

---

MARRAKECH – ALAC Strategy and Working Session Part 1

Saturday, March 05, 2016 – 09:45 to 12:30 WET

ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If you can speak English, French, Spanish, and Arabic, all four languages here, then you don't need a headset. And again, apologies. It is going to be very cozy, but we need one person per seat, and just we'll have to squeeze up a little bit to get everyone around the table. Thank you. Non-ALAC people.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl, for initiating the meeting. For those who've not been formally welcomed to Marrakech and Morocco, welcome. And I'd like to ask staff to start the meeting. We had allocated 15 minutes for it, we now have three minutes left, so we'll speak quickly.

GISELLA GRUBER: Welcome, everyone. Welcome to the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Strategy Session today. Today is Saturday, the 5<sup>th</sup> of March, day one for us here at the ICANN meeting in Marrakech. Thank you to all the local people to make us feel so

---

*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.*

---

welcome, and thank you, especially, to Aziz Hilali for being such a wonderful host, and for organizing this meeting.

You have a very beautiful country. If we can, for this first meeting, we have new faces here, we have new people joining us, and just a reminder for all the usual suspects just so that we can run this meeting seamlessly and avoid to lose any precious time. I'm already speaking too much, just a few reminders.

If we could please ask people to be back on time after the breaks, after the coffee break, and after the lunch break. Please do come back on time to allow for us to start in a timely manner. If we could also leave the main table seats today for the ALAC and regional leaders and liaisons, and if there are any free seats, please do come up.

Please do log into the AC room. You can find that on the main ICANN 55 website. Please click on the meeting and it will be the virtual streaming. These meetings are all recorded. In order to be heard on the recording, please use the microphones that are in front of you. The red light needs to be on to speak.

State your names at all times. Every time you take the microphone, please do state your name, not only for the transcript purposes, all these meetings are transcribed into the four languages that we are streaming in. But also in the booths behind us, we have very important people who are doing a

---

wonderfully challenging job of doing live interpretation throughout the whole week. They are in those booths, it's very warm, and they have to listen to us all day every day, so please say your name, they don't know you. It will allow them to identify you on the other language channel for all remote participants who are on the Adobe Connect or listening to the live streaming to identify you, as well.

And also to make sure that you speak at a reasonable speed to allow for them to interpret accurately. We do sometimes tend to speak too fast in our native tongue. And if you would like to take the floor, please use your tent cards, raise your tent cards, and we will note the speaking order, and the people in the Adobe Connect joining us remotely, welcome, as well. Please raise your hand on the Adobe Connect room and our remote participant staff member will read your question out.

Also, if Alan could please clearly state the action items for the meeting today, and again, last but not least, your tent cards. Please either keep them or hand them back to one of our staff members when we do the round robin just now. You will be introduced to the At-Large staff if you don't know us already. Just hand it to them or please take it with you. Otherwise, you may just not have it for the next session not only for us to see what your names are here, the people who don't know you.

---

The cameras here in the middle of the room will rotate when you're speaking, and the people on the camera there can see who you are and it is really wonderful when you are participating remotely to see the name of the person. I've taken up too much time but I thought that that would be a good start to the week. Thank you very much and back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Gisella. One more item of housekeeping and then we'll do a round robin of people introducing themselves. As many of you know, we have on occasion used timers to limit how long people are speaking. We're trying something new at the start at this meeting. We'll be using a count up timer that is, it will display how long you've been speaking. I guess someone's approving of what I'm saying.

The target should be about two minutes. We're not putting an absolute limit but be reasonable. If people do not honor the reasonable speaking limit, then we will start using countdown timers, which have very rude alarms going off at the end. If we end up using countdown timers, when the timer goes off, finish your sentence or another one more sentence, but don't speak for another five minutes, please. Be courteous to other people who also want to speak.

---

So we're trying to be flexible, but let's make sure everyone does their own part. Please do not repeat what the previous person said just to hear yourself say it. If you want to intervene and say, "I support what John said," fine. But let's keep it concise and make sure that everyone has time to do their part.

I'd like to go around the table and have all of the ALAC members, and regional leaders, and mentors., and other people here in official capacity, including staff, to introduce themselves. If we can start at that end of the table, please.

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay. I'm going to speak Spanish. Good morning. I am Harold Arcos. I am ALAC member representing LACRALO.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Good morning. I will speak in Spanish, as well. My name is Humberto Carrasco. I am the current LACRALO Secretariat and future LACRALO Chair.

ALBERTO SOTO: My name is Alberto Soto. I am LACRALO Chair until Thursday.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: ... Scartezini from LACRALO in ALAC.

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Glenn McKnight, NARALO.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Nathalie Peregrine, ICANN staff.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Seun Ojedeji, ALAC AFRALO.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay. This one's going to be good. Beran Gillen, mentor and mentee.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC Member, Vice Chair, and I am mentor of all our NGOs.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sandra Hoferichter, EURALO.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yesim Nazlar, ICANN staff.

ARIEL LIANG: Ariel Liang, ICANN staff.

---

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco, ICANN staff.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, ALAC from North America.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg, ALAC from North America and Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee. Yeah. Sorry, when I ask people to introduce themselves, we also have a number of NGO representatives around the table, and I would be delighted if they can introduce themselves, as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]. Thank you, Mr. President. [inaudible]. There's a little bit of an echo. That's what it was. [inaudible] I'm [inaudible] I represent the [inaudible] Women's Association for Development and Solidarity in Morocco. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Mrs. [inaudible]. I am a member of the Bar Association in Tunisia. Thank you.

AZIZ HILALI: Aziz Hilali.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible] Maureen Hilyard from the Cook Islands representing APRALO and ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: And our ccNSO liaison.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, ALAC from APRALO.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Siranush Vardanyan, APRALO Chair.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer, SSAC Liaison.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] from Egypt.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] Director of the Domain Name System Entrepreneurship Center.



---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:     Sebastien Bachollet, I am a member of ALAC and I represent EURALO.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:     [inaudible] from APRALO representing ISOC Armenia.

ALI ALMESHAL:             Ali AlMeshal, I'm the Assistant Manager, APRALO. LACRALO NomCom-appointed member for the ALAC and CCWG Co-Chair.

JIMMY SCHULZ:             Jimmy Schulz, ALAC Member NomCom [inaudible] by for EURALO.

RON SHERWOOD:             Ron Sherwood, dot VI, ccNSO, ccNSO Liaison to ALAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Australia, you'll forgive me for that, Mentor and previous Chair of the ALAC, amongst many other things.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:     Judith Hellerstein, NARALO Secretary.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anyone else who's arrived since we started? All right. Not present we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, who is the ALAC Liaison to the GNSO and as per his duties, is at the GNSO meeting right now. And he is also former Chair of the ALAC. And you're pointing to somebody who has arrived.

People on the chairs. Sorry. If anyone else would like to introduce themselves.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] ICANN staff.

[YANIS]: Hi, this is [Yanis] from that mission from APRALO.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I work in Morocco for the Communications High Authority.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any staff who haven't introduced themselves?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, just for those if you weren't in just now, Gisella Gruber, staff. Thank you.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH:                   And this is Heidi Ullrich, staff.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:           ICANN Director and At-Large Director. At-Large Director.

ALAN GREENBERG:           But not the Director from At-Large. We specialize in very confusing names here. Thank you all very much. The first item on our agenda is a discussion on ALS criteria and expectations. You will recall that there is a taskforce that is looking at this and we are now at the stage where we have a pretty interesting list of criteria for admittance as an ALS and At-Large structure, and what we expect of At-Large structures once they are admitted.

And just to be clear, the expectations that we put in place will be applying with a phasing period to existing ALSs. Now a bit of history, the current version of At-Large has existed for about ten years now. About 2007, we started putting together formal procedures, for exactly what qualifications do we want in ALSs. This is rather interesting because we already had a number of ALSs by that time before we had any criteria.

And these processes have been put in place and have been used for the last eight years or so. There has been a constant problem with some ALSs that is they joined as ALSs but they're not very active. And there's a lot of reasons for that. Part of it is the

---

recruitment of ALSs has been, to a large extent, identifying groups, clubs, associations within the various regions that had an interest in the internet because they're the logical people to do this.

As it turns out, some people who have an interest in the internet don't have an awful lot of interest in ICANN, and therefore, there's really been no nexus, no connection between what they did and their relationship with ICANN and, therefore, in many cases, we have found that the only real contact with ICANN is in the one person who's identified as the representative.

And if you're a group of 100 people or 10,000 people, and it varies all over the place, simply having one person come to meetings occasionally doesn't really demonstrate that you have a real presence on the ground and how you are using your connection with ICANN.

So we put together this group to try to review the overall situation, look at what we are really looking for if we are to have really effective presence on the ground within all of our countries, what are we looking for, and what do we expect these people to do once they're part of our club, so to speak. And so that's essentially the issue.

We have had a group for the last several months, when time was available, a lot of ALAC time has been focused on the various

---

IANA transition activities and accountability activities, so they've detracted a little bit away from our focus on these issues. But we are now at the stage, I think, where we need ALAC-wide discussion and following this discussion, discussion within the RALOs of are we on the right track? Are we making rules that make sense? Are we doing something really dumb? Which some people say we are. And there's certainly a wide set of opinions. And assuming we can come to closure and come up with some new recommendations, I think we need to approve them and then there's a whole number steps that have to follow.

Some of these recommendations that we're looking at will, in fact, require changes to the ICANN bylaws. They will certainly require changes to our procedures, which are approved by the Board.

So it's not an overnight process to fix these things. On top of that, we have an At-Large review, an external group will be appointed actually at this meeting, I think, to start review of At-Large with a main focus on ALSs and the RALOs, the Regional At-Large Organizations. So essentially, what we're doing is feeding into that process. Hopefully, we are short circuiting some of their work and making their job a little bit easier in that we're presuming that the same problems that we have identified over the last half dozen years are probably the same ones they would have identified if we hadn't even thought about them. So

---

hopefully, we're making their job a bit easier and starting the process of fixing what we see as problems.

And as I said, there is some question in some people's mind about whether there are problems. And I think that's one of the things we have to discuss. So could we have the slides, please? And the next one. All right.

This is basically what I summarized. We have to have the discussion here, we need to finalize the draft proposal, circulate it for wide discussion within the RALOs, get feedback, revise it as necessary, and then adopt it, and then we start another procedure to actually put the rules in place. Next slide.

All right. Criteria, we've divided the overall task of the review of ALSs into four different sections. One is criteria. What are we looking for to make the decision on whether to admit an applicant? The second part is expectations. Once you are an ALS, what do we expect you to do? And, of course, we're going to tell people ahead of time for the new applicants and they're, as part of the process, they will have to agree to it. We have another situation of what do we do with the 200 ALSs we have and how do we get them up to speed if and when they're not.

There is a third section on the application process. Just to be clear, I am running the criteria section, so we have four different groups within the taskforce. Yrjo Lansipuro is doing the

---

expectations. We have the third group on the application process, and Nathalie Peregrine is doing that. We took the rather unusual step within an ICANN group. I've asked a staff member to lead a group within the working group.

Normally, staff members sort of assist but do not actually lead processes. In this case, Nathalie is the point person who handles all of the applications and it was quite clear that she was absolutely the best person to know what was going on and make recommendations to be approved, of course, by the ALAC on where we go forward and I'm delighted that Nathalie agreed to do that, even though she's now largely focused on other parts of ICANN, but she still comes to visit us for this.

And lastly, some regions, starting with North America, have individual members. The intent following the last At-Large review is there was a strong recommendation, not a requirement, but a recommendation that all regions should have individual members and Cheryl Langdon-Orr, the past-past Chair of the ALAC and by far our most active member in all of ICANN, I think, is leading that effort.

Today, we're going to be focusing primarily on criteria and expectations, and venturing into Nathalie's area just a little bit because a lot of our criteria obviously are going to be part of the application process.

---

Criteria are the things that we judge an applicant by. It would be nice if everything is completely objective, we could tick boxes and say, “Yes, they are a good applicant. No, they’re not.” The reality is almost all of the things we’re considering are subjective. It’s a matter of interpreting their words, understanding what they are actually doing.

The process says once staff completes a due diligence, that is, they meet the parts of the process that are objective and we can define, it then goes to the RALO for a more subjective decision on whether this, in fact, will be a good addition.

It is subjective but it has to be defined if we’re going to reject and applicant, we have to tell them why, but it’s important to remember this is a subjective issue and, therefore, a lot of our criteria are not absolute. And as you’ll see when we go through them, some of them are very absolute, but many of them are not. Next slide, please.

All right. Some of the criteria we have general agreement within the taskforce. Now that doesn’t mean this group can’t change it, but we’re just setting on the table this general agreement. The current criteria, that is the ones in place today, are relatively minimal. The group must be self-funding. That is, they can’t expect money from ICANN. So we’re not the source of money to create a new group. That doesn’t mean, on occasion, they



---

might not get money for certain projects, but that's a relatively unusual occurrence.

They have to be largely controlled by individual people, not companies, not the government, and individuals who are citizens of the region. That comes right out of the bylaws and we don't have much discretion to change that, and nor would we want to. Now that doesn't mean there aren't parts of their organization that may, in fact, be government. May, in fact, be corporate. But the control, who controls it? Who selects the president, as it were, and decides on what the group does? It has to be individual led.

There are no specific terms as to whether you have to be incorporated, whether you have to be a formal not-for-profit. There was a lot of discussion about that, and in some regions, people feel exceedingly strongly that you must be formally incorporated. It turns out in other regions, the cost and the time it takes to incorporate is so large and so long that we would guarantee we have no ALSs. The rules vary around the world.

Similarly, I'll give another aspect. We're not talking about it right now, but I'll give an aspect because it's an important one. There are some places in the world where they say, "Well, if you're also making money off of domain names, you're a registrar or registry, then you shouldn't be able to hold a position within an

---

ALS.” And that works very well in some parts of the world. Other parts of the world, there are relatively few people involved. Everyone wears multiple hats, and if you exclude the people who actually work in the internet industry, you may not have many people left who are willing to run the organization.

So we are quite flexible in those, in those overall rules. And that’s where we stand today. So everything else we’re talking about essentially is things that are not on the table today, but we believe would help the situation. And we now had one of our other ALAC members from Asia-Pacific, Kaili Kan, who has joined us. Kaili, welcome. Sorry. Everyone else did their introductions so I’m pretending I’m you now, just introduce you.

The first item is a relatively trivial one. That is, if you’re going to be an ALS, we want three names of people that we can contact. Some of our regional only require one, and we found that these people disappear on occasion. Their e-mails stop working. One person leaves the group and suddenly the whole group is gone. We can’t find you anymore. Asia-Pacific has been using three for a while and it’s proven exceedingly well. They don’t lose their ALSs nearly as often, so it seems like a good reason to go. And if you can’t come up with three names, you’re not really a big ALS.

The next one is the contacts need not be organization leaders, but whoever is applying to be an ALS must certify that the

---

organization leaders know about it. Because this sounds like a no-brainer except we have, again, have contacts where they disappear, we find out who the chair or the organization is or the president and contact them, and sometimes they say, “ICANN? ALS?” Because although someone applied in their name, they didn’t know about it, so, again, we’re trying to fix that kind of thing. Next slide.

One of the concepts we’ve always had, but we never actually put it in writing, is we are assuming that if we send information to our contact, they will relay it to their members. Some of our ALSs, no doubt, do that, many we know do not. And we believe that the contacts that we are given must have the ability. All that means is they have to be able to send to a mailing list, perhaps, or post something on their Facebook page, but they’ve got to be able to do that. And we will, of course, later on ask that they promise to do it, and we want to know how they’re planning to do it. So all that forces them is to actually set up the mailing list that they could set up.

The size of an ALS is interesting. We have some ALSs that number their numbers in thousands and tens of thousands of members. Now how many of those tens of thousands of members know we exist? Good question. But certainly, they have it. We have other ALSs that are a handful of people. And in trying to decide is there a minimum size, it turns out it didn’t

---

make a lot of sense to try to have 10 as the cutoff or 6 as the cutoff or 100 is the cutoff because our ALSs come in such different forms. But it's clear that if the only people you have in the ALS are your three contacts, you're probably not real. So this is one of the judgment calls that are going to have to be made is are there really people there?

Remember, we are looking at individual members in each region. If you are really just one person, then admit it and join as an individual member and you don't have to pretend you're an ALS to become part of the group. So, again, very subjective, but an important aspect. Next slide.

The current application is sort of [inaudible] and the policies associated with them of using the internet. It does not look at connectivity, it does not look at spam. We may all dislike it but we don't control it. We don't look at content. So you may find pornography offensive, you may like it. It's not our business. So the question is what is it about ICANN that fascinates you, that wants to get you involved?

We expect people to have some level of online presence. If you're a group focusing on the internet, and you have no online presence, and there are some right now, it's sort of hard to justify how you're doing your job. Now that's a rule that I'd be willing to bend if someone had a good reason why. But it should

---

certainly be one of the basic criteria. And you have to be able to certify that you understand the commitments and expectations that we have.

So open the floor. Are there any things listed there with a possible exception of an online presence that people really feel are ill-defined and shouldn't be there? There's a whole list of other things that we have to talk about, so we're not looking for new things, but is there anything there that's wrong? I see your card up, Judith.

I generally will notice cards and I'll try to notice that the order that they go in. Occasionally, I have peripheral vision that says I don't see everyone, so to the extent, and I see Garth's. To the extent that I miss someone, I'm not really picking on you. But I do occasionally miss them, so call out. I will periodically announce who the speakers are and the order I think they're in. Forgive me if I've got the order wrong. We have Tijani, Seun, Judith, and Garth.

Garth was the first. Thank you for the correction. We have Garth, Tijani, Seun, and Judith, and order in general shouldn't matter a lot, but I try to honor it. Garth?

---

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. The order does matter because usually the people at the last end of the queue get cut off. So the order is actually very, very important. I have to take issue with the Chair's description of the situation. It's a little backwards.

We're talking about how people have to approach ICANN as if it were some sort of holy order. And really, everybody should be welcome. I mean, that's the intent. The internet users may be square pegs, we don't need to make it a round hole for them to try and fit in. We have to find a way to include everybody. Obviously, our leadership needs to be informed, our leadership needs to be active, but when in North America, we went through a very strenuous period of outreach and recruitment, we specifically targeted a massive list of organizations who are self-described as internet technology groups.

Most of them had never heard of ICANN before. So that was our first hurdle is that we, as volunteers, had to explain to them who ICANN was, and then we had to explain how they could participate and why they should participate. And for some of the groups that did join or try to join, some of their complaints right off the bat were that it was too confusing. They didn't understand what was going on.

So I think that this idea that they have to come to us with this preset concept of what they're going to do, it should be going

---

the other way. And to say that to stick by this explanation that ICANN's remit is very, very narrow is a mistake from our perspective because everybody who uses a domain name is impacted by it. And if you're getting spam, it usually involves a domain name, sometimes several domain names. And the policies behind those domain names are what we talk about here. So to close that door off from the beginning is a huge mistake. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just to be clear, our current environment makes it very difficult for ALSs to participate. There's no question about that. When we get to expectations, we'll be talking a lot about what we're planning to do to try to make that participation a more viable one. But certainly, I believe and, but it's up to the ALAC to decide, at what level do we want participation or are we just happy to have a name? Now if someone is indeed interested in domain name policy, and because of spam, that's fine. I welcome their discussion. The question is do they need to have some interest at all? And next, we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. First of all, I will speak for English now, but during the day, I will speak French, Arabic, and English. The first, Alan, I will not repeat what you said. As your advice at the

---

beginning, but I will say that I agree with you that Nathalie the best, and Nathalie, I have worked with her several times on those applications and I can tell you that she's very professional. We can feel it when we have problems with the application, when we cannot have problem, we not feel it. But when you have a problem, she's really responsible and she do a very good job. Thank you, Nathalie.

Second point, you spoke about objective criteria. As much as we can make our criteria objective, we will have less problem to certify or not certify ALSs. So yes, we cannot have all of them objective but we have to try to have the maximum of objective criteria so that it will be very more easy, let's say, more easy to decide on certification.

Another point, very important for me, any application should be signed by the head of the organization or of the ALS. It must be signed by him. We may have another contact for the application. He may appoint someone to be the contact for the application and for ICANN, but the application should be signed by him. It is the decision of the leadership of the ALS.

Last point. Multiple heads. It is not the problem to have multiple heads. The most important thing is that the ALS shouldn't be a commercial entity, shouldn't be a governmental entity. But if you are working with a government and you have an NGO, you



---

may be an ALS, no problem. So the problem is about you come to At-Large as what? As an ONG? As an NGO? As an association? Or as a commercial body or as a government? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you, Tijani. Just to summarize, and I'll try to do this as we go along. I believe you were generally agreeing with what we said with the one exception that you believe that the leader must essentially sign the application as opposed to what we had here that the leader must be aware of the application. So I'll note that as the, I think that's the main issue that were you differ from what was presented. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. I prepared my comments based on the attachment that was sent to the list, so I'll be referring to those bullets. Bullet point five, which was referring to minimum size and then the follow-up with the paragraphs in judgment [inaudible] to decide if appropriate in individual case. I think that bracket actually applies to bullet point one, two, and four. If it is one person, I don't know [inaudible] person will have three contacts. If it's one person, I don't know how the person will have some of the resources that we're asking into to have as part of the criteria. In terms of voting, I don't think there should be any

---

restriction in that. There should be flexibility. We could always say this guy is in the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, can we keep to just the criteria we've talked about here? There are other items that were in the document. This is just the first section.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Anyway, what I wanted to just communicate is that the criteria we are bringing up, it's a little bit too [inaudible] committed in terms of individual members or in terms of organizations or organizations that don't have [inaudible] much resources to actually participate or to actually meet up with some of these requirements.

I, for instance, from I applied as an ALS because that was the option I have. If not for everyone that just joined, joined my ALS, I would say I'm probably the only active person in my ALS. Maybe I'm not doing a good job within my ALS, but again, I can only do what I can do. So I think we should be very, very careful about the requirement. The only requirement that we should actually have is that the person or the group joining should understand that it's committing to participate in ICANN. That should be the goal. That's really that they should have some

---

requirement at home. It is the participation within the ICANN community that is very much important. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Seun. What I heard there was you're objecting to many of these criteria. Remember, we are requiring each region to have a concept of individual members. It's not there today. We know there are many ALSs that joined because it was the only vehicle they had. We will have to fix that. But when we present to the world and to other parts of ICANN that we have 200 ALSs, which are groups on the ground, the problem is when it turns out it's only one representative there, that really hurts our ability to have any credibility.

So that's why we're differentiating between individual members and ALSs, and there's really no way that we're going to be able to change that. So I think we do have to have the other things. So I would appreciate as you go through the documents if you can really identify the issues that you specifically object to, as opposed to simply saying, "We shouldn't have any criteria at all." We know that's not working right now. Next, we have Judith.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. This is Judith Hellerstein, for the record, NARALO Secretariat. I do like the ideas of some of the points that you mentioned. Especially having the three names because as Glenn and I have discovered, as you rightly mentioned, ALSs who joined and not have been active oftentimes, the other parties in the group don't know about it or we don't know how to contact the group. So having three names, I think, will be very helpful. But also, those three names also have to come with confluence accounts and also have to be added to the list. In the previous things, by default, only one name was added. You could request the other ones to be added, but I think if we're going to do it this way, all three have to be put on at the same time as the ALSs accepted by ALAC.

Second point I have is on requiring more than three. I think that is maybe a desire or something that would be helpful. But if you want, as you said, and as Seun said, people to be active, you could have three or two people being active in an ALS and they have desire to have other people but they got too busy in different revenue-producing activities and other ones that they're being paid for that they haven't been able to recruit as many as they would like or recruit active people.

I think it's important to have an ALS that is active and that is engaged. And those are what the criteria should be. And what I mean by engage, either I mean being on committees, being on

---

working groups, coming to meetings, putting in points is fine, is good, but I would prefer high-quality engagement to just someone who comes once in a time.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I can interrupt, you're focusing a lot on the expectations once they're there, and that's the section we'll be dealing with afterwards.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Chair, but you also mentioned that you wanted to have more than three, and if you didn't have more than three people in an ALS, that you didn't think that should be an ALS. That was one of the slides that you mentioned.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I think I said that was going to be a judgment call of the RALO on whether you have sufficient mass or not to be an ALS. Go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: The slides that show but the slide did say so, but your comments did not.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. I'm trying to read my handwriting and figure out whose name I have written next. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Obviously, my particular passion and interest here with criteria is to ensure that the opportunity for individuals who are unaffiliated at that stage within an At-Large structure, but may indeed be planning to create an At-Large structure, that's fine. The opportunity, and this goes to some of Seun's points and concerns for the individual member in an unaffiliated capacity to work effectively and contribute, in many cases, equally to our most active ALSs, is important.

We have to build this in to the DNA of each of the RALOs. It is the single thing that is still outstanding and incomplete from our last At-Large review, and ladies and gentlemen, we are about to start our next At-Large review. And it will be focused specifically on not the purpose and fitness of ALAC within our community of ICANN, but of the ALSs, unaffiliated individual members where they exist, and the RALOs. So it is essential that this work becomes part of your regional interests. But please remember, unless we change the bylaws, it is the ALAC that needs to be satisfied and ratify these memberships, be they an At-Large structure or an individual unaffiliated member. This is

---

opportunity, this is growth, this is potential, but we need to make sure it's managed at these layers. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to note, currently, ALSs are approved by the ALAC. Individual members at this moment are approved purely within the RALO. That is a change that could be made should we desire that appropriate. Next we have Maureen. If Olivier was first, I didn't see it, but Olivier, go first.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And it's good that I can follow up from Cheryl. She mentioned the first At-Large review. I was going to remind you of the At-Large Summit with our 150 At-Large structures that met face-to-face in Recommendation Number 43, which has magically appeared on your screen here. Says, "RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements." That's our ALSs asking for this, and that is in direct line with what we're working on. So I just wanted to remind you of that and I hope that the ALS Participation and Criteria Working Group will be able to come back with some good recommendations that we can implement and, therefore, close off this Recommendation 43 and certainly hopefully before ATLAS III. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to make two comments. The first one relating to Garth's comment earlier about the ALAC being inclusive, etc. I think that when we're doing our outreach, I think one of the important things is engaging people into ALAC, into ICANN, and informing them about what ICANN is all about, and encouraging them to be part of At-Large.

I think that when we come to the ALSs, however, this is when they formalize their connection to ICANN and to ALAC, and, therefore, the criteria that we expect of them as an ALS changes from the At-Large sort of like contributions, which anyone can make. Anyone can join At-Large and anyone can contribute. But the expectations of the ALS is this sort like a formal sort of membership.

Well that's the first part. The second part that I wanted to talk about was the three-member contacts. I'm from a little island that has 9,000 people on the island, and so, therefore, the membership of our ALS is sort of like quite limited. And we have three members, except one. No, we have more than three members, but I can nominate. I can actually have three contact



---

members and one is myself, of course, with the ALAC, and another one is very active in the GAC, and another one is active in the ccTLD community. So, I mean, but then again, it's the whole thing is to do with contacting and making sure that the ALS is still in existence so that if I wasn't around, I'm sure you would contact the others and find out, you know, whether we're still engaged. But I think that that's something else that we need to sort of take into account. They may not necessarily all be in ALAC. Just in case.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well in fact, most of them will not be in ALAC. The ALAC is very limited to the 15 ALAC members and only three per region, but that's – Maureen, a clarification. You said, "Anyone can be a member of At-Large." But my understanding is it is only ALSs can be members or individual people in the RALOs that support them. I'm not quite sure what you meant by, "Anyone else can be a member of At-Large."

MAUREEN HILYARD:

When we actually have asked for public consultation, for example, they don't necessarily have to belong to an ALS, but they're members of At-Large community, aren't they not?

---

[off mic speaking]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: They can simply certainly participate but I wouldn't class them as members. Otherwise, we have a third category of members who we don't know about but may come and go as they wish, and I guess we can call them members, but we haven't to date.

MAUREEN HILYARD: If we do a consultation, we have people coming from all over the, well, ICANN community, but are they part of – they're not an ALS.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's talk offline. I need some examples.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, all right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think I'd like to distinguish them. I understand Garth's point, which is everybody should be interested. We're talking about criteria, though, for an ALS, and if you are an ALS and have the ability to start to participate in terms of sending people to meetings and so forth, and indeed, spending ICANN money, we have to ask for participation. In return, we have to be able to measure participation, and it has to be in relation to the things that ICANN is or does, and those are about names and numbers.

So I'd like to say, "Yes, people can participate and that's fine." There are PPs, you can go out and ask a range of organizations representing users for input, but I think from my understanding, what we are talking about is about membership of an ALS and I would like to say there should be criteria because, in fact, we will be measuring asking for participation. We'll also be saying, well, at some point, some of your members will be paid to go to meetings we expect them to actually produce at the meeting. So please, let's distinguish between the two.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Humberto, you had put your card up at one point. Was it still up? Oh, Alberto, go ahead.

---

ALBERTO SOTO:

I will speak in Spanish. I fully agree with the three comments. We have been about decertifying an ALS because the only representative that we had left the organization. So by chance, we came to other person and that's why that ALS is still active, but we started the decertification process because we didn't know the contact, so that's why it is important to have three contact points.

And I believe we should be fully inclusive, but the way in we are guarantee that inclusion should be through participation, through engagement. And we need to ensure participation through metrics and those metrics should come from ALAC, and after that, within each RALO, we need to debate that.

We have been discussing that, but due to our internal issues, we were not able to approve those metrics, but we need minimum metrics that should come from ALAC. And the rest should be within the RALOs, the metrics of the RALOs. I believe with that combination, we might be able to get good participation. I say minimum metrics because in a RALO, we might say that we have certain amount of freedom and, perhaps, that we are being limited somehow, and that might create an issue.

Now, when it comes to working within a government, well, we need to see what this means. We had an ALS and the person came from the government. It was employee by the government

---

and that person didn't have the chance of making any of the decision and he was not affecting the interest of end users, so that he was accepted with no problem.

Then we had another issue with another person. He was the chair of a chamber involving governmental institutions and, at the same time, certain private companies and as the chair of a chamber, that person would have to vote and that might impact end users. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Alberto. Just to be clear, the criteria we're talking about for joining are At-Large wide. When we get to expectations, you'll see that we will have, I believe, as we do now, a flexibility that RALOs can add expectations if they believe it's appropriate to their region. So we're distinguishing between the criteria and expectations for that reason, because to apply uniformity in the criteria, we have to use the same set of rules for all ALSs. But expectations can, in fact, be different, and we will be getting to that.

In terms of the qualifications for people, I think that's going to be something that we have to decide. Up until now, we have decided that we do have people who wear multiple hats. So as an example, one of the leaders in APRALO runs a very large gTLD registry, but that doesn't mean he doesn't also represent users,

---

and he just has to be careful about which hat he's wearing. Next, we have Garth.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. I just have to respond to Holly because she mentioned my name specifically and my comment. I just want to clarify what I'm saying. Having ALSs is important, absolutely. We're not getting to them. We're not getting the message to them. We don't have anything that's really ready made to explain to them why they need to participate or why they should be here.

And when I went to organizations that self-describe, self-declare themselves as policy groups and internet-interest groups, they had never heard of ICANN, and once I opened the box to show it to them, they actually didn't want to be part of it. They didn't like what they saw. Some people joined, and even after joining, they didn't like what they saw.

So there's a more fundamental problem here. And we're sort of going in two strange directions here within this discussion. One is that we have to have these more rigid expectations and rules for ALSs, but yet, we want to have individual participation. There's a gap in here where there's people not being informed, people are not being welcomed. People are not being shown the path of how the domain name system impacts their lives, and

---

their money, and their careers, and giving them the tools they need to participate in the discussion. And I think we're closing the doors on them, and I think that we're looking at this problem the wrong way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Garth. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Thank you. Just for the record, again, I'd like to also say that my points about individual membership is not for me because, after all, I'm just, I'm an ALS already, so it's not necessarily for my interest, but it's also for those that are going to be joining in future. I won't talk about the individual membership again since Cheryl has made a very important point, and I hope it has been noted.

To the substance of some of the things that we displayed. On the website, I think by default, ALSs have a wiki page, so I think that should already, under the website parts, then on the voting part, I think we shouldn't because I'm trying to understand that particular criteria of voting. Are we referring to voting when the person becomes an ALS or are we referring to voting of during the application process? Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. That's an item on the next ones we're going to be discussing. So, perhaps, you can defer it until we raise the issue.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. So it means the bulleted document that was shared initially was not good. It's not up to date. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: The slides were created from it but I did distinguish between ones that were generally agreed upon and ones that are still up for question. Cheryl next. Sorry. Jimmy, I wasn't sure if Jimmy or Cheryl, or whoever is first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're fighting over it. And thank you, Jimmy, that was very generous. I would have thought you had the right as ALAC to go before as a sort of a peripheral person. Regarding the criteria, capital Ps in both cases, regarding the criteria, Alan, for many of the At-Large structures in here, I'm putting on my hat as ISOC AU, now internet Australia, which was, I believe, the fifth At-Large structure ever formed and brought into the ICANN world, well before any region was ever formed.

This was way back, 2005, right? So the criteria then we established, we met. Many other organizations have done the



---

same. We still need to ensure with this new criteria that our, hopefully, still active and engaged older At-Large structures are brought along. It gives us the opportunity, then, Alan, to collect the three contact names and numbers and e-mail addresses should this not have happened to date.

But it also gives the opportunity to do what I think is a very important criteria for the At-Large structures. And that is to ask for some form of entity-based recognition, be that a point out of a meeting of the executive, but to make sure that that entity has us as an ALS interest on their books. Because in ten years' time, new leadership will be in that structure, and it would be very useful for us to be able to say, "On the 23<sup>rd</sup> of December, 1927, this is what your group said." You know what I mean.

So we need to pick up on that and rerun that, and it may be some entities go, "No, well actually we're no longer interested." And that's okay, too, because we have decertification processes, but I do think we need to remember ALSs have joined over the years out of a lot of very different outreach programs pitched in a lot of very different ways, and their expectations of us are quite different. So the engagement that has to now go on, and I want to give credit to staff, what they do with new ALSs, I think, is onboarding them in a far more professional way and Nathalie could give us all sorts of gory details. But we do actually do a good job of bringing people onboard now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Cheryl, just as a summary, I think what you were saying is you were supporting what we said that the leadership must buy into it, must be. Okay. We have, at this point, three speakers on the list. We have run out of time. There's a 15-minute coffee break, which I don't mind going through, but there may not be coffee afterwards, and the next session is CCWG review, and we have no option but to start that one on time.

So if the speakers would like to continue, I'm game, but I would suggest that we try to find time to continue this session, which is obviously taking far longer than the hour we had allotted to it because we've only gotten through about a quarter of the slides and continue this later in the week. If people really want to have their intervention now, then we can cancel the coffee.

I see cards going down. We're on coffee break for 15 minutes. We actually have gone three minutes into the coffee break. We'll reconvene at 11:20 sharp and start the discussion on the CCWG. Thank you.

Folks. We're five minutes late. Can people please take their seats? Can people please take their seats?

Can ALAC members and regional leaders please take their seats?

All right. Do we have the presentation ready?

---

All right. We're reconvening the first session reviewing for the ALAC reviewing the CCWG final proposal with the intent of deciding before, hopefully, the end of the weekend, perhaps earlier, whether we are going to ratify, or not, this proposal.

To recap, you will recall about just about two years ago, two years ago next Monday, the US Department of Congress, NTIA, announced that they are willing to give up essentially control of the IANA function. But the internet community and ICANN was asked to take responsibility for it, and had to come up with a transition plan. And whatever organization took responsibility for it would have to be accountable to the internet community because they would no longer be there to say, "Hold on. You're doing something wrong."

The CWG Stewardship put together a proposal for the names function. The IETF and the address registries put together proposals for their respective parts of the internet ecosystem that they oversee. And since ICANN would be, at least initially, running all of the registries through the IANA function, and was the steward of the names registry, we needed accountability functions within ICANN. The Accountability CCWG has been working for about 15 months and we now have a proposal.

As one of the chartering organizations, the ALAC has a responsibility to say whether we support this proposal and its 12

---

recommendations or not. I'm assuming that everyone in this group has either participated in the two briefings we had last week, or been following along the process in intimate detail, or has at least listened to the presentations and watched them since then.

So this is not going to be a detailed review of each of the recommendations. We'll be doing a very brief overview of them, one by one, and then opening the group for discussion with the intent of understanding are there any concerns? Are they concerns which are going to be sufficient to not ratify? At this point, of the ACs and SOs, two of them, the SSAC and the ASO, have ratified already. There are four remaining, the ccNSO, the GNSO, the GAC, and the ALAC.

The expectation at this point is most of the recommendations will be ratified by most of the groups. It is conceivable something might be rejected by one group, and it is conceivable that particularly in the case of the GAC, they may be silent on some things because their rules may not allow them to support or object to things.

Of the discussions we've had prior to this, the general tone within the ALAC is there are some concerns but not sufficient to not ratify. That's not a commitment on anyone's part, but that has been the message that has come through. Now we must

---

come to the point where we actually make a decision, and that's the process we're in.

As I said, we'll be doing it recommendation by recommendation, and then we will have a session to decide on actual ratification. We can ratify the whole group has a single entity, or we can do it one by one. We are obliged to give the CCWG an overall statement of our support or nonsupport. I'll open up the floor quickly to anyone else who wants to talk about the process we'll be following and then we'll start the actual details. Go ahead. We have Leon and then Sebastien.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. Whatever the outcome we produce, I would strongly encourage it to be as simple as possible. We have received approval by the ASO and the SSAC in a very lean, concrete, and straightforward way. So I would definitely encourage, as I said, that whatever the outcome we produce and whether we ratify or not the proposal, we just communicate it to the co-chairs of the CCWG in the most simple way possible. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sebastien.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, no problem with the proposal or the expectation of this group, but I am concerned that not all the 15 members of ALAC are not in the room. And we set up those times to be able to have a discussion among all the members of the ALAC to have the same level of information, exchange, and discussion. And I really feel that if one is missing, we will miss the point. I am sorry about that, but I think really the 15 members of ALAC will have to vote on that issue, and need to be here all together. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. I think that warrants a comment. We have two people who have not arrived yet. One of them because of illness, he's not going to arrive until late tomorrow. I don't think we have an option to delay this whole process until then. If my count is correct, however, we do have two people who are present here and not at the meeting. If I can ask staff to confirm.

[off mic speaking]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl, for the transcript record, and yes, I'm happy to have this transcribed. We should put an RFID tag on everybody and you should have the ability to track them. Well, not using a mobile

---

phone, something we can clip on them, and haul them in, give them a little electric shock, ring the bells, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Staff, can we identify who is? I presume we're taking attendance at each session. Give us one moment. My count said we had 11 people here. I may be wrong. While we're doing that, if we can go to Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you. I think just to be sure I had, Alan, I think it's two years now. It will be two years now that we had the announcement, not three years. I wanted to ask, there was a meeting of the CCWG yesterday. Is there an intention to actually provide a brief update of that particular meeting? Is it part of the agenda? And then specifically to know if there's any change or any difference in what was proposed. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Alan, may I reply to Seun?

ALAN GREENBERG: You certainly may. I don't think there was anything to report in relation to what we're talking about, but please go ahead.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Seun, there was no change. The report is final. As we said in our meeting yesterday, the intention was not to revisit any of the issues, not to reopen any issues. The report is final. So there is no change between what is proposed and we are discussing here, and I think that this is not the time, of course, to update on the general work of what we did in our session yesterday, but I would happily update when the time comes and Alan considers it appropriate, I would happily update everyone on what we did yesterday and our next steps forward on implementation on Work Stream 2.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just for the record, my count was wrong. There are 13 people here, that is the complete ALAC that is in Marrakech at this point. Sebastien, I realize I may have cut you off. Were you finished before? You're okay. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Just to follow up. I think if there's anything to update from the CCWG, I think we should have it before we continue this discussion. Thank you.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding is the only update is the request from the CCWG for answers as simple and concise as possible from the chartering organizations.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am in full agreement with Sebastien. All members of ALAC must be here to vote. Wafa, for example, cannot be here today. She comes today but she couldn't be here yesterday, so she will come to today and she will be present tomorrow, so we have time to vote today but maybe we can vote tomorrow. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand what Sebastien was saying that everyone should be here for the discussion, and I'm afraid I don't think we can wait until everyone gets here or we will not – when we arranged these sessions, a number of people asked for two full days of discussions. That's about 16 hours. We ended up scheduling about seven. I don't think we can cut it down to one or a half,

---

which is what we would have to do if everyone is here. I think we have to live with it.

Anyone else like to speak before we start the review? Kaili.

KAILI KAN:

Thank you. Yeah. I have a question that actually I discussed with Cheryl some time ago saying, my understanding is that we at ALAC, we are supposed to represent the end user consumers. But my point of view is that whether there's a transition or not, it will not directly impact the end user or consumer's interest.

So that means on what ground do we vote for if we are to vote on behalf of the end users and the consumers? In that sense, my personal feeling is that we would vote that make sure that the end user and the consumers that we represent will not be sidelined or any future processes. So that is probably my understanding about the ground that we vote on, rather that we agree with this measurement or not disagree with a measurement. So that is my question, yes, that on what ground we vote on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I put my card up but Holly, if you'd like to go first.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd like to hear you first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess there's two parts to that answer. The first part is we made the decision quite a while ago to be a chartering member of the CCWG. Therefore, we are obliged to give our opinion, regardless of how we formulate that opinion, and each of us in the ALAC might use a different methodology for doing that.

But you ask a good question. The question is, why do we care at all? Now, unless the transition is done exceedingly poorly, users will see nothing. Nothing will change, the world will keep on turning, domain names will still resolve through the DNS. We're going to have to mess up really bad for users to even notice.

We already approved the transition plan. That happened quite a while ago. We are now looking at the accountability plan. Why does the ALAC care about accountability? Well from my perspective, it is, at some level, the same reason we cared with great passion about the transition plan. It's hard to imagine us doing the transition so badly that users would notice even if we had implemented something really poorly. And I think what we're implementing, I've gone on record as saying I think it's too complex, I think it's too expensive, but it should work fine.

---

Why do we care about the accountability plan? We care about a viable ICANN. To go to the extreme, if the ITU takes over ICANN's responsibility, there's no home for users in the ITU. We lose our seat at the table, we lose our ability to influence the policies. The policies will be influenced by TELCOs, and governments, and similar organizations. So we care to a great extent to make sure that ICANN is a viable organization because then we have an opportunity to represent the interest of users.

It's not so much the interest of users in this actual transition, as opposed to the ongoing ability to represent users and represent users well. That's why I care. That's why I put a huge amount of my time into this process. I see Kaili's card up.

KAILI KAN:

Okay, thank you. And also, thank you, Alan. Now I understand. We vote to defend the multi-stakeholder model. That's it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's certainly one way of looking at it. Good. We don't all have to have the same reason. Anyone else? Sebastien.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I guess we care about ICANN as an equal multi-stakeholder organization. I will sometime point words. We are not a model, we don't want to be a model. We are one way of doing multi-stakeholder organization and since years, I really feel very disappointed when we talk about model. Model to whom? Model to what? We need to be the organization who are giving today the place for end user to be able to talk, and to be able to participate, and to be able to be part of the decision. That's why we care.

And I feel that one of the discussions we must have is that do we think that the overall plan here will enhance, not just accountability of ICANN or the circle accountability of ICANN, but also the place of end user? And sometime when I read the comments of some part of this organization, I have fears that we are not going the right direction. It's something we will need to discuss during the session on the topic during the next two days, sorry. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Anyone else? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sebastien. When we are talking about the model, that doesn't mean a model for others. The model means a

---

method or a path. So it's a method for multi-stakeholder, so it's not a model for others.

ALAN GREENBERG: Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Yeah. Thank you, Sebastien. Yeah. I take it's not the model. I would say we vote on behalf of the end users, consumers, to defend the multi-stakeholder principle. I think that's a better statement. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, we don't all have to formulate our reason the same way, but it's important that we all feel we're doing this for a reason. Thank you. Anyone else? Kaili, you want back up? Nope. Am I missing anyone's cards? No. All right. Then we are going to start the process.

The recommendations comprise 12 different recommendations. They are tightly linked. We're going to go over them in the order that we did in the briefings, which is slightly out of order for the first few. I understand that they are linked, and there's going to be an inclination in some cases for people to try to address them all. To the extent we can keep discussions focused on the single

---

recommendation at a time, I think that would be preferable. But if people really feel that they need to go on to something else, then identify it ahead of time so you're not encouraging me to point out you're drifting off of something else. But certainly, we will be flexible.

We do have a count-up timer. How much time do people think is reasonable? Two minutes a reasonable target? We won't start going off with alarms, but if people start going up to four minutes, then we will go to the alarms afterwards. I ask staff to please try to diligently start the timer when people actually start talking.

The first recommendation, if we can go to slide number eight, I think, is the empowered community. So this defines the community as the five groups, the three SOs, the GAC, and the ALAC. The RSSAC and the SSAC have explicitly chosen to be outside of this process. The bylaws will give the empowered community certain privileges, certain options that they can exercise. Next slide.

The mechanism that we're doing this through is through an unincorporated association. There will be some mechanics that will have to be exercised just to satisfy the needs of the laws and the mechanisms by which we can create this unincorporated

---

association and cause things to happen, but they are relatively minor issues.

The empowered community will also act as the designator, the group that will appoint or remove directors. In the case of the designator, the empowered community will act solely on the instructions of the ACs, SOs, and NomCom, or the empowered community as a group to appoint or remove directors. So the legal mechanism by which we appoint directors will change. The net effect does not change at all, and we have the ability to remove directors should that be a decision that the various parts of the community take.

The whole crux of the empowered community is to give the community a way of, in certain cases, either supporting or overriding the Board of Directors. Currently, the Board of Directors is the only – next slide, please – group that is officially responsible for looking after the public interest. The directors are explicitly required to put aside their personal views and consider the views of the internet and of ICANN as a corporation.

We are now taking bodies, some of whom have very slanted views on the world, and personal aims that they need to achieve, and putting them as an ability to override the Board of Directors. The presumption is that by requiring a significant number of ACs and SOs to take action in any given power, that



---

we are balancing the various slanted views of the organization to match the concept of public interest and care of ICANN that the Board has.

The ALAC may make statements saying, “We care only about users. We don’t care about registries or registrars. We don’t care about governments. We don’t care about ccNSOs.” But we can’t unilaterally exercise our powers ourselves, so the others will have to join in and either agree with us or they disagree with us and nothing will happen because we can’t act alone.

=

So that’s the overall concept. The concerns that the ALAC has raised in general is – sorry, next slide. There have been concerns that some of the various parts of the process are not optimal. Well, the whole concept of a multi-stakeholder model is we have people with different views, and we have to find some common ground. So everyone gives something, none of us are completely satisfied most of the time. And that’s simply part of the process that we’re buying into.

When we preach multi-stakeholderism, we’re preaching compromise. It’s not always easy to do, in fact. And the concerns that have been raised is – next slide – is that it is conceivable that certain parts of the community might have views that working together, work against other parts of the community. It is a possibility, the thresholds are such that it’s not really likely

---

and, indeed, the Board of Directors right now will make decisions on occasion against the given community because they balance the things.

So that's about it. Open the floor to comments on the empowered community. This rate it's going to go fast. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay, thank you. I recall that there was a message that was sent to the mailing list some time ago about some suggestion about clarification of threshold, which actually affects annex one and annex two. So I like to, if there was, what was the, was it pushed to implementation or was anything agreed as a compromise on that particular issue?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The thresholds, I believe, are integrated into recommendation two, and we will have slides identifying exactly what they are in all cases.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

It's also reflected in annex one, as well.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, can you qualify? I don't believe there is anything in annex one except in one very special case, which we'll discuss under number two. But Leon, go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. Seun, if I understand well your concerns about, of course, the thresholds and how the discussion developed in the last weeks, the threshold stands still as they are in the proposal. I am aware that the thresholds established in recommendation two might affect other annexes and other issues within our proposal, but they stand as they were proposed. There is no modification to that and, of course, if the situation within ICANN changes, we would be able to revise or to review those thresholds at that given time. Okay?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. I think should be more specific, then. There was, if that change happens, if that time, where does any difference in ICANN structure and [inaudible] for the change? It's been suggested that the intent for that change is actually to prevent anonymous voting. So I just want to be clear on whether that intent was actually recorded as the reason why actually we're doing the change. Yeah, thanks.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. As I said at the beginning, these recommendations are interlinked. There's no way they cannot because about four or five of them together fully define the empowered community. So in terms of thresholds, I would suggest that we defer the discussion until we come to the one on thresholds because for people who are not heavily versed in this, it's going to be really confusing having the discussion without the chart in front of us. But I do understand what you're saying.

Leon, as a clarification, then we'll go on with the queue.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Just to follow up on what you were saying. I think that the question in regard to recommendation one is simple. Do we want to support to have an empowered community or do we not want an empowered community?

ALAN GREENBERG: With the modification, with the empowered community, as defined in a slide, a few slides ago, as those five AC/SOs. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. To give you my comments of feeling or point of view about this recommend one. I think it's a good way to go to

---

have a [inaudible] community, but I really think that we are collectively missing to include all stakeholders as we have two ACs who already declare not to participate. There were no wish to fix the problem, for example, the question of the selection of the SSAC by the Board to find other way to select the SSAC and to allow them to be part of the community.

So they decide not to be, I know, but from my point of view, it's wrong as they are part of the multi-stakeholder system in ICANN like the root servers. And the discussion about the fact that they're only certain root server and, therefore, certain manager of the root server, that's not compared with the four billions of end user. Yes, maybe, but it's not relevant on the participation. I am not talking if we need to discuss about the how many votes or what is the participation threshold. But I really feel that we are missing a point here. When I say "we," we collectively the CCWG but the ICANN in general.

And the last is that we spend a long time to seek solution if the Board go rogue. I hope that the sole designator will never get rogue because it will be very difficult to fix it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The next in the speaker list is Sandra, but I believe Julie may want to address the SSAC issue. I'm going to give my perspective very quickly, but I'd like Julie to fill in. There are all

---

sorts of reasons that parts of the CCWG did not want the SSAC to participate, including being appointed by the Board. I don't believe that was the SSAC's rationale, though. Go ahead, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Alan. As SSAC Liaison, I can understand why Sebastien would like to see all parts of the community participate. The SSAC specifically has a very narrow remit, and that is security, stability, and resilience. And it does not wish to expand its remit, which it would effectively be required to do if it participated in this community.

That would actually jeopardize its core role because there is a potential that people without a pure security and stability focus may wish to try to join SSAC to actually exert influence on its participation in the empowered community. The point about being appointed by the Board really doesn't come into play. The SSAC proposes members to the Board, and that's after a fairly detailed interview process and engagement with the potential member.

The Board has never refused to concur with a proposed member of SSAC, so the fact that SSAC is, in theory, appointed by the Board isn't really an issue. I think the final thing I would like to say is the SSAC most definitely will continue to monitor any activities that occur within the empowered community and in

---

the community forum, should it identify any security and stability issues associated with a particular topic, it will definitely provide its advice into the community forum without actually exercising power. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Julie. Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Alan. I want to formulate it as a question. Is this the right recommendation or the right moment to mention or to speak about the possible GAC carve out or is there another point in the slide stack, which is more appropriate? Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further concerns or issues to be raised on recommendation one? Now I will say something I should have said at the beginning, and it's something Sebastien has pointed out, but it's not only felt by Sebastien that it's fine to approve recommendations one by one. The other question is do we feel that overall, all of these together are good for ICANN?

And some of us certainly feel that if we were going to unilaterally design ICANN's accountability ourselves, this may not be how we would have done it. But this is a joint effort and so the real

---

question becomes, is this going to harm ICANN in a way that we feel is dangerous or not?

And certainly, we will have a discussion after we do the one-by-one recommendations on that particular subject. Any other comments on recommendation one? Okay. If I can summarize, I haven't heard an awful lot here, which says on this recommendation alone, and remember, they are interlinked, that this is something that we would not support. That is, we would likely ratify this recommendation, all other things being equal.

Do I have any disagreement on that? Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry. Just to clarify, this is not a vote, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: This is not a vote. I am trying to summarize the tone of the group. This is not a vote. One of the things we will have to decide after we go through all 12 of them is do we do a vote one by one or do we simply say, "We ratify or not ratify the whole thing?" That's a discussion we will have to have, not right now. Tijani, go ahead.



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I think that we have to discuss those recommendations one by one, and if there is a particular concern about one recommendation, perhaps, you will ask for a straw poll or something like this to see if there is an opposition to this recommendation. But I think that the best is to have a ratification of the whole proposal. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Agree with Tijani also for the reason if you go one by one and we have disagreement on one, what does it say about the whole proposal? We can't ratify it. So I think there would be a procedural problem if you do it one by one, don't find consensus on each of the ones. We have to have a vote on the whole thing at the end. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, ALAC rules say if we have a vote, unless it's one of a very small number items, that a majority rules. So the question is, are we going to have a rejection that we may certainly have individuals who object to a given recommendation? Based on an untold number of hours of discussions we've already had, I'm not predicting that we will

---

have a majority of the ALAC rejecting any recommendation. That's not to say it won't happen, I have no control over what people actually do as we go ahead, but I think it would be highly unlikely based on what we have heard to date, but that's not a direction of how to vote. That's just a prediction on my own part. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. I would strongly hope that we will not go to the majority vote. I would prefer that we have a consensus better than a vote or a majority vote. When you have this majority vote, you have people who lose and people who win, and this is something very bad. So the best is to have the consensus. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Again, for those who haven't memorized all of our rules, the ALAC does, by preference, make decisions by consensus. There are a few cases where we want to go on record of actually recording that we are unanimous or something like that. Our definition of consensus, if I remember correctly, is about 80%. So if we can achieve 80%. There is a formal definition. I think it's 80%, but I'm not sure. If we can achieve 80%, then it's deemed decided by consensus unless someone explicitly calls for a vote. Any ALAC member can call for a vote should they choose.

---

If we do not meet consensus, then we revert to a vote. So just to put the rules on the record. Any further comments on recommendation one? No? Then we will go to recommendation three, which is the next one we're talking about. We will be coming back to two at the end.

Recommendation three says, "Instead of the regular bylaws that we have." Right now, ICANN has a set of bylaws. The bylaws can be changed by a two thirds, if I remember correctly, vote of those directors present at the vote. The same rule basically applies to the Articles of Incorporation, which are essentially super-bylaws that are used to register the corporation in California in this case.

Because we are going to be putting the accountability measures in the bylaws, if we have stuck with only a single class of bylaws, the Board of Directors could then make those bylaws disappear by their own vote. So we would have gone to all this trouble, as it were, of creating empowered community and the Board, should it choose, could meet tomorrow, the day afterwards, and simply remove them. That was not felt to be appropriate.

Now our Board has had a tradition of only making changes to the bylaws after consulting with the community, and if the community radically disagreed, tended not to do it. But they are allowed to change them with no consultation. So the

---

recommendation three creates two classes of bylaws, standard bylaws, which the Board can change on their own, but now will have mandatory consultation, and one of the powers you'll see when we go on to the next recommendation is the community can veto it after the bylaw is changed, and there will be fundamental bylaws.

Fundamental bylaws are basically the bylaws that are associated with the community powers and the mission of ICANN. Those can only be changed with the empowered community's agreement, so the Board cannot change those or the Articles of Incorporation without the empowered community. So recommendation three creates the concept of fundamental bylaws and the Articles of Incorporation, which can only be changed with the empowered community's agreement.

And just as a matter of time, we have Rinalia coming in, in about five minutes. We will halt the discussion when she comes in and resume it when we next meet again, but I'll turn open the floor right now and I see Tijani and Jimmy, and I don't know who is first.

JIMMY SCHULZ:

I'll start, not to make the same mistake again. It's, I think, more a question than a statement. Of those bylaws, you spoke of two

---

classes, were they going to be clearly marked as being, okay, question – .

ALAN GREENBERG: I nodded my head yes. It is very clear which are fundamental bylaws. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I don't think that the creation of the fundamental bylaws is because we are afraid that the Board can change the bylaws without us. Because in the new accountability mechanisms, even the standard bylaws cannot be changed if we opposed to it. We have the veto, we can say, "No." So I don't think this is the reason.

The reason was to have the main things, the things that we don't have to change except in special cases, we put them in the fundamental bylaws so that they are not easy to change. We need special condition to change them.

For the normal bylaws, we change it very, very often. We add an AC or SO, we have to change it, for example. So I think this is the reason why we split it in two parts. One part is it difficult to change, it is from the model for the organization, and another part, which is changing on a regular basis, more or less. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I'll point out that why we did it is moot once we do it. Other comments on the bylaws? Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Yeah. It's, I guess it's useful to have this split in terms of bylaw. I am concerned that we didn't go to the end of this work and also take out from the bylaw a lot of operational things that are linked with each SO and ACs. And we may have under to clean up the bylaws with one category will be fundamental, one will be the standard bylaw, and the other will be operational documents.

But it's not the case and we have to be careful that now when we will wish to change our operational bylaws, we will need to have the agreement not only from the Board but from the rest of the community. And it may be of some concern sometime with some part of this organization. It's why since the beginning I was suggesting to take that out and to put it in operational document. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. I'll point out we don't need the agreement of the rest of the community; we need to not have their opposition, which is somewhat different. I personally agree

---

there's all sorts of operational stuff. And in fact, with these changes when we get to a later recommendation, we are adding a lot more operational stuff into the bylaws. I think that warrants a cleanup at some point, but it's not going to happen today.

Rinalia's here. Is there anyone else wants to get a last word in this recommendation before we turn it over to Rinalia? We will continue this recommendation after we resume at some time in the future. Seeing no opposition, Rinalia, you're on. Would you like to start or would you like us to grill you?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Okay. Hello, everyone. It's such a pleasure to be back and have a chat with the ALAC and the At-Large community. As I understand it, you have a set of three questions for me. I had actually planned to do all those three items plus a few things that I wanted to put on the agenda. So if you'll indulge me and can give me more than 15 minutes, I would greatly appreciate it. And in the future, I would really love it if you can give me more than 15 minutes to spend time with you because it would benefit me in my role to know more about your views on issues. And if you would like me to be with you longer, I think that would serve both our purpose.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, the agenda says 15 minutes. Staff tells me there's really 30 minutes, and in the future, if you want three hours, we'll give it to you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Super, okay. Okay, Sebastien. Objection noted. So what I wanted to do was to give you an update on Board activities in Marrakech, and I'll start with the 3<sup>rd</sup> of March. We gathered for a meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of March and we discussed two items. One is on .africa and the other one was the on the IRP ruling regarding Vistaprint Limited, regarding string confusion, objection, expert determination on Web and .webs.

On .africa, the Board voted to proceed with a delegation of .africa with ZACR. It's been a long saga. Unfortunately, immediately, there was litigation. And so there is a court litigation in proceeding right now, and if you have any questions about that, the instruction is to direct those questions to ICANN General Counsel, John Jeffrey and Amy Stathos.

On the issue of Web and .webs, basically, the Board decided that it would not resend the expert panel reevaluation for reevaluation. It decided that we will stick with the decision that we had made before. We also had workshops. We started with our workshops today. Yesterday, Board members were participating in the CCWG meetings. Today, we were updated



---

with what's happening with the transition. We just had a meeting with Larry Strickling just now talking about the sensitivities, dealing with the government in relation to the high-level government meeting.

And also, on the agenda for the workshop is CEO onboarding because we have Goran Marby with us. He's in the room right now, so he's fully onboard. We are also going to get a deeper briefing on ICANN's Africa engagement and strategy, and this was based on Board member request because we go to specific regions and we don't get deep briefings on what's happening. And so for the first time, we are going to get this comprehensive briefing and we're very pleased. It hasn't happened yet, but it will happen later today and also tomorrow.

So between Friday and Sunday, Board committees will meet. All the committees will meet with the exception of the Board Governance Committee, but it does have a meeting with NomCom. And the Board Governance Committee is not meeting exclusively because it's had several meetings in the lead-up to Marrakech.

On the 9<sup>th</sup> of March, the Board is meeting again formally, and on the agenda is that we will basically decide on the contracting and venue of ICANN meetings between 2016 and 2018. And we will also discuss bylaw term sheet, because right now from the

---

CCWG work, we are going to proceed with bylaw drafting and the term sheet is basically what the Board considers it this is our instruction to our drafting team, and if they deviate from that, they basically need to come back to the Board to get further instructions. That's essentially what it is.

And there's also a confidential executive session on compensation for the CEO because the CEO needs to be paid and we have to approve that, so there's that on the cards. Otherwise, you know we let Fadi go without paying him.

And finally, on the 10<sup>th</sup> of March, we have the public Board meeting. It has a very large agenda. On the content agenda, we have the appointment of the F root server operator, we have a new representative as a new representative in RSSAC. We have the appointment of the independent auditors, an update on the investment policy for ICANN, next steps on the IRD final report, and the Board member mentorship program. You might be interested in this and to know that, finally, we have a Board mentorship program ready where Board members who have reached their two years on the Board qualify as a mentor for incoming new Board members. So I think this is a positive step and this came about from working the [inaudible].

So on the main agenda, we have consideration of .eco and .hotel IRP declaration. We have in the two most important things is the

---

USG IANA stewardship transition, specifically on the FY '16 expenses and funding because we need to make sure that the work gets funded and it needs an approval from the Board to do that. And, of course, the approval of the CCWG accountability proposal. So that's essentially what the Board has been doing, is doing, and will be doing until the end of the meeting itself. Are there any questions on those topics?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Tijani and then Holly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. And thank you, Rinalia, for this report. I would like to know what kind of litigation you received. Is it a request for an IRP regarding .africa? Is it a request for IRP or what kind? Because I think that you did all the steps necessary for it, so what is the need of this – or what is the litigation, more or less?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. It's a court proceeding. They DCA requested a staying order to prevent us from proceeding with a delegation of the string. We have not presented our case in terms of whether or not it is appropriate or not, and you are correct. We've reached the end of the process, but we have to demonstrate to the court

---

that there is nothing more to be done and there's only one pathway forward. That's all I can say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anybody can sue someone or try to do something. Whether they win or not is a different case. But it has nothing to do with our procedures. We can't stop someone from taking action. Holly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you please speak louder because I hear you barely?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very often in these rooms, if they turn the volume up too loud in the speakers, we get feedback.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I've been interested to know if Larry Strickling had anything in terms of feedback that we should know about as opposed to is it just he's comfortable. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Two big message. One, respect the process. Two, do not be presumptuous. And do not be presumptuous in the sense that do not – just don't be presumptuous and respect the process. Don't over-celebrate it because the process has not ended yet.

---

The U.S. Government still has to evaluate it and we don't want to influence them adversely. So respect the process.

ALAN GREENBERG: I participate in a number of briefing calls on a regular basis and the people who are overseeing the implementation of the transition, the IANA transition, not the accountability part, are, from my perspective in history, exceedingly competent, and they're doing a really good job of it. But there are certain things that they are doing ahead of time and certain things, particularly ones that will be perceived as if we do them ahead of time, we are assuming the government will approve it, and those we are carefully, even though it will make it really difficult because we'll have to do them in a condensed timeframe, we are not doing because it would be presumptuous on our part. So there's lots and lots of politics involved.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much, Rinalia, especially for the news of dot Africa. For the [inaudible], I hope you're not asking for more time just to avoid being [inaudible] it out when the bylaws, the new powers are implemented. Now to my main point, there was this letter from one Senator Cruz, I don't have the details of that, but I wanted to know is there any impacts that? Are you seeing any signal that this could actually significantly or otherwise affect the transition in any way? Or even ICANN relationship with NTIA or USA in any way. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. The letters from Senator Cruz, among other communication coming from elsewhere, are always discussed in the Board regarding risks to the transition. And appropriate responses are being made and they're being made carefully. So if you see steps being taken, it's not rash, it's very deliberative, and there are always reasons behind it in terms of the approach and what is being said.

ALAN GREENBERG: It would appear there's no more questions right now. I don't see any cards, hands in Adobe Connect. No. Go right ahead.

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So the next topic I believe is reflections regarding the CEO selection process. As you know, I was a member of the CEO Search Committee. It was a very interesting process, and as I reflect back on it, I noted that the total number of applicants in comparison between when the Board recruited Fadi and when the Board recruited Goran, is that the number of applications were about 200-plus back then, and it was only 100-plus this time.

And in my last meeting with you, I highlighted why this was the case. I indicated that there were several factors. One, the transition makes a lot of people nervous about the status of ICANN, what kind of an organization might emerge. It's considered unstable, so a lot of people are deterred from putting themselves forward. The other big factor is, of course, Fadi Chehade. On the global stage, he is proven as a leader of high stature, and to be able to rise up to that benchmark is extremely difficult and it deterred a lot of people from applying, as well.

Irrespective, we did manage to get more than 100 applications. I would say my view is that the people who applied either didn't realize the magnitude of the job or they did and they had supreme confidence that they can actually do it, and we were very lucky because we did have high-quality applications and we vetted them very, very carefully.

---

And the result is reflective of that. And Goran Marby, I was told this is how we pronounce his name, Goran Marby. Yes, and all the feedback has been extremely positive. And I want tell you that I was very, very tough with him during the interview process, and we interviewed him several times to a point where we managed to get full Board consensus on his selection.

And I was tough on him because I was thinking of all of you in the back of my mind in terms of how this person from Sweden, a regulator, who has experience with the ITU and all his technical and operational skills and experience could relate to you, a global community of individual internet users.

And I discussed this with him, also, on a personal level individually because I understand that it could be a problem. There are various cultures around the world, some of them are more direct, and prefer that. Some of us are more indirect and direct communication sometimes make us uncomfortable and we don't know how to deal with that.

What I like about Goran is that he is a very open person. He is honest. I believe him to be a person of high integrity and principles. He's also very strategically minded. He's extremely intelligent and he captures things very, very quickly.

He does not know ICANN fully, this is his first ICANN meeting, and you know you will see him in the corridors and he would



---

love to talk to you and all that. I heard that his plane didn't arrive when he was in Casablanca and he was on a bus with 30 community members, and he told me that he really enjoyed that experience in talking to strangers, getting to know them, exchanging jokes. He loves jokes and you can, you might encounter this with him.

But what made him stand above the shoulders of everybody else is that he had the operational experience of managing an organization of the size, scale, and complexity of ICANN. And in terms of dealing with the world, his ITU experience of negotiating with tough delegations, that's good. It is global, but it is primarily governmental. But what I like about him, also, is that he highlighted for me that as a regulator in Sweden, he has to deal with all kinds of stakeholders, and he deals with individual users, as well, and his heart is in the right place.

The last time I interacted with him, he was on his way to parliament to talk his parliament about the importance of, and the possibilities of using the internet for disadvantaged communities, including the disabled. So I believe that he can be the ally of the At-Large. Please give him a chance, do not prejudge him, just be open and direct with him. He will be open and direct with you. I think that we did make the right selection and I hope that I will get the reinforcement that we did make the right selection for us and for you.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Rinalia. I have one question. What are the plans for the onboard process to community to take part on this onboard process? I don't think it will be the right approach if Board plus staff are taking over this responsibility. I think the community has to be included in the onboarding process to a very great extent in order to get a clear understanding for the new CEO how the relationship staff community really is. We might all remember Fadi mentioned that after three years, he finally understood how ICANN works, and I think this was way too late, although to the great work he had done in his time, it would have been a great advantage if he would have understood how ICANN really works way earlier. And the same applies, obviously, to the amount of stuff he brought in during his period. So how this is going to be conducted and how will this happen? Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. It's a very important point that you're raising. I would say that the reason that it took Fadi three years to understand the community is because there was no onboarding process of Fadi in place, and that is an oversight that the Board realized and is correcting now. And so we are taking proactive

---

action in making sure that Goran’s introduction to ICANN is managed.

And we start with the Board looking at the community schedule, taking into account all of your meetings, and your Board representatives, the representatives that you select are involved in that. I will get to the community involvement a bit. And also, staff has to handle it because the incoming CEO desperately needs to know the staff that he has to work with, so that’s being handled and led by Susanna Bennett.

For the Board, the process is led by Steve Crocker and Ram Mohan is seeing through the implementation because Steve has many things on his plate. I agree that there should be an engagement planning with community members, and I think that was planned for yesterday’s SO/AC/SG/RALO leaders meeting where, sorry, it’s a long title, but that is what it is.

And that was supposed to be the initiation of that to bring Goran in to meet with the leadership of the community, have that engagement first, and then give him the time to walk around and make sure that he attends strategic important meetings. And I can assure you that every community meetings have been flagged. And the ALAC is on the agenda for meeting with the Goran, but it’s not confirmed yet because he is experiencing an overwhelming schedule and he’s saying, “Gosh, I need time to

---

freely walk around and see how things are happening.” But perhaps, that’s not going to happen to him so much.

He will walk around during this meeting. He will always have a shepherd with him. But in terms of the engagement, I will take your point, and I will bring it back to them to see now we need to bring in the community in terms of planning his onboarding, and I think it would be good if each community were to present itself to him directly, rather than hearing from Board or staff.

Of course, he will hear those perspectives but he should have the opportunity to also hear it from you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, just a little notice or story. I crossed him yesterday in the corridor and I represented and we talked two minutes and in this two minutes, he tell me, “I spend my life six years to deal with end users and customers and I am on your side.” That’s the only message he give me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Rinalia, you gave us the report of the onboarding process. Thank you very much. I trust you and I hope

---

you will be as good as you said. But I would like to know what is your feeling about the enhancement of the process of onboarding. Do you think that what we have now is the best? With this experience that you just made, do you think there is something to enhance, to better do? Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Tijani. I never said that I was good or doing it in any good way. I think that actually the his schedule could have been shared with leaders of the community, and they could have given feedback in terms of what's missing. Because the Board and staff have a specific perspective and if community perspective can be added to it, then it would be total, it would be comprehensive. So that's the point that will be relayed back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Yeah, I agree with you. Well, first of all, thank you, Rinalia, for coming here and discussing so much. Well I agree that Fadi has done a great job in promoting ICANN on the world stage, awareness and so forth. However, I am not so sure about other aspects. Well so my question about the new CEO is whether the Board asked the new CEO about his opinion and positions about

---

the, I think it's ICANN goal and mission as one world, one internet. That is against any attempt to fracture the internet in the world.

So I just wonder if the Board has asked questions to the new CEO on this issue as well as what will be the new CEO's position on this issue? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Without putting Rinalia in an awkward position, may I suggest that our Board is an intelligent set of people and they learn from past history? But you can further answer should you choose.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: The answer is yes, and in terms of his position, I would suggest that you ask him. But in terms of ICANN's official position, that is something that we would have to develop together with him when he formally starts. He hasn't formally started yet. He officially starts early April.

KAILI KAN: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you, Alan. Thank you, Rinalia for all these explanations. I suppose it was a difficult process. It is a very big job for the community, the CEO of ICANN. I just wanted to know, I imagine that each candidate had a project, a mission on the implementation of his or her strategy. Fadi, as you said, left his print on the work on the approach that he took.

As you know, Fadi was very close to ALAC. So I would like to know what are the things that were implemented by Fadi such as the meeting from the AS, the SO, the AC, and the RALOs. Will that go on? This was in the remit of Fadi. All these things that'd been applied in those meeting, will they go on?

Yesterday, we had dinner with RALO leaders, we had a dinner with Mister – how we're supposed to pronounce his name? Marby, Mr. Marby. He was very nice, we had the opportunity to meet him, each one of us, each RALO chair talked to him. And the project of this new CEO, does he have the African strategy among his project?

His projects, will they carry on, on what was started before? Will there be any important changes made?

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: We have a five-minute warning and I still have, I think, one topic and the issues that I wanted to raise still unraised. The ICANN CEO, no matter who he is, cannot have a personal project that does not fit in within the framework of the ICANN overall strategic plan and budget.

So when Fadi came in, the mandate that the Board gave to him was globalize ICANN. That was his mandate. That's why we now have regional strategies, we have engagement offices all over the place, all over the world that made us a more global institution.

With Goran, his mandate will be slightly different because we are at a different stage in our organizational development. His mission is essentially to consolidate the organization, to make sure that we are excellent in what we're supposed to be doing and to become stronger. There may be some changes in terms of our external engagement because there is a perception that we are perhaps over engaging internationally, but that doesn't mean that it would result in an isolationist policy.

So if I were to say personally, because there is no board position yet on this, I would say personally that existing strategies will continue. It makes no sense to scale back on them because we have put the organization on a particular path. What we need to



---

focus on is doing what we're supposed to be doing better within the remit of our mission.

ALAN GREENBERG: That being said, a new CEO will make decisions. Rinalia, can you tell us what the other topic is? We have three cards up right now. We have Kaili, I think that's Vanda or is it Alberto? And Sandra, but can you tell us what we're missing if we go ahead with these speakers.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I wanted to raise the issue of getting feedback from you regarding my performance as a Board Director, and that's because I am about midpoint in my journey. You see me publicly, but you don't see me in the Board, so you could give me feedback in terms of what you expect of me from what we you see me doing, but in terms of what you're not seeing me doing in the Board, I would like to encourage you to get feedback directly from the Board. Especially from the Chairman of the Board, Steve Crocker, because he's been on the Board for a long time, he has seen Board members come and go, whether they're effective or not, so he could give you an objective perspective and be honest about it.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. We have a couple of minutes left. On that last item, I will point out to those who aren't familiar with the schedule. We will start the process for selecting Rinalia's successor, who could be Rinalia or it could be someone else, in a few months. We have a very long, elongated, protracted, I'll use several adjectives, process to go through, and it will be starting well before the end of this calendar year.

All right. I'll open the floor for another couple of minutes to either that issue or the previous one. The speakers were Vanda and Sandra in that order.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well the first question you read is the mission.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I interrupt? I'm told the interpreters will have to quit very quickly, so please be very, very concise.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Well, so mission is done. The second question is exactly because of the mission, how it's supposed to this kind of mission be combined with the necessity that will be certainly raised from now on of the international connection with the governments and so what. So I have been not heard so much because most of

---

the information from here is in switch here. I cannot trusting in translations, and so who is going to do the job to convince people around with this new formation of ICANN? Because this will raise a lot of discussion and the seawall will be very involved. How they can manage that if that mission will be in it looks like well selected for that mission? But I don't see in the other mission for other international approach and convincement and so on.

I don't know if [inaudible] the question we have a chance to make the question direct with you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We will invite Rinalia to our next teleconference to continue this discussion. The queue is closed after Sandra and Tijani, I'm afraid.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

If I understand Vanda correctly, you are asking, "How will the new CEO communicate ICANN's mission, organization, priorities to the global community given the changes that's happening now?" And you are concerned because you haven't really seen him speak in public and everything about him is in Swedish.

There are some YouTube videos that have him, there are not a lot, but in terms of what he will say and the positioning of ICANN,

---

the organization, the Board will work this out with him. We have retreats scheduled in April in Amsterdam where we will sit down, talk about the ICANN strategy, mission, orientation, direction with him at the CEO level. So this is coming and it will be addressed, Vanda.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Alan. I just want to share a detail with you, which might interest you. I had a chance to work with Goran Marby already because he was the host of the EuroDIG in 2012. EuroDIG is the European IGF and I just want to let you know that although he didn't know what was going to be expected from this conference, his staff and himself did a very, very great job and it was a pleasure, really, to work with them and so I'm quite confident that you made a very good selection. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Rinalia. We'll be convening or stopping for lunch right now. We reconvene at 2:00 o'clock and Fadi will be here for a very short time. If you want to give him a few minutes to talk or to talk to him, you have to be here before 2:00 so we're sitting and ready to talk at 2:00. So please judge your time accordingly and we'll see you here at 2:00 o'clock or slightly before. Thank you.

---

And thank the interpreters for going way over on what they were supposed to be doing. And tech support, I'm just learning this job.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**