
DUBLIN – Joint Meeting of the ICANN Board and the At-Large
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 – 08:30 to 09:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

STEVE CROCKER:

Good morning, everybody. This is the beginning of what we call constituency day in which the board tries very hard to engage, briefly but meaningfully, with a whole series of different groups, and we get to start off with you guys.

The -- I want to say what I just said again but to say it in quite a serious way.

Our goal is, even though this is brief, to get right into substantive matters. However, before we do, since this is the annual general meeting and there's some new people and some people who are finishing their terms, Alan, maybe we can introduce the new people in each group.

Let me start with the board members who are joining us. I think I've actually spotted them hiding in the front rows here.

Lito, Lousewies, Ron, why don't you just stand up for a second and people can see your faces.

I can tell you that we've already inserted them into meetings. They've gotten the full blast of what goes on, both inside and

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.

around and so forth, and they will not -- they will be just like brand-new cars that have been driven off the lot and have devalued and they're used by the time we finish the meeting.

[Laughter]

Let that sort of vivid imagine sit in your minds.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. At one point, we calculated the maximum number of ALAC members that could turn over in a year. At this point I think we have exceeded it -- or we may be right on -- due to the fact that my position and my -- the fact I'm changing from a NomCom- to a RALO-appointed position added an extra new person who would otherwise not have been appointed this year, and we've had a phenomenal amount of turnover. We have seven people, of the 15 on the ALAC, who will be changing this year. And that's not counting me.

And if we could -- I hope they're all here. I haven't checked yet. Seun Ojedeji. Sorry. My mouth is not working. Is Seun here?

Over there. And he's a RALO appointee from Africa.

Wafa Dahmani. Wafa, I've seen you somewhere here today. I thought she was here. Wafa is from Tunisia, when you see her.

We have Kaili Kan from China over there.

Tim Denton from Canada.

Harold Arcos from Venezuela. Harold?

Okay. And someone you've never seen before, Sebastien Bachollet, from France.

[Laughter]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

ALAN GREENBERG: Brand-new. We're going to have a hard time explaining what ALAC is.

[Laughter]

And that's all for that part of the business.

STEVE CROCKER: Good.

Two other things before we get into the agenda that -- your items.

On logistics, we tried an experiment of just how to rearrange the engagement. This auditorium is maybe one of the more challenging settings that we've been in. We don't always have control of the facilities. But the experiment that we tried last time, we got mixed feedback from, and I'm still interested in any suggestions and so forth.

We have a board operations team --

Melissa is not here, is she? No.

Okay. But in any case, we have a board operations team, and one of the things that I've tasked them with is continuing attention to this question, and so there may be some engagement on the side.

Another thing which is not probably on your agenda, but as we know we're in the middle of this CCWG very intense process. The formality of that process is that when they produce a proposal, it will come to the chartering organizations, of which you guys are one, and require formal action, approval or non-approval or whatever, and -- before it comes to us, and then we have to deal with it.

One of the questions, as we're deeply enmeshed in all the discussions, is to what extent ALAC as a whole, or leadership, is engaged in watching it as -- as -- in relationship to the people

that you have appointed to be on the CCWG, and to what extent the positions that we see being taken by the members there reflect or are known by or are consistent with what the thinking will be when you see the final proposal.

So I'll just let that hang there.

And George, you had asked -- you know, framed that question. Have I come close to what you had in mind?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: Close enough. Okay. That's the best I ever hope for.

The agenda is really yours, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. The only things on our agenda are primarily the accountability issue, and we would like to spend a few minutes at the end talking about outcomes of the at-large summit that was held a little over a year ago in London.

The position that's been taken by the ALAC is moderately consistent over the period of -- the entire period of the time that it's been running. It has changed periodically because the world

changes around us and our understanding of some things has changed very significantly.

One of the issues in the CCWG altogether is we went into it saying, "We want enforceability."

The lawyers gave us solutions with enforceability that had implications and side effects, as it were, that we didn't really understand when we asked for it, and therefore that's one of the reasons that some people's positions have changed, and certainly it's one of the reasons our position has changed, when it has.

But we have been moderately consistent that we were never looking for what some people have wanted as absolute enforceability.

I think our position has been closer to the board's position that - - or at least some board members, in any case -- that if we ever get to the stage where we're taking each other to court or killing the whole board, we are in really bad shape.

And as the -- perhaps the poster child example of it, there was a discussion yesterday within the CCWG of how do we get absolute enforceability on separation of the IANA function if we go through all of the processes which has -- starts with a complaint to the IANA functions review, to a CCWG to, in fact,

enact separation, to the board refusing to honor the CCWG's output, to an IRP, to court. And my take on that is if we're really doing this because IANA was dysfunctional, the IETF and RIRs would have left a long time ago, the registries and the root server operators would have figured out another way to distribute a root, and while we were debating the issue, IANA would have moved, de facto, just because people do have a slight desire to keep the Internet running.

So we have taken a somewhat different position than some people within the group.

Now, to what extent is this the position of the five people within the group and the -- or the larger ALAC and at-large -- excuse me -- I guess the first thing to point out is the five people in the group who are formal members do not always agree with each other. So I don't think we have a single unified position on every -- all of the details. We do have an overall unified position, but --

Although we, at one point -- thank you -- at one point would have liked to be able to make comments to the various public that are, "This is the ALAC position," in a lot of places we're waffling because we have different views and we have to admit it.

Over the years, we have sometimes been accused -- and sometimes validly being accused -- that we issue a statement

that's written by one person or two people or three people and then effectively rubber-stamped, and the reality is, in many subjects the topic is obscure enough that a significant part of the community has to rely on the experts who really understand it and can make a convincing case.

This is not one of those cases. On both the IANA transition and on accountability, we have a -- we involve the ALAC on a regular basis, so the people who will ultimately have to make the decision to accept the report or not have been regularly updated and consulted.

Moreover, we have an overall larger at-large support group that I -- I think has 50 or 60 people on the mailing list, at least, and about half that number who regularly participate in teleconferences, and we have tended to have anywhere ranging from a teleconference every two weeks to two, and I think in one case three, a week when things are getting really hot.

So I think I can say with some level of confidence that whatever we finally say, I'm sure there will be someone who disagrees. That's the nature of our multistakeholder model. But I think we will have a high degree of agreement, and it's informed agreement, it's not something that they're just listening to someone else and saying, "Sure, I agree with you."

So I said I wish I could say that on everything that we do, but in this case, it certainly is the case.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. Holly has her hand up here.

HOLLY RAICHE: I was just going to add, there are -- there have been critical times when we've sat down, gone through particular issues on the day, and actually voted. So it isn't just the ALAC has been consulted. It's that after a discussion, we've actually said, "Let's take a straw poll so that we're all pretty clear we're on the same page." And I think of the most recent example of that where we were looking at models, including members models and different models of the designator, and we took a position after a lot of discussion and then we voted, and it was unanimous.

So "consulted" is not a strong enough word for the support that we've given for the positions. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Very interesting. Thank you.

Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give you an example of one of the switches we made, and that was one quite early.

Out of the first report, there was a question of, "Do you prefer the membership model or the designator model?" And this was before there was a lot of in-depth analysis of them. And our answer was very simple: "Membership."

And the reason why was, everyone in the world understands the concept of membership. If we're introducing a new word like "designator," it is going to cause confusion. ICANN is inherently a confusing place, and to add a brand-new word that virtually no one in the world knows in the context we're using it did not seem like a really good idea.

Once we started understanding some of the implications of membership, we changed it.

So that's one of the examples of a blatant change that we made, and it was simply that we -- we didn't need to think to understand what the details of the model were at that point. Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. I can certainly understand that. I mean, a lot of my time this week has been actually trying to explain people the legal

differences, and it really is an artifact of Californian law. It's not really something that is a globally used term in any way.

I prefer that we try and simplify our language and basically say, "We're agreeing to form a single legal entity and we're going to use that single legal entity to be able to enforce the powers and the bylaws" and just keep it simple.

Because trying to use the term "designator," it has a very narrow legal meaning and just confuses people. So basically we're just forming a single legal entity that has the power to enforce the bylaws, and it's as simple as that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Bruce, actually you've honed in on the core issue.

We have been calling it a single -- the sole designator, and there is -- there is an entity -- there will be that entity that acts as the designator on behalf of the three SOs, the at-large, and the NomCom, but it will also be acting on behalf of all the SOs and ACs for the other powers, and that has not been well understood.

Because we called it the designator, many people have assumed that it was only acting on behalf of those parties that could designate.

So changing the name is -- turns out to be not just superficial but a really important aspect.

That also comes down to the -- to the concept that something -- it was a revelation for me when I realized it -- that the multi-designator and the sole designator, the only difference between the models -- because even in the multi-designator you will still need this body to enforce -- the only difference is whether I, as chair, can write a letter to the secretary of the board saying who my new director is, or if I have to ask someone else to write it. Turns out that that is the only model. However, given that -- given the lack of difference, I personally at this point don't care.

[Laughter]

I don't want to make this the Greenberg show, so anyone else have any thoughts in the audience or here? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan.

When we put this point on the agenda, we thought it would be the main point because it will need a lot of discussion, but I think after what happened yesterday and the day before, I think that perhaps we will not have a lot to say now since now we agree on everything, more or less.

[Laughter]

So I do think that the solution we have now -- at least the element of solution we have now will, in my point of view, solve the problem and perhaps we will have the transition and I hope we'll have the transition on time.

There is a lot of work to do before we reach this point, but I think it is possible. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. If you think everything is settled, you may not have been at the same meeting I was at yesterday afternoon.

[Laughter]

We have a comment from one of our new incoming ALAC members, Kaili Kan.

KAILI KAN:

Hello. Thank you, Alan.

Yeah. As a newcomer, over the last few days I had a question. It is that actually, these are two issues. One is the transition. Another is accountability.

Transition, in my mind, is a one-time issue, while accountability is a forever issue. Okay.

Why in the world are these two mixed together? And as a matter of fact, this morning when I was together with Cheryl, we were trying to figure out.

And then I believe -- well, at least for myself, it seems like, Alan, your explanation just told me the reason, that some time ago we made a mistake without fully understanding the implications of enforceability, and then we're in the ditch. I don't know if that's correct or not.

But anyway, I -- as I expressed my feeling at ALAC meeting during the first day, it is that I strongly believe that ICANN's governing structure is a good structure. As a matter of fact, I believe it is the very best so far we can see, so we want to preserve that structure as much as possible and preserve that regardless of the transition going on.

And so in that regard, I will say that I would not like to see that the board could be easily overthrown or any board member could be easily kicked out, and that would only open the door for many sort of chaos and also some -- maybe some special interest groups or just make an ongoing forever chaotic process.

So seems like we've already -- saying -- yesterday morning we've also got to someplace, like the single designator, but also I would suggest that, for example, like to kick out a board member, that only can be applied under certain circumstances.

For example, like -- like -- just like kicking out the White House President of the United States. That cannot be because of his own personal opinion or judgment. Only by like something immoral or something like treason against the Constitution or something.

This must have some strict restrictions not because of I don't like a board member and then every day I just want to kick him out and make this forever; that we must have a very narrow definition that what reasons can apply to this kind of a mechanism. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: Excuse me, Alan. If I could, are you free after March?

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Kaili.

STEVE CROCKER: George, the chair of our search committee is sitting right behind you.

ALAN GREENBERG: There you have an example of a new person in At-Large. And at the beginning of his intervention, he was exactly in line with all of At-Large. And at the end, he addressed one of those issues where some of us are very divided. But, luckily, we are coming to closure in the CCWG on that -- on that issue.

But, Kaili, although brand-new is not unlike a significant number of other people in At-Large that have participated in process. And most of the time we have come to agreements. The fascinating part of multistakeholders is we're surprised when we don't all agree with each other.

And the fact that we can agree on occasion I think is a good sign. Olivier. We have an intervention? Olivier, and then Seun.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I think Kaili gave us just one example of the concerns that some of us have and in some cases we are slightly divided and have various points of view. One thing which I found in our community to be a consensus is we do have concerns about capture. We want an ICANN that continues to work, that continues to operate its functions according to its bylaws, and for the board members to be able to act according to the bylaws. Having any kind of system that would provide more power to the community at the expense of the stability that we've had so far and of course the whole accountability of

the board but also the accountability of the community is something that we've been very concerned about. We wish to make sure there is no possibility for capture by the Board or by the community. And this is one of the reasons why we have had a much more balanced view, I think, of some of the topics that have been brought forward in the CCWG accountability than maybe some other communities in ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. We have 15 more minutes for this topic and we'll continue -- we'll run over if necessary. But if people can keep their interventions short. We indeed threatened to have a timer and buzzer for this meeting. We chose not to, but do try to keep things short. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Hello. Hello. This is Seun. So, so up on that. I used to be the fortunate one that gets -- at the time I started. I'll be short.

So the -- I just want to ask the board a few questions. In regards to the individual board removal, as the -- currently the -- what has been proposed by the CCWG still sums up to the appointing SO or AC completing the process of the removal. What is the board thoughts about this? How do you see this, especially in regards to the differences in the removal process for NomCom

appointees and the individual SO/AC appointed board member? Do you think it's something that you can live with? Do you think it is okay for you because at the hand it's a matter of how you think -- what you think it is because within the board you understand yourself. Do you think this way impacts the way you guys behave amongst yourself?

My other comment is, I hope the board is actually using this process to learn that it is important to get involved early enough. We may not have got into wasted this much time if we had actually experienced the intervention or participation that we experienced from the board in the last, say, one month or two months ago. I think we need to maximize some of our leader resources because At-Large, people participating in the At-Large SO are classified as people who actually lack resources to participate and maximizing that time in getting solutions as early as possible would really help us so we don't (indiscernible).

So I hope the body is learning from this process. So that anything we have in future you can also be sure to engage early enough and we can conclude the process faster. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thanks. Bruce Tonkin, our vice chair, has been the formally-appointed liaison to the CCWG. Let me ask Bruce to speak to the issues that you raise, Seun, which are very important issues.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yeah, just on the last one, I think that the board itself is actually quite limited in resources, too. So when you're talking about, you know, predominantly volunteers and there's 20-odd people and a fair bit of the time was being devoted to the work of the ICG and the CWG and the various other parts of that IANA transition piece. So once that became finalized, then you started to see board members get involved in the CCWG. So we also had bandwidth issues. But I get your point. I think it would have been good if we had been more involved in the detail of the work much earlier on. So I think that's a fair piece of feedback and a lesson for us as well.

Specifically to your question of the board member removal process, that certainly has been an area of concern, mainly because when it was initially described it didn't have much flesh in what process would be used so it sounded like, you know, an SO could just by a simple motion decide to remove a board member because maybe they didn't like a decision on that particular day, and that's the sort of thing we were concerned about because we think the board members are independent and they're making decisions on behalf of the whole community, not just on behalf of the organization that appointed them.

Since then, though, both in meetings in Los Angeles a few weeks ago and also over this weekend, I think that process has evolved quite substantially. And so part of that process is for an SO to remove their board member, they have to actually call a community forum and that forum needs participation from the other parts of the community, the other supporting organizations and other advisory committees. And then as Chris posted in the mailing list and spoke yesterday, the other thing that we had suggested is that after that community forum that that supporting organization get a formal response from the other supporting organizations and advisory communities and then after they've got the output of the community forum, the formal responses from the other supporting organizations and advisory communities, only then should the supporting organizational or advisory committee make a final decision. So I think, you know, we're broadly comfortable with that, certainly as it was refined by Chris yesterday.

The issue of removing nominating committee directors, my view on that is, it's a pretty similar process. It goes to a community forum. The difference there is that in actually making the decision, the decision, instead of just advice from the other supporting organizations and advisory committees, there should actually be a formal resolution of some form from those other supporting organizations, advisory committees, and I

think my understanding of the current proposal is at least four supporting organizations and advisory committees would have to positively recommend the removal of a particular director appointed by the nominating committee and that no more than one advisory committee or supporting organization would have an objection. So I think that's where that's currently sitting. But that's a process that needs to be fleshed out in more detail before I think we're comfortable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cherine on the same topic? Quickly. Unfortunately we're going to run out of time.

CHERINE CHALABY: I'll go very quickly. I -- in response directly to what the gentleman said in terms of how do we feel on the board, I hold two principles very, very strongly on this issue. One is, we cannot have two classes of board members. Absolutely not, under what circumstances. And the second one is, we have to protect the independence of board members when they reach the board. Okay?

So I started with a very strong position that I was against the SOs and ACs removing the director appointed by the board and I started with the position that there should be a community

process for doing that. I have moved my position because I have -- the change that has been made met two of my requirements. And one is, if there is a transfer of power from the board to the SO and AC then the accountability of the processes that support this power has to be heightened very, very, very much. And that is happening with what they've described here as the process where the community is involved to make sure that the SO and AC understands the response from the community, understand the community view is important, and the process is transparent. And therefore, they can't just with one action or without rationale or without any explanation to the community get rid of their board member. So that satisfied my requirement that the accountability that goes with this power has been raised substantially.

The thing we need to do now is ensure also that we must raise the support for these -- support to these board members when they go on the board and ensure that we preserve their independence. So there has to be a heightened accountability in the community but also a heightened preservation of that independence. And that has to be with -- when the appointment is made, it has to be clear to the SOs and AC that you are appointing a member of the board not to follow your own agenda but just to bring your own perspective. And the bylaws

have to be very clear from that perspective. That is my personal view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Chris and George, are you on the same topic or a different one?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: I'm on a different topic.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, me too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then we'll --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's the same topic but a different point about it. I just want to -- I just want to say that I must -- it's interesting for us to be telling you our views. I actually want to know what yours are. I want to know if you have any red lines. I want to know if there is any -- anything that is currently being discussed in the CCWG that the At-Large has any real problems with. I want to know if your resolution, which I think was a -- an excellent way of delivering a message to the CCWG. CCWG is working for you. CCWG is not

working in a vacuum. It has to take its stuff back to you, and you have -- you and every other SO and AC has to sign off on it. And there's just been an assumption that it will just happen because if the CCWG reaches "consensus" you'll be fine with that. So I'd like to hear from ALAC about those topics rather than from board members about what they think.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Then I'd like to close out the discussion on removing -- Holly wants to speak.

HOLLY RAICHE: Very briefly, Chris. When we sat yesterday and looked at -- and particularly the outline of all of the steps that would be necessary it's clear that there's a framework there. Not all the of the steps are completely clear at this stage. But from what I saw up here yesterday, I think that your concerns are being addressed. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, George. You want to speak on the board director topic?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: George, go. You were before me and that's --

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. This is a different, fairly innocuous topic compared with what we've been talking about. But it strikes me that, you know, we meet at these cross constituency meetings. We also meet lots of other places, in the hall, at public forum, informally at cocktails and the like, and I'm wondering if there isn't a better way to organize the way in which we meet and the way in which we discuss issues. There may not be but it occurs to me that we -- I don't get a lot of feedback. I don't see feedback from the community on this. I don't know how the schedule is produced. It may be by common consent, but I think as a board member I'd like to hear, not necessarily now but can we -- can we construct ways, can we restructure, can we structure ways of communicating about issues that are more effective than we -- than we do now? It's an open question, but I hope the community will try to give their opinions and be heard on this subject. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, George. On that, it's a continuing discussion and, you know, I think it's probably one that we need to have within our own group first and come up with some ideas and bounce them off of you instead of ad libbing here. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Merci. Since we have interpreters, I'm going to use their services. And I'm going to speak in English -- in French. Thank you.

First point, these subjects are extremely complicated. If you -- if we want the community's opinion, there is a sort of work that hasn't been done in order to explain. I talk to some of the newcomers who are here in this room or outside of this room. Our -- there's a conversation that is on the -- it's difficult to understand. We use a lot of acronyms very, very quick, very quickly. Newcomers and even other people are completely lost. So in order to get the opinion of one and the other, it's very complicated. Even if we have tried to explain within At-Large we have -- we had meetings. We tried to explain, but we know that those who express themselves are the one who are within the subjects. It's a -- it's very complicated. It will be very hard to resolve. We still have to talk about it in the future because we have to seriously think about it because if we want to give information to the community but if we give them the information in something they cannot understand, we won't have any feedback.

Now rapidly I wanted to -- oh, Steve asked if the five members representative of At-Large and the ALAC in the processes were in

agreement with the process. No. And it's a good thing. It's a good thing. Do we have the same ideas? Maybe. But at a certain price that some of us renounce to some position. For example, I was -- I was -- I am -- I was against the fact that we should have a member of the board that could be called every three years might be enough. But I don't like much the situation right now where we want to, as we say, do a -- an English kangaroo court. Exceptional court. We don't need that in ICANN. If we ask of a member of the board that we want to -- to kick him out and he has to explain himself in front of everybody, this is another point I want to be clear. We don't talk about it enough. If there was one day a decision taken to kick off all the members of the board, what are we going to do? How is -- how is it going to function? For me, that subject is even more important than the rest because capture will be clear. The staff will have the power because they will be the only one who know what is happening. Even if we have people to replace them for few months and then we can elect other people, the capture will be among the staff. Therefore, I consider today that all the solutions to kick out the whole board is a heresy. And if we do this, might as well close ICANN and go do something else. Let's go fishing. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think one of the saving graces of the processes we're evolving is many of them will take longer than the rest of the term for the directors in question. I think in many cases it's going to be easier to wait for the three years to be over than to actually run through the process. That may be a good thing or it may be a -- a careful plot. Who knows? Who else has anything to say?

I'd like to go -- go a little bit into -- now I've lost my train of thought so I'll ask for other speakers until it comes back.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You always forgot me. Okay. No problem.

There is a question asked by Chris about what we feel about the discussions inside the CCWG and the resolutions of the CCWG. Chris has been always with us, so he knows very well. One of the most important problem we was facing in the CCWG, for example, the budget veto. The other is recalling individual

board members. There are other problems, but I think those are the most important two problems.

We were always advocating. We didn't give up even if they told us the majority said that. I didn't accept that. I said that are the charter says that the decision should be made by consensus, and it is the duty of the chairs to find the consensus.

Finally, we reach some acceptable solutions, and I am happy for that. I think we need to think about the future. There is a lot of work to do now. It is not finished. In French and even in English, they say the devil is in the details and the details are not yet finished.

I think that the most important thing for us for At-Large is that we are always trying to go into the important things. We don't agree on anything all the time. But we find a common ground, and sometimes we don't find on certain points the common ground. We express it. For example, AFRALO had always its statement with the statement of ALAC. We are very close, but we have some differences. I think it is a richness, and I think that we need to continue like this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. I will go a little -- if I may. I'll try to address Chris' question from a slightly different angle.

On the really important things, the ALAC is moderately aligned. And, ultimately, on things like who gets to remove a board director, the CCWG will have to come to closure. And whichever way it is, I don't think any of it -- we're not going to refuse to ratify the report because of the proposal, because of that.

We have made it clear, for instance, in the last report that we would accept the member model but we didn't like it. Now that the CCWG is again talking about a designator model, we made a decision two days ago to withdraw our support for the current member model. That doesn't mean if suddenly the world would change and everyone wants members again, we could not accept it. It's not a red line. But our acceptance is off the table at this point.

On the other hand, there are some other issues, ones we never talk about, which are red lines for the ALAC. If, as a significant number of CCWG members have proposed, the ALAC were given lesser status than the SOs, I think we would -- I'm pretty sure we would refuse to ratify. We have a strong belief that all the ACs should be participating. They do not recommend policy, but they are a very important, crucial part of our overall community. So things like that.

There are a number of the core mission and values where there are subtle changing in the words that we object to very

strenuously. There are a number of them where currently the board has discretion, and that discretion is apparently being removed. And we consider that quite improper. So there certainly are a number of things like that.

How hard a line do you have at 9:30?

STEVE CROCKER: Well, we have another group coming in, I think, at probably 9:45.

Fadi wanted to say something and then maybe we'll close this off and touch on whatever.

ALAN GREENBERG: Christopher, quickly. And then we're going to switch on to the topic of the ATLAS II recommendations.

Go ahead, Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I just wanted to say a quick word about a very practical aspect of accountability on behalf of the community and direct it to community.

I have seen recently on a couple of occasions where the staff blithely, casually designated the contributions of the At-Large participants as a minority report. I don't actually asked for a poll

of the working group to determine which part of the report was agree for the report was actually a minority report. I don't want to go into practical details. Those who are involved know perfectly well what I'm talking about.

As a rule within the staff, I do urge you to be a little bit more open-minded and a little bit more cautious as to what you decide to dismiss as a minority. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Chris.

Any final comments on the accountability issue before we go on to the other one? No?

Then, Olivier, I'm turning it over to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking.

We thought we would give you a little update of the ATLAS II recommendations that came out over a year ago, June 2015 -- June 2014. Sorry. That's how long it was.

We had 150 At-Large structures. They all worked on these recommendations, and the document was transmitted to the board just as a reminder and for the new people in the room.

We are just going to go through a couple of them. The first one was Recommendation Number 27. And it was a reminder to the board that it should implement ATRT2 Recommendation 9.1 which reads, "The ICANN board will respond in timely manner to formal advice from all advisory committees, explaining what action it took, and the rationale for do so."

Now, we presented this to the board not the last meeting -- the previous-to-last meeting. And we haven't heard any feedback on this. And we'd appreciate an update on where we are on this.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you. This recommendation is something that I personally am very concerned about. I had inquired about it before, and I have a status.

An internal team of staff had been working on translating this into concrete bylaw changes. And it was scheduled for board review and approval at a particular date.

Then CCWG work kicked in and diverted almost all of our legal resources. And also the work in the CCWG essentially will also translate into some bylaws changes. So there is this sense that we might have to wait in order to look at what possible interactions there may be.

Having said that, there are a few board members who are concerned about this as formal advice from the advisory committees with the exception of the GAC, pertains to the ALAC, the SSAC, and the RSSAC. And there are deep concerns about technical advice coming to the board and receiving appropriate responses as well. It's on our agenda, and we're going to follow up on that.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me speak my personal view about this but one I have been very active about.

My strong feeling is that when we get advice from ALAC, from other organizations and other groups, that it should not be necessary to have this embedded in our bylaws. The essence of what's here to me is simply good practice, combination of courtesy, business-like operation, and smart management.

I have been distressed that we have not been able to follow through. And it has remained on my list of concerns. We have gradually improved our processes internally. We are making some very strong changes internally.

I can easily understand a reaction like, "And why has it taken so long? This has been an ongoing process." And I share both

concern and -- and I offer a sense of apology because this is certain something that's languished.

But from where I'm sitting, I have no objection if this is put into the bylaw. But the actual issue in my mind is getting the internal operational processes, staffing, priorities, and so forth in place. And that has to be done. That has to be done irrespective of whether or not the bylaw is put in there. Putting the bylaw in won't make it happen. We have to make it happen. We are making it happen. We've made some internal changes. And my fond hope is that by the time we meet in Marrakech, you will feel very differently about this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Steve.

As an ATRT2 member, you will recall we had all these discussions then. The initial recommendation that was being discussed was one identical or close to the GAC one where we had to have a normal negotiation process. We toned it down to be essentially what you said was already either in practice or should be in practice. And it was accepted.

The wording in the actual ATRT2 recommendation was patterned after the current bylaw wording. So there shouldn't have been an awful lot of legal work. And by deferring it till now,

we are now at the time when there are ATRT2 -- sorry, CCWG discussions where people are saying we're giving ACs too much power. Introducing it right now is probably the worst possible time to do it. So I really regret that it wasn't done already.

Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

It's all at the wrong level from my point of view. The real action is internal. And I can assure you that this has gotten up to the top level of our priorities in terms of board attention and now staff in two different ways. We have a very active advice-tracking system, development process that's been longer and more complicated than I had expected it would be putting that in place.

And, secondly, we now have a more muscular board operations group, and this is one of the priorities to make sure that these things get taken care of.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think all of that is understood. But the ATRT2 did feel very strongly the bylaw change was required, and it was accepted.

Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

So some of the recommendations require board attention. Some of the recommendations require attention from the ALAC internally or work with global stakeholder engagement. If we go to the next slide, this is one which we'll just provide the board with an update on some of the 49 recommendations which we had to work on. This one is Recommendation Number 33. And the message was quite clear from our At-Large structures, the ALAC should arrange more At-Large capacity-building Webinars. Certainly a need to learn a lot more about ICANN and about ICANN's processes.

I'll hand the floor over to Tijani Ben Jemaa to take us through the At-Large capacity-building Webinar series which he was in charge of.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Alan just told me that we have a problem of time.

So we had during the last part of 2014 and the whole year of 2015 Webinars on a monthly basis. And we focused more on the IANA functions. We explained to our ALSs what are those functions. We focused on the transition, what is the transition, why there is a transition, et cetera. And we focused also on the

accountability -- enhancing ICANN accountability. Those are -- we made a lot of Webinars on that.

But, also, we addressed the policy development processes in At-Large and outside At-Large, especially in GNSO.

We addressed the issue of the working groups inside the At-Large and the cross-community working groups.

We addressed -- in the last part of 2015, we addressed also the ALSs, how to engage them, the volunteers. We addressed also -- the last one will be -- one moment, sorry -- the tools to be used as a communication tools. And we intend to address -- the Webinars are not the only tools we are using and we will use for capacity-building. We plan to use others now because the organization doesn't need exceptional funding. But we have a project to make capacity-building -- face-to-face capacity-building in the regions where we never go, in the small islands in the Pacific, for example, in the Caribbean and the small countries in Africa.

And we proposed a budget for that for this year, but it wasn't accepted. I hope it will be accepted for next year. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani.

And there was also, I think, also earlier on -- and, of course, with the CCWG work, it has pretty much cleared our minds -- some capacity-building Webinars on security and stability and use of the Internet, so some technical side to it.

A bit concerned of the time.

Just wanted to also mention the regions also doing their own capacity-building as well. Sometimes really specifically for the region. And for this, I'll ask our superstar Siranush Vardanyan to just provide with details of what APRALO has been doing.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Siranush Vardanyan for the record.

Yes, after our ATLAS Summit, we have discussed with APAC hub how we can move forward with identification. We identified three main focus areas. And this is language localization. This was capacity-building. And the third one was outreach.

So within the framework of capacity-building, we conducted a survey among APRALO ALSs to identify the topics which are the main interest for them. And since April 2015, we have started to run those Webinars in partnership with APAC hub and their real support in this. And we have already conducted four topics on IDNs, on Internet governance, basic DNS, and DNS ecosystem. And just recently we had new gTLD program Webinar.

And we have already the topics identified till June 2016. So we are continuing this process and quite -- this is quite helpful for ALSs.

That's all from APRALO.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Siranush. Equally LAC RALO has also conducted a whole series. I can see our colleagues. But we don't have the time. So thank you for this.

Just wanting to mention it and the fact that the work with the global stakeholder engagement team has been really essential. This is work that the board doesn't often see. You see our policy work because you receive our statements. But we thought we'd mention this part of our activities because it is often unknown both from the board and the community.

Finally, the last slide, since I know we are running out of time, where are we now? 43 ATLAS II recommendations. We dropped one because it became irrelevant. We only have 5% completed where response is required. 5% where no response is required. Some are on hold pending external processes.

Certainly many of them dealt with ICANN accountability. And we raise the points which the working group, now the CCWG is

raising -- we raised those one year earlier. So it's good that we were a little bit ahead of time.

And so we thought we would wait for the external process to complete on this. The internal on hold are the ones which we haven't been able to address because there is no more time, basically, on any of our communities' timetable due to all the work we have at the moment. We are working on 37% of them. That includes working with staff and working also with different parts of our community.

And that's the report.

Just one last thing I wanted to mention. I think we'll discuss some of these with Steve on the Friday morning session with the ALT, the skillet session. So we look forward to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: And with that, I thank everyone. And we are adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]