh my goodness, how are we going to go through all of that and how much work is this really all about?" And I gather we're not going to submit objections on all of the... [laughter] Well, I hope but we could of course. I have had someone suggest to me that if we actually objected to enough of them there wouldn't be any batching problems anymore but we would require probably more resources to be able to do that.

We might be hated by some but loved by a lot of others, and certainly loved by those people behind the digital archery and etc., etc.

Anyway, however there is one thing, and coming back to being serious: what I do ask both Dev and Avri to do in the early days of this Review Group is to find out how much workload there is likely to be – if there's a lot of comments, if a lot of objections are being received. At the moment no staff member is devoted to running the Wiki and all of the legwork that is involved with getting the tools to work. If we do see a high workload then please advise me and at that point we could look into having Operational staff being able to help and certainly lightening the load on the volunteers that are working on that.

Any questions or comments by anyone else? Yaovi?

Yaovi Atohoun:

Regarding the objection, for me it's like during this week there is a need of – Yaovi speaking – a lot of information to the public, as during this process there was a lot of outreach information but at the end we didn't get the result we were expecting. So this group is in place now and we are talking about the objections, and my comment is maybe you need to talk again every day, every hour about this objection process so that people are more aware and can really have the group work.

My question is regarding the SARP: only three applications are requiring support, and the initial budget was to cover about 14 people. My first question is when is this panel going to be installing members or not? And regarding the rest of the amounts, what is the plan for the amounts as you have only three applications? Thank you.

Avri Doria:

Thank you. I think those are really good questions that will carry through to the meeting. We've asked for Kurt and others to be at the meeting so at the moment all I can say is really good questions, I haven't the faintest idea. I think that the SARP, or the streamlined version will be culled together rather soon. In terms of what happens to the \$2 million and what happens with the money from auctions and everything going forward, and how we plan to have big enough budgets perhaps for the future or some other imperative means of trying to succeed at what we failed at – those are all open discussions that I think the group... For example, as I said that the failure of the Applicant Support problem now becomes one of the rollout of new gTLD issues, and as far as I'm concerned that's a very open subject.

I think it's a problem for ICANN that they failed at this and perhaps we should come up with a recommendation of how they should fix this in the nearer future than five to ten years hence. So I think that it's a really good open discussion but at the moment I don't know the answers, but I'll make sure they're on the agenda for the meetings. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Avri, and since we are running out of time we'll have to move on to the next part of our agenda. But I'd like to have a round of applause for Avri, because Avri, you have come from other parts of ICANN to join us and to help us here with the New gTLD Program and with Chairing the New gTLD Working Group and we really do appreciate it, so thanks.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, next is the At-Large Future Challenges Working Group and I have here Evan Leibovitch and Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I'm not sure who will... Is it Jean-Jacques, or is it maybe Evan? Evan, do you think maybe Jean-Jacques will speak it?? [laughter] Going once, going twice, take your microphones... Oh, Jean-Jacques winning by a hair. [laughter]

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Just to say, Evan, do you want to do that? I had understood that you were starting and I would follow up but never mind. A few comments: thank you for giving us this opportunity to Evan and I to say a few words about where we now stand.

The whole point of us bringing this up here this morning is actually to call upon you for further efforts to carry this forward because we've only achieved Step One. This R3 paper has two main aspects – I'd like to concentrate on the first one, content, and the second one is working with others. So first on content: it's unusual, and I've had comments from members of the community saying "This is unusual" because it's a very long-term view. Long term doesn't mean that we neglect short-term necessities, procedure, etc. It's simply that the timeline is voluntarily extended beyond what we usually do.

It concentrates on the global public interests because we have felt that this was a term which although it's supposed to be underlying all the

work that we do in the At-Large and ALAC, actually it's quite difficult to get consensus on this in the ICANN community. People are asking all the time for a precise and limited definition of what the global public interest is. But it's also unusual in that we take the pains to look at what is the multi-stakeholder model, not to put the question is it valid or not – we think it is – but rather to say “Why is it not working as well as it should?” because we think it is a valid model. So how can we make it more efficient and sustainable?

I'd also like to underline that perhaps this is one of the first ALAC-wide or At-Large-wide documents which is presented almost simultaneously in all the UN languages. And finally, as far as content is concerned, the reactions we get is that this is a bold document. It can be improved, it must be improved, but even as it stands today it contains suggestions and it reviews the internal balance within ICANN on such important things which are hardly ever touched upon, such as the balance of power between the ACs, the SOs, the Board, the staff, etc. That was on content, a few remarks.

Now, a few other remarks on where do we go from here, how do we go from here and how do we work with others. The first remark is that Evan and I, when we launched this we considered it would be very timely to be able to present it in Prague. Why Prague? Well, among other things because it's a new ICANN which we're looking at in the coming months – a new CEO has just been nominated and will assume his position on the 1st of October. But also it's a new ICANN because whereas in the past we were really a not-for-profit organization suddenly the New gTLD Program brings to the organization something

like \$35 million so there are questions of the proper use of that. So we're looking at a new ICANN.

Communication on the R3 was done in a very personal basis because we don't have all the tools necessary, but even then so far it has been rather good. For instance, it was put online on [Circle ID] and on other sites and on Circle ID alone, I looked this morning and there were about 1000 clicks. And also most of the co-authors in this sent out personal notes to people and it looks like we touched about 50 or 60 influential people in the internet community. Now engaging others, this is the whole point of Evan and I bringing this up to you now because we think that this is the point where your suggestions will really help us improve the R3 paper, but also understand what is the way forward.

And finally, I'd like to say thank you to the co-authors and contributors: Evan Leibovitch first, because the R3 paper was really his idea to begin with. He wanted a brave, innovative, thorough view on what we should be doing; also Yrjö Lämspuro who's not here today, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Carlton Samuels, Avri Doria. So I do hope that now we will have a few minutes to discuss, oh yes, and myself – and we will have a few minutes to discuss what you think should be the way forward now that this first step or this first effort has been done. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. And Evan, do you wish to add a few more words?

Evan Leibovitch:

Thanks, Olivier, this is Evan. Essentially just to add a little bit to what Jean-Jacques is saying, and in fact to bring things around with some of the comments earlier about ALAC Improvements – one of the things that we’re trying to do with this, and indeed with the Future Challenges Working Group, is to have a higher-level view of things. So in fact, rather than just talking about ALAC Improvements and GNSO Reviews and individual things – sorry, I’m not usually accused of talking too lightly – but rather the idea is actually taking a look at an ICANN 2.0 as opposed to simply thinking about revisions of individual pieces.

We’re trying to see about invigorating ICANN in view of all the threats that we see happening to the multi-stakeholder model. So what we’re trying to do is to offer a secondary path to those who see that the status quo is insufficient but that some of the externally-designed replacements are no better. And so this is our attempt to try and deal with this.

At another level, in talking about the Future Challenges Working Group in general, the R3 paper is not the only thing that we’re working on. The group has also been very, very active in trying to address issues that have dovetailed into some of the registrant rights matters; and we’ve strived to do things like bring the research of Garth Bruen to the forefront in our dealings with ICANN staff and to try to hold it accountable in trying to deal with the question of if ICANN has a hard time dealing with issues about the existing TLDs how well is it going to cope when that number expands by a huge level?

So those have been the two main focuses of the Future Challenges Group. Essentially our goal is to try and augment the existing work of

ALAC by taking a higher-level view and trying to come up with ideas where we are helping to drive the agenda rather than merely reacting to public comments of other constituencies. This is going to be an interesting time where the rest of the community gets to react to something we're doing instead of vice versa. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Evan, and just to add onto what has been said: the R3 paper is indeed just a white paper. I gather it's the start of a longer process with perhaps more detail. One of the questions that was immediately asked to me by someone I saw yesterday was "Oh, do you think that the Board has to act on this tomorrow?" And I said "No, this is not how we work on this really." We are looking far in the distance and we also have to be aware of the environment in ICANN that is changing. A new CEO is going to start functioning in October, so perhaps you and your Working Group will have to think of various strategies towards achieving maximum impact but not maximum impact as in flash-in-the-pan maximum impact and then everyone forgets about it; but long-term maximum impact, and your strategy to drive this through in a sure way but a firm way in order for the community to be able to follow on and comment on this.

Just to add there is a comment period that will start on the R3 paper after the end of the Prague meeting. The reason for it to be started afterwards was primarily because we had so many other things and staff had so many other things on their plate. But I hope that the Working Group will choose a long comment period. As we know, during the summer some parts of the world take extended holidays, my part of the

world being one of the culprits. So you'll have to work out a time for everyone not only in At-Large, and I guess At-Large has already been looking at it but certainly the rest of the world. I know the Circle ID post has brought in a lot of readership but certainly the ICANN formal public comments process and of course think about what you're going to do afterwards.

Any questions or comments on this? And if there aren't we then now have IDNs, the At-Large IDN Working Group with Edmon Chung providing us with an update. Edmon?

Edmon Chung:

Thank you, Olivier – Edmon Chung here. So there have been a number of developments for the IDNs, not something new but just I guess an update on the VIP, the Variant Issues Project; the JIG, the Joint IDN Group; and I guess I wanted to cover a little bit on what Avri mentioned as well – the gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs situation right now.

So in terms of the VIP, after much work – and thank you, Rinalia, who just I guess went for a photo shoot – we put forward a very strong comment and we were quite successful in having the VIP re-prioritized, their project; and also to Tijani's concern about the budget, they've also reduced the budget from about \$3 million to \$1.5 million over the next couple years. And we're driving towards at least say a fighting chance for implementation work in Q2 2013. So I see a pretty good movement and progress there.

There is now a call for volunteers for the next phase of work, driving towards the middle of next year into implementation, so I'd encourage

everybody to take a look at the call for volunteers right now. I'll send it around to the list as well, send the link as well, and they're looking I guess for volunteers with linguistic backgrounds or with policy backgrounds – basically I think most from At-Large. It would be good to have more people from At-Large participate in the next phase of work. So that's an update from the VIP. There is going to be a session during this ICANN week on Wednesday, 11:00 am to 12:00 noon in Congress III.

And update from the JIG, that's the Joint IDN Group, mainly looking currently at the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs; and also coordination work with the VIP. In terms of the universal acceptance, the group is moving forward to start working on the final report which will focus more on the issues with policy implications for the GNSO and ccNSO considerations. And having I guess somewhat successfully raised awareness of the staff part, I think a good portion of the continuing work will be directed to the staff team that is being formed right now. So that's also the JIG meeting is going to be Monday, 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm.

In terms of the IDN ccPDP, that's the PDP at the ccNSO for the long term – not the Fast Track but I guess the long track for IDN ccTLDs. It's been a quiet working group. I haven't been receiving emails since I guess Costa Rica. Either myself has been removed from the mailing list or something [laughter] but it has been pretty quiet. But we do have a meeting Thursday morning, 9:00 am here so there's not much update there but there will be a meeting and there will be slowly, glacially we'll move forward with IDN ccTLDs I guess.

So I wanted to spend a little bit of time just updating everyone on I guess a quick comparison of the IDN gTLD situation and the IDN ccTLD situation after at least the submissions of the applications for new gTLDs. From the applications we see 116 IDN applications which are representing nine languages or scripts. I'm not very good with the Arabic or Cyrillic and they don't distinguish between which language, so there's Arabic, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Hebrew, Latin and Thai; 14 of which, out of the 116, are in conflict. So they have more than one application and representing seven TLDs, and they're all in Chinese. Basically out of the 100 gTLDs applied for in different languages and scripts only 7 from the Chinese TLDs are in conflict or there are multiple applicants for.

So in total that represents 109 TLDs that could eventually get into the root. That is compared to the current ccTLD Fast Track which has 31 IDN ccTLDs being already delegated, and that represents 21 countries and territories because there are multiple IDN ccTLDs for certain countries and territories as well. And that's compared to 23 languages over 15 scripts for the IDN ccTLD side.

Another couple of interesting statistics, I guess: out of the IDN gTLDs applied for, seven are indicated as community applications, none of which sought financial support except an interesting note from I guess our own Siva – there's a .idn which is seeking financial support. Out of those identified as IDN TLDs that are community, three out of seven are actually coming from the Vatican for "catholic" in Arabic, Cyrillic and Chinese. And a final statistic: seven out of the 116 indicated themselves as geographic TLDs representing Abu Dhabi, Moscow and five other Chinese ones.

So I think if you find the statistics interesting there's a... And in terms of the comparison, there's two important statistics I guess. One is that it's looking like there will be much more IDN gTLDs than IDN ccTLDs going forward – that's the similar case for the non-IDN situation, but the percentage of IDN TLDs is still extremely low compared so the ASCII world. I guess that's one type of measure of how the New gTLD Program is moving forward.

So there is a plan for the next new gTLD round, a session here that I think is relevant – that's Monday at 5:30. And that's sort of the update. And finally we will have our own IDN Working Group meeting this Monday between 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm back in this room. So thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Edmon, and any questions or comments? Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks, Olivier, this is Evan. Edmon, given the fact that there's so many new gTLD applications and given the fact that At-Large has expressed the concern that IDNs are a very high priority, is there any value in your opinion to ALAC taking a position that as ICANN gets involved in its batching and prioritization activities that we try and make an explicit effort to ask that IDNs be moved to the front of the queue?

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Evan – this is Edmon speaking again. Because I'm slightly conflicted I wish... I'll state first that I helped a number of IDN TLD

applicants, but I personally think if you take my suggestion with that statement of interest I do believe that ICANN should prioritize IDN TLDs.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Edmon. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Well, let me fill in for Edmon because I'm not conflicted in any way and I just want to support that idea. And coming from Evan's question I think yes, because we purport to represent the general user worldwide so it's quite usual that we do this and we mark it as a priority. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Just I guess with one caveat of course: because of the IDN Variants work that is taking place, perhaps non-variant IDNs. But we have Sandra and then Cheryl. Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter: Just one question or one clarification: the batching process has been suspended so there is no need to drop...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Suspended means it will come back in effect at some point in one way or another.

Sandra Hoferichter: Okay, but then we have to look at what are the conditions, right?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well we'll find out when it comes back up in another-

Sandra Hoferichter: No, I'm referring to what Evan just mentioned, to put them forward. I mean we will have different conditions that we've had up until now because, or am I wrong?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks, this is Evan. What you're saying makes all the sense in the world, but if ICANN is saying it's not using digital archery there's still with this many applications has to be some way of doing batching or prioritization. So I'm simply suggesting maybe there's an opportunity for At-Large to say that while ICANN is reconsidering how to do its prioritization that this becomes a factor that perhaps was not there when they considered digital archery.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Next is Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I think what I'm hearing now, and again I'm in no way conflicted other than having been a card-carrying supporter from even the [mink]

list in the wonderful world of IDNs. So I've spent the best part of a decade arguing these kinds of cases as has Hong and others at this table. But certainly I wouldn't see myself as conflicted because I don't even speak English. I do speak Australian but as yet we're not a script that's been identified. I am so tempted to interspace a couple of colorful adjectives at this moment to put it on the transcript record but I will not. [laughter] Self-control is being exercised – that is for the record.

It's absolutely in keeping for us to perhaps encourage the ALAC to make a statement, a piece of advice to the Board on this particular topic. Sandra, it's the sort of thing that keeps me up at night, worrying what will happen with this bizarre batching business. I think what we need to do is look at there is contested and uncontested, and if it is an uncontested string then if it is community-based or geographic-based or IDN, it's in the vested interest of our community view to get those as soon as is possible into the root.

However, with your note on variants, Mr. Chairman, there might be some even variants issues which are not as technically challenging as others. So I would suggest caution on taking that statement as she is writ to the record, alright? Once approval is given, the technical box has been ticked and ICANN has said in whatever system, batching or bunch them all together and then drip feed them out – I prefer the latter but that's another story – would be it's ready to go into the root. Then there's a whole bunch of stuff where oops-es may happen. There may be a piece of "Oops, we'd like to go live by July 1st but we can't because we've got some lookup table issues," or whatever, and that's okay.

What we want to do is make sure there's no artificial first mover advantage given. This has to be equitable. This has to be a level playing field. We have enough competition between the cc space, Fast Track and now ordinary IDNs, and the g space. In my Utopia I'd like to think that what in the future we're looking at is not g's and c's at all, but a whole different other set of classifications including multi-lingual, multi-script ones. So just temper using variants as a stop.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this. In fact, this afternoon we have two sessions that will relate, well one a little bit more than the other, but the first one is the Universal Acceptance of all TLDs, the second one being the IDN Variant Program update. And perhaps some of the discussions on this might be taken to this afternoon.

We are running out of time for this morning; we're outrageously late as usual, but then it's good to foster good debate and good discussion. We'll move now to the next part which is the At-Large Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Working Group. I first just wanted to thank Rinalia very much for having picked up the ball on a couple of occasions and drafted some pretty damn good statements, so...

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I guess you and Edmon are working very well on this issue, and leading the group well so I think it's a good thing moving forward. Okay, Beau, you are now having the floor, so go ahead, Beau.

Beau Brendler: Thank you, Olivier – it's Beau Brendler, Chairman of this Working Group and Chairman of NARALO. I have a cold so if you can just bear with my croaking here; I'm not attempting to do Tuvan throat singing or anything.

So this type of discussion has been going on, and when I say "this type" I mean a discussion about registrant rights and the RAA, and all of that sort of thing have been going on for quite some time. And it occurred to us in the group as things were kind of happening over the last month or so that there were some opportunities to address the specific issue of.... When we say "registrant rights and responsibilities" I think in a sense we're also talking about the relationship between ICANN and registrars, because if there's not a clear understanding of how ICANN works with or regulates, or oversees or whatever term you want to use the contracts that it has with registrars, it doesn't do a heck of a lot of good to talk about registrant rights and responsibilities before you have certain aspects of the structure in place.

So actually thank you for putting up that document. I also sent this document that I'm working from to all of you in the ALAC internal list. I won't go into it in too much detail because a large portion of it has a lot of very technical information, but I did want to go through some items on the meeting agenda. We do have a meeting here in Prague on Tuesday on this topic, and we would be very happy to have as many of

you join us as possible because there are some interesting kind of moving targets happening within this meeting right now that could be very interesting to participation. So that's from 5:00 to 6:00 on Tuesday in this room here.

So if you look at the meeting agenda, the first thing is we're expecting a report from, we have a few lawyers in the group and we're going to go through the May 10th, 2002 Registrar Advisory concerning WHOIS data accuracy, WHOIS of course being a very substantial issue involving both registrars' and registrants' responsibilities. It's a ten-year-old document and it's still being used to make decisions about WHOIS and so there's a real need to work on that. Then along with that particular document we're going to make some decisions about a proposed rewrite of Item 3.7.8 on the RAA because that contains sort of the key legal loophole about WHOIS data accuracy and in a sense makes contracts unenforceable on that.

Number 3, collaborate with the WHOIS Review Team – I think you're going to hear from them just a little bit later on a statement that could possibly be endorsed by At-Large that ICANN move the Contractual Compliance Department out from ICANN Legal. There has been some discussion about whether Contractual Compliance has been able to be effective in its current corporate structure. That's something of a moving target and there's some discussion on just how to go about doing that or not happening now.

Number 4, collaborate with the WHOIS folks and other interested participants on a statement that could be endorsed by ALAC to appoint an investigative panel to review the structure of the Compliance

Department. There's a very interesting document that Garth Bruen uncovered about the Compliance Department's flowchart for how it operates. And you're all familiar with flowcharts – this particular flowchart doesn't have a flow towards anything related to compliance. So it's quite a fun document to look at, and since we started discussing it ICANN has removed it from its site which is interesting.

Number 5, collaborate with the WHOIS Review Team on a statement that possibly could be endorsed by ALAC to appoint a liaison to the RAA contractual negotiations process from either this working group or the WHOIS Working Group. Since Costa Rica there has been a range of negotiations and discussions on the RAA which has made it very difficult to be in this working group because those discussions are closed to anyone outside the ICANN registrar community. So we need to have that come to an end so we're going to push for that.

And then Number 6, a review of the current updates and additions to the RAA itself so we can move forward from here on creating a detailed list of rights and responsibilities that are more substantial than the ones that have lived on for the past few months. And Number 7, that's really not all that interesting in light of what we're talking about this morning, and if you want to read further background that sort of unpacks and discusses and substantiates those agenda meeting items then it's all there. Okay, so we look forward to hopefully seeing as many of you as can make it to this meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Beau, for this update. Do we have any questions from around the table? Holly? If you could say your full name, please.

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche for the transcript record. Beau, those documents, are you including in those documents... I think there's an accuracy specification thing which really does bring forward some of the issues about WHOIS and starts to define... Is that in the list that's going to be looked at?

Carlton Samuels: He didn't note it up there but that is part of the documentation set that [we've made for it].

Beau Brendler: Yeah, this is Beau. Yeah, there's also a Wiki page that's been kept up for quite some time that has a lot of the supporting documentation.

Holly Raiche: Yep, okay – happy.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Next is Salanieta.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Hi, Beau – Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the record. I just have a question: has there been any discussion from the RALO point of view in terms of Compliance matters? For instance, countries' governments are

sort of hemorrhaging cyber security and most of them sort of have national strategies and that sort of thing, and has that had an impact on jurisdictions in terms of the accuracy of WHOIS data records from a jurisdictional point of view, a transitory phase? Or is there a tendency to sort of incline towards letting it sort of be restricted or confined between the registrar/registrant obligations and ICANN, let's say, given the fact that ICANN clearly is not intending to enforce WHOIS data accuracy records? And just in terms also of considerations from a registrar point of view, in terms of transition requests in terms of compliance; and any form of standardization or sort of a time in relation to transitioning to maintaining accuracy, that sort of thing?

Beau Brendler:

Ah, thank you, Sala, this is Beau. Hello back. We have not really discussed the impact of RALOs as you put it in the RAA group. Carlton may have, I don't know because those issues of regional jurisdiction may have come up in the WHOIS Working Group. As far as registrar provisions to be able to make changes, I can't really say that that's come up too much. I will say that we do have at least one registrar as part of our working group, so one of his functions fortunately has been to lend some concrete perspective when necessary. So I hope that answers your question; if not, let me know.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Beau, and we are going to have to move forward to the next agenda item, but I do actually have to ask for a round of applause for the amount of work that in fact Garth has done, and of course you and others.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So since the coffee break has started I guess the next two sessions, or the next two agenda items stand between you and coffee. [laughter] The first victim is going to be Dev Anand Teelucksingh who is the new Chair of the Technology Taskforce which is half cut-out on my agenda. Technology has let us down already, but please let us know a few words about this, Dev.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Olivier – Dev Anand Teelucksingh for the transcript. The Technology Taskforce Working Group issued a call for membership on April 23rd and I'm delighted to say that there's been a good response from all the regions – about fifteen persons on the Technology Taskforce call. We had our first call on May 29th. We discussed the At-Large social media strategy, the technology workspace – this is where we document the various tools and best practices and add-ons that will help At-Large. We discussed the redesign of the At-Large website and how we can be a community liaison to work with the persons involved with the redesign of the website; and also we talked about the technical issues facing the machine translation of emails on the LACRALO mailing list in particular.

So the upcoming work will be to continue to evaluate the At-Large social media strategy and look at implementing the aspects of the social media strategy already identified; and documenting the technology

workspace; and also looking at the layout of the At-Large Wiki and how we can assist At-Large staff. So it's the early days, there's a lot of ground to cover but we are happy to do it. That's it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Dev, and certainly one thing that has worked is your timing which is fantastic. Of course there's a call for membership of course, if anybody is interested in joining. If any additional people are interested in joining they're very welcome to contact Dev directly. Any questions or comments?

Just one comment from myself: as we know, the At-Large Wiki is still a bit of a mess although Matt has been working extremely hard to try to put some sense to it and shape it in a way which makes information more easily accessible. I understand that some members of your team will be helping Matt perhaps with reorganizing some of the parts of the Wiki. In addition to that the ALAC website itself is even more of a mess, and points to information that doesn't exist anymore in many, many places. There is a process on at the moment to redesign it as well. I think we'll be speaking about this a little bit later on today so we'll make this quick. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you, Olivier. I think that we need a Wiki page on which there is all the links related to the At-Large work, so that it could be more or less a table. And you are not obliged to try to find every link, every page – you have only one page to remember, to recall and there you have everything.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, thank you Tijani, just a big agenda page basically with links for everything that's going on. There is a policy development page which I hope you've all put this in your browser. It actually shows you start times, end times, etc. It's an easier way for everyone to track where we are going thank linking directly to each one of the Wiki pages for each statement that we are working on. And I have to thank Matt for the amount of work that he's done into putting this one together, so Matt...

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And oh, Heidi asks me whether she can ask me a question. You've already asked it. No, go ahead. [laughter]

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you, this is Heidi Ullrich for the transcript record. Tijani, on our proposal, would perhaps a Wiki page that is updated monthly with all current policy statements, activities of various working groups – would that be something that you're... Okay.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, not monthly – any new page has to be added to this page. Any new link, any new page – open it. The link to this page has to be added to the summary page life.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Actually there is a feature on the Wiki site, wherever a new page is added it will actually come there. What you don't realize is that in fact there's sometimes dozens and dozens and dozens of pages added in one day – this is the amount of work that our community does, but... For At-Large, yes. Why do you think they have no bandwidth? Because they just create page after page after page. The growth has been incredible. However, I do understand your idea of having one location where someone who wants to just quickly synch up can go to, and I see various people saying "Yes." Okay, perfect. Let's have this as an action item, yeah. Great suggestion, thank you. Dev, any more?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Just to follow up with Tijani. I think it was a comparison with the GNSO's Wiki which because of their reorganization now they have, it is more logical to jump into any working group page and so on from that landing page as you described it. So definitely.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thank you. And next is Carlton with the WHOIS Working Group update. Carlton, you are the only person who stands between us and our coffee so make it quick, please. Thank you. [laughter]

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Olivier – this is Carlton Samuels for the record. Just a couple of things: first of all, the WHOIS Working Group takes its mandate from a very simple thing – Affirmation of Commitments 9.3.1, and I always tell people it says we're looking at existing ICANN policy and we're concerned about any changes to that policy. The existing policy says

ICANN implements measures to maintain timely, unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete WHOIS information – that’s what we’re about. We just want to keep their feet to the fire because that’s the existing policy.

So we look for things that would tend to undermine this obligation, that’s the first thing. And the second thing is we look for any changes to this policy that would change what we consider to be the responsibilities to the user. I tell you that to now talk about the WHOIS Review Team final report. The final report was a masterful report – it made some very specific recommendations, and you can see...

Holly Raiche:

The final-final.

Carlton Samuels:

The final-final report [laughter], which you’ll see that we endorsed, the ALAC endorsed. There are a couple or three things that I think you should be familiar with. It made a recommendation that the WHOIS should be more strategic, should be accepted as being more strategic which is just kind of bouncing the [rabble] because since it’s a specific requirement of the AOC you’d imagine that it would be strategic of ICANN. What it said though is that they are proposing a new working relationship between ICANN and Compliance. They now are proposing that ICANN Compliance report directly to the Board, which we have endorsed – that’s the full idea. It goes back more than two years to the ALAC position that what we needed was a philosophical approach, a

new philosophical approach to compliance and that is the start of what we see happening there.

The other part of the Review Team's work that gave us some start was the Review Team recommended that the effectiveness of Compliance, they thought it merited some close attention. And you heard from Beau's Registrant Rights Working Group that there is some convergence between the WHOIS Working Group and the Registrant Rights Working Group where this is concerned. And so we're working with the Registrant Rights Group to address that issue and we have some specific requirements which we will talk about later on.

They had endorsed the privacy/proxy situation, and what they did say was there needed to be a specific policy developed for privacy/proxy – and that has been our posture, the ALAC posture that we needed to have a specific policy developed around privacy reveal. In all of this there's several surveys, there's several things that are happening in the WHOIS space that bears some interest. You may know that there has been an RFP put out for a new WHOIS policy. They're trying to change the terminology – they're trying to call it now... They want to change the terminology essentially about WHOIS. What we need to ensure is that whatever they change it to the objective for us is delivered, and so we're keeping a keen eye on that.

They had a survey on the reveal from the GNSO Working Group on the proxy/privacy reveal study. I personally didn't think they should have expected anything more than they got out of it. Essentially they wanted to see from the persons who were impacted whether or not they could develop a survey that would give us more information about why they

need to use proxy/privacy. Eh, I really didn't think that was too much, and that's my personal opinion.

Our policy is very straightforward: WHOIS has a specific objective, and that's why we collect the data. If you try to obfuscate it in any way that is against our objective, and so whatever you try to do to obfuscate that data there has to be a rational basis to accept it, and that's all we're saying. If you decide that there's a rational basis for it then let us put it to the policy process and come up with some way to manage it so that we do not lose the objective of the WHOIS in any event – that's the idea.

There's a technical survey that has been out and essentially it just wants to find out if the questions they're asking about WHOIS are clear enough for the people who are going to [advise it], and this has to do with input to the new protocol they are trying to put in. The protocol is not so new because it's based on one that exists, the so called RESTSful protocol that has been implemented by the RIRs. So for those of us who are interested in the details in these kinds of things you can see what it is.

What is important for you to get is look at the dataset that has been collected, look at how it's collected and look at how it's revealed – those are the three things that are important to us: what you collect, where you store it and who has access to it. So there's a lot of work coming down the pike for the WHOIS Working Group. I see most of it is going to be in time then with the Registrant Rights Working Group and we are keeping a keen eye out for it. Thank you, sir.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. Any questions for Carlton around the table? Avri?

Avri Doria: Hi, I just wanted to add one comment – this is Avri Doria. I wanted to add one comment that the technical work that’s being done is basically just the possibilities because the decision about what is revealed by whom and when and to whom are being left for the policy. So all that set is defining is what are the possibilities, not what would actually be done, and that’s where you’ll find all of us privacy ‘nuts’ having arguments.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, Avri – this is Carlton for the record. She’s absolutely true – that’s what’s being done and we welcome all of that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Any other questions around the table? None. Well, I wanted to have everyone have a vote of thanks for you, Carlton, for the amount of work you’ve done on this. I think since you’ve been holding the flag recently pretty hard on these issues, and since this is really coming up to a hard hit – a frontend hit against a wall I guess, but hopefully the wall will crumble at some point. Well done and well done to your Working Group for working on this.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And this takes us to our long-awaited coffee break for this morning. I've seen a few people doze off around the table and I think it is time to inject some caffeine into your bodies. We are going to have to keep this short, coming back at five minutes past 11:00. If I could also ask that Carlton and Holly and myself, okay, have to go to the photographer now as well. Thank you; we'll be back in fifteen minutes, actually ten minutes – at five minutes past 11:00 local time. Thank you.

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Two minutes – we'll be starting in two minutes.

Order! Order!

Okay, we're a few minutes late and we have to restart this session. So welcome again, everyone to the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session I, I guess "part 2" since we've all had a quick break. Welcome back to our online and remote participants. Just a little housekeeping note: we're going to switch two agenda items around. The first agenda item we had now was the ICANN Academy and capacity building activities – we will be moving this over till after the next agenda item. And I hope you're listening, Sandra, because you're not on right now so I think you can remain where you are at the moment.

But what we have right now is the At-Large Outreach Working Group working with Global Partnerships, and I have to welcome to the room

three out of the four Vice Presidents. We have Rodrigo de la Parra, Regional Vice President for Latin America; Professor Xiadong Lee – have I said this correctly?

Xiadong Lee: Yes, very good.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. [laughter] Well, we do have a Chinese member of ALAC who has been teaching us how to say those words and how to pronounce names. We are quite international in that respect. And well, I'll resort to Hong to correct me if I make any mistakes in any future introductions as well. We also have, well Jamie Hedlund unfortunately, the Regional Vice President for North America is currently not able to join us; and we also are supposed to have Nigel Hickson, the Regional VP for Europe – is he on his way?

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, fantastic. Right, well I hand the microphone over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is Chairing our At-Large Outreach Working Group, but prior to that though I do have to welcome you because it's the first time we actually have the VPs coming to see us. So this is a great thing for us and I hope that you're going to enjoy your time in the, well we call it the "skillet," sometimes, "the grilling seat." [laughter] Over to you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and my name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And gentlemen, and I do note with some sadness however that you are all gentlemen because Mandy's not with us, so we have very little gender equity across our regional leads but I'm sure you'll fix that in the not too distant future with appropriate outreach and staffing activities. I gather Mandy isn't able to join us even remotely, that's the case? Okay, thank you.

What we do need to do today is recognize opportunity for the very first time; not just the landmark that the regional leadership that you have from a Global Partnerships point of view is actually at our table, but we are the most regionally designed part of ICANN. There is a natural fit for us to find or try to find as many synergies and leverage as much opportunity as we possibly can. I'd like to warn you, gentlemen, that we've had these conversations any number of times, any number of years, any number of meetings before but it was at points in time when Global Partnerships simply was not at the capacity that it is now.

And of course we have an opportunity for change, and as with any opportunity for change it would be nice to think that we may be able to step forward at least in some way together. And welcome, nice to see you here – thank you very much for joining us. Nigel, I'm just giving a little brief overview on where we've been.

The ALAC, which of course is the 15-person committee which is the bylaw-mandated committee advising the Board, is often the interface you will be thinking about first. But that is not the most useful part of our community. The most useful part of our community are the other

people sitting around the table – the five geographic regions with their now, what, 143 – am I correct, 143 At-Large Structures?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's 144 now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Each of those At-Large Structures, Professor Lee, for example, you have in your region At-Large Structures that are ICANN-accredited At-Large Structures, organizations which have said "We want to broker information to community from ICANN and from community into ICANN processes." Some of those have memberships of 11,000 or more members. You have an ability, gentlemen, to tap into a critical mass of edge community which is unequaled anywhere in ICANN, and I would suggest anywhere in any other multi-stakeholder model.

We, and here I'm speaking on behalf of the Global Outreach Work Group but also I believe it would be echoed by all the regional leadership, stand ready to work hand-in-glove with anything that you believe we can assist leverage on. In many cases, of course, we have closer ties to sovereign governments and departments than you do because we work with them day in and day out. So use us, but we'd also like to use you. [laughter] And to that end you have a talent pool that you're able to draw on, and I'd like to ask each of you to perhaps speak just as a knee-jerk reaction on what you think might be possible with no commitment. We can call this Chatham House rules and we can close the doors if you'd like.

We're not going to hold you to it but we'd like to just explore the possibilities, recognizing that we have ministerial advisors in our ranks. We have peak body leadership in-country in our ranks. We have talent in an awful lot of places that you might be able to leverage on. And of course we would like to think that is going to be valuable for ICANN as well. The diversity of language is an issue that we all recognize and I do have to take my hat off. Obviously the European challenges are many-fold and Professor, of course you recognize that you've got something like 63% of the world's languages to deal with in your region so there are some real challenges.

And so if we have our aim, and it is a stated aim for the At-Large community to have at least one accredited At-Large Structure in every country – and we already have some countries with many At-Large Structures. But our aim is to get at least one in every country – that's a foothold that I think Global Partnerships could and should exploit very successfully. That's enough of an introduction. Mr. Chairman, would you like to take each of our representatives in turn to perhaps present themselves and in some cases their [shellfish] on the ground, some of the concepts before we go to questions?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well first, thank you very much, Cheryl, for this very extensive and complete introduction of At-Large. I do have to record this for the next time that you introduce [laughter], but yes, I think it would be a great idea for each one of our VPs to introduce themselves and introduce themselves to our community.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

If that's the case, Mr. Chairman, then I'd like to show my Asia-Pacific bias and ask our newest entity in with a huge welcome and heartfelt thanks that we finally have what we need in the structure of ICANN – proper representation where it's meant to be in Global Partnerships in our region. Over to you, Professor.

Xiaodong Lee:

Okay, it's my own honor to join this meeting. I thank you for the very wonderful and detailed introduction. Oh, sorry – this is Xiaodong Lee, now serving as the Vice President for the Asia-Pacific. And I'm a new staff of ICANN, now here only six months so it's my first time joining this meeting. So my first task is to listen and my second task is to learn, and maybe next time I can do something for you and work together with you.

So for Asia-Pacific it's a little bit different. For Asia-Pacific there is a 60% population and 40% of the internet users of the world, so it's a large region. Also, I mean in the nationality population and distribution, it's [totally] distributed so I think it is a very challenging work for me. But I think it is a very good work for me. I prefer to be challenged. You called me "Professor" and professors [these days normally] stick to colleges, but I note with interest that there are other professors here. So I don't want to speak a lot but I just want to give my opinion – I would strongly support this group to work together with you closely and try my best to do what I need to do. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Professor. Perhaps we can be kind now and pop over to... Shall we do Latin America? Rodrigo, please go ahead.

Rodrigo de la Parra: Yes, absolutely, and good morning everyone. I believe we do have Spanish translation, do we? So can I do this in Spanish for the benefit of the ALSes in the region? So I'll just wait a bit, yes.

For the records this is Rodrigo de la Parra, Vice President for Latin America and the Caribbean. I really appreciate your invitation to work together with ALAC on this project and to work closely together in projects as needed. A brief introduction: I have been working for ICANN staff for a year and a half in the Global Partnerships Department. Prior to that I was involved as a Mexican government representative to the GAC so I have been around the community for several years now.

I think that ALAC is one of the most important elements or the one that makes ICANN stand out from the remaining global organizations. There are plenty of organizations where the private sector and the government are involved, but very few where users have a voice and can be a part of this multi-stakeholder model. And I feel proud of this. And Global Partnerships' responsibilities include the responsibility of outreach. Our outreach is not only focused on governments and businesses but also on At-Large Structures within our organization.

Among the processes for At-Large Structures' approval we contemplate a review in our Department. That review entails comments on the applicants and then that is incorporated into the review so that ALAC has the final say on the approval of these structures. Eventually we are

invited to participate in events held by ALSes in their countries or regions. We are always very pleased to attend these events. I attended an event in Colombia, invited by an ALS in Bogota so we are closely connected with them. We know that there's plenty of opportunity so that we can work together, we can coordinate our efforts; and it is really pleasing to see that your agenda includes outreach.

Outreach is also a part of our agenda so I think this is a very good time, a very good moment for us to coordinate our efforts, and as Cheryl said for us to help one another. We need one another and this is what ICANN and the community is all about. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Rodrigo. We'll be making you an honorary At-Large member immediately. You talk the talk and walk the walk and we see great strength from the Latin American and Caribbean region, I think not in a small part to your active involvement. So perhaps you could mentor some of your fellow Vice Presidents in how you're getting it right. Nigel, what language would you like to talk to us in? [laughing]

Nigel Hickson:

Yes, so what language would you like? No, I can do an impersonation of Welch but not very good. [laughter] Well, good morning, ladies and gentlemen, Professors and distinguished guests. Let me introduce myself. I'm actually the newest Vice President, well the newest in this area anyway.

So I'm Nigel Hickson. I'm the Vice President for the Global Partnerships Team in Europe, and because ICANN is an old organization – Europe for

ICANN is a bit like the EuroVision song contest. Europe is ever expanding, so Europe includes the Middle East – yep, obvious really, isn't it? And at the moment Europe includes Africa as well, which I think is fine but I'm deputizing for the Vice President for Africa as well at the moment. But fortunately we have someone on the Global Partnerships Team that does Africa, Anne-Rachel; and of course we should also mention our other colleagues on the Global Partnership Team that you would probably see more than us, or certainly more than me. In my area I have Vinnie who covers Russia and other parts of Eastern Europe and the Stans, and I have Baher who covers the Middle East. So that's sort of part of the Global Partnerships effort.

As I said I'm very new to this. I see our job in Global Partnerships as a two-way function, and I think the two ways are very important and have been touched on already. I mean first of all it's to listen, it's to understand what is going on in the community, to understand what are the concerns, what are the aspirations, what are the objectives of the community in terms of this project of ours; and to ensure that we as executives can report back into ICANN those concerns, those objectives, those fears, those whatever because in any organization, and in an organization like ICANN it has to be global to survive. So let's make no bones about this. I mean I came into this organization because I believe in a multi-stakeholder approach to the internet. I'd been in government all my life until they found out I was no good at it and got rid of me. It took them 29 years but governments in the UK are pretty slow about doing that sort of thing. [laughter]

But I'm passionate about the multi-stakeholder approach for the internet. I've been involved in internet public policy for the last sort of

twenty years, and it's good when it works well – public policy on the internet. It's good when you have a solid foundation for your decisions. It's good when all the community is involved. It's bad when just governments do it because governments on their own make poor decisions, like any group on their own without the necessary input, without the necessary collaboration makes poor decisions. And ICANN, we don't own the internet but there is a portion of the internet that this community is responsible for – the domain name system – and we must make sure that we make the best decisions, the best way forward in that area. And this is where everyone comes in.

So part of our role is to feed that back into ICANN to make sure that the Board and others make the right decisions, and of course the other area that we work in a lot of the time is also to feed back into the community what is happening in ICANN. And I know that this is something that you all do, and you probably do it much better than we do, but there is this – and I was talking to the Fellowship this morning. We were talking to the new Fellowship this morning and there is this misconception isn't there about ICANN in the community sometimes? You read the blogs and you think "I would like to say something on that blog," and then I think "Well actually, I'm not quite sure what to say," because there is often a misconception, there's a misunderstanding of what the ICANN role is and what ICANN stands for. And therefore we all have a job if you like of trying to explain that to the community.

And so as you said, Cheryl, a lot of the At-Large membership of course are intimately involved in the governments as well – many of you serve on government advisory boards and you're involved with the government at a national or regional level. And therefore yes, we on

the Global Partnerships Team should make sure. And I know this needs to be improved, that we have this interface with you, that we can understand what you're doing and you can understand what we're doing.

Just briefly in my area, part of the responsibility for Global Partnerships is not just to interface with the governments – so there's quite a lot of governments in Europe of course and in the Middle East, etc. – but also to interface with the institutions. So we split up the institutions on a geographical basis, and it just so happens that I got a bit of a bad deal on this because for some reason there seems to be rather a lot of international institutions in Europe. So we decided that Geneva won't be in Europe anymore so we got rid of the ITU, which was...

[Applause]

Nigel Hickson: Ooh! This is a public session! No, no!

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: This is recorded and transcribed, Nigel, may I just remind you, please?

Nigel Hickson: Oh, that's alright – I didn't say anything. It was the... [laughter]
Something happened, sorry.

So I have responsibility for interfacing with, because you can I'm a diplomat I have responsibility for interfacing with the European

Commission which is also an important institution for the ITU, for organizations in Geneva like ISOC and various other organizations – the Council of Europe, the OECD in Paris. And so we work with those organizations, we work with governments but of course we also work through the local communities and we work through the structures that you have in place.

So I want to be more involved and understand more about you. Fortunately, one of the first persons I met when I came into ICANN at all is my good friend here, and he told me a bit about At-Large and so I understand a bit about At-Large; but I haven't quite understood the GNSO yet, but I'm getting there. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

That makes 2.1 billion of us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yeah, Nigel, if you can sort that last one out do get back to us. That would be good. [laughter] Gentlemen, it's been delightful to hear from you, and you notice there's been a lot of smiling faces which is not always the case when we have these meetings at this time of our ICANN week. I'm feeling, and I suspect what a lot of the members of the community sitting around this table are feeling, is as this is a bit of a landmark to have all you VPs here – and even those who aren't here – committed in principle to working smarter, not harder, and that's really what we all want to do. But there's a limited number of resources including human bandwidth so we may as well do this as well as we possibly can together.

I'm going to open for questions and I'm going to ask Matt, if Matt could because I'm now doing this Adobe room mobile which means I can't see any hands come up, so you might just ping the room and see if we're getting any remote questions. One of the, I think important issues is for us to have a non-binding interface which simply acts as a transparency vehicle on who's doing what. We've certainly had situations in non-ICANN context but with us wearing our ICANN hats, so for example in an IGF meeting where we are in the name of, in this case for example ALAC or a region with an accepted workshop who are still there doing work in the name of ICANN; and unfortunately Global Partnerships is surprised when they see us on the agenda.

We don't want that to happen in the future. We'd like to know that you know what we're doing and vice versa, that if you're coming to talk to an industry group down under in Australia that you know, if you're in Perth we might be able to line you up with something in Perth; if you're in Sydney, we might be able to line you up with something in Sydney. So just a non-committed but a mirror that goes both ways could be very useful.

We also don't want to have you drowned with the cacophony of voices necessarily directly from ALSes. We want you to have the ability to know who your trusted network is, and so we'd like to talk to you about how you want information sharing. One thing we discussed in the past with Mandy was to simply have a shared, dedicated calendar of events. That's not publicly committed but then you all know what we're all doing, right down to the At-Large Structure level; and if you happen to be there then we'll invite you and you can get some benefit in that same meeting. So that might be something but it's really, we've had

those discussions in the rarified atmosphere; we now need to get it at the [coal face] which is with you at the VP level.

I'm going to ask for a speaking order in a moment. Is there any additional points any of you would like to make before we open for the grill? No, we're ready for the grill? In which case I look around, I see Sala first and yes, so then I've got an order of three. Go ahead, Sala, please.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the record; Sala for short. Yes, first of all I'd like to say congratulations on your new appointment, Nigel, and thank you very much, Global Partnerships, for the excellent work you're doing. And I know that for Asia-Pacific you work very closely with the network operator groups, and I know there are frequent emails coming from you to the At-Large Structure that I belong to. And I can see [Savey] over at the back there who's been doing excellent work in terms of PACNOG trainings and DNSSEC trainings and that sort of thing with the network operators.

But I echo Cheryl's sentiments in terms of the need to identify potential mutual synergies in terms of strengthening perhaps the At-Large Structure base, not so much just the network operator groups but looking at a way to strengthen meaningful participation into the policy processes. And so I know that the DNSSEC trainings and the IPv6 trainings and that sort of thing, but perhaps if there could be at some stage – even if it's outside these formal parameters, but like an ad-hoc discussion perhaps... I know that ccNSO, I think they have an informal working group that's tasked with looking at capacity building in that

regard, and I know that there are countries in the Asia-Pacific like say Tuvalu that has a ccTLD but they don't really know that much about it – not so much the ccTLD operators and that sort of thing, but they also belong to the ALSes.

And again, echoing Cheryl's comments, there are very strategic plans that are also within the ALSes from the Ministerial level and so forth, and so just identifying that. And I'd just like to issue an invitation. We are also looking into developing capacity building for the At-Large Structures and working closely with you guys, so it would be good at some point to sit and perhaps share a coffee and sort of discuss. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Would you like to respond at all to that, gentlemen? It's not compulsory to react to every one of us but we are open. Thank you. Please go ahead. "Why not?" was the response from the Vice President for Asia-Pacific – succinct but we're happy to hear it. Thank you very much.

Alright, I have a speaking order at the moment of Oksana, Jean-Jacques Subrenat and then Yaovi. I see Fatimata and I see Olivier. Okay, please – after you, Oksana.

Oksana Prykhodko:

Thank you very much, and thank you very much for coming – Oksana Prykhodko, EURALO Secretary, Ukraine. It was great to meet Nigel one week before in Stockholm for EuroDIG and actually I have a very specific proposition. Tomorrow we will have (inaudible) an ambassador of

ALAC. I expect to receive a lot of very interesting and very useful information. Is it possible to create a [recorded] version of this event, to present this [recorded] version during the IGF, during regional IGF events, national IGFs, to translate it into a different language – first of all Russian for me? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Oksana. I suspect that might be a question more for first our own At-Large staff to deal with what record we might have; and then it may be appropriate for us to explore with Global Partnerships where languages, and in many cases they're languages that would fall outside of the UN languages as well. We have a desperate need for example, for Portuguese as you all know, and we have some local language needs in the Asia-Pacific that would not fit within the six UN languages as well. So we might need to take that in two parts.

My suggestion is we'll take that on notice. I do know however, and Heidi, correct me if I'm wrong, that we will be video, photographed, transcribed, translated and in all other shapes and forms recorded so I'm pretty confident that we can put something together. And Olivier, you'd like to speak to that matter?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl – it's Olivier for the transcript. Yes, the ten years of ALAC will be recorded tomorrow and we will be working with staff to determine whether we can have this translated. Of course it will all be recorded. The presentation will also be put online and hopefully we can have it translated into other languages so as to be able to make

use of that vital bit of information. It is the first time we actually go through those years in such detail having the people who made it happen being there, so yes, good suggestion. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

So thank you for that question. Next in the speaking order is Jean-Jacques and then I have Yaovi, Fatimata and Olivier; and if anyone else wants to make themselves known? Thank you, Sergio. Go ahead, Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you, Cheryl – this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. First, congratulations to the new appointees. I think it's very important to have the Regional Vice Presidents all in place. And the next thing I want to say is that I agree with what previous speakers have said about the importance of having contacts frequently between us as ALAC and you as Regional Vice Presidents.

But what I'm about to mention is at another level. It's more strategic. What has happened before you arrived at ICANN as Vice Presidents is that about two years ago in the Board there was the setting up of the Global Partnerships Board Committee, or the Board Committee for Global Partnerships which has not been mentioned yet; and the purpose of that was precisely to enable ICANN to dispose of a global and strategic view at all times because there are many other organizations which purport to deal with internet governance and we have to find our way.

Now, to be very blunt the reason why someone on the Board at that time three, four, five years ago had suggested setting up that Board Committee was that it was felt that up until then, international relations and institutional relations of ICANN were dealt with well of course but insufficiently by staff and CEO. And it was felt that strategic direction belonged to the Board, and after two and a half years that Committee was set up. So I think that is a reminder which is necessary at this stage.

My second point, still dwelling on that Board Committee, is that it's one of the few committees that has not published to my knowledge anything substantial about its world view. In other words, the appointment of Vice Presidents is fine but what is the strategic view region-by-region which ICANN has developed for each of those regions? What about the institutional approach? Where do we stand vis a vis let's say ITU or many other organizations? What is our point of insertion into the IGF? I think we need a strategic vision.

So in keeping with that, I think that whereas we indeed have to keep up this relationship with Cheryl has called for between us and each of you, I think that is not sufficient. Now it is time for the Chair of the ALAC and the Committee which is chaired by Cheryl to actually relate to that Board Committee as well. In fact, in a paper which was recently published online, a temporary paper by the ALAC which is called "R3: Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected." I think that the idea is for instance to make it mandatory for that Board Committee to actually consult the community. For instance, some members of the ALAC actually do have a vast international experience – they're around this table and others are on remote calls. And I would like to see at least on a yearly basis if not more a report by that Board Committee not

only on what it has done but more importantly on how it envisions the next six months or the next year with regard to institutional relations, etc. All this is part of accountability, and I'm surprised that that has not become the case yet for global relations.

So in conclusion I would say that there is one sticking point where you as Vice Presidents could make a very quick difference for us. It is that you would intervene with the next CEO and say "Look, these people in the ALAC do have something to say. Why is it that so little money is made available to them to participate more actively in fora such as the IGF?" For instance, what is the number of us who were actually paid for by ICANN, travel and accommodation to attend IGF meetings in the past three or five years? It's extremely minimal. We would not go there as individuals. We would go there with our background as ALAC, and I'm certain it would contribute to our collective work. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I see Rodrigo – please, Rodrigo.

Rodrigo de la Parra:

Rodrigo de la Parra for the records. There is this Committee which we call the BGRC and there is a lot of work on its way now, and one of the items on its agenda is precisely the Strategic Plan for ICANN's internationalization or global relationships institutionally. This Committee is begin chaired by Gonzalo Navarro, our Board member from Chile.

And I think that yet you are right and we need to share this document, and it's not ready yet. There have been a lot of interactions between ICANN staff and the ICANN Board to build a Strategic Plan that can eventually of course be shared with the community, and ask for feedback as well. So thanks for pointing this out, I think it's very important and those are the brief comments from me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Rodrigo, and Nigel, did you want to intervene? And then I'm going to give the floor, literally the floor, to Sebastien.

Nigel Hickson:

Yes, thanks very much, just a couple comments – Nigel Hickson. Yes, as Rodrigo said we are intimately involved in the BGRC Committee. Indeed we had a meeting yesterday morning with them and we've had several others in the last few months. We're working on this international plan, this global plan that has been mentioned and hopefully that can be consulted on. There was a questionnaire that came out, wasn't there, about what people thought of the international aspects of ICANN and that questionnaire has been discussed in that Committee as well.

And in addition to that, we've been discussing with the Committee a strategy for dealing with international organizations, particularly the ITU in the context of the WCIT and the WTPF, and of course we're involved in the ongoing initiatives on the WYSIS. So I think there is a dialog that we have. I mean obviously we can feed back your views about a more enhanced dialog with the At-Large community. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Nigel. And to the occupier of Seat 15 on the ICANN Board, our very own Sebastien Bachollet. Over to you, sir.

Sebastien Bachollet: Hello, yes, thank you very much – Sebastien Bachollet for the record. You may have seen that the Board decided to vote on the Strategic Planning except one part of the Strategic Planning, and this one part was the international relationship. It was on purpose because deeper work must be done. And it's where we are today. We are in the urgency with the IGF, ITU coming at the end of this year but at the same time we wanted as the Board, and I am [now] talking on behalf of the Board – I need to say that each time I talk, but we wanted as a Board to have a comprehensive view of where we are going and how we are going there; not just the objective but also the road we want to follow.

And it will take some time. I hope that there will be interaction with the community at one stage, I am sure there will be, but also taking advantage of having elected one Board member to pass on the idea if you wish on that subject, even though I am not a member of the BGFC. In the same time, we hold a set number of decisions and all that will be after we have this comprehensive plan taken back and the new leadership will be able to take a quick decision after this work gets done. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Sebastien, and we always appreciate your intervention. And one of the privileges of being our seat holder on the Board is that of course he gets to jump the queue. But now we're going to go back to

the queue and that is Yaovi followed by Fatimata, Olivier, Sergio, Evan and then Carlton. Over to you, Yaovi.

Yaovi Atohoun:

Yaovi speaking. My question is to better understand the structure. I can remember that some years ago, I don't know the situation now – we had a liaison, an ICANN liaison for all the regions, so if it is the same what is the relationship between the liaison and the Vice President? And then from the presentation, Nigel said he's advocating for a position in Africa because I know in Europe you have many, many things to do in Europe. I had seen an advert some months ago about a Vice President for Africa. So is that advert in line with that recruitment for Africa? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Who gets the short straw on that one? Nigel, over to you.

Nigel Hickson:

Yes, Nigel Hickson. I can certainly just briefly comment on the latter point at least. Yes, ICANN at one point did go forward to recruit a Vice President for Africa and that's currently sort of under consideration; so it's not being actively pursued at the moment but hopefully it will be actively pursued in the future. I mean it's part of the overall plan that's been developed in of course, having a Vice President for the African region. I mean fortunately as I said, we have Anne-Rachel as the Regional Manager who has an excellent understanding of the African region. I also hope to visit Africa – not that I'm saying just me visiting Africa is going to make any difference but I do intend to visit Africa. And

of course the African region will be hosting an ICANN in due course, of course. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Nigel, and I would suggest that we all recognize that this is not a one-man or even two- or three-person job. We have a big world out there which is why we're going to make sure whatever deficits either party might have here we can complement each other. Over to you, Fatimata.

Fatimata Seye Sylla:

Thank you, Cheryl. [speaking in French] I'm going to start once again. I would like to thank Cheryl and all of the Vice Presidents here with us today. Unfortunately Africa is not represented here and I've heard different explanations but this still does not prevent me from asking the questions I had thought of. I would like to second Jean-Jacques and Yaovi and their concerns, and I would like to know, seeing that you're here with us today whether the African community is present and the African community here present has such concerns which are taken into account by you who are here; and those concerns of us who have come not only from Africa but from all regions.

Next Wednesday we're going to have a joint meeting with the African community, and our greatest concern in Africa comes when we see the results for new gTLD applications and that will be the focus of our meeting on Wednesday – Africa not being represented. I wonder whether these concerns will be taken into account by you. In the meantime we're waiting for African representation; otherwise, what

would be your strategy to take into account all communities? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Fatimata. You make a number of very critical points and whilst it would currently fall to Nigel to respond to that, I'm wondering, Nigel – I will give you the microphone but feel free to take a number of those points on notice because apart from everything else, I'm hoping you might be able to squeeze into your busy schedule joining the AFRALO and AfrICANN meeting on Wednesday. Our people will talk to your people and it will get into your calendar, if you like, because this is a critical issue that Fatimata has raised – 1% out of Africa? That's appalling in new gTLDs, terrible. That had to be a communication problem. We can't fix it for now but we need to make it better for the future. Over to you, Nigel.

Nigel Hickson:

Yes, thanks – no pressure, then. I mean first of all I'd be delighted to take on anything I can. I've got a few problems of my own on Wednesday but I can talk to you about them, and I'd be delighted to talk offline and follow up with some of your concerns. I mean obviously I can't rewrite gTLD applications. I can take concerns in terms of the communication part of it back to the ICANN Board or back to the ICANN staff. I mean clearly let me be honest: when the names came out I obviously went through them and had a look at them. We were not privy to anything before it was published on that lunchtime in London. I wasn't in London actually; I was doing work elsewhere. And yes, I would have liked personally – I mean from what I said earlier, being

passionately committed to the global internet – a more diverse range of applications but there we are.

But I still think that there were some from the African region and there were some important ones as I understood, including IDNs from various regions as well. So I think we have to build on that. As you know, ICANN has committed to having a second round at some point in the future, and perhaps lessons of communication or whatever can be taken into account.

Just on the point again, let me emphasize the point about the appointments. We on the Global Partnerships Team are absolutely convinced we need a Vice President for Africa. We want to take that forward as staff as soon as we can. We recognize the importance of the region in many different ways. Obviously Nairobi last year, I had the pleasure of going to the IGF and with my UK Minister, then as a government official and it was an excellent occasion. And we really do want to follow up. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, and I'm sure you've raised the smile on some of our African representatives' faces here. But might I suggest, because I can, that in some cases we've heard all of this before, boys. [laughter] Let's see if we can actually take words and promises into action as we have new opportunity. We have a long memory and we can give you the transcription in three to five languages, but we look forward to making the change.

My next speaker – Nigel, don't even try answering. We're going to go to Olivier, then we're going to go to Sergio, Evan, Carlton; and I believe that is the close off and you can all run away after that. Over to you, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thanks very much, Cheryl – it's Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the transcript record. And on this occasion I shall take my hat off and speak on my own behalf. I think we're being way too nice at the moment with the VPs who have joined us, and I thought I'd add a little bit of spice to this discussion.

We've spoken about IGF last year in Kenya – a lovely location. Several of us wanted to go and carry the At-Large flag and the ICANN flag over there. None of us got funded, and those who went funded themselves or got other organizations to fund us. Now I understand this could be something to do with special requests, or this could be something to do with Finance; or this could be something to do with communication. There are many different departments within ICANN.

The problem with this at the moment is ICANN doesn't have more than is it a couple hundred employees, but currently behaves like an organization which is so bureaucratic with hundreds of thousands of employees around the world that one side doesn't talk to the other. The frustration in this community, and at least my frustration is that we ask again and again and again every year the same thing; and every year again and again and again we're sent from department to department. One time it's Global Partnerships' fault when we talk to the Finance Department; one time it's the Finance Department when we talk to the

Communications Department; one time it's the Communications Department's fault when we talk to another department.

And then of course now there's another department which has been created – that's the New gTLD Department, which appears to be totally uncoordinated with everything else that is happening at ICANN, which therefore means that when the roadshow went around the world our ALSes found out about it the next day in the newspapers – which means that the launch party which took place in London did not even have the ALAC Chair over there although the guy lives in London – that's a bit strange, and he didn't even know about it except thankfully of course he knew about it because someone who went there said "Ooh, are we going to see you there?"

The same thing in Brussels – there was a party in Brussels and our ALSes in Brussels were not advised about this, and it goes on again and again and again. When we start asking for funding to go to IGF meetings or to go to any other types of meetings that take place where we actually carry the ICANN flag, the ALAC flag, we relate to the community locally, we are told for expenses as low as £500 – I see Tijani nodding - £500 or \$500 in some cases "I'm sorry, we don't have any funding." And yet I don't know how much was spent on those parties, how much was spent on the communication that was spent – well, we will deal with communication a little bit later on.

But the amounts that we ask to send one, two, or three people every few months somewhere around the world is nothing. We're ready to eat McDonald's but we just need the flight-

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, we'll have to remove the brand and choose the favorite cheapest thing you can think of. Anyway, we're ready to just barely survive, have food rations but at least the flight and the actual accommodation is something that ICANN could spare for some of us, because not only are we taking time off work, not only are we taking time off our families which sometimes don't recognize us after a while; but at the same time we also have to use the holiday money or whatever finances we have that we would like to buy a small gift for our children for Christmas and have to deprive them of that in order to go and carry the ICANN flag.

I think I've made my point clear. [laughter] I know I've said that separately but it's on the record, and I think we need to make sure that this gets resolved in the future. Thank you.

[Applause]

Cheryl Langdon-Or: Okay, thank you, Olivier, and I think you've... Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record and it's nice to see the Chairman take his hat off occasionally but we're not going to let you do it too often. However, I don't think there was a word he said other than the golden arches reference that didn't have the wholehearted support of the community sitting around here. And just for the record, I think when I was Chairman the lowest numerical value denied for attending an ALS event

which was one, interestingly enough, that the ICANN community then gained a great deal out of – so I won't go back into it but let's put it this way, it was in San Francisco – was going to be less than a \$300 US expenditure.

Heidi might remember, I think it took something like six or seven weeks for the "No" and that was actually filling out the exceptions paperwork. I mean if you feel that we are a little cranky at times, bear with us – it is not without cause. But we are mature, we are intelligent; we are keen to get it better and we are happy to move on. And with that I'm now going to move on to Sergio. Over to you, sir.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

I'm going to speak in Spanish so please wear your headsets. This is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. I want to thank Rodrigo and Professor Xiaodong Lee. As Cheryl indicated my name is Sergio Salinas Porto. I am an ALAC member and I represent LACRALO. My fellow members have voiced several issues already. First, I celebrate the fact that there is a concern and this was mentioned in the Costa Rica meeting; so I celebrate the fact that there is a concern about the lack of a VP for the African region. And I want to celebrate that publicly together with my fellows, and I urge you to work out this issue as quickly as possible.

I think that it would be really useful for ICANN to have a VP focused on African-specific issues. Also regarding regional visits, Olivier mentioned that point. Rod Beckstrom visited Brazil and our Brazilian fellow members were not told about it. They did not learn about it, and the same happened with Rodrigo in Colombia. So I think it's important to have a synergy in that regard.

I am bringing this to the fore because it is quite likely that you will be visiting countries whose governments are not represented in the GAC, but the civil society of those countries is represented in ALAC. So it's very important to forge those links or relations, so please include this on your agendas. If we see that you are going to visit Latin American countries then we can work and see how we can work together with outreach organizations within ICANN and with the governments. And this is quite likely going to be highly beneficial to the community.

On a separate note, we can think of a two-year agenda starting now, for example, and include or contemplate regional visits so that we can perform outreach in our own countries. If we visit a country and we work with ICANN then that country's community can learn about ICANN, what ICANN is about, and we can foster further internet user participation. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Sergio. Rodrigo may wish to respond but I think what you're hearing you have heard before, and I do want to pick up on the opportunity that has been outlined here about some future planning because we can be on the ground prepping the business community, the civil society, all sorts of people months if not years out if you've got a targeted project going in an area. So whilst I'll ask you to respond to that it may be something that all the VPs might want to talk to each other about as well.

Rodrigo de la Parra:

Thank you very much, this is Rodrigo de la Parra speaking and I will speak in Spanish also. I want to build upon Sergio's comment but also upon other comments put forth by other members. I believe the lack of communication and coordination issues does not only affect ALAC. We have received complaints and suggestions even from the GNSO. So in my view we need coordination between staff, the community and the Board and we are working on it so that we can address and pursue shared objectives and achieve synergies.

As regards resources, and we know resources are scarce, I do not mean to say that we have spent significant amounts on events or on sponsoring At-Large events but there have been resources allocated to that end. Probably they may have not had the desired effect, but I think that pretty soon what we need to do is to have a communication channel with At-Large. We are now here with you and can work on it and see who we can work with to coordinate these efforts. Should we do it through ALAC? Should we reach the RALOs? Should we reach the individual ALSes? So maybe you should decide and suggest a course of action and maybe you can tell us "Well, we want it centralized through ALAC," or not; maybe "We want resources and attention to be allocated on a regional scale or we would like you to contact ALSes directly and have ALSes invite you to events and ask for sponsorship."

It is my impression that sometimes our efforts are lost or diluted, if you will. I think we need further coordination efforts so as to maximize our limited but existing budget. Also we need to work on engagement and participation. We need to include ALAC and other leaders, SOs and ACs when for example we are going to participate in the IGF meeting or when ICANN is going to be involved in certain fora. We know that we

from the staff are limited, we have some limitations and we need input from the community because ICANN is exactly about the community. But we also need to be efficient. We need to find efficient and fast mechanisms to obtain input because ICANN's opinion needs to be expedient.

This process is useful and enriching but at times it is inefficient and we need to reply, to be responsive, or else we need guidelines from the ACs and SOs indicating to us the way in which they want ICANN staff to work. We need a framework evidently. We are willing but my point now was just to outline these issues and to let you know that we want to work them out with ALAC and with everybody else. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Rodrigo, and we do hear what you're saying; and I think the framing issue that you brought up is a critical one and one that I suspect this table would probably think should be managed at the AC, SO and cross-community layer; and then each of our component parts will manage to fit into that model because we're all about efficiencies as well. Over to you, Xiaodong.

Xiaodong Lee:

This is Xiaodong Lee. I think this issue is not only in Latin America, so I just wanted to cover some (inaudible). The Asia-Pacific I think is also very important for me to work together along with the community and also reach out to ALAC to have some kind of outreach framework in the global community. Yeah, that would be very good and would get a very good response.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yeah, it's very fulsome but it's very important that we get it right. We are a layered organization but ALAC and the At-Large community would like to think that it is *the* most transparent, and therefore we have some opportunity because everything we do is recorded, taken down, transcribed and held against us as necessary; but that we can in fact do some test bedding, perhaps some experimenting on how a model might work. So I'm sure as beta testers we'd be very happy to put our hands up.

My next speaker is Evan and then we have Carlton, and we are ending at that point other than any rounding up conversation that you'd like to take an opportunity to review. Over to you, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch:

Thanks Cheryl, this is Evan for the record. I wanted to just switch tacks a little bit because many have already spoken on budgetary and resource issues, so I'm not going to repeat it – and Olivier, you did a wonderful job on that, thank you. It's something I could have easily-

[background conversation]

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay. I want to speak almost a little provincially now and focus on my region which is North America, and not speak as ALAC Vice-Chair but as a former Chair of the North America Region and an ALAC rep from North America. I realize the three of you are not in a position to speak

on behalf of Jamie but I would like you to pass a message to him, and please ask him and remind him that North America does not just mean inside the Washington beltway. [laughter]

There is a special relationship that ICANN has with the US government but it doesn't immediately take away from the fact that there are these other guys to the North and there are these islands to the South, and please don't ignore them not only from a geographical viewpoint, but also the fact that so many of ICANN's contracted parties come from North America cannot, should not hide the fact that there is also civil society here. There are also internet end users here. There is also an At-Large community that also has its own needs that do not have people that have a vested interest in being involved in ICANN.

We have ALSes that have difficulty remaining engaged. We have outreach issues of our own. I'm not trying to at all put down what's happening elsewhere in the world, but just asking not to ignore ICANN's own backyard and to remember that Jamie has a significant task in his relationship with the US government; but maybe that means that there is a separate role, perhaps, for somebody that has to deal with the kind of outreach issues in North America as a whole, both in nongovernmental organizations in the US as well as with Canada and the Caribbean. And so I'd just ask you to pass that message on, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Evan, and I think that all of the gentlemen at the table will be ganging up on Jamie and saying a few words to that. Carlton, over to you, sir.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Cheryl – this is Carlton Samuels for the record. I want to echo what my colleague Cheryl says that we've heard this before, but I want to make a special note of no VP in Global Partnerships for Africa is a travesty and it's about time we straighten up and fly right and get it right. It's way too long to say that... It's just a big hole that should have been recognized by somebody someplace and it irritates.

The other thing I want to, and it's another irritation – the Caribbean. In international organizations, the Caribbean tends to punch above weight, but we've always had to fight not to be marginalized. When I got into this ICANN business we had a liaison that covered Canada and the Caribbean, a youngster named Jacob [Maltos] and he was very good – he was the one that got me to get involved in this process, and he was very, very good at what he did. He was always in your office, in your face or around, asking who he could meet. And so we had that kind of relationship and we saw ICANN working through this one person in the Caribbean.

And then we had a liaison for the Caribbean, and that was a fellow named [Sheraden Asepa] who lived in the Caribbean in [Capen] Carriacou and again, we'd see him all the time. When he came in-country I always heard him before he was coming; he asked me to set up meetings and so on. It was something that we had a lot of. Now we don't have any since [Sheraden] left and went to ISOC, and I'm still waiting to see the hole filled. I'm a little disappointed that it is taking so long.

Here's the thing that you might not know: in this dispensation with the ITU making grumblings and the IGF where we could do a better job than most [other ICANN] people in getting to those people, we are not doing the best we can. Let me give you an idea. The Minister who is in charge of telecommunications and internet matters acted as a cheerleader and a part of the team that elected the current Secretary General for the ITU. He comes to the region very often – when he's asked, he's always there. As a matter of fact, the first time [Tora] came to the region I was a part of the Internet Forum, and he showed up and he stayed the entire time.

That Minister is back in power. He's still closely connected to the Secretary General of the ITU. What am I saying to you? You need friends at court in ICANN, for ICANN. You're not doing very well if you haven't figured that out. Here's the other thing: the IGF tends in the Caribbean to get official representation primarily because of how it's configured. The senior policymakers in the governments in the region tend to go. For example, the person [on the mark] is the Director for Internet and International Relations in the Ministry of Technology and Foreign Affairs from Jamaica. They tend to take the line of the government.

I talk to them all the time. As a matter of fact, when they are going to meetings they ask me to tell them what's been happening in the ICANN world. Now, the point I'm making is this: if ICANN is under threat ICANN needs friends at court. ICANN needs the outreach, the Global Partnerships to do what it does best. The Caribbean contains folks that are influential on one side. You have to raise your game to gain some interest on the other side. There are a few of us carrying the ICANN flag

in the region and we are not well served if we are marginalized. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Carlton, and I think that's more of an intervention than a question, so we might let you all off the hook other than final comments if you don't mind, gentlemen. Do you want to respond, though? Please go ahead. I'm very open and friendly and democratic.

Rodrigo de la Parra:

Thank you, Carlton – Rodrigo de la Parra for the records. I think you are right but however just a brief update: we are going to have a regional manager for the Caribbean. It has been taking a little bit longer than we expected. I have been trying to cover for some of the meetings in the Caribbean. We acknowledge how important and strategic the Caribbean is for these discussions on internet governance, and I recently attended a CTU Ministerial meeting and we are just about to enter into some talks to establish a memorandum of understanding with them. And I know the work that [Jacob] made in the past and also [Sheraden] made in the past and we want to take it from there – let's just not talk but let's have some results also, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Canada will have to speak separately – this is Cheryl for the transcript record. Time is our enemy but progress is not. I believe we have an opportunity here and yet again, another good indication that progress is possible. Let's move it from words to action. We know it's a big, wide and very scary at sometimes world out there but we all have a place in

it, and we're keen to find the best way forward in the name of ICANN because very few of us in this community in ICANN – it's a rarity – have a vested interest in how we earn our daily bread, very few of us. Most of us are here for very altruistic reasons and that's a rarity in any multi-stakeholder model, so I think we've got a little bit of PR and advertising that we can do along those lines.

Gentlemen, is there any final words from you? If not, I would like to move a formal vote of thanks... Yes, Nigel, go for it. [laughter] Briefly, sir.

Nigel Hickson: Certainly – “go for it.”

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: She's Australian, forgive her. [laughter]

Nigel Hickson: Madame Chair, no – not on behalf of the team in any sense but on behalf of myself I wanted to thank you for inviting me, also I wanted to thank people for their frank and forthright views. I obviously haven't had the pleasure of sitting in front of you before but others have, and clearly we have not lived up to your expectations in one sense or another and we've got work to do. We will be reporting back on these discussions and making representations as appropriate in places. So I just wanted to finish by saying we'd be delighted, and I'm sure I'm speaking on behalf of others as well, to come back next year so to speak

– well not next year, but come back at the next session. Certainly they're not every year, huh? [laughter] To come back in Toronto, sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much for that; I think that might have been a Freudian slip. Mr. Chairman, do you want to do the vote of thanks?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, I think we can indeed. Yes, a vote of thanks; will anyone second this? I see Holly – I think Australia, another Australian seconds as well. Thanks very much for joining us. It's a first and I hope it will not be another five years until the next time you come and see us. But we really are looking forward to working with you, and I think that what's come out today is that you're feeling the same way. So great, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bravo, thank you gentlemen. Thank you.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And as Cheryl mentioned earlier, time is ticking and time ticks faster than we speak, although we are quite verbose as well – that's another problem. But we had a very good discussion. Now, we might have to do another housekeeping item which is to move the ICANN Academy and capacity building discussion until this afternoon. We do have a

spare slot for a hot topic so I hope that Sandra and Sala will not be too upset about this. But... And oh, Sebastien is, oh.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, we'll hopefully-

[break – audio begins again with next session in progress]

Sergio Salinas Porto: ...promote these short radio programs on new gTLD advice, for example, advice on good internet use, advice on how to improve participation in ICANN. This would give a very important opportunity for people to become engaged in the community and to make their contributions. I think the financial support would be minimum. You know, any person driving while in their car listens to the radio, or any person not connecting to the internet listens to their radio all the time. So if we had these types of short radio programs promoted by ICANN in several countries I believe this would be very useful to the community and to organizations doing outreach for ICANN and the internet. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sergio, and a follow-up from Alejandro.

Alejandro Pisanty:

Sorry, I hadn't planned to follow in the queue but Sergio's intervention has prompted me to absolutely not yield my turn. [laughter] I'll try to speak very briefly and concretely. I don't agree fully with Tijani or the position that JAS expresses, not only his, but the idea that because there hasn't been outreach enough about the availability of the money support program for establishing new gTLDs for organizations which are underfunded, I don't think that is true. I think that's only part of the truth. Part of the truth is that there's not enough speculative will or inventive business or whatever. But the models are not there, the business is not there – just not there.

There's a small number and you would have a bit more if you had announced the money, had made a better campaign, but honestly it's not there. It would have been there already, you would have noticed; and you cannot ask ICANN alone to go and teach people how to do business, how to speculate with domain names in Arabic characters, or (inaudible) – anything like that. So that's one part. I mean it's not incumbent on ICANN to solve everything just because there's money. Let's be very honest about that.

And then that takes me to Sergio's intervention on [welcome back teaching]. Sergio, I will say something in Spanish. It's going to be untranslatable – I apologize to the interpreters... [laugh] No, it's a very decent thing and I will translate it myself somehow. "Could" is a verbal tense of the verb "you can" and of the verb "to rot." [laughter] That happens only in Spanish. So yes, you could ask ICANN to review programs but why don't you do them, because if not then I cannot say.

If our organizations are not doing the outreach in the regions with the tools we know, with the media we know, with the language we know, with the relations to the community we have then I cannot say what I'm going to say now to Jim, which is, Jim, you have made the most appalling statement I've ever heard from ICANN Communications, which is "We didn't have the media experience to communicate with Africa." You may not have it, that is true. I'm a former Board member, you may not know it – I was in the first elected Board of ICANN so I've seen the organization grow. We had one employee when I joined the Board.

It's the internet, sir. It's the internet out there. It's the At-Large community – it has everybody everywhere able and willing to take part in the effort, to help craft the message, to help take it to places; to help give you feedback about how it's working.

Jim Trengrove:

Okay. Well I'm sorry if you think it is appalling. I put it to the point that the structures that we have dealt with normally, we are developing new structures and understanding new ways of doing media. We did use Twitter-

Alejandro Pisanty:

The community has it, and Twitter is where you get beaten.

Jim Trengrove:

I'm sorry, Twitter is...

Alejandro Pisanty: Twitter is where you get beaten twice a week or three times a week.

Jim Trengrove: Well, I want to put that point aside and endorse what you also said, and it's the point that you made to Sergio about "Why don't you do it?" But Sergio, you also can call me or write to me and say "There's this wonderful program. Can you set up Akram for five minutes on Tuesday afternoon and have him talk?" I'll say "Absolutely." Radio is the most effective way of getting these kinds of stories out.

And I look at you now not as a group but as a series of individuals, with Tijani now who I know, and I can meet and I can say hello to; and Sergio and Alejandro the same way. But you can send me an email at jim.trengrove@icann.org and all come to me because we need your help on the ground. And I don't want to sound defensive by saying we need your help to spread the word about the Applicant Support Program, but Tijani, when I said "Can we review on what worked and what didn't?" I think communications did not work but I think the [lateness] that we got started and all of those things – that's why I there are lessons to be learned.

But you are all the ground folks, and I just see you as the frontline of communications for us. We will give you support as we can with materials, with time, with making people available to have discussions. Lynn is providing materials as well. It's not going to be done on a global scale. It has to be done individually, region-by-region and that's why I said earlier, the part that I loved about my job working with Public Television at *The News Hour* for many years was going out and understanding how everybody is different, how every region is

different, how every local community is different and the way to engage with them is different as well.

Carlton Samuels: Can I just, I have to say something about the radio.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Carlton, I was going to let you have the last word on this, so please.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you very much, Chari – Carlton Samuels for the record. There are two issues with the radio. I've been saying since 2007 that radio is the way you get to the next billion, and something has happened. Let me tell you what the difference is. Sergio makes a point, because I have listened to him online on his radio program. There are people who already have radio programs on which they talk about the internet, and that's good – that's going on everywhere. I have been on radio. Here's where ICANN can make a difference. There are podcasts, blogs, things that you can set up that actually explain specific things that then can be used to infuse radio programs.

For example, in the Caribbean every government has a time allotted for public broadcasts, and what they always want is information. And when we get those podcasts we hand it to them, and they cut bits and pieces of it and they put it in the public broadcast. That has been happening, some of them have been. Dave Piscitello was one who did some and a couple of persons did some more. What we are suggesting is that you have to expand that program because there are ways to infiltrate that

kind of media into the mainstream media in every country, and that's what I would like for you to look at. Thank you.

Jim Trengrove:

Carlton, I appreciate that and that's another idea that I've just gotten; and I would hope you would share with me any information on that – and Sergio the same, Alejandro, with all of you to come. And I can't say that we're going to honor every request but I think that this is the way to do it. We have to do it piecemeal; we have to do it member-by-member, person-by-person, region-by-region and localize this as much as possible.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Jim, and while I keep on reminding our delegates that lunch is pending and they're missing out on it there's still unasked questions. I just noticed one region might have not asked a question or commented yet – Fouad, you have the last few words. Fouad Bajwa.

Fouad Bajwa:

Thank you, Olivier – Fouad Bajwa from APRALO, Pakistan. I don't know if the tweets about the new gTLD interviews passed your side. Even Rod Beckstrom actually tweeted that as soon as there was a public official announcement about the financial support program, I started reaching out and (inaudible) into detail interviews in *[AU Pakistan] Magazine* and it's part of the *[IDP Publications USA]*. And then at the same time *[global]* started picking it up and then during the National Bloggers Conference I actually was a speaker and I sort of directed the whole

discussion on the new gTLDs, and the gap between actually realizing the potential of it.

I would like to remind you of something which happens in another arena, which is about the IPv6. We lack specific small business cases, one paragraph business cases about “Why do you need this?” or “What can you do with this?” That is why there’s a huge disconnect in the adoption of IPv6, and even Olivier might confirm to this because we’ve been together at ISOC meetings and this is a challenge.

And the same challenge would apply over here. Whenever I sit with someone and we start discussing the new gTLD Financial Application Support Program, for them to understand the very first logic which is “Why do we need to participate and how can we participate?” and in the local language. That’s a major challenge because this was a disconnect in the earlier part as well, that when we were asking for IGF participation we were not part of ICANN delegations. We would be at the IGF, we would be intervening on our own behalf but the technical knowledge would just not be there. The local knowledge would not be there with the ICANN delegation.

And then when the public interaction or public debate was starting between ICANN and other stakeholders of the world, it was just chaos, negative. So that’s one small thing. We have to move into this together, and there should be, for example like my language is Urdu in Pakistan. Urdu is actually Hindi in India. So that’s like, I think after all the international languages that is the largest international language spoken in the world but there’s no recognition for that. I know that’s a UN issue but still, just imagine how far we can reach out – like 5 million

Pakistanis in England? They actually support my country each time there's a problem – that money comes into Pakistan. Just imagine what we're missing out on.

So Urdu, [Devanagari] – I think that's a localization issue but that's where we have to get together and work it out. Thank you. Sorry for delaying lunch.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Fouad, and I think we can close this. Just two things: the fact that there is an action item in the At-Large/ALAC Improvements which mentions that there should be a "Beginner's Guide" prepared for each ICANN meeting. So the one that was prepared for this meeting was *The Simple Guide to Consumer Outreach* – I believe we may have copies available in draft form at the moment, so you'll be able to look at them and they will be printed and ready for Toronto. And the one that will be drafted for Toronto is *The Beginner's Guide to Participating in ICANN*, and I'm sure there will be more forthcoming at future ICANN meetings as well.

So Jim, just closing this meeting and I think we're all pretty hungry and you probably are as well. First I have to thank you for coming to see us, but what you have here in front of you is an amazing communications machine as well that can reach further than anything else in ICANN. Use it. Use it because it's something that doesn't cost as much as a communications agency that receives \$1 million and does very little – sorry, I had to say that one.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But it is something that really reaches the right places and also high places. We currently, and we have to be clear – we currently are in a battle for telecommunications and for communication, and this is part of your soldiers that are right here. And they can go straight behind the lines wherever they are, whichever they can – well, we don't want to use the "enemy" thing, it's not "them and us." But we can blow them into pieces. [laughter] So use us and we'll be able to really help, and I hope that in return you can really help us in our work. Thank you.

Jim Trengrove: Let me say a quick comment if I can. Again, thank you very much and I really am honored to be here with everything that's going on – this is really terrific. Two things: number one, as I said please send me an email if you have ideas. I would much rather talk to you in person, though, and so as you see me during the week or if I see you – and we talked about how we can do better outreach into your specific areas of the world – let's have a conversation about it, and let's start there. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thanks very much, and thanks, Lynn, as well for coming here.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And no doubt you'll receive a lot of emails from us, so thanks.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And now we have the lunch break. Now, the only problem is that we are already 45 minutes late. We cannot have a ten-minute lunch break; just queuing up is about ten minutes. Just let me consult with, is Heidi here? Or Gisella will probably be able to first tell us where to find some food and then estimate how much time it might take us to do that.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Can we leave our things here?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mr. Chairman, what time are you reconvening?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, we have consulted with Heidi. We are reconvening at 14:00, 2:00 PM back here. So that gives us about 45 minutes, which is the closest we can to an hour. But please be here at 14:00 because we have a lot of things to do this afternoon. Thank you and bon appetit!

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: For those people following us remotely people are trickling back at the moment. We'll start in a couple of minutes.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, welcome back, everybody!

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So welcome back, everyone, to this afternoon's session of the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session I. The time is 14:15, or 2:15 PM. We have an action-filled afternoon and I guess we have to start right now. We have two presentations: the first about the Consumer Metrics and the second one being about the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group. And so I hand the floor over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr who will be providing us with a short summary of what's been happening in the Consumer Metrics Working Group. Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I've asked Matt to pop up Slide 2 of the slide deck, which is – and we will not apologize for the fact – designed for presentation to the GNSO. The GNSO had this presented yesterday by one of the CCI Work Group which I attend along with Olivier. It is a GNSO – I've lost the word, "chartered," not difficult to get once I got there – chartered work group, so the primary purpose of this slide deck was in fact to use with the GNSO, and it's getting a rerun with the GNSO and GAC meeting we believe. So this will be or is already in the Dropbox space that you find all things background- and material-wise for today's and this week's meetings; and I just wanted to take you very briefly through this slide deck so we're all equitable and fair and we've all got the same information.

For those of you who haven't been living and breathing consumer metrics, choice and competition – and there is trust in there as well; and I don't know how you all haven't been living and breathing it but just in case some of you haven't been day-to-day watching this space, we have been developing an advice letter which is based on the deliberations of the Work Group. The At-Large community and specifically the Work Group is well represented by Olivier and myself, and I say well represented because we haven't missed a meeting – there's been no meeting where one or the other of us haven't been there. And we've ensured that the issues as we understand them are constantly in front of the group.

The group, as we presented last time, has gone through the matter of the definitions. We had a first draft of advice that was out and was deliberated in the Costa Rica meeting. That was part of a public

comment period, and the public comment period between Costa Rica and now has closed; and we were delighted by the extensive and very thoughtful – in fact in some cases scarily so – information and commentary we got in from a very wide cross section of the community. We even had a late entry which we were I think not unreasonably generous enough to bring into the fold of commentary. When the United States government takes the time to write some 13 or 14 pages on your advice letter, you would be ill advised not to let them get it in a day or two late. So naughty us. [echoing sound] That was not the Australian’s fault, even though I did say “naughty us” but we did allow that to come in.

We have if memory serves something like 73, 74 comments categories that we are dealing with and we are about halfway through the review of all of those. Each and every comment is being considered, and what this slide deck is going to do is to just give you some of the high points. I don’t think I need to tell this group why consumer metrics are important, but the slide deck – and you may wish to use the slide deck with your own communities – does go to the detail of the Affirmation of Commitments and why we are doing what we’re doing, remembering that the ALAC as one of the requested bodies of ICANN from the Board resolution has to do a piece of advice. And we figured we may as well work with one work group than work with several.

If you can move to the next slide? Thank you, Matt, that would be great. So looking at recent developments, yes, you know it’s been chartered. We’ve updated to say we’ve got 75% of the public comments having been considered. As I said, they are particularly meaningful and quite deep and analytical comments, and the full range

of comments plus our commentary tool will be available for public scrutiny but not just yet. Next slide, please.

When we look at why we were here, what Olivier and I are trying to do on your behalf is ensure that when this letter, this draft advice comes out it's something very close if not identical to a sentiment that the ALAC will be able to say "Yes, we agree and we think these measures and these definitions are reasonable." What we need to be very clear on is that all that it's doing is providing guidance to the ICANN Board on the types of things we need to measure, and to measure have defined, so that we can have baseline material – now stuff, and targets – then stuff. The twelve months after new gTLDs after the root, the Affirmation of Commitment-required review team which has to look at competition, consumer trust, and choice – it has to do that – that they have material they can choose to work with. There is no requirement for them to pick up on all of these things but we're trying to get the groundwork done and the baseline material created. We're in no way trying to say that this is going to be the only sets of metrics or any of the metrics that they choose to run. Next slide, please.

The advice definitions, ladies and gentlemen, have been adjusted to reflect comments that people even at this table made as a result of our public comment period, so I will read to the record what our current proposed advised definitions are. We have a fairly familiar outline now that "consumer" in our terms are actual and potential internet users and registrants. Please note, ladies and gentlemen, the order that they are in now, and I think we have gone a fair way towards satisfying the concerns that we're not just talking about domain name registration holders in this process.

With that as the definition for “consumer” we’re now defining “consumer trust” as the confidence consumers have in the domain name system – a big overarching statement and something I hope you will all feel fairly comfortable with; if not, let us know. This includes – notice includes, does not say it is limited to – trust in the consistency of domain resolution, confidence that a TLD registry operator is fulfilling the registry’s proposed purpose – in other words, the answer to Question #18 – and is complying with ICANN policies – and this is a change – and applicable national laws, and confidence in ICANN’s compliance function. And that, team, is a big ask but we think it’s worthwhile putting out there. Next slide, please.

With that same definition of consumer, we’re looking at “consumer choice” being the range of options available to consumers for domain scripts and languages, and for the TLDs that offer meaningful choice as to their proposed purpose; and integrity of their domain name registrants. It’s one of the more difficult sentences to try and bludgeon into something acceptable because we did have a number of people commenting that we can’t just be looking at script issues, that we can’t just be looking at trust from the registry – we also need to look at the resellers, we need to look at the whole food chain. And hopefully this sentence will satisfy that.

And finally, the definition that we propose for “competition” is the quantity, diversity, and the potential for market rivalry of gTLDs, TLD registry operators, and registrars. Note, we are excepting in that sentence that ccTLD operators are part of that story. If you can go to the next slide then I’ll just very, very quickly go into some of the key issues that we think we’ve worked on, and hopefully when you see the

final advice letter you will agree. We've now expanded the metrics fields to some 40 – in fact, I think it'll end up closer to 50 particular metrics or measurements and we now have a proposal for an expanded user and registrant set of surveys where we will be eliciting specific questions on consumer trust and consumer choice.

We will be measuring or proposing that they measure the relative incidents of registration abuses because we realize it's a bigger field but we still want to know is it an order of magnitude more or is it pretty much the same that we have now, it's just there's more of them? So I think we're trying to tease that out. We're looking at defensive and duplicate registrations and we're looking at a competition situation where the proposal currently is that we'll collect wholesale and retail pricing despite ICANN Legal's concern on this matter that it will have some effect on some of the interesting laws that seem to be applicable in the United States and not necessarily in all other sovereign territories. But to satisfy their concerns what we're proposing is that this is done by a third party and that it is in no way seen as collusion because the datasets will be sanitized before they come back into the mix for us.

We also have gone into what could have been a rabbit hole but we think we've got it fairly well managed by electric fencing of about 40,000 volts is the cost versus benefits of the gTLD Expansion Program. This is something that members of the GAC and the United States Government are passionate about. Next slide, thank you, and then I'll call for questions.

You'll note a small change, those of you who have lived and breathed the last results set of advice, that we've done huge things to our

timeline. We've got fuzziness and dotty bits, and so do note that the fuzziness and dotty bits are a change in the timeline; and that we think that the timeline as she was writ is still valid but we recognize that there are some pre-work pieces that need to be done in terms of recording of metrics from an ICANN perspective on the assumption that the ICANN Board will instruct staff to do so; and also that with shall we say a couple of interesting delays and the potential for even more we're not quite sure where the go live is going to be, and so we've got the dotty line before the Affirmation of Commitments-required review of the New gTLD Program and its effect on consumer confidence, consumer trust and consumer choice is dealt with.

I'll now open the floor to questions and I'd be very keen for anyone who has a substantive comment on this very, very brief, very, very high-level review to pose them now. We may, I would suggest, Olivier, take the opportunity to take them on notice particularly if there's something that we haven't dealt with in the 25% that we still need to run through. I recognize you, Beau, go ahead.

Beau Brendler:

Thank you. I wanted to compliment you. When this Working Group first started out I didn't think it was going to turn out to be worthwhile because I didn't really understand the scope of it. But you know, it's good – I'm glad to see it. If you could go back to your second slide, though?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yeah, that would be "Recent Developments?"

Beau Brendler: One back.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: “Why Consumer Metrics Are Important?”

Beau Brendler: Let me see... No, the next one. I’m not finding it. There was some language having to do with registries fulfilling their registry something... Oh wait, wait – you just had it. Nope, now it’s gone – there it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know what you’re talking about.

Beau Brendler: “Trust in the consistency,” yeah, “confidence in the TLD operators fulfilling the registry’s proposed purpose.”

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Beau Brendler: If this was supposed to be for consumers, or if consumers are going to have the opportunity to review this or even have it benefit them – I mean I don’t know what that means: “confidence that a TLD registry operator is fulfilling the registry’s proposed purpose.” Can you elaborate on what the proposed purpose is?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I certainly can, Beau, and more importantly I can assure you that these definitions are for use in the Affirmation of Commitments Review on the effect of the New gTLD Program, and not as an outward-facing set of definitions. We're happy to have them as an outward-facing set of definitions and we'd like to have consumer groups help us socialize them provide that the intent is still there, but what we're talking about is the ability for a real measure of "Is what people said in the answer to Question #18 of their new gTLD application actually what they are doing?" And we have to ask that question at twelve months, two years and three years out from go live.

Beau Brendler: Okay, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is there anything online, anyone? You know, my inability to see hands... Nobody? In which case, Mr. Chairman, back to you and we shall keep you posted. Oh, one final word I suggest is that it would be the group's intention, the Work Group's intention that the final proposed draft letter of advice come to the At-Large Advisory Committee sometime between now and the Toronto meeting. So it is unfortunate that we are unable to present it to you all at this meeting but we will not be waiting until Toronto; it will come between now and Toronto. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this very timely report and the next part of our afternoon is now going to deal with a fifteen-minute update about the DSSA Working Group. This is the dynamic, well the DNS Security & Stability Analysis Working Group which as well is a cross-community working group. I'll wait for Matt to upload the presentation on the Adobe, and in the meantime I'll pass these one-pagers which have been prepared by Mikey O'Connor who was supposed to be sitting behind me at some point... He's hiding. Mikey, would you like to step up to the table, please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Mikey, we need to make you step up, boy. [laughter] And just while they're being passed out can I do a huge "Yay team!" for Mikey in his role? I mean he's one of the Co-Chairs but he's the Co-Chair who has taken the lead, herded the cats, listened to the cats squawk, turned it into at least some semblance of the English language, and bludgeoned what I think is an amazingly complex set of stuff into... I mean my grandmother, should she still be alive, would understand this. And I think this is brilliant and I really want to mark this moment formally to go "Yay Mikey!"

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Mikey has indeed been a fantastic Co-Chair, and in fact every week we've had two calls – the first one with the Co-Chairs talking to each other and Mikey leading the show, and the second call with everyone in

the Working Group being on the call and Mikey leading the show again. But Mikey has done a fantastic amount of work on this and if it wasn't for him I don't think we would have been as far as we are at the moment in something which is a very complex thing. The DNS Security & Stability Analysis is a case of where do we start? We're dealing here with a worldwide resource with many, many different stakeholders and with confidential information also included in the lot just to spice it all up.

So let's go over to the first slide, please, and we'll remind you a little bit about what the DSSA does. As its name suggests it's the analysis to find out if the DNS is about to collapse, if the internet is about to close down tomorrow or tonight. And the DSSA was started by establishing a cross-constituency working group as we all know, about was it a year and a half? Time goes so quickly. Oh, two years – two years! My goodness, that's a long time, but what it has done is to clarify the scope of the effort that was required – that took quite a while already. It developed a protocol to handle confidential information, and I believe we showed you that protocol the last time that we had a quick run through of what the DSSA was doing. It built a risk assessment framework and it developed risk scenarios, and we're going to look at a few of these as we come into the next slide of this presentation.

And the next steps of course are to complete the risk assessment, refine the methodology and to introduce the framework to a broader audience than just geeks and techies that are in the DSSA Working Group itself.

So if we go to the next slide you might get an idea of how the DSSA Working Group work actually fits. The Board has a DNS Risk Management Framework Working Group which deals with all parts of ICANN and basically finds out the risk... It's great to have things dancing around my screen but it makes it a little harder to read it, especially when it's all crunched up now. I really appreciate it. Would you like to make it go around in circles as well? That'd be really good!

Matt Ashtiani:

I don't know how to do that yet. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

No, but on my own screen now I've got "Lobby Maintenance," I don't know what else. I mean it's great to find out what's happening in the lobby but I'd rather see what's going on here.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And it is funny because it is the second time we're faced with technical problems when we address the DSSA, and I sometimes think our findings might actually be required yesterday rather than today. But Mikey, we'll have to take note that this is one of the problems – the inability to actually display the results of what the Working Group is doing.

Thankfully I have a backup scenario as we all do in our risk analysis, so I'll put it on my screen if the other screens don't work too well. The DNRMF, the Board Risk Management Framework deals with assessment of risks, mitigation of risks and monitoring of the risks. And it's a feedback loop which once you start monitoring you start the assessment again to find out in all sorts of cases what will happen next. The part of the DSSA's work, if we go to the next slide if we can... Fantastic. Well, thank goodness I'm not reading from that screen because my eyes are getting worse – I'm going to be cross-eyed.

So the DSSA is effectively dealing with the assessment of the risks and there needs to be a method designed for that, and this is the primary core part of the work of the DSSA. If we look at the various organizations of ICANN that deal with risk and deal with its mitigation and monitoring, etc., looking at the next page... It'll be interesting to see how that comes up on the screen. Oh, that comes up well. You'll see that you have standard tools and techniques at the top, risk planning, risk assessment – looking clockwise; monitoring, education training, awareness and all others including frontline mitigation. The DSSA is just one tiny little part of the triangle of risk assessment; there's other work going on and you can see that the DSSA is part of a much larger security and stability ecosystem that includes a whole list of parts of ICANN which I will not go through one at a time due to time constraints.

Now, what is this risk assessment framework? Well, if we go to the next page the way that it was designed by the working group was to base it on the [NIST 830 standard], a standard that was worked on – and the NIST is the National Institute of Standards and Technology. They've

worked on that for quite a while – I gather it's for military reasons. But it's a pretty good framework and it's tailored to meet unique ICANN requirements.

Taking you to the next page: so it starts basically with the sources. There are two types of sources: you've got an adversarial threat source – hackers, people who are trying to take your network down. And the next page you have a non-adversarial threat source, which would be effectively the cleaner unplugging the computer systems and routers in order to clean the place up which might also be adversarial in some cases. [laughter] Anyway in that case this is not adversarial and it might also be due to other causes.

Now, this has a couple of contexts. The first one is the context of predisposing conditions with varying pervasiveness. By the way, next slide – okay, so that's the one. And after that you also have security controls. Now, these are all the contextual things. You have to take those factors into account to be able to perform your analysis, so planned and implemented security controls. And finally, next – taking advantage or making use of the vulnerabilities of the system itself. That obviously has a big repercussion on what the consequence is going to be. Next slide, please.

This could initiate something – be it a total shutdown or be it something that no one will ever notice, but it goes in various levels of consequences because of the various levels of the predisposing conditions and the initial scenarios. And so it would cause a threat event which would have various impacts and could result in... Next slide – adverse impacts, here we go: shutting off the network, delaying things

and basically all sorts of impacts that you can look at. And of course the DSSA Working Group has worked on quite a few of these.

And if we go to the next slide – this is the combination of the whole system. Basically you have the threat sources create the risk for the users and the providers of the DNS, and the accommodation is a whole range of impacts and likelihood and the effects are felt. Now looking at the next slide, and I'm going through these very quickly so Mikey, do tap me if I'm totally wrong on this so far. It's fine? Okay.

Looking at the next slide, there are several risk scenarios which were identified by the group and you have this pretty pyramid system which has to be read from the top to the bottom, actually, which is strange because in ICANN we know that everything usually works the other way around, from the bottom to the top. But in this condition, in this way if you look at the pyramid at the top you have strategic scenarios; at the bottom of the pyramid you have tactical scenarios. On the left-hand side you'll see long-term effects and on the right-hand side you see immediate effects. And so the risk scenario, it looks at five different scenarios here. And we'll start with the first one – next slide, please.

And the first one is the gaps in policy management or leadership splits in the root, so we're dealing here basically with a lot of things that we do here – the policy part of it. If we don't write our policy correctly there could be a gap in it and it could be exploited, and that's something which usually happens more in the long term than the short term, although it's somewhere in the middle. When policy is badly developed it usually is ecosystem-wide, so the whole internet would be affected by it. Next slide, please.

Further down you have reductive forces, security, risk mitigation, control through rules – things that effectively split the root because of what’s going on. And these are somehow more short-term because you’ll find out about them right away. They often have a regional or a segment focus, and well I’m not quite sure if I have to add any more to that.

The next one, further down the pyramid so becoming more tactical and less strategic: you have a widespread natural disaster – there was another idea – which could bring down the root or a major TLD. You have to understand, these are five specific scenarios which have been looked at or which will be looked at I guess. And this widespread natural disaster is something which is more immediate, less long-term because you’d imagine that there would be some form of repairs going on; but it’s something that would be more tactical and less strategic. It happens, darn. Next?

Further down, even more tactical and more immediate results: attacks exploiting technical vulnerabilities of the DNS bringing down the root of a major TLD. We’re dealing here with mostly hacking attacks and denial of service – there’s all sorts of malware that might happen; or attacks on the software itself. Can we move to the next one? And of course the more immediate threats you have the more immediate scenarios you have the faster coordination you require, the faster the response and good coordination. In the long term you actually need good models, good tools, a good direction, good management I guess.

So the last scenario here is the inadvertent technical mishap which brings down the root or a TLD – that was the cleaner effectively or

anyone else chopping through cables or this sort of thing. So that's the whole set of scenarios which were looked at. The big question for this group, and now is the time that you have to pay attention, is have we missed any important topic? Can you think of something that we have missed in our different types of scenarios, and if you can and if it is an embarrassing thing we have Paul Vixy who is in the Working Group and who has volunteered to confidentially receive your emails if you know of something that no one else does. That does not include anything that your Chair does, of course. [laughter]

So I think that we've gone through the scenarios so we can go to the next slide, please. The next stage of course is to go to... Is the next slide up? Oh, fantastic. The next stage is to go deeply into the five risk topics and to develop scenarios for these but more deeply – so basically effectively go from the start all the way to the end. Next slide. And we would be doing a refine by doing, so effectively taking a case study as such. So the first one, we would build and validate the tool itself through a case, next slide... And go through the whole assessment. One has to know this is not just some easy thing. Having to take into account the starting threat and then the mitigation, and then the whole set of factors that evolves the event taking place – it is a rather longwinded process which is one of the reasons why it's taken a couple of years to develop this. But these five scenarios will be put through the system and the assessment will be finished till the end so as to be able to validate the overall system.

And so finally the last slide is just whether you have any questions. And I know we've been through this pretty fast but I hope the one sheet we have sent around might be of help. I'll also let my colleague Mikey

O'Connor who has led this and who has done all these fantastic graphs as we've said earlier be able to fill you in on anything that I've missed.
Yes, Yaovi?

Yaovi Atohoun: Yes, Yaovi speaking. The expressions "split the root" and "bring down the root," if you can clarify – it's not very clear for me. "Bring down the root," "split the root," so...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, this is Mikey O'Connor for the transcript. One of the things that we worked awfully hard on in this Working Group is to define our terms and also to set the scope of things, and there are a lot of things that we could have considered but we chose to limit what we looked at to two primary threat events. One of those threat events would be if either the root or a major TLD or a minor TLD were to go down, and good examples of that would be in the case of an adversarial attack where to pick a range of outcomes... One outcome would be an adversarial attack against a single country code, ccTLD, ranging all the way up to an adversarial attack that actually took down the root and thus took down the whole internet. So that's one category of threat events – either the root or a TLD goes down.

The other threat event that we looked at and that tends to be more at the strategic level, would be if the current architecture of the internet is

that there is one root from which everything flows, but there are scenarios where that root could become split into more than one. There's a lot in the popular press right now about that, and the Working Group views that as another significant kind of threat event. And I think it's important to say that that list of five scenarios that we've just listed is a list of things that we want to look at. We don't want to say that these necessarily exist – these are the topic areas that we really want to explore in a lot more depth, and this is a somewhat controversial one, clearly. But we think it's an important one that could have substantial impacts on the users of the internet if it were to happen. Does that clear it up or do you need more? Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler:

Hi, it's Beau Brendler. Is this a reference to some of the discussions about what might be happening with China and...

Mikey O'Connor:

Correct, this is Mikey again, although just to editorialize a little bit, the Chinese proposal is being referred to as a proposal at the IETF; and when one reads that proposal carefully it's not clear that that one actually splits the root. That's a different, a slightly different thing.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Mikey. The interesting thing of course is that the Chinese proposal looks at one of the types of threat events which was at

the top of the pyramid whilst having consequences maybe further down, and that's something which we might have not thought of. I have a queue at the moment. I think there's Jean-Jacques, and then there was Holly and then Fatimata; and then Siva.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you, Olivier – this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat speaking. Mikey, I have a question about the current country which holds the system for historic reasons, and apparently there's one risk which you have not studied because it's not part of the mandate maybe, which is what happens if right at the top of your pyramid in your strategic tip or the core, one country – which you may know fairly well – decides that one TLD, one ccTLD is lousy for whatever reason? Instead of having blue eyes they have blue skin and black eyes or something like that, or blue hair – that would be even more interesting.

Now, have you studied that at all? Of course it leads into another question that Beau Brendler brought up, which is the separation of the splitting of the root. So as a non-US citizen I'm interested to know if you consider that that would be equally a threat or if it's just keeping the monopoly?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor:

I would put that somewhere in the first or the second of the scenarios that we've described. The ISOC has been looking at a number of

scenarios as well, and the second one on the list is really derived from ISOC's work, and I'm not sure if the one you're describing fits in there or in the very first one. But I think it's safe to say that, and again, I have to emphasize over and over again that we haven't actually analyzed any of these yet. These are the ones that we think we want to analyze. But I'm absolutely sure that that question is going to be found in one of those two analyses, maybe both.

It's interesting: historically, and I think when we were chartered, people tend to look at these sorts of questions from a technical standpoint. So the third, fourth, and fifth scenarios on the list tend to be the sort of technical issue that security people usually look at. I think one of the interesting things that the Working Group has come across is the very issue that you're raising. It's essentially that the policy layer can be considered a risk as well, and that we the community need to look at that just like we look at the technical issues and see if there are things that need to be done.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Excuse me, Olivier, may I put a follow-up question?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, we have a lot of questions and very little time, Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yeah, it's about a forum or some whistleblowing, Mikey. Can you think of something that would entitle and make efficient community-wide

intervention in case of such a takedown which the community may consider unfair or even illegal?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: You really have to squint, but if you look at the pictures that are on the screen right now, the six-sided circle diagram which is one of the earlier pieces of work that the Working Group had to do – that's a diagram that needs to include a lot more people than just ICANN. It needs to include registries, registrars, ISOC, IETF, the community, you all, etc., and that's why we've raised it as "gaps in policy, management or leadership may lead to these kinds of issues." It's outside of our charter to recommend solutions to these. Our charter is to assess the risks and determine essentially the likelihood of them happening.

The next one up in that circle is the manage the risk or mitigate the risk section, and one of the gaps that we're possibly going to discover is that there isn't a coordinated way right now to do that. So I can't overemphasize how much work remains to be done, and again, how important some of the issues that you're raising are. But we don't necessarily a.) have the answers, or b.) have within our charter the mandate to recommend solutions to that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mikey. Unfortunately we have actually run out of time, and I know we had four people in the queue. We had Holly, Fatimata, Siva

and Sala. Can I ask that you email your questions in and they will be published on the list from Mikey and from the Working Group? I'm really sorry about this but we have Compliance that has arrived, and because we're running late and we have a lot of things to talk about with Compliance, perhaps we should thank Mikey for coming over to let us know a little bit more about this and keep on going on with the good work. One last word?

Mikey O'Connor:

Just a 15-second word: this is a Working Group comprised of 50 people across five ACs and SOs. It is an extraordinary group of people and it is not in any way an accurate representation to say that I had anything but a very small role in this. This is an incredible piece of work.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Alright, thanks very much.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, moving swiftly on we now have Compliance, and Maguy Serad and her team have entered the room and are currently taking position, starting gates, yes. So thank you and welcome again. After the last time we had quite a bloodbath going on – no, it wasn't really. I know that you enjoyed it and we enjoyed being able to speak with you as well. I know that we have also Garth Bruen online remotely as well, and we had a number of questions. And I understand that between our

meeting over in Costa Rica and our meeting now there's been a lot of discussion going on between various members of the At-Large community and yourselves as well.

What I'm going to do is to hand the floor over to Carlton but perhaps, are you going to start with a presentation or... Okay, let's start quickly with a presentation and then we'll open the floor for discussion after that. Maguy, you have the floor.

Maguy Serad:

Good afternoon, everyone. This is Maguy Serad from Contractual Compliance. Thank you for the opportunity of being here with you. What we would like to propose if you do not mind, allow us the opportunity to go through the slides. The slides will address, I think we have about eight questions from ALAC; and at the beginning of the slides I have a couple of slides I will leave with you but I will only speak to one of them to share with you the progress and updates on what we are doing.

With me in the room I'm pleased to be joined by Stacy Burnette; Owen Smigelski is one of the new team members that joined us a few months back – he's also an attorney with over ten years of experience with IP. I also have Carlos Alvarez. He's a Colombian attorney; he's been on the team with us for a couple years. So with that, Matt... Okay.

So the general slides I want to share with you is a slide that we communicated upon my arrival after the [three year plan]. We are in 2012 and the update I want to share with you briefly before we go to the questions is that we continue to grow staff in numbers and

expertise. I am pleased to announce that in early July I will have another lawyer joining our team and this lady, Laticia, is joining us. She's Spanish, originally from Spain and comes to us with a couple of years of experience. We also have two open positions that we are very actively interviewing for.

On the operations side we continue to standardize our communication, update our website for the sake of transparency and also providing better information. Under plan and develop for the 2012 plan, we're pleased to share with you that over the next few slides you will see – I'm on Slide 3, Matt – we are in the process to continue to develop additional metrics, and that's the best way to measure not just the Compliance activities but the activities that are happening outside the area with the contracted parties. We have developed an audit strategy that we will bring to the next ICANN meeting in Toronto; we will hold an outreach session to share with you in-depth that opportunity.

System enhancements continue. We developed and updated the system as I shared with you. We have fragmented tools and we're looking into a long-term solution, but we cannot wait for the long-term. So we updated all the C ticket enhancements to align with the process so that you are very aware of it and all the stakeholders and all the contracted parties that now we follow. We just completed the UDRP ticketing system with those enhancements and we are now working on the WHOIS Data Problem System, and that is due to complete in line with the process by the end of July. With that also one of the activities for this year is designing an annual Compliance Report and working on new gTLD activities.

So what I want to do is leave you with slides. If you, Matt, don't mind going briefly through Slide #4. Everything metric-wise is going to be aligned with this process and approach, so you're going to see on Slide #5 how in the past we used to just share with you volumes at a level of the type of complaints we get. Now we are sharing with you in the two phases, the prevention phase and the enforcement phase.

The next slide, Matt, is going to show you now how we're aligning our metrics by the types and also by the phases. We're able now to break down to show you how initially we have such a high volume. Through the prevention phase and collaboration we get many of them addressed and only a few portion of those tickets or complaints or issues make it to the second level. And usually by the third level we have very little tickets that are not in compliance or that might require escalated actions into enforcement.

So Matt, if you don't mind going directly now to Slide #10 and I'll leave the rest of those slides for ALAC to look at; and if they have questions they can come back to us. With that I'm going to turn to the questions that were asked. The way we presented the questions is you will see the question on one slide highlighted, and then following, the next slide will be the responses. What I'm going to do is ask Owen, it's his first opportunity to speak to ALAC, to present the questions. Again, if it's alright with staff, with the team around here and on the call, allow is to answer them and we'll be more than happy to come back to the slides and address them in more detail.

I see Carlton and Olivier shaking their heads – you're okay with that approach? Thank you very much, I appreciate it. Owen?

Owen Smigelski:

So Question #1 was whether ICANN does or does not have the ability to enforce 3.7.8 of the RAA with regards to accuracy of WHOIS data. And going on to the next slide, ICANN does have the ability to enforce all the provisions of the RAA including 3.7.8. We are authorized to breach registrars who fail to delete or take reasonable steps to correct inaccurate WHOIS data. As we've said previously, what's done is on a case-by-case basis and it's not necessarily just because one thing happens that automatically triggers a breach or a de-accreditation. The next slide...

The next one is that ALAC requested that the General Counsel be in attendance. In response we have Sam here because John was not available for this. So if there's any questions that can't be answered she's here to do that. Next slide.

This inquiry was asking at what level are decisions not to do breach notices made, whether it's in Compliance or within ICANN and what type of criteria are there? Compliance staff makes a decision in line with its processes for enforcing the RAA.

The next slide, Question #4 was what is the legal rationale for keeping names secret of registrars who are subject to unresolved complaints? The rationale for that is we do that because it's not necessarily a breach until that notice has been published, and we like to work the collaborative environment; and shaming people publicly for everything won't lead to that type of cooperation. So we get a lot more cooperation if they work with us, and to the point that we're able to

resolve them a lot of these things never do get to come back up and I think it's going very well now with that.

The next question: what is ICANN doing to instill public confidence in the New gTLD Program given its questionable track record in addressing problems within the existing number of registrars and registries? There are a number of things that have been going in Compliance and Maguy's been giving those updates in the last few meetings on that: strengthening Contractual Compliance is one of ICANN's strategic priorities. Some things that demonstrate that is the increase of the budget 62% from FY'12 to FY'13; improving current systems; hiring new staff; more outreach activities; increased transparency; improved communications. There's a number of things that are going on multiple fronts for that.

The next slide, Question #6: how many ICANN-accredited registrars are currently out of compliance with the RAA? When will their accreditation be revoked? That's really difficult to answer because that changes day-by-day based upon the various preventative measures that are going on through that informal resolution process. Accreditation can be terminated when a breach has failed to cure and have not been given that, and that's something that is published on the ICANN website when that breach notice does go out.

Question #7 asked by ALAC is what mechanism is in place to inform consumers of an occasion when an ICANN-accredited registrar is out of compliance with its trust mark? There was a little problem with this in that we weren't really sure what the trust mark was and how that would relate to our enforcement capabilities. If we can have some

more information about what that meant, if it is referring to the ICANN-accredited registrar logo. Upon revocation of accreditation they lose the license to use that mark – they are not allowed to use that logo anymore.

And I think that does it for the questions and the slides.

Maguy Serad:

So I know we went through them quickly and I'm sure there are a lot of in-depth questions that relate to them. If you don't mind I'm going to turn it over, Olivier, to you or to Carlton to facilitate us through the next session.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I think you'll pass it over to me and I'll pass the hand over to Carlton who will be leading the discussions here. It'll be interesting. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Olivier – this is Carlton for the record. Maguy and your team, thanks for coming again. We are quite pleased, some of us at least to see that you've made some progress with some of the outstanding niggling issues we've had with Compliance. I want to go to the new flowcharts that you put out recently, and I'm asking Matt to put up the first one – the first one that says their approach, the ICANN approach... Put up the approach one first, Matt, if you would because this now speaks to the philosophy of Compliance here forward, and I'd like to understand in detail.

It's good that you have taken an approach which allows you to capture what happens during each stage of this, and if we look at the numbers you are reporting here there's some evidence that maybe this might work some. So let me ask you this. The first one says "Prevention State" and you have the first, second and third inquiry and there's a lot of steps. As you know, in any enforcement action, the line that you draw that people have to respond to is going to be very important to their sense of meeting their obligations.

So you have a timeline by which people who you are congressing with because of one thing or another have to respond. Is it the same timeline for the informal process as well as the formal process?

Maguy Serad:

So I just want to make sure I understand the question, Carlton. The timeline that you're asking for is the timeline that we respond in the prevention and the timeline that we respond in the enforcement?

Carlton Samuels:

Right.

Maguy Serad:

Right, thank you. So in the prevention phase, what we have is you see the three steps. What we try to instill is a timeline in general and we have that shared with you in the main deck on Slide #4 that has those timelines for the prevention with the exception of WDPRS – the contractual obligation says we have to give 15 days' notice for the first prevention. With the exception of that the timeline is five business days

for a contracted party to respond to us. Now, that's the timeline for them to respond to us. In the enforcement, the timeline is very specific. When we issue a breach notice it's very specifically stated in that breach notice with that specific date, and we enforce that also. And there's only one timeline in the breach notice – it's not like three steps.

Carlton Samuels:

Okay, so this is very clear that in the informal process you have a timeline and you follow through that. When you move to enforcement which is the breach process then there is a very specific drop dead time that they have to respond. Can I ask you this, then – is there a sense that you are getting, those that have been issued breach notices is there a sense that they are responsive to that time?

Maguy Serad:

What I would like to do is ask Stacy... Stacy has been with the responsibility of enforcement since my arrival. We keep evolving our team but she's the one who's been responsible for issuing those and can address that question immediately.

Stacy Burnette:

Most registrars take action and cure their breaches. We have had a few instances in the past where registrars didn't respond and we had to move forward with termination because it appeared that they abandoned their business. But most registrars do reach us in time and in fact, you can look on our website and you can see the updates that occur – once we hear from them and they cure the breaches we update the webpage.

Maguy Serad: And I'd like to add one thing also. It's about building up the reputation and the respect. I've noticed I think recently that some of the breach notices we issued, we heard back from the registrar much earlier than that drop date, right?

Stacy Burnette: Yes, sometimes within 24 hours they're contacting us, inquiring as to what they need to do to cure the breach.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Maguy, it's Olivier for the transcript. We actually have a couple of questions that have come in, first from Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Yes, this is Eduardo Diaz for the record. In one of your slides, I think the one with the budget where it says you're increasing staff and you're doing more outreach activities, can you give us an example of one of those outreach activities, what they are? Thank you.

Maguy Serad: So we had put together our staff and kind of brainstormed on what are the kinds of outreach activities, and as you all know it can span due to technology from something like webinars, conference calls directly; and the outreach activities can be directed at contracted parties or at the general audience. Our immediate focus, because of the different

challenges since my arrival that you've all been aware of, we've focused on outreach activities now between us and the contracted parties.

So I don't know if we have it in the appendix of this deck. I will look at it and inform you, but the outreach activities for example for the past trimester: we focused on WHOIS inaccuracy and transfer complaints. We did a very simple approach. We picked very simple math, not by registration volume – just by the number of complaints we are receiving. We took the top ten registrars in that space and we had assigned and built information based on the data we have, and we touched base with each of the ten registrars – conference calls with our staff and their staff and the Compliance Department to share with them what we have and to understand their processes and procedures, and if they're seeing that same volume and what is being done about it.

So again, our outreach activities for the short term, Eduardo, is focus on contracted parties. Another outreach activity we did is with the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. Effective June 1st there were some changes to the policy, so an outreach activity in that space was two-sided, the first one at the North American Regional Meeting which is a two-day meeting for contracted parties. We presented to them the changes. We took a proactive approach of showing them what are the changes, what does it mean from a compliance perspective? We're not here to educate on policy but a compliance perspective and what we will be looking for.

We also turned that presentation into a PDF format and put it under "Outreach" on our website. So the short term is focusing on immediate needs that we have, and we want to do additional outreach activities

and we are exploring the means and putting together what would be that plan and how could we benefit from it. Because it's such a global ICANN community we want to make sure we're doing it well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. We have a queue in operation. We first have Evan and then we'll have Garth, and I see that Beau has put his hand up. So first, Evan. Oh, were you in there as well? Holly as well. Okay, so Evan, Garth, Holly and Bea.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. I have questions for two of the answers on the slides. If you could go back to #6, please, and that was the question about... Question #6, sorry. Okay, how many registrars are currently out of compliance, and the answer was well it varies and it comes and goes. Okay, you're here today, you knew you were coming here today – what's the number today?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The microphone system is working. There is just a calculation going on.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: And the silence is being interpreted properly in several languages.
[laughter]

Maguy Serad: Okay, so to answer very directly, Evan, we have... If you look at our website you'll see how many are in breach and those are the ones we

look at as noncompliance from a public perspective. In the prevention phase those are the numbers we have up on the previous slides and we can look at that table and let you know. I didn't count them, I'll be honest with you. So if you look at Slide... But again, this is from March through May, Slide 5.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm sorry, it wasn't meant to be hostile. It was...

Maguy Serad: No, no, it's a good question and again, we are enhancing our systems. I cannot go to one tool and say "Pull up the data," right? So our reporting is backtracked. But I can go in today if I'm looking for something specific and identify it, but to pull this data is not at the tip of our hands. That's our mid-term enhancements that we're working on after we finish the process. It's very important to get the process aligned across the three systems; the next enhancement is about that consolidation of reporting.

Evan Leibovitch: I understand. My only point was you asked for the questions in advance. You had the questions in advance – one of the questions was "How many?" So although the system is variable and the numbers are variable, you knew well in advance we are asking this question as of today. So I didn't realize that it would be difficult to say "Here's a number" today.

Maguy Serad: That's fair. Like I said, we only pulled up the data March through May, and I didn't pull up the data for today.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I won't belabor the point. I'll go on to Question #3 please, if you could go back to that? Okay. And so my eyes are failing me... The issue was what happens in the case of... There's been occasions where there's been a decision that a breach has been made and yet no further action was taken, and so the question was why was that choice made? It goes to the part of the flowchart that says "No further action," and I guess the question is why has the decision been made to take no further action? And I'm asking for a little bit more detail than just saying "This is adhering to the RAA." I'd like a little bit more if you could on the thought process of how the interpretation of the RAA would say this kind of breach doesn't require us to do any more. Thank you.

Stacy Burnette: I want to respond to that question, and I think it requires a full explanation... I'm sorry, Stacy Burnette, Director of Contractual Compliance – I work with Maguy every day. Excuse me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sorry, the "Cheryl-for-the-transcript-record" is for the transcript record in three languages; it's not because we don't know who you are. It's why we say "Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record."

Stacy Burnette:

Very well, no problem. So I think it requires a full explanation of the informal process and the formal process. We have an informal process that concerns us doing an inquiry concerning an alleged breach. We get complaints from the community, sometimes via our audit results it looks like there might be noncompliance, and so we inquire with the party. After an inquiry period if it becomes clear the registrar is out of compliance with the agreement we give them a short period of time to correct the breach informally. If they do not correct in like five days as Maguy said, then it goes to escalated compliance which is the enforcement stage and then we tell them formally "If you don't correct in fifteen business days you may be subject to termination."

And so sometimes if a registrar's in the informal phase and they correct in five days that ends it, it's over, so there's no need to go to escalated compliance and send a formal breach notice because they cured in the informal stage. Does that help you understand?

Evan Leibovitch:

Mostly but not 100%. It's my understanding, and Garth who's on after me will probably come up with some details, but there's a couple of examples of cases that have gone on and have been found in breach, and then go to a dead end. And I think those were the specific ones we were asking about in this case and I think that was the basis behind #3, is that we understand yes, there's an informal process and if things are voluntarily cleaned up that's the best case all around. But if there's been cases where things have gone into the formal process there appear to be some instances where that has gone into a dead end as well.

Stacy Burnette: So let me make sure that I understand. When you say it goes into the formal process that means we've sent a notice of breach but we didn't follow up with a termination – is that what you mean?

Evan Leibovitch: I believe so, and Garth who's on after me can give some more details about that. And there are some specific instances where things have gone that far and then at the end of the chain there is "We decided to take no action."

Stacy Burnette: Okay, so if you could give me some details then I'll respond directly because I don't want to speak in generalities if you don't mind.

Evan Leibovitch: Garth is next.

Stacy Burnette: Okay, great.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Evan, and thank you, Stacy. The next two questions or two or three, four questions? My goodness, we'll have to answer them quickly or otherwise we'll have a lot more and we don't have enough time for all of them, but are you going to read them to the

record then? Okay, so Matt will be reading the questions from Garth Bruen.

Matt Ashtiani:

Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. These questions come from one of our remote participants, Garth Bruen. His first question is "The new Compliance flowcharts show registrar termination and nonrenewal as the final step in the process. However, the registrar A Technology Company was terminated for failing to pay \$5639.57 in accreditation fees. After paying the fees back, A Technology Company's contract was renewed. Where is the process which allows terminated registrars to renew without reapplying for accreditation?"

Stacy Burnette:

So I do recall the matter concerning A Technology, but what I'd like to do just to make sure we provide all of the facts is provide a written response, because I don't want to misstate the dates and exactly what happened. So Maguy, we'd have to go to the office and look at our records to provide a written response. I don't want to misstate anything concerning that matter.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And it's Olivier here. I think we're not looking at the specific example, but the question is where is the process which allows, in general, which allows terminated registrars to renew without applying for re-accreditation? It sounds as though was that a special case maybe, because there should be a process. So if something is terminated I

guess there usually is a reapplication process which starts I guess from scratch.

Stacy Burnette:

That usually is the case, and again, I want to look at our records to make sure we give you the correct response. I'm not saying we didn't follow a specific process, maybe they did reapply. I don't recall and I don't want to misstate anything, and I think that's fair to you. You wouldn't want false information here today.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Stacy. Next question.

Matt Ashtiani:

Garth's second question is "The .jobs registry has been in breach/arbitration for over one year. There is almost no information published by ICANN or even documents with deleted text. What is the status of this issue? This is not a good sign for the potential handling of all new gTLDs."

Samantha Eisner:

This is Samantha Eisner, Senior Counsel for the record. The .jobs registry matter is in arbitration now which is why Compliance is handing it over to me, because arbitrations are handled through the Office of the General Counsel. If you look at the ICANN Litigation page you'll see that the .jobs registry matter is proceeding through arbitration. We do agree that there was a long delay in getting the arbitrator selected, but you can find from the page that the arbitrators have now been selected.

We had a process where the arbitration panel provider had to go to the arbitrator selection for the third arbitrator, but now we do have an arbitration panel seated. There is a provisional timetable up on the webpage and we expect to see the statement of claim from employee media in the matter on record by the end of August.

As we were negotiating the timetable ICANN did fight for a much more truncated time schedule but the arbitrators determined to go with the schedule that you'll find in the provisional timetable. And just so you know, this is one of the items that we are trying to address through potential revisions to the RAA where if you note what ICANN put up as its proposed timetable, we are actually trying to expedite any sort of arbitration process that comes out of agreements to reduce the number of arbitrators so we don't find a delay in the selection side and consider other ways that we can expedite the dispute resolution process that is part of the rights of our contracted parties.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sam. Next question, please.

Matt Ashtiani: "A question for Owen in response to his presentation: how exactly can ICANN enforce against a registrar who fails to delete a domain where ICANN Compliance's own advisory states this is at the registrar's discretion?"

Owen Smigelski: This is Owen speaking for the record. Many of the registrars do take reasonable steps to investigate alleged inaccuracies in a timely fashion following ICANN requests, and this is something that we have to look at on a case-by-case basis to see what kinds of actions are taken. This includes requesting copies of correspondence, communications, things like that and it's done on a case-by-case basis. There is no one-size-fits-all approach. You can't just terminate a registrar because they did fail to delete; you need to take a look at the specific facts and the background and see what's going on, and we do that manually to address that. And there can be a breach and other compliance actions that come out of failure to correct information or to take those reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of that information.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you, Owen. Next question?

Matt Ashtiani: "Compliance has indicated that Core, Biz.cn and Moniker have not fulfilled their obligations under 3.7.8. Compliance has resolved the issues as closed. Who made this decision?" Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Evan is able to-

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, I actually have a chronology that's been provided. So this is Biz.cn, and the chronology, the last one on 21st May is that there's a notice from ICANN Compliance saying "Registrar verified that the data

was correct in response to initial W ticket notice. Ticket closed.” And so the question is was this third party verified? When you know there’s already something going on at a certain point, are you verifying that or is it simply because the registrar says “We fixed it?” Are you verifying that they fixed it? The idea of closing the ticket merely because they’ve claimed they fixed it seems not to be sufficient.

Maguy Serad:

So to answer the question, again, I’m not in the processing of the tickets on a day-to-day activity but I know that when we receive the data as requested – and you’ll see in the deck, and Eduardo also... Please, everybody look in the appendix. We’ve provided some of the changes, one of which is for WDPRS. We’ve asked for specific data from the registrars to provide to us. WDPRS today is not fully aligned with the new process. That’s one area. But to answer your question, when we receive information we have the staff that looks at it and closes it. So I cannot speak specifically to what and how the decision was made, but I know it’s not just closed because we got “Yes, I closed it.” The staff looks at the information received.

Evan Leibovitch:

Sorry, this is Evan. Then I imagine you would probably want to give what you just told me and put that in your documentation, as opposed to just saying “We received something, ticket closed”; that there be some indication at least in your own documentation that you didn’t just say “Well okay, they sent it – we take their word for it, case closed”; that at least you’ve documented that you verified that what they said they did was actually done. And so there were a couple of cases, and I think

Garth emailed you a number of these and so rather than going into the details of them, if these have indeed been closed the way you've said – that there was some further follow-up done from your end – please document that. It just seems unfulfilled to say “The registrar said they did this, ticket closed.” It doesn't indicate that you actually double checked that afterwards.

Maguy Serad:

Thank you for the feedback, Evan, and again, as we continue to enhance WDPRS which is still not fully launched in that way we'll make sure we address that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Maguy, and thank you, Evan. And it seems that part of your work in Compliance is going to instill confidence in users that Compliance is doing its job and it's following procedure, and certainly performing enforcement. Was that all the questions from Garth? Okay, so we have a long list of people queued up and it's closed now. We have Holly, Beau, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Carlton and Edmon. I think I haven't forgotten anyone and I don't want everyone's hands to go up. So Holly?

Holly Raiche:

Holly Raiche for the record. I think at the heart of the trouble that many of us have in understanding Compliance is 3.7.8. Now, I've looked at the newer version, the draft version and luckily it now has reference to a specification. The draft specification actually says in detail, now or at

least in some detail what you mean by “accuracy” – that is a step forward which is good.

But the term “reasonableness” is still there, and I know you’re going to say it’s on a case-by-case basis but I would like to stress the importance of what Evan said, and that is when we look at “reasonableness” there is a complete lack of confidence as to what you mean. What are you going to ask for? Because when you look at some of the links that have been provided by Garth, what you see is an outline that says basically “We got all the way down here; the registrar said ‘Well, I tried to contact them, the domain name didn’t resolve so sorry, bye,’” and it just looks as if you don’t care. So unless we start to understand the steps you take, the way it’s actually enforced there’s not going to be confidence that 3.7.8 means anything in Compliance. It only means that you get a Scout’s promise from the registrar that they really didn’t mean it.

Maguy Serad:

This is Maguy for the record. Thank you for the feedback, and as Olivier stated to earn that confidence we have to bring it forward and show you. And I just want to repeat one more time, if you look at the deck in the appendix we have a slide that shows currently how WDPRS and the old way operates. We know it’s weak, but the reason we didn’t address that enhancement first is it’s a very complex application, very hard coded if you are in the coding and technology space. We wanted to make sure we make success one step at a time, because we cannot afford failures. We started with C tickets – less customization in that

application. We ensured the success that now we are C ticket processing at the steps with the right validations.

We moved to UDRP and what we hope to do, part of publishing as you saw in how we updated our processes – before we publish we do internal review and we make sure also our contracted parties understand it. So the next thing we want to publish is the templates that we send for our registrars based on the different issues. For example, the template that will be seen in the future that's still not finalized, we're finishing it up – we're applying it and we plan on applying it, but we want to publish it. We will show you what is asked for from the very first day, Holly. We want to have facts from the first time, and what is asked of the second level and the third level.

So by publishing those you will see what we are looking for and you will hold us accountable to what we say that we are doing. And we will do what we say we're going to do.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Maguy. Next in the queue is Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler: Sorry, Beau Brendler. Could you go to, I think it's the seventh slide – it's one of the questions you had up there, the one that had to do with the trust mark you weren't sure about?

[background conversation]

Beau Brendler:

Where it says please provide more information, in fact you do have the correct notice of what a trust mark is – the ICANN accredited registrar logo. I have two questions related to this logo: do the registrars who are currently out of compliance today, we're not sure who they are but are they displaying that logo? Also what about [zin.net], do we know about [zin.net]? What about [Enom]? What about Moniker? Are any of these registrars displaying this accreditation logo, and if so why because it would not seem that they would be in compliance?

I have a brief comment also which there have been a number of references made to informal negotiations or informal resolutions. The problem with those philosophically and in general is that they tend not to be transparent. And I've heard a number of references also to case-by-case bases. While there obviously is some latitude to determine specifics in contract law, a contract is a contract and so there are only a limited amount of circumstances where something can be case-by-case. Thank you.

Maguy Serad:

Thank you, Beau, for your question. To answer the first part of it regarding the logo being displayed for [zin.net], [Enom] and MarkMonitor, based on our published breach notices there's none for them under enforcement, which means there is none for them either as terminated, as accredited registrars. So you said "seem to be in noncompliance." Based on the process and what we went and validated against that got resolved and closed.

Beau Brendler: I think we're not understanding each other. You have a chart that you've been sending back to us repeatedly saying that that's the number of registrars currently out of compliance or currently not, whatever terms you use. So let me make my question more simple: of those, how many of them are displaying ICANN-accredited registrar logos?

Maguy Serad: So unless they are terminated as an ICANN-accredited registrar the logo will be displayed. So it's the termination that removes the logo.

Beau Brendler: So compliance with the contract is not the same as being accredited.

Maguy Serad: I'm sorry, I don't understand your question, Beau.

Beau Brendler: I'm a registrar, I'm out of compliance with the RAA for a variety of reasons but yet I'm an ICANN-accredited registrar – I can be both of those things at the same time?

Stacy Burnette: That's correct. Under the contract, all ICANN-accredited registrars – this is Stacy Burnette for the record, I'm sorry. All ICANN-accredited registrars are given an opportunity to cure a breach. So that means you

remain ICANN-accredited even though you're out of compliance with the agreement, and if you don't cure the breach in 15 business days then you are subject to termination. And that's when your logo license must be removed from the website and other materials that you use if we proceed with termination and set a termination date.

Beau Brendler: I understand that, thank you. Let me just try to just [convey] this with respect to everybody else who is in the queue one more time. There are registrars in that situation now, correct, that have not responded within their 15-day time period?

Stacy Burnette: No, we don't have any outstanding breach notices where the registrar has not cured and we've done nothing. We have one termination that's effective in July of 2012, and that's because the registrar didn't timely cure. And that termination notice is posted for your viewing. All the other breach notices that were outstanding, the registrars cured.

Beau Brendler: Okay, thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Beau. I just want to understand one technicality on the way regarding the logo itself. Is the logo run from your website and then you delete it, or does the not-accredited-anymore registrar have to remove the logo? And if they don't really care about what

they're doing at the moment they might just use any logo – they might just continue using the logo.

Maguy Serad:

So once a registrar is de-accredited they have to remove the logo. So that would be a good test, Beau, for this one registrar that's going to be terminated is to go and check if the logo has been removed. And that's something that our staff will also do because that's one of the steps we go and confirm.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And will you have a follow-up on that that could take place? Oh, there's someone behind me.

Samantha Eisner:

Sorry, this is Sam Eisner again for the record. Once it comes to a point where the registrar licensed to use the ICANN-accredited logo has been terminated, contemporaneously with the termination of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement the enforcement of that then becomes a Legal issue and not a Compliance issue. Once the contract is terminated it's no longer Contractual Compliance's obligation to enforce the contract. It then becomes my department's job to go through and send cease and desist letters or take other actions to protect ICANN's trademark in the logo license appendix.

So that's how we follow up. And we have had situations where we've identified registrars who were previously terminated who have put their

logo back up, and we have gone back and gotten them to take it down. We do monitor for improper use of the ICANN-accredited registrar logo.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sam, I think that was the sort of answer we were looking for. Okay, next in the queue is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. I can't remember another session with Compliance when we were given as detailed and accurate responses as this time, so that's very good. Thank you. I'd like to follow up on what several of my colleagues have said: I support everything which has been said so far by Carlton, Evan, Garth of course, Beau, Holly and others. But I'd like to submit to you another view of things, a slightly standoffish view, perhaps at a greater distance.

Where are we today? ALAC is in a new phase. We're going to have a new CEO very shortly. I suppose that in the coming weeks you will have a brainstorming session with the outgoing and the incoming CEO, and the acting CEO and etc., etc., so maybe this is the time that we should tell you really what we think about all this. Now frankly, there's one thing which annoys us and has been annoying us for a long time. We don't care who takes care of this, whether it's Compliance or General Counsel or whoever – that's not our business. I speak as a member of ALAC and as a former Board member: that is the kitchen part we are not supposing to worry about.

Now, what Sam has just mentioned is a very important indication of reality today. The whole process is cut up into several pieces. There is

not one single window as it were for the whole process, which means that neither Compliance nor General Counsel nor anyone else really has the control over the whole process from beginning to start – let's say from accrediting to taking down the logo. So my natural conclusion of this is to say well, if it doesn't fit into any one of the directorates of ICANN, fine – so it has to be the COO or the CEO who has to be that window.

So this is something I want to impress upon you. This is the kind of thing perhaps you have to tell the next CEO, that there is a sense that because of the natural evolution of things and because the budget so far has come mainly from a certain part of our community, there is perhaps a perception right or wrong that there is some tolerance towards registrants. And this is unfortunate at a time when our chief duty, the main challenge for the coming years for the whole of ICANN, not only for ALAC, is actually to bring the global public interest back into the forefront of all our preoccupations. And the way this is functioning today is not answering that requirement.

So my plea to you today is bring this up one notch, and make it such a system that we can trust the compliance system whoever is in charge of it – I don't care; but that from beginning to end of procedure, from accreditation to take down of logo if necessary there is effective responsibility. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. A follow-up from Maguy?

Maguy Serad: Maybe we can take it offline, Jean-Jacques, but if you can provide a little bit more as what and how can that trust be instilled for that item you just mentioned that will help add more clarity to it. So how can that trust be gained because there will always be different roles and responsibilities within the organization?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Relax, Olivier, I won't be giving that now. [laughter] I just wanted to mention that this is one of the two main topics being worked on by the Future Challenges Working Group within ALAC, the other one being the R3 paper which was just put online. So we will gather this. Evan has taken the leadership on this with the very great work of Garth and others, so yes, we can do that and send it to you. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques, and I was about to answer that question just now. In fact, I may just take my ALAC hat off – I did take it off this morning and I went into an outburst. I will try to not have an outburst. Grow some sharper teeth and use them, and I'll put my hat on again. Thank you. Next question goes over to Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Olivier – Carlton Samuels for the record. Maguy and the Compliance Team, from what I see here today there's been definite progress and I think you ought to be congratulated for that. I believe you're going down the right track by using this process and documenting it into this informal process and the formal process. Here is the disconnect: if you look at 3.7.8, you see that kind of

“reasonableness” to lawyers – it means something entirely different to lawyers everywhere, and it depends on what part of the common law you’re in on the civil law side.

That last clause about inaccuracy, remove it – put it into a separate clause on its own, and connect that clause to your enforcement outline there because the real difficulty we are having here is the enforcement outcome. There is not enough... We don’t have a good sense that in the enforcement part of it the outcome is as to be expected, and I believe it stems from this clause. This clause is subordinate. It needs to be removed and put what happens if the stuff is inaccurate. That’s enforcement. And I think you would do yourselves a lot of good on top of what you’ve already done with making this break between the formal and informal process by changing that clause and linking the inaccuracy clause, the new clause, clearly and directly to the enforcement effort. Thank you.

Oh, one other small thing I want to ask: there has been a sense, at least it’s been [till] now, that maybe the disabilities – and I’m using the term [advisedly] – of enforcement might be related, might be improved if we had third party beneficiary rights embedded in the contract. What is your view on that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I know that Sam was going to respond to some of your points. Sam Eisner.

Samantha Eisner: [laughter] Yeah, I would advise her not to answer that one as her lawyer – this is Sam Eisner for the record. But in all seriousness we do have the RAA negotiation process going on right now and I know that you in your prior statement here referenced some of the statements that you saw in ICANN’s proposed draft. And while we don’t yet have firm language for a draft yet out for community comment there will be opportunities at this meeting and then as we get further down... Eventually there will be an RAA negotiated draft up for public comment and I encourage you to take advantage of the opportunities for comment on the RAA negotiations Wiki to put these types of comments in because Compliance can’t make these changes, right? It’s the negotiations. And so we are trying to enhance Compliance’s rights within the changes that we’re trying to get through in the RAA negotiations, but if you have further suggestions of how we can do that get your comments into the record, into the place that they can be considered.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, we’ll have one more – Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yep, thank you, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: He was in the queue way before you, Holly, I’m sorry.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. Hopefully this is a short and simple question. I noticed that some of the statistics on the complaints you separate into regions. I'm just curious, are you talking about the complainant coming from that region, the registrar coming from that region or the registrant from that region? That's one, and then I'm looking at the numbers and the numbers are kind of interesting, but how do you use it or why are you separating it into regions? And then a third sort of comment is that perhaps the Regional VPs might be... Because I do observe some differences between the regions, so I guess cultural or you know, other possibilities and maybe even language is a consideration. So those three things: which entity are you talking about, how are you using the data and whether the VPs are the right people.

Maguy Serad: Yeah, thank you, Edmon. This is part of our plan to improve on our metrics and reporting, and honing in on the different areas. So what you see here by region is by the location of the registrar. Today that's the only information that we have – the complaints specific to the registrar location. And why by region? If I may answer your three questions because we really have to go and I don't want to be late for the next...

Edmon Chung: But some of them say "unknown continent." So how is a registrar unknown continent?

Maguy Serad: Right, it depends on the entry.

[background conversation]

Maguy Serad:

I gave you the courtesy to ask your three questions; let me finish my three answers please. So by region is by registrar. We understand there is a need to take the level of metrics to the next level, maybe by the complainant, by different areas – today we don't have that. So that's what we have.

The next question is why do we want it by region? So we understand what is going on and we can hone in on an outreach activity which is available in the appendix and it goes to I think Eduardo's question. And so the other one regarding "unknown" – we all know InterNIC – I don't see Alan Greenberg. It's everybody's toolbox. Nobody likes InterNIC, right – it's not user friendly, it's not capturing all the right information. For those complaints that are not complete for us we have to do a much sort of manual analysis to determine what, where and how to go about it.

With that I think I want to say thank you very much for this opportunity and we've heard you, Holly, we've heard you, Carlton. Of course Garth, Beau, Evan – I hear you. We continue to move forward and one day we're going to sit here and instead of talking questions and answers we're going to have champagne on Olivier.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I was concerned. I didn't get any thanks in the whole thing and now I have to get champagne, goodness. Well thanks very much Maguy, Owen, Stacy and also Sam for joining us and for answering our questions. Next time let's hope that we can celebrate.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so we were supposed to have a break but we're not going to have a break and we're going to continue straight on. But then I see everybody disapproving so I think we should really get coffee because several people need coffee around the table. We'll have a fifteen-minute break. We can afford it because we have more time at the end of... Well, we're twenty minutes late, so... We can do a five-minute break, yeah, it's all up to you but I was going to say fifteen minutes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Five is generous.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, five.

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl, it's interesting that you said five minutes and it's transformed spontaneously into more than that.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, it's 13 minutes past 4:00 in the afternoon. We were somehow a little late but we managed to catch up a little bit. Welcome back, everybody. This is the next part of today's celebrations, or should I say sessions on the ALAC and Regional... Well, it is a celebration – we are getting answers to the questions we have so it's been pretty good, and I've seen smiling faces around the table on occasions – not your smiling face, Cheryl.

So we now have the visit of Karla Valente, and it's the first time I actually get the name right because I just heard her say it in Brazilian. So Karla is going to be able to speak to us about the universal acceptance of all top-level domains, and she has a presentation for us. And I'll give the floor over to Karla right away so as for her to be able to take us through the slides. Karla, the floor is yours.

Karla Valente: Thank you. Hello everybody, and thank you for being here today. There is a PowerPoint presentation on universal acceptance. I will have to tell you that this PowerPoint presentation was used with registrants and registrars and I'm presenting on behalf of a colleague, and when I looked through I thought it was pretty technical. There's a lot of

examples there that are interesting to look at but I don't really want to spend a lot of time on talking about the technicalities of it because I'm not a technical person; also because I think it's useful to discuss the issue and maybe the solutions to address the issue.

So what is universal acceptance? Universal acceptance of TLDs is something that we are aiming to have all of the software and all of the new gTLDs basically working online. So when we launched new gTLDs in the past, we had the 2000 and 2004 rounds, what happened is we figured out that some of the gTLDs were not working in the marketplace. And the reason why they were not working is because of the programs that were built online. They were built in a way that would recognize for example only three characters or would recognize a fixed list of TLDs – like a white list of TLDs and only those are valid, etc.

And that problem was addressed to a certain extent but it still exists, and it's likely to continue to exist or increase as we have new gTLDs, because with new gTLDs we have much more than three characters, you know? Some of those gTLDs are quite lengthy. We have IDNs for the first time in a way that those browsers or those systems are not really used to. We have Arabic and other things that are right to left and really different things. So TLD acceptance is something that we are really aiming to have.

What can go wrong basically? Some websites require registrations and do not accept your extension. You have an email address with a certain extension, you're filling out a form and then all of a sudden it doesn't recognize your email address. Legal and other contract terms do not recognize your TLD extension. Emails might not reach the destination.

Web browsers will reject your domain name. Operating systems do not allow your domain name to be used online. Anti-spam software, for example, can mark your TLD as not trusted.

So the issue with that is that in order to correct that problem that is around the world, you need to go to different companies, technical people, business people – you need to go to the browsers, you need to go to the software developers. You need to go to all of them and educate them on the issue, convince them that this needs to be addressed. You also need to talk to the respective business people, right, because sometimes technical people know how to correct the issue but it's not necessarily within their budget or their authority to consider this a priority – it's not something that they can simply make a call to do it. So you also have to educate the business people that would empower them to make that change.

So this is the challenge that we face ahead of us as we have those new gTLDs: how do we work together, how do we ensure that those TLDs are accepted in the future and people have a good experience working with them? Because from a consumer standpoint, they went to a registrar or a seller, they bought their domain name or they have their email address and all of a sudden they're filling out a form and things are not recognized or rejected – chances are they're not going to understand what's happening, and that has nothing to do with the legitimacy of the registrar they're dealing with or the registry that they're dealing with, or the TLD that they chose to use. It has to do with a software or a system that they are using.

So ICANN, what are we doing? How can TLD acceptance be improved? Well it can be improved obviously with technical work, with public relations work, with ICANN outreach. We need to connect with ISPs, network providers, and real users, too, need to be aware when something like that happens. Nowadays they don't have any place to turn to, right?

So what is ICANN doing in order to be able to address that? Well, we created an internal group that works with some of the registries and registrars to really identify what the problem is, and we are trying to create a campaign and work with the different parties to spread awareness about the issue. So you're going to see a website and on this website you're going to see some materials, and there is also a software that one can use to check whether or not a domain name is resolving.

We plan on doing some outreach through some of the parties here to identify what are the correct targets that we need to talk to in order to address the problem; how are we going to identify success? How are we going to know whether or not our outreach or our interaction with these parties have been successful? We will be following up with them and we will be seeing whether or not they fixed the problem. To what extent are we going to be able to fix that issue? So for example, how many browsers do we really need to outreach? How many software developers do we need to outreach? What kinds of things can we do in addition to having all of the information and materials and talking to them, going to conferences or maybe to certain publications and making them aware of it?

Because you see, the problem is even if we do a comprehensive and timely communications campaign to make people, especially those targeted parties aware of it, we are not really in a position to enforce them to do anything. They might choose not to upgrade their systems for whatever reason – either a business priority or they just don't feel the value of it. And so our work will have to continue in doing so.

So this is what we've been doing in terms of activities – putting together, creating this discussion group; we have now a dedicated website. If you go to the www.icann.org "Resources" you'll see there's a TLD acceptance page. This page is going to be updated. It's very basic right now. We're thinking about updating it, maybe having a section for example that is specific to the technical people to tell them "These are some of the solutions that others found and others applied in order to resolve the issue," and maybe have some section, an FAQ that is for consumers that is a little bit more high level and that explains from a consumer standpoint "This is what you can and cannot do," and so forth.

The verification tool that we have online is very basic; that was created for the previous rounds. Basically you run through a TLD and you see if it's working. This tool will be upgraded as we have more TLDs entered into the root. We want to consult with ICANN stakeholder groups and ask for their help to identify the parties that we can or should be accessing; like we were really focusing on browsers and software developers and then looking a little bit closer on the user experience and we said "Well, wait a minute – a lot of people use Twitter, a lot of people use Facebook. This is not exactly the category that we were

targeting and those things need to be added to the list of targeted parties.”

How about if you go to the Asian region or to the Latin American region, what are exactly the companies that the users go for there and the targets that we need to have in those countries? So what I would like to know is how could we work together maybe to identify those targets in the most precise way as possible within the different regions, within the different countries; and what do you suggest that we do? In addition to preparing the website and having informational materials at hand what else could we do to work together to address that issue?

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Karla. I am sitting in for the Chair Olivier while he’s stepped out of the room. Are there any questions for Karla? Holly?

Holly Raiche:

Thank you, Carlton – Holly Raiche for the record. We were talking, I think it was before or directly after lunch to the Communications persona about getting the word out. When you’re saying that some things are not going to resolve, there’s going to be from a user perspective I suppose a lot of a lack of understanding of what’s going on here. I’m just thinking is there a way we can work with you and the Communications team to see what sort of messages do you put out there so from a user perspective... First of all, I’m sure there is not a lot of familiarity with all of the intricacies of generic top-level domains. Once people start using them and things don’t resolve, then people are

going to be wondering “Is it my machine? Is it my ISP? What’s the problem and how do I deal with that?”

So it seems to me there’s a real level of communication that maybe we need to work with you but also the Communications Team to say “It’s not your fault and it’s not your ISP,” not necessarily blaming anybody but “There are teething problems and we’re trying to work it out.” I’m just starting to think that’s a real user problem, actually, lack of understanding.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Holly. You want to follow up, Karla? No?

Karla Valente:

Yeah, I agree with you. I think communications is going to be essential for people’s awareness. But it’s more than being aware of the problem is “What do I do?” If I’m having a problem where I need to fill out a form I need my email address to work – I just want that to be resolved and I have no idea who I turn to. And ICANN is not the entity to turn to because ICANN doesn’t really have the power or the ability to fix the tool. And in some situations I don’t think people will even know where to turn to to address the issue. They will have to troubleshoot, so how much can we really build and how can we inform people on how to troubleshoot? I think maybe it would be very beneficial to talk to the community and have a better understanding of okay, what are the things that one can do to really troubleshoot, because I can foresee an enormous frustration from a consumer standpoint who is trying to do a

simple task like filling out a form and all of a sudden not having the TLD working.

I'm confident that we can work with the registrars and the registries to help us to create awareness and help us to try to fix the problem if it's in their reach, but then you also have resellers. You have many other layers between the TLD and the consumer, and that's when the challenge presents itself.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you very much, Karla. I see Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Karla, I think there's an opportunity here to use the existing network that the ALSes and the At-Large community may offer, but we do need to pick up on Holly's point of working sooner rather than later and having things ready in a timely manner for promulgation. Many of us would have a contact in what would be perhaps in some cases an in-territory but if not things like Consumers International and those types of organizations, where an albeit not terribly savvy but savvy enough end user may turn; and we might be able to get some preparatory material. So we're getting the right information out but it's got to be also done at the right time.

And to that end I'm very aware that there's an awful lot going on between now and insertion into the root. We might need to prioritize some project planning, and I would suggest the action item there, Carlton, would be for our staff to liaise directly with you and just look at

what is on your short-term agenda because we're talking... If we need this out in fifteen months' time or if we need this out in twelve months' time, when do we need to start getting those first drafts done? And it's getting awfully close, and I just don't want to be in a too little, too late situation.

Karla Valente:

Yeah, so we have a draft, Cheryl – this is Karla Valente for the record. We have a draft of some informational materials, and one of the things that we were discussing is how many informational materials do we really need? Do we really need one that is specific to the technical community that would actually address some of the technical concerns and provide some of the technical solutions – to tell them “Go to this tool in order to test your software,” “Go to this tool and do A, B, C, D” and things like that? So this is something that we plan on doing or at least have on our website because the website is a good place to control content up-to-date rather than in print.

And we certainly need something that is very basic for the consumer. There is a question of whether or not we need something in between for the business people that will be the ones that make the decisions on the priorities and will tell the engineers or others “I want you to address that – this should be a priority for our company.” Because sometimes we talk to engineers and they say “Yeah, yeah, I understand the problem but it's not really in my budget nor in my list of priorities to address – that is not my call. And they're aware of it, we already told them so maybe there has to be some pressure from outside.”

In terms of timing I think you're right. I think it has to be started yesterday, something like that, and we should not underestimate momentum – the momentum of new gTLDs and all of that, and add to the communications campaign the messaging on that in a way that people will not say “Oh well, you know, there's a problem here”; in a way that people will say “Oh, this is a potential issue and that can be addressed in a timely manner. That can be addressed.” And we should as consumers, we should as an entity really pressure those companies that have the power to address that issue to do it.

So just to summarize there's some materials. I think one of the steps that we can do is to share those materials and make sure that they are understood. They are understood, they translate well; they talk to the right audiences – a basic one, a technical one. Do we really need the business one? This is something that I'm not quite sure people are convinced. How many different versions do we need? I am one of those people that think if you have too many versions to too many audiences you enter the risk of not doing the distribution properly. So I think at least a basic and a technical is a must and then if you really feel that we need to build upon it let's build upon it. And this website that will have the information that one can point to and we'll have the list of the TLDs updated to the online tool that we have and so forth.

Another thing that we brainstormed about but we have not really made the call is would a community Wiki be useful for people to add intelligence, for example, from all those companies that you talk to in Asia, for example, because they are responsible for the major browsers or major software that consumers here use? And this is the kind of intel

that I think ICANN has within staff up to a certain point, and it's not as comprehensive I think as it should be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Just a small follow-on if I may, Mr. Chairman. I'm very keen on the concept of having things in a single repository, even if it's a number of layers that one has to go through once you're in that repository or choices – you know, you go to "Consumer" or you go to "Business" or you go to "Technical," that's fine. But if each and every one of us are out there at the edge and the opportunity comes to influence, for example, a consumer advice organization or whatever, the likelihood of us having our laptop with us is small enough; the probability of us carting some piece of paper around that ICANN has printed is almost nonexistent.

But if we could have something as simple as a few blank business cards with the ICANN logo on one side and the New gTLD cutsie something or other, you know, whatever Marketing wants to promulgate; and just a simple cue card that took us to the landing page – it doesn't matter how frequently you change the versions on the landing page – this will always take us to what's most up to date, something that's literally in our back pocket or in our purse. I think that's about where we should be trying to pitch it from our community's perspective anyway.

Karla Valente:

Thank you. And our two-pager has that. We're just going to share with you feedback on what the effectiveness of the messaging would be, greatly appreciated.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, thank you, Karla. Thank you. We still have an action item for our support staff to get with you to see about the messages you have now; to give them to us to see if we can make some input into that. So thank you so much.

Karla Valente: I send that to you and to Olivier?

Carlton Samuels: To staff. Yes, they will coordinate with us.

Karla Valente: Super.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you so much.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Carlton?

Carlton Subrenat: Yes, right after this, Jean-Jacques. Avri? Oh, you're passing. Okay, Jean-Jacques, you have the floor, sir. Thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, I didn't have the right dose of coffee otherwise I would have reacted more swiftly but thank you. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Just a quick remark: I think that in this world of new gTLDs you have all those who are in the domain name business on one hand, and then aspiring people especially from developing countries – but there I notice that most of the information they have access to comes through the vendors actually. And I just want to underline that because I think that there's probably a need for more things from the community to be made available and not only through the vendor-scapes.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Yes, that tends to be the case; in most places we hear more from [domainers] and you might have a situation where they're speaking to interested parties. So that is well taken indeed. Yaovi, you have the floor, sir.

Yaovi Atohoun: Thank you, and thank you, Karla, for the presentation. You were mentioning important information on the website. My question should be for the Communications Team but as you are here, maybe when you have [them] you can raise it. When you go the ICANN website, I know since last year they were trying to have a multilingual website. But when you click on French, and I don't know about the other languages but you just see the article information data available in that language, like French. So my idea is, I know it's not easy but if you can try to have something like the ITU website.

If you click on the ITU website right now you have the same information at least in French and English, the same information. I'm saying it's not easy but at least there's static information for what we are doing, like the previous presentation was on Compliance. But if you cannot see stacking information, something that people from the other language communities can have access to – you cannot see that. So I think it's something that is very important not only for the TLD [concept] testing but other teams' work, the Communications Team, to have the basic static information in all the languages. Like I can go and read just one page and see what we are doing, not only the document that is available and translated into French; when you go to the ICANN homepage and click "French" that's what you see. But we don't see really a website in many languages so that can help also.

When we go back home we try to do things in our language, and we say "For more information go to the ICANN website." When we give them the link they go to the ICANN website but it's in English. Thank you.

Karla Valente:

Thank you, that is a very good point. So we have as a goal to have the materials in the six United Nations languages and have the landing page of the TLD acceptance also translated. There's still the issue you mentioned about how do you get to the landing page, right, how do you get to the TLD acceptance page? You go to the www.icann.org and how many times do you have to click, or how do you know where you have to click to get to the TLD acceptance; and this kind of architecture is really a question for Communications, a communications issue. But I understand the challenge. I speak other languages, and when I look

with my Portuguese-speaking hat or my Spanish-speaking hat I say “Okay, how do I get there?” and that is an issue.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Karla. Are there any other questions from our colleagues?
Yes, Dev Anand?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Carlton – Dev Anand Teelucksingh. There was something in the slides there that you had mentioned, I think it was something with issues with publicsuffix.org – it was in the slides you had shown. So if that something you have contacted? From what I got it seems to be a vendor. Because you left it as a question mark I wasn’t too sure – is it, you know...

Karla Valente: So this is a vendor that provides like a white list, [so we’ll] use it. And yes, we have a plan on contacting them, making sure that they include all of the TLDs. Again, it remains the fact that you educate people, you ask them to do it but you cannot enforce something like that to be done. But yeah, that is identified as one of the targets.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you very much. We are at the end of this session. I’d like to thank Karla for sharing the information with us and we will look forward to furthering the particulars in discussion with the At-Large staff. Thank you.

[Applause]

Carlton Samuels: So I'm still sitting in for the Chair, and the next session is the IDN Variant Program update, and we have Dennis Jennings and Francisco Arias here to dazzle us. [laughter] How's that, Dennis?

[background conversation]

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Carlo. So Dennis and Francisco, we are up when you are ready, sir.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you very much indeed. Dazzling I try and do on the dance floor; I'm not quite sure how I dazzle here but let me launch into the update. What I'm going to try and do here is very quickly go through the same presentation that I'll be giving on Thursday at the main session. Obviously I'll be going through it very quickly here and there'll be a lot more detail on Thursday. The session on Thursday is at 12:00 noon. The schedule has been updated. If you have in your diary an earlier time it's wrong – it's now 12:00 noon. I don't know where it is but the room is on the schedule – Congress 3, okay, there we go.

So what I'm going to try to cover very quickly because I know you're under pressure for time. It's on the agenda slide here and I hope that's

available on Adobe Connect for the remote participants. So a quick overview of the program, a quick presentation that will be very brief here on the projects to be completed in the coming fiscal year '12-'13; a summary of the follow-on projects; we'll announce the team – we'll be doing that in detail, we won't be doing that here for each project and staff and consultants; reminding you that there's a call for volunteers that's been published with a closing date of the 13th for Project 2.1; and dealing with any questions that you may have.

So moving on to the next slide if you would... We've just had a slight technical... Can we look at the program, next slide? So the background to the program: the Issues Project was the first phase of this, it's now completed, and that was to look at the issues associated with the workable approaches of deployment of IDN TLDs containing variant characters. It was initiated by decision of the ICANN Board in 2010. The approach we took was a two-phased approach: we had six community-led case studies – Arabic, Chinese, Greek, Cyrillic, Latin and Devanagari case studies – and looked at the issues associated with their scripts.

And then the team with support from a number of members of the case study teams developed an integrated issues report which after publishing and public comment and so on was completed in February of this year. I recommend the integrated issues report to you to be read. It is not the easiest of reading but it does highlight the issues synopsis from the case studies, and we think sufficient that we don't have to do more case studies but can move ahead. The integrated issues report highlighted a number of next steps, and it's those next steps that we've taken up as the program of work to be done. Next slide, please.

So the program goals are to define the processes that must be in place to enable the management of IDN Variant TLDs, and the work is focused, as you see in red there, on exchangeable code point variants only. That is Unicode points that can be exchanged one for another; in some cases one exchange for two or more code points but generally one-for-one exchanging of code points. The issues report classified code points in two general categories: one was exchangeable code points and the other were variants associated with the whole string – synonyms, dialectic variants and so on. And the integrated issues report outlined the difficulty in dealing with that and as we'll see, based on public comment we decided to defer work on that. Next slide. Next slide, if you would... There we go.

So we published the program timeline with a number of projects – it was published in March, 2012; was discussed in Costa Rica. And we'd gotten a lot of feedback from the community on that original timeline, which if you look at the next slide we'll see that the feedback consisted of expanding the number of scripts – and as I've indicated, we don't plan to do that explicitly in doing case studies but actually expand the whole to every script, the whole Unicode set of scripts. Support for variant TLDs to minimize user confusion and fraudulent uses, which is why we're doing this and there were a lot of comments on that. The key one was the prioritization of code point variants over whole string variants for the reasons of complexity and the fact that it's hard to imagine a deterministic way of dealing with or establishing what whole string variants are; and the community feedback was to prioritize code point variants. To address individual community needs, we'll see if that

can be done; and some comments on the advantages and disadvantages to various script communities.

On the basis of that we revised the program plan and I'll go through that in a moment, but we have a call for public comments out on the revised program plan; and if we go on to the next slide we'll see – and this hasn't been closed yet and hasn't been analyzed and published –the sort of comments that we're getting. First of all to accommodate different script communities, and we recognize that there are different communities with different needs. Some may be more "ready" than others, whatever that precisely means because there's some processes we've got to go through first. A desire that this program would move ahead sufficiently rapidly so that the delegation of IDN Variant TLDs might be possible in the first batch of the New gTLD Program – I understand that desire. I think it's unlikely that we'll achieve that but we note that that is a desire.

Collaboration with the technical and language communities and of course we're taking that onboard – just as the Issues Project was largely driven by the community so the key project, Project 2.1 which we'll look at in a moment will be driven by the volunteer community with support from experts and the ICANN team. And a comment on the terminology – we had used the label generation rule set technology, code point repertoire in label generation rule set. We had for familiarity and convenience switched back to talking about IDN tables and we're probably going to revise that because IDN tables is an overused term. It's not technically as precise as we'd like and we'll probably go back to label generation rule set and code point repertoire for the rule to be a little bit more precise in what we're talking about.

So if we look at the next slide, we see that the revised program – yes, I thought there was another slide coming up. This slide, the revised Program Plan focuses on the format of the tables or the label generation rule set – that’s Project #1. The key technical and linguistic project is Project 2.1, which is the process for creating and maintaining the tables. We need to agree on a process, and once that process is agreed globally with the community we’ll then be able to move later on to implement that process. And a very interesting project, Project P6, is to study the user experience issues and solutions to these issues associated with active variants – variants that have been delegated and made active.

And the key here is to make sure that the user, whether that’s an application on a computer or a human user, has a consistent predictable experience so that they can either be programmed by systems or understood by codes in some way by the user, so that the user’s expectation will be that however strangely the system may operate it operates in a defined, predictable, learnable fashion. And we’ve decided to reprioritize the other projects and defer them to a later date.

So if we now look at the new timeline which I think is on the next slide, the revised timeline you see pulls forward to March-April-May of 2013, towards the end of this coming fiscal year, the key decision – the go/no go decision – taking the output of the projects that I’ve highlighted as being prioritized and moving on to the implementation phase, the implementation of the process and looking at various other things. If we look at the next slide we’ll see that not only have we, or just a final comment on that timeline. So basically we’ve responded to public

comment and reprioritized, brought forward the dates and tried to expedite the whole program.

The projects to be completed in this fiscal year in more detail start on the next slide, and I'm only going to go through these very quickly so let's leaf through this as Project #1: the format specification which is a standard way of taking the label generation rule set or the table format and processing it. That project has started, the documents have been published; a lot of technical community is involved in that. The next slide is Project #2.1, which is the key technical and linguistic project for the process of creating and maintaining the tables where we do "Should we wait and have the whole table complete? What happens when there are changes in Unicode or there are changes in variants for one reason or another? What expertise is required? Can we do it in some piecemeal fashion based on scripts?" which I think would be a desire of the community. What about the shared, the common script tables that are shared – what's the process of developing this table?

In more detail the next slide gives the timeline for this, and the key things are to flag that we hope to have a first round of consultation in August of this year and a second round of consultation with volunteers in September/October this year; and to produce and publish the community-agreed process in March, 2013. So that's our goal, and if we achieve that we'll then be in a position to start using that process and fill out the table. And I'll go through this in more detail. Francisco Arias was responsible, Francisco here is responsible for that project and will be going through it in much more detail on Thursday.

Project #6, the user experience one – this is a key project to try and put some framework around what is a reasonable user experience, preferably a good user experience is the focus of this project. Again, if we look at the next slide we'll see the timeline for that project and that indicates that there will be draft reports. In fact we're going to publish a study proposal in Prague and you'll hear more about that on Thursday. We're going to execute the proposed study, draft for public comment, second public consultation in Toronto; revise the report and hopefully publish this in January. And ideally this will provide not only a guideline for a good user experience or at least an acceptable user experience for TLDs but also be a model for an acceptable user experience at second and other levels. So that's not the focus of our project but ideally that would be a very useful document for the community.

So moving to the next slide, those are the three projects that we're focusing on this fiscal year. The follow-on projects – Project #2.2... If you're wondering about the numbering, we kept the numbering the same as in the original timeline so as hopefully not to create further confusion. Project #2.2 is the follow-on from #2.1 and it's about actually filling out the tables or the label generation rule set for the root zone. Project #7 is to do with updating ICANN's programs, gTLD and ccTLD programs; and Project #8 is update to ICANN operations. And these are follow-on projects. They'll start as soon as we've done the three projects that I highlighted and once we get the implicit or explicit go ahead from the ICANN Board.

On the next slide we want to highlight a number of issues that have been identified so far, and what we are doing here is as we go along we'll be identifying issues and we'll be publishing them, and we'll be

consulting widely; and we hope to have an opportunity to present these emerging lists of issues to various SOs and ACs from time to time for consideration.

The first is the atomicity or the individuality of the IDN Variant TLDs. So consider an IDN – a string and its variants, that set, is it indivisible? So let's say there's an intellectual property rights challenge to a variant, does that knock the whole set? Is it an atom or is it divisible, and what are the implications if it is divisible which seem to be rather difficult, but obviously there are difficulties if it's not divisible. That's an issue.

Conditions for delegating is clearly an issue. The evaluation requirements and fees, I think people might have views on that. Ongoing fees for registries and registrars, are there any differences? Requirements, technical, contractual, operational requirements for registries and registrars – those are issues. WHOIS output is clearly going to be an issue; and rights protection mechanisms – how are they handled in a situation where there are variants? And that may lead back again to the first issue, the indivisibility or not of a variant TLD set.

We think, our working assumption is that the current policy environment, policy decisions are sufficient to address these issues. That's a working assumption – maybe it's a bit optimistic, but that's why we're flagging it to people to make sure that these issues can be considered independently of the project. We'll certainly be working on them.

The next slide is a call for volunteers. You will have hopefully noticed that we have published a call for volunteers for Project #2.1, and this is the process for creating the tables or the label generation rule set. And

we're seeking volunteers, and these are volunteers across the globe because we're not talking about six case studies now; we're talking about the whole Unicode code set for all scripts and therefore all languages across the globe. When you say it like that it's a bit daunting; it's scary – that's right. We're seeking volunteers with expertise in the DNS and IDNA, and in Unicode and preferably people obviously with linguistics and language expertise, a key point; and with an understanding of ICANN's role and responsibilities, and including the policy development environment. We're not looking for policy people but we're looking for people who are familiar with that to be in the volunteer group.

Responses should be set in by, there's a website there to click on and volunteer by the 13th of July. If you're intent on volunteering please don't just say "I'd like to volunteer." Please give us some information about who you are, what your skillset is, why you want to volunteer and what you think that you bring to this. Based on responses already, our challenge is not going to be to get volunteers – our challenge is going to be to find some reasonable way of limiting the number of volunteers so that we have a manageable set of volunteers. It probably is two people per script language community, and I know that probably seems like a small number until you look at what we're trying to do. Anyway, that's a decision for the future. It's generating a lot of interest which we're very pleased about, and it is the key aspect of the project that this be driven by the community and be a community-endorsed project.

On the next slide, I'm kind of trying to remember what I said on the next slide... Yes of course: the main session will be gone through in detail, oh dear – and it's only Sunday, I know, I know. Anyway Thursday at noon –

I'd like to just emphasize that again. It's an hour and a half session. The first hour will be devoted to this presentation and questions and answers, and the presentation in more detail and more opportunities for questions; and the last half hour, it's our plan that the last half hour will be focused on the case study proposal or the study proposal for the user experience – to discuss that, publish that and so on. And the website if you need more detail on that session is there.

And I think that's all I've got to say. The next slide probably says "Questions." Thank you for the opportunity.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Dennis. I'm going to hand it back to my Chair but just before I do that, you mentioned that there was some community interest in having the IDN strings being in the first batch, and there is a certain very extended sentiment in the At-Large for that. But then you've raised some issues here that I personally didn't even think about – they're not as easily managed as I thought. Anyway, handing it back to the Chair, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Carlton, it's Olivier for the transcript and I open the floor for questions. And I see first Cheryl Langdon-Orr then we'll have Edmon and then Hong. So Cheryl first.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I've been asked to cede to Edmon, so go ahead, Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Olivier – Edmon here, thank you for letting me go first. I want to apologize; I need to run right after this. I think-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You just run in and run out. [laughter] Go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Sorry, apologies. I think it's a great improvement in terms of the plan now going forward, and I think the At-Large – I can't speak for everyone but at least we feel like you've heard our comments finally, which is a good thing still. [laughter] No, I think it's very positive, getting this project back on track. I hear Carlton with a little bit of concern that just sort of hit you that there are still so many issues with IDNs, especially with IDNs with variants, and that is true. But I'd like to make sure that it shouldn't sort of dilute the fact that we should prioritize IDNs, and some of the issues of variants as Cheryl mentioned earlier this morning, it doesn't come into play until the delegation. And hopefully with the new project plan we will hit the implementation phases as we get into the delegation phases, so of course that is a very optimistic view of how it will develop.

But I want to make sure in general, and I think I can speak – I think the At-Large believes that IDNs should be prioritized in the gTLD Process. One thing about the whole process as I mentioned this morning as well, I really encourage people from the ALAC and the At-Large to participate and volunteer themselves. I think there is already a lot of people volunteering and that will make your job even harder to select, and I think that would be a good problem to have rather than a bad problem.

And so I guess overall we're glad to see that the prioritization is there. Prioritizing some of the projects I think is on the right track and we wish you best of luck to really speedily get this done.

Dennis Jennings:

Thank you, Edmon – Dennis Jennings here again for the transcript. I'm aware of the anxieties and the desire to move rapidly in the community. I'm also aware of the anxieties and the desire to move very cautiously in the technical community. I'm very aware that IDNs have been on people's wish lists and activities for many years. All I can say is that I got involved in this project in February of last year; I think we've made substantial progress, steady progress. I think you're seeing progress, steady progress and I promise you that we will make steady progress over the coming year. And that's all I can do.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Dennis. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I'm going to do something that I occasionally have action to do and that's echo some of what Edmon has just said. I also want to raise a particular point. To begin with I want to thank you very much for, I mean Sundays are busy for all of us but particularly for this group, which as you know has perhaps come for some of us a little late into the debate on variants but nevertheless is coming quite passionately.

Some of us have been molding on the edges for a long time with it but we've tried to get up to speed and keep up to speed, and having you and Francisco take the time to come and run us through in advance of Thursday I think is greatly appreciated, particularly because I'm feeling a lot more comforted by what I am seeing in this slide deck. Yes, I did get the words right – I couldn't think for a second. I heard myself and wasn't sure if I was still speaking any semblance of any form of language understandable to mankind in any way, shape or form.

So yeah, thank you very much for what we are seeing but you need to recognize two things, and probably why it's so valuable that you are here today. Unfortunately with the time of 12:00 on Thursday the ALAC Wrap-Up Session isn't scheduled to complete till 12:30. That's okay, you've given us a run through. We may not get the deep dive that we would like to but be aware of that; do not take that in any way as a reflection of lack of interest – it's not. If Olivier wraps it up and gets them running out of the room quickly enough you'll get into the sort of second half of your first hour.

You do have a number of people who will then want to continue to engage, and obviously Edmon is particularly aware of potentials for conflict; Rinalia has taken on the mantle for any of these mantles, and it might be useful for you to make sure – Francisco, you as well – to look to Rinalia now and identify her as someone particularly for example in Project #6 that might be worthwhile focusing on as one of the leads and representatives for what was just an IDN Liaison and is now a Work Group. So you've got a team to work with, so intercessionally that might be good.

And then finally other than my thanks and the fact that I'm smiling more than I thought I might be when we started, is that I'm only triple booked between all of that 90-minute session, so don't take my absence as anything other than I'm not cloned yet. But know that I would be fairly affirmative, particularly our involvement in that user one at the end. I think that we need to work earlier and get involved in that, perhaps a special purpose teleconference between now and Toronto or something might be of some use. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dennis Jennings:

If I may just briefly respond: the concept of me moldering at the edges while dazzling has been somewhat befuddled. [laughter] Sorry, that's just a comment – back to you, Chair.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Dennis. Next is Hong Xue.

Hong Xue:

Thank you, Chair. The revised project plan does reflect the inputs from the community. I can't speak for anyone but it's warmly welcomed by the Chinese-speaking community, so there's a significant improvement and we do notice that. And just now my colleagues mentioned, and it may be critical to have a sustainable and a stable [dispatchable] of variants policy and implementation plan at the delegation stage and at the implementation stage.

I actually want to draw your attention to an imminent issue of the new gTLD-applied for strings that will soon be put into the reveal period. I

guess this is a very much critical moment now, where rather than wait until some of them will be finally approved and delegated there is an imminent issue that is in front of us right now. Let's take a look at the new gTLD strings revealed by ICANN a week ago. Among almost 2000 strings, there are more than 100 Chinese character strings either in Simplified characters or Traditional characters. Of course, in the application documents they may have identified their preferred variants.

So these are not very controversial. We can still wait until the delegation period, but there is one applicant – oh, I use this as an example. I disclose I don't have public interest, I don't know this guy or this organization; it's actually a company from Hong Kong. This is a very persistent applicant. This applicant precisely applied for two strings, one in Simplified characters and another in Traditional characters. To Chinese readers, they are exactly the same characters; they're just variants. But now the issue here is that in the reveal period, these two strings will be mutually exclusive. They will be exclusive in the first round – they won't even go to the string contention period.

So this is a very interesting scenario. We are entering into this interesting time. We don't have policy to handle this issue for the reveal, so now is this possible – this is my rough thinking – for this Variants Project Plan, the new team to have some ad-hoc policy or guidance for the technical panel for the reveal of these IDN strings? Otherwise I guess it would be really unfair to the applicants just because of ICANN's design process and being excluded from the new gTLD opportunity in the first hand. So this is one example, but it shows the

imminence of this issue. Of course I'm looking forward to your very wise, insightful observation on this issue. Thank you.

Dennis Jennings:

Thank you. That's what I think Americans call a "curved ball" so I will probably give a curved answer. [laughter] Formally I have no responsibilities for the New gTLD Program and therefore I'm not either authorized or competent to answer the question that you raised. But I'm aware of the issue. I'm not sure your characterization of it, that the applicant will get no string is necessarily correct, but you do identify a gap, a lacuna in what I perceive as a gap in ICANN's ability to handle this situation because ideally we'd have done the IDN Variant Issues Program and have the LGR, and have the processes and have the policies – whether those are internal, operational policies or not – prior to such a situation arising.

But I can imagine that within the current processes for the New gTLD Program, there are existing processes which may well be able to deal with this in a way that may be reasonably satisfactory. I don't want to go through them because first of all I'm not allowed to, secondly I'm not competent to. But I am aware of that and I expect that there will be, to again use an Americanism – there will be a "huddle" about this. That's a different game but there will be a huddle about this to see how this might be appropriately finessed and handled. And I'm sorry, what I should really have said is "I can't answer your question" but I'm trying to indicate that there will be effort to make sure that this is not a cause celebre and some way is found to deal with it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Hong, and thank you very much, Dennis. Any other questions? I don't see anyone waving their hands around. I had one question which I've been trying to formulate with some difficulty – I'm not very good with curved balls. I play football and even in that I manage to fail. With regards to the statement that we alluded to a little bit earlier with Edmon mentioning that the At-Large community has been a real supporter of IDNs and is proposing that the IDNs would be in the first batch – this is a view that has been held for a long time.

I think Edmon alluded to having the two processes run in parallel, effectively knowing that the first batch would not actually be put online for at least we can say about a year or so before the first batch gets online. Of course it's difficult to evaluate, but certainly there will be a specific amount of time spent until the actual implementation stage; whilst at the same time, the IDN Variants Issues Project keeps on moving forward. Do you have, and I'm afraid I arrived a little late but do you have an estimate of the resolution of the issues with regards to those variants? And within your view, would this be in line with the launch of the first batch?

Dennis Jennings: Another curved ball – for the record, Dennis Jennings here again. I think realistically if we manage to stick to the timeline for these projects which is Q1, end of Q1 next calendar year plus some Board processing and getting ready for the next follow-on projects, and we do those pretty effectively I think it's going to the end of calendar '13 at best. And there clearly is a difference in that timeline with the timeline for the first batch of the New gTLD Program.

Mind you, having been an observer on the sidelines of the New gTLD Program and watching the comings and goings I gather that digital archery is no longer an Olympic sport. [laughter] I don't have a good handle on the timeline for the first batch of new gTLDs but I imagine that it will be the end of this calendar year, beginning of next calendar year. So there is a mismatch in the timeline and I don't have an easy answer for that. Just to remind you, just as much as there's anxiety to proceed rapidly on behalf of some of the communities including ALAC, there is a very great anxiety to move as cautiously as possible among the technical community because there is a real concern that there are real risks to the DNS here if mistakes are made.

I'm not competent to judge those risks; that'll be for other people to contribute. And somehow ICANN, in its role as responsible for TLDs in the root is going to have to find a steady, careful process to go through this that considers both the desire and the urgency and the caution and does it properly. And all I can say is we will do our best to do that and I cannot be drawn on timelines. I'm sorry, I'd love to be able to say "It will be X" but I can't.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Dennis. And I have another follow-up question which is with regards to what still needs to be done in engaging in several parts including IDNA. As you know, the IETF has done an enormous amount of work and has some if not a lot of knowledge and potential people who could help in this. Have you issued a call in IETF circles regarding that?

Dennis Jennings: Not directly. The program will announce a number of very expert consultants that it has hired as experts to support the program. We'll be announcing those names on Thursday I believe? Yeah? Francisco.

Francisco Arias: This is Francisco. We have some consultants already engaged and we are still working on having the contacts in place for others. I'm not really sure what is the timing but it's just in a matter of days.

Dennis Jennings: So Francisco's reminded me that again, we have to be cautious. Until we have contracts with individuals in place we cannot of course make announcements. So we'll see what we can announce on Thursday, but we're recruiting some very expert individuals who have a broad breadth of experience including a lot of IETF experience, so there will be strong links. But the IETF isn't an entity out there that you lob a problem to. There's a misunderstanding about the IETF. The IETF is a collection of individuals who take up problems that they're interested in and so the first challenge is to engage enough individuals to say "You know what? I'm going to stick my neck out and do some work in this area."

So there is a perception in the comments that the IETF is a group of hungry wolves out there – you toss a problem over the wall, they devour it and spit out the answer. It's just not quite like that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dennis, and certainly the hungry wolves part might not fit the IETF. Have I saved this one? Yes maybe, only just. No, I think the

question was not whether you could lob the problem at IETF to work on it but obviously send a call for volunteers in IETF and perhaps have some of the people that have been involved in IETF circles to actually also be involved with this, knowing full well that some IETF volunteers would prefer having a root canal done rather than going to an ICANN meeting. That's a sort of personal choice for some people.

Dennis Jennings:

You'll see we have good links into that expertise and I think you'll be comfortable with that. I hope you'll be comfortable with that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, well I don't see anyone else putting their hands up, so thank you very much Dennis for coming to speak with us. It's been very, very helpful and thank you to Francisco as well. So a big round of applause for you.

Dennis Jennings:

Thank you for the opportunity.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Right, we are now reaching the next part of our thrill-filled afternoon, and the next part is the hot topics. And the hot topics were supposed to be originally a set of topics which we were going to think about and say "Well, an additional topic to talk about..." but of course due to the time

clicking very quickly today we had to move a couple of sessions, a couple of discussions back from this morning. And the first one is the ICANN Academy and capacity building activities. I see Sandra Hoferichter and also Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro, and I hope I got this one right? Yes, practice makes perfect.

And I'll ask is there any presentation that you wish to make or are you just going to... Well, I'll hand the floor over to Sandra and she can just tell us a little update about the progress on the ICANN Academy. Sandra, the floor is yours. And I will ask you to be quite brief of course because this is sort of added time that we're on at the moment. So Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you, Olivier, it's Sandra Hoferichter for the transcript. May I just ask you to move forward to Slide #5? This is the only one I want to show. Well, I'll actually start with I got a message today that the proposal to organize an ICANN Academy was somehow adopted by the ICANN Board. It will be a first pilot project, a leadership training program planned for Toronto which is based on the ICANN Academy proposal. I don't have any detailed information about this so I think we have to wait about the news of this week, and maybe at the end of the week we will know more; and if there are any significant developments I'm sure there will be a possibility to inform you about this.

However, I just want to give you a brief update on what has been done since Costa Rica. I'm still waiting for Slide #5... The discussion which took place in Costa Rica was where we had our first broader outreach. We're still focusing and demanding something more than just a

leadership program for 50 selected ICANN leaders, and there was not only the demand from the ALAC community but also from the business constituency and so on and so forth. In parallel, ICANN staff presented the new outreach framework which is on the left side of this slide and when I went home, the Program Committee, we started to think about how this could be harmonized and how this could be brought together.

So what we did is we selected and we compiled all the capacity building provisions which are already existing, and it was not surprising a lot of stuff was already there. You can just go to the website – you will find a huge amount of learning materials which can be used for ALSes, for end users, for business representatives, for governmental representatives and so on and so forth; and these are actually meeting the observer and the contributor level which is here marked in blue and in green. So far there is no capacity building provision in place for the leadership level and this is actually what we are talking about here with the ICANN Academy leadership proposal.

In the outreach framework they are also talking about the ambassador level, and we see it or we propose that who else is the best faculty than the ambassador – than those people who are participating in ICANN for a very long time? They are able to spread the message and to transport the idea through all three levels: the observer level, the contributor level and also the leadership level. Later in April we sent out a call, Olivier sent out a call to all other ICANN communities, to all other stakeholder groups, SOs and ACs, calling for participation to an expanded ICANN Academy Working Group because as it was our plan from the very beginning we want to include the entire ICANN community. It should not remain an At-Large or an ALAC proposal.

We got a pretty good response from this community. We have now around 27 new members from the entire ICANN community and a first briefing call took place at the beginning of June. This briefing call was only for the new members because what has been presented and what has been discussed during this briefing call was actually nothing new than what has been presented in Costa Rica and what has been offered in early March or late February, I'm not quite sure, to the At-Large community. And we don't want to open a new discussion; it was just to bring them all on one page so that the new members have actually the same knowledge as the At-Large community already has.

During this week, the Expanded Working Group meeting is planned and has been announced through the At-Large Working Group mailing list. It will take place on Wednesday, 9:00. The purpose of this Expanded Working Group meeting is first of all to create a new Program Committee because we made a positive experience that working with the Program Committee is very more effective than having a Chair and a Co-Chair. The Program Committee so far was designed from one representative from each region. It was according to the ALAC rules for geographical balance. Now we are not focusing only on geographical balance but rather on stakeholder balance, so the Program Committee has to be renewed and we have to include willing volunteers from the other stakeholder groups – not from the At-Large because the At-Large will keep on working with the existing Program Committee, but from the other stakeholder group we will try to redesign a new Program Committee.

The task of this new Working Group will be to agree on the curriculum, because so far At-Large proposed a curriculum but it has to be

somehow adopted by the entire ICANN community, by the other stakeholders and SOs and ACs. We will start on defining faculty members and create a concrete program, but for this next step we also need all the detailed information about how long this training program will be – two days, three days as proposed or even shorter or longer. This is the information we are still waiting for and I hope to give you maybe an informal or formal update later this week. Thank you very much. And we'd be happy if there are any questions to answer them.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sandra. Any questions or comments? Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you, Sandra, this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Just a question in terms of numbers: what does this look like, number of contributors, number of leaders? Do you have any idea?

Sandra Hoferichter: It's actually not about numbers; it's about the level of engagement within ICANN. The left picture was designed by ICANN staff, by Kurt Pritz and his team and it was presented in Costa Rica. I'm not sure if it was presented before that, maybe on a webinar? Okay. And what I did is I adopted the colors and the levels according to existing capacity building provisions, and looked in detail into which capacity building program – either a webinar, audio briefing, podcast, newcomers' lounge, newcomers' track – which level do they actually meet? Do they meet the observer level which is quite huge? Do they meet the

contributors' level, which is number-wise smaller than the observer level but which has a very broad varieties of capacity building programs? And is there something for the leader level also?

But we found out there is nothing there, and this actually shows that something which we are talking about – a very concrete proposal for a leadership program – is still missing. Does this answer your question?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: If I may follow up on that, well it does partly but I think the problem in a community like ours is availability. There will always be many candidates who want to learn, right? I think part of the problem is who do you put in front of them to provide the knowledge or the experience. So I just wanted to get a sense from you is it dozens of people, is it hundreds? Is it units? Just an order of magnitude.

Sandra Hoferichter: You mean the faculty or... I didn't really get that.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, people who would be speaking in front of these people who want to get a training, what you call faculty, yes – what's the size of that roughly?

Sandra Hoferichter: It's Sandra for the transcript. For the ICANN Academy, we have only 15 to 20 participants, fellows, trainees. We won't need in a three days' program a huge number of faculty. The idea could be, but this is up for

discussion with the ICANN community, to arrange a sort of pool of faculty members, members which have the mandate by the entire community to say “Okay, we want you to spread the message for our future leadership community,” because if this program will go on not every faculty member may be available for every training program, for every meeting. And I’m only talking about the yellow brick at the moment; I’m not talking about what is happening or what has been done in the Newcomers’ Program or on the webinars or so forth. But of course, and it makes sense that some people who are already active in the blue and in the green area, they might also become a part of the faculty of the yellow brick.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Sandra, it’s Olivier for the transcript. One last question from Hong and then we’ll have to move on. Just saying one thing: the faculty members are not paid for faculty members, at least in this test case; and we are looking at community members being the faculty members, and this is one of the reasons why a widened ICANN Academy Working Group has been created so as to have those members of the community from each SO, AC, and also SG take part in the development of the curriculum and also in the delivery of this curriculum when it takes place. Hong?

Hong Xue:

Oh, just a quick one – not a question, a comment. ICANN has got a new CEO and there’s a couple of new Vice Presidents. I think they should be selected or invited to join the program in Toronto.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Hong, and I think we can take this as an action item, actually, to invite them formally to the session. So action item: the new GPs as well as the new CEO should be invited to the ICANN Academy if it takes place in Toronto. And Vice Presidents – you might not know them but they were around this morning. Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter: One short addendum: I just read that the new CEO was active in software implementation for educational organizations so I think we cannot just even include him as a trainee – we can even ask him to provide, I don't know, some software stuff. And I hope we will have a CEO in favor of our proposal.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sandra, and I am particularly pleased to see that many of us here do our homework on whatever else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's cloud, which of course makes moving to later on that we could actually utilize the remote and things. Once it gets past [this] it should be perfect.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic, thank you. Now Sala, do you want to add anything with regards to the capacity building please? Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Thank you – Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the record. First of all I bring greetings from the ALS and the APRALO that I actually belong to. I'd also like to greet all of those who are streaming in – I'm not sure if there is still anyone streaming in. I know in the Asia-Pacific region it's probably 3:30 in the morning? Yes. So to the LACRALO, APRALO, EURALO, AFRALO and NARALO that are streaming in warm greetings, and I'd also like to acknowledge the presence of all the RALO executives who are here and those who couldn't make it but are streaming in.

In relation to capacity building, some of you may know the brief history of this. There's been some numbers crunched: it is essentially we just wanted to know how many ALSes were actually from the different RALOs, and last year I sort of wrote a paper – was it last year? I can't remember, probably this year – it just feels like, yes. Anyway, but in terms of the penetration rates, ALSes per RALO what was noticeable was that it's something that can be improved, that should be improved. The other thing is before just going a bit further, I stopped to define "capacity building." I sort of Googled it first and there's so many definitions for capacity building, and one of the things that I'm mindful of before I go on any further is that if you say "house" to a different person, to somebody in Africa "house" is different, or to somebody in Germany or to somebody in the Caribbean.

Similarly with capacity building, it's two words that can mean two different things to two different people, but when I speak of capacity building in this instance this is what I'm referring to and it's something that will be put out to the RALOs for consultations, especially from the edges: "planned development and increase of knowledge, 1; output rate, management skills and other capabilities of an organization." And

if we look at the policies emerging you know, if we go back to the internet governance WCIT 2005 document one of the public policy areas that these experts identified was global meaningful participation, yes?

And as an At-Large structure or as At-Large, the global community, if we say meaningful participation, what does it mean? Is it just one or two people from the RALOs participating actively in the policy processes? Is it sustainable or what sort of mechanisms should be in place to enable or facilitate this thing to go forward with or without the active members and that sort of thing? And so each of us, and I would like to urge each of the RALO Secretariats that are present, the RALO executives, I'd like to challenge each of us to ask the question if we're really coming to a time of introspection and really ask the question: is there enough meaningful participation coming from the edges or is it just one, two, three, four or five people? Is that enough?

I mean today we heard from the IDN guys a call for volunteers, and they said "We want people who know about IDNs." But if you look around our RALOs, how many people know about IDNs, that sort of thing? And yes, we do have quite a few people who are skilled and who have been in the system, who understand the policies but how do you translate and how do you share that knowledge, and how do you pass it back and that sort of thing?

So one of the approaches that we've done since Costa Rica, the good news is that the ASO Council Meeting in Costa Rica, in San Jose, Rinalia and I attended and we put forward to the ASO Council what they thought of having liaisons from ALAC into the various NROs. And the response was very positive and that sort of thing, and of course that

was due to the good work that's already been done by ALAC for quite a long time – you know, brokering that and that sort of thing.

And at the same time I would like to draw your attention, before we begin in something like capacity building we ask ourselves “Okay, so who's doing it already within the organization?” because the last thing that we need to do is to duplicate things. We have limited resources – I mean the economic challenges. So we looked around and we found the ccNSO Council has a Study Group on Capacity Building. And it's a closed group, and quiet – it's a closed group. Global Partnerships has verbally expressed, and it's very good to hear them say that they want to partner with us. And At-Large [is doing] capacity building clearly, and the GAC, even from speaking to the GAC members they're also interested in capacity building as you have heard from Sandra.

So and Kurt Pritz if you remember in San Jose in Costa Rica, he said to the ALAC and to the At-Large community that stakeholder relations, that they want to work with us in terms of capacity building and communications. So you know, when we say capacity building how do we increase – increase critical mass within what we already have; and how do we also draw? Because I think when we build on what we already have it creates like a vortex where people just naturally come in and the system grows.

If I may I'd just like to draw your attention to one region, and I would first like to apologize to this region if it causes offense. It's not intentional, this is just academic, the way I will put it forward. Take for example LACRALO, yes? LACRALO has the largest penetration rate out of all the RALOs. All the rest of the RALOs are under 20% penetration

rates, and when I say “penetration rate” I’m meaning ALSes per country. So one of the challenges that I’ve heard from a few colleagues in LACRALO is that even though there’s a high penetration rate they feel that they need to have capacity built still so that people can meaningfully participate. Yes, LACRALO? Feel free to disagree, it’s a free house... Yes.

And so the point is if we want to build our people the resources are there. The resources are there and it’s just a matter of us putting our heads together and working together to make it happen. And so the good news is ever since Costa Rica, San Jose... Yes, almost wrapping up – two minutes, yes, we all want to get out of here, trust me. Yes, ever since San Jose Dev and I have been working on a list of indicators which could possibly be used to measure the things that need strengthening.

And as soon as we complete that that’ll be sent to everyone, but one of the things I’d ask staff before coming to this particular meeting was to have a regional consultation, a RALO consultation where we send out a survey and you ask your people what do they want built? Like in Asia-Pacific there’s consensus – everyone wants to be built the things that they’ve identified. But what we want to do is to formally initiate a process where the RALOs tell us, tell the ALAC what they want. And also in terms of the indicators then we’ll begin to measure; and we’ve already got the commitment and we don’t want to rush into anything. But then, once we know what we want and organize a strategy we can then go and say to the ASO, say to the Global Partnership “Hey, this is what needs to be done. This is what needs to happen,” and that sort of thing. And so with that turn, Mr. Chair, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sala, for this comprehensive report; and certainly it's heartwarming to see that there is a lot going on and there will be a lot more going on. One of the suggestions was that the monthly Secretariat calls could also be touching on this. It certainly is that capacity building is a worldwide matter. I can also let you in on a little insight: I had the chance of meeting with the new forthcoming CEO, and one of his priorities it appears will be capacity building and how can ICANN help the communities out there. So devising a plan for capacity building and certainly having all of that available for the near future – we are talking about October and of course preparation for the fiscal year after that – is something which the At-Large community is very well catered for and has to really think of and work a lot on.

I'm afraid we can't take any questions; we are running out of time and it's primarily because we only have a few more minutes left for quite a number of items left. I'm going to give a couple of minutes to Dev – and I'm sorry, it started at ten and then five and now it's two to three minutes – to Dev for the At-Large social media; for Dev to be able to provide us with a little information on that, please. Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Olivier – Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Well, on the Technology Taskforce call, one of the items we're being tasked with is to come up with an At-Large social media strategy, and the question really started out as why have an At-Large social media strategy? And some of the answers were that well – and I've tried to synthesize it into one

sentence – is to enable At-Large Structures to easily disseminate information about ICANN At-Large to its members and the public in a timely manner.

And just to give some idea of the background here, because the At-Large Structure Survey that was done in 2010 identified that while many ALSes use social media tools like Facebook, Twitter and so forth, most ALSes actually only meet once every two to three months. And well, given the pace of ICANN policy work and 30 day comment periods and so forth an ALS representative has a very difficult task to try to distribute information about the ICANN policy to its members and to try to even get meaningful feedback for that ALS represented and to take it up into the RALO and into ALAC and so forth.

So that's one reason. The other reason is that well, outreach to individual internet users that could become members of At-Large, because many potential internet users interested in internet governance-related issues including [articles] related to ICANN polices related to domain names, don't really know about ICANN or don't even know about the ICANN At-Large and that they can participate in ICANN and At-Large. So that's another reason to have an At-Large social media strategy.

Another reason is that social media networks have many users. I think the latest statistics as of March, 2012, Facebook has 901 million users and Twitter has 140 million users. So currently At-Large has a Facebook page and a Twitter account, and that has seen some growth. I think it was 118 last year and now it's up to 1200 followers on Facebook or persons who have subscribed to the page; and on Twitter, we didn't

have a Twitter account until last year and now we have 410 followers. So there is interest, and to actually post content on the Facebook and Twitter accounts requires actually logging into those things separately and that's time consuming.

So far what we have as one of the draft items for the At-Large social media strategy is as a first step have the emails that are sent to the ALAC announce list, which is the primary email communication for any and all of our At-Large activities, to be immediately sent to Facebook and Twitter and possibly look at other networks like LinkedIn, which is also very popular. I think in Dakar there was an informal survey done, and LinkedIn was actually more popular than Twitter or Facebook. And another thing would be to ensure that when the ICANN At-Large website is redesigned, ensuring that it caters for the sharing of information over social media. So those are the strategies.

Now, because we haven't had a chance to really discuss this further there is another aspect that is more related to the engagements and participation, and that comes back to a bit of what the Communications Department has and its problems. I think it's trying to get the global public interested in really understanding what ICANN is. I mean an example would be that okay, we could submit and share information about the IRT Part C policy that's out for comment but most people are not simply going to understand that.

So we may also have to look, as we start using the social media tools look at the ALAC announce to try to make sure that our language is in a form that certain people reading it can see "Well, this is why I should care about actually looking at this document" or "looking at this policy."

Because once you show that page, and this is thanks to you directly then, I think you might get some more engagement and participation. So that's what we have so far. And like I said, it's only been one meeting we've had so far with the Taskforce. So I guess that's it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Dev, and thank you for being concise. We don't have any time for any questions or comments but as with Sala's report as well, I ask everyone who wants to follow up or actually be involved with either the Technology Taskforce or the work that you do and also the process which Sala is leading to volunteer directly with them and add yourself to the group. I'm sure there is a lot of demand, and of course that's the same thing for those people who are at home and those people listening to the recording.

Right, we have a couple more items to deal with before the top of the hour. The first one, and I think I'm going to perhaps ask Matt to do something, to click on the following: put into the Adobe Connect, I'm putting a link. This is a link to a statement which had to be written pretty quickly at the last minute due to the fact that prior to an ICANN meeting so many things take place simultaneously, and well, the closing time for initial comments was during the ICANN meeting or just before the ICANN meeting. It's the proposed At-Large public comments solicitation for fiscal year '13 Community Travel Support guidelines.

A workspace was very quickly created; the statement was actually initially drafted by Alan Greenberg and it's getting late now, and it was sent on my behalf. I spoke to Alan and he sent it on my behalf to the public comment process. What we have to do is to formalize this

statement. It was done without formalization due to the fact that it was basically correcting facts, facts about errors that were actually on the document that was distributed. So I wanted to read through this and let you think about it and ponder about it, and alert you to the fact that this statement is up there; make any corrections which you believe there might be but I guess because these are facts there's probably not that many corrections that need to be made.

I'm glad Tijani is back with us having had to go quickly to the Finance Committee meeting, so I thank you, Tijani, for being back. And I'll read through the statement for all of you to listen to and then we will have to have a vote on this not today – we'll have a vote later on this week, either in the Tuesday session or on the Thursday wrap-up session, possibly in the Thursday wrap-up session since we'll have other votes to run at that time.

So "On behalf of the ALAC and At-Large I would like to thank ICANN for their continued travel support as it is essential for At-Large to carry out its mandate. I do, however, have several comments regarding the section on At-Large Travel Support." Now, the actual exact wording might change because this was a personal statement, but this of course will be formalized in the final statement. So "One: the concept of repurposing the funding allocated to ten regional leaders towards regional assemblies has repeatedly been rejected by the ALAC for very well-documented reasons. Having regional leaders be present at all ICANN meetings is absolutely necessary for the At-Large to be effective.

"Moreover, it is incorrect to state that this is how the regional participation in Dakar and Costa Rica were funded. In both cases,

separate funds were made available. These obsolete references in both Sections 3 and 5 should be removed. Two: regarding how regional assemblies or Summits should be funded, the ALAC is in ongoing dialog with senior ICANN financial management. This is documented in Section 6 under 'Special Requests.'

"Three: it is unclear in whose mind At-Large Travel Support was thought to be needed only during its startup. It has always been clear to all of those involved in At-Large that to withdraw travel support would effectively kill any semblance of At-Large and ALAC effectiveness. It is true that some have proposed..." Yes, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I apologize for the intervention. I do need to leave but I know who made that statement – it came from the President and CEO back at the very, very beginning. So we do know. You might need to temper that. It was overturned in I'm thinking 2003, March-April 2003 but it was right back at the very beginning. It was part of the creation process. So I don't think you should say "We don't know" because we do know, sorry.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, so we should say that we do know and I will ask for your input until Thursday when we vote on this to be overturned. Yes, it is dinosaur time; it looks like cut and paste. I'll just finish the sentence for the record and for you to understand.

"It has always been clear to all those involved in At-Large that to withdraw Travel Support would effectively kill any semblance of At-

Large and ALAC effectiveness. It is true that some have proposed lower or no funding but that concept has never been implemented nor should it be if ICANN wants to have the input of the world's internet user community" – end of statement. Jean-Jacques and then we'll have to go on to the next item. Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you. I think that overall this is a good approach. I just have a question or perhaps some hesitation about Point #1. I need to change my eyeglasses but apparently it says something like "having regional leaders present at all ICANN meetings is absolutely necessary." I'd be more affirmative. I think that we should not give the impression that the existence of At-Large or ALAC is subordinated to the availability or not of transport. I think that is a given, full stop. That is not negotiable. In addition, we think it is necessary or advisable or whatever to have these people attend meetings. I wouldn't limit that to these regional meetings; I'd say also to more general meetings such as IGF. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. And the point has been made in our previous statements. The comment here relates specifically to the report which seems to have not moved from a position that was held by ICANN four or five years ago and which had been upturned. So someone obviously cut and pasted from the wrong very old report rather than reading through the right files. Tijani, you do want to say a few words or no?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, just if it's possible to send this statement with all the changes made on the email list so that everyone will have it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It is on a Wiki. It is on a Wiki and as we always do the final copy will be on the Wiki, and if you could please, Jean-Jacques as well, make your comment on the Wiki page itself which is on there. The link to the Wiki is actually in the Adobe Chat.

Okay, the last item or the penultimate item, and have we been given a five- or seven-minute extension? We have seven minutes to do two things. One is to give the floor to Jean-Jacques to say just a few more words on the R3 paper. There was a suggestion that a small interchange of discussion could take place there; I'm not sure if five minutes is enough but you have the floor, Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Fair enough, thank you very much. Two points: one, content; two, communication. On content it's obvious that this was a temporary paper; it was a work in progress. I say this because a couple of colleagues from the ALAC approached me saying "Why at this stage is it not yet officially an ALAC-stamped-allover paper to be distributed to a whole lot of colleagues in the GAC and the GNSO, etc., etc.?" Evan is not here, otherwise he would have addressed this more fully than I can but I can say that because of the subject matter which is very innovative I think, broad, not about process we were not confident enough that we could launch just like that right off an ALAC paper. That's the

explanation about the content – we were not completely confident about.

So we are looking for reactions now. We have got some and overall they are quite favorable. I got from one of our colleagues an indication that the ccTLD folks are not quite happy with some of the stuff we put about registrants. We'll have to look at that more in detail. Now about communication, obviously in order to make this a success for the ALAC we still have a few more steps. We have to engage other parts of the ICANN community but also outside of ICANN in a second step. So we will be doing this during this Prague meeting. In fact, I'll be seeing Evan probably tomorrow morning in order to see if we cannot shorten the timeline.

Initially Olivier, as you remember, we were thinking of making this available as a truly ALAC document, fully agreed upon, etc., sometime between the end of the Prague and the beginning of the Toronto meeting. But for various reasons I am led to believe that this may be unfortunate and that we should revise our timeline and make it available perhaps a bit earlier. I'm not sure it's possible; we just want to look at it. So we'll be coming back to you, Evan and I at least, very shortly to consult you and to say what we on our side have learned which we think will make it possible or impossible to accelerate that timeline.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Just in response to your suggestions, and I'm not saying no or yes obviously – I think it's for the community to voice its point of view. The new CEO will be taking office

in October and until then the Interim CEO will be Akram who will be basically just run the day-to-day affairs that a CEO needs to do. The real switchover will take place at that time and certainly in Toronto will be the time when the new “era” will begin. The suggestion that was made to me by several people outside of this room was that this process itself, while there is a certain timeline to be thought about should incorporate some significant discussions to take place in Toronto which effectively does provide you with much time – bearing in mind that in between, July and August are the traditional times when a majority of people will be doing something else much more worthwhile than playing around with domain names and thinking about these things, certainly in Europe, certainly in some parts of the world.

So think of the timeline carefully. You don’t wish to have a flash in the pan which will be old news by the time we reach Toronto, but at the same time obviously I understand that you wish to engage as many as possible on that road. But perhaps in the next few days would you discuss it with your colleagues and find out which way, and perhaps also discuss it with those people who have read the paper outside of the community because it is true – many people have come to me from outside the community and said that they have read it. And if they have not read it they’ve heard about it, so it certainly is having some effect.

Right, we have two minutes remaining until we lose everyone including the interpreters, including most of the people around this desk. One last point is to do with the reporting which I often, and my predecessor also had to push... One minute? Okay. Well, the reporting is all about, well going to other sessions effectively and writing about it on our Wiki – is it our Wiki where we have to write about it? So last time, the last

two or three times – Costa Rica, Dakar – we’ve had a very, very bad response. Very few people have actually undertaken that.

Now I understand on one side that we have a very full schedule and many of us are actually in the room working on the issues that we had rather than actually elsewhere, but it is still good to have some of us being able to go; and when you do have some spare time going to the other sessions. And even just a few words about the other session is good. We should stop working in silos; we always push that we shouldn’t be in silos and it’s great for us to be able to really show we’re not the siloed ones. Jean-Jacques, you just wanted to say...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

A quick comment on that. My experience as a member of the Board leads me to say that all that has been experimented already. If you leave it to the members of whatever community, in this case the ALAC, to go or not to go to this or that meeting and to report or not to report, then it becomes unmanageable and too dependent upon individual initiative. So what was decided in the Board, and I think it’s still being carried out that way, is that there is a designation process by the Chair of course in consultation with volunteers, etc., to designate. You don’t want to cover absolutely everything. There are too many things in the ICANN program, but what we consider to be essential to our feedback and our role. I would say for instance for myself, I’d like to be asked to sit in on the GAC sessions officially as far as that is possible and I would report to you fully in writing in order to not take up too much time in our oral sessions. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. We can't take any more questions I am afraid because we're going to lose interpretation. So I have to thank all of you. We will continue this discussion perhaps afterwards, perhaps one evening and of course in the corridors. I have to thank you all for spending the whole day in this room. It's fantastic to see all of you still awake and still taking part. Also a big round of applause to the interpreters who have been working very, very hard.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And also a round of applause to our technical people who have managed to make this work really well today.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And thanks of course to our staff; they are ever so incredible.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And with this have a very good night. Bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]