
Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...discussion. We were taken up by a breakfast taking place next door and in ALAC we speak a bit too much sometimes. So apologies for that, but I think we'll move swiftly forward and Dennis is going to speak to us about the IDN Variant management work and – if I can actually read the screen – and you've got about half an hour to speak to us about this and I believe you have a presentation. So, welcome Dennis thanks for joining us and we look forward to learning about the progress on this very important subject.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh there is?

Dennis Jennings: Can you hear me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So maybe it's this microphone that doesn't work.

Male: No, we can hear you.

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.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: One, two, test. This is better? I think it's probably this microphone that makes me sound like Darth Vader.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We only need to listen to Dennis after all so that's alright.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Dennis, you're on.

Dennis Jennings: So as long as people can hear me. Could I ask for the slide deck to be put up? I don't have control of this but I believe that somewhere in the magic there is a slide deck that was sent and I'd like the last – the first, the last – the first slide please. Yes, I'd like the last slide. And thank you very much for listening to me. Excellent, thank you. Thank you very much indeed.

So, I'm here to talk about the IDN Variant TLDs issues project, or as I like to know it as the VIP Project which sort of panders to my arrogance and sensitivity, and the room of course, the VIPs here. Many of you, I hope, were at the IDN session yesterday and I'm sorry, but this is going to be a repeat of that, but I'll plow on regardless. This is an update to you. If I could have the next slide please?

The whole project is an "issues" project and what we mean by that is that we need to identify what the problem is, what the challenges are, what the issues are, what the statement of requirements is,

what the problem statement is. Because it turns out an awful lot of work has been done in the IDN Variant issue area, but it hasn't been collated and there isn't agreement. So, the first thing we're going to do is to create a glossary of terms vetted with the technical and linguistic communities. It may seem sort of obvious and redundant but actually there is no common agreement on what a Variant is. And that's kind of basic to the discussion. So that's the first piece of work.

The second is to identify the challenges, taking into account that those lists of things there – linguistic accuracy, technical feasibility and accuracy, usability, accessibility, security and stability. That's the scope of work. It's an "issues" project; it's not a solutions project. It's the first phase. Next slide if you would. The final proposal, well the original proposal was published for public comment, we got comments and the final proposal was published based on those comments and you'll find it on the ICANN website.

And as a result of the feedback we got, which was very good and very positive, we decided to add a Greek case to the Arabic, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Latin and Chinese cases that we had already proposed. And we had proposed an Indic case and we realized, based on the feedback and as we started the work, that Indic first of all isn't a script, it's a sort of generic definition of a whole lot of scripts. And it became clear that that was impossible and it should be redefined to become the Devanagari case study, so we did that.

Next slide. As a result of that, the next thing was to publish a call for volunteers. Because the important thing about this project is

that it's an ICANN project in the sense that it's an ICANN community project; it's not an ICANN staff project, it's a community project. After all the people who have the issue to be solved is the community and not ICANN. We're there to facilitate, coordinate, bring together the people.

So we published a call for volunteers for the six case study teams and we received 70, over 70 applications across the six case study teams, which I thought was pretty impressive given the short time scale that were working on. And we reviewed that and we completed and published the selection of the team members. We also selected, based on the information we had, the case study coordinators. And these are the key people who will Chair and chase along the case study teams to get the work done.

Next slide. And the case study team coordinators are Dr. Sarmad Hussein for the Arabic case study, Dr. Xiaodong Li for the Chinese case study, Alexei Sozonov for the Cyrillic case study, Dr. Govind for Devanagari case study, [Vagalis Segadakis] for the Greek case study, and Jothan Frakes for the Latin. Unfortunately, [Vagalis] had a serious car accident almost immediately after he volunteered and as I said yesterday, I hope there's no correlation between volunteering to be a case study coordinator and having a serious car accident, and I believe he is quite seriously injured, has had surgery, will need more surgery, but he's on his computer.

So I'm not quite sure whether that's because, I mean he broke his hip in three places and lost a lot of blood is what I'm told, so pretty damn serious; pardon my language. So we don't quite know how

[Vagalis] is going to continue to contribute or not and we have sent him our best wishes for a speedy recovery. But that's an impressive list of individuals with, as it turns out, an extraordinarily, collectively an extraordinarily amount of knowledge and experience in this field.

Next slide. And we've also selected host organizations. We invited proposals for host organizations and we invited them to make proposals to support the case study teams and ictQatar, we have selected based on the information we have for the Arabic case study. The CDNC, the Chinese Domain Name Consortium, for the Chinese. UNESCO in Paris for the Cyrillic, the relationship with UNESCO is, I think, increasingly important to ICANN in a number of ways.

Next slide. The Department of Information Technology, DIT, which incorporates [C-DAC and NIXIE], two organizations very knowledgeable in this space, for the Devanagari case study. Forth ICS, where Vagalis is based in Crete for the Greek case study. And the Swedish Internet Infrastructure Foundation, better known as the Registry Operator for .se for the Latin case study. Again, these organizations offer a variety of levels of support from meeting rooms through to admin support through to some level of local funding and telecommunication support and so on, varies from one host organization to another.

Next slide please. The case study teams, we went out to select expertise in a variety of areas – the DNS, registry/registrar operations, linguistics, security, the IDNA protocol, policy and so

on – led by a case study team coordinator, as I said. And they will have regular conference calls and face to face meetings and we would provide support. Next slide. So okay, before I go on to this and while you copy this down I can see your enthusiasm, you want to get involved, that’s the mailing list for getting involved. If you want to participate there is a general mailing list for all the case studies and there is a Wiki as well for publishing of information.

The case study teams have their own mailing lists for their internal work. It’s closed because they need to be able to work and chat together, but all the outputs will be published. So it will be as open and transparent as we can get while allowing them to do their work and their internal discussions as they go along. Next slide.

The work begins. I should mention before going on to this slide that I don’t think there’s a slide in the deck – the key, from our side, from the project side we have case study liaisons. Each case study coordinator has an individual liaison member in the project team who is the key link and support person to the case study coordinators. And I see that relationship being really very important to help the case study coordinators to track the work, to provide the resources, and so on. And I think it’s working very well already.

So we started the work here in Singapore and I have to say it was a challenge to get all this done in a relatively short amount of time, very short amount of time and get the teams here and get some financial support for some of the team members to get here or to extend their stays here. And we organized a full day working

session on Saturday, which was extraordinarily successful. It was a plenary session where we outlined our thinking and our input documents, which was very successful.

Then we had a working session. We had only three rooms available to us and we had six case studies so we had only three case studies with remote participation at a time. But with a little encouragement all the other case studies who didn't have a room found a corner in the building and got to work immediately. And did an astonishing amount of work, I think, in a very short period of time. And continue to do so. There have been morning meetings and afternoon meetings and evening meetings and there's a special meeting at 6:30 to catch up on some stuff, this evening, which I'm going to sit in.

And this is overtaken by events, case study coordinators will present a summary of their from the Saturday sessions on Monday and that should have been edited out of this particular presentation, so you might conclude that this is a copy of another presentation if you were just paying attention here. So my apologies for that. And we did and I think those people who attended that session got some idea of the difficulty and the complexity and indeed the amount of work done. The Arabic case study, Dr. Sarmad Hussein was able to produce a very detailed timeline between now and the project end. I think that's on the next slide, not the details but the timeline. So, next slide please.

Yes. So what's next? Well a lot of hard work – periodic telephone conferences, inter-sessional meetings organized locally with

perhaps physical participation but certainly remote participation from the team. And we have set a deadline, and we've kept the deadline of the 30th of September for the individual case study issues reports. Now there's not a lot of time between now and the 30th of September, particularly if you live in Europe in the Northern Hemisphere or in the Middle East when there's holidays – and this year Ramadan is in August, which makes life a little more difficult.

But it's very important that we try and achieve this and I'm quite stunned by the determination of the case study teams to deliver the reports by the 30th of September and really very impressed. I've also been very impressed about how much work has been done in the past, which will provide a base for the work that's going on here.

And the other overall timeline is that the final issues report is due by the 15th of December and we hope that the case study coordinators will meet in Dakar in Senegal and begin that work; taking the individual case studies and producing a consolidated final issues report identifying what's common and what's different across the individual case studies. Next slide. Questions?

I should make some comments before we go to questions. There has been a general view that his whole thing was just a technical problem and that surely the DNS must have a way of dealing with things that are the same. Well as it turns out that maybe there are some tools that might provide part of the solution – C name and D name. But no one really knows whether they do. For one reason,

the question isn't properly defined; the statement of requirement isn't properly defined. So it's very hard to answer a particular technology meets the need if the need is not accurately defined. But even if it is, and even if D name turns out to work the way people think, and that is the first question, and then works in a way that might provide a solution to some or all of these questions, D name is not widely deployed in the DNS.

So it will be a long time. Andrew Sullivan, who is a consultant in the DNS and IDNA area that we have brought into the project, suggests it might be 25 years before D name would be fully deployed throughout the DNS. I'm not that pessimistic. I don't think it will be that long for it to be deployed where relevant, but years certainly. Andrew tells me I'm far too optimistic.

So there isn't a nice pat technical solution. This isn't something you can say toss it over to the IETF or whatever and surely they must fix it. We need to define the problem first. The second thing I keep saying to the case study teams is let's reduce the complexity as much as we can, or I'll put it another way, the perfect is the enemy of the good. Let's be realistic here. Or as I said to one of the teams, how many TLDs do you expect in your script.

And you know, it's not millions so maybe you don't have to deal with every possible combination and maybe you do; I don't know I'm no expert. My role in all this is just to facilitate the work and to make sure the project moves ahead. So with those comments I open the meeting, my presentation to question. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Dennis and thanks for this update which [audio switches to French interpreter]

Alan Greenberg: ...not really asking for an answer, but I'm pointing out that this is not the first time that we have let a critical known problem fester and be ignored until it was really almost too late. And the shame I think of having the Board be the one that had to charter the Working Group to do this I think indicates that there's a problem in ICANN in general that we can let things like this lie and I think it's something we need to think about as we go forward.

Dennis Jennings: I really can't comment on that. Of course organizations have missed opportunities, don't do everything that perhaps they should do, but I really can't comment on that. I know that. And I'll provide the feedback. Has the microphone gone off? I don't sound as echoey as before.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It might be an improvement. Either that or it might be totally off, I'm not sure.

Dennis Jennings: Oh I see. Can people at the back of the room hear me? Okay. I really can't comment on that. Yes, of course critical things like

that should not have to go be identified by the Board, of course not, but hey, I sit on many Boards and every so often something comes up and you say what the hell is going on here? Why haven't we? And at the end of the day that's what Boards are there for, to be sufficiently overseeing the things, to catch those things.

Alan Greenberg: My hope is that we've learned a lesson and maybe next time the Board will not have to catch the next one.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan. Thank you Dennis. For the transcript, there was an interaction between Alan Greenberg and Dennis Jennings and it was not just one person with a schizophrenic attitude talking to themselves. The next person on my list is Edmon Chung.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Edmon here. Just I guess to add to the background that Alan mentioned. I think I would say that in fact the issue was not omitted or anything and in fact it was discussed in the GNSO IDN Working Group, it was deliberated and it was discussed. And there were certain implementation items that were, at that point, intentionally left out. It's not that it wasn't discussed, because it was at a policy level at that point. And I guess it was probably a mistake at that point because we were, the group at that time, the IDN Working Group at that time had the feeling that it was, the issue was well known enough and the implementations were well

practiced enough, especially in the Chinese community because that was – at that point, again, at that point – driving the discussion. Remember, that is 2005, 2006 time.

What happened was that the IDNC, the IDN ccTLD Fast Track then came about, it was pushed through fairly quickly and this issue was not fully described and also it was driven by the situation where the group felt that the issue was clearly enough understood. But what became an issue was when the implementation actually took place and additional languages realized that the Variant problems pertained to them as well.

And that sort of sparked a new round of a discussion. I think all along, from the 2005, 2006 gTLD discussion and the 2007 to the 2008 ccTLD discussion, the Chinese situation was well understood and I think it still is. But we had additional issues. So I guess just to add to that background, it's interesting because things, as we roll along additional issues could come up. The original sin, I guess, of the problem was discussed and deliberated quite extensively, but eventually new items did come into play.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: I think that's fair. Dennis Jennings here again. I think that's a fair comment. Ram Mohan has advised me that this problem is like peeling an onion except every time you peel one of the layers off

the onion grows bigger. So you know, I think a lot of well intentioned decisions were made along the path, as Edmon has indicated. And things weren't caught perhaps as they should have been and other requirements emerged as time went by. I think you're absolutely right.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Dennis. And if I could, just as a matter of housekeeping, ask everyone to mute their computers. I do hear regular beeps from Skype and stuff so. That is Skype. Any questions, further questions, comments – this is your time to ask them. There are hands up in the session unfortunately I can't see them there. Right, I see Hong Xue as the first hand up. Where is Hong? Is Hong – behind me? Oh! This is why I don't like having people sitting behind me, I can't see them. Thank you Hong.

Hong Xue: Thank you very much Chair. I have a very small question. First of all, I guess all the Chinese speaking people are very grateful that ICANN is launching this Varian study project, which is really important for Chinese characters. But also we notice that there are actually six languages and the scripts are being studied at the same time. I guess Dennis is absolutely the expert on this and you know the different status of research and development for all six languages. For Chinese language community we actually have been working on this for more than a decade already.

Technologies and policy have been developed for quite a long time. We are mature community.

Other communities are very respectful and very important; they just began their study and research. Of course it's very important initiative; the issue here is that it is the same timetable going to be applied for all six languages? Of course, I'm not asking for favorite treatment, not at all. All the languages script should be treated extremely equally. The issue here is that, as you said very insightfully in the beginning session of this Variant study, that perfection should not be the enemy of goodness. So looking forward to your kind observations.

Dennis Jennings:

Thank you, Dennis here, Dennis Jennings again. Thank you for the question. Yes, our current guidance from the Board is that we should try and get the six case studies reports at the same time for the issues and produce a combined issues report and then move on to the implementation. And that no script will move more rapidly than any other. However, it's perfectly clear that were it to turn out that there were laggards, there were some cases which were taking a lot more time than others, it would be unreasonable, in my opinion, in my view, to hold back the moving to the second phase, the solutions phase for one script that is ready because others are not going to be ready.

Our goal is to bring them altogether at the same time; we'll have to see how that emerges. I'm fully conscious, very conscious of the

state of readiness of some of the scripts. And actually I've been very impressed by the amount of work that has been done that I certainly didn't know about in other scripts. So let me just say I'm sensitive to the issue. We will certainly not unduly delay moving to the second phase for any script because other scripts are taking too long. But our goal is to bring them all to conclusion at the same time and then move on to the implementation phase; to get the maximum understanding of the Variant issues from these six studies at the same time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Dennis. Next on my list is Eric Brunner-Williams.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Dennis. I'm going to repeat something I think I said to you at a Cairo meeting as an ad hoc or individual conversation. I want to advise of observe that there was a proposal to provide intermediate tables as a solution to a problem we called Variants, Chinese Variants, that was made to the IETFs IDN Working Group in 2001. The IETF was unable to consider managing a table as a means of correcting a problem in a code set, which we still call Chinese Variants. The lesson here is that the IETF erred and had ICANN provided clarity that the solution proposed by the joint engineering team ought not to be rejected for the reasons the IETF chose, which was the issue of code table control, the Chinese Varian problem would have been solved in IDNA 2003 and we would not have this problem in 2011. We would be discussing

Variants, but we wouldn't be discussing those Variants. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Eric. Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you for that information. I don't think I can undo the past.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right well thank you.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Dennis, we need to learn from the past.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think we all need to learn from the past. Thanks very much. I think we're reaching the end of this session, I just wanted to ask if there were any more questions? Okay, we have Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: The question I have is about process. I saw that the final report is going to come out in December and this whole process is opened up so how is this going to be included in the process of the new gTLDs?

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings here again. At this point in time, if you look at the application guidebook, what it says is that IDN Variant TLDs will not be delegated. In the application, including in the first round, they can be applied for, in other words you can apply for a string and declare a Variants. I think the text in the guidebook needs some work in that area, but what it currently says, and this is the Board decision and there's a paper with the rationale for this that in fact the project produced for the Board and the Board has published, to review the history, review the rationale; that is the current situation. So until that changes, until we have a way of dealing with Variants, no Variants will be delegated. That's the current position.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Dennis. Yes, please.

Dennis Jennings: Just to remind everybody that there is an opportunity to participate, so I encourage you to sign up and get involved.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dennis. One last question from Edmon Chung and then we'll have to move on.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. I was going to say sort of the same thing. I think there are people around the table, and others from the ALAC with At-

Large that should pay more attention or would be interested to participate. So I think most people are welcome to participate. One more thing is that I personally am on the study teams as an observer from my capacity as a JIG I guess the question is also, I do wear a different hat here as the IDN liaison from ALAC, so perhaps also in that capacity I guess asking to be included in the study teams in that capacity as well.

Dennis Jennings:

Can you and I have a conversation about that Edmon while I reflect on it. You're right to mention the JIG, we've invited the JIG to have an observer on each case study as a way of liaising with the JIG. Edmon I think I need to think about that and not respond to you on the fly; this request for another observer status. So let's talk about that offline. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Dennis, and thanks for joining us. Hopefully we'll be able to see you in the next meeting in Africa, in Dakar. And by that time you will have no doubt had a lot of work done. Thank you. Moving swiftly on, our next guests are coming from Compliance with the ICANN Senior Compliance Director Maguy Serad, may I invite her and her team to join? And she's joined by Pam Little. Hello Pam. Well we were supposed to have about an hour with both of you to torture you and time is on your side. But Compliance is an issue which with the launch of the gTLD process is going to be ever so important because of course

we always think of the world as being full of nice people that there are also some not so nice people out there and Compliance, the big stick of ICANN, is something which I think internet users are really looking towards in order to sort of protect their interests.

Whenever I travel around the world and speak to some of the members of our At-Large structures one of the things that come forward always is oh why isn't ICANN doing something about my registrar or my registry that has not fulfilled its mandate or about my domain name YXZ being stolen or about, well all sorts of things. So I think we're going to hear from you regarding these issues and I'm not sure, first thing I guess, you want to introduce yourselves since you've just arrived into this, what would you call it, barbeque, this very – roasting pan, that's a good idea; yeah, the skillet. You've arrived in the skillet so yes, please. The floor is yours.

Maguy Serad: So, the skillet? That means you're a hot audience?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Very.

Maguy Serad: Good morning everyone. My name is Maguy Serad. For the team in the room I'm proud to be wearing the bright green tag as a newcomer; this is my first ICANN meeting. And I've been really excited, it's been exciting and a bit nervous also, like a kid in new

toy land here. So many stuff on the agenda – where do I go, what do I attend? But thank you for this opportunity this morning.

I've been with ICANN for two months. Just a fair warning, I'm not a lawyer, I come more from a business background; more from an automotive industry background. My strengths to the team that's already been existence, what I bring to the team is more of my business knowledge, my Six Sigma expertise and my focus that's been over the past few years on contractual compliance. So I'm very proud to be part of this team. We've got an amazing team that's very legal strong. And with me in the room today I have Pam Little, and some of my team members in the back, if you don't mind raising your hands. I have Stacy Burnette. I have Khalil Rasheed and Carlos Alvarez. So, skillet or no skillet we're here and ready.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If I could just say I think that Khalil put his hand up when Stacy was called; I'm just concerned.

Maguy Serad: No, we don't have personality issues. Maybe it's my accent. Oh, Stacy stepped out of the room; that's what it is. Very good one. See I have to address looking forward, I can't tell what's happening in the back.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I have to spend all day here with people in the back so.

Maguy Serad: Okay. You see, Introduction to ICANN 101. I'm learning. You have to keep your eyes all around the room. Alright. So we have prepared a couple of slides for you guys; I'm not sure how this forum is run being my first time. So we'll just go for it a slide at a time. I noticed it was very interactive session, or you want to hold the questions till the end, that's up to you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Olivier here. Since it's your first time we'll be very nice to you.

Maguy Serad: Thank you. I'm just worried about the skillet person with the comment you want to be burned.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No comment.

Maguy Serad: Alright, so who's conducting the slides here; who's driving.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The slides are connected by Matt.

Maguy Serad: Alright, next slide please. On the agenda, since I've already introduced myself I will get to that slide, we do want to share with

you a little bit. The biggest question I'm always asked is what are your plans as a newcomer and then some of the major initiatives underway. And we have some information to share with you about the activities over the past few months.

Next slide please. As I just stated, I do have about 20+ years of experience in compliance, technology, program management and global business operations. And also as I stated, I come more from an automotive industry where I've changed roles within that industry and different responsibilities, but the biggest role that impacted me the most and I carried with me is the Six Sigma certification that I obtained which allowed me to take on different strategic initiatives within the automotive industry.

As we all know we're barely now, the industry is barely coming back from a terribly few years of impact from the downfall here. So in the automotive sector we really focused on efficiency, effectiveness, results – and we were measured and held accountable to it. So some of those strengths I'm bringing with me to the team.

My style and philosophy, it's very simple, it's clear communication. You can never communicate enough. And we all know communication has many, many venues. One of them is what we're doing here today. It could be newsletters. It could be local presence and face to face with the different stakeholders and the ICANN community. I do like to keep things simple. Keeping it simple keeps us easier to manage, easier to track, fact based

decisions, accountability – I’m really big on accountability on rules and responsibilities and about managing results. Next slide please.

So the short term plan – when I was interviewing for my job, what scared me before I even joined, I said there are a lot of pressure on compliance, we’ve got this new gTLD, I said okay...And all the pressure was facing even before I said yes to joining the team. And a lot of people were expecting miracles. We do not have miracles. We do not have, it’s very common sense, logical approach.

The short term here is where looking at it, when I joined the team of course I had to support the current compliant activities underway; we can’t stop activities to say hey what are we doing. So we had to continue support for our obligations and our stakeholders and everyone else. But at the same time, I took a step back and I was able to, through the skill sets that I have is like okay where are we, what is our organizational structure today.

I’m proud to say that it was just recently that we really, the Contractual Compliance staff was brought up to the full time head count that they had a year ago, which is not a surprise to the audience. So assessing current state is looking at basically what is the organization made up of. Not just head counts; skill sets. How are we operating? What are the processes? It’s about people, processes and tools. That’s what I’ve been looking at over the last two months. And then that’s going to help us, once we understand, from my perspective understand that, we’re going to try as a team

over the next trimester to identify those efficiencies and effectiveness and hopefully implement them.

The third bullet is of no news to anyone. As a newcomer you always have to understand the ICANN model. I think I know most of the abbreviations. I think I do. But every time there is a new one. But mostly the ICANN model is the complexity and the diversity of the model. In my previous roles in the private sector were contracts between two parties. You know, the ICANN model has all those additional community members that influence those contracts, those decision making. This bottom up approach, all this consensus driven decisions, in the previous private sector it was very easy who is deciding. You've got two parties and that's it.

So understanding the ICANN model and stakeholder groups is very critical to the success of what I'm bringing to the table. And I've been doing that through not just reading, but also connecting and trying to meet with people, a lot of my counterparts at ICANN to understand and learn what it is. But also, the hands-on experience through the ICANN meetings is going to help me also learn more about it. Cultivating the relationship with the community, which goes along with understanding the model. Next slide please.

So, the major initiatives – staffing update as I just stated, we are back to the eight full head count in contractual compliance and that was the head count a year ago and then it dropped. So it's amazing that the team was able to really keep up and maintain the workload

to be able to deliver. It's a very high demanding job and a lot of expectations.

We do have plans for expansion. Not just plans because of gTLD, we already have a head count that we're putting together finalizing the job description that we're bringing on, that we want to interview and post and all this. But we also have approved head count for the new gTLD. From an operational perspective it ties with the short plan. Part of assessing current state is that operational effectiveness.

So the organizational structure, as I just stated, we're really now trying to, with the additional people that came on board and the future projection is what are the structure of the organization, not just for now but for the future. So we're looking at that. We're looking at the processes as I spoke to and the tools. That's been a very, very important and critical foundation for us. We depend on data. We depend on the tools. So we're really looking at the tools that have been in existence for a while and exploring the idea do we enhance or do visit something that's going to be different. So these are some of the initiatives we're looking at from operational effectiveness.

On the WHOIS compliance front some of the initiatives that we have, I'm very happy to announce, again, being a part of these acronyms, I came on and said okay, first thing John – John was my VP, John Jeffries said we need good focus on WHOIS. I said WHOIS who? So I've been here now two months, I understand the importance of this and thanks to my teams support we have

identified a person, and even made it a promotional move for Khalil Rasheed, who is sitting here in the audience. He is the Senior Manager for WHOIS.

So talk about accountability, we have it. Talk about putting a plan and a future, that's what Khalil is tasked with. Talking about run the business, that's what Khalil has got to do. So he has a good task ahead of him and a good opportunity also because he's going to have the focus. Again, back to availability of staff, the staff were running compliance like a queue – send the queue, we'll run it, we'll process and we move on. So whoever is available they take it and they do it, which is amazing.

So now we're able to say okay, how can we divvy up the responsibilities and be accountable for different areas to be able to be proactively supporting compliance activities, but also reactively because we receive a lot of complaints. So we're looking at that. And the WHOIS Senior Manager is one of the first moves in that area. So that will allow Khalil and the community to know who to reach out to and he will be leading that activity and working with everyone.

From the tools perspective, on major initiatives for WHOIS compliance we all know about WHOIS Port 43; it's a monitoring the access to that information. So what was implemented, one of the initiatives was we already, we were doing that, we'll continue to do it from an ICANN IP address, but now we're doing that also from a non ICANN address so we do it like a user experience, not an ICANN experience. So we're trying to look at different areas

and as I said earlier, from the tools, WDPRS is a critical tool that we use for the WHOIS data problem reporting system. So, do we enhance it, do we revamp it? Those are all good questions we're looking at.

Another tool we have is called C-Tickets, which is our complain tickets. It's the general public where you just go and you log in a complaint and Pam will share with you some of the data. Some of the complaints that way have to do with WHOIS. So there are a lot of different inputs into the WHOIS process. So the initiative here again is to look at the tools and see what's going on.

Enhancing communication – we all know when organizations suffer with head counts the first thing that goes is communication; whether it's newsletters or events or outreach activities, all these are forms of communications that suffer first because we have to continue running the business. So enhancing that aspect of it is one of our first priorities on the agenda. How can we do it? And how can we develop it and grow it? Enhancing the communication has to do also with collaborative efforts. By enhancing our communication we will be able to do face to face with many communities and our, not just registrars and registries, but the community itself and the different stakeholders. So that will feed into that communication.

So we have a lot of good opportunities here with the collaborative effort. The team was doing it, but it was more on an as needed basis. So we will hope to again be more proactive with that approach. And again, to the topic I think that's very important to

all of us – first thing like I think Olivier was saying is compliance ready for new gTLD? And I know that's the question we all ask and we're asking ourselves too. And we are getting ready for it, but we are getting ready for compliance activities regardless of gTLD. Part of that operational effectiveness we have. So if you allow me to finish that one bullet and then I'll take the question?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes absolutely. We'll take the questions at the end. Just in the queue. We have early queue here, a bit like the Harrods sale, 24 hours in advance people sleep here for the queue. So I've got Beau, I've got Carlton, and Dave, but please go on.

Maguy Serad: If I may finish this bullet and then we'll open that, is that okay Olivier? So again, all efforts that you heard me talk to in the previous bullets are efforts to help us be ready not only for gTLD but for our obligations and commitments from our contractual compliance perspective. I'm ready.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thanks very much Maguy and we'll immediately run through the questions. First with Beau, Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler: Yeah. Beau Brendler from North American RALO. Please don't take any of the following personally, but I've been coming to

ICANN meetings now for three years and this is yet another presentation of platitudes, in my opinion, without any substance behind them. And I know that that's not your fault, you're brand new, and you've got a new team, all of that sort of thing.

But when we come to these meetings, in order to talk back to or in order to address the issues and needs of people in our constituencies, we want names and numbers and results. We want to know we've addressed this complaint about this registrar, this is the action that was taken. I don't want to have to root through some spreadsheet that's created. I want to know what exactly has been going on in compliance. Number of complaints - number of complaints resolved – who the registrars are; that's the first part of my comment.

My second part is, my suggestion to you would be if you want to make a splash ad start out with something that's like low hanging fruit, go to the list of ICANN accredited registrars, go through their websites and see if indeed the material in the – just see if they actually match up to the guidelines. Because I think you'll find, specifically with a group of registrars who will remain nameless, from China that you will find that they don't come anywhere close to matching the certification that they've got. And that has in essence turned the ICANN accredited registrar program, in the opinion of a lot of people in my constituency or area, it's a joke. A joke.

Maguy Serad: I hear you. And I reserve the right to answer that maybe at the next meeting. But thank you for sharing your thoughts about it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Beau, thank you Maguy. Next on my list is Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Chair. I welcome the new Senior Director. I am speaking here as the Chair for the At-Large WHOIS Working Group. And I'm going to ask two questions. The first one concerns the structure of compliance. You said earlier that we've always had, well let us say that we always believe that the compliance staffing was inadequate to task.

And you said there was an inadequacy to staff, but also the way it was managed was that everybody was just picking from the queue and doing, you know it's a hit or miss situation. They were pinch hitting in other words. And that is a reflection of inadequacy of staffing. Do you believe the now assigning an officer to deal with WHOIS issues as the Senior Manager adequately addresses that disability. So you have a bandwidth problem and you have a tool se problem.

So let us talk about the tool set. You mentioned that you are adopting tools that will enable some automated outputs for WHOIS compliance. Some of these tools have existed and they work. What has been missing is the validation response to what

the tools tell you. How do you see that performing in this new dispensation? Thank you.

Maguy Serad:

Okay. So Carlton, if I may divide it into two questions – the bandwidth, I don't recall saying that it was managed properly. All I said is when you are understaffed you have to be able to address the demand and I gave the analogy as a queue. So I don't know how it was managed, all I'm saying is that we had a load that need to be processed and worked through. So from a bandwidth perspective you are correct that now we are ramping up, and at this point we are to the head count that existed a year ago, what I was told. So for several months the team was short by several staff members.

Going forward and the assignment of Khalil as an accountable for WHOIS, is that sufficient? I think that's a very first step. That's the first step but you also have the processes and the tools that support the functionality of WHOIS. So we are looking at the existing tools like you're saying, the WDPRS is one of the key tools we have. And we need to assess is it fulfilling what it needs to do. If it is than an enhancement would be the right approach. And what is we want to enhance, maybe additional information. If it is not, then we will have to decide if we need a new tool.

Carlton Samuels:

I just have a quick follow up. Is Khalil the new head count in compliance? I didn't think it was.

Maguy Serad: No it was, it is not.

Carlton Samuels: So what new compliance, the head count really is just you right?

Maguy Serad: Myself and Carlos; Carlos joined a month before me.

Carlton Samuels: Oh it's Carlos. I see. And Carlos is not assigned to WHOIS but Khalil is.

Maguy Serad: Khalil is yes. And Khalil will have a supporting staff member with him. We're still working through our organizational structure.

Carlton Samuels: And is that support member in place today?

Maguy Serad: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. So in actual fact there are two improvement and two in the head count in compliance, is that what you're saying?

Maguy Serad: We also hired on, we had a contractor, we hired on a contractor to be a full time employee with us. So...

Carlton Samuels: So there are two FTs, additional FTs in compliance, is that what you're saying?

Maguy Serad: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Carlton, thank you Maguy. Next is Alan; Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. First, welcome Maguy.

Maguy Serad: Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: I should point out that we are treating you quite specially. Normally we don't provide the skillet, we just put you right in the fire.

Maguy Serad: Thank you. Thank you very much. No it's fair. I mean Beau started it up really well.

Alan Greenberg: I've got a couple of pet issues and projects and I'll let Pam introduce them to you offline or we can get together. I've been chairing a GNSO PDP which has a specific recommendation regarding compliance, which I am hoping that we will have significant interaction between the implementation group of the PDP and compliance in implementing. I guess I'd like to identify what is important to us, not in terms of WHOIS or something, but in terms of overall attitude.

I think we need candidness. Compliance has not done a particularly good job in the past; an embarrassingly bad job in the distant past. And is always going to be somewhat understaffed and under resourced to handle what are expectations are. And we need candidness in talking about that I think. We don't want ever to see again at a single ICANN meeting being told by one person that we're up to staff and the other person that we have three open positions.

Those are not likely both correct on the same day. And that's been the kind of situation we've seen. We know you're not going to do everything, but it's interesting to know whether this is a "we would like to do it if we had head count or time or once we get our handle around the tools" or "we need resources" or "yes it would be nice if we could do that but we're just not going to do it, it's not high enough in our priority, convince me that it should be."

If we can be talking honestly at each other we're likely to avoid some of the problems. I don't think anyone in ICANN wants to continue the mode of compliance management by embarrassment, which has been the rule for too much of the time. And I think if we work together we're not always going to be happy with the answers, but I think we need to be bluntly honest with each other about what we can do and can't do. And hopefully we'll be in better shape – and I put the "we" as both ICANN and the groups within ICANN and consumers ultimately who have to live with the results.

Maguy Serad:

Right. So Alan if I may, I totally support candidness. And when you say, and I just want to clarify again, when you say important to us you're talking about the ALAC community? When you say what is important to us...

Alan Greenberg: I'm certainly talking about me, but I believe I am representing the ALAC and At-Large in saying that. I haven't checked it with anyone first, but I'd be surprised if the answer was no.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Point of order, you're not representing but you're joined by millions, what, two billion other people who might have the same view as you.

Maguy Serad: So, and if I may comment on the other items you discussed. You said updates about additional head counts, that was the biggest push and everybody was always on my case since day one I got here. You don't have enough head count. You do need enough, do we need to support you with head count. I have been here for two months; I can tell you Carlos joined one month, so there were five full time employees – Carlos joined one month before me and during my presence I have asked Jonathon, who is one of our team members, he was a contractor, so he's now a head count. And I will bring in a whole structure so you will see it and you'll see names, but again it's not ready. So I will not share with you something that's not ready because I cannot stand behind it yet.

So I will be forward and front, but what's important also to understand guys is again, the ICANN model is very complicated as I said earlier. It's very important for, not just contractual compliance, I'm talking here for Maguy as a newcomer to understand the different areas, the different groups. I'm not saying

I'm going to put myself in your shoes, but I need to understand your perspective. So when you say about now doing a good job, if you have that, give me some specifics and I'll be able to look at that and see, evaluate, what is it not doing a good job. Maybe we're doing what's expected of us but not what you expect of us.

So we have to level set on some of these things. I cannot speak to it intelligently again, I'm fact based. So I would appreciate, I welcome – you will have my email, send me emails. Don't complain. I tell everybody in my life, whether it's professional or personal – complaint window is 8 am to 8:05 am and I never answer during that time because I'm having my coffee. You take it on yourself.

When people have a complaint or unhappy about something they have an idea or a solution in mind; tell me what's on your mind and I will be working with you openly and transparently to make sure either we address it, if I cannot do it, we will properly close it. So that is my style. That's why I said my style and my philosophy. So not doing a good job, I cannot speak about that. So I appreciate as you said to me thanks for not having a campfire, it's already very, very hot in this area.

So thank you, but give me the benefit of doubt and we'll see you again. Don't expect miracles guys because if you have miracles you should be in my job. Okay. So clearly communicate to me what is it I'm not doing or my team and I will take full accountably. I am the lead of contractual compliance. I take full accountability for that role and I proudly stepped into that role.

And I want to assure you I have full support of my management on a lot of the activities and the proposals underway and we hope to bring more facts to the table next time. Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Maguy, and in fact, when you just mentioned now having full support of your management, I do hope that you have full support of your management in that political issues might not curtail your authority in some of these matters if you are serious about actually bringing some sense of cleanliness to this business. Alan, did you just want to follow up or can I move over to Dave?

Alan Greenberg: I just wanted to say I want to make clear that I wasn't trying to identify particular problems that needed to be addresses right now. Just going a little bit of the philosophy that will make life easier when we do have structural issues that we do need to talk to.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The queue is closed at the moment already, but I do have a queue at the moment of Dave Kissoondoyal, Eric Brunner-Williams and there are also questions online from Danny Unger, one of which I think has already been answered. But quickly Dave Kissoondoyal.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Thank you Chair. For me it's not a complaint but a question. On the communication side, on the ICANN website, the last newsletter is dated March 2010.

Maguy Serad: Yes.

Dave Kissoondoyal: But after that we have so many bridges of compliance, the website lists so many bridges. So how do you provide this information? Is it only that you wait for the end user to go to an ICANN website and then to check what are the compliance or do you have a public mailing list allowing all stakeholders to subscribe to that list?

Maguy Serad: May I defer this to you Pam, do you know?

Pam Little: Sure thank you. I'm not sure whether its' correct to say the last newsletter was March 2010. I think – sorry?

Dave Kissoondoyal: October 2010.

Pam Little: October 201 yes, okay. So since then we didn't publish anymore newsletters because we didn't produce one. We thought it would

be a better, more timely communication to the community by providing updates, more real time updates. So if you go to our web page you'll see those updates. And yes, they haven't been like last month. I think we did the latest update posting will be around April, but those bridge notices, communications with registrars I think is very recent. I believe I posted one on the 9th of June to a bridge to a registrar.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yeah but my question is do you wait to people to go to the website to check for updates or are you having mailing lists?

Maguy Serad: Oh, is it the push or the pull approach of communication? I think it's more of a pull no?

Pam Little: Yes. We would update our website.

Maguy Serad: Communication to registrars, sorry, will be published immediately as a bridge letter goes out. But in terms of update, we would just post the material as soon as it becomes available.

Pam Little: But Dave's question is do we have an email list.

Maguy Serad: Oh, there is a subscription email list; you can subscribe to our newsletters. We don't really sort of send the alert out we have a new update. People do need to log on and check.

Pam Little: So what we're hearing is it's a pull approach. We post it and you like anything on the internet, people go look for it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Olivier here. Is this not something that is referred to in the regular ICANN newsletter that gets sent to everyone? I thought that compliance was one of the links that was in there saying the latest newsletter is available.

Maguy Serad: In the past I believe you had a subscription mailing list for newsletters, so if you are on that mailing list you obviously will receive them. But as this gentleman pointed out, the lat newsletter was October 2010.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So a small suggestion I guess, come back to that.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Compliance is a very serious issue. If a registrar has not been complaint, meaning it's going to be bad for the end users. So the community, the stakeholders need to know what has happened

with that registrar. I think it's really important that once there's a breach of compliance that communications should be sent to all stakeholders.

Maguy Serad: Again, communication has many forms. When you say sent are you referring to an email sent?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm sorry. I think we're going in circles suddenly and I'd rather sort of move forward if we can. Simple mailing list push across and that's the way to do it. Anyway, we'll move swiftly on to Eric Brunner-Williams.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Olivier. Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript. Maguy welcome. I would hope that you have some questions like coming in and asking what's broken, but that didn't happen. So I have a few questions of my own and you don't have to have answers of course. But do you know what a shell registrar is?

Maguy Serad: Do I know what?

Eric Brunner-Williams: What a shell registrar is?

Maguy Serad: A shell registrar, no.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Okay. Do you know how many there are? And probably the answer to that would be no also. And do you know what registrars hold more than 100 of them? And the answer to that would probably be no also. The point of those three questions isn't to embarrass, hardly. But it is to suggest that there are two types of registrars at the very least; and therefore two types of compliance activities are prudent.

Next I'd like to go on to an advisory that ICANN issued in 2002 which is specific to shell registrars. And that was an advisory on the loaning of registrar credentials. Now the point of that advisory was to advise registrars of the systematic misconduct by a third party, or third parties, which act as resellers to registrars. And I appreciate this is probably all Greek to you, but this is all about the backorder market. We have currently a similar situation in that the unsolicited transfer authorizations are presented as renewal notifications.

This is a common abuse of registrants, and also of registrars that don't engage in, how should I say this, in symmetric activity; that is, not stealing registrants from other registrars. So we have several contracts to choose from, several registrar contracts to choose from, but the broader question is what liabilities exist for registrars as contracted parties for the willful blindness to systematic misconduct by non registrar resellers.

Now this has been discussed on the TDG legal mailing list, which you probably don't yet know about, but I recommend it to you because there the question was asked in a slightly different context. What are the liabilities that registries have where there's willful blindness to the systematic misconduct of registrars. So ICANN has issued an advisory on this issue in 2002 and it's within ICANN's ability to issue similar advisories on it in the present about this similar problem; that is the misrepresentation of renewal notices which are in fact transfer authorizations. And that really was all I wanted to say. Thank you.

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

Maguy Serad: May I just ask a quick – may I Eric, I appreciate the openness about you were expecting me to come and say what's broken. I would like to turn that around and if you have as a team a list of what's broken, or I don't know how you collect that or what you do, but send me and I'll be happy to look at it. I don't think, I'm not ready as a first comer to say what's broken. I've already been warned between the skillet and the fire, but I will keep that in mind.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Maguy, if I can save you from the skillet or the fire at this very moment, I'd be glad to do so. I think the problem doesn't lie in you specifically; it's more of a problem of institutional memory,

which is completely missing from ICANN. I have spoken to several people, in fact many of us have spoken to several staff members at ICANN and this is something where we experience Groundhog Day at every meeting.

We have to repeat the same thing again and again and certainly what is broken has been said on many an occasion at this desk. And unfortunately every time another meeting happens we're asked what is broken. And yes, we see a lot of stuff broken. So perhaps maybe may I say that we'll try and compile something from our own memory that we do have hopefully and transmit it to you. But one thing that needs to be done is institutional memory within ICANN itself. I see that...

Male: We're going round and round like a rotisserie.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sorry, what was that about? Any complaints, any problems?

Carlton Samuels: Can I tell you, I don't think it's an institutional memory problem. I think it's a philosophical problem. They have a certain view about what compliance ought to be. And you might say what you want, I told you earlier, this is our view of what it is that we're supposed to do. We want to hear about your view of what you think we are supposed to do. This is where the disconnect is.

Maguy Serad: That's what Alan and I said earlier – what is he expecting of me...

Carlton Samuels: And that has always been the disconnect.

Maguy Serad: And I know it's not a personal attack, Olivier, I understand that. But I can also go back to the team who've been here longer than me and see if they have information about problems. I've noted what Eric said about some of the areas so I will do some additional research. But again, I'm here if you hear something send it to me and I'll try my best to follow up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Maguy. Alan you wanted to say just a couple of words? I have to go back to the queue afterwards. There's still a couple of questions and I don't want to run too late into this.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan Greenberg. Just to follow on to that. Maguy, you're very lucky in that you are not living with what some other parts of ICANN are where the whole unit disappeared and there is literally no institutional memory. You do have people working for you who have been in our fire before as it were. And they can share some of the history. Certainly one of the issues that Eric has mentioned is the issue of registrar resellers. Pam can certify that

it's not the first time this have been raised and there are many subtle aspects to that particular problem that ICANN has chosen to sort of ignore completely for many years and some of us feel I think that's inappropriate. That's one of the issues I was alluding to that we need to talk about. But you are fortunate, there are people in your group who have listened, hopefully heard and maybe remembered.

Maguy Serad: So is it normal practice if I hear something I can contact that person back to get more information? Is that acceptable?

Alan Greenberg: We will bless you if you do that. I would bless you if you do that.

Maguy Serad: I'm afraid to ask what blessing in this forum means.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We are civilized.

Maguy Serad: I'm not scared. I'm being careful. I heard you yesterday.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Maguy. We have a couple of more questions from remote participants. And Matt is going to go through them. So Matt?

Matt Ashtiani: Hi. Matt Ashtiani for the record. The first question comes from Danny Unger. It says “the compliance department’s full time equivalents appear to be at last year’s level. At the point when the new gTLDs are launched how many additional full time equivalents are budgeted to be on board?”

Maguy Serad: I’m sorry. There are two conversations going on. I cannot hear you.

Matt Ashtiani: So let me repeat the question. It comes from Danny Unger. He says “the compliance department’s full time equivalents appear to be at last year’s level. At the point when the new gTLDs are launched how many additional full time equivalents are budgeted to be on board?”

Maguy Serad: Alright. What I have approval for is three additional head counts. But I would like to remind the audience guys, you can throw a lot of resources at anything you do in life. That’s why I’m saying

please give me the benefit of the doubt, let me finish the assessment, processes, tools and people; it's all three.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If I could just jump into this actually, let me turn the table around. What is the maximum number of compliance issues that you can tackle in one quarter?

Maguy Serad: I do not know.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Because there's a queue of several hundred out there.

Maguy Serad: Okay. That's one of the reporting that we're looking at. What's in queue, what's been resolved, what's the old...You're right. I'm not disagreeing.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Next.

Matt Ashtiani: The second question also comes from Danny. He asks "this year will you be pursuing selective audits of the RAA or a comprehensive audit?"

Maguy Serad: I'm going to pass that to Pam.

Pam Little: Yes. I'm actually going to talk about that in more detail, is that okay, when we come to that.

Matt Ashtiani: The third question also comes from Danny. He asks “unlike shrm.org, ttpc.travel does not post Board minutes, resolutions or financial reports. In the view of the compliance department do ICANNs accountability and transparency obligations extend to gTLD sponsored communities?”

Maguy Serad: I don't understand the question.

Matt Ashtiani: No problem. “unlike shrm.org, ...

Maguy Serad: I have no – that was not on my list of acronyms.

Matt Ashtiani: I guess the general question would be, in the view of the compliance department do ICANNs accountability and transparency obligations extend to gTLD sponsored communities.

Pam Little: Transparency and accountability responsibility certainly extends to all ICANN community.

Matt Ashtiani: The last question comes from Dwi Alfreda. She says “regarding – I believe this is directed at Maguy – “regarding your statement that ICANN is a hard organization to understand, what would be your advice to make it easier to understand? Yesterday a member of the Board, Sebastien Bachollet, also said the same thing. So if you have already had years of experience in ICANN how would you advice a newcomer? Do you think it is good for us to be a hard organization to understand?”

Maguy Serad: No. In the sake of transparency no. How am I going to fulfill my roll if it’s a hard organization to understand? It’s a complicated organization. Two people can’t come to an agreement, like I said, in the private sector contract between two people is hard to deal with. Now you have such a larger global contracted parties, non contracted parties, all the different stakeholders; that’s what I mean about hard to understand.

Again, it takes time. It takes working together. It takes transparency. It takes giving people the benefit of the doubt and if they don’t do it, get to them – I say that to you – if I don’t do what I said I’m going to do talk to me. So, it is hard to understand because it’s so big, but it comes with experience and with interaction and as you go on.

Matt Ashtiani: Dewey actually has a follow up and it is “what’s your advice to make it easier to understand?”

Maguy Serad: There is no “how to know” ICANN guidebook. Not just ICANN, ICANN community guidebook. Usually you come in, it’s like a cookbook, what’s the recipe here? What are those ingredients? What are the different areas? I mean there’s a very generic one, but again it’s got to take that interaction.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If I may interject, this belongs to maybe another debate. We’re dealing with compliance and not with Scott Pinson who would be the person to ask perhaps for these questions. I want to move swiftly on over to Pam Little for the second part of the presentation and maybe a little bit more fire towards the end of that. Thank you.

Pam Little: Thank you Olivier. Can I just check Olivier how much time I have? How much time do I have so I can control my speed?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We haven’t got very much time, we’re already over time, but how much do you need five, ten, fifteen?

Pam Little: I'll try to run as quickly as possible so we can leave some time for question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. These issues are huge for our community. If there is anything in your agenda that you can shrink later in the day, I for one would put forward that giving Pam sufficient time, if 15 will do it. So 20 into this agenda is well worth this groups removal of something else later in the day.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl I was going to think with regards to the presentation, thus leaving more time for the actual discussion afterwards.

Pam Little: Okay, thank you. I should start. So Maguy mentioned some of the major initiatives we have and she has in mind. I heard what you said just now, a lot of difficult questions to answer and we don't take it personally. We are actually on the same side because you want us to do better and we want to do better. And we know you've been critical because your expectations were very high of us and we want to be able to meet that expectation and we're working on that, striving for that. And you know we've had constraints in the past, but I'm very pleased to share with you what we are planning to do in the pipeline; three very major, and I think important initiatives that will have an impact on your community.

The first one is the registrar self assessment tool. We're planning to roll it out, I think one of the questions from the chat room was about what sort of RAA self assessment we'll be doing. The second is about registry data escrow audit and the third one is about our law enforcement initiative. Could I get the next slide?

Thank you. So we talked about, I think Carlton alluded to where there was a philosophy issue open with issue right? I think this is actually, yes a bit of conceptual and philosophical issue as to what would make contractual compliance successful within the ICANN ecology, within the internet ecology. And I hope you agree in this room actually everyone in that ecology actually plays an important role right? Even including the community you represent, the registrants, the users. But in this regard, in terms of RAA, a contract between ICANN and the registrars, we also believe the contractual model we have so far isn't very effective.

So we're thinking, this is guiding our thinking, the registrar should be compliant at all times. They enter into that contract. They took that serious undertaking. So they should be the party who is constantly monitoring, assessing whether they are in compliance. It's not because, it should not be an adversarial approach. ICANN you have a hugely staffed department; you catch me if you can – if I can put it that way. They should strive to be complaint at all times. In other words, compliance by registrars should be the norm. Non compliance and then having to involve ICANNs intervention or for ICANN department to enforce, force them to

become compliant should be the exception. Okay? I hope we're on the same page.

So to achieve that goal we need registrars to do their bit. Put their business practice operations in place that would meet the requirements under the RAA. And we want to roll out this online tool, where they can do this self assessment every 12 months telling ICANN where they are complaint, where they are non complaint. That doesn't mean after they've done that we just go home, we don't have anything to do. We still have to do our check-ins, spot checks, based on risk or other issues.

And to match up what they tell us versus what we find or what we observe. It's like data matching. But they have to do that first stage self assessment and that's our purpose in the plan as I set out here and as you can see. We need to move towards online more automation; it's not scalable the way we're doing it. We do some audits. We have this different compliant intake system, very labor intensive, very time consuming. We've got to figure a way that is more proactive and more scalable. Next slide please.

So this is what we're going to do in terms of this tool. We want to make sure we developed this questionnaire that is compliance meaningful. Means we get enough data that it's going to be meaningful for the registrar so they can help improve their compliance, but also meaningful to the community like your members; the internet user or registrant. So we know which one or which area really are compliance challenges or difficult areas to

become compliant so we can work on those as a continuous improvement.

So we want to then develop the questionnaire and develop this online tool and test this questionnaire, and test this tool and hopefully we can roll it out sometime in 2012 and then there will be an every 12 month frequency interval registrar has to go through this exercise. But in between those self assessments every year, their goal really is to make sure, you know they can check all boxes yes, yes, yes every 12 months because if they check no we want to know why, we want more details. And we also have to monitor in between those self assessment periods or seasons if you like. Next slide please.

And this, I already covered this. Once we get the assessment we're going analyze it, we're going to make sure what they're telling us is truthful and complete and then we do our own matching, we do our own follow up. But we also need to let registrars, things do happen, things go wrong sometimes. So if they tell us they are non complaint we will then need to work with them to help them become complaint.

And then we want to publish, share this data not just with the registrars community but also with the general community like your users so they know what the trending is. We, for example, want to be able to build this tool where it will be much easier for us to pull data. So we can improve our reporting to your community, to your members. Say maybe trends for policy really is difficult to comply with or maybe the expiration renewal is

difficult, the compliant rate is low so we know how many registrars are actually having difficulties in that area. And then maybe there is policy improvement, policy work needed. So it would sort of complete the whole look right? It's kind of everyone would then to make sure there is really a multi stakeholder model there at work. Next slide please.

This registry data escrow is about making sure that at the moment registries are required, like registrars they are required to escrow their data in case of a registry or registrar failure. In the past, as you know, our compliance efforts were very much focused on registrar compliance. We haven't done so much registry compliance although we did have a breach issue in the last few months. But we want to do this as well, especially in light of the new gTLDs coming, not in the next 12 months, but soon, maybe very early end of 2010 or 2013. So in case there's a registry failure to make sure we have data for business contingency purpose. Next slide please.

Law enforcement initiative, this is one we feel is also very important to our community and to the ALAC community. Again, this is really trying to be true to this multi stakeholder model where everyone has a role to play. ICANN has contracts with contracted parties, but all contractual authority is limited and our agreement is also limited. But the risk and abuse are real. So we want to make sure when we do see those clear cases where there are risks and clear abuse, we want to be able to refer those matters to the law enforcement agencies so they can deal with those issues. ICANN

is not a law enforcement agency. So they have their role to play and we have ours and we want to be able to have more formalized process where we can facilitate information sharing and all contribute to a better, healthier internet ecology, obviously. So that's our plan. Next slide please.

So the next few slides I want to share with you what we've been doing in terms of compliance activities, and this is consistent with the format or data we've been reporting to you in the last few meetings, but we welcome feedback. And I heard one of the questions was about knowing which registrar was doing the wrong thing and all that. So hopefully when we have better tools, it's a continuous improvement and we're hoping to be able to report to you better. The C-Ticket will be the next slide Matt, please. This one we can't see the slide. I think we had that problem last meeting for some reason.

Okay, so I can just talk. Most of the complaints, we receive over 1000 consumer complaints every month in our C-Ticket system. About half of them are really not contractual compliance issues. Half of them are customer issues, customer issues or support issues, which we really can't intervene or have much to do. But the rest of them will be categorized into three major categories. The biggest one being transfer related issues.

So about almost half the compliance that we can deal with, we have contractual authority to deal with, really over 2000 ICANN – I can read on my pie chart here. Out of 5,600 something we've received over the last five months, 2,433 are related to transfer and

241 related to WHOIS issues and another 80 related to UDRP. So that gives you a gist of flavor of the type of nature of complaints we get and we have to deal on a daily basis. Next slide please.

Unfortunately...

Maguy Serad:

Matt, the charts are showing in the presentation itself that's going to be circulated. Okay.

Pam Little:

And this one really sort of evolved from last slide. So out of those complaints we then would escalate by sending compliance inquiry, compliance notices as a start to registrars who received those complaints, or those complaints were against those registrars and get them to take corrective action. So most of these complaints, we sent 3000, over 3000 complaints out of which 2770 were relating to transfer issues and the rest are the different categories we highlighted there. So you can see we spent a lot of time and effort trying to help registrants with their transfer issues. The next slide please.

And of course out of those notices we send some of them don't fix the problems, therefore we will try the next level of escalation. So we then send all these breach letters, non renewal and termination notices – only 25; and rightly so, the number keeps shrinking. If everyone is doing their job we really shouldn't have any

termination on non renewal or breach notices, but unfortunately some registrars do not fix their problems. Next slide please Matt.

And this slide unfortunately you can't see. We basically track all the termination or non renewals since 2003. So last year we had 13 and this year to date we have four non renewal or terminations. So the figure just keeps shrinking and that's I guess the natural trending. So Port 43 maybe has a copy so I won't cover that again. The next one is about registrar data escrow.

As I mentioned earlier, registrars have the obligation to – next one, I'm sorry, Matt. Next one; the registrar data escrow. This is an obligation on the registrar to escrow their data, registration data and we track this a well. We follow up with registrars who don't deposit according to schedule or who's deposits were unsuccessful. It's a constant ongoing process. And we recently did send a breach notice, that's published on our website I mentioned earlier, the registrar persistently failed to deposit. But as of yesterday that was cured. So that was a good outcome.

So it's labor intensive and its constant compliance improvements exercise if you like, but we need your help and the whole community all needs to do their bit to make sure that it's a successful and strong compliance program at ICANN. That concludes my presentation. Should we now open to questions?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Pam. It's very interesting to, well we'll look forward to receiving the graphs by email, I believe, and they will

probably be linked to this meetings webpage as well. We have a queue yet again with first Beau who was the first one to camp outside the door, Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler:

Beau Brendler from North America. This is a long distance for me to come to look at a bunch of slides that don't really depict anything that would be meaningful to someone who's not an expert on this; that's just a side note, but this is not a properly prepared presentation.

It strikes me as patently absurd that ICANN has taken up the resources of the compliance department to create a registrar self assessment tool when we're talking about a group of multimillion dollar, I mean I realize some of them operate on narrow margins or whatever, but these are corporations with money and yet the compliance department is building a self assessment tool for them to figure out whether they're in compliance with their own contracts and then supply you with their own data as to whether or not they're out of compliance. That needs to be completely turned around. You should be building a compliance assessment tool that tells you who's out of compliance.

Can you go back to one of the earlier slides there, one of the first couple of slides where you were talking about a feedback loop from data. Stop, that's the one. Yeah. So the first one there "seek feedback on content of questionnaire" – who is the feedback planned for on that, registrars only or how does that work?

Pam Little: No, we are just trying to figure out what is the most efficient and effective way in terms introducing this tool because we want to get enough data, meaningful compliance data from registrars. So I think the design of this questionnaire, the content, the format is important. So we are seeking feedback in terms of how that should be structured.

Beau Brendler: But my point remains is the fundamental core data is self reported, so you're relying on the registrars to report their own compliance data exclusively, is that correct?

Pam Little: We will also do our own checking. The stuff like the RD, we do our own checking. The financial compliance we do our own checking. At the moment Beau they're already doing this, this is not an invention, with the WHOIS data reminder policy that registrars need to send to registrant every year. It's all online. It's electronic.

Beau Brendler: Okay, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Beau. Next on the queue is Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Two quick issues. In terms of your statistics on non renewal and breach notices and such to a somewhat cynical public, which is not us of course, it would be really useful to know how many of them are related to nonpayment and financial issues that is breach of the financial things between ICANN and causes which have to do with actual users out there. Although I don't want registrars who aren't paying their bills, a measure of how well you're meeting the perceived compliance issues from our perspective has a lot to do with the non financial issues. So breaking those two out on a regular basis – and I don't necessarily need it at this moment – would be very useful to increase your credibility.

Maguy Serad: Thank you, good feedback.

Alan Greenberg: The second issue, and it goes to one of the issues that I talked about before and we'll be talking about on PEDNER, but your ticket system right now forces a person filling it out to pick the single reason. And very often, even using the categories that are on the checklist right now, and they may or may not be the best ones, a given complaint often fits several categories.

And based on what the person's perception is of the most important aspect of it, your statistics don't necessarily reflect the problems people are having with other things. Transfers are relatively simple to tick off, the more subtle problems people may not be ticking off the one you're expecting. So I know when we

were looking at renewal post expiration issues, there were about five different categories people might tick off and something as simple as – and I'm not trying to prescribe the answer - as simply a lot of people have multiple answers may give you a much better hand on some of the problems. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Alan and next on the list is Eduardo Diaz.

Eduardo Diaz: Sorry, can you move forward to the slide with law enforcement?

Maguy Serad: With law enforcement?

Eduardo Diaz: Yes, in the statement that says “the process for referring clear cases”...can you give us an idea what a “clear case” is, what the requirements are there that would make that a clear case?

Maguy Serad: Well clear cases means these are cases of abuse that fall within the law enforcements jurisdiction. But we, as you know ICANN doesn't deal with content issue, for example, right? So if we think it's a content issue than we would refer it to the proper law enforcement authority. So content is one example to give you.

Eduardo Diaz: Well you know I was referring more that there is the RAA, you know and you use that for compliance from within that RAA contract, what makes it a clear case.

Maguy Serad: Sure. The RAA requires all registrars to comply with applicable laws and regulation. So if we suspect, we have reasonable ground to suspect there is a violation or potentially a violation of applicable laws and regulations, then we would consider that sort of case as a candidate for referral to law enforcement. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. And just as a reminder, this meeting is being interpreted and transcribed as well and perhaps if we could say our names before we speak it might make sense. I do realize it's just very bizarre when "yes", "no" perhaps. So the next one in the list is Eric Brunner-Williams. Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Olivier. Hi Pam. I'm going to start with a couple of questions too. What are the top 25 registrars measured by total registrations and what percentage of the registrations are covered by those 25? Is that a question you have a yes, that you know the answer to that or is that a question...

Pam Little: Sorry Eric, can you repeat that question please?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yeah. When you look at registrars by their registration totals can you identify the top 25 and I think the answer for you is yes. That's fairly easy. Now, what about the top 25 registrars measured by churn within their inventories; that is by what percentage of their inventory has been changed in the last year whether it's a change of address for the registrant or a change of contact information for the registrar, registrant excuse me, or by transfer in or transfer out or a new registration? I think that's a harder question but I think it's a useful question to be able to say eventually the answer is yes, you can identify the top 25 measured by churn, not by total volume.

Pam Little: You definitely can and I that information is actually available on the ICANN website. That comes from registries monthly transaction reports they submit to ICANN.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Right, from the registries transfers yes. So I wanted to point out also that the 43 scan is useful or measuring up time for WHOIS servers, but only for the 43 server and not for the 80. But that's still not actually, I mean that is useful for the compliance issue of the WHOIS server itself but it doesn't really reach deeply enough into the operational capability of the registrar or the locust of bad acts and the registrar. So for instance, if all of the registrars/registrants name servers point to a few well known

parking page serving name servers, that's significant piece of information about the business nature of the registrar and the kind of compliance therefore that should be targeted towards it as opposed to a registrar that doesn't have that kind of correlations.

But let me continue. The registrar self reporting tool, I share Beau's concerns about the source of data and the purpose of the tool; that is that it's essentially an industry voluntary compliance kind of approach, which isn't really quite what we want from contract compliance sitting on side of the contractual table. But as a tool it is still also size and churn unaware. So you're asking registrars who have a very stable relationship with their registrants, some for many years, the same question that you're asking registrars that basically are engaging in the sequence to, or what comes after domain tasting; that is they're still engaged in fairly high churn activity where abuse is far more likely.

So, the approach that I think you're taking as an institution towards registrars is to treat them all equally when in fact there are several types of registrars, as I pointed out on the previous set of questions, and also there are several types of registrar inventories indicting their business models; independent of whether or not they're primarily focused on the drop pool or not. So being blind to these fundamental purposes of registrars doesn't seem to be the most useful way to obtain the awareness of the compliance issues for the specific registrars. I think we should be seeing more of the business activity of the registrar rather than just their name on a list that is sorted alphabetically.

In addition, the audit tool should not make life harder for the six registrars in the Latin American region, or for the three registrars in Africa; we basically should be making their English tax higher, their cost of business to figure out what those North Americans want should not be increased in order to provide compliance data. And I know that's very difficult because you're being asked essentially to translate into the arbitrary language the arbitrary legalese that comes from Jeff, which is difficult. But still, we shouldn't be making their lives harder, we should be catching bad guys and gals, not making life harder for the non Anglophones that are outside of North America, Europe and parts of Asia.

On the audit, I have to say as the author of the 2000 registry audit requirement and having some involvement with some subsequent activity about registrars that our requirements assumed, we assumed in 2000, and I know this is before just about anyone here who is present, but we assumed basically six big registries. Our assumptions were that everyone was going to be big. So I stuck into the requirements things like you had to be able to chain together multiple images from multiple pieces of media and stuff like that. We're looking at a future in which there's a lot of small registries.

The requirements that we had then were implicitly "com" oriented. We should be thinking about registry requirements which are much more like co-op where we should be looking for smaller images and much more reliable registries actually, except for, aside from those which ICANN lets go through which are bad actors. That's

inevitable that that will happen. But most of the community or sponsored registries have behavioral patterns which don't raise compliance issues and we shouldn't be making their lives harder by providing them with requirements which are really written for someone else; monsters with bad behavior to put it bluntly.

And I think finally as a last item, we need an alternative to Iron Mountain. They're a registrar. That's not the problem. They actually place more requirements on the registrar escrow data path than someone did in about 2007. Thank you.

Pam Little:

Okay. Thank you, Eric. I think you raised a lot of very good points and that's why I say we need to get our balance right when we design this audit tool. And you alluded to some of that. Your last comment about Iron Mountain, Iron Mountain is no longer an ICANN accredited registrar. They voluntarily terminated their RAA.

Eric Brunner-Williams:

That's good, but there are still requirements that Iron Mountain as the registry escrow deposit receiver has added to what the registrar must do in order to successfully deposit an image, than are in the registrar data escrow requirements that someone in this room wrote in about 2007. Thank you.

Pam Little: Right. And we are reviewing the Iron Mountain contract so we'll take on board your comment. Thank you, Eric.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Eric. Thank you, Pam. I think that we are reaching the end of this session which has gone way over time. We've actually crushed one of our further sessions afterwards, the Hot Topics discussion, but it appears that this one heated enough to become hot enough for all of us. So there's still one more question from a remote participant, matt if you could please.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi. This question comes from Danny Unger. Do you intend to audit registrar compliance with bulk WHOIS provisions?

Pam Little: That will be part of the questionnaire. The questionnaire is actually intended to cover most of the registrars obligations under the RAA except those we are now constantly checking and auditing.

Matt Ashtiani: Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Well thank you very much. Thank you Pam Little. Thank you Maguy Serad and thanks to your team for joining us. And we

hope that by the next time we see you we will have to not heat the seat that you're sitting on as much as we did today. Thank you.

Maguy Serad: We're going to rise from ashes next time.

Evan Leibovitch: Next time it's just a microwave.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: For the record, Evan Leibovitch said "next time it's just a microwave". So, next joining us we have Dave Archbold and Robert Hoggarth who will be joining us to speak to us about the geo-regions, if I have this correctly listed. So Geo-Regions Working Group update with Dave Archbold and Senior Policy Director Rob Hoggarth; are you ready to get moving? Of course just as a quick reminder, the Geo-Regions Working Group was set up – and I can see some – there's a lot of noise in the background, people moving and coming out.

The Working Group was set up to look at the ICANN geo-regions, some of which are slightly disputed because some, and that affects us of course because the At-Large is geographically distributed organization. The regions are, well all the different RALOs basically and that would mean that some of our At-Large structures might have to move from one RALO to another RALO. So anyway, without any further ado, are we ready? We are, fantastic. So Dave, you're on.

Dave Archbold:

Good morning or good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for inviting me to go through this yet again. Some of you might be somewhat fed up about hearing about regions, but I have got about nine slides to run through very quickly and then I'll be very happy to answer any questions and enter into any discussion that you may want. Very, very brief history, which you may have seen before.

This started many years ago before I had a single gray hair in my head with a GNSO Working Group which sent a report to the Board. The Board set up a Cross Constituency Working Group. Our initial report covered how geographical regions were used within ICANN. The interim report covered what are we trying to achieve when using geographic regions and are we achieving those goals. And we're now working with the final report which are recommendations for improvements.

Some of the findings – there is no single independent authoritative list for countries and regions that ICANN can adopt. So they can't pass the buck to anyone else. The present regional structure has a number of problems and in fact has never been properly authorized. The original intent was that the structure should change to reflect the changing makeup of the internet community. It hasn't, but in fact, does that really matter now?

Geographic regions have worked reasonable well for their original purpose, which was to ensure the geographic diversity of the

ICANN Board. And that's all it was originally designed for. And it's not worked quite so well for use by some of the SOs and ACs. And we did note that changing a number of regions would likely cause quite significant financial and organizational issues.

Okay, some provisional recommendations – and the state that we're at at the moment is that we have got a working document, or a working copy if you like, of the final report. So, we'd like comments back from you, feedback now. It will go onto official public comments in about two to three weeks. So you're getting an early look. First one – have a formal drop down regional structure for use with the ICANN Board membership. So something similar to what we've got at the moment, except adopt the present structure of the regional internet registries; i.e. follow the infrastructure. And I'll expand on that in a minute.

That would result, as you will see, in about six state countries changing which region they are in. So the proposal is that we would allow as part of the transitional procedures, allow those countries that are being asked to move to have a one off opportunity to opt to remain in their own region, provided they get government agreement. A recommendation that the Board might consider: a more general right to self select with government agreement down the line. As far as SOs and ACs are concerned – this is the default structure which you are welcome to use to ensure diversity within your organization. Alternatively, you can make proposals for an alternative methodology to the Board for their

approval and agreement and that would be incorporated into the bylaws.

Going back to the RII structure, this is in effect what would happen. And I can give you actually details of each of the individual countries that would move if you want them, but at the moment I'm just leaving it there. So you see Africa, no change; Asia-Pacific, plus 11 but it would lose 26; Europe changes 24; Latin America drops down slightly; North America increases.

Some of the benefits of using the RII structure – a number of regions will remain the same. So that would avoid having to do any significant restructuring. And aligning the regions with what is ICANN's technical infrastructure seems to make sense and it's defensible; there's a reason for doing it that way. There are a total of 62 countries and territories that would move to new regions, however many of those are territories being assigned to their proper geographic region rather than being lumped in with the region of their mother country.

Another group of countries that would move are some of the Middle Eastern and Central Asian countries out of AP and into EU. Now that would reduce, to some extent, the geographic spread of AP, which some have raised as being an issue. And in addition, some of the countries involved have already indicated that they consider themselves to be more European oriented because they are now either part of or are seeking to become part of the European Union rather than Asian. So that sort of makes sense and meets some requirements.

The third group is from the Caribbean where many of the English and French speaking Caribbean countries would move into North America from LAC and then most of these countries have actually a closer language and counsel with travel links with North America than they do with LAC.

It increases numbers of countries in a previously and numerically very small region, so that should increase the options for representation and participation within the region. And then as has been requested, there will be no change to the African region. And it should encourage participation as joint meetings and both the RIR and ICANN region would be more simpler. It's the same countries and jurisdictions coming together for those meetings.

Not without disadvantages, however. For example, there was quite a lot of lobbying to create an Arabic region which this would not do. It would split the Caribbean countries in two, partly on geography and partly on language. Some countries may not want to change regions. And some other countries may not wish their countries to be in a different region to themselves.

So going back to what we had already looked at as the other recommendations, we were saying this should be a one off ability to say we don't want to move, let's stay in our old region. So that would answer some of those queries.

It wouldn't deal with lack of an Arab region and it wouldn't deal with a splitting of the Caribbean. So another proposal is to quite separately introduce a bottom up. Now I call them special interest

groups here, there are problems with names. Can we just call it a special interest group for the moment, because it's what's in my brain, it's a rose by any other name, we could change the name to whatever you like. And these may be temporary or long-term for groups of countries with shared interests.

For example, there is the shared islands, small island states, there's the Arab nations, there's the Caribbean countries. I can think of lots of other examples, some may even be topic based, rather than geographically based or whatever. But we've got to be clear; these are not part of the ICANN decision-making structure. But of course they could lobby for support from the normal official representatives.

Perhaps there should be a requirement for a minimum number of members for a special interest group before ICANN recognition is granted. And the amount of support from ICANN obviously is something to finances which may be nil, but it should – what is available should be directed, I believe towards helping this communication between members. So the use of mailing lists, perhaps website page, or website references, perhaps teleconference bridge, things of that sort.

And that really is the end of where I plan to go and would like to turn it over to you for questions, comments.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. And I now open the floor for questions, and I see Tijani waving his hand and then we'll have Sergio afterwards, but first Tijani, Sergio and Mohamed. But Tijani.

So say your name before they speak, please for the interpreters, thank you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa. I appreciate your proposal to provide the possibility for countries to choose their own region. This is a very good – it's very good in your proposal. With regard to – to go back to make a regional division with regards to RIR, I don't think it's logical at all, because if I – if we analyze certain Middle Eastern countries there are no cultural linguistic links to European countries.

The countries you attributed to Europe are not Northern African countries that are maybe closer to Europe. So such a division would never promote linguistic diversity which was at the basis of the geographical division at ICANN – geographical regions were adopted in order to promote diversity within the Board. So this is my first point.

The second problem if we create several sub-regions, this is will be a mosaic and we will have finance – financing problems, not – not all who want to constitute a region will be able to, so the rules are not well-defined. I do not think this is a mean to really satisfy the objective needs of this regional division which is to promote diversity within ICANN. Thank you.

David Archbold: Two points I think; one about the logical or otherwise of the RIR structure. I didn't quite understand why you raised the issue of North Africa, because there is no change within Africa whatsoever. So I don't quite understand your point there.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I said certain – that certain countries within the Middle Eastern region if we follow the RIR division, these countries will be assigned to Europe, if they had been North African countries, this would have been more logical. But Northern African countries remain African, that's fine. So other countries in the Middle East have no link – cultural or linguistic links to Europe. So diversity would not be ensured in this case.

David Archbold: And that – but an example might be Turkey for example, which country is in Asia Pacific, and yet is seeking to associate itself with Europe. So I don't think we can in a presentation like this, talk about each individual country, but that's one of the reasons that we suggested that there was a flexibility for each country to opt to remain in the region that it was in.

As far as your second point is concerned, I'm afraid I've forgotten it already. Can you remind me of your second point?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: [French response]. That would create a mosaic of regions.

David Archbold: The specialist interest group is not equivalent to regions at all; there is one formal top down regional structure that is used for ICANN's decision-making process. All we are trying to do is react to in ground swell if you like, on bottom up which to – for different kinds of countries or jurisdictions to come together to share information, to perhaps promote a particular point of view of particular interest.

Now, this is common in many international structures. It happens in the ITU all the time, it happens in many of the UN bodies that groups come together for a common purpose, a common interest, essentially become lobby groups.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: The problem, David, is that ICANN – there's a financial aspect that will determine whether these groups are accepted or not, so this could create a very non-democratic, non-logical situation.

David Archbold: I can't see that it is necessarily finances dependent, for example within the Caribbean there is already, if you like, an association of ccTLD managers and it doesn't cost very much to get a mailing list

going etc. So I don't see that it is necessarily all that much finance dependent. But it would be nice to be able to have a meeting room at one of the meetings during the year to have a physical face-to-face get-together. So we're talking perhaps about the cost of a meeting room once or twice a year. It will vary obviously.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Merci Dave, merci Tijani [French].

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you Mr. President, I will address the audience in Spanish, so please put on your headsets for those who do not speak Spanish.

Dear Dave, the second time in a row, I have my chance to agree to you. My name is Sergio Salinas Porto. I am an ALAC member for LACRALO. I have two consultations, two questions to make.

The first, I would like to know there is one that you already answered, that is the – is it optional to change, and it was been answered.

And the second question is countries are involved and representatives are involved of ALS in my region, and I would like for you to tell me which are the countries that will be involved, so that I can send them to the list and to have a discussion and to have an information sharing with that, since this change that is upcoming might affect the functioning of our region. Thank you very much.

David Archbold: Yes, I'd be very happy to; unfortunately I've been disconnected from the screen, so I can't actually put them up on the screen for you now. I had them all there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Dave, they're next to you actually, Matt has got them on there, so you could –

David Archbold: No, you don't.

Matt Astiani: It's on his –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: On a different slide. While we change quickly from one system to another. Yes, please Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Dave, while you're doing that, I just also wanted to remind you to perhaps factor in when you're done with this specific question, to talk a little about next steps as well. Thank you.

David Archbold: I'll let you do that. When I say I've got the list here, what I have got are the countries that will actually move, so do you know which countries you're –

Rob Hoggarth: Latin America.

David Archbold: That's what I want. Perhaps I should quickly run through these. These are the additions into Asia Pacific. If anybody wants me to pause, let me know, otherwise I will flick on. The losses from Asia Pacific are the regions in brackets of where they will go to.

[background conversation]

David Archbold: Europe additions. Europe losses. You see most of these are overseas territories. Latin America gains and losses and finally North America that's the gains and those are the losses.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Could you go back to the Latin American and Caribbean please?

David Archbold: Losses – no, sorry, --

Sergio Salinas Porto: We're looking at Latin America.

David Archbold: Losses, losses in Latin America. And we've finger trouble not understanding.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sergio, do you have a question about this or comment or you're fine. Okay, we'll then move to the next person on my list and that's Mohamed, Mohamed El Bashir.

Mohamed El Bashir: Thank you very much, Mohamed El Bashir for the (inaudible) script. A couple of comments. I mean, the first one – when you talk – I mean you find – you did find a solution for the special groups by giving them a chance to have some sort of a formal recognized grouping given in a status like observers. That's really fine, because even the practice was those groups are meeting actually, I mean through the many years there is an Arab group meeting, I mean people from that region would just meet here. So this is a good solution I think.

But my question is here, how you – how the ACs and SOs will integrate this in their – in their operation? This is the first question.

Secondly, regarding the move or gain or loss of countries within those regions, I think we need to be very careful. I need to

understand what is happening here. This is a mapping of the current region structure to our RALO structure? Because we can't say lose and gain, because those countries did not – or at least the countries I know in the Middle East region did not foresee to that level in terms of self-selection. So I think we need to be very careful when we talk about gain and a loss and all that. Those countries did not – did not self-move to those regions. This is very important I think.

And I can give you an example. , I mean in those countries you can find [Katta] for example, Kuwait. They're listed here at EU because legacy wise, history they are obtaining their IP addresses from RIPE, for many, many, many years. Now, [Katta] itself is member ebTLD and a ccTLD, so it's already in two regions if you can say it. So I think we need to treat this very carefully, this are not countries moving or shifting, this is just mapping to the – of the current ICANN regions to another structure.

Then later on those countries will decide themselves if they want to move or not. This have to very clear, because is presented looks like there's a decision and countries are shifting or I think that need to be clarified.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Mohamed. Dave, would you like to reply?

David Archbold: Yes, very, very quickly. Certainly, I mean these are only recommendations to start off with, so they haven't been accepted by the Board, they haven't had a public consultation period yet; so no, definitely not a decision.

But you're right, this is a mapping – if the Board were to accept a recommendation that we move to the RIR structure, this is the mapping that would occur between the existing structure and the new structure. And we have already said that we would recommend a one off ability for a country to say, whoa I don't want to move.

Mohamed El Bashir: I think it will also better to put it in the table for each country to decide themselves, other than to put it as this is the new structure we are implementing, you're either here or – you don't have – you don't need to create this confusion really. I think this is a chance for countries who have issues in terms of representation to resolve those issues, then we put in a table is this is the Board decision, you're going to either select one of those –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Carlton there is list awaiting there, so I think I'll give you microphone lectern, Eric Brunner-Williams next in my cue.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you very much, Olivier, it's Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript record.

My personal perspective, and I repeat this is my personal perspective is that Indians in the Americas are poorly served by the division of the Americas into the Anglo-French Americas and the Spanish-Portuguese Americas as the representative of the unaffiliated members in the North American RALO, and therefore internet users not otherwise represented by or likely to join the existing At-Large structures, which are mostly urban, and also mostly Anglophone or Francophone, I want to share the observation that the largest indigenous language speaking group in North America are Indians who's second language is Mexican and Guatemalan-Spanish, not English or French.

A cure for this specific problem, the non-representation of Mexican and Guatemalan Nationals has residence in the North American region is the attachment of the Mexican and Guatemalan states to the North American region. I'm aware that this is not viewed as an issue requiring a cure by some others in the North American region.

So I share you with you as an individual for informational purposes only. I want to point out that neither the current model, nor the RIR model appears capable of benefiting the indigenous peoples of the Americas and becoming better served by ICANN's means of global regional allocation of Board seats and any other regionally allocated asset or benefit. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Eric. Any response or further – okay, so next in the cue is Dev Teelucksingh.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Dev Teelucksingh. I just wanted to find out two things. One, with regards to this presentation, is it going to be translated in any form for – to allow for better informed comment, especially in the Latin American regions and so forth? And I guess too, has this report ever been shown to the GAC and if there was any feedback?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Who wishes to answer that?

David Archbold: I will.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Dave.

David Archbold: When you say this report, the final report is purely in draft, so no it hasn't yet. It will be. All our previous reports have been translated into all the ICANN languages, six? All the UN languages and distributed, and all have been discussed with the GAC, and we have had workshops at every ICANN meeting for the last several years.

And we have another on Thursday, yes; eleven o'clock, but I can't remember the room. But there is one – it is on the schedule, eleven o'clock on Thursday, and we would pretty much welcome input from you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Dave, next in the speaking cue is Cintra Sooknanan.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Olivier. I wonder if we can just go back to the slide with the losses in LACRALO. Losses. Thank you. Effectively, what is shown here is a splitting of the Caribbean with Trinidad still being part of LAC, and the rest of the Caribbean joining North America. So I mean I just want to flag that as an issue. I don't know how practical that will be with us being left out of the rest of the Caribbean essentially. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Cintra. And Dave do you have to comment on this?

David Archbold: Yes, just a quick comment. It's not just Trinidad that's been left out. There are a fair of other Caribbean countries that will remain in Latin America-Caribbean.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Dave, next in the list is Carlton. Carlton Samuels.

Carlton Samuels:

Carlton Samuels for the record. I'm a member of the WHOIS Working Group so I don't want to spend too much time on this. Cheryl Langdon-Orr and myself represent the At-Large in this Working Group.

There's two things, first of all, the reports have been put up and they've asked many times for comments, that this is not new.

Second of all, these are suggestions, these are recommendations. The basis for the recommendation for the re-mapping is that we harmonize to one structure, one geographic structure and we choose the ROI because it seems to follow a pattern. This is not something written in stone. It's just a logical.

The second thing that you need to – members need to understand is that if you look at the recommendations, you see one map, here is what the mapping result is, give people time to assess whether or not they wish to be re-mapped, and then if those of you who can't be re-mapped, then you might have interest groups that could be developed to defend certain interest.

So it's very important that you make your contributions by commenting on the report, and I would urge all of you to go to the Wiki and make your comments on the report. It would certainly help us to finalize the final report for publication. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, next in the cue is – no, not Cheryl, not yet I’m afraid, now that we have first Edmon, then we’ll have Evan for three words, and then we’ll have Cheryl after that. So Edmon Chung first.

Edmon Chung: Thank you Olivier, Edmon Chung here. I guess on what Carlton just said, I was wondering if that was the sort of motivation of the group is to harmonize it to one set. Because I wanted to I guess remind everyone that currently we are working with at least two sets, you know under the ASO, that’s the RIR, under everyone else that’s the five regions.

So you know I guess the question then becomes that leads to my next question is, if we are going to harmonize and if we are not going to use the RIR model, would the ASO be willing to change at that point? So you know – I guess that’s – because that begs the question right.

Okay, so that’s the crux of the two questions, and then I have a couple more, but I understand that Carlton said, asked us to comment there, but if I may still so I ask is whether the group had talked about these few things, one is if there is – if we go down the path where there is an option to choose, who chooses you know the government, or you know certain ALS, or you know the ccTLD or you know I mean who gets to choose, or who gets to object to being chosen, that’s one question.

The other is which is related to the harmonize one, why harmonize and why is it a problem with different area, different boundaries. I understand that the Board, the governance, you know some of the geographic diversity requirements require some specificity, but why can't we have different boundaries for different areas. And was that discussed in the Working Group.

And I don't see a status quo suggestion, it might be in the report, I haven't read it, but at least not in the slides; was that also considered and whether you know that was a viable option as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Edmon, Dave.

David Archbold: Where do I start? The reason for the first report from the ccNSO back however many years ago was because of a dissatisfaction with the status quo. That dissatisfaction was then supported by all the other SOs and ACs, so and they agreed to set up a Working Group to come up with an alternative; so, no the status quo was not considered acceptable, that was the whole basis for the creation of the Working Group in the first place.

And the reasons for that are complex and would take more time than I've got here to go through. But if you go back to the old ccNSO report, many of the other presentations that are on the net, you will see why that is so.

There was not a specific requirement at the outset to try to coordinate or to rationalize between the sets; that was not the case. Remember where we came from. It was way back when the ICANN Board was looking for an independent, a solidative allocation of countries to regions, because they didn't think they should be in the business of doing that allocation.

They attempted to use the UN statistics list, but in fact something like 40% of the countries ended up being allocated to different regions than the UN list. So that one didn't work. We then looked at every other possible source of an independent list that we could find and didn't find a consistent one that was accepted everywhere. Everyone has their own different list.

So we came to the conclusion that sorry, ICANN, you're going to make up your own mind and create your own list, because that's what everybody is doing. So at that stage, we said fine, what's the basis for that list going to be? And one of the options was looking at the RIR organization, and it seemed of all of the possibilities that were out there, and we even looked at footballs allocation of countries for the World Cup, so I mean we really did try.

Of all the possible allocations, this one seemed to be based, agreed partly for historical reasons, but it is part of the ICANN organization, the allocation of numbers is a fundamental job of ICANN. It's out there, it's an operational solution for an administrative purposes, seemed to us to be logical and defensible that we at least use that as the basis for a new regional allocation.

Albeit, we are looking to be as flexible as we can be once that is actually implemented during our transitional period. I don't think I can say much more in the time available.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Dave. We have a few more people in the cue, what I'll do is to close the cue now, otherwise we'll be – I'll take one last person after the last person in the queue so far. Even you have 20 seconds.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I won't speak too fast, because this is being translated, this is Evan Leibovitch, for the transcript.

Two questions, or I guess they're more curiosities. Going back to your very first slide, it seemed one of the initial premises was that none of the external – no external groupings that's ever been done by another international body would be sufficient.

And it's sort of always – mission creep has always been a concern of mine and ICANN into – getting into endeavors that is not a core competence is always alluded me, and if there are other bodies in the world that have done international groupings, it sort of surprises me that these existing groupings, whether done by the UN, World Bank or whoever, that these external standards would not be sufficient. Yes, that very first one, yes, there's no single independent authoritative list, there's a couple of them out there, and I guess it sort of makes me wonder why ICANN had to

reinvent this wheel, rather than allow for an existing external body to make a definition that ICANN could grasp.

And the other question I had is, is there any other grouping in the world, whether it's the United Nations or FIFA that puts Syria in Europe? I guess that kind of movement just sort was surprising to me. I was not – I was not expecting that, and it just seems like something that is – you know having Iran and Syria in Europe is just something I have never come across before.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Evan. Dave.

David Archbold: (inaudible) with another one, they've also put Antarctica in with North America.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, one more participants, yes, Siranush Vardanyan.

Siranush Vardanyan: Just for the record, Siranush Vardanyan from Armenia. I would like to know if there are any dates specifically pointed out for public comment and for – and when it's expected to be adopted by Board or result.

Rob Hoggarth:

This is Rob Hoggarth from the ICANN staff. The Working Group has generally agreed to a schedule that first starts with these consultations here in Singapore, in terms of just the general thought process. What the group agreed on in San Francisco was to share this draft final report with the community for a full public comment forum, that we're like to open within the next three or four weeks after this meeting. That will likely engender a 60 to 80 day public comment forum on all six UN language translations of this draft final report.

The Working Group will then take all of the community input from there at which time they will produce a final, final report. Now the Charter of this Working Group was established by the Board of Directors, and that Charter then calls for that final report to be shared with the individual supporting organizations and advisory committees; so the At-Large advisory committee will independently take the report, evaluate it, and you all will decide yes, we like it; no, we don't; what sort of exceptions you have.

If all the SOs and ACs agree, then it will go to the Board as a unanimous recommendation and the Working Group will report that. If there are groups that don't like it, then that will be a part of the report as well. As you can begin to see in terms of the timeframe now, we're talking September, October, November. The report will ultimately go to the Board. When the Board gets it, they'll say thank you, we need to have a public comment forum. So there will be another 60, 80 days translations and the rest. So

we're probably talking before the Board actually acts on this, probably close to a year.

So there's a long period of time; then once the Board makes the decision, I'm sorry for adding and extending this explanation; as Dave mentioned, there's likely to be a transition period. The final report drafted right now suggests that staff be directed to then come up with a transition plan.

And then as Edmon and others have noted, then you've got a complex series of processes for how does a sovereign government or an individual ALS, or whatever the make-up is, how do they choose to self-select, so there will be a process and a transition there, that's likely to take place over two or three years. So as you can begin to see this is not anything that's happening any time soon, and there will continue to be great opportunities for public and individual input.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rob, and it's very helpful I think for the community to know what the road map is, it certainly puts things in perspective. We have Tijani, and closing statements or questions from Cheryl. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. When we do this new geographical division, we should not forget that a main objective of a geographical re-partition within ICANN which was to promote diversity within

ICANN structures. So any proposal to divide – and that does not ensure this diversity is contrary to the objectives of this re-partition, so and it should not exist. So that whatever the proposal, we should ensure that there will be diversity within ICANN structures with this new division. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you I wasn't asking to be out of order. Just a very quick response to Tijani; assuming we're not going to go a much, much larger number of regions, I don't think we can ever guarantee that the diversity requirement be satisfied wholly by regions. There are just more than five diverse or seven diverse groups in the world, so somehow we're going to have to have compromises, I guess.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: All right, thank you very much, Alan. I think we'll have Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Olivier, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record.

And I'm delighted that I asked to go last, because Rob's next steps and pathway, which is a very important thing for our community to understand, I think will give an enormous amount of relaxation and breathing space for them, because what you're seeing as work group members, and what Carlton and I have been, I guess, very aware of, but trying to insert into the process of the work group, is the ability of very fixed lines of change to concerned people in our

community. And our community of course is only a micro-chiasm of what we will be facing in the wider ICANN community and dare I say the sovereign states and nationalities that yet need to be involved in this. So it is a huge undertaking.

But what we can do as we listen and then discuss later moving towards the final report is perhaps ensure for our ICANN communities, whether that's done more broadly in Dakar or whether it's done in – to some extent in session with each part of the ICANN world, I don't know yet; but we might actually go through some wide type of exercises where what we can agree as a group is there would be an opportunity for advantage to change the listings of countries from what is currently an ICANN five region model to a model that with some mechanism, some transition and opportunity to self-selection better meets ICANN's needs.

The RIR model is of course one list that with a five by division, does not have the complexity of financial and other aspects that as ICANN, we need to fear and to be concerned about. So to that end, I think we can do a lot in the socialization of this change with the community.

What I need to make sure that you take back to your edge communities is that there will be the opportunity for this discussion, both in the preparation of responses to what is final reporting towards the end of the year, but also via the ALAC process whereas an AC, we will be going out to you very deliberately, and we would like to think that you've had 12 months worth of discussion and perhaps even approached some of your

leaders and decision-makers within country, to make sure we have the right people with the ability to make the statements we need to hear at the table, at the time.

There is not a short time course. There is a need to first of all have asked and answered a number of questions, which in the last two milestone reports, I believe we have done. Do we need geographic regions at all, any regions at all, yes or no. These are the things we have done. Is there a model we can grab off the shelf, clearly not. I did actually ask one of the RIR leaderships lately how they would feel, they hadn't read this particular report with us adopting an RAR model and he wrote some very politically sensitive issues, where they themselves are maybe very concerned and respond in a way that we have not predicted.

So a multi-stakeholder model is going to need to be used, but we also need to remember there are countries who are simply not engaged at all in anything to do with ICANN. And the decisions on where they belong are going to be made at a hard point in time. We might also need to propose opportunity for future modification, because it's the lack of that future proofing in the list we have now, that caused so much of the problems we're faced with and that the ccNSO identified.

Other than that, do it in as many local languages as we can, I'm sure the geo review team will do their very best to deal with any of those challenges. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much Cheryl and thank you to Rob Hoggarth and to Dave Archbold for joining us for this extended session on the geo regions Working Group. Thank you.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, as some of you have noticed, we are late on our scheduling, and we have zapped a session which was the hot topics, which we merged into our first session that was contractual compliance. There were questions raised by Danny Younger with regards to the Section 3.2. – let's have a look, 3.3.2 of the applicant guidebook which mentions ICANN At-Large Advisory Committee dealing with the objection filing fees, and the process by which the At-Large Advisory Committee is going to be filing objections.

That is work which is going to start soon, so far we haven't had the band width to do this, there have been so many other issues in the lead to the new gTLD launch that we – well, we're busy, we've just been over stretched, and certainly staff has been over stretched, but this is coming up soon.

Before we finish this morning's session we still have a fast update from Evan Leibovitch, who will speak to us about the future challenges Working Group in the absence of Jean-Jacques Subrenat who unfortunately was not able to make it to this meeting in person. So Evan, I'll pass the mike over to you.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks very much, Olivier. This is Evan Leibovitch for the transcript. I had hoped or originally planned that we would be able to engage in a fairly broad discussion of future issues and challenges. The entire point of the future issues, the future challenges Working Group is to try and at least create a corner of At-Large that is not constantly responding to public comment periods, responding to stimuli from the Board needing input or this committee needing input, but to actually allow At-Large to initiate policy, for us to create and innovate and drive an end user agenda within ICANN that is not simply reactive to what other constituencies and other bodies within ICANN are doing.

Time constraints are going to make it extremely difficult to engage in an appropriate debate on that, although I guess Olivier, how much time do we have?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We have time – of course your time table is important, because you have to run out at some point. We can perhaps extend for another ten minutes, if we do have a discussion that rises both here or remotely from the chat. We have a hard stop at 13:00 exactly, but I would like to give participants here a little bit of time specifically APRALO participants who have a meeting starting exactly at 13:00, they might need to go and grab some lunch or something. So maybe 10, 15 minutes.

Evan Leibovitch: I would also notice before the Q&A that there is a Charter being worked on by Danny and myself, he's – between Jean-Jacques, Danny and myself, there is going to be a formal Charter being made and considered by the Working Group. That as of this moment is still a work in progress –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Finish your sentence.

Evan Leibovitch: -- and yes, I've been asked to finish my sentence, because apparently I'm being summoned, my apologies.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, so I think several people here have been involved with the start of the work on the future challenges Working Group; and I just wonder whether there are any issues or questions or there's any discussion that we would like to raise here. The floor is open.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much Olivier, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record.

When the draft Charter is in front of us, obviously, we as a community and indeed as ALAC specifically, will be in a better position to discuss some of these issues. But perhaps it would benefit, if we have for the record the community's concepts, the

community's wishes, the community's – community, note, I'm saying – desire of how the ALAC does or does not enshrine in the practices and indeed the Charter of this very important work group, which could be either open ended, a monstrosity or a delight, it's yet to be determined, whether or not there should be some fairly formal or reasonable mechanisms where at large structures or individuals can ensure that issues or concerns or even matters or just a rush of blood to the head of an idea could be funnel towards this work group.

And they may or may not then be able to take the temperature of issues. If for example there is a sudden increase on matter X or Y, then they may be able to say this is clearly of concern to the community, be able to look whether it is one that is global or regional, and then be able to structure their rather open-ended work load for whatever analysis and then a product out of that analysis is appropriate.

I'm not saying there are particular answers, but I think we have a rare opportunity now in the few minutes we have to give it, for the ALS's original leads in the edge community. In other words, pretty much everyone who isn't ALAC, to have their say on this. So in the absence of Evan micro-managing the meeting while he's out, which could be a bit tricky, I wonder, Olivier, if we perhaps we could almost – if needs be do a round robin to those of us who are not ALAC, to get a temperature and a feeling of what this work group could and should achieve?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Cheryl, and usual we're going to run in – shall we do clockwise order or anti-clockwise. I can see people running out of the room so far. Let's start anti-clockwise perhaps and I'm going to call on each of you that I don't believe is ALAC and of course the first person next to you Cheryl, sorry, no, we are turning clockwise, so it's Eric Brunner-Williams.

Eric, sorry to put you on the spot, but usually Beau ends up on the spot every time, so I didn't think it was too fair on him.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I wasn't paying attention, I was editing a text. What am I doing?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, any input, any views, any thoughts that you might have on the work for the futures Working Group, yes.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I believe in clocks. This is Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript record and I believe in clocks. We shouldn't be surprised when dot net renewal occurs, we should have known about it five years ago, five years from now we should not be surprised when the dot net renewal occurs. We should know it today. There are clocks. We should be clock aware.

Every contract that moves on a temporal – on a clock, should not be unknown to us until someone on the staff side puts up a notice, and by the way they're renewing the contract with the Golden

Hoard, or someone equally evil, and we have 31 days or minutes to comment on it. So thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Eric, and I see that people nod in approval around the room and in fact the – is it Work Team D is working on this in the At-Large improvements? One of the Work Teams, Work Team D is working on the clock side on the At-Large side and I also understand that the improvements committee is also looking at ATRT recommendations going in the same direction. Right, I'm starting to mumble. Next Cintra Sooknanan.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you Olivier. I think we do need to work on our procedural mechanisms for engaging other stakeholders in the community, such as the GAC, the GNSO, and that kind of thing when basically we've been working blindly, and pretty much going along with whatever it could in terms of you know different Charters, and that kind of thing, because the gTLD program is now up and running, certainly we do need to have a lot more cross community interaction and I think if – it would be helpful for us to really formalize how we interact. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cintra. Any response, or we just continue around the table. Interesting views. Next one, and I'm jumping over a few

people, because you're all ALAC, it's Oksana Prykhodko. Oksana.

Oksana Prykhodko: Thank you very much. I would like to join Cintra's proposition and to raise the issue of education ICANN Academy, media accompanying or supporting ICANN activity and a penetration of ICANN issue into Russian-speaking community. And then I would like to say that I am just communicating via first work with Russian participants of EuroDIG, Yanna (inaudible), and she is ready of course she is working now on document to join EURALO. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Oksana. And certainly education is a very important part, not only in the Russian-speaking region, but I would imagine all over the world, very hot topic. Next Siranush Vardanyan.

Siranush Vardanyan: Yes, Siranush Vardanyan for the record. To my point of view, one of the big challenges which we might see is to increase the outreach, especially in my region in – it's Eastern Europe to some extent, and it's Asia to another from another angle. But actually in – there is almost lack of information in the region where I live, probably a lot of outreach might be done there and from my point – I am ready to support in that aspect, also.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Siranush, certainly a number of heads nodding here as well. Is this something that the futures Working Group needs to look at, because I think it's already somehow in specific processes, that we are working with Scott Pinzon, etc., etc.

Siranush Vardanyan: I think that the results of each Working Group should be somehow outreached, and every group should – every Working Group should be deal with that aspect.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, sorry, Cheryl you're saying? I can see you waving around and it's in Australian, I can't understand it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I even wave in Australian, that is genuinely tragic, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And Olivier when we are not on record, I will wave to you in Australian and it will be very clear.

However, I think what I'm hearing is there is a difference between the input into work group for futures topics, and the necessity for the outcomes of the futures work group to be properly outreached and socialized and that information flow out, so obviously I will be corrected if I'm wrong, but I think that's what I was hearing.

Clearly there is not – futures we have a current issue of dealing with our in service work and our outreach work, but I think what I'm hearing there is the future work group needs to ensure that it's outputs are properly outreached and socialized, thank you.

Siranush Vardanyan: Thank you Cheryl, you got my point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Cheryl, thank you Siranush and next on the list is Charles Mok.

Charles Mok: Sorry, what –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you for paying attention. I'm sorry, Charles. We're going around the table, looking at the future challenges of At-Large – you have been just busted, just so –

Charles Mok: Yes, my future challenge is just the meeting that is coming up in 15 minutes, so that's why I'm doing some last minute thinking about that right away.

But I think the biggest challenge that we face in our region is the level of participation from our ALS members in particular we have been trying to improve our outreach and policy work in the last

year, that I have to say unfortunately hasn't been too successful. There still the number of ALS and members that are really participating more actively, is still a very relatively small number and we need to try to find a way to improve that.

That is still the biggest challenge, and we got a few new people coming in a new Vice Chairman and so on, so we like to see whether or not that – that we can have some new ideas.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. I'm going down, maybe Alan, although you're not strictly ALAC, but you're very close to ALAC, and yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I think I'm not part of ALAC; therefore I fall under the criteria of those you're serving.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You qualify but you do speak to ALAC quite a lot as the liaison, but that's fine.

Alan Greenberg: I do on occasion; I've been known to actually have an opinion. I see three things, one of them I list as outreach and education. And I don't agree that it is just the outreach and education of whatever the group is working on. I think a standing item is what do we need to do different to make it work? And yes, the discussions with Scott and other people you know these are today's plans, but I

think it has to almost be something on the table all the time. This is a difficult problem and I don't think we're succeeding real well, and I'm not sure the next phase is guaranteed to solve all of our problems. I'm not sure it's the hot topic at the moment.

The number two is in response to Eric, I don't think it's just a matter of clocks. There are plenty of cases where we know we have been woken up, we have talked about an issue where something – some outcome is necessary and we just procrastinate. I think we have to address ways of stopping to do that, awareness of it is not just that we didn't notice the date was coming up; you actually have to do something.

And the third one is how do we get real participation? Yes, including people from our ALS's who aren't participating but let's not just forget the ALAC members and the regional At-Large people, many of whom do not necessarily do an awful lot of work on the central issues between meetings. I mean I know they're busy on the regional issues, but that's not sufficient, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Next Darlene Thompson.

Darlene Thompson: I have nothing new or further to add, I really do agree with what Alan said, it's very difficult to engage those in our community and we have actually been looking at that within our own region to

better engage people on actual policy endeavors, rather than just looking at process which really tends to turn people off.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Darlene, Dev Anand Teelucksingh next.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Chair. I think one of the future challenges is the increasing At-Large presence in countries that don't have an At-Large presence. I think – I mean what's also been said outreach, getting real participation is also of importance. Hopefully the At-Large improvements will go to implementing that would go a long way in trying to kick start back.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks Dev. Next is Michel Tchonang, and the microphone has disappeared, there it is.

Michel Tchonang: Thank you very much, Olivier for ALAC's future, one of the difficulties that we have to – we are confronted with was to put the – to improve the participation within the process and also – also thinking about the capacity re-forming of the ALS, so that they become more efficient when they have to act. I also would like to raise an aspect here as a collaboration within ALS and the private sector that working one the TIC and they're very present here, but in our regions, we do not see this collaboration that would work

together to improve the participation of the majority within the process, especially in developing countries.

I also want to add that this is a preoccupation, and it's not always – what is important is it's not always to favor to participation with regards to the number of ALS, but we have to also improve the quality of ALS to improve efficiency on the ground, thank you – in the field, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Is – oh, I think well he's an ALAC member, so sorry you can't say anything. So it's Beau Brendler next.

Beau Brendler: Three things. I'd like to see some sort of living document on ongoing definitions, whether that has to be part of a mission statement or whatever, and to be more specific, by that I mean I don't want to come to an ICANN a year from now and still be talking you know what should ICANN be? What's ICANN's scope, blah, blah, blah, blah. Yes, the internet is dynamic, yes the internet is moving, but if we don't give people some purchase to make some activity from then you know this is a waste of time.

I think At-Large should name a liaison to law enforcement, maybe liaison is the wrong word, but I think there needs to be more engaged activity between At-Large or ALAC and law enforcement, conversely my first comment was sort of negative.

In a more positive sense, when I came to an ICANN meeting, my first couple of ICANN meetings four years ago, I was told that DNS abuse, cyber-crime were outside ICANN's scope and that this was the wrong forum to talk about that, and now today you know times have changed substantially since then.

Then my third point or my third suggestion sort of follows on, I feel like ALAC has dropped the ball on safety, security, stability. I don't know if we have an SSAC, what are our interactions with SSAC, why is SSAC not and who is it? Van der Waal, but he's not even part of ALAC anymore.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: But he doesn't need be, but he can always report to ALAC.

Beau Brendler: Okay, well so you know, draw from that what you will. But there should be –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: For the record, Patrick van der Waal and he's not part of ALAC, no, but they don't need to be part of ALAC.

Beau Brendler: Well, I understand that, but we need information about it, and it should be part of the discussion of whatever we do, and that's not happening, so, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Bill, point taken, but of course, the ALAC is also – or At-Large actually is also represented in the DSSA Working Group, the DNS Security and Stability Analysis and the SSRT as well, so a lot going on. Mohamed, I'm sorry you can't speak yet, because we haven't spoken with all of the non-ALAC members, and I see behind you Fatima Cambronerero.

Fatima Cambronerero: Thank you, Olivier. I'm going to talk about what I know about that's my RALO in my region. I think every region has its own particularities regarding education and the way how you encourage people so that they get involved. I think what's missing in our RALO – in our RALO is some creativity to get them to involve more – to get those who are outside more involved. Those of us who are already participating, I think there's a large degree of participation of involvement, plus we need some more training on some issues.

I don't really have the solution, but I think it has to be something original and creative, funny, so that it incentivizes and not to punish people so that they leave, actually we should do the contrary, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, point taken. That's an interesting viewpoint. And I see there is someone hiding behind the pillar, and I'm not quite sure who that is. Please come forward.

Natalia Enciso: Okay, I'm new, so from my point of view –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Your name.

Natalia Enciso: I'm sorry, Natalia Enciso LACRALO, nice to meet you. Capacity building also and more engagement and participation.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, great. Thank you and now I guess there's no one else in the room is there, not behind me – oh, my poor neck. Maybe Mohamed, you wanted to add a couple of words and then I think we can probably break off afterwards. I have asked – are there anybody online who also wishes to comment. I know that you've asked – all right Mohamed.

Mohamed El Bashir: Thank you very much, Mohamed El Bashir for the records. I really support Beau's recommendation that we need to outreach to other stakeholders, then the normal stakeholders we know, at least listen to them and engage them and build a bridge for them.

The second point is – I mean we’re talking about the future. And this – at least we have a mechanism to sense external environment. External environment currently now is about social media, use engagement empowerment and really we’re not using those tools. It’s – I’m afraid that we’ll become outdated really. Because what is happening outside that now, people are very active use, young are using the internet actively. We need to engage those and listen to those and use those tools actually, we need to use Twitter, Facebook, and reach out to those people and get their voices, otherwise any talk about future, I mean planning or engagement it will be just a waste of time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Mohamed. Any other comments or – oh, Cheryl, I should have guessed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record yet again and it will continue to be the case for a long time, all the way to the end of the year, so just get used to it. I had no voice as Chair, I warned you all, I now have a voice. So get used to it. Thank you.

Picking up on what Mohamed said, it struck me that what we might be talking about – he had come from our breakfast discussion as well, the ability for that small section of the circle to look towards and liaise with the population and the interest in the outer circle of what is the internet eco system. But these key players law enforcement is obvious, perhaps the future challenges

Working Group could be addressing themselves to how they identify and what qualifies as a worthy outside of ICANN to engage with at these levels, so that there might be some really good stuff for them to chew over.

And that's it for me, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to thank you as a member of APRALO for giving us now three minutes to find lunch, have lunch and have our meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well, thanks very much for everyone to attend. Matt has some USB keys to pass around to all of us which have all the documents required for our meetings. I'm really sorry for the speed at which I'm speaking for the interpreters who have done a fantastic job this morning. So thank you.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Just a small housekeeping note, so the APRALO meeting is taking place in –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: -- now, and I'm really sorry about this, Charles you will not have a lunch.

Charles Mok: Well, I'm fine, for those other APRALO members or anyone who likes to join us, I mean the only thing is we might have one or two people dialing in, so if we can keep it, it's probably not going to be very long.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, and one last thing also for Jean-Jacques Subrenat who I gather will be listening to this, you have your work cut out. And if I was to say that in Australian – you have your work cut out Mate. That's good, okay, thumbs up from Cheryl.

One other point – there is a WHOIS Review Team session this afternoon at 15:30 going on until 16:30 in Padang, I know that Carlton will be going, but there will be a – well, it's an important session isn't it.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, but I have it 14:00 session too.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And okay, so –

Carlton Samuels: I have another session

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So that's one and then beyond that, I remind everyone that tomorrow morning, we have an interaction with the Board in this room, at nine o'clock in the morning, so please – you know we need to have a full room here, and we certainly have plenty of questions for them, the agenda I think is already passed to them. But it's particularly important that we are there bright and early.

So thanks very much to all of you and we'll have a good rest of the day. It is in this room in the VIP Room.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It depends which schedule you're looking at, because that schedule is probably a couple of hours out of date or days –

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No, the official Singapore schedule is a nightmare. Check on the ICANN community pages, the Wiki pages, those are really kept up to date.

[End of Transcript]