
DUBLIN – ALAC and Regional Leadership Meeting Part 2
Sunday, October 18, 2015 – 13:30 to 17:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. We will start now. Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, we will start this ALAC and Regional Leadership Session, Part 2. We will start with Edmon Chung, who'll update us on the universal acceptance. We have slides to be shown. Go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Tijani. Edmon Chung here. I'm here to give an update on what's happening in universal acceptance, and especially on internationalized domain names and email addresses. I'm sure most of you know, but I'll quickly talk a little bit about it. This is the issue of including both internationalized domain names, internationalized email addresses, as well as new gTLDs, especially longer ASCII TLDs, where some applications and systems, including databases or other user interfaces, are not able to accept, store, process or validate these new domain names, whether they're in different languages or whether they're especially long TLDs.

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.

Therefore, it's an effort for the ICANN community to reach out to the broader Internet community and especially technology, but also other parts of the user community to be able to be aware of the situation, and also to do some work to upgrade the Internet. I think that's the way that we see it. Not that these domain names don't work, but there are systems that are not upgraded yet for them. This is the background. Next slide please.

This issue has been brought up at ALAC for a number of years. What's good to know is that finally we have a good momentum. There's a parallel session happening on universal acceptance just upstairs. We're talking about issues that will address the universal acceptance issue. There are four groups that have been identified. We're working on technical issues, especially what we call top-line technical issues. The particular project that's identified is internationalized email addresses, because if systems can handle internationalized email addresses like email addresses in Chinese, Russian or others, then they are most likely going to be able to handle different TLDs and longer TLDs.

So it's a super-set of issues. We've identified that in some ways as a flagship. We're going to go out and ask people to pay attention to internationalized email addresses and that hopefully will help solve some of the other issues as well, and then bring some focus to the issue. We also have a group on internationalization itself, and that covers a number of different

items, including IDN specific issues that are not related to the long ASCII domains.

Then there's a very important part, which is the measurement and monitoring. We want to be able to figure out what indices and how to measure whether people are what's called universal acceptance ready or not, and how the whole environment in the Internet is doing; how ready the Internet is for these new domains.

Then finally, this is the part where I want to spend a little more time and engage, is community outreach. We are producing most of the work in English at this time. That also needs to be internationalized itself, and we'd like to engage with the ALSes around the world, because to connect to your constituencies and your local technical and policy people to get the awareness developed. Next slide please.

This is an issue we think is important, not only we hope to engage with ALSes, to connect with the local technical community, but also the local governments. We've identified governments play a very important role in creating awareness. For example, if their tendering process, like finding suppliers for system integration work in the government, if they require universal acceptance, a certain email address to be able to use the native characters, that has a ripple effect into a lot of the

system integrators, developers, and other communities at the local level, that will create the awareness that universal acceptance needs.

The other part that is now we have the support from ICANN, including some funding, the ICANN translators are very good, especially the interpreters, but sometimes the documents, especially when they need to be technical, are not as accurate. We want to engage with ALSes to get really local people to take a look at how to relate what those issues are and translate some of the documents, in order for the local communities around the world to make sense of this issue and actually contribute.

I'm going to leave it there. We'd love for more ALSes to participate in the UASG, the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. It's pretty much a volunteer group from the ICANN community. We've got about \$700,000 from the ICANN Budget to help get it started in the next year or so, but we really need your participation to get the word out.

Here are the mailing lists, and if you're not signed up, tell me or Dawn, or just let us know, or let Heidi know that you want to join or take down the mailing list and get signed up. We want to call on you, especially when some of the core documents of explaining what universal acceptability is, and what are the best or good practices for doing it are. We want that to be available in

local languages, and your help is especially important there. Thank you.

That's all I've prepared to talk about, but I'd like to get some feedback, especially on whether that's something that ALSes could get involved in, and whether there's interest to do so.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Edmon. Much appreciated. I understand very well what the ALSes, what anyone can give to this process, because as you said, the linkage or reaching out to the governments or to the technical communities on the ground will be very important. Do you have any questions for Edmon? Satish?

SATISH BABU:

Thank you Edmon for this update. I think this is an extremely important area. I think it's partly done, partly not done but in progress. What I'd like to know from you is, I come from India, which is very diverse in terms of its IDNs, especially, but also the emails. There's a lot of interest in emails, and the governments want to give emails to everybody, all citizens, and then the script becomes extremely important. There are a few of us, ALSes, in India, who are willing to devote time to this. Is there anything specific you'd like us to do, or take up an initiative?

EDMON CHUNG:

Definitely. First of all, make sure that when the government implement those programs that they have EAls in mind, so that when they look for suppliers to provide the service, or when they provide the service internally, they'd have the capability of using the different scripts in the email addresses. That's the first thing I'd encourage ALSes to do. The second part is to get them to participate in the UASG as well, because one of the key things in the next six months or so that we're trying to do is to come up with those documents of good practices.

Sometimes there's no one best way, there are multiple good ways to do it. One of the things we've realized in the past few months, more and more evidence coming in, is that the issue itself seems to be simple, technical resolution of it is usually simple, not so complicated. However, the scope is very broad, because domain names and email addresses are used prevalently for IDs, in storage, in linking different things. So different dependencies between systems.

So even though it seems like a simple issue, it has a broad scope, and therefore one way of thinking about it, which I think is very good, is it's like the Russian dolls. You look at it, you open it, and there's another one. You keep opening it and you find more issues. Instead of that, part of the best practice document is to

say you need to look at it as a system-wide issue, at a CIO level, and take a look at what all the system dependencies are, and go about it more methodically.

The second part is when they look into those issues, please come and participate and share the experience, because just by providing email addresses, it's not just setting up a mail server. There's a lot of different systems that need to be in place, and it's not just updating your mail server. There's much more to that.

If you create the awareness and they take that on board and say, "Yes, we need to have it in Hindi, we need to have it in Tamil," then the next step is the entire system architecture needs to be prepared for those things. That's when the interaction and best practices could be created for future reference as well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Follow up question?

SATISH BABU: At the level of At-Large itself, is there any coordination or any support required for this, coordinated among all the ALSes?

EDMON CHUNG: That's a good question. My immediate reaction is it probably doesn't have to be coordinated through At-Large, for each ALS to

participate in the UASG. I'll leave it back to probably you to think through whether there might be a role that a coordination from the At-Large is useful.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Edmon. I understood that the most important thing you are asking for is more outreach, more awareness than other things. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. I think my question is a follow up to what was just asked. How is this group utilizing existing Working Groups and Working Parties, like the Outreach, the IDN Group and so on and so forth? Because in the process of the UASG you actually need this already existing component to actually be more coordinated. Even we as At-Large, we are still trying to coordinate in trying to reach the ALSes.

If we say an ALS should just come like that, without some form of medium; through the RALOs or existing Working Groups, it might be difficult to get that message across to them. I think working through existing structures might be more efficient in actually getting those words out to the ALSes.

My other comment is in relation to... Actually, it was a little fast when you were scrolling through the pages for the monitoring,

but is it that this is about to start, or it has started? I saw your mailing list, that it looks like the discussion started maybe six months ago, a long time ago. What is the progress like? Are you seeing progress? What is the level of improvement? Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG:

Your first question first. A lot of the part of this morning's meeting was spent on collaboration and understanding what other groups are doing. The UASG is very cognizant of the issue, and we don't want to replicate work. That is why I'm here. The other thing is that there's also some surveys and studies that ICANN does for new gTLDs. We are trying to tap into that as well. There are groups in the Chinese community, in the Arabic community, and in the [Hindi 00:21:13] that we are trying to tap into, that are doing similar work.

What you mentioned in terms of the outreach, that actually we haven't thought about, so that's a good addition. We should look at it as a general outreach issue as well, because what we did identify is that UA has a relationship with what is called the SDG – the sustainable development goals – that were just put out from the UN. I think that relates it to general outreach, and I think we should take that on board. Your second question was where we are.

The best way I think is to describe it is that we had a lot of progress in terms of getting ready. It's like the sails are up, the wind is blowing, the ship is just starting to sail. Some drafts of the documents are there, that have been drafted. An interesting logo was created, and some documents are in the first draft. But we are ready. We just got the budget approval from ICANN to actually start the work, so we have some staff support from ICANN, and also some additional budget to do studies and to do certain events so that this can push forward. Now is a time where, so to speak, the ship is ready, and we're trying to get everyone on board and start sailing. That's where we are right now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Edmon. I really appreciate your clarification, and as Chair of the Capacity Building Working Group, I am happy to prepare a webinar about the UASG, in which you'll be the speaker. I hope you'll have time to come onto our webinar. Any other questions? Yes please?

[HADIK KHAN]:

Hi. This is [Hadik Khan 00:23:34], also a new appointee to ALAC. I remember that a few years ago, for the Chinese characters, there were original ones and simplified ones. My understanding is that both the mainland and all the Chinese in the world will agree

that this is a single one language, but [differently 00:23:59] written forms. A few days ago I heard that it's not fully resolved yet. I just wondered what's the current status?

Also, regarding a policy issue, it seems like this problem related to the Chinese characters probably is not exactly unique. For example, for [Hanzi], there's maybe four or so countries, especially in the Asia Pacific region, with this same problem, and this might be in quite a number of countries. I just wonder, on the policy issue, what is the current status? Those were my two questions. One is specifically about Chinese characters, and the second is overall policy. My feeling is that this internationalized DNS is very important for the under-developed countries, especially the rural under-developed regions in these countries.

EDMON CHUNG:

Agree very much, and I give you good news, which is after over ten years of trying to convince everyone that the Chinese simplified and traditional Chinese is an issue, I think most of the community agrees that it is an issue and needs to be worked on. Policy – and it's not a purely technical issue, and it has policy implications – I think that's in the bag. We're good. The problem then of course is getting the policies done, and that is in process. ON that issue, yes, simplified and traditional Chinese. You mentioned that other languages have these issues as well.

The complications there – and I use Chinese as an example – is for example Han characters are also used in Japanese in Korean contexts, so the simplified and traditional Chinese that we see as the same character may not be the same as what the Japanese and the Korean see. So there's some coordination that needs to happen, which is happening right now.

I was just in a meeting that was talking about the coordination, about how kanji characters in Japanese, they are Chinese characters simplified in traditional, and also hanja characters in Korea, how we coordinate it so that at the root level, at the root DNS, which everyone shares, we have a consistent policy of mapping those what are called IDN variants. This is somewhat different from the UA issues, although they are related. But the policies, at least the good news is I think most people agree that this is an issue that needs to be resolved. The policies are still in the process, and hopefully we're seeing it being done in the next year or so.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Edmon. The queue is closed after Yuliya.

YULIYA MORENETS:

Thank you Tijani. Yuliya Morenets, EURALO Secretariat. I just wanted to support what was stressed about the language issue.

Personally I'm a part of the Working Group on Cyrillic IDN. You just said that there is a need to have a really [unclear 00:27:42] of the local community, and from time to time when we work, and even when we speak all these languages, we're not very comfortable because we're not linguists.

So we decided to engage and send letters in order to have support from the linguistic community from the region, even if you're native speakers from the region. So it's really very important. I was also suggesting to this Working Group to have more outreach, and just what was said a couple of minutes ago. So thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Yuliya. You need the linguists, but not for the UA, I think. It is a more technical thing, isn't it? Thank you anyway for your comments. Now, I would like to thank Edmon for his presentation. If you have a last word to say, Edmon, go ahead.

EDMON CHUNG:

I think the language issue is the key message I want to bring. We are going to produce documents that describe the issue and also describe how we can attack the issue and solutions. They are mainly in English as we create them. We need them in the local

language, and we need them in the technical language of the local people. Again, ICANN translation is great and all that. It's very general. We need documents that read and resonate well with the local community, and we're hoping that ALSes can step up and help us there.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Edmon. Our next subject will be the proposed approach to civil society engagement, with a focus on At-Large activities. Our guest will be Jean-Jacques Sahel, who is in charge of civil society, who is VP for Europe and in charge of civil society. Sébastien, you said...?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I would like to say two things. The first one, we are supposed to be here. Is it the one who wish to be here? I don't see our Chair, the Vice Chair and so on? I am asking this. The second point is I still struggle, for a long time, with the fact that we want to impose the use of civil society within the ICANN organization. I really feel that – and maybe I'm the only one in question in this organization, and if so please tell me – but I really think that ICANN is...

We have to take care of end users and civil society. Outside of ICANN, I have no problem. It's not the question. But inside

ICANN, please don't take this word from outside to be imposed to our structure. It will create trouble and it will not help what we need to do. We are end user representatives and we need to speak on behalf of the end users that we are. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Sébastien. I see that you are not happy with my Chairmanship! Thank you very much. It doesn't matter. I'd like only to tell you that anyone in this group can have other things to do in ICANN during this time, so we all have some time to be absent, and the Chair is not excluded from that. Alan has something to do, but it is a duty of ICANN, of ALAC that he is doing, but not in this meeting. Our guest is Jean-Jacques Sahel, VP of ICANN for Europe and in charge of civil society.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Good afternoon everyone. It's nice to be back here today. I've got a few slides, but I'd really like to be able to have a discussion with you. I'll try and do the slides in ten minutes and then hopefully open the floor. My colleague Adam is going to join us as well to lead the discussion from our perspective. We presented to this group, in a joint meeting with NCSG, which I think was a great joint meeting in BA. The idea is that we have four broad stakeholder groups in ICANN. We've got business,

technical community, governments, and a grouping that can be referred to as civil society.

We give you an overview of how we thought we should structure our engagement with this stakeholder group, and as a follow up to our meeting we circulated a very short concept paper in the summer to try to get feedback from the community, and also concrete ideas about activities we can do. I wanted to give you an update on where we are, briefly, and then get into a discussion on, concretely, what we can and could be working on over the next coming months. Having looked at a lot of ALAC work in the last few months, including the outreach strategy, I think there's excellent synergy with what you all have in mind. It's a good opportunity to do concrete things on the ground.

This is a very quick high-level summary of the paper that was circulated. I should stress, this was all to illicit feedback from the community, and that's why I'm really keen to have a discussion today, rather than just me presenting. All of this is something that we'd like to do, but we need your input and we need your feedback. The first point is not an objective in itself, in a way. It's just saying we want a structured approach. We have got stakeholder engagement. We have done it for the past couple of years for business, for a particular focus.

Government engagement has been something that ICANN has been doing for a number of years already. Technical engagement is something that's started to be structured only this year, with the arrival of Adiel Akplogan in ICANN staff, from AFRINIC, and civil society, we've ran a number of pilots over the past 15 or so months, and we want to structure how we do this better.

Three key areas: number two is around content and communications; to look at what we have in terms of content around the participation of civil society in ICANN at present, and how we can better communicate to the wider audiences about ICANN, about how to participate, why to participate in ICANN. It's how we roll out a program of activities tailored at those audiences, and also a capacity building element, because it's not just about interesting people and getting them ready to participate. It's actually also giving them the tools, the skills, to be able to start easily.

I think someone made a remark like that this morning, that you want to be welcome at your first meeting at ICANN – and not just that, you want to feel increasingly comfortable and able to participate, to really have your voice heard effectively and impactfully in the policy discussions. The scope of this plan, again, something that we are working to get feedback on. We've identified three key groups in ICANN that broadly fit the stakeholder category, and that's the At-Large community, or at

least a large part of the At-Large community, and then NCSG. Within NCSG it's two constituencies – NCUC and NPOC.

That, broadly, if you want to put it in other terms, should represent non-governmental organizations, individual end users, and academia. That's the sort of thing you saw on the concept paper. What we did last year, we put together a small internal team, so that we have people in each region who are our point persons in the regions to engage specifically in civil society, that will be the experts on civil society engagement, and your direct interlocutor in your region. You can see the pictures here. You know a lot of these people quite well.

Obviously Rodrigo is well known to the LAC community, Yaovi, who works with Pierre in Africa, Kelvin who works with Kuek, based in Singapore, Fahd in the Middle East, and we have, on top of that, at the global level, we have Heidi with the At-Large and also the general policy perspective in this initiative. Someone from our Communications Team, Luna, who's our Director of Communications for EMEA, who will be focusing on communications for civil society worldwide, and our colleague, Joe, in North America, who has got a strong civil society background himself, before coming to ICANN.

So I'm coordinating all that at a global level, and on top of it all, as some of you might have known, I've been really lucky that

Adam Peake, who had joined the ICANN staff a year and a half ago now, to focus on the accountability work, joined our team. He's now our global coordinator for our civil society engagement. So we benefit from his experience as a long-time participant in ICANN from the community side, rather than staff.

Next slide please. I'd like to give you an idea of the sort of feedback that we got. This is still ongoing, and that's why I want to have a discussion today with you, to try and continue to refine our approach. There were discussions about the sort of content and communications that we already have. We started looking at websites, meeting reports, et cetera. There are already ideas about how we could social media, having a dedicated civil society mailing list, newsletters, Twitter account.

Some of this exists in the sense that communities have their own material, and some don't yet. We're still taking input on what would make sense. NCSG is developing a Newcomer Handbook. There are ideas about having a guide to ICANN and the DNS, specifically from a civil society perspective, having webinars, et cetera.

Then on engagement activities, nothing new really. It's something that we already do, except this time it will be focused on civil society audiences, and many of you have been involved in some of that, many of you have led those sorts of events. We

do engagement events here, at ICANN Meetings, or in the days running up to ICANN Meetings. We're also having events ahead of ICANN Meetings. That's something we should think about for Marrakech, for example. If we want to encourage civil society people to come to the Marrakech Meeting, there's not much point in doing it two days before the meeting starts. We need to do it a few weeks before.

We did something in Dublin, not specifically for civil society but including civil society. That was just over a month ago now. That's the same sort of thing we should think about for all our meetings going forwards. Let's do events beforehand to try to drum up publicity and explain to people why it's important, why it's useful. Then we do events just generally in-between ICANN Meetings, across the regions, because again, what we need to do is go beyond our immediate communities; the people who are already interested in ICANN.

We need to go out there. We need to go to civil society conferences, or NGO conferences, academic conferences when it's relevant, to explain what is ICANN, what is the role of civil society in ICANN, and how you can participate, et cetera. I'm almost done now. This is an overview of some of the feedback. This is some of the ideas that manifested from feedback we got, in terms of material we could develop; brochures, handbooks, maybe even a journal.

It's something like an initiative around a call for papers, where maybe once a year we could do a call for papers around civil society and academia's participation in ICANN and Internet governance, to use that as a means of publicity, but also creating useful content and getting people to think about civil society's role in Internet governance. On engagement activities, we should talk about that from the ALAC perspective, because you've created your own calendars.

We should try and synch up, in some ways. We want to be able to plan ahead quite well, have an event calendar online that's targeted at civil society. We should try and synch with the ALAC calendar, see where there are synergies between the two. There's various ideas that have emerged on event strategy. I'm not going to go into all the detail. I think we'll just move on.

What we have planned, it's been quite difficult because there are so many meetings this week, and we've had to move this session to another time because of a conflict. But this one should enable a lot of people to attend. That's this Wednesday, from 15:00. We'll try and keep it short so people can come and still go to the EURALO GA afternoon sessions. The idea there is to basically go again along this concept paper that we circulated, and really try and finalize it, or start finalizing it.

And importantly, it's time to really plan content, communications and activities together; synching calendars, as I've mentioned, but also thinking – this is particularly relevant to ALAC – when we think about events in countries, in regions, how could we work with the ALSes better? I've done it on an ad-hoc basis with quite a few of you. I work very regularly with people like Olivier, Wolf, Sandra, Sébastien, and sometimes Jimmy as well, in Berlin – we've done some great stuff there. How can we reinforce the links with the ALSes?

It's killing two birds with one stone, in a way, because we want to reach out to civil society, but at the same time it would be great if we could get some help from the ALSes, and at the same time also help them gain visibility. I'm done with the slides. I'm sorry. I really wanted to not speak too much in order to have more of a discussion. By way of finishing, my colleague Adam had a few leading questions he wanted to propose, to get the discussion started. Then we'll open the floor. Is that okay, Adam?

ADAM PEAKE:

Good afternoon everybody. It's nice to be back in this room, which is pretty much a second home. There are really three issues I wanted to touch on to follow up on what Jean-Jacques is saying. The first is how we're thinking about civil society within ICANN and how we're defining that. The first has been

mentioned. We have the NCSG, which would be the natural home for civil society organizations – the NCUC and NPOC.

But what we're thinking about specifically for the At-Large is that you have ALSes, some of which are technical organizations and would orientate themselves in that way. Some may be business, and some I'm quite sure are not-for-profit. We feel that it might be something that the ALSes themselves decide to self-select, or otherwise as they wish. That is the way we think you may wish to participate.

We are aware that people have commented that one of the great strengths of the At-Large is that you are multistakeholder, so there is no way and desire for us to impose on you what we decide. But it's an option, and we would welcome your participation in the schemes we have going forward. I think that's the first point – that this is something that you have a discussion about, and the ALS join as they wish, and they would be very welcome. I think that's something I'd like to make clear at the start.

This distinction we often struggle with. I'm sure you have Fellows who come to meetings and they wonder, "Where is my home in ICANN? Where do I belong if I am a not-for-profit oriented person? Do I belong in the NPOC, or the NCUC, or At-Large?" That's something we'd like to work on with you

generally, to try and make that distinction. I think it's something that would be extremely helpful for ICANN generally, and this is something that Heidi suggested actually – that we may have a meeting in Marrakech where the three groups get together and try to work this through.

It may be something to put in the handbook for civil society, so that we have this clear distinction. That would, I think, be helpful for all Newcomers into ICANN; to know where they may belong and how they can participate more appropriately to their various missions. So we'll begin discussing that before, but I think it would be a good meeting to have in Marrakech, and we'd like to ask you for time on your Agenda, if you think this is a good idea going forward.

The last part I'd like to mention is one of the first pieces of content we'd like to produce, which is a newsletter, and thinking that it might be a nice beginning to invite people who do have a civil society orientation to say what the outcomes were that were relevant to you from Dublin, and what the highlights of the Dublin Meeting were for you. So it's not the whole of the At-Large. Again, it's those who feel that they belong and wish to participate in this particular activity.

This would be something that we would then produce on a rolling basis – a newsletter that is about outcomes of the

meeting, and then a newsletter that would be a prelude to what's going to happen at the next meeting. So a newsletter that would be what to expect and anticipate of Marrakech. Those were the three issues I wanted to mention. I can see all kind of name cards up, so thank you very much, and I look forward to a discussion.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. You use all the time allocated to this slot of work. Thank you anyway for the information you've given. It was very important. I have a very long queue to manage, and I have very few minutes, because Nora is here and she has a hard stop. I will begin with Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Can we roll back a couple of slides please, to the pictures? When are you going to stop stealing people from At-Large and take them as employees? Disgusting! Outrageous! Anyway, no, my question has mostly been answered already by Adam with regards to the multistakeholder part of At-Large. We're not all civil society organizations.

I do note that Jean-Jacques, you were in the room earlier on this morning as part of the GSE Team, and there was one of the ATLAS Recommendations that was complaining that there

wasn't enough engagement between the GSE and the local ALSes when a meeting takes place in that region. I'm very, very happy to see that now there is this moving forward, and so there will be much more symbiosis between ICANN and the ALSes, specifically in the civil society. So that's really good.

Finally, one small point. Where do organizations in civil society belong? Do they belong in NCUC? NPOC? Or in At-Large? There are some organizations that are NCUC or NPOC and ALSes. May I suggest that we invite them specifically if we're going to have this discussion in Marrakech, so that they are able to share their knowledge and why they're members of both. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. Next hand will be Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you very much. Thank you for the presentation. I think this is a follow up to what Olivier was asking. I'm really concerned about civil society within ICANN. I really don't understand. Is it a new SO or is it a new AC? Are we setting up something new? Because it looks like civil society, by definition, is from some of the existing SOs and ACs already. I don't understand why we need to formalize civil society within ICANN.

It's not clear. That's just it. I think we need to clarify it. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I will ask you to be very brief, otherwise we'll not manage to finish this session. Next is Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI: Jean-Jacques, we didn't talk to one another, but it's exactly the question that Seun asked. I want to know, what is the final objective? Is to create another constituency for the civil society? Is there a redundancy? Isn't there some redundant aspect with ALAC, with NPOC? I don't see where the borders of those groups are. For instance, all the ALSes are part of civil society, so we already have a civil society. Where are we going? What is your final objective?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Just as a point or matter of clarification, I think in this respect, Sébastien, we have a major dissent, because if I count the existing EURALO At-Large structures, there are around 50 per cent who could be considered as technical groups, like ISOC

Chapters, but more than 50 per cent, if you ask them, they consider themselves as civil society. I think we should be open enough to follow their self-consideration and not say, “You may consider yourself as a civil society organization, but we in ALAC have to consider you as end user representatives.”

So I do not see the contradiction in it, personally. I personally see this as a completely useless and unproductive discussion, which we call in German “[schpitz vindich or 00:52:33]”. This is not leading to any real clarification. I think we have a common goal – protecting end users, Whether we do it via a self-declared end user representative, or we do it as a civil society entity, I think we have a big job and a big challenge ahead, and who declares whom whatsoever is not interesting or more or less secondary for me. Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Wolf, we don’t disagree, but why do you need borders? This is civil society, “I should do that, I should do this.” For now, to be a Member of At-Large, an ALS does represent end users in their country. That’s the minimum requirement. All those issues and what we’re talking about, who asked for it? Are we talking

bottom-up now? This is something that is imposed on us at ALAC. We do not need this distinction. We do not need to talk about those issues we have in our structures. We have civil society, we have technical societies, technical aspects, some do represent only the end users, we have the young, we have the old... But we do not need this new framework.

Once again, I repeat – let’s stop it now. If we need a dialogue between NCUC and NPOC and At-Large, let’s organize that. I’m not sure that the staff should be in charge of it. I think we can do it ourselves. If we haven’t done it so far, there might be some very good reasons for that, but please, we should stop wasting our time talking about useless issues that aren’t going forward for ICANN, at ICANN. We do represent the end users. Thank you.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks Tijani. I will speak in Spanish. I am really quite confused and I sort of understand what Sébastian is saying. I remember that many years ago, if we said we were from civil society within At-Large, they would hit us on the fingers, like teachers used to do back at school. I remember a heated discussion between [unclear 00:56:14] and Olivier about civil society organizations who were participating in At-Large, or if they were not civil society organizations. Now we are saying that within At-Large we do have civil society organizations.

So I believe that I haven't understood a thing throughout all these years. I also believe that this is going beyond ICANN's scope. Why are we discussing this issue here? I really don't understand it. It's a question, and I'm really confused, because I'm thinking, "What have I been doing within At-Large for the last few years?"

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Fatima. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm also confused. When I look at the ICANN structure as a whole, and I see these civil society groups within the GNSO, the only thing that I can think of is if you are an ALS, you're an advisory type of structure. But if you're in the GNSO, you're in the policy making. So that's the only difference that I see between a civil society and an end user. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Eduardo. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you. It's unfortunate we can't see AC. But we've been posting – those who are online, and can see the posts – you mentioned, Jean-Jacques, about a calendar. There is something

that we don't utilize very well, which is the TM Meeting Calendar. Dev, with the Technical Taskforce, has tried to educate the ALAC Members to use it. If you go on, you'll see the link to the calendar. Each RALO should be updating events that you're doing. So that's one of the links we did.

Also, we provided the link to the actual document that was created. Unfortunately I still don't see the numerous events that we worked on weeks ago. It's not integrated into the document. There's only a couple of North American citations in it. We've been very systematic with our list of events that, particularly leading up to the Puerto Rico event, which is systematically, how can we reach out to civil society in a progressive way? So that's just a bit of my feedback.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I too am very much confused about why we're bringing in the term "civil society". To me, it tends to mean more of academic groups, as opposed to the non-profit, technology, end users, or other technical groups. So that's also confusing. Also, I think we represent end users in At-Large, and it seems like a lot of the work that we tend to do seems a lot more aligned with some

other groups, but besides the listing of events, we should also have more representations, more working closely within the ALS, so that if we're going to highlight an event that you're going to go to, and the ALS in the region, we should work together.

We should maybe even do a conference, an information session for new people, or other things to get new people in, and not just attend conferences and that type of thing – but actually work closely to have real sessions and real involvement, and close new stakeholders.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Judith. I am not confused, as a lot of you are confused here, because I understand very well that the stakeholders in ICANN are GNSO, ccNSO, ALAC, At-Large, et cetera. But inside those stakeholders, you can find civil society, you can find academia, you can find the technical community, you can find the governments, et cetera. So it's not a harm to speak about civil society, because in At-Large we have a lot of civil society organizations. I would like to add only one word, because I know that Nora is waiting, and Jean-Jacques has to answer the questions.

I think that the most important thing that ICANN can do for the civil society is capacity building – very important. I hope that the project that we can submit to you, for capacity building, will be

accepted and will be treated seriously. Thank you very much.
Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Thank you very much for that. If we go back to the discussion we had this morning with GSE, and we think about some of the Recommendations from ATLAS, “ICANN should continue to support outreach programs that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.” There’s more that are relevant. I could go on, but basically outreach. “ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views, proportionally to the scope, and relevance,” et cetera. It goes on.

I agree with all those, and I’m very glad you made those recommendations. How do we take it forward, and how do we fit with ICANN’s mission to seek to have a diversity of views and a diversity of participation in ICANN? We try to engage with wider audiences. So the exercise is not at all to create a new SO or AC. Thank God! No, definitely not. If you think practically, are we going to go out and say, “We’d like to promote ALAC. We’d like to promote GNSO.”

If you look to the wider world, people will not gel with that. It will require a lot more extra education to explain what we’re

talking about. We have to think about what it looks like out there. What are the broad stakeholder groupings that exist? Can we talk about a business community out there? Yes, and we have, so we have business engagement that has started. We have the technical community, and true – technical community is varied, and it's a broad term, and we're only just starting our structured engagement with them, with Adiel. We'll see how that develops.

That's another category. Then you've got the government and inter-governmental side. Then you've got the rest, and the rest includes NGOs, not-for-profits, end users, and the people who look after end users interests, and you've got academia in that. I am more than happy to use another term than civil society. I've tried, and I've looked for a good definition of civil society, and frankly, I haven't found one. I've looked at the UN, I've looked at ten different UN agencies, where they all define civil society differently. If someone has a good idea about how to categorize these different stakeholder groupings, I'd be happy to. It's simply in order to be... We have to be able to engage with different groups.

Now, if you put aside technical community, business and governments, you leave the rest, we could think about having a dedicated engagement with academia and a dedicated engagement with people who think they represent end users,

and a dedicated engagement with NGOs. But it's just not very practical. Now, I'm more than happy to get feedback from everyone on what I'm trying to explain. What we're trying to do is go out there and talk to communities out there to interest them in becoming members and participants in our work. That's all it is.

There's no other design. So we've called it "civil society", and we might, and we will, talk slightly differently maybe if it's just an academic audience compared to an NGO. That's where we need your input. But there's nothing hidden in there, and we're happy to work with you. I'm sorry if it confuses you, but it's just trying to take forward some of the missions that we've been given, generally as ICANN in the Bylaws, and from people like ALAC, on trying to broaden participation and be more diverse. That's all it's about.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. I'm sorry, we've run out of time. We've had Nora waiting for a while. So this session is closed now. I invite Alan Greenberg to take over.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Our next speaker, Nora Abusitta, will be talking about her department, as it's evolving, and the

responsibilities, several parts of which are of great interest to At-Large. I hope we can shift gears from our previous presentation and focus on this one. We are delaying the coffee break by 15 minutes, and hopefully Patrik Fältström will be able to delay his presentation by 15 minutes, and will take the time out of the ALS Criteria Session. Nora, I'll turn it over to you.

NORA ABUSITTA:

Alan, thank you so much. Thank you for inviting me to speak to you in Dublin. Always a pleasure to meet with this group in particular, because many of you users of our programs, but many of you are authors and masterminds behind a lot of the thinking and a lot of the programs that were developed in DPRD. To very quickly go over why we established this department, there were many good efforts within ICANN Operations and within the community to strengthen participation, to invite more people to play an important role in what ICANN does. But these programs were not really formalized or streamlined.

For this reason, the department that looked at what we're doing in order to increase the pool of people that participate, invite new faces, strengthen the current level of participation was established. Really we built on what we had before and strengthened it, and then looked at where the gaps were and started filling it. This is a very young department. We're only a

year and a half old. We're also very young – my team that had to leave and go to another session – but I also have a very young team. A lot of enthusiasm, a lot of energy.

I think you're all aware of our areas of concentration. I like to think of them as three types. We develop tools; either tools to help the community and staff do better, or tools to invite more participants, or tools to help our other departments reach their goals. We work very closely with GSE Teams, with the Policy Team, to see what tools can be developed for them to do their jobs a little better, and easier.

Another area we work on, I call programs. They're really programs to support the next generation of ICANN. Many of you know the Fellowship Program. I will not take credit for it. I was here before I got here. We try and strengthen it. We try and see what better can be done for it. I'm really trying hard to increase the number of Fellows per ICANN Meeting. We are taking a look at it right after this meeting to see if the criteria that we're using is still applicable, and if not then we'll need to engage with you to see what better criteria needs to be used.

The NextGen Program was really designed because we felt there was almost a missing piece before the Fellowship Program – a younger generation that needed a little bit closer follow up, or a little bit more handholding. So the NextGen Program was

designed for two reasons; one, it targets a younger generation, but it also just targets the region where we are. We always felt like we came to Europe, or to Asia or to Africa, we set up shop with an ICANN Meeting, but we never really left much behind.

I feel like the experience that the NextGen'ers are building during the ICANN Meetings is a great thing that we're leaving behind. You will see the NextGen'ers during the meeting. Please welcome them. I know a lot of you are talking to them, so great group to engage with. We are looking at the Newcomer Program as well, to make sure that it evolves as ICANN evolves, and then finally we are taking a closer look at how remote participation can be done better. Those are the programs that we're overseeing.

Finally, that orange box is collaborations. We have a lot of partners that ICANN deals with – whether it's on education, whether it's on Internet governance, my department starts these relationships. Very often they spend a month to more specialize the department, but we try and assess the merit of these relationships and send them out to the relevant departments when needed. This is a little more detail about the programs. I'm going to skip through this, because I think you're all aware of it. One thing to note always: these programs and tools and collaborations need your support, your buy-in, and also your feedback.

Ultimately, they're not going to work if I don't have good contact with you and I'm not listening to you. At any point in time, whether you're dealing with the Fellows, or the NextGen'ers or you're using the online learning platform and you feel there are areas of improvement, please let me or my team members know. Because this is an evolving department, as I said.

There are a few things that I know you would like to get updates on – first off being the Mentorship Program. I will give you a very quick update. We are taking another look at mentorship. This came through to us from the Stakeholder Journey Team, that still identifies mentorship as a very important piece of the ICANN experience. I know it's been attempted before. We're taking a look at what worked and what didn't work, and we will launch a new Mentorship Program in Marrakech.

From now until Marrakech, we are going to socialize the idea with the community. We're going to engage with community members to see what they think we should and shouldn't do. We will try and target mentors that have gone through some of the training, maybe leadership training, maybe people who have been Fellows in the past – just to make sure that we are pairing the right caliber of Newcomers with the NextGen'ers.

This is happening a lot, by the way, informally, but we felt like we need to formalize it better and to make sure that this time

around we have a gardener for the program – not just establish a program and hope that it’s going to survive on its own. DPRD will be responsible to make sure that the Mentorship Program works better than it did in the past. The questions that I received from you I think are status questions on some of the recommendations that are pertinent to DPRD, one of which is how does DPRD support outreach.

Like I mentioned in the beginning, we try and develop the tools that are very helpful for the GSE Team. I see the OLP as a great tool. We produced a lot of the content that is used by our team members when they go for their engagement, whether it’s academic engagement or other. I am currently looking at a project for local content creation, whether it’s for our outreach materials or for the OLP. So rather than just taking content that was created in English and translating it, I’d rather look at the regions themselves – what is important to them, and create the content from scratch there. I think that would be a little bit more helpful.

Second question was about increasing the number of staff and budget for the programs that add valuable community contribution or helps the community develop so that they can better participate. I’m constantly pushing for a bigger budget, obviously, as everybody does.

I will need your support for that. A little bit of pressure on the Board would be great. We have a very young department, as I mentioned earlier, so I think the support of the community, buy-in from the community, that these are worthy programs, that these are programs that are giving us real results in terms of participation – not just numbers, but also quality – is very important.

In terms of staff, the team is growing. I started off with two people, and I have six now, so we're getting there. But we also do rely a lot on other groups or other teams within ICANN, and on frankly community members as well. I've reached out several times to many of you to help us with creating courses, or with helping out the NextGen'ers and so on and so forth. So I really look at my team as, okay, my direct reports, but it goes a little bit beyond and it goes into the community a little bit broadly.

The last question I'll touch upon is what we've done to support public campaigns to promote ICANN. Again, we do a lot of the content. If there's any content there that is missing, I will ask for you to point it out. I think I'll just close here quickly by saying a lot of the tools that we develop are identified by the community, so we try and listen as much as possible, my team engages with the community a lot. If there's anything we're missing or any areas that are lacking, please let us know. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Nora. We have about 15 minutes for discussion. I will ask for a timer and the alarm to be used. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Nora for this presentation. You spoke about local content development. I really love that, but I want you to tell me how you will do it. What are you doing for the local content development? How can you enhance the local content development? This is the major failure in the developing countries and regions that are under-served. Second point is about the ICANNLearn. You are in charge of it. I would like to ask you about what's been done so far, and what could be done in the future. Thank you.

NORA ABUSITTA: About local content development, we realize there's already a lot out there that we haven't tapped into. There are academics in every country that have content. I know some people here that have good content – and I'm looking at Aziz. That was created in French, for example. We're going to start with that. If you're aware of any good content in Spanish, in French, that was carted in those languages, then please let us know.

Enhancing it, I will rely a lot on our Regional VPs. After we understand how much is out there, we will identify gaps in themes, and then we will either look to consultants or to experts or to academics to create that content for us. I'm starting a project with the GSE Team called "gaps" to look at gaps in education, in content, outreach, and so on and so forth.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

May I follow up? I see that you are talking about content for the platform, or for ICANN. No, I am talking about creating local content on the Internet. How can you enhance the content development in those regions so that they will be present on the Internet?

NORA ABUSITTA:

It's a long-term process, and I think you know that. It takes much more than putting the content on the OLP or making it available. But I'd like to do a little bit more academic outreach, to be honest, and start encouraging people to create in their own languages. Many academics, when they write about Internet governance, will go to English, because that's the popular way to do it. I think that we will develop a plan for that, and we will certainly include you in it.

The ICANNLearn question, we launched the new ICANNLearn. I don't know if you were able to see it. It's extremely easy to use. It has much more courses, it's very interactive, it will allow for people to teach courses, to create them themselves. I encourage you to take a look at it. I know Jeff Dunn is going to speak to many people about what this looks like, but in some of the booths we have the new ICANNLearn.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'm next in the queue. I don't really need any answer, but I want to make a couple of comments. When I look at the items that are on that chart, I have very different feelings about some of them. The Fellowship, you will not find a better supporter than me, and the single, easiest reason I can give is to look around this room and to find the number of really outstanding people here who started in the Fellowship. You can take your bows. I cannot say enough good things.

I don't know what the return is, that one in ten people end up being active contributors. It's probably not a 90 per cent number, but the people that do come through it and stick around are outstanding. Anything you can do to support that, I strongly support. NextGen is fun, is trendy, and I haven't seen a lot of hard numbers about how it's really going to help us, but it sounds like a good thing to do, and we should help you, and

they're fun when they're here. But again, I don't know what the real benefits are. Perhaps it's a cheap program that is not bad.

I'm being honest. Heidi reminds me that we're going to be inviting them, and I'll find out what the real [unclear 01:24:22] is. I didn't say stop doing it. I'm saying we really need to understand it. Leadership Training Program, I went through it last year, and as someone who's been around for many, many years, I cannot endorse it more than I do, and I wish we could put a multiple number of people through it.

NORA ABUSITTA: I can't claim credit for it, because it's not within my department, but I am a big fan as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought it was moving there, but okay, I'm wrong.

NORA ABUSITTA: It's welcome to move in there, but I can't claim credit for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Lastly, I haven't looked at the new ICANNLearn, but I have looked at a number of the courses, and received a fair number of comments from new people trying to use it. The words that often are used are "confusing", "disorienting, because it seems

to be talking about things that aren't of concern to me", and "out of date". So be it. Again, I'm not really asking for answers. Next in the queue is Olivier, and he has two cards up, but he only gets one speaking slot at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for coming to see us, Nora. I'm following up on some of the ATLAS Recommendations. It's very good that you've provided us with answers on Recommendation 2, 1 and 12. I have a few more. I have Recommendation 18, 33, 38 and 41 to address. I hope I can do that in an hour and 30 minutes, but perhaps I'll try it in one minute and 30 seconds. The first one was to do with the increase in the budget. I think you've touched on that.

The next one was support end users to take part in policy development, and I think the key word here is "policy development". ICANN is doing a lot to bring more people in and to get them engaged in activities, but it's not policy development, and that's really the core business we have to help them with. That's one thing. That was Recommendation 18. The next one, 33 – the ALAC should arrange more At-Large capacity building webinars, and here I think we would probably need a bit of help with regards to speakers, slide decks, et cetera.

There was at some point the talk of an Internship Program to be able to help with such things, so I'd like to remind you of this, please. The next one, Recommendation 38 – ICANN should ensure that the Beginner's Guides are easily accessible. The post-ATLAS II discussions show that they also need to be updated, and brought up to date. They were originally written by members of staff as personal projects. Some members of staff have moved on and so on. We will need to do a follow up on that.

Now that I've got 17 seconds to speak to Recommendation 41 – the ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities. We have discussed this with Sally a bit earlier this morning, but it would be interesting to see what we also can do with your department on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. You can keep one of your cards up, and if there's time we'll go back to you.

NORA ABUSITTA: I'm going to touch on a couple of things. One, supporting or bringing in new people for policy development. We are looking at that more closely when we look at the backgrounds of people

who apply for NextGen and for Fellowship, because we would like to bring people that are interested in that specifically. For the next meeting format, Meeting B, this is what we're going to target – people who only want to do policy development. Capacity building webinars – I'd be more than happy to provide you with a space on the OLP or content as well, so let's talk offline about that.

Finally, the Beginner's Guides – we don't actually own them in DPRD, but you just gave me a great idea of taking them and creating more digestible courses from them, so thank you for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I can just say, capacity building webinars, the key word there was “intern”.

NORA ABUSITTA: We just launched the internal Internship Program, and we have our first official intern at ICANN. I'm assessing this program for the next six months, and when we know we have things right, we're going to launch the one with the community. I don't want to make any mistakes. This is a very tricky subject.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The queue is closed, by the way. Vanda is next.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Mine is quick. Nora, nice to meet you. Just to remind you that in Brazil we are having a very creative idea together with the engagement people over there, from ICANN. I invite you to be connected with us, and just to share new ideas of how to use people inside and expand everything. Because we started doing the program with Portuguese, and now we are doing a lot of different things together with the engagement people over there. So we can keep in touch. Just that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have exactly two and a half minutes left, and four people in the speaker queue. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thank you so much Nora for this presentation and for your ideas here. We mentioned earlier, when Sally was here, I'm glad to see you're revamping the Fellowship Program, because one of the main problems we've been having in getting engagement within North America is that the disadvantaged communities in the US and Canada, specifically the Native Americans, the people in the rural areas, who really are classified as disadvantaged, have no

access to any of that. So many people here have regenerated because of the Fellows.

We all have access to the Fellows, which we'd like to [have to change 01:31:07]. The second thing is also with the new generation we are working with, because of wanting new people, we are working with your staff on creating new ideas for new generations, so we [unclear 01:31:21] about that program. On the remote hubs, we wish the program would start... I know it got transitioned from IT to your department, but it came so late this year, that it was very hard to get people interested in it, because they were interested in it earlier when we kept telling them about it, but it just didn't happen.

On the Technology Taskforce we had a discussion on this earlier, and had ideas from people who'd done remote hubs before on what was good and what was not good. But that got lost when it was transitioned to your department. We would like to take that up again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Appreciated. Beran?

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you. I'm going to make it shorter than even Judith. I just wanted to ask about, regarding the New Meeting Strategy, which

is going to be rolled out next year, Meeting B in particular, what the plans are for NextGen and the Fellows. I also wanted to know more about the internship, as well as the mentoring, but we will do that offline.

NORA ABUSITTA: For Meeting B we were looking at how best to maintain the Fellowship and the NextGen Program, but to make it significant. As I mentioned briefly, earlier, the criteria for picking the Fellows and NextGen'ers will be more based on their experience or interest in policy development. This way we'll maximize on their presence and they'll get the most out of it. Because people have expectations when they come to ICANN Meetings, and it's not just the policy development part. For me, I want the Fellows to be satisfied as much as the community members.

ALAN GREENBERG: Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you very much Alan...

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Judith Hellerstein again. The Fellowship and looking at the criteria and trying to get involved... Some more people from communities that haven't been represented...

NORA ABUSITTA: We are going to take a look at the criteria as soon as we're done with this meeting. There are other issues with the criteria that have come up in the past few months. I will reach out to you offline as well to see what other things we need to take into consideration. Because yes, we've had areas where people don't qualify, and it makes no sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The queue was closed already. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you very much Alan. Nora, I just wanted to have a proposal for you that might enrich this OLP. We could mix it with NextGen. This is something that could be a criteria for the selection of people that could benefit from the NextGen or the Fellows Program – first of all to train those people online to use the OLP, so that we don't lose any time when they arrive, they'll already be trained, instead of them starting at 7:00. They would have this online training, and during the ICANN Meeting they could do something a little bit different and be more performing.

Secondly, at ALAC we have old people like me with a lot of experience with ICANN, and we can be useful to train, online, those younger people. There's one by my side. I'll also be ready to train in French. I started a course Internet governance in my university, in Morocco.

NORA ABUSITTA:

First of all, yes, we ask NextGen'ers to have three or five courses taken on Internet governance, and OLP, and they already know about ICANN. What they must do is "how to survive an ICANN Meeting". We already do that. But very often they arrive and they have so much information, so many people, they're totally lost. We need to help them out. For that, you're absolutely right. We need to enrich their program before they arrive at the ICANN Meeting.

Absolutely, I count on you, Aziz, and the others, if you have time, if you are willing, if you could teach on our platform some courses, that would be absolutely great. It's on a volunteer basis, as usual.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We are about five minutes late. We have asked our folks from SSAC to delay their presentation by 15 minutes. Therefore, we have a ten-minute coffee break. This group is very famous for

coming back from coffee breaks 15 minutes late. I am going to ask Patrik to start pretty much on time, and if you don't really want to hear what's going on with SSAC, next time we won't bother inviting them, but if you want to hear then be back from coffee break. Thank you.

[Audio part 2]

JULIE HAMMER: Good afternoon everyone. It's my pleasure to introduce Patrik Fältström, Chair of SSAC. If we could just cease any private conversations now, please? Thanks. Patrik will give you an update on SSAC activities over the last few months. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Thank you for inviting me and SSAC to come here. SSAC Members are not really here on site yet, but we have some. Can SSAC Members stand up please? What are you doing here? It's also the case that we in SSAC do have excellent support staff. Can you please stand up? Look at that! Cool. All of us together have managed to not only do a lot of work, we've also produced a brand new slide deck with new graphics.

Joking aside, one of the most important reasons why we've been working quite hard on this is because of the input from you, in ALAC, that you find it important for people to understand what the various organizations in ICANN are doing. Being an AC we find it important that people understand who we are, or else people might not take out advice for what we believe they are.

We're currently 35 members appointed by the ICANN Board. Our Charter is just like it has been for many, many years now – to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocating systems.

So it's the ICANN community and the Board, and this is really important when we go to the next slide and look at what ICANN is dealing with, but this is us. We try to ensure that we have expertise in a wide variety of areas. You see down to the left what we believe we need expertise in at the moment – addressing and routing, DNS, DNSSEC, domain registry/registrar operation, DNS abuse, cybercrime, internationalization – both regarding domain names and data, Internet service and access provider issues, and of course ICANN policy and operations. The things we've strengthened the last couple of years have to do with cybercrime issues and addressing and routing.

We have 73 publications since 2002, and we divide them into reports, advisories and comments, and then of course we try to do outreach, like this meeting, to inform the community on what we're doing. Next slide please.

If we look at what ICANN is doing to understand where we fit, what's important for us is to tie our Charter to the mission and core value of ICANN. What we find in the ICANN's mission and core values are, 1) to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems, and; 2) to preserve and enhance the operation, stability, reliability and security and global interoperability of the Internet.

So what we are trying to do is we find that we are chartered to be an AC to the ICANN Board and the community to ensure that the organization and community follow and do actions that do not break this mission and core values. That's the connection. To talk briefly about the CCWG and this whole discussion about membership and revoking and throwing out Board Members and Budget and all those things – which, by the way, Julie is one of our champions on doing that work – what I just described, the match between our Charter and ICANN's mission and core value, that's important for us.

Then throwing out Board Members and whatever, that's secondary, that's operations, which of course is important, but

that's also why we're more looking into the square that you see to the right – that one of the ATRT 2 Recommendations was to change the Bylaws to ensure that the ICANN Board must take advice from the ACs into account. That is much more important for us than other things.

Because if it is the case that the ICANN Board do not, then they have a breach of the Bylaws and whatever, and then we take for granted that you, the rest of the community, have come up with a mechanism of how to handle the case when ICANN doesn't follow its own Bylaws. We more think about setting up the rules that ICANN is supposed to follow when they're doing whatever they're supposed to do.

If we look at the publication process we're using, which is the one down-left, we form a Work Party on an interesting topic, which can be based on actions, that we come up with things ourselves, or it might be the case that someone asks us a question. ALAC could do that. Please. There have not been many questions from ALAC lately. Julie, what do you think? When did you last hear a real question from ALAC? Anyway, jokes aside, GAC has asked us questions and the ICANN Board has asked us questions, so please send us questions if it is the case you have any.

We do some research and writing, and we might conclude, “No, there’s nothing we can say here. We cannot give recommendations that actually will make the world better.” Just describing something as a problem is something we don’t really want to do. We want to really make a recommendation that makes things better. Regarding if it is the case the recommendation is to the Board, then we have a special thing you will see to the right; that we submit the advice to the ICANN Board, the ICANN Board acknowledges and studies the advice, the Board takes formal action on the advice, and the formal action can be one of four things.

In the action into the policy development process, one of the PDPs they have, it might be a request to staff to implement it with a public consultation, just like normal. It could be dissemination of advice to the affected parties, which might not be inside ICANN – it might be other external parties, like for example the issue with certificates that we issued an advice on. The ICANN took contact with the CA Browsers Forum and made some agreements there.

Or it might very well be the case that the ICANN Board chooses to do something else, a different solution, and explain why the advice is not followed. One example of that has to do with namespace collisions, where ICANN took a different path forward

than what SSAC did, which resulted us making t-shirts. Next slide please.

The current Work Parties include: working on the New gTLD Program Review; registrant protection, that I'll talk a little bit more about later; we have the DNSSEC Workshops, both for Newcomers on Monday and then also more for people that have been working with DNSSEC for a while on Wednesday; we have one newly created Work Party on IPv4 address exhaustion, which is increasingly problematic now, when we literally have run out of IPv5 addresses in many areas of the world; we are explicitly looking at tracking Board advice more carefully, because with the previous pictures you understand it's pretty important to keep track of all the advice we give.

We, together with the ICANN Board and ICANN staff have identified that a large portion of the issues we have with our advice not being taken into account properly is simply just because we haven't had any tracking system. So it's not the case that a tracking system stops the problem, but it's very difficult to rely on individuals keeping track of things and advice. Thanks to the good staff that we have, we actually have not dropped so many balls, but a few of them actually unfortunately have taken a little bit too long. This is absolutely no finger-pointing there. We just see that we need to do better work, all of us together, and we are working on that.

The recent publications include SSAC 73, comments on root zone key signing key rollover plan – I’ll talk about that later, because that’s a newly published document – and then a large portion of the latest documents of course have been formal and informal input as a chartering organization to the CWG and CCWG. We have our own webpage, ssac.icann.org. We are trying to use this new social media thing. It’ll never catch on.

And, new thing – we have started to make videos! Whoohoo. You can even watch us on TV trying to explain what we are doing. Of course, we not only have the videos that we have made. We also have some other people that are interviewed. We’ve now started to really come up with better documentation, specifically when we’re doing things which are best practices. We feel that we should do more outreach. That is specifically something that’s been triggered by lots of good input from you in ALAC, let me just emphasize that.

So we have tried to listen. I think videoing was something that was suggested by ALAC, if I remember correctly. Because we would never come up with such nutty ideas. Next slide please. So that was a description of SSAC. Does anyone have any questions on SSAC in general? Or should we move into more substantial material? Let’s move on. I already listed and talked about the various things we’re doing at the moment. The

milestones we had is that we just published SSAC 73. We have the DNSSEC Workshops at this ICANN 54.

In the next quarter we envision releasing the document on registrant protection accreditation management that I will present shortly for you, because that is one of the few documents that we are presenting during our development of the document. Otherwise, because of various disclosure issues, we are not talking much with the community about the document that we are producing or issues we're working on. In that case we are, because we wanted to have input on what the best practices are. We wanted to know what the industry was doing.

Then, first quarter 2016, we think that we are done with advice for the New gTLD Program Review, and of course the workshops at ICANN 55. Next slide please. If we go to SSAC 73, comments on the root zone key signing key rollover plan, it's a very simple document, and it is simple because of two reasons. There is a Design Team for KSK rollover that have come up with a plan, where they wanted to have input from the community. We have already published a document on KSK rollover in the form of SSAC 63, which is ten documents ago.

In SSAC 63 we discussed the key management of the root zone, motivations for it – basically why it's a good thing to do -, what

the risks are, the various mechanisms that are available, and then we tried to quantify the risk of a failed update, and DNS response size consideration and a couple of other things. We basically went through a couple of various risks and mitigation mechanism and various issues, including saying that there are always risks, with outreach, and all that kind of stuff. It's important to do this in a proper way.

It's specifically the case that we, in SSAC 63, have five recommendations for ICANN and the root zone management parties. What we did was we took SSAC 63, which we wrote, and we compared that with the report that the Design Team want to have comments on. Unfortunately, we don't see that, or how the Design Team addressed those five recommendations. It might very well be the case that they actually did look at those recommendations and did choose something else, but as this is advice to ICANN, we don't think that it's good enough.

So SSAC 73 is actually a very simple document that, with SSAC 63 as an Appendix, where we ask ICANN to please go through those five recommendations and let us know what they have done, if anything, or why they did choose something else. Not difficult. Any questions on that? Let me just say that Jeff is part of this Design Team and also an SSAC Member.

It might well be the case that specifically the root key rollover thing is something that can be really important for ALAC, and maybe there are some outreach things, and that could be interesting there. I think ALAC, even though you might think, “It’s just a technical thing that the technical community take care of,” no, that’s not the case. If this goes bad, it will affect quite a lot of parties. I encourage you in ALAC to take track of what’s happening here regarding root key rollover. Is that a good summary?

JEFFREY DUNN:

Thanks Patrik, yes. You may not know it, but around one in three users of the Internet actually do validation of the keys, one way or another, with DNS. Over the last couple of years, quite quietly and quite efficiently. DNS is now coming more and more secure. So when we talk about rolling the keys, we’re talking about rolling the entire chain of trust of that entire system. Potentially, we could affect a lot of folk if we ever do this wrong. There’s an awful lot of care and attention being paid to this exercise to make sure that as we change that trust anchor right at the root, we don’t break the Internet on the way through. Thanks.

PATRICK FALTSTROM:

We express it differently. All of you have probably gone to websites and they’ve said, “I’m sorry, I don’t know the certificate.

Do you want to continue, install an exception?” Think about that happening with anything anyone is doing on the Internet, and that it suddenly happens. While some people are trying to find more oxygen... There’s a question?

ARIEL LIANG:

We have a question from remote participant, Murray McKercher: “What is the most critical issue with respect to security and stability of the Internet, and how could the ALAC help?”

PATRICK FALTSTROM:

How long is a piece of string? There are many, many important things, and I think the overall issue that we in SSAC are dealing with now is first of all the root key rollover, but, as you will see if you go to the next slide, best practices for... Well, it sounds a bit nerdy, the text itself. What this document is about is actually what are the best practices to ensure that people’s passwords, people that are domain name holders, don’t get lost, so people can break into registries and registrars. What we are looking at, to answer the question, very much now is the best practices.

We are really nervous that we have so many websites, so many services out there that simply are not run in an effective way, and that creates secondary effects. ALAC, of course, just like Internet Society and others, has wide outreach, wide community. It’s

really important to explain to people what they can do – not as academic papers, but what they can really do. If you look at, for example, the best practices for registrant protection and password, there are a lot of things that people talk about in academic papers, like, “Do this and this and that,” but in reality, when we look at libraries for PHP and WordPress and whatever, you cannot do that in real life.

So what is easy to do? What are the cheap wins when you try to secure things? That is where I think ALAC can help, which I think you also are, by referencing a lot of the work we’re doing. What we have been looking at are the various attacks where TLD registries – not on the gTLDs, of course – have been attacked. People are taking over domain names by breaking into the registry, by doing social engineering to the registrar, by simply guessing passwords, and these are actually pretty serious things. It’s not a good thing if the Google domain name in a country is taken over by someone, that fools people to use something that’s not Google. That can have pretty serious secondary effects.

So what this advisory is trying to give is a background about the problem, and is trying to give specific best practice guidelines that will help registries and registrars, and the ones that operate services for registries and registrars to simply do the right thing.

On top of that, it also gives some recommendations for ICANN and the community regarding these kinds of issues. Question?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Jeff mentioned before that one in three users somehow use DNSSEC and validates these keys, and therefore may in fact be impacted. Are you planning on looking at any statistics here as to the number of domain names that are stolen, broken into, whatever, and the causes and the effects of that? As Chair of the ALAC, and as someone who's chaired a PDP on a related issue, I get a fair number of complaints from people saying, "Such and such a registrar stole my name," or various other things. It's not clear if these are one-off cases, or this is just the tip of the mountain that actually get to me.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

To make you happy, I say yes. In reality, what we have been doing and what you will see in this report is that we've been looking specifically at .3.20 of the RAA, if you remember the RAA off the top of your head. The RAA requires, in .3.20 registrars to report breaches to ICANN. What we have investigated is why is that recommendation there, and what is that information used for? One of the things we've discovered is maybe it's the case that it would be good if ICANN actually published some statistics

from that reporting. Because today it's just reported, and then nothing else.

On the other hand, we have also been looking at whether it is possible to, from that data, also disclose who was breached. Under the current RAA and legal situation, we have found that that's probably not possible. But at least if we can publish the statistics, so we understand whether it's a one-off issue, or we see changes or trends in the various breaches, that would be a good thing. But that is not done today either.

ALAN GREENBERG:

In many of the cases that come to me, people say, "The registrar claims I made the request, because they have no evidence the password was changed." So I don't even know in those kinds of cases if the reporter is breached.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Of course, having ICANN publish statistics on the breaches gives us a picture on whether breaches actually are reported, because if you take another example, which is completely unrelated, but still, if you look at the Google Transparency Report from various countries, if you for example compare countries that should be equivalent, one would think – Sweden and Norway – and they're completely different numbers.

Or, if you get different numbers from, for example, the Swedish Police on how many requests they claim they ask Google, and then they ask Google, “How many requests have the Swedish Police asked you?” and those two numbers differ, that gives some indication that we have to dig further. That example for Sweden is actually approximately the same number from the police and Google, luckily enough, but I was a little bit nervous before the numbers were released.

In this case, with ICANN and .3.20 for RAA, we just give very, very easy recommendations. Because we think and hope that our recommendation can be the trigger for that kind of discussion. We don’t really know what the final answer is.

Okay, so we’re looking at credential lifecycle; best practices for creating and distributing passwords, et cetera, how to store them, how to store backups, how to revoke them. Then we talk about also what kinds of credentials you need to authenticate an identity. That is critical for domain names. We talk a little bit about two-factor authentications – what is good and what is bad – and give some suggestions on what actually can be done. The recommendations are few, but on the other hand, the document itself contains lots and lots of what I think personally is very good material for anyone that is a registrar and registry, and I think it would be good for people to read this. That’s it. Julie?

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks Patrik. I was on that Work Party, and one of the things I wanted to add was that that document hopefully will be released within the next couple of weeks, but as a follow on, one of the things the Work Party wants to do is produce a few one pages like a one-pager of best practice guidelines for registries, and another one-pager of best practice guidelines for registrars.

I think what we should also look at doing is a one-pager guidelines for registrants where we can say, “Here are the things you should be asking your registrars when you’re buying your domain name or renewing your domain name,” and the things that they should be looking for from their registrar, and if they don’t get them, go to another registrar.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a question. Ages ago, many moons back, there was a really useful SSAC document about what registrars can do or tell their registrants. Are you going to roll in some of that advice? Because that advice is just very useful for registrars, but also for registrants. I’m thinking if you're doing fact sheets, that actually has a lot of also very useful information.

JULIE HAMMER: I'm trying to remember the one, but I suspect, Holly, that it's on a different topic, and what we want to do is produce a one-pager on this topic and not roll in other topics. But I might follow up with you afterwards about perhaps seeing if that's appropriate to do for any of our other reports.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: It is correct that we've written a couple of documents regarding registrars and the best practices and other kinds of things. Yes, it might well be the case that we are going to do a compilation of those kinds of things with registrars. But on the other hand, at the moment, no, we are not thinking about rolling it. Instead, we see this as two different topic areas. But, on the other hand, that could be an excellent work item for, for example, you in ALAC to maybe take out material from the SSAC to explain the relationship between the registrant and the registrar. I'm pretty sure that we, in SSAC, could help with reviewing that kind of document.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks. I think before I take Olivier's question there's another one from a remote participant? Thanks Ariel.

issues. On the other hand, a lot of things we are looking at is course coming up with policies and suggestions that help law enforcement do whatever they are doing.

JULIE HAMMER: I have in the queue Olivier, Vanda, the second remote, then we'll close the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julie. I have a question on something else than what Patrik has spoken about. Is it general question time now? First a comment. I heard about the Swedish Police and Swedish videos. I'm very happy that you're still able to be with us. That was a joke. The question itself is relating to IPv6. I know we haven't spoken about IPv6 for a while, but the Applicant Guidebook had a number of questions relating to IPv6, relating to the ability of the name servers – at least two name servers needed to be IPv6 compatible or on IPv6, WHOIS, websites, et cetera.

To my belief, it was not made mandatory at the end, but it seems that some of the new gTLDs who have IPv6 are complying with this and some are not. I wondered whether the SSAC was planning to do any survey of this to see where that was going, as

these days we're seeing more and more people use IPv6 out there, and that obviously has an impact on end users.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

If we look at TLDs, we are today having 1,080 TLDs, out of which 1,047 do have IPv6. I think to some degree that is sort of taken care of. The problem with IPv6 has more to do with whether the name servers and the registrars that the end user is using, whether that can handle IPv6. There it's lower, and we don't have any protocol police that can assure that. I think to answer your question, I don't think a stronger policy there would help to raise the number from 1,047 closer to 1,080. I think on the TLD level we don't have an issue with that. Jeff is of course having a little bit of a different view there, but I think Olivier and Jeff can talk a bit about that.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Well, being in the region where mostly the registrants are using resellers, because we don't have many registrars, resellers do not have agreements, and there is a lack of knowledge. So when do you plan to make this one-pager, please remember that we need to address to ISPs that become resellers or general resellers that are in the field around without huge knowledge in the entire LAC region, that this is the reality – we have resellers, not registrars.

We have in our entire region 17 small registrars, and that's it. So that is something that I ask you to think about. I have been, this year, circulating around, talking with all registrars around about ISPs, about new technologies, new domains, new TLDs, and how to do that. But I am facing a lot of ignorance about what is going on in that area, and how they really need to behave to protect registrants. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Thank you very much. First of all, before I make this statement, I personally do have a pretty strong view here. Let me say that I think the whole discussion about resellers has been derailed just because people use the term “reseller”. From my perspective, if it is the case that you have a registrar that is accredited by a TLD of any kind, or accredited by ICANN, it is and should be the responsibility for that registrar to ensure that all requirements on them, including norms, not only contractual requirements, that they are fulfilled, regardless of whether the domain name is sold directly or indirectly – whether there is one step or multiple steps of entities between whoever's buying the domain name and selling it.

So unfortunately, I think there are a lot of things that need to be done there and cleaned up there regarding indirect sales of domain names, which is what I would like to call it. That of

course also has to do with some ccTLDs, who also have policies that make it impossible for people to register domain names that they want, for example in a country when they don't have presence there. That forces the registrants that do have interest for buying the domain name to use a proxy. That means that there are a lot of things that are regarding indirect registration and indirect sales, which I think we, as the community, has not addressed enough yet.

HOLLY RAICHE: Vanda, if you've read the 2013 version of the RAA, the registrars are responsible for ensuring that the resellers... So you may have a problem, but it's a breach of the RAA.

JULIE HAMMER: I'll just ask that you finish that conversation offline. We'll take the last question, Ariel, thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Actually, Murray McKercher, the remote participant, raised his hand. Murray, can you speak up via audio? I will connect with him afterwards, but he posted his question in the chat, so I'll read it for him: "Excuse this simple question, but what is the issue when, in WHOIS records, a domain name has signed DNSSEC?"

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: That they have or have not?

ARIEL LIANG: Have.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: If it is the case that a domain, according to the WHOIS record, has DNSSEC, that means that the domain... Let me take a step back. It means that the technical manager of the domain name has created a key by which the domain, directly or indirectly, is signed, and has passed the key to the registry. So that the domain has DNSSEC means that the registry has received the key from the child domain. Unfortunately, the reason why I'm a little bit detailed here is because I do expect that the person actually asks a very detailed question here. It doesn't say that the domain itself is signed. It says that the parent has received the key from the child zone.

JULIE HAMMER: That brings our session to a close, so on your behalf I'd like to thank Patrik very much for giving us the time, and I'm sure a lot of you will run into him in the corridors and you can ask him further questions there. Thank you very much, Patrik.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes, or other SSAC Members like Jeff and Jaap and Julie. Thank you very much.

[Short break]

ALAN GREENBERG: We are starting the meeting right now. Please take your seats, or at least stop talking about other things around the table. The Meeting on ALS Criteria and Expectations is starting. We are starting with the group on Design Team A, the application process. That group is led by Nathalie Peregrine. Nathalie is here, and she has three and a half minutes left before she has to go back to the GNSO. If you could turn your attention to her please. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you Alan. This is Nathalie Peregrine from staff. We are working on Design Team A of the ALS Criteria and Expectations Taskforce. This was studying the application procedure for At-Large structures – so from the beginning of the application through to the ALAC vote. It was quite interesting, because we managed to study it from a staff perspective – I had a little

insight on that –, community perspective, to see where we were lacking community input or where there were issues, and then looking at the application procedure itself, as a theoretical procedure, and seeing how to solve it.

It was quite hard to pick focal points, so rather than do that we decided to go with what we thought the obvious issues were with the procedure, as it stands now. To be brief, we realized that not all potential ALSes were equal in the information they could provide to us, as staff, and community, in order for us to consider their application. Some of them had inactive websites, some of them were less responsive. This was not a reflection on their value or their own activities as organizations.

So as staff I think we first need to make a big effort to make sure we manage to get as much information possible during the application procedure, so we can present a fully informed description of these applicant organizations. The next step was community input. There were several elements there. The main one for us, and for you here, was the ALAC Members and the voting period, and the fact that – I don't know if all of you know – when there is an application received, once regional advice has been received from the RALO Membership. ALAC Members receive a voting package on the same day as the vote starts, and the vote period is for only a week.

So this is a very brief period. It doesn't necessarily allow for all subsequent questions ALAC Members may have to be answered. So we decided that a week before the voting period opened would be ideal for discussion periods. We also discussed how various RALOs are different in the way they handle both the actual due diligence document they receive, and equally the discussion afterwards with RALO Members regarding the regional advice. So we had a lot of talk about that, and how to streamline it in order to make sure we're not violating any previous rules and regulations. It appears we are.

So we need to work more on that one. We will shortly be putting forwards a document of recommendations to the RALO Leadership, in order to streamline the due diligence treatment and how regional advice is gathered. The next element on this is certain lack of flexibility in the application procedure. That's also something we're working on. It regards when to put an application on hold. Right now we have a three-month application period, which allows for no flexibility. We've had recent instances where a whole period would have been needed.

This could have meant that maybe the applicant was not responsive within the due diligence timeframe. It could have meant that RALO Leadership needed further time to discuss an application during the regional advice period, and again, ALAC Members would have needed a lot more time to make an

informed decision before they voted. So we've resolved a few of those issues and with the ALAC Members' extra week we still need to work on that. We also need to decide – and your input would be precious here – what would be an idea hold trigger, who decides what the hold period is, and when it's satisfactory to start the application procedure once again.

On a more uplifting note, we decided we needed to focus on engagement from the very start of the application procedure. Right now, staff has put together an onboarding process. It's slow. We're very pleased with what we have, but we need to put more effort in it. It only starts once the organization is accredited. I think we believe within the DTA that we could do that from application, which means distilling information to the applicant from the ICANNLearn website about At-Large and ICANN as a whole.

It means also making sure that maybe the applicant could take part as observers in the various RALO monthly meetings, to feel they could start discussing. There could even be through those RALO monthly maybe a mentorship system put in place. These are really suggestions. Equally, we feel strongly that RALO Leadership should be encouraged to get in contact with the applicant from the very beginning. It can be a brief contact, but it would give a sense of belonging that maybe these organizations don't necessarily get once they're accredited. I

apologize for the speed, but that was the summary from Design Team A. Do you have any questions regarding this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. One of the problems I have is I can't read the bottom of the sheet. The AC room doesn't work. It's dead.

ARIEL LIANG: We were informed there are serious technical issues happening in the US, so it's impacting our audio and video and Internet feed in the AC room, hence there's a delay. So we apologize for the inconvenience.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Blame the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Better still, blame the US! Any other questions for Nathalie before she runs off? Thank you very much. There is another question from Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm very happy to see the work proceeding with this. Is there going to be any additional work as to when an ALS gets accepted, what sort of information and welcome package they

receive – whether it’s a package or whatever it is – or is this not the remit of this Working Group?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The remit of this Working Group is to make sure we have effective ALSes, to the extent that we can control it from the various processes. So I’d think that yes that is an issue. It’s not one we’re looking at right now. We’ll be glad to assign it to you as soon as we’re ready to look at it though. Which presentation are we ready to do next? We will now do DTC, the ALS Criteria – the criteria we were looking for to admit an ALS. All right, let us start.

ALS Criteria: the whole purpose of this game is that when an organization applies, or even when they look at what they’re going to have to do if they apply, that they will be able to provide information to convince us that they will be a good ALS – a productive ALS, one that is engaged and is contributing to the At-Large process and to the ICANN processes. It’s quite clear we cannot provide them with a 400-page questionnaire. They don’t want to fill it out, we don’t want to read it. Can we condense the things, but identify the issues that we think are important?

Like in Nathalie’s case, where her group looked at the current process and said, “What are the problems?” we have done the same thing. Point number one: the current criteria are relatively

limited. It says: “An ALS must be self-funded.” That was ICANN’s very initial Bylaw requirement, to say, “Don’t expect any money from us,” and that we are not changing. That doesn’t mind ICANN won’t provide some money on occasion, but it should not be presumed.

The second is that the organization be largely led by individuals. That might mean there’s government or industry involvement, but the decisions should be made largely by individuals. Again, that is a Bylaw requirement right now. I will make it clear, we are changing enough things. We will likely be changing enough things that the Bylaws will have to be revised. So they are not sacred. But these two we believe are still correct, and should be applied.

One of the problems that we’ve had on an ongoing basis with ALSes is they seem to disappear, or at least our contact with them vaporizes. So instead of asking for a contact, some RALOs have said two contacts. APRALO uses three and has had spectacular success with actually knowing who their ALSes are, so we think this is a really good idea and we’re stealing it from them. So we’re going to ask for three contacts. That is three live human beings, hopefully all of whom will respond to email when we send something to them. But in the worst case, at least one of them will.

Number three – the contacts need not be the leaders. We’re well aware of the fact that someone who happens to be president of an organization, or executive director, or chair, or whatever they call it, may not be the person who cares particularly about ICANN, and certainly may not be the person who wants to receive 100 emails a day that we sometimes seem to send out. So they need not be the leaders, but we want assurance that the leadership of the organization has knowledge of the application and supports the application. We’re not asking for notarized statements, we just want people to tell us that.

The reason is simple: we have had cases where the contact person disappears, for whatever reason; their email is no longer valid. We contact the head of the organization because we find their website, and they say, “ICANN? ALS?” and they don’t know anything about it, and someone has applied with their name but is really only acting as a sole actor.

Number four – whoever is listed as the contact must actually have ability to interact with their membership, because one of the whole purposes of the contact is not just to talk to us on occasion, but to really be able to relay messages to the membership and perhaps get answers back, if the membership has any interest. In some cases, that might be addressed by simply giving us the name of their own mailing list, and we’ll

simply include it, but probably that's not the right answer in many cases.

We talked a lot about how big an ALS is really an ALS. We have some ALSes that are a modest number of people. I think one of the people around this table said her ALS is only seven or eight people, but they all care passionately. We have ALSes that have tens of thousands of members. We probably have some ALSes that have many thousands of members, maybe even tens of thousands, none of whom have ever heard of ICANN or being an ALS. So the numbers don't count, as such. The level of activity counts.

However, we believe that the membership should be larger than just the three contacts listed, or should be larger than the two contacts listed, if there are only two contacts listed, because there are only two people in the ALS. It should be larger than the board. If a board of an organization is the whole organization, I've got a problem. But it's a judgment call, and it's a judgment call that will have to be exercised by the RALO in doing the first triage, in giving the RALO opinion, and by the ALAC, if it's a questionable issue and has to be looked at.

Lastly, we are going to ask – and this sounds like a no-brainer, and I certainly wonder why we never did it before – but we're going to ask, “Why do they want to become an ALS? What is the

intersection of their interests and those of ICANN?” When you look at how ALSes were recruited initially, and still are to some extent, they are organizations that have often a passionate interest in the Internet, or some aspect of the Internet, but not necessarily a lot of care about domain name or the arcane things that we do within ICANN. So we’re going to ask.

That’s as far as we’ve gotten, and perhaps as far as we will get, because again, we don’t want an exhaustively long list, but we want to make sure that we have some chance of succeeding. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. I will repeat the same question of this morning. We need objective criteria or objective metrics to say if this organization is important or not, or this ALS is important or not. You spoke about the number of members. Where will you put the bar? You spoke about activity. How will you assess it? What are the metrics? This is very important, because we may put any criteria in, but you need the metrics to assess it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, and we will try. How well we’ll do, I don’t know. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I just want to mention that whether we like it or not, number is one of the important reasons why we're actually recognized as multistakeholder in nature. That is the number of ALSes we actually have on paper. Seeing those [dotted around 01:07:04] is actually one of the things that people look at and feel, "Oh, we have so much membership." Apart from that, I recognize that we also need to make sure that those ALSes are actually active. I think there's a need for balance between numbers; whether we want to reduce the number or we want to get activity from them.

I think one of the criteria was talking about the people who apply need to get confirmation from their leadership. I think we need to face the fact that some people apply because they have no other means of applying, and they really did not want to engage their organization in the first place. If they had, [unclear 01:07:57] applying. So I think we need to start considering whether we could have individual options for registration. Maybe this is actually going to be at the RALO levels to consider, but I think we need to be very flexible on the requirement that we are putting up for the leadership confirmation from the organizations. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Seun. Unfortunately, we have about three minutes, because the last session did go over significantly. We have two more sections of this, the fourth of which is individual members. I'm afraid we probably are not going to get to them today, and we'll somehow try to fit it in later in the week, because it is an important subject. I have no more questions on this particular one. Eduardo, you have 30 seconds.

EDUARDO DIAZ: When we're looking at this, how we look at what other organizations do for their own members – again, we learn from them insofar as if they do this criteria, once they get to be members, do they follow up with them? How do they do it? I'm thinking about the NPOC and the NCUC and stuff like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: All I can say is that if you have experience in those particular areas, then join the Taskforce and help us. The queue unfortunately is closed right now. We will be continuing this discussion later in the week, time to be announced. This session is closed. There is a remote question?

ARIEL LIANG: There is a remote participant, [Alexi and Telise] from Internauta Venezuela: “Question – we do not believe it is necessary to define a policy for monitoring the tasks carried out by ALSes.”

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. I was looking around for my Co Chair for this next session, who I’m told is not here. But Katrina will be here in a moment. I’m told we’re having a switch of staff to handle the remote participation, and the screen will be ready in a moment. This is the Joint Session between the ALAC and the ccNSO. We have an intervention from staff, who want to interrupt my introduction.

GISELLA GRUBER: Just to remind everyone, because we do have new people here today, we do have simultaneous interpretation, so please do say your names when you speak, and speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This is the Joint Session between the ccNSO and the ALAC. The Chair of the ccNSO, Byron Holland, cannot be with us, so for those who are mathematically inclined we have Byron prime, and Byron prime-prime, and Byron prime-prime-prime. I will let each of them introduce themselves for the ccNSO, where

they're from. Then the Agenda is a moderately short one, which will probably go on for well past the period of time we have, if we allow it to.

For the ALAC, here I should point out there's an ALAC and Board Cocktail immediately following this session, so you might have a vested interest in being on time. That's an hour later? Okay. But there is something else going on that I'm supposed to be attending, so I will leave at 30 minutes past the hour. Now that we've wasted a significant amount of time on scheduling, the Items on the Agenda are significant ones. The first Item is the CCWG proposal and how each group intends to handle it.

The second is the submission of the Final Report on Geographical Regions, and, time permitting, an update on how each of us look at the use of country and territory names as TLDs. Let's do introductions first.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Hello. My name is Katrina Sataki. I'm the Vice Chair of the ccNSO, and on behalf of our Chair I have to apologize. He cannot be here because of his sudden illness, and I hope he will get well very soon. If you see him and have any questions to him, just use your opportunity. As you can see, there are three of us trying to cover up for Byron. We have some ccNSO Councilors here with us. Again, I have to apologize that due to some clashing

sessions, they had to be in other sessions. But that somehow always happens, especially lately, with some unexpected sessions popping up, and we have to very quickly reshuffle.

Talking about CCWG proposal and where the ccNSO is now, and what ccTLDs are thinking about. We are having two very intense meeting days in front of us, on Tuesday and Wednesday, and during these days we'll try to cover as many issues as possible, to brief our community and to see what they feel and think, and how we're planning to proceed. This morning we had a Council Meeting, where we discussed the status quo, and potential scenarios, and the way we're going to reach a final decision. Here I'd like to give the floor to Bart and ask him to give a short summary.

BART BOSWINKLE:

Thank you. My name is Bart Boswinkle. I'm a Senior Policy Advisor to the ccNSO. One of the issues, which is probably very important to understand in order to understand how the ccNSO is viewing and looking at the CCWG proposal, but also at the CWG proposal, [unclear 01:20:50] - and we explained this in the past - is that the ccNSO effectively consists of two layers, or you could say even three. The first one is the ccNSO Council, and the second one is the ccNSO Membership. The ccNSO Membership is just a subset of all ccTLDs. Currently there are 256 ccTLDs, and

156 Members, and we have a new application, so hopefully the Council will approve that on Wednesday.

But going back to the structure, why it's important is that at the end of the day – and I think this was clearly shown in Buenos Aires – the ccNSO Membership needs to support the proposal itself. It's not the ccNSO Council who makes the final decision – it's the ccNSO Membership, effectively the broader ccTLD community. So in order to take a formal decision by the ccNSO Council, as an administrative body, and allowing submission of a proposal to the Board in this case, they need to have a sense of support from the broader ccTLD community.

Now, in order to get a clear picture – and, as you know, at ICANN Meetings not all ccTLDs are present, and not all ccTLDs are involved in the works of the CCWG and were not involved in the CWG – the ccNSO has organized, jointly with the regional organizations, as Katrina alluded to, a set of sessions in order to inform, discuss and identify potential issues across the ccTLD community during the upcoming two days, resulting in an understanding, at least, for where the potential issues are for the community, and trying to communicate this to the CCWG as well.

Due to the fact that the CCWG has not finalized its proposal for various reasons, in time for the Dublin Meeting, the envisioned decision-making process has to change. One of the reasons is

the overall timeline, if you look at the whole IANA stewardship transition. It's not just this proposal, but it's also the implementation phase and the approval phase by the NTIA and the US Congress, that determines that overall timeline. As a result, the Council looked at it and said, "Now there is an opportunity for inter-sessional meetings, or there is maybe a need for inter-sessional meetings and inter-sessional decision-making."

Going back to what I just explained about the role of the ccTLD community, and the ccNSO Council, that's going to be very, very difficult for the cc community and it's going to be a very intense discussion, probably, on Wednesday afternoon on what level does the Council feel comfortable to take the decision as yes, the cc community supports the final proposal, and therefore it can be submitted to the Board as part of the whole transition package.

The reason for putting it on the Agenda here is first of all to explain, but also to understand how ALAC views a potential inter-sessional meeting, and if there are any issues, say, on the ALAC side in the approval process. Because that's more or less the outcome of this morning's discussion – and not just this discussion, but the preparation of the meetings here in Dublin, and over the next months.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. In terms of how we view an inter-sessional meeting and how we'll go about approval, the ALAC is probably capable of doing an approval inter-sessionally without a formal meeting. But given the level of controversy, given the various sometimes strong opinions that we have had on many of the issues, I would not feel comfortable doing that. I believe a face-to-face meeting would be quite appropriate and very useful in making sure that any decision we make solidly has the backing of the ALAC, and hopefully the groups we represent.

That being said, regular ICANN Meetings are scheduled relatively well ahead of time, and doing something on pretty short notice, which will almost certainly be close to the holiday season for many people is going to be a challenge. There's no question about that. But if it's a choice of doing it with some remote participation or not doing it, my personal preference – and we haven't discussed this at all – would be to go ahead and try to do that and try to have an inter-sessional meeting.

This is a really crucial thing, and I would not want to glibly be accused of having a two-hour teleconference where some people may not even fully understand... We've had discussions over the past day, and it is almost frightening in that people have sat in the same CCWG Meeting and have had completely different

opinions of what it is we've decided or we're discussing at any given time. The terminology and the concepts are confusing enough to many people, that there's not a lot of clarity. I may believe things are completely clear, and someone across the table will tell me, "No, that isn't what it means at all," in a very radical way.

So I would think a face-to-face meeting would be appropriate, and hope it would be scheduled in such a way that we could actually attend, and hope ICANN would fund us to attend – all of which is completely unknown. There is a precedent. The 2003 change was done with an inter-sessional meeting in December 2002. It was a lot smaller of an ICANN and a much different ICANN, I understand that. Anyone else want to get in on the ALAC side? Suen?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you very much. Thank you for the quick comment and introduction. I hope I'm not putting you into too hot a seat by asking this question: how does the ccNSO currently understand to be the current status of the CCWG proposal at the moment? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKLE: In flux. Let me be more explicit. This morning at the Council Session we had one of the Co Chairs of the CCWG, and we had one of the Co Chairs of the CWG, and it's very clear that the CCWG is putting in a lot of effort to overcome some of the issues identified. Whatever we call a status is overtaken in time – maybe even within the hour. It's until Monday that the CCWG is really working on it, and that's the good thing about having our sessions on Tuesday and Wednesday, and we have a lot of people who are deeply involved in the CCWG's work; doing the presentations, explaining to the cc community where they're at, where are the issues at that stage.

The good thing in that sense is at least you understand where there are areas of agreement, where there are areas of disagreement, and where there are areas of further work needed – ultimately going in to say that's what the ccNSO Council knows and what the community knows by now, which is there will not be a decision at this meeting. But that's why I said it's in flux.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other specific questions? Bart, let me ask you or anyone a question. By the way, if there are any other ccNSO Members who want to sit at the table, we'll clear spots for you if you're interested. If the ccNSO were doing this alone, what kind of accountability model would you have ended up with? I'm using

model with a lowercase m, and I'm not asking you to design something major, but what would your end point have been?

BART BOSWINKLE: ...Staff.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm asking you as a keen observer.

BART BOSWINKLE: Let me turn the question around a bit. One of the major issues that's maybe interesting for you to know is what most outsiders are not aware of is there are a lot of internal rules within the ccNSO. At the time the ccNSO was created, back in 2004, we had a document called the Rules of the ccNSO, and if you were to look into the Bylaws, it's linked with the Bylaws, and it's all around accountability of the Council. One of the reasons why the Council is what it is, and why it plays its role right now as I just described is because of this rule.

If you were to go back to the proposal or resolution from the Council in Buenos Aires, it explicitly stated this resolution only becomes effective seven days after publication, because in-between the publication there is the opportunity for ccNSO Members to ask for a vote. That's one of the things that we, as

far as I know – the ccNSO – wants to avoid, having those, because that’s a grueling process with quorum rules, et cetera.

So they seek the consensus of the community in order to move forwards, and that’s why it’s always been the case, and that’s why it becomes a bit weird, why the ccNSO Council does not play the role the GNSO Council plays, for example.

ALAN GREENBERG:

For the record, I did ask you, Bart, or anyone. Ultimately, you are one of the chartering organizations and you need to either accept or reject the proposal, and I was just asking if you were in a position to share something that you think might have been an acceptable answer that you would accept, but feel free to not answer that. Olivier had a question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: First, I have a question to our Chair regarding the question itself: the CCWG proposal and how each group intends to handle it, is this just dealing with process, or can we actually ask questions on the content?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we’ve heard what the non-answer is going to be from the ccNSO. I certainly am in a position to answer on behalf of the

ALAC where we think we want to be, and I can certainly describe our process for making the decision, which essentially was one of the Items of the Agenda I hadn't gotten to, but I'm not quite sure what Olivier is asking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have a question about the position of the ccNSO at the moment. This morning the ALAC voted to reverse a decision or position it had made in one of its recent statements, when it was supporting the membership model. It reversed it. I then went to the GNSO room next door, it was lunch. A tremor hit the room, plates broke, everything was an absolute mess and it was horror. I wonder if this sort of announcement would get the same sort of response in the ccNSO room?

BART BOSWINKLE: You will have the response from individual ccTLDs, and that's why we need these two full days. As a ccNSO support person I don't know the sense of the room, because if you would go back to, for example, the public comments – and I think that's an indication – you will see that some cc's have supported the proposal fulsomely. Some have some remarks and some are very strongly opposed. That's the debate we need to have within the cc community, of where they are. That's why the ccNSO, for example, are very reluctant, as such, to make a statement.

For example, the exception was because that was the result of other work on the ICG proposal – maybe you’ve seen it. There was a specific reference to ICP 1 and how it’s been treated in the CCWG proposal. That’s where the ccNSO Council stepped in. But that’s the only time they do it – if there is a clear position from the community. We don’t know the clear position.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Maybe for the benefit of the ccNSO people here, I’ll outline a little bit about process and where we are on substance. The ALAC has taken a position from the very start of this that we were not in the camp of those that said, “We need strict legal enforceability and we have to put shackles on the Board.” Yes, we have found a number of problems with Board decisions over the years. Interestingly, in many cases, I don’t think there would have been very widespread community outrage over it, because in many cases when one group is outraged, another one claps their hands and says, “Great.”

The Board has always had the ability to say, “SOs? You don’t have directors anymore.” But they haven’t. Yes, they’ve blown it on a number of individual decisions, but not necessarily on changing the overall structure and philosophy of ICANN. We were looking for – to use an American expression that was probably never appropriate – a “kindler and gentler ICANN”, but

one with more community input into the process, if not control. That being said, on the current proposal, which was a membership proposal that seemed widely accepted within the CCWG, the Board had not at that point spoken.

We were prepared to support it, although we had a number of very particular problems we wanted to see fixed, but we made it clear that it wasn't our preference. We're not going to be one of the chartering organizations that vetoed it, if everyone else was willing to go along with it. So we were feeling quite flexible.

As of yesterday, and certainly Friday, there is back on the table a designator model, which is a little bit less powerful and onerous than a membership. In the membership model, members have a number of abilities, including unilaterally changing Bylaws, dissolving the corporation and vetoing budgets without necessarily taking any responsibility for what happens. That worried us. The designator is back on the table at this point.

We don't know whether the Board will support it or not, but they've made it pretty clear they won't support the membership organization, and we've taken a rather pragmatic view. No matter how bottom-up the process is, ultimately, to effect the change, the Board is going to have to approve new Bylaws. The Board has a fiduciary duty to not approve Bylaws they think are going to harm the organization.

So although the Board's approval is not necessary for the CCWG proposal to go forward, ultimately they're going to have to agree if the organization's going to change its Bylaws. That's really a pragmatic view. It may not be fair, but it's there. At this point we said since there are other options on the table formally in the CCWG, we are withdrawing support of the membership model. We could go back. If the whole world changes and everyone loves membership, then we will certainly reconsider it. It's not a red line saying we'll never accept it. So that's where we are right now.

BART BOSWINKLE:

May I ask you a question that's maybe on the sideline? It's one of the items that will be discussed at the ccNSO, so this is for the benefit of the ccTLD community. Do you think that as a result of your decision, the proposal will change in such a way that a third public comment round will be necessary?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't believe that as a result of our decision today a third public comment will be necessary. But I believe as a result of the almost inevitable change in the proposal, if the Board indeed is not going to accept a membership model – and they've been pretty clear on that – then I believe whatever comes out by Monday afternoon is going to be substantively different and will

require a PCP. It's a PCP that could be slightly shortened. The CWG ones, and I think the initial CCWG were 30 days. I could imagine that happening.

I could imagine if there is a widespread belief that's what in the proposal is something that is close to what we'll end up with – that is, we're not expecting a lot of public comments that will alter the proposal – I could see us going to the chartering organizations in parallel. Again, not putting an absolute vote out saying, "We accept something that we haven't seen," but, "If it's like this, are we going to be prepared for it?" Then the process after that is somewhat simpler. I think a public comment is inevitable at this point.

On the other hand, I think approval by the chartering organizations by the end of the calendar year is also essential if the transition is to happen, because remember, after that we need the Bylaws in place, and the NTIA has essentially said the Bylaws have to be in place, or awful close, and that takes at least a month because there's another public comment there. And we have to actually draft the Bylaws, which again could be done in parallel. So I see it's inevitable that there will be another public comment. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I just want to twist the question again and try to say it in a different way. I'm optimistic and I expect we are all optimistic about the work of the CCWG, especially in the next 48 hours. However, if it happens that after the next 48 hours there's really no... As I understand, your meeting is starting in the next 48 hours? Tuesday, right? Yes. So if it happens that by Tuesday there's really no clear direction from the CCWG on designator or membership, or whatever it is, are you guys considering to have an Agenda Item that actually looks at formally agreeing on what you would not expect going forward?

For instance, ALAC has formally presented something today, which I expect would indirectly save some time, especially when they are considering those that have consensus for membership. So are you in the position to actually discuss that? Because we know that membership is still only [unclear 01:44:42] today. So if happens that it's to be on the table by Tuesday, are you in the position to discuss that and get some level of agreement on your view on that particular model? Just like maximizing this face-to-face, to have some feel from the ccNSO? Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much Seun.

BART BOSWINKLE: As I already mentioned, we have two days of meetings, and we've allocated enough time for discussions, for introductions, and for formal and informal talks on these proposals. We definitely are in a position to discuss. That's what we do at the ccNSO, and not only at the ccNSO. Of course, we inform our membership and we give them all the necessary information for a well-informed decision.

If we are in a position to take a decision, first of all it depends on how it goes, and we are aware that not all ccTLDs, even not all ccNSO Members are present here in Dublin. I don't think we will reach any decision. We will definitely sense the feeling in the room, and after we have this feeling, the ccNSO Council will have to... Bart?

BART BOSWINKLE: What is interesting is if you would go to the ccNSO website and look up the Agenda, there is a full description of all the sessions. Going back to what we discussed a few minutes ago, within the community you have some strong voices in favor of, for example, the membership model. At the same time, in the same community, you have some very strong voices against the model. It depends very much on these strong voices presenting their position, and it depends very much on the debate and the

discussion and what the open issues are and where the CCWG is at, at that stage, what will be the outcome of that discussion.

So whatever we say, whether the ccNSO is in a position or not, that's pre-empting the outcome of that discussion. So in that sense, whether they will or won't be in a position, that's unclear. By Wednesday we will know.

ALAN GREENBERG: We seem to be questioned out on the CCWG. We're going onto an update of the Geographical Regions Report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure that I'm going to do much, other than repeat to some extent what I did in an earlier session. Do you want to first of all bring everyone up to speed of where are in terms of the administrivia? We've received input of course from GAC, and I know Rob and I are trying to put a few tweaks onto the document. There's nothing else happened whilst I've been doing other little things? Okay. It was a question raised yesterday, so these questions were prepared a lot earlier, and of course then it did happen to come up in session yesterday.

But it may be that we have people in the room who'd like to ask some more questions. Bart, we do admit this one has been around for a little while, hasn't it? It's just possible that someone

might have a question on it. If you'd like Alan to open the floor briefly, we can deal with any questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: I will open the floor briefly.

BART BOSWINKLE: Just one thing, and it's a side remark: although most of you will not find the topic very interesting, we're now talking about the CCWG and the CWG. If you would go back to its Charter, you will see this is probably one of the first real CCWGs, and this one was structured a little differently, but where you had all the SOs and ACs requested by the Board to approve the outcome of the report. That's one of the reasons why it took it so long – and that's what we've learned over time – is that the Board requesting CCWGs resulted in some ACs or SOs taking part with no interest at all.

They stepped out, and then you had to find alternatives, et cetera. This goes back to 2009... No, even before 2008. It doesn't matter. But at the time, it was already structured in such a way as you will see back in some of the CCWGs right now. So CCWGs with charters well defined have been around for quite some time, which people tend to forget.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We might just have to regularly remind them of that. Seriously, if there are any questions, be more than happy to field them online or in chat later. Of course, we're here all week, aren't we, Bart? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? We have exhausted that topic. We have four more minutes. Is it your choice to go onto the alternate topic, or to adjourn? Next topic?

ANNABETH LANGE: I'm Annabeth Lange, ccNSO. I'm here because I'm the Co Chair of a CCWG working with how to deal with country and territory names in the next round of gTLDs. We are two Co Chairs from the GNSO and two from the ccNSO, and members from all the communities. We do encourage people that are interested in this to come, and Cheryl is already there. What we are trying to do is since we know that these names, the two-letter codes, the three-letter codes, and also full names, short names, long names, whatever, were protected in the first round.

We first had a study group, and after the study group had finished, they recommended to establish a CCWG to look further into this question to see if we could find, if possible, a framework that was a compromise that everybody could live with on how to

treat these names. So far we have discussed the two-letter codes and we have an initial recommendation that will leave them as they are now, not taking into the gTLD names.

So both those are already on the [ISO 01:53:18] list, and also other two-letter codes, since it's not we in ICANN that decides who will be new countries in the world, if there are, and we see in the world we are living in that could easily happen. Then we wouldn't have a situation that the two-letter codes for that country, decided other than us, would be taken. So we agree that that will be, for now, our suggestion.

So now we are into the discussion of three-letter codes. What we have done in the Working Group is to find some options that we think could be a possible way forward. We have written down all the different options in questions, sent the questions to all the Chairs of the SOs and ACs, and asked them to think it through, so we can get a feeling in the communities – what do you think? How should we use them? Should we use them at all? Should some of them be protected and others taken? Et cetera.

I think the Chairs here have got these questions as well. What we recommend is that all the different stakeholder groups look into it, send it to their Chair and goes back to the Working Group. We can collect all the different answers. It has been discussed in the GAC today. We will discuss it in the ccNSO on Tuesday, and I had

a presentation at the [center of 01:54:52] our regional group last week, and we are sending out a survey to get a feeling of how people look at it. That's where we are now, and when we have finished this we will put out some suggestions on how to go forward, and then discuss the full names. That will be even more difficult, I think.

Then in the end, when we have collected all of this, we will make a draft and send it out to a hearing for everyone again. It's a long story, but I think this is so important that we should do it properly. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The ALAC has submitted a response to you, with Maureen and Cheryl as the authors. You asked a number of questions of, "Should we do this, or this or this?" for three-letter codes, and we answered yes, or no. We are somewhat divided, and noted a lot of the things that make it very complex I'm not sure we helped you come to a resolution however. Certainly a few of the three-letter codes are recognizable as the countries they represent. Some of them are even less recognizable than the two-letter codes.

At least one of them is already in use by an obscure TLD called .com. I strongly suggest that you say that ICANN would cancel that contract unilaterally! That will work really well, I'm sure...

We can see the merit of opening up a lot of these to gTLDs. On the other hand, for the ones which are recognizable as country codes, or related to the country, then we have an interesting situation where these gTLDs are now really competing with the country codes. I

n other cases, it would take someone doing a PhD thesis to find the connection between them. So I don't think we've really helped you a lot, to be honest. We have presented the options and issues that were relevant to our community. On the more general case, we have taken a strong position... For instance, there are continual comment periods being opened on the use of country and territory names at the second-level on close generics.

Our position of that is that there are so many of them that are already used in the existing ones, and in ccTLDs, it's hard to demonstrate any real harm. It's not as easy a call at the top-level, and I think that's where we stand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A question to our Chair regarding the statement that you just mentioned here. I'm looking at the Wiki page that deals with that statement. I'm not sure if it has been followed through. Maybe the page hasn't been updated, because it doesn't show that it's been submitted. It says "comment" at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe Ariel can tell me, because I'm confused. I thought we'd finished that, but I see we have not finished that. What's the current status?

ARIEL LIANG: We have a finalized statement uploaded. We're just waiting for Alan's direction on whether we should go for a vote.

ALAN GREENBERG: I suggest you find a new Chair who keeps up with these things! Then we will take a vote on it soon. It still won't help you a lot, I'm afraid.

ANNABETH LANGE: I think that's okay, because our intention here at least is to show you all the complex issues we are dealing with. It's better to think now and try to figure things out, instead of having a huge paper at the end, and you haven't thought about any of it before. Perhaps we can find some way. Also, when we collect some questions, some have already said, "Why didn't you ask for that and that and this?" So you can even expand the questions. Perhaps it's other options that we haven't seen. So all inputs are

valuable, and then we'll discuss later, next time. I think it will take time, to be honest, but it's better to get it right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The comment period says it closes on October 9th. Are you still accepting comments?

ANNABETH LANGE: Yes, we are. Actually, I think that was a really very short time. We should meet here. It's a lot of presentations going on here on this issue. I just talked to Lars Hoffman today about this deadline, and we'll expand it, and every Chair of the SOs and ACs will get an email from us telling them that. It's not that rushed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. If I can just follow up then and perhaps suggest we might wish to put it on the Agenda for Thursday, when we're voting? I think it's been on the ALAC for a while. Our drafters have done a great job, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else? We have run over a little bit, not as much as usual. I thank you for coming.

ANNABETH LANGE: Thank you very much for having us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good luck to us all.

ANNABETH LANGE: That's what we need.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry Alan, is this session now officially closed?

ALAN GREENBERG: This session is now officially closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]