
BUENOS AIRES – Joint Meeting of the ALAC and the ICANN Board

Tuesday, June 23, 2015 – 08:30 to 09:30

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

STEVE CROCKER:

Good morning, everybody. This is the first of a series of experiments that we're running today to try to make better use of the time in a very specific way. As everybody knows, this is a time when the board meets with several different constituencies. What we've tried to do, based upon some feedback and some thought, is to say, let's identify issues ahead of time and particularly issues which are specific to the constituency. We'll try to take common issues, rather than, from the board's point of view, interacting on the same issue over and over again with each constituency, and try to move those into the public forum. Not a hard-and-fast rule and we certainly had some interactions with constituencies that said, "No, we want to have that discussion with you anyway."

So that was one part of the experiment.

And the other part of the experiment is to have a kind of richer dialogue with a smaller set of people who are engaged in a back-and-forth.

So we asked, both within the board and within your group, to select a handful of people, and I was a little surprised when I walked in to see the way it's arranged here because I had a kind of more intimate closer model --

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.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: Yes. And who are you? Yeah.

But we'll try this out and then we have everybody sitting around.

I don't know whether this will be a great idea or terrible idea, and, you know, at the very least we'll try it out.

So with that, on the board side, we have Rinalia, Ray, Chris, Wolfgang, George, Cherine, who volunteered, and we actually had a surplus of volunteers, I guess. Markus and Asha and Suzanne also volunteered.

More important -- and I'll turn things over to you, Alan, in just a second -- we have a set of topics.

Do we have any way of flashing those topics up on the screen? No, that's an agenda. There we go. There we go. Good.

So that's probably a good lead-in.

Alan, let me turn things over to you to introduce and kick things off.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Steve.

On the ALAC side, we'll have the ALAC leadership team, which is one person per region, and we have Tijani, Holly, me, Leon, and in that empty seat, that's Olivier, plus Cheryl is joining us as a past chair and

relatively knowledgeable on one or two of the issues. And Olivier is now here. The schedule --

Olivier, over there or anywhere you care to sit.

Scheduling this meeting has been somewhat of a challenge, and the European RALO was meeting just prior to this and apparently ran over a little bit, and --

The topics are seemingly unrelated, and in fact, there are two common themes that weave between them or weave among them. One is funding and money, and the other one is communications.

And I'll quickly review all of them and then we'll go into the actual discussion.

The first one is equitable access for all stakeholders. There was an ATRT recommendation that specifically said that stakeholders who aren't funded by industry and other similar sources should not be at a great disadvantage compared to those who are. The board accepted it. We haven't seen any plans yet for how to implement it and it's not a particularly easy thing to implement.

So we thought we'd raise the issue and start a discussion.

The second one -- and there are implications in that one also that we'll go into in a moment.

The second one is I guess an epiphany I had in a teleconference several weeks ago that we had a meeting with the review group within

ICANN and we were told the board has decided that maybe we are all overloaded. Maybe.

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG:

And maybe we need to reconsider scheduling of reviews.

Cheryl and I, in a back -- in a back chat, came to the conclusion that we are exceedingly relieved because --

Because of the timing of the review, even if you decide not to delay reviews, the public comment has delayed the review. So thank you.

But we realized -- both of us knew that at the timing that at that point scheduled, there was no way we could do a reasonable job of it.

Neither of us, who are not known to be meek and mild-mannered, had been willing to even say anything about it because we felt it was a done deal, it would be a waste of our breath to raise the issue, and that says something really bad about communications at a high level between the various parts of the organization.

The last one is what has happened on the PICs and the Category 1 safeguard 1 to 8 TLDs, which is a good story. Instead of the board simply sending back a message saying, "Yes, we're accepting your advice" or "No, we're refusing it," there was a request to talk. Rather unusual.

On the other hand -- so the process was marvelous. The outcomes were not necessarily as marvelous, and we'll talk about that in a little bit of detail.

The last two items are not really asking for any answer from the board. We're raising the issue and I think some interesting discussion may come out of it.

But we're -- you know, we're not asking to come back and fix the problem. It's not clear what the problem is. And if it's going to be fixed, it's not going to be fixed by a statement in writing.

Okay. To go into the first item just a little bit more, we're in a situation where, on a regular basis, various parties with money are able to do things that at-large is not able to do. I'll give you a couple of examples.

Very recently, at this meeting, we have one of our ALAC members appointed by the nominating committee who's not here. The reason she's not here is she lives in a disadvantaged country in an awkward place in West Africa, the Gambia, and to get a visa, Argentina told her she had to travel to Abuja in Nigeria. She was willing to spend the time -- and it would have taken a good number of days of her time -- but was not willing to put personal money up. The cost of a trip like that is a good fraction of an annual salary in the Gambia, even for someone who has a moderately good job, and in fact, I believe she's now a consultant and not necessarily a good job --

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: -- depending on how things go.

This is not a situation unfamiliar to ICANN, since you had a board member from the Gambia and I suspect have a little bit of experience in these issues.

Nevertheless, she was told, "Sorry, we have a \$200 limit. You can't do it."

Another example recently is when you look at the CWG/CCWG meetings, we have a number of participants who are not funded by ICANN to go to the face-to-face meetings.

If you look at the face-to-face meetings and look at who came -- who comes who is not funded by ICANN officially as a member -- capital "M" member -- it tends to be registries and board members and a couple of other people who are in strong positions. At-large, certainly not.

So I don't know how we fix the problem, but we have a problem and we have -- we have to at least admit it and see where we go from there.

There are some other implications, but I'll stop talking and let other people talk.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. This situation of our members not being able to come to our meetings is not new.

As you may remember, for the London summit, I started speaking about this from -- I don't know -- several months before the summit, and I got in a meeting like this the commitment of Steve and of Fadi that everything will be done so that all the members for the summit will be there and they will work on the visa issue.

Unfortunately, a lot of our community didn't come. Especially from this region, the African region, and some other developing regions.

The case of Beran that Alan just mentioned is more complicated than that, because even if she was able to go to Abuja, she wouldn't get the visa because our colleagues that live in Abuja didn't get the visa till the last day. The last day. (saying name) is here. So this issue of visa, we had some countries that are very tough in giving a visa. We had the experience of Toronto, London, and Buenos Aires, and now Buenos Aires again.

So I -- in the meeting strategy working group, I was a member of this group, I answered on the issue that the visa delivery should be one of the main criteria for deciding on the venue of our meetings, and we put it in the report of our group.

I hope that in the future, this will be considered so that our community will be able to participate. Thank you.

[Applause]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani.

Just to be clear, we do have visa problems, but I'd like to focus on dollars on this one.

We're not going to fix sovereignty problems and, yes, we should try to avoid them, but this particular one was not a sovereignty problem. At least yet. It may have become one, but we don't know that at this point.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.

I'm switching hats slightly here as a nominating committee, current and past, because this particular person is a nominating committee appointed individual into the ALAC.

Now, we have been encouraged in the nominating committees, current and recent past, to try and ensure that in our efforts to give better geographic and cultural diversity, that we do look and focus at regions out of Africa and of course Asia, inclusive of central Asia.

It beggars belief that when the time, the energy, the effort, and the talent is found and appointed, that we cannot go the extra mile to ensure that otherwise active and engaged and high-performance

individuals are not able to attend critical meetings, and in this case, this is a critical meeting.

It is bad optics. It would be PR dollars well spent to get it right.

We cannot say to emerging and developing economies, "You are welcome, please come," and then when there are ways, all be them somewhat difficult and occasionally expensive, have a system which does not allow for exceptions. And this is what it is. I'm not saying rewrite policy. I'm saying having policies that allow for intelligent, expedient, and effective -- transparent, albeit -- ways of working with exceptions.

So I think that's the way I'd like to take this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. And just for a moment, I did write a letter to Fadi about this. I have absolutely no -- no concern that it will happen again. As outrageous as the requirements are to fly 1500 kilometers at great expense, I don't think this issue is going to happen again, so let's not focus on that issue. Let's focus on the general concept, which I think is far more important.

And by the way, this is the second meeting she's missed for visa reasons.

But as I said, there's a theme of communications why I didn't hear. Not only was she refused, we don't know at what level in the organization she was refused from. We don't know if it escalate -- if it was escalated below the first-level person -- beyond the first-level person, to her manager, to David Olive, to Fadi. I don't know where it - - where the -- it was a bureaucratic decision that we were not allow to challenge- -- we were tried to challenge and we were told no. But we don't even know where the decision was made and who to complain to. Thank you. Chris?

I'm sorry. Fadi.

FADI CHEHADE: How many dollars did she need more than \$200 to go to Abuja? Are we talking about 10,000 or 200?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe the travel -- the air ticket was estimated at about a thousand to 1200, and I think four days of hotel and lodging was the estimate.

We have since found out from other people from other countries -- and of course these rules are country-specific -- that it might take two weeks to get the visa and may even involve two trips. We don't know that for sure. It's hard to get embassies to commit to things.

FADI CHEHADE: Okay. I get it. Thank you.

Secondly, has she applied now for the Moroccan visa?

ALAN GREENBERG: Typically, one cannot apply for a visa without invitation letters, often hotel reservations. In this case, the Argentinian embassy with other ones not only wanted a reservation, they wanted a commitment from the hotel that they had a credit card.

FADI CHEHADE: Precisely. So --

ALAN GREENBERG: ICANN's general account is not good. They wanted a credit card.

FADI CHEHADE: Precisely. But that is the reason I'm asking this is, we should start think- -- since we plan our meetings a good while ahead, we should look at the processes, and I will take that. This is why I'm asking you.

Third thing is, do you have money in ALAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have zero money.

FADI CHEHADE: All of you have no money in ALAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm presuming our staff have access to some small amount of money, but they don't have the discretion for how to use it.

FADI CHEHADE: Okay. How about if we arrange to give each SO and AC a \$10,000 emergency fund so you could use it in cases like this when your counsel decides this is urgent?

ALAN GREENBERG: You would have my blessing.

[Laughter]

FADI CHEHADE: So I'm going to do that in the budget for this year, so that we never again have a bureaucratic think, allow a councilperson -- or deny a councilperson's presence. If you as a council decide this is urgent, we're going to dispense \$2,000, make your own charter, your own rules, but I'm -- on my end, I'm prepared to issue a \$10,000 emergency fund to each SO and AC that we will replenish every year.

How's that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think that would be marvelous. I also think there -- in the worst case, there may be cases we use it up in the first three months, but --

FADI CHEHADE: It's an emergency --

ALAN GREENBERG: It is infinitely better than what we have today, yes.

FADI CHEHADE: Good.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Negotiate with the other SOs and ACs to give you their 10 grand. That's another way of doing that.

Can I -- I want to address the communications plan because -- for what it's worth and speaking entirely personally, if I as chair of the ccNSO found myself -- if I as chair of the ccNSO found myself in the position that you were in, I would probably have gone to my -- one of my board members and said -- I use the term "my board members" loosely because I don't actually have any board members, but -- and said, "Look, I'm having a problem." So I think that's also -- and that's in communications generally. I think that's worth remembering. There is a pathway. We can't always do anything about stuff but it's worth asking.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. My board member is telling me what I'm supposed to do next.

[Laughter]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I wouldn't listen, if I were you.

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm told we have Ray, Cherine, and George in that order.

RAY PLZAK: Actually, I think I was in the queue after George or somewhere down that line.

But since I now have the microphone, I will hold it.

Notwithstanding everything that's been said about emergency funding and problems with visas and so forth, the real problem in terms of equitable access is the fact of the way that ICANN conducts its meetings.

There is no reason at all why all discussions have to be held in a single global forum, at all.

The regional registries have been conducting regional meetings for longer than ICANN has existed. And somehow or another, they

manage to coordinate between each other very well to the point that they produce global policies when needed that are clear and succinct and all have agreed to one set of language to including where the punctuation marks are.

They also have a number of policies that are more regionally specific in that all of them may have a policy regarding a particular matter, but the difference reflects the differences in the regions. There's no reason why others can't do the same thing.

If you were to attend a regional registry meeting, you would note very quickly that the particular region that's conducting the meeting spends a large amount of time discussing what is going on in the other regions with regard to the policies that they have at the table. And they also expose those policies that are being discussed in the other regions for which the host region does not have a policy. Invariably when a new policy is proposed, one of the first questions that gets asked in the forum is: What are the other regions doing about this? So it is very easy to arrive at common policies with regional flavors. The amount of participation is much, much higher because it is in a region so travel costs tend to be lower. Visa problems tend to be much less. And so there are a large number of reasons that would make that a much more feasible way to get more access to the stakeholders.

With regards to funding for the At-Large for this effort, I would say that the crop model is not the way to go. And here working in conjunction with the budget produce money that supports these meetings. Let ICANN become a sponsor of these regional ALAC meetings or AfTLD

meetings or GNSO regional meetings -- or GNSO can pay for its own. They get tons of money anyway. Don't tell them that.

The same people that pay to come to a global meeting would pay less to go to a meeting in their region, right? So I think that it is high time to give serious consideration to that and consider what is it that you're really trying to achieve in this global conglomeration of people that requires you to be in cities of a certain size with hotels of a certain size that can accommodate a number of -- the large number of people and have easy access to affordable restaurants, et cetera, et cetera. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Ray.

We have Cherine next.

CHERINE CHALABY:

I want to go back and kind of support Fadi's suggestion because what it does is it gives you some predictability where you have a pot of money and then you can support your own people and help them.

In looking at the size of Fadi's suggestion, I think we could do even a little bit more. We need to discuss that. But I think he's absolutely on the spot in that direction. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not all that worried about the size. Presumably it is refillable under duress. And I don't think we ever would have an expense quite that large or twice as big, so I don't think it's an issue. But, please, let's not use the emergency fund to not fix the policy, please.

George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you, Alan. I'd like to go up a level. The particular instantiation of the multistakeholder model that is ICANN has some declared characteristics which we are, I think, rightly somewhat proud of. One of them is equal access, on an equal multistakeholder -- each stakeholder on an equal basis. That is not -- as the examples here show, we don't have equal access to ICANN. We have different stakeholders. They have different reasons for being in the mix. The contracted stakeholders, the domain name industry clearly has importance in ICANN; and they are, I think, faithful followers of ICANN and contributors to ICANN.

But -- and they have the funds to be able to attend these meetings and participate in groups. That's not so true of the ALAC. It may or may not be true of governments, depending on which government you're talking about. It may or may not be true of the NCUC.

What I think we have is a promise to provide equal access, but we have not actually investigated in-depth the ways in which equal access is not -- is not yet present in our meetings. And how can we -- what

measures can we take to really provide that equal access? And I would propose -- I like the \$10,000 emergency fund. But that's right; that's a Band-Aid. It's a very good Band-Aid, but it is a Band-Aid and it's not policy in the same way.

I think what we ought to be doing is studying what are the impediments to equal access and how do we remove them? Does it require changes in organization? Does it require changes in the methods in which we deal with groups? Does it require transfers of funds? Which it probably does. And this, by the way, is nothing new. Governments do this all the time in terms of implementing their social policy. Why don't we have a policy like that? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have Rinalia next.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. Chris mentioned that in such a situation, in the case of Beran, the ALAC would flag it to the board member. And they did. And I flagged it to management and I said, Can something be done? But it was just not possible this time around. And I'm glad Fadi came up with the suggestion, and I support it wholeheartedly.

Secondly, I want to say that I also think that a regional aspect to ICANN's policy development process is necessary if you really want diversity of input, global participation. And this is also reflecting on the recent GNSO review report that highlighted we are severely lacking diversity in input in ICANN's policy development process.

The last thing I want to flag is also in line with what George says. The ICANN board has accepted the ATRT2 Recommendation 10.5. So the organization is committed to that, and the organization is in the midst of implementing that.

Chris chaired a board working group to look at what is the state of progress in implementing that recommendation. So there is an overview of where that is.

But I don't think that we've gone into the specific assessment of what are the different components of ensuring equitable access for the stakeholders that we have right now and how well they're serving that need.

I think we need to look at that very carefully and come back with an analysis, a clear indication of are there gaps. And we need to fix it systematically. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Rinalia.

I guess I would like to question the concept of "it was not possible." We were talking about \$1,500.

I see you, Cheryl.

I want to introduce another aspect of this. Do you want to talk directly on this particular one? Okay. Then go ahead.

But I'd like to switch away from visas and emergency funds to something that I believe is far more important.

Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.

I just wanted to pick up on the point Ray was making and make sure that we all remember in this conversation that from this coming financial year, we are embarking on a new design in terms of meeting strategy where we have our A and B and different types of meetings. One of which is specifically designed, of course, to allow for greater regional input.

And I think we're taking steps along that way, and I think this is probably a good time to be having the conversation about building a better model and ensuring more predictable, equitable access.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Wolfgang, go ahead. Maybe you want me to do my part first because it adds a different perspective to this. And I think we may want some comments on that. So if you bear with me for a moment.

We're approaching an annual general meeting and people being elected or selected for various slots. And At-Large, many of the

regions are routinely and validly criticized for rotating people among slots. And, you know, the same faces come back again and again.

We have a real problem. Just like the rest of the organization, we have a hard time finding really committed volunteers. But we also have a problem that if we can't find a slot with travel for them, they typically disappear. If you look at, you know, some of the more better funded organizations, people who no longer are on the GNSO Council still participate. In general, all of our people are employed by companies that have nothing to do usually with the Internet, nevermind the DNS. And, therefore, without some level of funding or support or something, they tend to disappear into the woodwork, if they're no longer holding a position.

Now, there's no way we can simply keep on adding infinite amounts of travel money, so it's not a simple problem. But we have to acknowledge that. And I think it goes back to what George was saying and look at the implications.

Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Number one, we have to separate the financial support and the visa issue. The visa issue is out of the hands of ICANN. And what I've learned with various other organizations, it needs a different track of cooperation with the hosting government.

The Hague Cybersecurity Conference organized a very good relationship. It was organized by the foreign ministry. So they had a

special channel how to apply for a visa. But this was done by the government itself. So it means if ICANN as they enter the host agreements, probably we can look how we can make an arrangement so that we have a special fast track for visa applications for participants in ICANN meetings.

With regard to the financial support, I think everything has been already said. And I support in particular CLO's proposal for exceptions. It means we have to look into a case-by-case basis. We need a general policy, but policy has to be flexible enough that we can accommodate it. And my recommendation is to do this as quick as possible because you waste your time in discussing these formal issues. And this is time you need to discuss substantial issues. This is much more important. If we just spend our time one week here in Buenos Aires to discuss these formalities, we miss our main objective, to discuss policies and, you know, how to move forward with all the substantial issues.

This brings me to the final point what you just said. The interest is going down if there are no incentives and things like that.

You have now more than 200 certified At-Large structures. I want to -- I'm interested how you organize a mechanism, a communication mechanism, with all these At-Large structures. Annual reporting? So that these At-Large structures have incentives to do the work at home. We repeat this again and again. Good Internet governance starts at home. That means engagement in ICANN starts at home. It does not start going to an annual ICANN meeting. It starts really at home. And

the At-Large structure should be encouraged on a national level to work together with the ccTLD, with the national ISOC chapter, with the national IGF, all this.

So that means if you encourage your At-Large structures on the ground to become a main organizer, an engine for national Internet governance discussions, then you have a much bigger incentive based on substance to become engaged on the global level.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Wolfgang. And I'll be glad to talk offline. We can talk about what we're doing and what we're planning to change to make that more effective.

Next we have Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks. Very briefly, I just wanted to pick up on what Wolfgang said and on what you said. The overarching topic of this discussion we're having is communication. And coming down to the next level we're talking about people don't have funding so they can't necessarily come to the meetings. And I think -- and then picking up on what Wolfgang said, I think maybe it is time to start looking at a complete -- I don't want to use the word "review" -- but a long-term look at how we do this and whether or not focusing around three meetings a year that everybody travels to is actually a sustainable model for the next five years, whether it's workable, because it may not be. You can't fund everybody. It just isn't possible.

So we maybe should take -- after we finish the transition, maybe we should start looking at the whole model of the way we do business. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly. Thank you.

Next we have Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: A question has been raised about whether we want participation from the floor. We set this up as a -- sort of a closed interaction among the people selected here with the audience watching. But it is an open question as to whether that's the optimum thing. So I'm just conveying to you whether or not you want to accommodate questions from the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: My personal preference is we're getting close -- well into the meeting and we haven't gone to the second items -- second and third items yet. So my inclination is to stay at the table. If we run out of speakers, we can certainly go to the floor.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm sure we'll cover this again in the evaluation of process, pro or con. That's good. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next we have George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

Couple of comments. First of all, the visa issue is a symptom of a problem as much as it is a problem. The money issue is a symptom of the problem. And the problem is that we have not -- we have not studied how to ensure equal access not only among all stakeholders -- that's a little easier -- but among stakeholder groups. We're not going to solve that problem here. But we should recognize -- we should tag it as an important problem for staff, board, community to be interested in solving. There's no question in my mind that the playing field is tilted now. We need to level it out. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, George.

We have Ray next.

RAY PLZAK: Picking up on Wolfgang said and what is actually very true, you don't have to be at the meeting to -- you actually don't have to do work at meetings. You have mail lists, and you can have some very dynamic discussions there.

The regional registries and RALOs have -- many of them have non signed working agreements between them so that in some of the

cases, the registries are giving fellowships to people from the RALOs to attend their meetings and so forth.

So from the standpoint of the number registries, it is a very good thing because it runs the participation and the policy process. There are a number of issues that exist in that community that actually directly impact consumers and, therefore, it is very valuable. So that is starting to work.

And I think that that speaks well to the idea of working together and to include -- in many cases, you pick up the same people from ISOC chapters and ALSs to those meetings. In the case of several of the registries, particularly in Africa and Latin America and to a certain extent Asia-Pacific, those meetings tend to be more of a regional meeting of a large number of groups so that it is not uncommon, for example, at an AfriNIC meeting to see ISOC there doing business and to see ALSs there participating and so forth.

So there's a lot of work being done there. And that policy process is much stronger for it. So there are things that are underway now.

And with regards to the thing that you mentioned, Cheryl, under that mode, the regional meetings are the exception rather than the rule. It should probably be flipped around.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much.

I have Tijani. Then I would like to do a brief summary of the next two items and switch to them, if we could. Otherwise, we are going to run out of time completely.

Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I'm proud of our cooperation with AfriNIC, that we are always on their program. We are always working with them. But they never paid one penny for us. They say they don't have money for that. Perhaps because Africa has a lot of need for people to come to those meetings. But they never paid one penny for us.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Tijani.

The second item I think I've already covered. It's -- it was rather disturbing to find that there was some strong feelings that no one felt was worthwhile mentioning because it was a lost cause before we started. And I think I want to -- I'm interested in hearing feedback on that.

The third item is when we issued our advice in Los Angeles on freezing TLD contracting and putting into the root zone, the reaction that we eventually got, not very long after, from the new gTLD process committee is, let's talk so we can better understand what the issue is and what the possible solutions are. That was a remarkable thing. That's never happened before, certainly with At-Large. We're told it

did happen once or twice in the history of ICANN with the Board and some other group. That alone may speak volumes to some people.

There's always a lot of discussion going on and certainly right now when we're talking about the bylaws concerning what ACs and SOs can do, there's a fair amount of talk, the fact that GAC has a privileged position in that we -- you actually have to talk to them before saying no. And I was very encouraged that you decided to actually talk to us also. So I think that's positive. I think it -- it's hopefully the first of many times that we'll do something like that. On the other hand, when the particular issue saw its way through, we had one call, we had a second call, we had a meeting, we had a -- yet another conference call, and in the latter ones, other parts of ICANN were brought in, including registrars -- registries, and ultimately the outcome was basically the registries who were present at the meeting said, we don't see any need. We're not going to do anything. And basically said, you know, it's a done deal. And again, that comes to multi-equal stakeholders, and clearly some are in stronger positions.

Now, we're not going to say we violate contracts because of a stakeholder model, but nevertheless, there should -- it's disturbing when the power structures are such that some parts of the organization are completely disenfranchised from even having a discussion because the other parties won't take part. And I'll leave it at that. And we have Chris first, Fadi.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Alan, I was also very encouraged by the process of us having the discussion. Just a little concerned that what I think I heard you say was that nothing happened because a number of registries who were present decided that nothing would happen. And I'm -- and that's actually -- I don't think that's actually right. I think the implication is that they -- that they would have a -- you know, effectively a veto on stuff happening. I wouldn't characterize it that way. I would characterize it as a way that we came, we sat, we listened, we talked, and came to the conclusion that to try and do anything at this stage would be very, very, very, very, very, very hard. But I certainly wouldn't say that there was just -- you know, just because the registries said we don't want to do it, that's what happened. So I only want to make sure because this is in the record that that's not my understanding of what happened. I think it's important that we're clear about that. About everything else you said, I agree with.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just for clarity, what we were asking for, the advice said freeze but the advice also said, let's be able to talk, and in a number of -- there were cases for specific registries, we simply wanted clarification for what they were planning to do and we couldn't have that discussion either because there was no interest in looking at it at a case-by-case basis. So although I may be a bit harsh in my crit -- in what I said, there is some aspect of it which could have been handled better with more flexibility on all sides. Who do we have next, Cherine?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I have my hand up, and then I think Cherine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry. We had Fadi next and then Rinalia and then Cherine.

FADI CHEHADE: I -- Alan, with your permission, I just wanted to add a question which you may table for a different time that is not related to your third point. When one listens to the Internet Society describe its biggest asset, they speak about their chapters. Without question, they say it's our chapters. Here we have how many ALSs now, 100 plus?

ALAN GREENBERG: 200.

FADI CHEHADE: 200 plus, and that is a kind of a hidden treasure of ICANN, that we have these hundreds of ALSs. When you came on board I was very encouraged that you said in your opening remarks, when you took the role, that the focus should be less on the number of ALSs now and rather than on how are we going to energize these ALSs. My question is, where can I get my hands on the kind of what I would call the five-year strategic plan for the ALSs and how can we cooperate to -- once you have that plan, how can we cooperate to make sure these ALSs are energized and -- with a strategic vision of how we would make them truly the treasure they really are. And I think as we see with all things, including Internet governance, the local is becoming far more

important than the global. But I'm not seeing that yet at ICANN, as an institution. So we -- and you are, as Olivier always said, you are the feet of this organization at the end of the day. So how are we -- what is our strategy? If we step back -- and frankly, if somebody asks me, what is our five-year vision of how the ALSs will be energized to be part of ICANN, I don't know. But I would love to know, and if we don't have that, when could we have that because really, that should come from all of you. Certainly not from me. I will support but -- and if others wish to answer your third question first and then we can come back to that, I'm fine with this as well. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I can answer very quickly. When I started eight months ago I did have some grand and glorious plans. The IANA transition and accountability sort of have gotten in the way. We have, however, gotten back to that issue. It's been discussed at this meeting. It will be discussed in -- in much greater depth in the next couple of months. And will also be the prime subject of the At-Large review. So I don't think we can have a clear answer until the end, but I hope by Dublin we will actually have had some movement and some changes. And we have Rinalia next.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you, Alan. On -- I would wait for Cherine's view with regards to the process that he led in terms of the discussions on PICs and Category 1 TLDs. The one observation and learning that I got out of that is, if the different stakeholder groups representing users at the

table were more aligned in terms of what they wanted and if there was cohesiveness, I think that you could have pushed it much further. That was the learning that I took from that, and I just wanted to share it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia. One of the things I've noticed over the last couple of months and we have multi-stakeholders because we disagree with each other.

[Laughter]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Work on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Well, first of all, Alan, thank you for your comments. I think they are much appreciated. Two things. One is, what was ICANN's role in those meetings? And very important to note here that our role was that of a facilitator. We were trying to give an opportunity for an open and frank discussion among the various stakeholders group to share information and perspective and maybe find a solution towards the PIC issue. I -- I agree with you that at the end we did not achieve -- or particularly At-Large and the GAC did not achieve what they wanted to

achieve and that was disappointing for them. But I think also there's an issue of timing. You said that, you know, this is a new way of doing things. If we can do more of that and early in the process, I think we will get more results. This one was kind of late in the day, fair enough, but the issues had to be addressed. If we did this maybe a year earlier or something. So I really want to encourage that kind of dialogue, that kind of interaction, as early as possible, because I think we will get better results going into the future. There's no doubt about that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cherine. And yes, I'm optimistic also. I will point out that a year earlier we had raised the issue and we didn't take that opportunity to actually discuss things. We just threw -- we threw documents over the wall. So we're learning, perhaps. I don't have anyone else at this moment, so Chris, you're on.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Sorry. I agree with Cherine. I actually have taken a much bigger lesson, not out of the specific but out of the whole new gTLD process. We -- we as a community -- and the Board is included in that -- allowed this gTLD program to go forwards when the policy was not complete. And much of the problem and angst that exists in this community today around that process comes from the fact that we didn't push back and say, until you solve these outstanding problems, we are not going to proceed. That's the major lesson, from my point of view, that comes out of this. And that, I think, is the trickle -- the trickle-down

effect on that is having the discussions that we had to have at the late stage that we had them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Chris. I have to respond to that. No, no, I do. The issues that are -- that we are worried about now were not on the table before the program was -- was announced. They had been discussed and the policy body had decided they're not relevant. So it's a more complex problem than just finishing it. Thank you. Do we have any speakers? George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Just a couple of thoughts. Chris, I couldn't agree with you more with respect to the new gTLD program. One thought, we often talk about means to achieve goals in ICANN and we concentrate on the means without either making the goals explicit or assuming that we know the goals and we all agree on the goals, which often is not the case. I think the goal here, if we were going to state a goal, it would be to have geographically widespread constructive involvement in ICANN and ICANN-related policy issues. And that's a job for the ALAC, for the ALSs, but it's also a job for every other constituency in ICANN. That's in part what the national IGFs do. They're multi-sector, multistakeholder, and if that's our goal, we should be talking -- I think, we should be thinking about how each of the sectors, including the ALAC and especially the ALAC because of its geographic reach, can contribute to those goals. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, George. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd like to go back to the second topic that we sort of didn't discuss but are discussing anyway, and it's really in response to both Wolfgang and Ray's comments and others. As part of the At-Large review we're now in a process, which has been slowed down, of developing questions that we want to ask as well as who we want to ask and one of the pointers that we have is, what are the organizations that we want to talk to within as well as outside of ICANN. So it's a way of saying how are we cooperating and communicating with each other. So it's from ALS, what do we do in terms of ALS talking to other ALSs, talking to the RALOs, what is the actual feedback process. So we are actually asking ourselves those questions. But then there will be larger questions in terms of how do we deal with the ccNSO, the GNSO. It's a way of actually looking at our place and, you know, if we are indeed the feet, have we got club feet is probably what we're asking. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia -- thank you, Holly. Sorry.

[Laughter]

This has been a very long week already. I see no other hands around the table. Sebastien, you had -- oh, sorry. We have Olivier and then

Sebastien had his hand up, if he still wants to speak. Make his way to the microphone. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I just had to smile when Chris mentioned that we launched the program before we had resolved all of the issues. In an -- unfortunately an "I told you so" moment, I would like to remind you of the ALAC statement of the 8th of December, 2010, where the ALAC mentioned in its conclusion that the current PAC, at it was called at the time, was unacceptable as presented. Sorry, but we had to put this one in there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien has canceled his hand. Rinalia, you're next.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. On the topic of the At-Large review, the ALAC is saying that they didn't feel comfortable or free to say that they were not ready for it. And I completely understand that, and I want to urge the At-Large to no longer feel this way about anything in ICANN. I've always pushed the ALAC and the At-Large to say what you need because we need to know what you need so that we can -- ICANN can support you better. And in going forward I hope that we can move towards a better position where you are free to say what you need. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia. I could call you Holly in exchange, but I won't. We have Ray and then Cheryl.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Alan. With regard to the At-Large review and reviews in general, you notice that when Holly was talking about formulating the questions and criteria, she said "we." That "we" doesn't include staff. That "we" doesn't include the independent examiner. That "we" includes the ALAC and the At-Large. And so it is the same thing that we did with the GNSO. And so that the real control of the review in terms of examination is inside the organizational review.

Now, there are a large number of questions that are going to be a given, such as things looking at all membership things in the same way, looking at all election type things in the same way, looking at -- if the organization has funds, looking at all the funds in the same way. So in that extent you're getting an across-the-board look at ICANN at specific items. But things that are peculiar to the organization are formulated by the organization and in addition, they have the ability to take those questions, for example, about elections and so forth, and tailor them as they need to -- to have them asked. So that the independent examiner does not go around and make up things as they go along and conduct a number of senseless interviews just to see what else they're going to ask the next person. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Ray. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I just wanted to make clear what I -- I feel about the postponement of the At-Large review and that is that I -- it was a blessed relief when through circumstances we've got this additional time in the public comment going on. And indeed, that hasn't stopped the work. Let's be clear. We have not actually taken a break. The organizing committee is still meeting regularly, we and the staff in ICANN which assists us in the implementation and planning of this. This has not slowed down. But it has given us breathing space. So it's not that we've all gone ah, that's better and gone and done something else. It's just allowed the human bandwidth problem which we were definitely suffering and that's all about the issues of transition and currently about the accountability work that we're so solved in, taking so much of that human bandwidth.

But let me come back to the systemic issue here. Even I felt I couldn't - - it wouldn't be worth my time to bitch and moan about the fact that because we were all so darn busy, and we needed to be and we still need to be, with CWG and CCWG work, that we should have been able to put our hand up and say we need to slow down on this other unrelated worth -- work pathway. And I think that's a systemic issue. That's something that we need to look at in terms of communication. Everybody knows you can do your best planning and have a five- or three- or two-year plan on what you're doing when. But stuff

happens. Unpredictable things come in, and when they take such a huge amount of people's time, I think we need to build in a, let's check and see where things could be given a little more space, where things in other projects could be readjustment. But I honestly felt it wouldn't have been worth my time to even raise that issue. And I think that's a problem.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. And indeed, that was the reason it was put on the agenda. What makes Cheryl and me meek and mild-mannered. And that's -- that, I think, is the real problem. But also to be clear, if the time -- the schedule had not changed, we would have done it. But we wouldn't have done it very well. We are five minutes over or four minutes over. I have no other -- no one else who's demanding to speak. Then certainly I, from the ALAC side, say thank you very much. This was an interesting experiment. We need to talk about it.

[Applause]

And I'll turn it back over to Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. And thank you, everyone, for cooperating in this format. As I said before, this is a first of a series of experiments that we're running today and somewhat tomorrow. I do expect feedback on this. So try not to be bashful. Don't be inhibited. If necessary, we'll send specific invitations to Cheryl and to you, Alan. Let us know how this goes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]