
DUBLIN – ALAC and Regional Leadership Meeting Part 1
Sunday, October 18, 2015 – 09:00 to 12:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

GISELLA GRUBER: For all the ALAC and Regional Members, please take your seats. We're going to be starting very shortly. Thank you. If I can please remind all the Regional Leaders and ALAC Members to please take their seat. We already have part of the GSE Team here, and Fadi is coming at 10:00, so we're on a very tight schedule. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I have your attention please? We unfortunately in this room have a very limited number of chairs. I want to make sure at the very least all ALAC Members have an opportunity to sit at the table. There may be enough room for everyone, but I'm not sure. If there are any ALAC members not at the table, please make your presence known. This is incoming and outgoing ALAC Members – any who today are ALAC Members or will be on Friday.

Can we start? Are we ready with the remote participation and recording? We are. Thank you. Good morning to all. This is the first session of the Sunday meeting. It officially starts tomorrow,

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.

but I hope you're all awake for day-1. A couple of housekeeping notes and such. First of all, we have a couple of people who weren't able to make it yesterday during the day, and I'd like to do some quick introductions and give them each a minute or so to introduce themselves. Number one, we have [Warfa 00:15:39], who'll be joining the ALAC at the end of the week. Just give us a minute or so and tell us who you are, where you're from.

[WARFA]:

As you said, I'm [Warfa], I'm from Tunisia. I'm Head of the DNS Operations Department at the Tunisian Internet Agency. I deal with ccTLDs. I manage our ccTLDs and I pay resources. I turned 39. Nice to meet you all. I have three children! That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Is Jimmy in the room? Jimmy is an existing Member who couldn't make it until last night. This is a EURALO GA Meeting, and we're having a significant number of EURALO ALSes represented, and they're starting to come into our meetings. I won't take the time right now to allow you to introduce yourselves, but you're welcome, and I hope you have a good, satisfying meeting. There is an AC for this session. We suggest everyone log in.

However, for speaking, if you are physically in the room, take your name card and raise it. I, or whoever's chairing the meeting, will do our best to notice it. If we don't seem to notice you, wave a little bit. If you don't have a name card, put your hand up. We will do our best to maintain the speaker list and not exclude anyone. Sometimes it's hard to see people at the side though. Do your best to make yourself known.

These meetings do tend to go on, and we have a number of speakers who will be coming in on time, even if we're not on time. We will be in general limiting interventions from around the table to two minutes. We'll be using a timer that's in the upper right-hand corner of the screen. We'll not use the beeper at this point, but I ask people to respect the two minutes. If we have to, we will turn on the beeper. If the beeper goes off, you can finish the sentence or two, but you can't go on for another two minutes, I'm afraid.

When you're speaking, speak slowly enough that the interpreters can understand you and have an opportunity to translate. Try not to speak too quickly. Lastly, we have had a habit at this meeting of starting late. This introduction period is from 9:00 to 9:15, and I started at 9:16. We need to get people into the room and seated at the table in time for the meeting. I know the meetings are stacked one after the other, and if you're changing rooms it's difficult, but in many cases we're in the same room.

Please try to be on time. It's not very nice for our guests to arrive and have to wait 20 minutes before they can start. I ask your indulgence, and please try to do that.

Our first guests are Global Stakeholder Engagement, but Sally Costerton is busy and can't be with us. However, Sally Costerton is apparently not busy somewhere else, and is with us, so I welcome Sally and I turn the floor over to her.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you Alan. Now you all know who I am. That was a good introduction. I've got my label in case I forget who I am. I did meet George Sadowsky this morning, wandering around carrying one of these labels, which worried me slightly. I was worried he was going to forget who he was at some point in the day! Very good to see you all. I know I say this every time we come to this meeting, but I really enjoy this meeting. Apart from anything else, for me it's the beginning of the ICANN Meeting.

In a formal way, we've been here since Tuesday night, so not in a literal way. I hope you're enjoying the lovely amenities that Dublin has to offer. It's a lovely city, and I'm sure many of you know it well. This morning's session is for us to update you and take questions on a couple of areas today, in terms of what we've prepared, but obviously we can take questions on

anything you like. I have a substantial selection of the Regional Engagement Team sitting over here, these lovely gentlemen.

Not a great gender balance, I come to think of it, looking at that. But hey! I run the team, so there you go. It's great to have them all here with us. We are going to cover two areas. One, of which we're going to do the main majority, is to follow up with you what's happening on the ATLAS Summit Recommendations.

I know that's a very important priority for you, and rightly so. Quite a lot of the programs and recommendations and requests that came out of that Report are inside our team, in one way, shape or form for implementation. I know Alan is keen that we update you on that, which we will do, and I'll ask the team to do that in terms of being able to report back to you on the areas they're responsible for.

Before we do that, can we have the slide with the map on? This deck, you will have a copy of it. If you are interested, and I know many of you are, in how we are handling engagement, this is a brand new deck put together by my team, and it has some very up-to-date data, which is shared between the data of the outreach, which is a lot of what my team are doing, but also how does what happens, what is the outcome of those activities. A lot of that is measured by the Policy Team, including what the

Membership of At-Large looks like, how it's changing, and the other constituencies.

So we are slowly making real progress in being able to measure and assess the whole process of engagement, from beginning to end. There's much more to come in the future on this. I've been a little frustrated in the past with this group, not necessarily being able to show, specifically, what's happening. I hope that you'll find this deck is much more informative on that.

What you can see on this map, some of you will know we split our Engagement Team into eight. I know ICANN has five regions, but we have always done this, because five is simply too much. We can't reach with only five. It's just too big. We realized early on that we'd need to make that work. That does mean that sometimes I'd ask for your indulgence that you'll see reporting that doesn't absolutely, perfectly match the ICANN five regions, but Jeannie Ellers, who does this with us, is very careful to cross-reference these two things where necessary.

The key piece of the takeout from here is many of you in this room are involved with my team on what we'd call the Regional Engagement Programs that are community-led. In this deck you'll see more detail about those programs – what they're doing, what the goals of those are, and how well we're progressing; not just in terms of process, how far we're getting

with implementing the programs you've put together, but also looking at what's the overall impact of that. If we have a different session at some point, we can talk about some of the problems and challenges.

These things are always tricky. We have a lot of progress, but we all know also that this is not straightforward. In some regions, specifically North America and the Europe region, I think perhaps because there are many more stakeholders there that are established in ICANN's ways, there was less pressure to have a community-based strategy, and they were quite happy to have a staff team being their people on the ground to facilitate their work, in a slightly different way. This is why you have these two slightly different programs.

I can finish by saying now these teams are fully staffed up, there is an enormous amount of work going on. It's quite overwhelming sometimes when you look at it by amounts of projects. But many of you in this room are very active participants in that, and I would not only thank you for that, I would encourage you to keep doing that. One of the key measures that we have in terms of our overall strategic goal on the ICANN Strategic Plan, which most of this work falls into, is globalizing ICANN. The second goal is really increasing our outreach at a regional level, in terms of relevance and effectiveness.

One of the key measures is participation in the various At-Large Structures, so you're very important as a group – not just for this particular group, but for ICANN as a whole – to have a finger on the pulse as to how well this is working. That's all I'm going to say. I'll hand over to you, Patrick, now, and then we can take some questions after we've shared with you some of the ATLAS outputs.

PATRICK JONES:

Thanks. Patrick Jones. At-Large had asked our team to provide some answers on many of the ATLAS Recommendations. We have gone through and looked at the recommendations, provided some feedback, both within our introductory note and within the slides. We wanted to focus on three of the recommendations that seemed most relevant to the work of this team. The first is Recommendation 1, that ICANN should continue to support outreach programs that engage the broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.

We viewed this really as the work of the regional engagement strategies. With us today we have our Regional VPs. I might turn to a few of them to talk about how some of the regional strategies – very briefly, because I know we don't have a lot of time – but I wanted to introduce Rodrigo de la Parra from Latin

America and the Caribbean region, and Kuek from Asia Pacific, Save from Oceania, Baher Esmat from the Middle East, and Pierre Dandjinou from Africa. I was focusing on the regions that have regional engagement strategies.

We also have Christopher Mondini, Michael Yakushev is in the room from Eastern Europe and Central Asia, and Gabriella Schittek is from our European Team. So quite a large number of the team is here and able to answer the questions that you have after the session. But very briefly if one of you wants to talk about how your regional strategy has been progressing? Just a few brief remarks on it, and then we might want to open it up to the group for questions, because with the limited time we have, we should really focus on the questions. I don't know if one of you wants to step up and talk about their regional strategy?

PIERRE DANDJINOU:

Good morning. This is Pierre Dandjinou. I've already been introduced. I'm from Africa. I'm the VP for Africa. Quickly I'll just say that our Africa strategy, now we're having our second version, and with the community we have good support on that. The new version of it is not that much different. We do have two objectives here, which is to increase participation from the African region, but also make sure that we support the DNS market in Africa. These are the two areas that we're working in.

We do have a host of projects around, and our flagship projects are the DNSSEC, for instance, for the security issues. We're also working on the DNS entrepreneurship that we're going to launch – these startups. We have ideas in a few countries in Africa. Quickly, we are expecting quick results to increase participation within ICANN, but also make sure that ICANN is better known in Africa, and then the second one is quite specific – how do we really contribute to the digital economy in Africa, especially by supporting whatever initiatives are on the ground?

Then our people can really start their business and eventually contribute to the whole policy development within ICANN. These are quickly the two areas we're working on. We do appreciate the support we're receiving from the At-Large, as most of you guys here assisted us, especially when we were doing our [assisting 00:29:54] transition in Africa. Some of you guys helped. [unclear 00:30:00], and we think that should also be continued in the future, so thank you.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Hello everybody. This is Rodrigo de la Parra. I'm going to provide an update in Spanish, so if you want to wear your headset? Good morning to you all. Thank you very much for this opportunity. I'd like to very briefly talk to you about how we've been progressing in the Latin American and Caribbean Strategy.

This is relevant, because recently, a few weeks ago, we met again in Montevideo with the community group that designed the plan originally. Of course, this includes participation from the RALO.

It was really interesting to review the progress. The strategy is progressing very nicely. It's incorporating more and more people, not only from the closest ICANN community, but also people from the region. It's people who've been interested in some of the projects. We've reviewed the project that was designed until 2016. We're now having a renewed strategy that goes from 2016 to 2020. Our idea was to align all the objectives and the projects that we aligned before. We aligned it with the new plan.

The new objectives for the Latin American plan are now aligned to the new ICANN Strategy. There are very interesting results. One of the main concerns we had in the Latin America and Caribbean community was precisely to have more participation of Latin American and Caribbean participants in ICANN. This has been increasing by this, and not only in quantity but also in quality. What I mean is occupying leadership positions within the community. This is something we're starting to see increasingly.

Capacity building has also been one of the main issues, one of the main focuses in our strategy, from end users to the

government, we've had very interesting initiatives in capacity building. It's also very good to have this new plan, and I'd like to thank all of those from ALAC in the region who've helped us a lot to increase this discussion. Thank you very much.

PATRICK JONES

Kuek, I'll come to you when we talk about the next recommendation. Recommendation 12 is in collaboration with the ALSes. ICANN should put in place campaigns to raise awareness and extend education programs across under-served regions. We have some examples from our work with the ALSes, particularly in Asia Pacific, on doing read-outs for different countries, as well as the under-served regions projects. Maybe briefly, Kuek and Baher, you could talk about those activities?

YU-CHUANG KUEK:

Thank you. I think in the Asia Pacific region we are very grateful to the guidance that's been given to us by APRALO, as well as the support from the Policy Team that we get. I think what's really been helpful is institutionalizing the collaboration through a framework under an APRALO and ICANN/APAC hub structure. I'd like to highlight one of the features we do on a regular basis, and that is a regularly timed webinar that is co-organized by APRALO and the ICANN/APAC hub.

It's to make sure that information pertaining to the DNS, and information pertaining to ICANN affairs are shared with a broader, regional community, and that the content being put up for discussion is jointly curated by both APRALO as well as staff, based out in the region. I think this is just one of the collaboration items under the framework. You might have heard me talk about the kind of language customization we're trying to do in a very diverse region.

I'm fairly happy this time that we're going to sign an MOU with Thailand to help them help us translate materials into Thai. In addition to that, with many of our partners in our region we take the outcomes of ICANN Meetings and have read-out sessions in country as well. That is something we're very grateful for. Maybe I can pass things onto Baher.

BAHER ESMAT:

Thanks. Good morning. This is Baher Esmat. I lead Global Stakeholder Engagement efforts in the Middle East. The Middle East covers 22 Arab countries, plus Pakistan, Iran, Afghanistan and Turkey. Very quickly, in relation to engagement efforts, as with under-served regions there are two main programs that we embarked upon a year or so ago – one in relation to development of the DNS industry in the region. We had an agreement with the Egyptian Regulatory Authority, NTRA, to

establish a DNS entrepreneurship center to serve Africa and the Middle East.

The objective is to not only develop capacities but also to further develop the ecosystem across both regions. In the past six months we have run five workshops in four different countries. We're very glad that last week we were in Tunis and [Rafar 00:36:05] was our host. We had a two-day workshop with registries and registrars in Tunis, focusing particularly on the local market in Tunis – what the strengths are, what the weaknesses are, and so on.

The other program is a School on Internet Governance. This is not our invention. There have been programs on Internet governance all over the world in the past ten years. We partnered with a number of community leaders in this field, and we started this program last year in the Middle East. This year, and upon the request from the local community in Pakistan, the ISOC Chapter in Islamabad, which is one of the ALSes, they led an effort to have a National School on Internet Governance as well, and we were happy to support this effort as well. Thank you.

PATRICK JONES:

For the last recommendation that we wanted to highlight, if you could move to slide nine? This is on Recommendation 19, eliminating barriers to participation and engagement with ICANN

processes and practices. For this one, we thought this really highlights the work of... There's a Stakeholder Journey Sub-Team within our Community Engagement and Policy Management Team. Christopher Mondini, you could talk very briefly about the work of the Stakeholder Journey Team? That might be a good segue into Sally and David talking about the work of the Community Engagement and Policy Team.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: It's a pleasure to see all of you. Thanks very much. This team that Patrick just described is a nice opportunity for some of us who work with you to spend some time brainstorming about the future and to do a little bit of what I like to think of as research and development about the future of ICANN. We have a shorthand name for the work. We call it stakeholder journey, and it really looks at the challenge of getting more volunteers, but also more volunteers who are more active; who stick around, who can convert from being followers into active participants, to help in all the important work that we do here together.

At a very high-level we've looked at some data, to look at where people come from, where they may get stuck, what some of their challenges are. We've looked at the structures across ICANN, because each structure approaches this question slightly differently, and each structure and constituency has slightly

different needs. We've made some high-level observations about how we might attract people, by looking first at what their question areas are, what their issue areas are.

We've looked at some tools that we can provide to help you be partners in doing that outreach. We're hopeful in the coming months to put together some sounding boards to approach a few of you, and float some of these ideas. We're looking for those of you who have a passion for bringing on the next generation to having a succession plan, so that the sustainability of ICANN in this community is assured. We'll be very happy to float some of the specific ideas that our group has brainstormed with you, to get your feedback. It's still very early days. This arose out of some of the SO/AC Leaders who asked for some help with this problem.

For those of you we've talked to, and some of the ideas that have been raised, we're very helpful. I do want to plant that idea in your minds, to think about we're thinking about ICANN 15, 20 years from now. Where will the talent come from? We're very eager to team with you to help attract that. That's a teaser on some of the work we're going to embark with you on together.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you Chris. I think I mentioned last time we saw this group at the last ICANN Meeting that for around nine months now

we've convened a coordination team inside the ICANN senior staff that is a composite group of the best of our ability, of all the staff that face the ICANN community. I can't think of a better way of saying it. That includes the Policy Team, the Engagement Team, the Communications Team, which is led by Duncan Burns, the Digital Engagement Team, led by Chris Gift, and the Meetings Team, obviously led by Nick Tomasso. Did I miss a team, Heidi?

Yes, we have two frequent guests, which is DPRD, led by Nora Abusitta, and she has, very critically, the Fellows Program under her remit in DPRD, which is a very important element of what Christopher was just saying about the Stakeholder Journey Program. We also have Cyrus Namazi in that group, who leads engagement for the GDD Team. The goal is to try to make sure we have a much more holistic view about how we, as a staffing organization, can maximize the resources at our disposal.

They are not unlimited, as I know you all know, but there are some, to address not just the day-to-day response requirements – that's done at a departmental level – but over and above that, to tackle some of these difficult challenges that the community faces as it matures and grows. This is a very good example that Christopher has outlined. Putting some dedicated staff time into saying, "Okay, we don't want to just constantly say, 'We can't solve this problem, it just is, like the weather'."

Because we know there is a great deal of exhaustion in the volunteer community. You see a lot of the same faces popping up in different Working Groups, and while that's great in some ways, because it's great to be able to do multiple different things, it's also not sustainable. Nobody thinks it's sustainable. This was before we were handling the IANA transition. When you layer a really big time limited project like that into an already limited volunteer supply, with no really very clear joined up strategy, you're maximizing all the resources in the ICANN community that are available to try and pursue the same goal, then we have a problem. So that's one of the examples. Another work stream this group is looking at is implementing the New Meeting Strategy, which I know you're very familiar with. We all take new projects into that as we go along. If there are specific problems like that, that are ICANN-wide, that you feel that the staff doesn't really address, or could do more to address, please do let me or David Olive know. We Co Chair that group. I think the first time we met there was a light bulb moment where we all went, "right, so not all AC/SO groups are equally open for Membership?" I think we all knew that, but when we're talking we throw our arms wide to the world and say, "Come to ICANN! We're very welcoming. Anyone can come. Our meetings are free. We don't expect you to pay membership fees," and so on and so forth. But actually, there are relatively few parts – this is one of them – where that is literally true, in the sense that you can just

join At-Large and there are no restrictions on that. But in some parts of the ICANN SO/AC community that is not the same. It sounds terribly obvious, I know, but it helps us to channel and focus the efforts we're making, in the right way. Let's take some questions, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You just said, "Please let us know if there's anything we can do." There are two ATRT II Recommendations that recognize that getting committed, hardworking volunteers is difficult. It is somewhat harder to get those working volunteers when they're not also happening to be working in an industry that pays them to do that work. I recognize that many people that are paid by the domain industry or by business to participate may put efforts into it, over and above what their salary demands, and we're all grateful. But virtually everyone in this room is paid to do something other than work in the domain industry, and often other than the Internet industry at all.

Most of the people in this room, I would suspect, are here on their own vacation time, because that's the way they get time off, or maybe unpaid leave. It is a measurably different situation for us than most of the other community. There are some other selected parts of the community that are similar. There are people in the IPC who are not paid by their firms to do it, but

nevertheless they are highly paid people – I daresay a bit higher than most people in this room – and have a little bit more flexibility with their time and their checkbook, as it were.

This is a really hard group, and I don't know the answer. The recommendation said we need some help. It's not just "give us more piles of money", although that would be nice. But it's really a different community, and we need to think out of the box about how can we get more committed workers? How do we lure them in and get them to stay when we have these constraints, which are measurably different from the rest of the community? We'd like to talk about volunteers in ICANN. Many of the people are not really volunteers. In this group, everybody is a volunteer, in the truer sense of the term. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Noted, Alan, and you just framed perfectly where the Stakeholder Journey Project came from. Absolutely. There's another aspect to that, which I should mention, which is in a not quite so early stage of development. Many of you will be aware that there are different sources for funding. I know you said it's not just about money, and you are 100 per cent right.

It is also about providing people with tools, it's translations – it's access questions, generally, whether that be money to get on a plane, or stay in a hotel, whether it's language tools that allow

you to participate in an even way, whether it's improving the search on the website so that it's a more friendly environment. So there are many touch points that address that need. We've tried to capture most of them in Christopher's project. It sounds to me like you need to get some input from Alan, certainly, into that, Christopher.

Rob Hogarth and Jean-Jacques here in the corner, who are also part of that group, another work stream that we've been looking at in conjunction with the Stakeholder Journey, which has been very much Heidi and Chris, is how do we take a holistic look, as staff, at all of the money that ICANN spends on volunteer support, community participation? Whichever word you want to use. Because we tend to view it in quite narrow pockets. There are particulate processes to apply for travel funding or special support work and so forth.

What we are in the middle of doing at the moment – and it's a slightly early stage, so I don't think I could offer you a great deal of insight at this stage, but we will be able to do so in due course – it's getting a real sense of, “How much in total, out of the overall ICANN Budget, do we have at our disposal? And how can we make sure that we match that, as effectively as possible, to this goal?” You might say, “Well, why don't we do that anyway?”

It would be a good question, but I think it's like anything in ICANN. It evolves and it matures, and as we do that, we're trying to take what you're talking about, as a more strategic view of it, to say, "Are there other ways we could do things differently that would make it easier for unpaid participants in the community to have a more equal participation?" This is supposed to be a multi-equal, multistakeholder process.

Part of being a multistakeholder process is to try to deliver a multi-equal access, a multi-equal experience, and it's not easy, but that's where we are at the moment. I hope that's helpful. More on this, I'm sure.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll just add one thing: without making this into a gripe session, which I really don't want it to be, there's also a concept of respect for volunteers. Those who have no money are sometimes treated differently, effectively.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Let's take that offline. I want to hear that though.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have a long speaker queue. I'm going to take them counter-clockwise. We have Olivier, Maureen, Siranush, Tijani, Sébastien, and Fatima.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Both Siranush and Maureen were before me, so ladies first.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. As many of you know, this is one of my favorite meetings with the Global Stakeholder Team, and I really love these discussions with the team. Probably it comes from the success we're having in APRALO, in our cooperation and communication with our Stakeholder Team. We had a lot of success by cooperating in the sense like Baher just mentioned, and before that, prior to the Islamabad School of Governance, we also had a really successful Armenian IGF where we got huge support from our Eastern European VP, from Michael. It's not only money. It's really not only the money. It's the feeling for local ALSes to feel the power behind us – the power of great company standing behind us.

It makes also the importance of the work that we're doing on a local level as well, with the support of the GSE Team. It's not only the case of money, or the case of some other stuff. There

are also a lot of things to be done. We have a great success, but there's a lot of space for us to move forward. For the APRALO region, we're having the upcoming APRICOT, the regional major event there, and we have an Oceania representative here, Save, and we're looking forward already to the collaboration there.

Within At-Large we have the Sub-Committee on Outreach and Engagement, and we created the outreach calendar, and each RALO has its own calendar. We also are already getting support from ALSes and [quick team 00:54:01] to put the activities that are conducted from both sides, to see where we can collaborate. I would also encourage and invite our GSE Team to be connected to those calendars, to see our activities, and to see where we can go together as well. Thank you once again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'm told Fadi is going to be here in about ten minutes. He has a finite window, so if we want to allow him a bit of time, we're going to have to end this close to that period of time. Please be concise. Next we have Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now I defer to the second lady – that's Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Olivier. I would like to just support what Siranush has said. Can I have the map back again please? I really appreciate the work that Kuek, Save and Baher have done with regards to the programs, the webinars, and the sorts of things that have been produced in collaboration with APRALO, which has been fantastic. But I'm still very concerned about that big, white space that is above New Zealand and Australia that looks as if there is nothing there.

There are 22 countries and territories, and from my perspective, as a person representing the Pacific, and I know Save is out there doing his thing, but I think Oceania seems to be pointing to Australia and New Zealand, and I wanted to see where the arrow was going towards the Cook Islands for a start, but I really think there's a big black hole when it comes to ICANN activities in the Pacific. 22 countries, there's no way Save can go around everywhere and try to...

As an ISOC Chapter for example, we're still struggling to address it. One of the advantages of PIC ISOC being an ALS is the fact that we do incorporate ISOC and ICANN activities whenever we can, but it's a real issue for us. I'd like to be part of a planning program that could look at how we can address that a little bit better.

SALLY COSTERTON: I'd love you to answer. If the two of you can take this offline? I 100 per cent hear what you say.

SAVE VOCEA: Hello. Thank you for the comments. Save Vocea, and I'm responsible for the Oceania engagement. One of the things you can see on the map there is it's a really big, white gap. 27 ccTLDs, about 22 from the Pacific Islands. In 2014 we started this stakeholder group bottom-up engagement where we brought the participants who've been involved in ICANN to be part of a Working Group to put together a strategy for the region.

One of the things the group did was highlight some of the main activities that could be important for the region. Some of it was really on capacity building for the region and how we could also assist in the stability of the DNS for the region. When you look at the map and when you look inside ICANN, you'll see Australia and New Zealand are very heavily involved, and I applaud them for that. We have a lot of them coming.

But the issue is how can we still get Pacific Islands participation? I think one of the successes right now is seeing that Maureen is now sitting in the ALAC. Never before in the past, you've never seen Pacific Islanders being here. In this meeting, we have about nine countries from the Pacific, I hear, through participating on Fellowships. For me, when I go around the region, it's more

coordinating with the regional organizations, so particularly with PIC ISOC, as they're the regional body for the ALS. Then there are other bodies outside, when we look at industry, like APNIC or the Pacific Islands organizations that are there.

So it's good to work in partnerships, but it's not concrete in terms of how we could set MOUs, but the thing is that they're receptive to us coming in. In the past six months we've covered about eight countries, working with [early years 00:59:18] training and capacity building, and that also involves working with the stakeholders within the countries. I think one of the successes is that they're very receptive to us coming. They're all smart people working in the regions. They just need ideas on how they can interact and engage.

But the challenge is still on communications. Even though we provide a webinar for the whole Asia Pacific region, in coordination with APRALO, the challenge in that big, wide space is how do they get access? How do they pay for this access? For us, as ICANN, one of the reasons is that they can't access our online meetings. Who is going to pay for the access? That's been one of the major problems, so we should probably work on how we can do that.

SALLY COSTERTON: We should also update our map.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have six questions left, presumably six answers, and about four minutes. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have about six questions, all on behalf of the ATLAS II, and I'm not kidding on this. Thanks very much for this. I'm looking specifically at the ATLAS Recommendations, and thank you for bringing us some updates on some of them. They weren't the ones that I had referred as the ones we were going to ask you questions on. There were a couple that were, but we had a few more. I was going to go very quickly through them.

First on Recommendation 1, which I think is the one that you actually responded to, thank you for providing us with details on the local VP engagement. One question that I had on that was whether there was good coordination between the different VPs, because it looks at the moment that some regions have made more progress than other regions, so evening out, with some programs working in some regions would work better in others.

But it's also related to Recommendation 2, which was that ICANN should increase support, budget and staff to programs having brought valuable members to the community. Here, several of our ALSes have admitted the concern that there might have been

some programs done by the GSE, and local ALSes were not informed of the events taking place, and therefore they didn't manage to get anything out of it. It didn't appear to have local ALS engagement at all. That's one thing which many have said – in some regions saying, “The event took place just down the road, and we didn't get anywhere, because we didn't know about it.”

So that was one. The Recommendation 9, it's the Regional Offices. I think that's pretty much done and dusted. You've opened offices to cover all of the five regions, so that works well. Recommendation 12, in collaboration with ALSes, ICANN should put in place campaigns to raise awareness and extend educational programs across under-represented regions, you've provided a good deal of information on that. I think that's also pretty much complete. Ariel is taking notes, so she'll be listening to the recording of what you've presented earlier, and I think we can close some of these recommendations.

Finally, Recommendation 41, the ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities. That is one that's come up, and we're talking here about sponsorship, et cetera, for additional activities outside. So the question here is how possible is it for GSE to help the ALAC raise additional sources of funding?

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, we're lowering it to one minute, and the buzzer will continue to buzz until you stop speaking. I'm sorry. Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON: Very quickly – and I'm happy to take this offline, Olivier, to allow us more time – on the coordination point, between the GSE Teams and the evenness of the programs, the ones that are community-led are community-led. So the evenness is what it is. It depends very much on what the community team wants to do. They are only facilitated by the VPs. That is a characteristic of the region and the particular priorities that that region has.

Second point, are we exchanging best practice at a staff level? I think that is implied in your question. The answer is yes, we are. We had a full day here actually with the entire GSE Team. We also had some other staff with us from other teams on Wednesday this week, to do exactly that. That was the theme of the day – to exchange best practice. So the teams are increasingly sharing information and knowledge. We're starting to move programs, such as the policy read-out. [buzzer sounds] I'll take the rest offline.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. You're the first one we did that too. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Sally, I'm very bad in thanking people because I'm always complaining, always asking for more. But I'd like to recognize the amount of work and the efficiency of your team, especially of two of your regions. I can tell you how well, in Africa, Pierre, Yaovi and Bob, are doing, and also Baher for the Middle East, so just to tell you. Last thing, I have a program for capacity building, since I am the Chair of the Capacity Building Working Group, to undertake some capacity building activities in the small islands in the Caribbean, and small countries in Africa where we never go.

I proposed to Jean-Jacques Sahel to collaborate on this, since he's in charge of the civil society, so I hope that we will make very good work in this regard. Last point, for Marrakech, we really need to work together to make Marrakech one of the most successful events. I want to work with you all on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastian? Sébastian passes. Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks Alan. I will speak in Spanish. Thank you. Very quickly, a couple of things. First, I want to commend the work carried out

by Rodrigo in the Latin American and Caribbean region with a strategy which exceeded in raising this barrier between the community and ICANN staff, with very positive results. Another very quick comment. I don't know if it's you who can do something about this. It's about the Fellows. Argentina was excluded from the countries that can apply as Fellows, according to the World Bank list.

In Argentina there are many leaders who have been in the Fellowship Program who are currently engaged, and many activities are being organized. Actually, next week there will be an Argentinian IGF. I wonder if you can do something to bring back Argentina into this list of countries that can apply for the Fellowship Program? Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Sadly I can't reply in Spanish, which I wish I could. Yes, actually, I can. You weren't expecting me to say that, were you? Because at our meeting where we were on Wednesday, coordinating sharing best practice, one of the topics that came up was this – and Argentina is not the only country that has fallen off the radar, because of this World Bank classification. We obviously have to use something to decide where we're going to allocate the resources.

But it's becoming very clear that in some parts of South America, and also in some parts of Eastern Europe, interestingly – which was a surprise to the team, because one of our team, I think Michael or one of his team brought this up, we have the same problem. Michael, was it Croatia or Slovenia? Very low engagement in the whole country with the ICANN issues because of this. Nora, who makes the decisions about this, is in the middle of reviewing how we do this, to make sure that these countries are... We find another way...

[Audio part 2]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I only have good words for our group, especially for the dedication. Brazil is in the top of the visits. I believe everyone from ICANN has been in Brazil this time. My point is just to focus on the B model that the first time last year the meeting will be in our region. We really need to focus everybody in that region on making it happen and really getting good feedback from outreach, because that's the focus. Just to remember that next year we need to drive our efforts to make it really happen very well. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you Vanda. I think the group might be interested to know that Rodrigo, because it's his region – well, it's not his personal region! – inside that Community Engagement and Policy Team, we had a session about four weeks ago. The group met, and we asked him to present a pilot outreach for the outreach day. Many of you participated in the B strategy. He's done a brilliant job at starting that process, rolling with us, at senior staff. We had a very deep discussion about some of the pros and cons, some of the challenges that we'll face.

But there's a strong, bottom-up, community request in these proposals that we focus on outreach, and part of the point of the B Meeting is to take the meeting to places where it can't go. So please do, Vanda – I know you will – stay with Rodrigo on this, but do know that Rodrigo has strong backing from the rest of his colleagues, not just in GSE, but in communications, engagement and so forth, and the Meetings Team, to try to make this work.

We want to have a really great start position, because it would be so disappointing if, the first time we do this B Meeting... What we want is for everybody to go, "Wow, isn't this great? We've really moved the ball forward." Tijani and I were talking about the Marrakech Meeting, and he mentioned it as well. So we really are very committed, at a staff level, to putting time and energy behind this, as well as money and resources. Thank you for raising it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Sally. Fadi has just cancelled, due to changes in the Board Agenda. It's not that he doesn't love us. So this session can go on until 10:30. Can we go back to a two-minute timer? If anyone who only got one minute would like an extra half-minute, we'll try to accommodate. We have Raf next. I'll put Sébastien back in the queue. We'll try to keep track of new hands. Can I remind people, since we have an extra minute, we should have all current ALAC Members and incoming ALAC Members at the table.

If there are no seats, I ask someone else, who doesn't fit into that qualification, to vacate one, but we really would like all ALAC Members, incoming and current. Thank you very much. Did you want back in for a moment? No?

SALLY COSTERTON: I was just saying, if there's time I'll finish answering Olivier's question.

ALAN GREENBERG: That could probably take 20 minutes, knowing Olivier's questions. We have Raf next.

RAF FATANI:

Thank you Alan. Like the others, I'd like to echo thanks and gratitude to the team, and the hard work you guys do. I work closely with Baher on many different initiatives in the region, and I think it's felt in the room when you see the amount of faces in the region that I attend these meetings, so thank you. I'd like to emphasize a word you've used. Your team works in a cycle, bringing in new people, but this cycle needs to continue. The word you used was "succession".

I think personally – and I know many on this table don't agree with me – but I do think we have a problem with this succession element. How do we maintain the old, but also bring in the new and keep them in? One of that is actually maintaining and allowing them to grow within various leadership positions. I, in the ALAC, think personally that we have a problem with this.

We see the same faces in various positions that rotate from different communities back into the same communities, to various flopping around various different leadership positions. I think that hinders your hard work being done, because whilst you bring in new faces the door is shut here, and therefore it doesn't allow people to maintain, and that's a good reason for them not to continue. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: You raise a very good point, and you're right. It's a sensitive point, and not just in the ALAC. We know this is an issue in terms of how the external world sees us, because we've been, collectively all between us, a lot more people have come to ICANN in the last few years. They come, but sometimes they run away, quite fast. There are lots of reasons for that. It's not just the succession issue. But I applaud you for putting this difficult issue on the table. I think in the spirit of how do we become more successful?

How do we tackle these tough problems that I referred to? It's not saying, "We can't handle that issue, it's too difficult." We have to try to find a way. I agree with you that we coalesce our resources, our thinking, our energies and our problem-solving together to recognize that we don't want great people to feel pushed out by the community either. We've got to find ways in which we can manage this life stage, or whatever we want to call it, for as long...

[Audio part 3]

SALLY COSTERTON: I would really appreciate perhaps you spending a bit of time with them to go into this in a bit more detail, and use you as... And

anyone else in this group, by the way, who is interested in any of these Stakeholder Journey issues. This is a very tricky one. Please do. Our door is very open, and we'd love help on working with you about how do we start to evolve this. It would be much appreciated, and thank you for raising it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sébastien, do you want to get back in or not?

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Thank you Alan. Thank you for all the work of your team, the Engagement Team. What I would like to say, Raf already said with other words. I think it's good to have new people come in, but they need to be received, they need to be accompanied, they need to be sustained, supported, received in good conditions. Because if that's not the case, they are going to leave and go somewhere else. I'm sorry, Sally. I have to tell you that even in my case, I'm not an expert, but I had some problems understanding what you were saying in some moments in your speech, because each one of us is in our own world.

I'm going to give you an example. Nora's team has a new acronym. Who is going to understand this new acronym? You spoke about Nora's team only with this acronym. I don't know what Nora is doing. Well, I know what she's doing, but some

people here don't know what she is doing. So we are always in the same difficulty – what you know, what you don't know.

I will take a very simple principle, at least during the General Meeting – that is to say the Annual General Meeting – during which all the new Members of the new ALSes arrive and are here, we have to consider that those people have less knowledge. So we have to begin from the beginning. We have to say everything. We have to explain to them, we have to help them, and we have to receive them. It's not to say, "You are working in the wrong way", "You are not [interpreting 02:46] in a good way."

We need to help them, we need to receive them, because we need their work. So we have to accept them as they are. I think that the issue of inviting new people and chasing the old people away is a question that we can ask ourselves. When I left the Board a year ago it was a question I asked myself. I left for a year. I'm coming back, and maybe too soon. Some people are not very happy to see me here, but I was not announced here, I was not received here. I didn't have a minute to intervene.

I feel like the new ones. There are some here around this table who were not received very well. I think it is our responsibility; the staff and those who are in charge of this organization must help everybody, the new ones. I think we must receive them in good conditions. It is very important for ICANN to do this, and

when we speak about responsibility and accountability for the Board, we have to do it at our own level. It's very important for the Board to do it, but we also have to do it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sally, I'll give you a chance to answer. Rinalia is coming at 10:30 sharp. Fadi is coming now, to say hello, but that is all. It is now 10:23, and Rinalia is already here.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you Sébastian. Yes. I completely agree with you, and it's interesting for you to express this personally, feeling the experience of a newcomer, and being perhaps objective about that in a way that one might not expect for somebody that's been part of the community for so long. How we welcome people is just as important as thinking about what happens to them once they're here, and how they progress their journey.

We certainly have responsibility as staff. We all have a responsibility, and I think you said that quite passionately, and I agree with you, to remember that it is very, very hard when you first join ICANN. I speak from somebody who went through it not that long ago. It's hard to even understand a whole sentence in an ICANN Meeting.

By the way, Nora's department is DPRD, which is the Department for Public Responsibility and Development, I think. I know that's on the record, and I have to go and check with Nora. You made great points. We do have an extensive newcomers' program. We can always do more. Is that Fadi? Okay. Everyone's waving!

ALAN GREENBERG:

At this point we still had Alberto and Judith in the queue. I'll leave it to you. Do you really want to intervene and get answers? It's your call. We do have a number of speakers lined up.

SALLY COSTERTON:

I was just going to make a suggestion, because I don't want to deny this discussion. It's such a great discussion. It's so helpful for me and my team. Heidi was just suggesting to me two possible solutions to the time. One is that you have regular calls of your ALAC Engagement and Coordination and Outreach Team. If you would like it, I'd be very happy to make myself and some of my team available, once, or regularly, to join that call.

This may give us more time to get into more detail about some of the tactical things we need to do. So please do, if you'd like to, let Heidi know, and she'll set that up for me. Also, as they say in the comedy circuit, I'm here all week! As are my team. Really, this is a very intimate venue. Please email me. Just come and

find us. We'll sit, we'll have a coffee, we'll talk about what you need to talk about. Please don't feel we can't keep on this discussion. You need the time back, I think, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for the lead-in. We do have an Outreach and Engagement Meeting on Tuesday at 19:00. You and your team are welcome to join that group. That's a one-hour meeting in this room. Alberto, you are the last word.

ALBERTO SOTO: Just very briefly – and I don't really require an answer right now – we have a plan for ALSes in countries where there's no coverage by LACRALO. I want to thank ICANN that we have been able to include Haiti, which was the first priority, because it is the country with the least penetration of the Internet, and we had to start work there.

We're not really very happy, because we believe that the Fellowship Program should try to continue with that policy, because they are now feeling a bit out of place, because we have already included ISOC for the Dominican Republic in the same trip, and the Dominican Republic has had representatives twice, and Haiti has never been represented. I think Haiti is the one that needs it the most. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: I'll ask Rodrigo to follow up on that with you, and with Nora, to make sure that we try and resolve that for the next meeting. Thank you for raising it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much all. We now have David Olive, who I'm told has been put into the Agenda for a moment. Thank you David.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you. I think I was part of the Agenda Alan, thank you, but the issue was I had to do a policy briefing for the Board of Directors that ran over, and so I'm sorry I wasn't able to be with you. Sally and I, as she pointed out, worked closely together to make sure that there is collaboration and cooperation among our staff, and directly with you, for your activities. To that extent I wanted to thank you. I don't need to say any more, because Fadi is here and so is Rinalia. So thank you for being here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you David. Yes, you were on the previous Agenda. I just hadn't noticed you, sorry. We now have Fadi Chehadé, someone none of us are familiar with – ICANN CEO and President, for those of you who might be unfamiliar with him. At this stage I've lost

complete track of how long he's going to be here, or for what, but Fadi, I'll turn it over to you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Good morning. I will be able to stay with you for a full half-hour.

ALAN GREENBERG: How does Rinalia feel about that? Rinalia says she can give you ten minutes.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Let's do that. People are pulling me from different places, saying the GNSO is also waiting for me. I'm especially happy to be here, because I'm going to give you a little secret, which I can do here, because you keep secrets very well, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Will all the reporters in the room please leave? Go ahead.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Once a year we instituted an award called the ICANN Leadership Award. We have two awards, as you remember. We have the Ethos Award, which is an awardee that is selected by the SO and AC Leaders. They come together and they select someone who needs to be honored for their volunteer commitment to the

community. Now, the Leadership Award, which will be awarded tomorrow morning in the main ceremony is an award that the selectee for that award comes from ICANN's staff, from the Management Team of ICANN.

We come together and we decide – really looking at everyone in our community, who deserves a Leadership Award. I'm going to give you half the answer, which is also a secret. The awardee this year is in this room. So the good news is the awardee is an ALAC awardee this year. So the rest of the answer you'll get tomorrow morning on stage. Sorry about that, but at least I gave you half the good news.

Delighted to be with you. For God's sake, four years ago when I started at ICANN, Alan, the discussion was still at the time, "ALAC's role in the ICANN community..." Again, as a newbie I was new to your community, so I was trying to understand what each community does, what each part of the community does. Today, I watch the work you're all doing, your Leadership is doing, many of you are doing. It is incredible.

The ALAC has become a picture of how the consensus multistakeholder community should work. Your contributions are balanced, they're deep, they're broad in every part of what we work on. There are many voices within ICANN. There's the voice of government, the voice of business, the voice of... But

there's also the voice of what I call the common wisdom – the voice that brings things back to the bedrock of what we believe in. Your voice is, in my opinion, that voice now.

Right now, that's how I view it, and I think that's how people are viewing ALAC, coming together. Really incredible, and I mean that. It's very much what I see now and what I witness. So congratulations on this. This meeting is about getting the transition really lined up properly. I think some of you heard my comments at the GAC yesterday, in the sense that the timeline is now pretty clear. We are moving in the right direction.

I don't need to give you any more updates on that. You have Leon here with you, who is very much in the plaza of this whole thing. If there is a plaza where all of this is happening, he's in the center of that plaza, on the fountain! Last time I saw him in Mexico, we had a beautiful dinner around a beautiful plaza in the heart of this fantastic city, not too long ago. So really to him go the questions on how we're doing, because this is a moving target.

Frankly, I put together my perception of where things are last Wednesday. It's already – as Leon noted yesterday – behind the times. Things are moving so fast. So let's respect that, let's work with him and with his team. Thank you for fielding him to this process. If I look at the three Chairs, he's been very much the

calm rock in that process, really. Kudos to him. I've seen some difficult moments, even with him, but he keeps his calm. He keeps his heart in the right place, and that helps me. It guided me a couple of times to back off. Thank you for that.

Alan Greenberg has been a very vocal Member of that group, so if you don't get answers from Leon, I'm sure you can hear from Alan. Again, I'm not going to cover this. Let me step away from the transition a little bit and tell you that I'm very keen, before I leave ICANN in Marrakech next year, I'm very keen to make sure that our Five-Year Operating Plan has a view of the needs of your community built in. This is important. This is the first time ICANN built Five-Year Plans, not just the yearly Budget and Operating Plan.

I have committed to your Leadership, and I will commit to do that with your team – that before we leave we bake into that Five-Year Operating Plan the necessary components that will assure this community for the next five years that into that plan are your needs for the ATLAS, for the other regional meetings – that we don't every year have to go into unnecessary back and forth. We should just build it into the plan. It should become institutionalized, is what I mean. I will work with you, Alan, with Heidi, with the whole team, to make sure that happens.

We are actually right now reviewing the Five-Year Operating Plan, so the timing is perfect. Heidi, please make sure we don't pass that Five-Year Operating Plan until we have finished that dialogue in the next few weeks. That's my commitment to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This session is being recorded, transcribed. That particular extract will be printed in gold leaf and presented to you to sign.

FADI CHEHADÉ: T-shirts as well! You know that all of you, many of you, know I have deep respect for you; for Alan, for what the ALAC is doing. It's the least we can do. It's just to give you the assurance that these fundamental things you need to carry on your work are in place. They need not be negotiated every year. That's why you have Five-Year Operating Plans. Imagine if we told our employees, "We're not sure if we'll have time to review your salaries every year. We'll see if we have budget for it." This is not dissimilar.

ALAN GREENBERG: And next year we may lower it.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes, “And next year we may lower it,” which is even worse. I think we’ll fix that. Do you have any questions for me? Do you have any clarifications you’d like from me before I leave you and before we enter this important historic meeting here in Dublin? Is there anything else I can be helpful with?

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m told Olivier has a question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Fadi, thank you very much for these introductory remarks. You mentioned the Five-Year Operating Plan and Budget, and we are of course very much geared towards that. If you recall in June last year the ALAC met with all of its ALSes and we had the At-Large Summit. At the time you emitted the thought that this should be a regular occurrence. I think you mentioned it was going to take place every three years or so. We’ve worked on this. So far we’ve worked on a five-year cycle, and a five-year cycle with regional General Assemblies taking place in-between the five years.

This year we’ve asked for two General Assemblies to take place. Only one was given. We’re now going to shift to actually provide a five-year plan of General Assemblies and of the Summit. My question to you is: are you still standing behind your words that

we should have it ASAP? Do we have your support for this five-year plan for Gas and the next Summit?

FADI CHEHADÉ:

That’s my CFO calling. This is what I meant to say earlier – that yes, you have my support to build this into the five-year plan, because we cannot have you every year fight for the necessary cadence that leads to a proper ATLAS every five years. This needs to be baked into the plan. This is what people do. We don’t have every year to have all this acrimony about, “How come you’re giving me two? Because I need to cover all my regions.”

Unless you come up with three regions instead of five, which I don’t think is reasonable, we need to have the plan. This way, we remove some of the unnecessary waste of time. This is why we created a five-year plan. This is a perfect example of how we should use the five-year plan; is to take something that is known, that is understood, bake it in, and then it becomes part of the institutional model. Get me the plan as soon as you can, clarity on that. I will work with my team and we end this once and for all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I will point out that someone yesterday suggested that we shouldn't have GAs, one GA per region in the four-year period between ATLASes, but we should have one GA per region every year. I think we are rejecting that for the amount of time and effort it will take. It's an interesting target, but not this year's.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Again, I'm waiting for the plan. I still need to discuss it with the Board, and Rinalia is here, so she'll help me, but I think the commitment from me is to avoid the fact that every year you seem to be needing to have a fight with us about what you need. So let's get the plan on the table, let's get it approved, bake it in, move on. So we can focus on what's important really.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and thank you for coming to see us.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Any other questions for me? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Thank you again Fadi. You did a lot in the internationalization of ICANN. Thank you very much. You did a lot of things. Now we have the four regions of ICANN with offices

of ICANN, except Africa. Don't you think it is time now to have an office in Africa?

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Where is Sally when I need her? Kidding aside, I think yes. I think it's unfortunate that we have a whole continent with a billion people without a presence by ICANN. It's my continent too. On top of it, it's personal for me, and I'm not happy with that right now. Why don't I just say, Tijani, I'm looking into it very seriously right now, and hoping that as I head towards Marrakech for my last meeting that we could have a few good things; actions, concrete things, to make a point to the African community that we are committed.

Just give me a little time. I took note of that. Thank you. Good luck with the meeting. Alan, thank you for inviting me. Sorry about the brief time, but I'm happy I came and I saw you. All the best to you at this meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you. I just want to make sure Fadi is out of the room before I say anything about him. You asked for a CEO search

update, and we have until 11:00, and I have a hard stop, because the Board will be discussing its leadership succession, and it's quite an important matter, and I have to be there. You saw Fadi. You've known him for a while. That's the guy that we have to replace, and it is a really tough act to follow. Let me give you an update of what the CEO Search Committee has been up to.

Fadi announced his intention to depart earlier this year, and the Search Committee formed in Buenos Aires in June and commenced its work immediately. There are eight Members. Let me remind you who they are – George Sadowsky, who is Chair, myself, Cherine Challaby, Steve Crocker, Chris Disspain, Markus Kummer, Ram Mohan, and Ray Plzak. Now, Ray Plzak is leaving the Board at the end of the AGM, so that will make the Committee a Committee of seven.

In terms of the CEO criteria, this was finalized in July of this year, and we factored all the input that was received. In terms of outreach method, we had community outreach and referrals. We had targeted advertising on the Internet. We had advertisements in print, and online in The Economist. Essentially, we highlighted the three categories of skills that we wanted to have in our CEO: essentially a CEO management/leadership type of a person; we wanted someone who understands diplomacy and has skills in that; and we

wanted someone with community facilitation and organizing skills. That's a hard act to find a person with all three.

In terms of results, with candidate pools at the moment we have more than 100 candidates, and I'll give you a breakdown in terms of percentages. This will be a little sad for some people. 93 per cent are male. Seven per cent are female. Nine per cent are from Africa, which is not bad, Tijani. 16 per cent from Asia. 27 per cent from Europe. Seven per cent from Latin America and the Caribbean, and 41 per cent from North America.

I have to say that the ones from North America are not strictly American-American. There is some diversity in that pool of those who are based in America and have American citizenship. In terms of the stages that we are at right now, we have started the interview process and we will continue until the end of next month. There are three stages to the interview. There is a telephone interview, a face-to-face interview of strong and promising candidates, and the final interview, which will be performed by the entire Board.

What we will do is we will continue to discuss the promising candidates, and try to refine our understanding of them, and hopefully we will select a good one for ICANN. That's all I have in terms of an update for you. In terms of deadline, we hope to complete our selection work before the end of the year, so that

by the time Fadi officially leaves us, by the end of the Marrakech Meeting, this person will be at the ICANN Meeting in Marrakech and will be seeing what is happening, and will be able to take over.

In terms of application deadline, the application period announced in The Economist has closed, but strong candidates are not discouraged from submitting an application. We would still consider someone, if that person is extraordinary and open to that. So, questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: Varna?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you Rinalia. I always think about this selection process like you are trying to shoot a duck. Yes, because to find people that have the three huge backgrounds is very difficult. Even Fadi and others, they don't have all the three. My question is, which is the priority? When you analyze the profiles, which do you prefer? This or that? When you are discussing about how you are going to select this person over the others, what are the priorities? Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Vanda. When we get a candidate, you will not get 100 per cent on each of the [buzzer].... As I said before, there are three categories. When we get a candidate, they are not all necessarily 100 per cent in each. But one thing that we are quite focused on is that we must get someone who has had CEO or Leadership experience. That is something that quite a few Members of the Selection Committee is focused on.

The other things we are quite flexible on. We would like to have more of those as well, but I think what's fundamental is someone who can oversee operations, because we want to make sure that operations is taken care of for ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give a perspective of someone who has nothing to do with the Search Committee, but has done lots of Search Committees. One of the things you look for is someone who, when you interview them, and read their résumé, they just jump out at you. Then you assess how they meet the qualifications. We have Tijani, then Aziz, and then Eduardo.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Rinalia, the outreach for this position, I see that it is always the same, this issue of outreach. It is always done in North America and Europe, et cetera. I think that advertising this

announcement should be done in all regions in the world, such as in newspapers... You know, you may find in the deep end of Africa a very good CEO for ICANN. If people are not aware about this announcement, people will not apply. I think that there is always a problem of outreach in ICANN. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I will just do a quick response. I agree with you, Tijani, and I asked the Communications Team to give the Committee an identification of publications, magazines, journals that would go out to these different regions, and we did consider them. But in the end, we picked the one that had the most global coverage, that is most likely for a person in a CEO capacity to have on their list. I note your concern. It was mine as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you very much. Thank you Rinalia. You said that seven Board Members are going to... You said there's this Selection Committee. Do you have also some specialized headhunters working with you? That's my first question. Do you work with a practice or office of headhunters? Forgetting what Tijani said, we talked about those magazines. They're American magazines,

I would say, and publications. I think you could find on other continents some important publications that could really help you out. Regarding languages, they need to know the communities, but I think languages is also very important; to have linguistic capacities, to speak at least three languages. That's very important. Because you know when you know language you also know another culture. That's essential.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Aziz. In terms of a headhunter, we are working with one, and I think some of us know them – Odgers and Berndtson – who also serve the NomCom. They have a large database and they also serve other ISTAR organizations. Your point about regional magazines, et cetera, for outreach is noted. In terms of my observation, not a single candidate is monolingual. They are all multilingual, which is excellent.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Rinalia, I want to expand on Aziz's question about the headhunter. Is this company also helping with the interviews when you're doing the screening?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, they are. Some of them need to be pre-screened, because the information that we get may not be fully comprehensive, and we're not sure, so we'd ask the company to go and have a chat with the person first, do a quick announcement. But we don't allow them to filter. We look at all the candidates that apply, but we may ask them to check on some first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Alan. I would strongly disagree with what's been said by the past two, three, and including you, Rinalia. I just want to remind ourselves, when we were asked as a community what the new CEO should have... What skills we were looking for, there was actually a great need to get somebody who understands the organization, ICANN, right away. Fadi had mentioned he needed three years to understand this organization as a multistakeholder organization.

This was – besides all the good things he's done – some of the issue and some of the problem; that if he fully understood the organization after three years, and he mentioned that publicly, what about the new executive staff that come in? Are they now

on the same page as Fadi is? Or are they still trying to understand the organization? Actually, one of the main points was to get somebody who is familiar with this organization at this critical point in time.

If you search for a candidate in the [last 36:32] region, in Africa, which might have perfect CEO skills, that's fine. But that might not be what we want at the moment, and this community expressed that very clearly – that we want someone who understands the organization right away, and can take it up at this difficult time and moment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Sandra. I'm closing the queue. We have two speakers right now. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: If you don't mind, can I take the other questions as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. We have a gentleman over there. I'm sorry, I don't recognize him.

SPEAKER: Yes, I am from Tunisia, from information and communication...
Been established are, let's say, the minimum. I can't imagine

that the future Executive Director of ICANN will not have these qualities. However, I think that the last couple of years, the most important issue that's been discussed within ICANN is the multistakeholder model.

I hope we'll have finished with the discussion, and the next step will be the implementation of the multistakeholder model. I think that the major condition to be observed when choosing the next person to lead ICANN will be his ability to implement this multistakeholder model, his ability to be an open-minded person that will be in a position to implement what has been imagined during all of us during these last years. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Just a follow up on what Sandra was asking. I wanted to confirm, are you in a position to actually give a rough percentage of persons who came from inside, from within...? No? Okay. The other thing I wanted to say is that I think in your review it's important that you consider people who have not just multistakeholder experience or CEO experience, but experience of the current status we have right now. It's obvious that Fadi

won't complete this process – even though I wish that he could – but it's obvious that he won't.

So please keep that in mind. Please don't also consider selection based on the percentage of where applicants come from, because it really shouldn't be one of the criteria. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you very much. I cannot tell you what the percentage breakdown is in terms of who has applied from inside the ICANN community, because we have to protect the confidentiality of that process. Knowledge of ICANN is a factor of consideration, but we are limited by the candidates that we receive. That's all ICANN say about that. Point about the current status of ICANN, knowledge of ICANN, understanding of the multistakeholder model – these are all factors in consideration. So it's not out of the equation.

It's just the challenge of finding the right person with the right balance of skills that's appropriate for ICANN, et cetera. If, for example, we get a person who doesn't have deep knowledge of ICANN, then the next criteria would be rapid learning skill, because we would have no other option. With that... I didn't mean to discourage you in any way. I see some really superb, outstanding candidates, and really the challenge is trying to find the right person.

It's not the Selection Committee that makes the decision. It is actually the full Board. It will be a tough discussion, because you need all of them to agree on one. So I have to run, my apologies, and I hope that I will see you later today at the At-Large Cocktail. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Rinalia. We have a 15-minute coffee break. We will start on time in 15 minutes. Please do whatever you choose to, but we will be back in 15 minutes. Ariel is looking at me as if I'm wrong. No.

[Audio part 4]

ALAN GREENBERG: They won't care. We could vote them all off the ALAC, but unfortunately that takes a significant number of the whole ALAC, not just the people that are in the room!

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome back from this very short coffee break. We now are going to have a session on discussion of the CCWG on Accountability and CWG on IANA Transition. We had a session yesterday afternoon that was very informative. This is going to

go a little further. I think we have further updates on when we're moving towards as far as accountability is concerned, and what the ALAC red lines should be, since there is likely to be some negotiating taking place this week. There's pressure for consensus to be found before Thursday. That's in a few days' time.

So we need to be absolutely clear about what this community in this room, and following us remotely, and of course Internet users out there would like to have, so what our preferences are. I'll turn the floor over to Alan Greenberg for a summary of where the CCWG is at the moment. No doubt there have been some 100 and something emails since last night. So let's see where things are moving, and then of course open the floor for all the participants and everyone who has a thought about this process to have a say. Over to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. This is the first meeting that the ALAC and Regional Leaders have formally had on this subject at this meeting, but I believe the majority of you were at the session yesterday. I know there are a few exceptions and I don't think we have the ability to review everything at this point. To those, I apologize, and we can try to do that privately. I'm not aware of any substantive change that we know of since yesterday. There

have been some emails. I don't believe they have announced anything earth-shattering.

There has been a Board Meeting yesterday, and I haven't heard any outcome of it, so I don't know what the results of that was. Someone else might. Cheryl, you implied you might know. Do you want to speak about it, or do you want to be silent? Let me frame it before you speak. As we were counted yesterday, there was some very significant movement within the CCWG in the last few days.

The essential movement was a seeming acknowledgement, although not really spoken, that the designator model will largely be acceptable to a good part of the CCWG, and specifically the sole designator model. "Designator" implies appointment of directors, and potentially removal.

The difference between what we are right now, where the ALAC and At-Large is effectively a designator, but isn't mentioned as such in the Bylaws, the difference between the sole designator and the current designator model, where the GNSO is also presumably a designator, but not mentioned, is that in the sole designator model, although we may have control over who we name, we funnel it through this single entity that represents the whole community. That's about the only difference.

The intent is that by Bylaws we provide the designator with some other powers also, but they're not really there because they're designators. The membership model that was previously on the table is very similar, except members have a number of other powers under California Law, some of which are particularly dangerous, if we don't have suitable accountability in the community. There are some of us who feel that we don't have such accountability there right now.

That's where we sit right now. The last update I had was a significant part of the Board are willing to accept the designator model, which de facto is what we have right now. It would be rather astounding if they weren't willing to accept it, because they'd be rejecting the current status quo. However, there has been a significant reluctance to accept the sole designator with the belief that there are other powers that designators might have.

I've never been able to get that list of powers identified, because the only other powers the designators might have are the ones that go into the Bylaws, and ultimately, the Board controls the Bylaws. Nevertheless, there was some reluctance. I understand that might have been discussed at a Board Meeting yesterday. I'll turn it over to Cheryl, if she wants to say anything. Or you may not say anything.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I may, but how likely is it that I may not? In fact, Alan, other than supporting absolutely what you've said, I wanted to correct the record from our update of yesterday. If I could get down on bended knee and get back up, I would, but I won't. I'll just stand here. Leon and I, as we discovered at our 7:00 meeting this morning have misled you all slightly. I do apologize and I want to correct the record.

When it comes to the removal of individual Board Member, which we discussed yesterday as an outcome of our very successful breakout sessions, both Leon and I must have been in a fugue state somewhere at the time, had assumed exactly because of how you've described the role of designator, sole or otherwise, that once the escalation process happens, once the community toing and froing goes on, and once the legal entity, the designator – notice I'm using the singular there, which might be a personal bias – that that would be the entity that actioned any removal.

You, Alan, however, thought that it went back to the appointing body, and you, according to where the breakout group was, are correct. That is where the breakout group did end up. We were wrong saying that it stopped at or is the designator. I have a problem with that, because I don't quite understand the purpose

of taking it beyond the designator to do that. But we can work on that in the next couple of day.

I do want to correct the record. You and others were correct. You obviously looked at the fine print, where Leon and I hadn't gone all the way across the page. That is still open for discussion, but as you've described designator makes sense, honestly, either way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. The issue for those who are now even more confused is the Directors currently appointed by At-Large or the SOs are appointed by At-Large or the SOs, period. In the sole designator model, the selection would be done by the At-Large or the SOs, and a secret little note written, essentially, would be transmitted to the designator entity for formally appointing the person. My understanding was the removal was the same thing.

The major difference is currently the selection is done wholly within the body. So the GNSO does not come to us and say, "What do you think about reappointing Bruce as our Director?" He's not eligible for reappointment, by the way. In the removal process, they would be obliged to say, "We are thinking about removing Bruce halfway through his term. What do you think about it? Let's talk about it."

If indeed they decided to continue, the formal decision would be theirs, passed onto the designator for action. That, however, is the proposal out of a small Working Group yesterday. It's not been considered by the CCWG, and I really don't want to debate the merits here. Those of us who knew for a while could repeat each of our arguments, and that's not needed. But just for clarity, Cheryl, the absence of saying anything says you do not have any input you can share with us regarding the Board discussion. So that is still up in the arms.

The sole designator model, and the multiple designator model, operationally, has really minimal changes. One of the differences is in the sole designator model, although only a few SOs and ACs are really acting with the function of designators, they operate through the sole designator. The other powers, which have nothing to do with Board Members, such as Bylaw approval, would also be enacted by the designator on behalf of all of the ACs and SOs. That could still work with multiple designators.

I think the real difference we have right now is one of mindset and where the CCWG is. We moved away from a multiple designator model a number of months ago, not as a conscious decision, but it was simply taken over by the sole member model. The CCWG has made very significant movement, or at least we seem to be moving in a place where many people have

been quite flexible and may give up – they haven’t made the decision yet – the member model.

If the Board comes back and says, “We’ve not changed our minds, we are adamant to say exactly what we said a month and a half ago,” that will, I think, send a message that the Board is saying, “My way, or no way.” Even though the two positions may be almost invisibly close to each other, there’s going to be a reluctance for the CCWG to move more without similar movement from the Board.

Now, that could be fixed in a matter of time, but we have at this point about 24 hours. Well, 27 hours, because there’s still tomorrow afternoon. I have nothing more to say on that. We have Seun and then Olivier and then Tijani.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I intend to also talk about the individual designator model, but I’ll leave that based on what Alan has said. I think I need to get some clarification. You mentioned that the Board actually, there’s some unofficial tendency that the Board supports the designator model but not the sole designator model. Is there a reason why they support the multiple designator model as opposed to the sole?

Then I think it's important to get some clarification in terms of whether indeed the CCWG actually is in the direction of designator, because apart from Leon, I don't see that sense of understanding from the remaining two Co Chairs, based on what they've said in other communities, like within the GAC, for instance, in regards to Fadi's comment that he made in GAC. The transcript is also within the CCWG to follow up with.

The third thing I'd like to raise also is that in this situation, what is the status or the view of ALAC now? If it happens that the CCWG thinks that it's moving from the member model, does the ALAC have a very strong conviction that, irrespective of whatever happens, it will not support a member model? I think we need to clarify that, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We are setting a timer now, and it will be going on for the future speakers. This is the first time the ALAC has met to talk about this subject since we approved our last statement. The ALAC does not have a position. We may well, before this period is over, and I'm hoping we will before this period is over, but at this point we don't have a statement. I haven't seen what Fadi said at the GAC, so I'm not going to comment on it. If someone else can summarize in one minute or less, that would be nice.

What I just said is what my readings of the signs, the tealeaves, as it were, are of the CCWG. NO, the CCWG has not made a decision to abandon the membership model. We are evaluating both of them. My reading is from both the words that are said and much private discussion with people, and that's that the CCWG, especially if we look at the members and the chartering organizations, would likely be prepared to accept the designator model. That's my reading of the signs, and it could well be wrong. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In response to your question, Seun, I'm going to be an ALAC Member for another four days. If a vote comes on a membership model solution, my vote would be no. I'll be very clear about that. With regards to the discussion we had a bit earlier regarding the removal of Board Members, my position is if an individual SO or AC is able to remove its own Board Member for whatever reason it has, that transforms a Board Member into a politician. The Board Member cannot then act in the best interest of ICANN. It has to think, "Am I likely to be kicked out if I do this?" That's a real concern.

When you mention the removal process – and Cheryl mentioned that with the single designator model – I wanted to have a clarification on this. Does that mean that the appointing body

consults with the other SOs and ACs regarding that Board Member they wish to remove? If the other ACs and SOs do not agree with it, are they bound by this? Or is it just a consulting thing where they says, “You don’t agree with it, we’re still going to kick them out”?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The answer is it’s a discussion process. According to the small breakout group yesterday – and don’t put any more weight to it that that – the AC or SO that selected them has the sole discretion to, after the discussion and input, take the action. Now, my candid position is if any AC and SO ever decides to do this, there’s a high probability that in the quiet discussion they would have with their Director prior to any of this formal starting, the Director would probably resign, in almost all likelihood, before any of the formal part starts. That’s, again, my person opinion.

But watching how other organizations, and how the ALAC, on occasion, has removed people, that is how it is worked out. That being said, Olivier, in this discussion right now I would really appreciate if people not restate their positions that they’ve stated many times before, fighting for something. We’re trying to update the overall group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Resigning under duress, that would be, then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Under duress which no one officially knows about. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. I received your message. First of all, I'd like to say that I have the same feeling that you have about the CCWG readiness to accept the sole designator model. Second point, on the group that discussed yesterday the removal of individual Board Member, I was one of the supporters. The Chair of this group told me, "You must be there, because you have this position." Olivier, the difference between the statement of ALAC and statement of AFRALO was this point exactly.

So we'll not come back to that, but I'll explain to you very clearly the outcome of the sub group yesterday was that the removal of individual Board Members would be done by the designator – the entity who appointed him or her on the Board. But there are two important steps in the process. The first step is the Committee Forum – discussion inside the Committee Forum of this removal. That means that this SO will come to the Committee Forum, will announce, and will say, "I want to remove this Director because..."

The Director will be there and will say, “No, that’s not right. I was like this...” So there is the SO who exposes the case, and the Director who can defend himself. This is one phase. Second phase, after this discussion, if the SO is still willing to remove his Board Member, the SO or AC has to ask formally all the other AC and SOs about their point of view, what they think about that, and they have to receive an answer from them, formally.

After that, he will have the sole right to remove or not to remove the Director. Now coming back to what Seun said – I, as a person, am not ready to accept any member model, because of several things. The Board thinks that the full designator model is better, because they think that if you put it as a sole designator, how will you concentrate all powers in this designator? I explained it is the contrary. If you use the sole designator model, you will have the power distributed among the whole community inside this sole.

But if you don’t do that, you will have any. The GNSO, for example, can come, can go, and do whatever they want. This is captured. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I’ve put myself in the queue, since we seem to have started the substantive discussion. In terms of the sole designator and the multiple designators, there are, as far as I can tell, no functional

differences. Many Board Members have been convinced, through whatever process – and I won't go into the discussions that are not public on the Board; I've made a number of statements saying they should be public, but they're not – there is a strong belief that through some form of magic or something else, the sole designator will be empowered with extra powers that would be damaging to ICANN. I do not understand.

Now, one of the problems is they view the concept of the sole designator – and remember, the term is a misnomer. It's a sole entity, which happens to pass on the designator powers. But that sole entity also has other powers, such as Bylaw approval. There is a belief in the Board that you can do that through ACs and SOs and have it enforceable under law, without forming that sole entity.

I believe they are incorrect, and I've said it a number of times. Their proposal says the AC/SO Chairs will be the legal entity that will take the power. As an AC/SO Chair, I have a problem with that. Number one, there are potential liabilities – legal, or financial, or otherwise. I don't know what they are, and I'm not going to pretend to know what they are in whatever country the lawsuit is taken. ICANN has said they'll indemnify me, and I'm not sure I trust that sufficiently. Number one.

Number two, if I decide on my own behalf to take that kind of action, there's a significant time cost to me, which they cannot indemnify me for. They cannot say, "I'll pay you back the week you're taking in a court." Number three, when I step down as Chair, and Olivier comes back, there is no way, legally... Same faces! We're going to rotate back and forth between the rest of us until we die! That was a joke.

However, the significant impact of it is there is no way, under law, that I'm aware of, for me to take a lawsuit that I have personally taken and say, "Oops, not me anymore, it's him." So there are significant problems. The problems are resolved by forming an entity, an unincorporated association, which must be formed before the event that you're fixing, which means it has to exist from the beginning. That is, as far as I can tell, not at all distinguishable from the community mechanism as a sole something.

So I think the models are almost identical. There has been a belief among many Board Members that there are some other powers. I don't know what they are. However, that's between the two designators. The issue of membership – the last statement the ALAC made said – and I'll try to quote, not quite verbatim: "We are prepared to accept the proposal of the CCWG, which was a sole member model, but we find it too complex, too cumbersome, too scary, and this is not the way we want to go.

But if the rest of the CCWG, including the Board, were willing to go along with it, we would also. We would not be the organization to try to stop it.” Now that I believe – and again, it’s my person belief – that the designator model is likely to be acceptable to the CCWG, I am prepared to withdraw my support for the member model, now that I do think there is an alternative. Before the end of this meeting in 35 minutes, I would like to hold a vote of the current ALAC as to whether we are prepared to make that a formal statement; that we are not supporting the member model and are supporting a designator model of one form or another.

I will be calling that question some time in the next half hour, and I would like some thoughts from people on that. I’m not trying to stop discussion on other things. We have Sébastien.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: We have in front of us to make a choice regarding the content. We have three or four words to use: designator or member, sole or multiple. The question for me is what is the most important. For me, it is to choose one structure and only one structure, which would become a legal structure. This is more important than the choice of the word designator or member. My choice would be to have only one structure, and for the second term I prefer designator. It’s a better term than member.

The term sole is more important. One suggestion I talked about yesterday, I think it's important for us to change the terms, and I suggest to call the proposal "coordinated proposal – coordinated sole designator" in English. That would be clearer in English. Coordination of all the people inside ICANN become one voice, which is the voice of the sole designator. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll give you my personal opinion. I don't much care what the name is, and if we can come up with something that confuses people less, you have my blessing. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I agree that technically there's no difference between the sole designator and the multiple designator, because technically all will still [get the support of the Board 00:39:46] before the power gets executed. The sole designator, [unclear] would happen not as designators, but when it's time to be executed, it would be executed as designator. So it's the same thing technically. However, I think the aspect that makes it differ is in the aspect of whether all ACs and SOs want to be formally recognized as designators.

I think that question is yet to be clarified. Have they indicated that they're willing to be designators? For the sole designator model, I had the question yesterday whether the issue we had with sole membership had been addressed within the sole designator – when some SOs said they wouldn't want to participate in that process. I understand of course that's been addressed, so that means that... Yes.

Then the other thing I wanted to mention is that I think it's fine to get consensus, ALAC voting on the membership part now. I will suggest that we'll still leave the designator open for now, and not necessarily say we'll prefer sole designator, because I think within the group – I participated in the sole group of enforcements – we recognized that even what you wanted to achieve could be achieved without necessary saying, [unclear 00:41:24]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I can answer both of those questions, and I'll go to my colleagues on the CCWG if they think I'm wrong. I believe I'm correct on both. Number one, are all ACs and SOs designators? No. The term designator is a term in law that has to do with appointing Board Members. The only designators today are the ASO, GNSO, ccNSO and At-Large. That doesn't say at some time in the future some other organizations may appoint Board

Members, and if that decision is made then those would become designators as well. It's a term in law related to appointing Board Members.

In answer to something Sébastien said yesterday, liaisons are not Board Members as such, and therefore ones who appoint liaisons are not, under California Law, designators. That part is really clear. That's a point in law. The question of will all the ACs and SOs participate. One of the things in the current model is that we decided to ask each SO and AC, "Are you in or out?" Several of them have made clear they're out.

The current proposal, again from a breakout group yesterday, is that we will not ask. To pass a fundamental Bylaw requires, under the proposal – not approved – the approval of four ACs and SOs, and not more than one of them objecting. It's a Working Group proposal not adopted, but if it were adopted, that would be the rule. So any of the seven ACs and SOs can say, "Yes, I want to support it," "No, I object to it," or be silent. If enough are silent, we don't get the four, and it doesn't happen.

I think that addresses the issues, and I think that's pretty definitive. I don't think it's subjective at this point, but it's based on a model that is proposed by a breakout group. Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Just a point of clarification that the level of support required – and I was in that breakout group, so I know what was discussed and suggested – but for the different powers, slightly different levels of support were recommended. They’re not yet accepted, but for some of the powers that required strong support, a level of four SO and AC support was required, and for some of the others where it was not deemed to be quite as critical, a level of three SO and AC supports. But for all of them, it was no more than one objection. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Although some people, I’m one of them, suggested that for the whole Board removal it should be more than four, or alternately a single objection is enough to kill it. That’s up for grabs. Sébastien, you’re next.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Go to somebody else please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I misunderstood your hand signal. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I’d like to support Seun’s proposal of not openly supporting the single designator model; of actually saying,

“We’re still considering this. It’s on the table, depending on what the circumstances are and the different details of the single designator model.” Of course, and saying no to the membership model, we’ve already discussed that.

ALAN GREENBERG: For clarity, I said I was going to ask the group – modifiable, should we wish – to reject the membership model. I’m happy to be silent on anything else.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, but it doesn’t mean that the single designator model is the only model that’s on the table. There might be other models...?

ALAN GREENBERG: I already said that I believe the single designator and the multiple designator are effectively the same, once you have an implementable version of both. I don’t much care. Other people might.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But the Board has another view as well, so I think at this point in time we should still be open to see...

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought I just was open? I said I don't care. How much more open can you be?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. My concern is, coming back to the kicking out of a Director from the Board, the process you've explained, Tijani, is a bit of concern for me. Everything is transparent in ICANN, and having a Board Member stand before what can be a kangaroo court on the reasons for their being kicked out of the Board, transcribed, in public, recorded, et cetera – do you think that any person with a stellar career throughout their life, nominated by NomCom or by an organization, would then take the risk to stand on the Board for something like this? They would resign. Anyway, it just doesn't sound right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani? You can answer this specific question first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. You're right Olivier, but this discussion inside the Forum will make the SO think a million times before asking for the removal of the Board Member, because they will be in front of everybody, explaining why they want to remove him. So if this Board Member has done something very serious, I think that he will resign immediately. But if they want to remove him because

he didn't get the position that their narrow interest wants to push him to take it, I think in this case they'll think a million times before asking for removal. This is why we insisted on the Forum. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The next speaker is Stefano.

STEFANO: First of all, thank you very much for the explanation about the words, designator. Now I understand. The day before it was not so clear to me. Now the designator seems to be a more acceptable solution, even for the Committee. Looking at the plural or singular designator, you explained very well that the two hypotheses have not so big a difference. But in my opinion, the use of singular could be much more acceptable and could reflect the multistakeholder nature of ICANN.

Because this means that all the SOs and all the communities have to find an agreement, let's say, and Latin used the term [unclear 00:50:13], and perhaps for the Board, to have the plural is more meaningful, because they say, "Okay, before they do something wrong with us, then it's better that the singular entities are not unique." So in the end, I'm agree very much that maybe the single designator is more acceptable.

In the end, for the GAC, for example, what is really the meaning and what is important is how the powers are reflected. How many Members in the Board? How many from this SO/AC? This GNSO? This is the real problem that will be debated, because we want to understand absolutely how the forces and the power are inside of the Board. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two things to answer earlier questions. In terms of Directors and the issue that Olivier raised, let me pass this by you: right now, AC and SO Directors, for the most part – certainly SO, and the AC one, us, we’re new at this game – typically renew their Directors. So the vast majority of Directors, if the person chooses to stay on, is renewed. The exception is very rare. We’re now talking about a group that thinks their Director is evil today but they will reappoint them in two years.

I don’t think a lot of those Directors are going to get removed, because they likely will be reappointed anyway, and their groups have supported them. Of those who might be removed through whatever the process is, some of them may well deserve it. Some of them, the group may be convinced through the process that it’s not worth the effort to try to remove them. Now, there’s an edge case of a Director who’s going to be removed for poor

reasons, that the AC or SO is determined to do it and goes ahead and does it anyway. That's a very small fraction.

We accept Directors on the Board right now who are close to incompetent, and we let them sit out their three-year term. That's a cost of doing business, and perhaps a cost of doing business is very occasionally we lose someone who's good through an invalid process. We have had Director resignations over the years. At least some of them were not completely voluntary. We don't know which ones, but we can guess. Was that fair? Who knows. That's life. Nothing is perfect.

In terms of single versus multiple, as I've said, I don't like the term single designator because people then assume that the other community powers are attributed to the designator, but they're not. We are going to have to create an entity that has the other powers, and the designator, if it's a single one, is a pass-through. I really don't see the two models as being particularly different. By using the sole designator, it implies we have to explain something to people, whereas if ACs and SOs are designators, that's almost invisible.

So the multiple one is a little nicer to me, assuming we do it properly. But there's no functional difference. I'm not going to make a big fuss over them, certainly. Next we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. I disagree with you, unfortunately. There is a big difference between the two models; the sole designator and the full designator model. You are thinking about the designator because you are thinking about designation of Board Members on the Board, that's all. That's why you say it's the same and it's a pass-through. But the reality is the designator has statutory rights, and the designator will exercise the powers.

If it is a sole designator, it will be only one sole designator who will have the right to exercise the powers. Not one of the ACs or SOs will have the right to exercise any power alone. It is inside the sole designator that they have... Yes please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just clarification – when you say “the powers”, tell me which powers we are talking about.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The five powers that we are talking about in the CCWG – removal of the whole Board... Okay. So there is a big difference, because in the full designator model, any SO or AC can have the statutory rights, and can exercise the powers alone without any consultation, without anything. They have the legal right to do so. I think that the sole designator is much better, because it will

make the power distributed among the community inside the sole designator model. I'm not finished. I'll continue.

Another big difference: if we use the full designator model we'll have only the three SOs and ALAC as designators, and they are the only ones who have the rights and who have the possibility to exercise the powers. But if we are in the sole designator model, and if we use the consensus and not the voting system, any SO and any AC, we participate in the decision-making. So there is a big difference. I don't see them as the same, at all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

When my turn comes around I'll try and explain why I don't think that is the case. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I'd like to just say that I think we should be careful to avoid reducing our requirements based on scenarios that may never happen, because the entire CCWG proposal has been based on "what-ifs". So I think that we should also make sure that "what if" of the community [capture 00:58:07] is also considered totally and is actually evident in our proposals. We've only been applying the "what ifs" to the Board.

The fact that an individual Board Member can be removed by a community – an appointing community or appointing SO is not

consistent with the principles of sole designator, if we're doing that. It's just not consistent with it. So it looks like we are trying to just accept anything that we think is fine, and want to move on with it, which is not right. The other thing I want to say is it's a matter of when we go through this cosmetic community engagement process, the question still is who makes the decision to remove the Board Member?

It still goes back to the SO or AC, which is very wrong. My other question to this floor is to ask, without specifically putting anyone on the spot, what is the status of stress test 18, if there's any update in that regard? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Seun. I'm next in the queue. Okay, the term designator, which we are using incorrectly much of the time, only applies to Board Members. So the sole designator only has one power as the designator to appoint or withdraw Board Members according to the instructions of the appropriate group – the NomCom, or the ACs or SOs. Now, I don't really want to debate a lot more whether an AC or SO should be able to do it themselves or not.

Different people believe different things, and one person saying the other is wrong I think is stating their opinion. There are different opinions. I personally can live with both. I don't

particularly care. But there are people who believe strongly the other side. So let's not say they're wrong. We disagree with them. Okay.

In terms of what Tijani was saying, we are using the sole “thing”, will have the designator powers on behalf of the ACs, SOs or NomCom, and will only act according to the Bylaws as instructed by them. But that sole “thing” also, we are endowing, with other privileges to effectively, among other things, approve Bylaws. That will be exercised not by the people who have Board approval rights, according to the Bylaws, but by all seven ACs and SOs, again, according to the breakout session yesterday.

So the four ACs and SOs required are all of the seven, regardless of how many act as designators, which is why I said the models are the same, because the decision whether to veto a Bylaw would be made with an opportunity for all seven to participate, even if they are not designators. In my mind – and maybe we want to carry it offline – in my mind they are functionally identical. The paperwork is different, but the net result is exactly the same.

If there's someone else, I don't know if Leon or Cheryl wants to weigh in, but that's my understanding of the current state of effects, as of the breakout sessions yesterday. That is all seven ACs and SOs will participate in the other powers, other than

Director approval and removal, regardless of whether they are designators at all.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Alan, yes, you are right. I don't know if I'm not being able to actually communicate myself, because I think I've explained this several times. Of course, I'm really happy to answer questions as many times as needed, but it's like deja vu. I already spoke about this yesterday and the day before that, but yes, I'm happy to clarify. But you're right – what you describe is actually right.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Don't confuse those who have the ability to approve Directors, which is as the Bylaws say right now, even though we're not using the term, with these new other four powers, which are in today's model, not in the proposal. The proposal, it was only for those who said yes. Now we're not asking, and anyone who at the time decides it's important to participate, may participate. Although we think under today's model the proposal that was on the table, we might only have three ever participating, now we're requiring four to do certain things.

So that alone says there's a difference. We are nine minutes before the end of the period. I would like to have that vote of the

current ALAC before we finish. I see your hand is up. We have three more speakers at this point, but we have four minutes.

LEON SANCHEZ: It's just a quick comment to answer to the stress test 18 status. It's something that's being discussed by the GAC, and that is the status. It needs to be discussed by the GAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I am not a lawyer – I am an engineer. I am not a native English speaker either. I may not understand English, and I may not know the law of jurisdictions, but I have read a table from our legal counsel explaining what the sole designator model can do. That's why I said what I said. I don't know. I'm not a lawyer. If I don't have knowledge, I cannot say anything. That's why I said what I said. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are not going to be voting on single versus multiple. Let's carry on the conversation privately and try to make sure everyone has the same understanding. I am neither a lawyer, nor an engineer, but I think I know what is on the table, and I can

probably interpret the lawyers' letters for you, because I had a long conversation with them afterwards. Sébastien and then Holly.

SÉBASTIAN BACHOLLET: I'm just a final user, and end user, and when I think in terms of an end user, my worry is that at one point, if I understand clearly, we will need to have someone, or something, or a group, an entity, become a legal entity, which will be called a designator, to act upon some powers requested by the CCWG. If we have a multiple model, there is a risk that everyone can become that legal entity without asking the others, and they can act as a legal entity.

Maybe legally it's going to be more complicated, but as far as the image is concerned – that's why I come back to it – I think it's an important choice. You may not agree with me. My first question was: is it only one person working alone, being able to do something? I would choose the sole, the singular, and for me the rest is less important. But I'm not the one asking the questions. You have my answer to a question you didn't ask.

HOLLY RAICHE: I appreciate how late the day is, but I'm just going to pick up on a point that Olivier made, which is if you've got the designator

model, you do, in essence, turn a Board Member into a politician. Because if the appointing body then has the power to remove, there's always in the back of the mind of the Board Member, who's actually... Once you're a Board Member you should be loyal to the Board. That's just basic good governance.

So if there's a reply to that, I would be more comfortable. I take Seun's point – we don't vote on that today. We vote on something else. But Leon, in lunchtime, when we're not taking up time, I'd like to talk about that a little bit.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will point out that by your definition, every Board Member becomes a politician near the time when they're up for renewal. I would like to now raise the question that I served notice I would raise, half an hour ago. In the previous statement, the ALAC said, "We could support the member model," implying if it was the general consensus of the CCWG.

I believe there are significant other models available today that might be acceptable to the CCWG, and under those conditions I am proposing that the ALAC withdraw its support of the member model, as today's understanding. We could change back someday, if we choose to. Is there any discussion among the current ALAC Members, before we hold a vote? Is there any

further discussion? Because we've had significant discussion. Seeing no hands... Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: The reason that we're voting for this now is because... Why? Does it matter if we say it's a membership? Is there something that if we keep it the way it is, does that mean that that's the only thing that we are thinking about; the membership? If we retract, does it bode that we're going to go ahead and do it? Right? Or am I wrong?

ALAN GREENBERG: When you finish your question I'll try to answer it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: The reason that we are getting this comment that we said about membership, is it because that's the only thing that we said we were going to do? Or are we open to other things? I'm confused. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: In our last statement we said we would support the membership model, which was the proposal made by the CCWG, published in August, because at that point it seemed to have very large

support, and nothing else seemed to. So we said, “We’re not going to be the one dissenting party that refuses to support it.”

I believe – I’m stating a personal position – that there are other acceptable models that might well be acceptable to the CCWG today, and by taking this action we are sending a message to both the CCWG and the various other parts of the community, that we believe the CCWG should come to closure on something other than the member model. Should the CCWG reverse itself and say, “Everyone’s back on the membership bandwagon,” and the Board says, “Yes, we like membership now,” when time comes to approve the final proposal, we could do it.

We’re not withdrawing an option, we’re just sending a message that we believe, at this point in time, there are other acceptable things that we think will go forward, and we’re sending the message saying, “We strongly support these other options in favor of membership.” Anyone else have any issues? Again, current ALAC Members? Then I call for a vote of the current ALAC Members. Is there anyone who wants to abstain?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Point of order – we do need to state clearly what the question is, and then ask the question.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will in a second. You're correct. I'm trying to jump the gun. The motion is the ALAC withdraws its support of the membership model as proposed by the CCWG Accountability. Do I have a seconder?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I second it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Staff, I ask you to keep record of who is in the current ALAC in the room. Do we have any people who want to abstain? I see no hands. I don't believe anyone has [husher's proxy 01:12:42] unless someone... if someone has indicated they have... That was documented to the staff? Then Tijani has [husher's proxy]. Sorry, I wasn't made aware of that. Is there anyone who wishes to vote no? Could we have a show of hands for those who want to say yes? A show of cards of whatever? Tijani has two of them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could we please have a list of the names as you read them?

[pause]

ALAN GREENBERG: We're convening the ALS Criteria and Expectation Task Force, which is meeting in this room, starting immediately.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]