
BUENOS AIRES – ALAC and Regional Leadership Meeting

Sunday, June 21, 2015 – 09:00 to 12:00

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

ALAN GREENBERG:

...Global Stakeholder Engagement folks who are here in great numbers. Tarek Kamel was supposed to be joining us, also. Unfortunately, he could not make it, and Mandy Carver will be speaking on his behalf.

Since we're already starting 15 minutes late, I am skipping any introductory things. I think everyone knows who I am. The agenda called for me to talk about rules of engagement. I think we've all done this enough before that we don't have to repeat things like that, other than please state your name before when you're speaking so the interpreters and the transcript can reflect who you are and not just be man, woman, man, woman.

And we are doing two-minute interventions for the At-Large people, the speakers. I have more freedom than that but this session ends in 20 minutes. I'm sorry. I'll turn it over to Sally.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Good morning. Sally Costerton, ICANN. We're getting pretty informal here. Good. Very good to see you all. This always feels, for me, like the beginning of the ICANN meeting, although I have actually been here since Tuesday night. ICANN meetings seem to get just longer and longer. But it's always a pleasure to be with this group, and I hope that you're all already enjoying a productive meeting.

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.

The thing that Tarek and I look after is I think almost sort of [presents] a big chunk of our stakeholder, of our community-facing our externally-facing capabilities at ICANN on the staff side. We are becoming, I hope, better, although not yet as good as I would like, at communicating out what is going on from the regions as it happens. We now have plenty of newsletters in multiple languages. Many of you participate in those. We have regional strategies around the world.

So I hope that you have a better understanding than, perhaps, in the past as to some of the things that we're doing. There's still work to do there, and it's something I'm spending time on. But I hope, this morning, you can get some insight. Particularly, I'm going to turn it over to Pierre Dandjinou for him to show you some of the results of the work that the Africa Strategy Team has been working on.

I think it shows you what can be done with really tenacious and dedicated process between staff, community, and board. I'll ask Rodrigo to share with you some of the key points of what's going on in this region, in the LAC region, but also what's happening at this meeting. Of course, it's a very busy meeting for the LAC region.

And then, finally, my colleague, Kuek, to just give you one case study of how we're working, in one of our regions, very closely with the RALOs. And I hope that that will be a good case study to give us more sort of ideas for how we can deepen that in the future.

So I'll turn it over to Pierre.

PIERRE DANDJINO:

Thank you very much, Sally, and very good morning to everyone. I hope these slides are on. Some of [inaudible] the whole engagement for Africa. It was a pleasure to be here for so many reasons, actually. Because I sat also with you guys some time ago. Kind of started, also, this process of At-Large. Now, so happy to see that we are spread over the world, and then actually working closely.

So, of course, in terms of my slides, I'm going to just [run] very few of them. It's our report, though, usual report to the ICANN meeting and what we've been doing in terms of implementing the Africa strategy.

Now, and before I move on, I will also like to say that we [inaudible] had very interesting, I would say, partnership – let's put that way – with At-Large, especially in the last two years. And even recently, we were really happy to resort to three or four At-Large members who actually were able to conduct a few missions for us when we launched our IANA [inaudible].

And I would like really to thank Tijani, Aziz, and I think two or three others that really came to our support. Because, of course, we know our team, our staff, is tasked with three members staff. We cannot cover Africa. Africa is about 54 different countries. But they were ready to assist, and we really appreciate this.

Now, to the Africa strategy. Well, we turned three, and the journey to date is what we came to Buenos Aires to talk about. So, if you can [inaudible] for me because do I have – no? Okay. Next slide, please.

So [inaudible] the history of this team. Started the working group, that we move on, and then today we are three years old and we have three member of ICANN staff working out of Benin and Nairobi, Kenya. Now, next slide will be – yeah, let’s pass the founding members.

The objectives, of course, you might know, is about promoting awareness and meaningful participation in ICANN. And the [inaudible] system. But second one, second objective, which is crucial for Africa is how do we transform the Internet industry in Africa? Because that’s something that was very lacking and ICANN is here to actually support and see how best to develop this market, which is still there, which is dormant.

Africa is 1 billion in terms of population. But in terms of domain and registration, is about 1 million and 300, and of this, you will 1 million from South Africa alone and 300,000 from other parts of Africa. So there is a lot of room to make progress there. So this is part of what we are trying to do.

Hence, some of the [inaudible] program or project that we put together that derived from these strategies as whole. So I’m going, quickly, to pass those projects and see what we’ve been to achieve. And, yeah, [inaudible] that. So next slide, please.

Okay. [Inaudible] now I think we moved to [inaudible] this phase. Well, there are so many ideas because what we did recently is to assemble a small group of members to think about the way the strategy has been implemented. Of course, our idea is to...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Use the other mic. We got new mics.

PIERRE DANDJINOU: Ah, okay. Ah, thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thought it was a [inaudible] you guys. Okay. Yes. So here, the kind of projects that we made, while they say [inaudible] from Africa, is always something new. Some of the thing that you here did not exist three years ago. For instance, the first plan. I mean, thinking of a plan for Africa to really participate to Africa. There was not something like that.

It happened now. We do have a document that is there. The concept, even, of the DNS Forum, and those started [inaudible] from Africa in Durban, and today, of course, we are actually planning this in different places in the world. It's becoming popular in DNS one in Africa is going to be the third one. It's happening in two weeks' time in Nairobi, Kenya.

We also launched this Africa DNS Awards. That where we really recognize those who are performing well in terms of registration and managing those ccTLDs and also gTLDs from Africa.

We do have what you have topical workshops. For instance, we had very interesting one on copyright issues, also on domain names and trademark issue, for instance.

We've launched this Africa ccTLD study, which is ongoing partnership with ISOC and fTLD. DNSSEC Roadshows are quite popular now. Went to 16 different countries, [touring] people to understand how to secure the DNSSEC, the DNS, and we launched this campaign on the Special IANA Awareness for April to June, 2015. It was quite interesting because we really relied on the local community to actually explain the whole process of the IANA stewardship transition, but also make sure that people really contribute from Africa.

This happened in close to 18 to 19 countries, and I can say that we really like the way the community, especially those we call the ICANNers who, in the countries, definitely the At-Large members and the rest, they really assisted us in spreading the word about the whole process. And, also, having engagement from.

And guess what? We were able to even discuss these issues with a few African decision makers, ministers for instance, that they are now following the whole process. Now putting questions, exactly, about what role governance has to play in the whole process, which is quite interesting. Of course, the digital entrepreneurship is a big one we have is for the younger generation. How do you develop your own [inaudible] but based on the DNS. And, of course, we plan to have the Steering Committee.

These are kind of pioneering ideas we see, and all of them have been translated projects that are now ongoing. So there's no issue about that. Of course, the rest is about what we will be achieving as of July financial year '16. Certainly don't have no time to go through all of

this, but definitely the key is, is it going to be that one where we really now are looking forward to how to finance this thing?

ICANN, certainly, provide this [inaudible] seed money to start the whole process. We are now thinking about alternative sources of funding so that this can have bigger impact.

So these are some of the point I wanted to highlight. And again, really, thank you very much. We value the importance of this community, and we value the importance of working with you guys on the ground, and we are looking forward to have more and more kind of engagement with you guys. So thank you very much for your attention.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Pierre. There's a full deck there. There's an Africa session later this week. You're doing an Africa session here? Not an Africa session. Okay. There is a full deck and there's a lot of more information, if you're interested in participating or know more about this. And Tijani wants to say something.

Thank you, Tijani. I know there was something.

Okay. In the interest of time, I'd like to just hand over, now, to Rodrigo. My colleagues are all sitting here behind me and to the side. It would use up the rest of our time to introduce them all. But if we want to do that before we close, then I'm very happy to do that. But I'll go to Rodrigo now. Where are you, Rodrigo?

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Hello, everybody. Good morning. I'm going to be addressing in Spanish, so if you want to wear your headsets, probably a good idea. Okay. I'm okay here.

Good morning. I'd like to do two things. First of all, as Sally said, tell you what we have planned for this Buenos Aires meeting for the Latin American region. And after that, share with you some projects we have been working on within the regional strategy.

As part of this exercise of the regional strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean, one of the important feelings – strong feelings – among the Latin American community when we made a diagnosis for the project was that there were not relevant issues within ICANN for the issues which were relevant for the region.

Most of the themes and issues were relevant for North America and Europe, and there were very few themes of interest to Latin America in the agenda of the ICANN. And then, so not too much participation from stakeholders in Latin American in ICANN. Today, we're going through first stage of implementation of the strategy, and we have a special program for Latin America and the Caribbean.

All the people who come to the registry and are from the region are given a leaflet, a brochure where we highlight the most important meetings within ICANN globally but also sessions dealing with Latin America and the Caribbean organized by Latin America and the Caribbean organizations. So we have an agenda that includes over ten sessions dealing with several themes and issues, security, connectivity, and others, which are of interest to the region.

We also have something special for the first time, which we'll call the LAC Lounge, which is a permanent space for all the Latin America and Caribbean community, and all the ICANN community can come to meet the regional organizations [inaudible] by LACRALO, but you can come and learn what the LACNICs, [inaudible]. You can come and visit the regional ISOC office in the region.

We have a schedule, which will be published. The daily newsletter, as you are getting through your e-mails, also stress the meetings that are of interest for the region. So the situation for Latin America right now is completely different. I think that together with the community, we have been able to change things completely. To change this feeling that there was a lack of activities related and of interest to the region. Of course, we still have a long way to go in order to increase our participation, but at least this is a very important first step.

And don't forget to get your pin. When you see this orange pin, this means it's people from the LAC region. We hope to see many pins at this ICANN meeting, which will expand the involvement of our region. And the second thing I'd like to do is to share with you the specific projects we are working on now with the At-Large community. LACRALO, as you know, LACRALO, of course, has been an important actor in our working group to create and design the local and regional strategy, but [inaudible] implementation we're doing some other things.

In capacity building, we already have a program – a comprehensive program – of online workshops, Webinars, actually. We have already

had two, and this is interesting because we bring speakers and people who may train us, people who are not from LACRALO necessarily, but LACRALO has also been a trainer for its own members, and this is a program which will continue in the long run. So webinars have been quite successful. We are trying to improve engagement. Well, these are two things that have already happened.

Another example of capacity building is the e-learning platform. All the content of interest for LACRALO will be uploaded to that platform, and these initiatives are converging. This is the regional strategy. LACRALO had already thought of training, of giving training, and we are trying to jump on that bandwagon.

And another activity or set of activities is the outreach activities and engagement activities, which of course, are a concern for LACRALO and for ICANN's [and] GSE staff. We did two things here. On hand, we are joining the existing CROPP program. You know that CROPP has some space to support activities of NARALO and of the GNSO is there, too, in order to do outreach on ICANN.

And now, we can also carry out activities, specifically activity as part of ICANN [inaudible] GSE has done is joined this initiative and provide additional support. So today from the Latin America region, we have the CROPP people plus the people who we are supporting through our regional strategy.

And something else, which has been well accepted [inaudible] suggested by LACRALO member of the committees. It was, well, to

have a fun activity so that people would get involved. So this fun activity or entertaining activity was a trivia.

We had a trivia on Internet with questions on ICANN. The theme was how much do you know about ICANN? People had some time to answer. Those who got the most answers correct would get a prize or an award. The award was paying for them a trip to come to Buenos Aires, and we are very happy because the person who got this prize from the Caribbean had been very active in the community; however, had never attended an ICANN meeting.

He or she participated remotely and this week, this person will be here with us. We're continuing with these activities. These are some examples of what we are doing with the people from LACRALO, and of course, we also update our calendar, our schedule on a monthly basis. And I think this would be. Thank you very much.

SALLY COSTERTON: Sounds so much better in Spanish, doesn't it? I don't even need to understand it. It just sounds great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You can use this.

SALLY COSTERTON: Okay. So I think, perhaps, Alan, if people have questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have one question from Murray McKercher. We'll take any other very quick questions, and then give Mandy a few minutes. I feel really guilty about taking these people who are doing really marvelous things and saying, "Go away, we don't have any more time for you." But our schedule seems to be rather tight today, and is being made tighter by the moment because of technology. Murray, are you online? If Murray is not online, I believe the question is in the chat. He is online. I don't hear him. Are there any other questions?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Here we have Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: My phone is not muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Murray, please give the question. Murray, if you can hear us, we're hearing an occasion grunt or something and no words. If you're speaking, tell us that on the chat, because we can't hear you. If you aren't speaking, speak.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Hello, Alan. It is Murray. Good morning from Canada. I'm speaking with my North American Region At-Large hat. And a quick question for

the Engagement Team. Sorry for the grunts. Are there any metrics that could be shared about academic engagement with ICANN from the various regions? Just, I guess, for the engagement team in general. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Hi, Murray. It's Sally. We are doing a lot of work, at the moment, about collecting data by stakeholder group and by region. And I don't think, but I will go and check, that we break out the academic stakeholder group from as a separate standalone group at the moment. So we have business and we have government and we have academia and we have technical community, which I think, at the moment, includes academia as it does in some other areas of ICANN.

But I would like to improve that. And we are now measuring input and participation in lots of different ways, including who's coming to meetings, and you'll have seen that we now ask people to – they don't have to, but we ask people to register by the group that they're coming from, as well as the region.

So let me take that. I'll go and check with my team whether we have broken out into academia. If we have, I will come back and share the data with Alan so that he can share it. If we haven't, I'd love to go back to you offline with [Xinyue Liang], who actually leads that program for our team, and see how we might involve into giving you that kind of filter. Because I know this is a very important part of the next stage of our engagement is reporting back out on what the results have been and by region and by stakeholder group. Thank you for the question.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you, Sally.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have three speakers on my right, starting with Tijani, and then we'll go to Mandy for a few minutes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Thank you, Sally, and all the team. I would like to tell you how I am proud of the cooperation we have with the African staff, and especially Pierre and Yaovi and Bob. We work, really, together tightly and the result is very good.

There is another cooperation of which I am proud. It is our cooperation with the AFRINIC, even if they never paid a penny for us, they always put us on their program, we are always participating, and we find it strategic to continue that. And we are using the CROPP program to participate with AFRINIC, even if we complement, we pay the remaining days from our pockets, but it is not problem.

What I wanted to say that I am the Capacity Building Working Group chair in At-Large, and we proposed, this year, to undertake a program of capacity building for our community in the regions where we never go. The small islands in Pacific, the Caribbean, some regions in Africa, and unfortunately, the budget couldn't be allocated this year for that, and the advice that to use the CROPP.

As I told you, the CROPP is used mostly to participate in AFRINIC activities, and it is only for two days, as you know, so it is not possible. I already spoke with Sally. She's very positive, and I hope that you will, together, work and have this program implemented this year. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Alan. Sally, I can actually give you an answer on this academic outreach question, because on the new website of the Department for Development and Public Responsibility, they mentioned, as one of their goals, academic outreach. It's not yet fully working, but it's there already something. So it's mentioned.

And this brings me, actually, to my biggest point of concern. As the Chair of the ICANN Academy Working Group, we are demanding since 2010 that we have to put all the efforts regarding learning, capacity building, and so on and so forth under one umbrella. At the moment, it's getting even worse.

GSE is doing something deeply, [RS] is doing something. The community is doing something. Each program is under one group managed by one team, and it's even getting more difficult to get an easy access to get an overview about all the programs to avoid duplications.

And as the Chair of the Academy Working Group, I don't know whom to talk to. I have to talk to you about some of the programs and I have to talk to Nora about some other programs. And then when I want to get website on or when the Working Group is demanding a website for the Academy Working Group since two years we are discussing this. There's no progress at all.

So it's really getting so difficult with those different departments, everybody is cooking his own little soup – good soups, by the way. Every soup is really a good soup. I mean, you are, meanwhile, doing summer schools on Internet governance, which is great. These schools are needed and I think they are successful. But the communication and the cooperation, and especially here with the community, needs to be improved.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Yeah. You raise a very good point, Sandra. I think it's very well taken. In a way, perhaps that the ICANN staff is going native sometimes and it's too bottom-up. I don't want to be facetious but, I mean, I think there are enormous amounts of, as you say, soup being made. This is an area where we need to do more to coordinate. I think we, at the beginning, it was about doing things at all.

And that's going well now. But we need to make it much clearer, particularly in the web environment, both externally and increasingly with we'll have an Intranet internally for the staff on the community wikis that there's a kind of one-stop shop to bring those together.

I really do genuinely take that comment to hear, and we've made some headway. David Olive and I now have a group, a coordination group, for example, which Heidi sits in, which is bringing some greater coordination. But we haven't solved this yet. I'm actually seeing Nora this evening. So I will have a chat to her on the back of this that you've raised it. And you really do have my commitment that we will try to improve. I know that it's not ideal.

ALAN GREENBERG:

One, at the end of the table now. One-minute timers, please. We are really very late. Mandy, for a few minutes, as much as she wants to take to volunteer at this point, and then we have Siranush, and the queue is closed at that point. Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you, Alan. Barrack Otieno from AFRALO for record purposes. First is just to join, to echo Tijani's comments. I think we've had a very good relationship with the team working in Africa. And I just wanted to stress on two points. Probably more emphasis on a regional calendar that will map out all the events that we have in our respective regions so that we can see how to spread the resources, the limited resources that are available to make sure that we make the most of these good events that we are having.

Then, I think, the second thing I want to stress on is probably we need to document some of the best practices or good things that are coming out of the activities that we are doing in our regions. I've been

part of the Middle East mailing list and there's a lot of good things that we are able to land from what's happening in the Middle East, what's happening in the LAC region, but we need to document this so that we can be able to share to those who do not have access to some of these mailing lists. So those are my two points. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Barrack. Mandy?

MANDY CARVER: Okay. First, my name is Mandy Carver. I am in the Government Engagement Department. I send you Tarek Kamel's profound apologies. There was a shift in schedule, and he was unable to attend but this is an important session for him. So he regrets not being able to join you, and I realize you're running very tight on schedule.

Briefly, I think most of you actually know about us, but Government Engagement is Tarek Kamel's group. We work in close coordination with Global Stakeholder Engagement on coordinating what is going on in the capitals, and we have a presence in Geneva and New York, LA, DC, working with the IGOs and the IOs.

We are actively engaged in questions of the WSIS+10 review and the renewal of the Internet Governance Forum mandate. We work with a number of the UN, the IGO and IO bodies, and also actively with the GAC Working Group here.

We coordinate with you all through activities like the Supplemental Budget Requests on Participation in the IGF itself, the International IGF. I'd like to make two quick plugs for the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, in which you are all well represented. There will be a session, public session on Monday on Internet governance, and then the face-to-face working group meeting for the CCWG on Internet governance is on Wednesday.

There was a question, also, about academic outreach, and I realize that this is yet another example of activities going on. We run a series of informational sessions for the UN staff and diplomats, for instance, so they can better understand the technical layers of the Internet and how it functions.

This is something we coordinate with a number of the other organizations with the Internet governance ecosystem. It's not just ICANN, but it's a way of bringing better information to people who will be making decisions tangentially that impact the Internet and the IG ecosystem. And we're also engaged in things like the summer schools on Internet governance.

Briefly, we have Veni Markovski, who is in New York working with the UN. Nigel Hickson, who many of you know, who in Geneva doing IGOs and IOs. [Anna Chelenet], who particularly works with the missions in Geneva. Jamie Hedlund is also a shared resource for us. And I'm going to stop there because I know we're short on time. And I can see one—

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Mandy, and I apologize to everyone for the time constraints. Siranush, last words.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Chair. Siranush Vardanyan, APRALO. I just would like to state that we, as an example of APRALO partnership with APRICOT that was started a series of Webinars for Asia-Pacific region in the time, which is really relevant to our region, and I would like to thank Kuek and not only Kuek, but all this staff is involved in supporting us.

We recently conducted, already, two webinars. One was on Internet governance and the second one was in IDNs. So the topics are really relevant to the current discussions, and the topics were identified due to the survey, which we conducted among APRALO ALSes. So the topics came from the ALSes themselves. We are planning to have the third one, already, in July.

And the second one on the Internet governance, I am happy to state that among presenters, also, APRALO leadership team was involved as presenters together with experts coming from APAC Hub. This is a really good partnership, though we are struggling, still struggling for the active participation, but I think that we will involve more people from ALSes to come and participant, but however, this is the good partnership opportunity and thank you, and thank your regional team to do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Siranush. I thank everyone for coming, and I ask the people who are coming in to take seats at the table so we can continue quickly. Thank you.

[audio break]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. Good morning to the ALAC and to the At-Large Community. It is always a pleasure to be back in a room with you. We have a rather important topic to discuss, and we are tight on time. I have to apologize on several counts. First, I have a new gTLD Program Committee meeting today that starts at 10:15, and there are important issues to be decided upon today, so please make sure you push me out at 10:10.

The other thing I wanted to flag is I have to attend to a family matter that requires that I leave Buenos Aires on Wednesday afternoon. But I will join the public forum and the public Board meeting remotely as best as I can when the plane touches down at midpoint. And I do apologize for not being here, but you know that I'm with you in spirit. And if you have any issues, you know that I'm only an e-mail away.

And I do apologize to LACRALO in particular for missing the Showcase, but you know that I am there with you in spirit, as well, and wish you a good event. Okay.

So the topic that we are supposed to discuss today is about the next ICANN CEO. You would have heard the announcement that Fadi Chehadé will be leaving us next year in March. And the ICANN Board is

responsible for finding and selecting ICANN CEOs in general. And a Search Committee has been formed, and you will hear more about this committee at the session that the Board will conduct on Thursday right before the public forum.

If you are having lunch, please make sure that you do not miss that session because it's quite important. You will have an understanding on Thursday on the Search Committee, its process, and the input that it would like to hear from you. What I did is basically to trigger the process earlier for the At-Large by flagging the criteria of the CEO in 2011, which is basically the baseline of where we're moving forward. And there has been some discussion in the At-Large with input being provided and put up on the Wiki.

What would be good is to hear feedback from you in this session so that you can also hear from each other in terms of your thoughts. And if you were to ask Fadi what would be the requirement of a CEO, and I have heard him say this, there are three buckets, essentially. One is manager of an organization, the size and the area of responsibility of ICANN as it stands today and where it needs to go next. A diplomatic, essentially, to deal with the community, internal and external to ICANN. And this includes the Internet community as well the ones outside. And also, finally, a community facilitator of someone who understands you, empathizes with you, and can connect all the dots and try to address all the needs.

So the floor is open and I'd like to hear from you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I see Vanda first.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I can speak from here. Rinalia, thank you. Well, I haven't share this idea for so long. And I will repeat it here. So I don't believe that, in general, one person can have the two opposite profiles like a diplomat profiles to deal with governments and all of the community and to be a huge executive guy to guarantee performance inside the business.

So all the business around the world is going to a more cooperation idea to governance inside their business. So I believe that ICANN, as a really different way of business that we know, should also start to think about to have two guys, one completely involved in getting performance, deal with the business community, and the other more diplomat profile to deal with the governments and deal with the community as a whole.

And those can work together and start to show to the world that that's the new way to do things. Big companies are starting to think like that, and ICANN should be the first one to really implement this kind of way. Thank you for listening.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Garth Bruen, NARALO Chair [inaudible]. [Another language]. Why were you listening to translation while I was talking?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a hearing problem and I was trying to listen to English. But it switched to Spanish suddenly. Try again and let's hope it works.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Entocies bien – no. So I thought maybe Alan was waving off my interpretation of Vanda's explanation as being a parliamentary model. But that's what it sounds like to me. I kind of like the thought of that, but my comment was more about I like the idea of us being a major part of this decision process and building the new criteria, and I welcome the opportunity for it.

I feel like some of the previous choices were made in the dark, and because of that, we had different problems. However, I think that we are, in terms of the CEO, we are evolving, even though it's not perfect. I feel like we're getting a little bit closer each time to somebody who understands the multi-stakeholder model better. So I guess we're going from nothing to better, to better, and hopefully to best.

The person that is selected needs to be really, really have a personal integrity that is really above reproach. And that, I think, creating the trust factor is probably the most important thing. So trustworthiness and a sincere trustworthiness is extremely important. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Aziz next.

AZIZ HILALI:

Merci, Alan. Thank you, Alan. First, I would like to say that this is the first time ALAC and RALOs have ever asked what their opinion is regarding the CEO's profile. So Rinalia, we thank you for asking this.

Within AFRALO, we added this item to the agenda over last conference call, and most members, of course, wish for the new CEO to have a profile with a background in the public sector and in the private sector, but also in the association's business, in the sector of non-profit organizations, which is important for him to be able to communicate with ALAC and with all the different constituencies that make up ALAC and ICANN.

So it should be someone diplomatic without necessarily being someone who comes from the diplomatic spheres, but someone who has a sense of humanity, who's close to people. And then we're also thinking that Fadi comes from Africa and he's of Arab origin, but by now, we think have someone from a developing country. We've already had an Australian, we had two Americans, we had someone from New Zealand. So why not someone from a developing country? Either from Africa, Asia, etc.

And so it should be someone with ease of language. It is very important to speak different languages. I speak French personally, and so I think I find it much easier to discuss with our current CEO because he spoke French fluently and he spoke other languages, too, which is very important.

So it should be someone who knows the different regions, who has already been to those different regions, and who has knowledge of the culture. I have other ideas, but I'll end here. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Aziz. Sandra next.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Alan. First of all, I would like to mention that it might be a difference, depending on how the IANA transition works out. This person might have different skills in terms of bringing process alive or continue with the process when the community can agree, or if there is no agreement, then we might end up in a state of risk management for ICANN as a [rule]. So I think this might be a difference.

Secondly, something I would really recommend is that the new CEO takes itself very, very lot of time to understand how the multi-stakeholder model works. Garth mentioned it already. We are getting closer with every CEO that they really get a deep understanding on how to this community works, what are the dynamics within this community, how are the stakeholders connected to each other, and so on and so forth.

And the third thing I would recommend is that a new CEO should maybe not bring too many new ideas, but rather continue with the ideas, which are not ready yet. I mean, bringing in so many new stuff was probably good in order to get ICANN's operation to work. But

those stuff has to be somehow understand the community and the multi-stakeholder model, as well.

And I mentioned it earlier when Sally was here. There are so many departments cooking their own little soups, good soups, but with a lot of duplication and a lot of confusion in the air. So I'm really hesitating. I used to say when usually in the offline world, when a new CEO arrives, he makes new furniture in his office. At ICANN, when a CEO arrives, he sets up a new website, which is a total mess for this community.

We are still suffering from the new change of the website. For academics, for instance, thousands of links just appeared for their academic research work just because there was the need for a new website. And this new website is not really functional. It's not really user-friendly.

So if a new CEO arrives and sets up a new website, brings in a lot of new stuff and a lot of new ideas, this would be, I think, the worst ICANN could happen. Let's, rather, continue with the processes and the way. Let's continue with this. Let's close the gaps and let's be less ambitious, I would say. Thank you.as you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Raf next.

RAF FATANI:

Moving away from personalities and traits and maybe building on a little bit on Sandra's first point regarding the period in which transition, this is happening, which is during the IANA transition, and the different needs of a CEO and President if a transition goes ahead and if it doesn't go ahead.

And I was wondering if the thought of actually having an interim CEO, an internal person that can manage to the end of the current tenure of Fadi, and then we start the process again, [inaudible] depending on where we are, rather than finding someone from outside the community, trying to get them up to scratch during a period where it's actually quite sensitive. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just for the record, Fadi has said he plans to stay through the transition, either the failure or the success of it, but not to leave partway through the process. Tijani next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Merci, Alan. Thank you, Alan. It's very easy to follow others because a lot has already been said. The three items that Rinalia mentioned are very high-level points, but they're still very valid. I'd like to go back to what Garth was saying regarding trust. He spoke of integrity. That's something that's very important, even paramount, to our community that should be an essential element in our choice, and in my opinion, the next CEO shouldn't come from the Internet industry because the Internet industry has a state of mind, which has not opened up to the

other communities. And so that person could not include all the different components of the community.

I'll now go back to what Aziz was saying that we should find a CEO from a developing country or an underserved country, but I would like to say that the CEO shouldn't be absolutely Western minded, shouldn't be someone completely oriented towards this state of mind that Westerners have when they consider things.

It should be someone open-minded, someone who understands very well the other communities, even if it is someone from the Western part of the world. It should be someone who could include everyone, all communities, all nationalities, anyone who works with Internet, who uses Internet. So I think the next CEO would have a very important role because he is to follow up after Fadi, who really turned tables on our organization.

And I think it should be someone who will go on working on the globalization of ICANN, someone who's efficient, who pushes things through. It shouldn't be someone who won't bring new projects, but rather make progress with what we have. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I have two more speakers in the queue. Rinalia has said we must kick her out in 30 seconds. So I ask people to be very, very brief. I'm sorry to have to do this. But it's better to be heard briefly than to have her outside the room when you're speaking. Fatima next.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Speaking in Spanish. Thank you, Rinalia, for putting this topic on the table for At-Large. When it comes to the [inaudible], I won't express my ideas here because I will do it on the mailing list. However, I'm not so optimistic when it comes to listening to the community. It is always the same, it is a North American citizen, and that is the CEO of ICANN.

So I would like to say something apart from what we have said about the profiles. We, the ones who are volunteers in the community, have a commitment. We ask for a commitment. So I would like that the new CEO have a commitment and that he would finish his term and not leave the sheep in the middle of the storm.

So I don't know if he's giving up or not, but I would like to take that into account. That is to say that is more commitment on his behalf. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And the last speaker, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. To be short and to be sure to be understood by Rinalia, who speaks very well French, I will talk in English. I will say things completely crazy, but why we need a CEO today? We may work very well with leadership team in place today within ICANN.

And I just want to give you one small insight of when the discussion was about hiring the new CEO last time. During the discussion, I say, in

fact, we need to hire three of the four candidates. And everybody, as very usual, laugh at me and say, “No, we need a boss. We need a CEO.” Then we end up to hire Fadi. And what’s happened in the next three months, he hires two of the other candidates.

I don’t know how it’s happened. I never said that outside of the boardroom. It’s the first time I expressed that publicly. But I think it was a good way to go. And it’s a good way to go. We don’t need to find the person, we need to find the team. And if we try in this direction, it will be less difficult. We don’t need to have the one who will be able to do everything. And we have already a very good team, then maybe we can live with this team for a few months and see what’s happened, and then the CEO will come naturally, I will say. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And it comes to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I think that the search party should ask itself two questions. The first one: is ICANN a business, a trade organization, or an organization that acts for the public good? The second question is whether ICANN is a North American corporation, just like Milton Mueller told us earlier, or is it a global organization? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for the 30 seconds and those two comments. Rinalia, closing remarks.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Thank you very much for the input, which I find extremely useful. I just wanted to flag the key points that Sandra raised regarding the impact of the IANA transition that will certainly affect the choice of who it is that we select coming in next, and also the next stage of where ICANN is going.

Certainly, I think, ICANN, personally, I think ICANN needs stabilization. We have been on a growth tangent, we need to stabilize, strengthen, deepen, and we shall see.

So on Thursday, please feel free to come forward in the public forum and share your views again, because I think it will be most appreciated by the Search Committee, and I will definitely relay these comments to the search committee itself. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia. And without any undue introductions that I think are not needed, especially since we now have his name in case we don't know who he is, Fadi Chehadé.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Thank you, Alan. Buenos dias. Good morning. Bonjour. Ramadan Kareem to all my colleagues who are here during their holidays. I always come to see you after my performance review. So I just left the Board where the Board reviews my performance. It's always before I come to see you.

It's very good, very good, actually, because it's always a sobering visit with the Board. I told the Board something, which I'll tell you. I've been on the job for three years. I don't think I understood this job until now, and then I'm leaving.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's why you're leaving?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Olivier asks, "That's why you're leaving?" Because you finally understand the job. No, that's not why I'm leaving, but certainly, I want to tell you this is a very, very complex job. Very complex. It is complex because it is not a job; it's three jobs. I am the executive in charge of a \$150 million budget spanning 300-some people in 30 countries. And, in that role, I'm an executive who must answer to thousands of people. I've never been a CEO in a job like this, because this is a job that requires more of a tribal leader than an ex-CEO. Someone who knows how to bring everyone around to make decisions.

So what is different about the CEO role is that the decision-making process is very different from any decision-making process I've experienced in my life. And that's just the CEO job.

The second job is that you're a political ambassador of this institution that is a very unique institution. There is nothing like ICANN on the planet. Nothing. There is no private company that has 151 governments who show up to give it advice. There's just no such thing

on the planet. Professor Nye at Harvard is coming back from retirement to write a book about this, because he says there's just nothing like it.

So, yet, I arrived to countries not to the VIP lounges, but in coach sometimes to just rush through security. In Canada, I got strip searched before I could go meet with the Minister. So I am an ambassador or President of an institution, but yet I have no flag. And that takes incredible persuasion to actually be able to meet with political leaders. But you have no power. I have no tanks and no flag. I have the power of the value of the Internet, and that's it.

That's the second time that no one told me I'll have. And, of course, when I arrived after Snowden, everybody needed to figure out who to talk to, to either kill them or to tell them what to do. And so I politically did not expect I'll be in this maelstrom, but this was the second job. And it's a totally different task and a totally different set of...

So when you are helping us write who the next CEO should be, it's almost like you need to write the second job description, and it's very different from the first one.

And then there is a third job, which it's the job I understood last. And that's the fact that I'm also a community organizer and facilitator. Not just listening to the community, no. I have a proactive role to participate in keeping our community strong. Not leading the community, but facilitating and enabling the community. And that's a very different set of qualifications because people who are good at being CEO are typically not good as being servants.

I'm a community servant. You have to be a community servant. That's the role took me longest to understand. And it took, actually, a breaking point, some of you will know about this one, they will write it down in Istanbul last year. For me to actually fully appreciate that I'm not being a good community servant. And then I had to switch and start doing things differently.

And for those of you here who attended our SO/AC Dinner a few days ago, a couple of nights ago. Wasn't it, Alan? A couple of nights ago. Compared to, say, our SO/AC Dinner, which you didn't attend, Alan, in Singapore a year and a half ago, was day and night. Because we are now a community and I feel part of it.

So these three jobs are what the new CEO has to come in and do. It's not easy. It's very, very hard. Very hard spiritually, very hard physically, very hard mentally. And, therefore, I urge you – I urge you to – and I said this to my Board this morning. It is very important that the learnings we got out of my tenure, and the transformation ICANN went through during my tenure. Because ICANN is a different organization now. All of us transformed it, it's a different place. That that is imparted fully to the next person.

Because if we leave them with what I was left with when I arrived, it will take them another three years to figure it out. You cannot afford this. ICANN cannot afford this. The political environment can't afford this. So we must make sure that that the next person is vested with the knowledge of what has happened and what we've done. And,

therefore, I beg the Board today to make sure there is enough time for he or she and I to spend time together. It's very important.

Otherwise, I got ten minutes out of Rod Beckstrom. Honestly. Ten minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Who is this?

FADI CHEHADE: Now some people say, "It's good you only got ten minutes." But I actually disagree. I really, Rod, understood a lot of the things, took me time to understand. I needed to spend time with him. I needed to understand from him, even his... Or to go surfing with him or whatever, but I needed to really understand things.

Now, the Board did its best to explain things to me, but the Board is not all these things. The Board is, in fact, almost itself just another island of activity that I must understand. For example, our Board is not a board. The fact we call it a board is a problem. So I keep dealing with it like a board because I've dealt with boards since I'm 28. They're not a board.

They're a board about 10% of their time. 10% of their time, they are like a board. They get together, boom, boom, boom, they make decisions like a board. But they're also a tribal council. They're a tribal council. They represent tribes. And my father-in-law was a tribal leader in the villages of Lebanon, so all the tribal people would come

and form their council and once a month they meet. And the dynamics of that are not a board dynamic.

[Robust rules] and all the stuff that we use to run a board meeting don't apply to a tribal council. Because people come with very different interests and so the Board is also a tribal council. The Board is also a political body. So just like I have three jobs, our Board should have three names or three functions. And if the next person doesn't understand that, they have difficulty.

So I don't know what to tell you other than this is the best job I've ever had by far. I loved every minute. I will love every minute left. This is, by far, the most rewarding job I'll ever have, now until I die. Period. I'll be telling my kids about what I did here and, hopefully, they'll tell their kids, because I loved it. I loved every minute of it.

And lucky is the person who will take my place. As hard as this is, it is a lucky place to be. Because you get to see, and understand, and learn, and do things that would be very hard to do elsewhere. And I would be encouraging many of my colleagues, friends, people I know to look into being part of ICANN. Not just be in my job, but to be part of this great community. I have every good feeling towards you, towards this community.

And finally, just before I hear some of your questions, I want to tell you that from now until I leave, which is the last day of the Marrakech meeting, I will be, and will remain, committed to you and to ICANN. Every single minute. Not doing anything else. I'm not running to another job. This is my job, this is my commitment, this is where my

heart is, this is where I will be, until the last minute, to finish the political phase of this transition, which I will do. You can count on me.

And when I leave ICANN, I made myself available to the Board as much as they need, to the new CEO. I will give them all the time I can to help them in no capacity other than a community member who wants to help them. Okay? That's my commitment. Any questions to me?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I'm told Fadi has a hard stop in four minutes. We have, at this point, four speakers in the queue. I got Sandra, Fatima, Raf, and Holly. And I will close it at that point unless we get an extension. Each of you have about 30 seconds if we want an opportunity for Fadi to actually say anything back.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you. Just a quick question. Would you, or do you think it would be wise to engage really three people. Sebastien mentioned it already. There may be a leadership team instead of one CEO. Do you think this would work to have three CEOs with different tasks?

FADI CHEHADE:

We have a deep bench at ICANN. We have a fantastic bench of managers right now. When I started, I didn't have that. I didn't understand whom I needed. So, for example, my relations with the technical community have been frayed for a while. Why? Because I did not have people who understood that community by my side to help

me, to guide me. Canaries out there who come and tell me, “Fadi, this is how you need to deal with that.”

Today, all the staff is there. But it took me a while because also no one told me, “This is what you need to do. Go get these folks, this person will help you there.” I had to figure this out by making mistakes, and I made many mistakes. My hope is to help the next person not make them, but also, you don’t need three. And you don’t need someone who can do all the things. You don’t another need another Fadi. Don’t try to necessarily replace me. That’s not the solution.

Because when I came, there was nothing in terms of depth of understanding of the complexity of this job. ICANN was dealing operationally with digital archery, may I remind you. Right? I mean, this is the level of operational fighting we were having. We didn’t have a deep HR development department, we didn’t have financial capabilities. I can go on. The list is long.

But all of this is here now. So you don’t need me. You need a person who can come and take ICANN to the next phase, who’s better than me, but now settled with a deeper team and a richer community, and a richer staff. He or she will be lucky because I have a superb team – an amazing team – to serve you at ICANN. So no three people. Not a solution. Intel is the only company that built this concept of two in a box, and they would put two CIOs in a box, two people in a box. It didn’t go well. They actually have now completely stopped it.

And this organization needs a leader who is now focused more on my first job, not my second, not my third. Because a lot of the community

leaders are now where they need to be, and a lot of the political machinery of ICANN from Rodrigo to all the people we have around the world is in place. What we need is someone to finish the internal management of ICANN and get it to the level it needs to be. And it's not done yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Having lost complete control of the meeting, we now have six more people in the speaker list.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Let's go.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'll let you go until Cassia takes you away.

FADI CHEHADÉ: She does it [very well].

ALAN GREENBERG: Next we have Fatima.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Fatima, please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Mr. Chair. This is Fatima, for the record. I will be speaking in Spanish. I have a question and a remark. The question is, are you going to leave the three letters to the next CEO? The final letter says that if everything goes wrong, he or she has to resign.

In the previous session, I talked about the profiles of the new CEOs, and I talked about the commitment of the about terminating his... About completing his term. We volunteers are asked for some commitment, and I think that same commitment should be required from the CEO. I think it's a contradiction that you are telling us it's the best job you have ever had and you are leaving without completing the job somehow, before it is fully completed.

When we teach or communicate our experience with our students, we who are professors and we talk about leadership, we always say that a leader is a person who may start and complete a process. And I would love to have seen the process of accountability in IANA transition completed before you left. I hope you may give all these advices to the next CEO because the community will need it. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: [Inaudible] percent of the Spanish, but thank you for testing me, as always. You do, Fatima, with Spanish. Look, I want to tell you something. The most important project at ICANN today is to strengthen ICANN's independence. That's what we're doing. And not just ICANN's operational readiness, which we're putting a lot of effort on, but it's independence.

I don't use that word lightly. ICANN is not independent today. It's not. It has minders. When ICANN becomes independent, you become the minders. The world is not ready for that. They're very worried about that. This is why they're trying to create all kinds of structures to make us, because they don't trust us. They don't understand our model. They don't know how you guide me. It's very strange for them.

So they're trying to create all kinds of new structures, members, whatever, all that stuff, because they just don't understand us. They don't believe this. They don't believe that people, volunteers like you, could come and tell me what to do. They don't.

I will not leave until this independence is done. I will not leave until it's done, and it will be done by next March. The political end of the mandate on ICANN will be done by next March. I have to finish this. If I don't finish this for you, then frankly, I have left you with a major wound that is not easily solvable.

And there are layers and layers and layers of complexity to do the transition. The community sees about the top two, but there are layers of complexity inside governments, inside power structures, inside different places. Luckily, we have enough people, now, managing all those layers so that we can get out of this clean. And we will get there. But please, I beg you, do not give up on the multi-stakeholder model. Do not fall into a legal trap that makes us easily captureable. And I want to committee ALAC for its courage in this discussion.

And I saw him personally argue for this, for you. Do not let special interests, special governments, control ICANN. I won't, but help me.

We have a road to independence between now and early next year. We will finish it. We have to finish it. I promise you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Raf, 30 seconds.

RAF FATANI: With the aim of time, I'd just like to [inaudible] thank you for your time. But, also, I'd like to welcome you and encourage you to join a RALO post your leave and continue with the community post leaving, and being part of it from the other side. And I think there's a lot of value from us and from us to learn from you, as well. And [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly. 30 seconds.

HOLLY RAICHE: What will you miss most?

FADI CHEHADÉ: The people. There is no question, the people. There are many things I won't miss. There are many things that are different. But the people of this community and despite the fact we bicker and we do all of this all the time, and we get at each other's... But it's the people. It's all that will be left. It's the human giving that happens at this altar every single day.

I had an employee work so hard that – and she’s a young employee – that she slept on her keyboard and accidentally, her head was on the delete key. This is how hard people give to this community. She deleted 200 e-mails, and when she woke up, she had to—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sure.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Olivier doubts. No, but people give. This is an altar where people keep coming and giving. And that’s why I will miss the people the most. I will.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Aziz, 30 seconds.

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you, Alan. Being someone who witnessed the birth of ALAC and its evolution, I would like to thank Fadi because he attached great importance to our constituency. I hope the next year will give us even more importance and more momentum. You have been the ambassador for us as the CEO. You should know that you have also created new embassies throughout the world.

It is those ALSes that have been created and that have joined us. Your visit to [Rabaul] was an example of everything you’ve done for Africa and for your creation of embassies. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

It is me who thanks you, Aziz, for what you do every day. What each of you do in your regions. It's amazing. And Sebastien always said that to me when he was a member of the Board. ALSes are ICANN's treasure and they're not well understood. Not yet, in any event.

But, for instance, when we speak at ISOC, they said that their greatest treasure is their chapters. They say it. We don't say it. Not often enough, and not yet. But you are our greatest treasure, and we must do something with that. It's something we haven't done to this day. We have supported you and I look at your group today, and I must say it is amazing. But we must go on working together.

I still have ten months to go. Remember that. Keep that in mind, I'm not leaving tomorrow. I have another ten months to go, and I have decided to end in Africa for a reason. You know that. Firstly, because I promised you that. I promised you that that meeting would happen, even if I wanted to quit the organization in December, but I'm going to stay until Africa because we have a lot to do for Africa.

But you all are our treasure. So we must engage, we must commit more.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Barrack, next. Sorry, I was told you're in the queue. [Shun La] is last.

[SHUN LA]:

Okay. Thank you. I think my comment, a question has been asked by Fatima, so I will just skip that. But my final comment, Fadi, is to thank him. I think one of the things that I value in him is the fact that he takes people's comments or contribution, what they're saying more importantly than the person.

It's a surprise when you write to him and he responds. It's so surprising in some of the communications. So that is very important, and I think when the new CEO comes also, he needs to learn that. Thank you for the community engagement, and we hope that you still remain with the community, even when you leave. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Fadi. Thank you, [Cassia]. Sorry. We had one more item on the agenda for this session. That is the category 1 high-risk TLDs. We are going to defer that. I hope we will have the time in the next session. We're on coffee break now. We will start on [inaudible]. We will start at 11:00 sharp. I'm going to start at 11:00 sharp, even if the room is empty. And I might simply adjourn the rest of the discussion and you won't have a chance to talk if you're not here.

[audio break]

ALAN GREENBERG:

He says facetiously to those who are not in the room and cannot hear. Those of you who can hear, thank you. Could I ask our staff cat herders to try to gather the rest of our tribe? If we can get one more ALAC

member to sit down, we have quorum. Glenn is at the back of the room. Glenn, would you like to come to the table, please? Thank you. All right.

We now have quorum. We can start. The subject of the, I think, this meeting is the CWG IANA transition proposal that is on the table. Excuse me, please. The state of this subject right now is the CWG, the Cross-Community Working Group, on the IANA stewardship transition has issued a final report. As one of the chartering organizations, we have to either ratify that report, and our ratification is asked for by no later than Thursday. But if we could do it today, that would be even better.

We can refuse to ratify it with reasons, at which point the CWG would probably have to reconvene to discuss what to do. As if we are the only group that would refuse to ratify, I suspect we would not be given veto, and the report might or might not be modified and we'll go forward. We can ratify making comments as to how we believe the proposal should have been changed, acknowledging that there is no opportunity to do that now.

The comments, however, might be subject to implementation issues. That is, if what we're saying is not in violation of the report, of the proposal, it could be modified in some minor way by the implementation or, of course, the ICG may take a look at what our comments are and send it back to the CWG with those things in mind.

The ALT discussed this today, and our recommendation at this point – it's not a recommendation, but the consensus within the Leadership

Team was that we should ratify and make some comments. But to give an unconditional ratification so that as planned, the report can be submitted to the ICG for incorporation with the other two proposals they have, and that be done on this Thursday or by the end of Thursday.

So I'm presuming everyone has had, if not a thorough read of the proposal then, at least a brief one, but I would hope a thorough one, because this is really a very important issue. Now, to quickly summarize where we are today, you will recall that the first draft that was issued in December called for a completely different structure, the creation of something called Contract Co and a number of other entities that would be outside of ICANN.

Contract Co could and, in some people's mind, should, on a regular basis, go out for an RFP to, perhaps, award IANA to some entity other than ICANN. Although everyone was happy with ICANN as the initial IANA. The current proposal is structured radically different from that. It, essentially, awards the stewardship for the names function of IANA to ICANN. Period.

ICANN might, however, choose to have the function carried out by either the current IANA group – and the recommendation is that we spin that group off into a separate corporation but still fully controlled by ICANN. But in some point in the future, we could designate somebody else to do the job other than that particular group of people in ICANN.

For instance, we might decide, five years from now, that the job should be carried out, out of Geneva, out of Senegal. And, in which case, we could award the contract to someone else. But the stewardship remains within ICANN. So this is a very, very different proposal from what we were talking about before.

In December, the ALAC, with one exception that is the Australian Domain Authority, were the only ones who were saying that that model was basically faulted in a major way. It's now been accepted by the rest of the community. I don't think I want to go around saying, "We won, we won." But the change is quite significant.

Not everything in the current proposal is perfect, from our point of view. We have some problems that the optics, the visibility of the multi-stakeholder management is not seen at all aspects. But ultimately, the decision-making processes are all multi-stakeholder. And from my personal point of view, I believe if we did anything other than ratify it, we would be doing a disservice for the community.

But, as I said, the ALT is recommending that we do issue a number of caveats of why we have reservations, but that doesn't alter our ratification. At least that is the recommendation. I'd like to open the floor now. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Can you mention what the comments are going to be or do you have a list of those that we can talk about? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Eduardo. I think the largest single one is that we would have preferred to see the multi-stakeholder involvement in other places in the process. The CSE is one of those places we would have prefer to see a better presence. The ALAC does have the opportunity putting a liaison on the CSE, which is the group monitoring IANA performance on a regular basis.

If the CSE decides that there is something radically wrong that has not been fixable, it then goes to the GNSO and the ccNSO for, essentially, ratification that there's a problem and to convene a multi-stakeholder group to further investigate.

We made a strong statement saying we think that the GNSO is not fully representative of the organization, and therefore, it should be a wider group than that. On the other hand, those groups are there largely to make sure the CSE is not taking radical action on its own. There's only a small number of people in that group. So since it's really a gatekeeper, there is not viewed as a huge problem.

We can't really come up with many scenarios where the GNSO and ccNSO would approve going to the next step and the ALAC wouldn't, for instance. But there's a matter of visibility and how it looks. Other people can correct me, but I think that's the main substance of the issues. There are some other minor ones, but I'm not sure that we would want to make them as visible at this point, other than complaining that we didn't quite get our way.

And, of course, the whole concept of multi-stakeholderism is you have to compromise. I have [Shun] next and then Olivier.

[SHUN LA]: Yeah, this is [Shun] for the record. Thank you, Alan. Eduardo has asked the question I wanted to ask, but I just want to ask another one. Is it the ALT considering looking at the comments of RALOs, regional RALOs for instance? AFRALO, for instance. Made a statement in relation to the CWG. So are you considering integrating that into your overall statement, as well? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: First of all, as a clarification. The ALT has no authority to do anything, and the ALT has already considered, and we've already said we are suggesting that we ratify with some statements. I cannot imagine the statement being drafted without Tijani being involved, and to the extent he chooses to take into account what AFRALO has said, I will leave to him.

Again, I would not want this statement to be a long laundry list of everything where we didn't get our way. But things that we think are worth putting on the record, understanding they're not likely to change – I don't think we are in a position to ignore anything that doesn't mean everyone's words get echoed verbatim. Certainly, I know mine won't all be echoed verbatim. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And speaking about the escalation process, I was one of the people that felt very uncomfortable when, in the past, you had the GNSO and the ccNSO. And I thought we were starting to lose this

multi-stakeholder component of the whole system, especially looking at the different committees that were being set up.

Certainly, the Customer Standing Committee is composed primarily of registries, and so the GNSO and the ccNSO, I guess, would also be driven primarily by the registries being involved in the whole process, and being involved in those committees. However, what was reminded to me was that this is just one of several steps in the escalation process.

So we don't actually have a diagram for this, but the way it goes is that the CSC would only – so the Customer Standing Committee would only escalate up if there wasn't any agreement within the post-transition IANA Board within the employees, the registries, all of the discussions that were [tapeless] at that level. Then it would go via the GNSO and ccNSO more as a gatekeeper function, as you mentioned.

The GNSO and ccNSO haven't got any other processes in place than having a vote, needing a vote of a super-majority to be able to escalate to the next level. And the next level is the IANA Functions Review. And that's a multi-stakeholder team where the ALAC would have significant influence and would be able to take fully part in this. It's, I would say, [inaudible] fully multi-stakeholder [but it is] multi-stakeholder.

If the IANA Functions Review Team decides that separation is needed and something – So a whole call for RFPs and so on is needed. That would then be sent over to a separation cross-community working group, which is another multi-stakeholder group. And they would be

then the ones who would be creating the RFP. They are the ones who would be making the selection, and calling out for other organizations to apply for this.

So the multi-stakeholder component in this whole escalation process is actually there, And I don't think we should be concerned about the GNSO or the ccNSO being those gatekeepers. I think it actually works in favor of stability. And by the time it reaches the separation working group, there really is something technically very wrong with the IANA functions. It's very unlikely that this would be exploited for political reasons. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And I'll remind people that when we say separation, this is separation of the operational group of nine people into another group, presumably, of another nine people, or maybe the same nine people in a different corporate housing.

We're not talking about separation from ICANN, so it's not the onerous separation we were talking about in the last proposal. The other comment it's worth bringing to the larger group here, because not everyone was paying a lot of attention. One of the alternatives to this GNSO was the Registry Stakeholder Group, because it is a gatekeeper function, and one of my problems that I had with it was not that the registries would sanity check the smaller group of registries on the CSC, but that in the GNSO we are including the commercial stakeholder group, the IPC, the noncommercial people, the business constituency.

So it is a subset of stakeholders, but not the whole set. It doesn't include, for instance, perhaps the most important group, the SSAC. It doesn't include information from the root servers, who are a rather critical part of the organization. So it wasn't so much that it lacked many multi-stakeholders, but it took a selected bunch of the multi-stakeholders. Instead, they're more equal than others, which I thought sent a wrong message. But operationally, I have no problem with it.

The other groups just add an extra level of restriction to make it even harder to go through that process, which I think is a rational thing to do. I have had no other people. I now see Sebastien. Is there anyone else who I missed giving little indications? Seeing no hands. Sebastien, you're on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Few points. I would like to have the list of the items where there it just suggests that At-Large write a comment. Second, I would, very much, to have the inputs of each and every member from At-Large or from ALAC who were a member of this CWG working group, what is their thinking. And, please, without be shy about your own position. Because if we send five people, it's also to have five, I will not say point of view, but at least five different possible comprehension of the situation. And I would like very much to have that.

Because I have some concern with what is the current projection. One of them is if, by bad chance or bad luck for whatever reason, the IANA left ICANN, I know it's not the goal, but then it's left the only multi-

stakeholder body we have, where we are the voice as end user, and it will be dramatically damaging for us. That's one point.

The second is that it seems that there are firm requirement from the CWG through the CCWG, and we are still in the CCWG, and the discussion of the issues, if it's come to it's what we want and you don't have the choice to discuss it. I feel it's a little bit problematic. Either the group send request to discuss something or they say, "We want that." And if you want that, then there is no discussion.

I take the example of the recall of the whole Board. It's one of the subjects. I hope that we will be able to discuss when we will go through the CCWG report. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. A couple of comments. Yes, I certainly welcome going around the table to the five people who are appointed as formal members representing the ALAC and At-Large for their comments. So yes, I fully support that. in terms of the list of things we would put, if the ALAC agrees on the basic methodology, we will have to draft something in the next day and refine it so that we can adopt it on Thursday at our closing meeting.

So, as I said, my recollection is – and I'm tired, I admit – is that it's largely an issue of multi-stakeholder visibility and apparent multi-stakeholderism, but there may well be others that I have forgotten. And the drafting would have to be done very, very quickly. So

certainly, the ALAC would have to be given an opportunity to look at that.

In terms of the CCWG, the CWG report is contingent on the CCWG delivering a certain set of accountability measures. It is contingent on it. It blows up and turns into smoke if the CCWG does not deliver. So let's make that clear. That is part of the recommendation.

And lastly, in terms of leaving ICANN, we have no control over whether the IETF and the RIRs choose to move away from our IANA to an IANA managed by someone completely separate from ICANN. That is outside of our control.

The stewardship of the names function of IANA stays in ICANN. Period. There is no provision for it moving from ICANN. Only moving is who ICANN designates as the people responsible for doing the job on a day-to-day basis. That's a very different separation than we were talking about before. So of the three parts, we have no control over two, and the third one isn't going anywhere.

Now, what happens if ICANN, for other reasons, dissolves? That's an interesting question that our report is not addressing. Thank you. Olivier, I think. Yes. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I just wanted to remind you all, we are just dealing with IANA stewardship transition here. I guess, yes, we do have concerns if there is separation in the future and a new totally independent organization takes over these functions, and we don't

have any ability to control them in any way. But that's not something that would be in this report.

I would imagine that when the – if we have to cross that line, when a separation working group issues an RFP, it will be working on this. And, obviously, there will be new rules for the new operator to follow.

I cannot imagine that a new operator for the IANA functions will be allocated that would be totally independent of the policy process at ICANN, and would be able to run off, do whatever it wants without taking into account the policy that's being developed at ICANN. For the names, of course. Dealing with the names.

And, obviously, if we start with separation, then there's also the fact that there are three functions, and then do you split the functions, etc. This is totally outside the scope of the current exercise.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Remember. The stewardship for the names function remains in ICANN. If ICANN, in the future, decides to shut down PTI, post-transition IANA, allocate to Jimmy Schulz the responsibility for running, doing all of the IANA names functions – so he runs the root zone – and we explicitly tell Jimmy, “You can ignore everything we say on the policy front. You make the rules.” We could do that. But it still is ICANN signing the contract to tell Jimmy he can do that. And I don't really think it's something we can cover.

But it would also be ICANN that could take that contract away from Jimmy and change the rules sometime later. So yes, conceivably, I

would think if we award the contract to anyone, whether it's PTI or someone else, we're going to put some clauses in that contract, say, "Oh, by the way. If we set policy, you have to follow it."

And much of the policy we're talking about is lower-case policy right now. ICANN, I don't believe, has ever set formal policy regarding capital "P" Policy regarding IANA functions. But we have some very long-established processes and practices, which are the de facto policy that they are following.

Olivier, and then I'd like to go around the table to the five people. And Eduardo is one of the five people, so you can say whatever you want at that point. Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I think it might well be that some SSAC policies were followed. I mean, they're not policies as such, but for example, the use of DNSSEC is something that was asked for by the SSAC. And I think that this somehow translated into the root being signed and all of these things. And, of course, there's also the keys for DNSSEC. These were also set by ICANN for IANA to pursue. But it's a sideline issue, anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, I don't think it's SSAC. Certainly, we adhere to many, many rules set by the IETF. There had been some practices that have been established by joint groups that include the IETF, ICANN, and a bunch of other bodies, and have been led by the NTIA. But I'm not sure

ICANN has set formal policy like that. But ICANN has acted as the overseer to establish the practices and policies. We're getting into an area that I think is beyond what we need to consider here.

I'd like to go around the table in table order, which means Eduardo is first for the five representatives of the At-Large on the CWG. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, if you can later, after I finish, explain what's the difference between capital letter Policy and lower letter policy so we understand what that means.

But in regards to the IANA, a question. This escalation process where we have the PTI, which is the board that will manage the operations, and then we have the CSC, which is overseeing how well the operation is performing. And then we have GNSO and the ccNSO as a filter before triggering another process.

I agree with Alan that the issue there – and we have been talking about multi-stakeholder since from the PTI. They say, “Well, the PTI have to be multi-stakeholder” and says, “No, it's strictly an operational thing.” And then we move into the CSC, which is checking the performance of the IANA and this strictly is something very technical about the metrics and things like that. So because we talk about the multi-stakeholder and the level of the CSC.

And suddenly, there is the GNSO, [ccNSO] filter going before triggering the mechanism where there is multi-stakeholder organization that will decide on RFP and making changes to the operation.

So I see those like filters, the CSC and the GNSO, [ccNSO]. And one of the arguments that was brought up when the GNSO, [ccNSO] was put in there is they are a policy organization. They don't do any operations. And suddenly in here, they're going to decide – they're a filter for something that happens within an operation.

In any case, so going back to what Alan said about this perception of multi-stakeholder not being there. I think that's the main issue. But really, there is this group that will be triggered that will make, really, changes to the operations if it goes [inaudible] stays inside is a multi-stakeholder committee.

So within that regard, you get these filters to get to that that trigger point when that happens. The group will be made the old community. So thank you very much. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Fatima is next.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Alan. I will be speaking in Spanish. As a matter of fact, lately, I haven't been totally up-to-date with the discussion. I'm going to repeat what Eduardo has said. He is continuously giving me information and updating me, and I think it's important to talk about

the PTI. It should be made up by multi-stakeholders because we have said this and [inaudible] from the very beginning, ever from the first face-to-face meeting we had in Frankfurt.

And, apparently, we have remind these two people over and over again because people tend to forget about this multi-stakeholder component. I'm going to stop here. If I have further comments, I will take the floor again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess I have to make a comment here. Another word for multi-stakeholder is political. Because the whole concept of multi-stakeholder is different. People with very strong opinions coming to closure on it. I feel very strongly that PTI itself, the operational part, should be as devoid from politics as possible.

So I am quite supportive of the Board of PTI not being a multi-stakeholder operation. It's a group that can manage the operation and, if there's a problem, fix problems. On the other hand, the control of PTI, ultimately, the decision of whether of how we handle significant problems that we can't address must be multi-stakeholder, and those are in the current environment.

So I would personally not be very happy if we said that PTI itself must be multi-stakeholder. I know it's one of the things we discussed many times, but I think adding multi-stakeholderism at that point gives an opportunity for different political factions to put their hand into the

operational thing. And I think that's one of the scarier thoughts that I could have.

Olivier next, I believe.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. In fact, could we just remind everyone the current composition of the PTI Board? So it's the ICANN Chief Technical Officer, I believe; the IANA CEO. I don't even know it by heart.

ALAN GREENBERG: The Chief Technical Officer, who is now David Conrad. The Chief Operating Officer, who's Akram Atallah. The Head of IANA, Elise Gerich. And there has been a very active debate going on as to what her title should be. One of the more humorous threads that I've read. I think Supreme Commander is the right title for almost everyone, actually. So I plan to change the name of Chair of ALAC to that. That's a joke, in case anyone didn't know.

And then two independent directors named by the NomCom or some similarly composed body. So essentially, three people controlled who have a significant control by ICANN. And since it's an ICANN-owned corporation, that makes sense. And then some independents to make sure that we don't go completely astray. That's the current board. That is the board and the proposal, rather.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, Akram is not COO of ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't say CEO, Chief Operating.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: COO. He's not COO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I'm wrong. I can't remember what the board [inaudible] proposal says. No. I thought it was Akram Atallah in whatever title it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not debating what Akram's title is. I thought that the description was mapped to Akram. Because currently, Elise reports to Akram, and I thought it was the right title that applies to Akram. I may be wrong. We can check the document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Yeah. Akram is running the Global Domains Division, the GDD. So with regards to this whole process I think that, indeed, you're absolutely right in saying that the PTI Board is entirely technical. And I have noticed also that there is a recommendation in there that the NomCom selecting two people to be on that board will be looking specifically at technical people. Not politics, technical.

Because it is a technical function and, really, what the Board is there to do is to make sure things get fixed, if the function itself has not performed according to service level expectations, which are going to be tightened, I understand. So topmost quality. I'm very pleased with the overall final report.

Yes, we might have not gotten all of the things that we wanted, but this is a consensus. This is a consensus. We have to give way to a few things in order to get a few other things. The first round that we had in Frankfurt with this Contract Co and so on was completely inadmissible and was certainly captureable by specific vested interests. I believe that the current proposal makes it very difficult for vested interests and political interests to be able to capture this.

And I think that's what we should be looking for. We should be looking for something that keeps the function stable, uncaptureable for political reasons, and that ensures the operational continuity of the Internet so that the Internet end users don't even notice that there's been any change. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. [Shun] next.

[SHUN]: Okay. This is [Shun], for the record. Hearing myself. Thank you, Alan. I think I can't wait for this to be over. I think it's been a lot of [bandwidth] and a lot of energy that has been spent on this. It's a very good progress we've made. Without echoing what my other

colleagues have also said, it's a good, significant improvement. We haven't made some of the things that I personally will have wished to have been part of the proposal did not make it, but again, maybe that is part of the multi-stakeholder compromise.

However, I think I need to mention a few things that I think we need to pay attention to. And again, we shouldn't see that [inaudible] saying it's a compromise. It's a compromise and so we move on because it could actually [inaudible] after the whole implementation.

From the proposal, I think the [IFLT] decisions then goes back to the GNSO and ccNSO for consideration and approval. I'd like to be corrected if that has changed recently. If [IFLT] is indeed the multi-stakeholder decision-making group, then I don't see why it needs to go back to GNSO for approval again.

Then the other thing I think we may want to consider is whether ALAC or At-Large is considering to have a statement. I mean, have a statement include the issue of their view about the trademark of the IANA trademark and the domain name. I think it's important we have our view about that, and then. Am I timed? Okay.

I think, overall, it's not about the fact that there is a multi-stakeholder point at the time. It's also a fact that there's a need to actually observe the process that takes the issues to the top. So we need to ensure that CSC is transparent enough and we're actually monitoring the activities and seeing that the reason why they're actually taking this thing to the next level is justified.

We need to see the reason that GNSO, for instance, is taking it to [IFLT] is justified. We don't want to invest so much in converging and setting up an [IFLT] just to discuss what we finally realized that is not what taking to the top in the first place. So I think those should also be considered. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. [Shun], I have a question or two. First of all, you asked are we considering making a statement on the trademark and the use of the IANA.org. My personal recommendation would be no. There is a recommendation in the CWG report. The last I saw, I believe, but I may be wrong, Alissa Cooper on behalf of the IETF said, "I can live with that."

But if not, it's an ICG issue to come to some agreement between the various groups. I, personally, do not think it's a particularly important issue. I think the only group that has a real vested interested in it is the IETF because the domain name is embedded in code because of their standards, and they have the most to lose if something goes awry.

I, personally, from a user perspective. Yes, users are obviously impacted but I don't think we have a particular unique perspective. So I would not recommend a statement on that. But I have a question for you. You're saying that the review team that would be convened to look at whether we should convene a separation team, it's a multi-step procedure, should not go back to the GNSO and ccNSO for ratification. Are you suggesting the ALAC withhold ratification because of this? Or are you simply suggesting we make a comment [inaudible]?

[SHUN]: No. We make a comment. Not [inaudible] stuff.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Because at this point, there is no process by which the CWG is going to consider these comments today. They might consider it if the ICG recommends it, if the ICG bounces it back. But I want clarity. I don't want people misunderstanding what it is we're saying when we say we ratify. Okay. [Shun], did you want to make a comment.

[SHUN]: Yes. I think, yeah, we make it as a comment. However, it depends on how the CWG sees it. If you think it's important to reflect it before they send to the ICG, they could do so. I don't think we should say the current proposal as final-final. It's not stamped yet. Things can still be changed if they want.

However, I'm not saying that we should make it as a condition. It's not the reason why we should not support the report or the proposal. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for clarity, from the CWG's proposal, this position, this is final-final. If it gets bounced back to the CWG because either some group doesn't ratify or the ICG come back, that's a different issue. But from the CWG's position itself, it is final at this point. So that's fact. You can't really change that.

Cheryl is not here. She's at an all-day NomCom meeting. But I think I can say, with some authority, that the position that Olivier and I have put forward, saying we believe this is a good proposal, it may not be perfect, but it is a good proposal and should be 100% supported by the ALAC. I have no difficulty in saying that she would say if she were here. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Alan, nobody said that ALAC should object or reject the proposal. But [Shun] said we may make comments. We may draw the attention of the CWG about certain points. And you said it is a final-final proposal. Yes, because it is submitted to the chartering organization. But if a comment come from all the chartering organization, this doesn't prevent the CWG to correct or to change something, knowing that it is approved by all the chartering organizations. But there is a detail that the chartering organization want to make. It may be corrected on the final submission to the ICG.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Eduardo is next, but a comment. And I have spoken to the co-chairs of the CWG on this. If we do not ratify, they have to reconsider. If we ratify, it will be submitted. So we're not going to do a Doodle to decide whether we meet again or not, at this point. And I asked [Shun] about whether he was suggesting we withhold ratification because the wording of what he... No, what he answered, the wording what he said made it a little bit unclear, and I just wanted clarity.

We don't want people leaving this room thinking we're saying one thing and meaning something else. So I just want clarity.

Eduardo, we have 15 minutes left in this session and we really wanted to try to make up some of the time to go back on to PICs. So if you have something new to say, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I just wanted to add to the comment that I made before that I support the proposal the way it is. It's a compromise, but from what we had in December, this is a better compromise that we had then. But that's my recommendation that we support what it is, and if we needed to correct that in the future, we will do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would like to make a suggestion that we charge the ALAC Leadership Team with drafting a first draft of the comment that we will make along with the ratification, and that we try to have that done no later than mid-tomorrow. We may not make that target, but try to head for that. Do I have general agreement consensus that that's a reasonable way forward? Okay.

We don't need cards. If no one is screaming no, then we have consensus. Tijani and Sebastien.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, Alan. I agree with your proposal, but if someone in this room wants to participate in the drafting, there is no harm.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've rarely seen us refuse to let someone participate. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe a different [inaudible], but why the five people selected by At-Large to be member of this working group are not in charge of writing that? It's their way participating day-to-day in this job, and I think it's the right people. You have enough people from the ALT inside this five people, and I guess some of the two people have already a lot to do and maybe it will be better to involve them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Noted. Given that one of the people who have been selected has said that she hasn't been able to pay full attention to this, and the other one is not going to be available, and we are willing to take anyone else on who wants to participate, I would suggest we leave it at the original proposal unless I hear any strong objections from the ALAC.

Having none, we have an action item on the ALT and whoever else chooses to participate to create a draft, hopefully, within the next 24 hours for consideration by the ALAC. The normal reality of that means one or two people will draft something and get the other three or four, or whatever to look at it, and then we'll submit it to the ALAC.

Sebastien, do you want to speak again? Done?

Okay. We pulled back the other item from the agenda, and that is the public interest commitments on the high-sensitivity TLDs. I put that document out for discussion a week or so ago. We've got about four or five people on the list saying they support the analysis. I would like to be able to, going into the meeting with the GAC, I believe on Tuesday, and the meeting with the Board should the issue come up, be able to say what the position of the ALAC is on that analysis.

That analysis, for clarity, was done by Olivier, myself, and Evan Leibovitch as the three people who were primarily interacting with the Board New gTLD Process Committee. And it was being done on a timeframe where we didn't have a lot of options to get wider inclusion on it.

But if anyone feels uncomfortable with the analysis and would like to say why, then this would be a good opportunity to do that. There may be some copies left over from the meeting with the NCSG for those who don't recall what it looked like and want a paper copy. I open the floor. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you, Alan. I made a comment and it was kindly corrected. I understood the correction and I do agree with that. So thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And for those people who were here this morning in the meeting with the NCSG, you have seen that there was no support from the NCSG for this specific paper with a concern that was expressed that a North American organization would be regulating content or would be seen to be regulating content around the world. And I think that we have to vehemently go against that because, ultimately, our goal is to have ICANN as a global organization, not a North American organization.

And if we start saying, “Well, this is North America dictating content on everywhere else,” that is really looking at the wrong end of the stick, basically.

The concerns, which I expressed this morning, were that although in North America and Western Europe there might be local laws or the ability to litigate against anyone that misuses these domains and that hurts consumer interests – and by consumer, I equate this to end user interests. In other words, you go on the website under these, you think you were with a legitimate website, and actually it’s completely illegitimate and you end up losing money or other things. In some cases, even losing your life if you buy fake medications and so on.

This is something, which can be remedied in the Western world. But in the most countries around the world, it’s not. And so what we will have is victims that will have no recourse whatsoever. That’s really the concern that I have on this. The need for harm before action takes place is simply not acceptable for an organization that has to, by its bylaws and through the [OSE], act in the public interest. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. As a North American, I characterize it somewhat different than what some people in the NCSG said. I don't think of us as a North American organization regulating what should be on the Internet.

However, I would phrase it that if indeed ICANN is a North American institution, let's just accept that for that matter. And the North American institution is doing its best to make sure people can't register domains that are used for phishing and ones that are particularly harmful, I think that's a credit to the North American organization to do that.

I disagree with the characterization of the organization, but nevertheless, public interest I think comes first over freedom of the domain industry, in my mind. So Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I also think...

ALAN GREENBERG: Say your name.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, for the record. I also think maybe we add a bit because the characterization of regulating content, which is the way it was characterized this morning. You dismissed it very well this morning. I think it's probably worth dismissing again, saying this is not about regulating content. It's actually about regulating the names relating to

content. And in fact, it is not out of jurisdiction if, in fact, we accept the characterization this morning that we have a jurisdiction that is incredibly limited.

I think we actually have to reply to the way that Milton characterized his comments this morning. I think it's sort of done in the paperwork. Maybe we just add a sentence or two to stress what we're saying.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Noted, and please remind us to do that. We have a comment on the Adobe Connect from Evan Leibovitch, which he's asked to have read into the record.

ARIEL LIANG:

I will read Evan Leibovitch's comment for him. "I am proposing that, in addition to that the scoresheets that ALAC had sent, that ICANN ALAC prepare a public information brochure that identifies the problem and at least informs the public to be aware. That is to understand that simply because a TLD string indicates a public trusted ward does not mean that there is any regulation of those strings. This is, IMO, especially necessary for the TLDs listed in read in the report card."

ALAN GREENBERG:

Noted. Next, we have Garth.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. Garth Bruen, NARALO Chair. I feel it's very important to echo what Holly said. It's a false answer and a false narrative to the question to answer it in terms of content. This is not about content. This is about commerce and transactions in the existing rules that underlie all of ICANN's contracts with registrars and on the registrars with domain registrants.

Our constant complaints within the community concern the way that the contracts are or are not enforced as they're written. And the contract as they're written don't deal with content, and our complaints don't necessarily deal with content.

To echo what Oliver said, I don't particularly care if there is a website discussing in detail the benefits of using illegal performance-enhancing drugs. That's a conversation. Selling illegal performance-enhancing drugs in places where it's illegal, that's a different story. And using false registration records to mask the true location and ownership of these operations is within ICANN's mandate.

So when we ask these questions about enforcement, to answer them in a context of content is a false answer to our question. And we have to make sure we stay on point.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I think it's important to remember what we're talking about here is simply allowing a string to be used and under what conditions it can be used.

Ultimately, we have no control over what goes on. We're simply saying that for certain string that, in the public's mind, have a meaning in virtually every jurisdiction in the world, rarely – I don't know many jurisdictions where someone can say they're a medical doctor just because they feel like it. There may be some. I haven't checked them all, but that's really the level at which we're talking about here.

There are a lot of issues and problems in ICANN, and we're not going to fix them all with this particular issue. But I think we need some clarity. And when people try to characterize it as we're controlling content, I think they are mischaracterizing it at a [inaudible] global level.

We have Alberto. Is there anyone who I've missed other than Alberto and the speaker's list? No. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO:

I do agree with my last three colleagues. Today, the group with the acronyms that I remember said or spoke about their activities and that ALAC was taking the wrong way somehow. And I said that it was not only ALAC; it was also the GAC. Alan also said that it was someone or another group that was getting the wrong path.

And what we do is to try to avoid the abuse of the strings, and we said that if there is abuse, we can resort to the legal system. The legal system does protect, as I said before. If we have law, we can protect, but if there is no law, we cannot protect. We cannot protect the legal asset.

Therefore, there are certain places where no laws are available, and abuse may be produced and may exist – and what we do is taking this into account, what we do is to protect this. It is our duty to protect this.

We have the duty towards the end user, and there are certain end users that do not have any legal systems. So what we do is to protect the right use of a string, and not the content of that string. They said we were getting the wrong path, but I'm wondering, if we are not the ones doing this, who is going to protect the rights of end users?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. All right. I'd like to have a consensus call. [Inaudible], last comment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Sorry. I had to interfere because I think we haven't discussed that yet. I don't think that we are the right organization to discuss if it's a misuse or not. The states, national laws do that. But we have to make sure that the whole thing works. And we haven't discussed the point, and I think it's quite important.

Should we allow anonymous gTLDs or not, so we don't know who is registering domains. And I think anonymity is, well, a fundamental right because it's part of privacy.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There is a general PDP going on right now talking about privacy and proxy services. I do not want to change the message here where we're talking about selected TLDs. I think one of the GAC requests could have been no proxy registrations allowed on these sensitive TLDs. They did not choose to do that, and I don't think we want to introduce that at this late date.

Maybe they should have said that, maybe they shouldn't have. I'm not disagreeing with the endpoint with you, but I don't think we can do that. To be clear, we are not deciding anything. All I was going to ask for ratification of is the analysis that was done, do you feel comfortable with it?

That is, we are identifying some TLDs that were the current safeguards that they have committed to are sufficient. Other ones where there should be discussion or at least elaboration from the registry of what safeguards they are providing, and a few where we believe the safeguards need to be stronger.

For instance, I'll give an example. Dot-doctor, which is medical doctor right now, and only medical doctors. The GAC asked for prior certification that is the registry or the registrar check the credentials that someone really has an MD license, a medical license. From my personal point of view, I'm not sure that's necessary.

If the registry commits to checking that after the fact within the first week or first month, this is a long-term venture. We're going to be around for a while. Yes, someone may be tricked on the first day, but I think that's a reasonable thing to say for that particular one because

we're talking very significant costs and really impacting the overall business model that we're looking at.

So I think compromises are to be made. On dot-bank, however, if dot-bank had not voluntarily done preverification, which they are doing, that one I would try to veto. Because it only takes the first 12 hours of a domain name for phishing to work. Okay. I really had closed the queue. Garth, very quick intervention, because we have another item and we're already overlapping lunch at this point.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Alan. I have to directly contradict your assumptions about dot-doctor. Because, just like with phishing for banking, people can be deceived by a fake doctor as quickly as they can with a bank. And I think opening up that for two days, that two-day window is a problem, too.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just to be clear, our statement simply makes it read. I was giving a personal opinion of what I would be satisfied with. No one's actually asked me.

[MIKE]:

[You're satisfied with the fake doctor in two days].

ALAN GREENBERG: People respond to e-mails that ostensibly come from their own bank. I don't really foresee people getting fake e-mails ostensibly coming from their own doctor, and Mike responded. Let's not have the debate. We're not asking for ratification. I gave a personal opinion. We can have that debate over lunch. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Comment from Evan [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a comment from Evan. Would someone please read that comment very quickly so we can go on with this meeting?

ARIEL LIANG: Comment from Evan Leibovitch: "The issue is greater than content, and besides, ICANN has already crossed that line when, by policy, it allowed for the inclusion of objectionable strings and is in the middle of controversy over dot-sucks. The issue is greater than content. The issue is public trust in the DNS."

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't believe there anyone here who disagrees that the ALAC is allowed to weigh in on this and should the question, right now, is do we have consensus that we feel comfortable presenting the analysis as an ALAC position as opposed to a position of three people? I'm asking for a consensus call. Is there anyone who disagrees strongly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Disagree.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are disagreeing. All right. Olivier is disagreeing with his own opinion. Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just a friendly one minute. On one of those listed domains in there, let's have a quick look. Here we go. Number 32, for SARL. The comment on the right-hand column is government forum allows a government to, when defined, about – well, to when defined... Find out about a new registration, there's no comment there. Presumably paying for that service, they can make a comment into a WHOIS entry pretty useless. I don't think this is ready for presentation to the GAC. Perhaps we could just reword that thing to make it a bit more soft. Because I don't think governments should be qualified as pretty useless.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier is suggesting that the consensus call be subject to some cleaning and minor editing of the language so that we don't offend people. I would support that as a friendly amendment. Thank you for pointing that out. Not thank you for not pointing out over the last three months or so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [I think I might have written that to start with].

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll take this as a decision by consensus. Okay. Thank you, all, for that. We will do a cleanup of the language before prior to the GAC meeting.

The next item on the agenda is the ALAC has ratified four of the five delegates to the 2016 NomCom. At the time that we did the ratification, EURALO had not named their delegate, or their recommendation for a delegate, because it is a choice of the ALAC.

EURALO has now recommended that Yrjo Lansipuro be named as their delegate or the delegate from Europe to the NomCom. We have a practice within the ALAC that votes on personnel issues be conducted by private vote. So I am first asking this group. Is there anybody here – and all it will take is one objection – anyone on the ALAC, who believes we should do this by a private vote? By a secret ballot.

The question is, do we ratify Yrjo as the delegate and you would have, on a secret ballot, you would have the option of ratify, not ratify, or abstain. Is there anyone here who believes we should be using a secret ballot to do this? All we need is one ALAC member to object. We have no objection. In which case, I will now ask the ALAC for do you approve Yrjo Lansiputo as the EURALO delegate to the NomCom? I have a show of cards from ALAC members only. Their cards or hands. Staff, could I ask you to count them, please?

Who is missing?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Beran is not in the AC room. We have tried to contact her. But right now, in this room, we have 14 out of 15. Ariel, are you ready to announce the vote? Results of the vote?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. You can put your hands or cards down. We have a rule that's saying on votes that for people not present at the meeting, we can extend the vote to allow staff to contact them. I ask you to contact Beran and see if she agrees on this. And let's say within the next 48 hours, and presuming that either she – regardless of her vote at this point, it is passed, but it would be nice to have a unanimous vote, if possible. So please try to contact Beran and ask her. Otherwise, that business is conducted. Thank you very much.

We're on lunch until... Sorry, I actually have one other item. Before Olivier, I have one other item that I was supposed to be doing at the beginning of the meeting. And because we started 20 minutes late, I chose not to. As some of you may have noticed, the schedule for this meeting is a little bit confusing, complex, and has been a moving target.

There are two people in this room who – there are many people in room have been involved in setting this agenda. There are two people who bore the brunt of it. One is Leon, who in parallel with having trying to run the CCWG, was heavily involved in the scheduling, and I

won't say more important, but I will say more important. Gisella, who has overseen this. [applause]

And now I'll finish my sentence. And made changes up until not only the last moment but ongoing at this point, because the rules are still changing as we speak. And we owe her a real lot of gratitude. And now we can applaud. [applause]

Olivier, did you want a last word before I adjourn this part of the meeting? Yes, you do. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I do have one question with regards to an agenda item, which is not on our agenda yet, but I wanted to find out when we were going to have this. And that's the council motion on the issues report for subsequent round of new gTLDs. I don't know if we have the time now to go into it or if we have to table it later on in the day.

What we do need, though, is to have a decision by tomorrow. In fact, sorry, by Tuesday. We need a decision by Tuesday because we need to be able to circulate the decision over to people in the BC and other parts of the GNSO at the time. It's the friendly amendment that asks for the PDP to start before the issues report is published or after the issues report is published. No need to go any further, but I just wanted to make sure we're aware of this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. We will try to fit it into the schedule sometime this afternoon. I do not know when. Keep on reminding us, and we'll do our best. If not, we will do it on e-mail and ask for people all to positively answer, but I would like to do it in person so we have an opportunity for a bit of interchange on it.

The issue, to summarize very quickly, is there will be a PDP looking at changes for the next round of gTLDs. There is also going to be an AOC review looking on consumer trust. Everyone agrees that the PDP cannot end until the AOC review report is out. The question is can it start before then or not? In other words, can it partly run in parallel with the AOC review or does it have to wait until the AOC review is done? That's the overall question. We'll elaborate a little bit when we get to it on the agenda, but exactly when that will be, I don't know.

Of course, if we come to closure on the CCWG discussion in less than an hour, it will be easy. I'm not predicting that. Heidi is suggesting we take our 15-minute coffee break in the afternoon and eliminate that. I think we all love that idea. Remind me when we are reconvening and what the first subject is on the agenda because I can't find it at this point.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's the CCWG.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We are reconvening at 2:00.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 1:30.

ALAN GREENBERG: 1:30. We have a whole hour and a quarter?

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may, Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry. I'll turn it over to Gisella because I obviously don't know what's going on. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. The next meeting here is from 12:15 to 1:15, which is the At-Large Review Working Party. The ALAC will reconvene at 13:30 and the first agenda item will be accountability. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Gisella, may we leave our things here? I suppose yes, but this is Leon. This is Leon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]