
MARRAKECH – Fellowship Morning Meeting
Monday, March 07, 2016 – 07:00 to 08:15 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

ALAN GREENBERG:

Summarizing, we have about 200 At-Large Structures. Some of the RALOs, soon all of the RALOs, will also have individual users. If you, as an individual person, have an interest in participating, in some regions, you already can. In other regions, you will be able to participate. You don't have to build a group of friends around you if you want to simply be yourself.

The regions, of course, I think by this time, you probably know where they are. The At-Large Advisory Committee, the thing on the right, is made up of 15 people, three per region. Two per region are selected by the RALO, and one per region is selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee to allow people who aren't already affiliated with the organization to get involved.

I, for instance, was appointed originally by the Nominating Committee because the RALOs actually didn't exist at that point, they were just starting to exist. And I'm now appointed by my North American RALO to represent them here. So 15 people, 10 of them up through the ranks and 5 of them in from the side so we can add new people into the mix, and get new views, and make sure that we don't get locked into a small group.

Now, what do we do? Well, I can repeat the first sentence again. We represent the interests of end users. What does that mean? ICANN is regularly, for instance, in the GNSO part of the world, and you'll be hearing from various people in the GNSO, the Generic Name Supporting Organization. They're responsible for recommending to the ICANN Board of Directors policies associated with gTLDs. gTLDs are probably the largest single focus that we have within ICANN. Because although we have a group that looks at country code TLDs, we have very little jurisdiction over them, so we can't make a lot of policies because they are effectively autonomous. There are a few exceptions, but in general, that's the case.

Again, addressing a core part of ICANN, the numbers, is done largely by other groups, the various Internet address registries, the IETF. A lot of the core work is done outside of our jurisdiction. A lot of the work here is gTLDs, and At-Large focuses a lot of energy on it.

We participate in community-based activities. Some activities in ICANN are focused on the individual parts of ICANN, gTLDs, ccTLDs. Other parts cross the community, and we obviously participate in those.

ICANN has something called a public comment. Public comment is any time ICANN is about to do something crucial, we either ask

for opinions on what do people think about what we've done so far. Sometimes at the very beginning, we say, “What do you think of the subject?” The At-Large looks at each of these. If we believe there's an intersection, a reason why this may affect users indirectly/directly, then we get actively involved.

I can't read what the next one says.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh. It says, “Provide advice to the ICANN Board.”

ALAN GREENBERG: Provide advice to the ICANN Board. Okay. Our formal job is to provide advice to the ICANN Board. Informally, we will provide advice to anyone. Some of them listen, some don't. The Board does not have an obligation to follow our advice. They do have an obligation to think about what we say. That's one of the things that's gotten better at At-Large. The ICANN by-laws do not actually require that, but thankfully, they actually do.

We oversee the whole community. RALOs are moderately independent. They follow some rules that they set themselves. They follow some rules that we set on their behalf, particularly in regard to ALSs, but we actually have the jurisdiction over admitting ALSs, for instance, or removing them, on occasion, not often.

We'll talk about recent activities. Some of you, I presume, have heard about IANA. There's a lot of talk in ICANN about IANA. If this is not your first meeting, you certainly have heard talk about it. IANA is this very small group that actually does the mechanics of publishing the information that allows users to use the Internet. It publishes the pointers to the core parts of the Domain Name System. It publishes the pointers, or the information, to the parameters that are set by the IETF, which allow all of your applications to work. It manages the number system on behalf of the Internet Name Registry. It essentially gives out the addresses that you can use to each of the regional registries so they can use them. There's a number of other ancillary things related to that.

Remember the history of the Internet. It started off as a U.S. Defense Department project, and grew to be a larger thing. At one point, it was called the National Science Foundation Network. It was funded by the National Science Foundation, and was largely linking together universities, research labs, super computers. It was then transferred to the US Department of Commerce when it was clear that this wasn't just for universities anymore.

ICANN was created, essentially, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and we've had a number of relationships with them, a number of – I won't say contracts

because they've never actually been contracts, but memorandums of understanding. Currently, we have something called the Affirmation of Commitments, which is not a contract, but it says what we promise to do.

What's the date today?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: March 7th.

ALAN GREENBERG: March 7th. Two years ago and seven days, the US Department of Commerce, the US government announced they were willing to give up that relationship. There are people in countries around the world who have been slightly upset, and I'm half joking because some of them have been very upset, that the core of the Internet is managed under contract to, in one way or another, the U.S. government. They said at that point they're willing to give it up. They're willing to give it up if ICANN, the group that oversees most of these things, the actual operation of them, comes up with a plan, a plan that will safeguard the Internet but take the US government out of the loop and not put any other government or set of governments in its replacement.

An interesting bit of work came up with an IANA transition plan, some of which is currently being implemented, some of which is

waiting, and we'll see in a minute. Part of the requirement was that if we came up with a plan to oversee IANA, it had to be accountable to the users of the world, to the various stakeholders of the world, because it couldn't be subject to takeover two years from now by governments or by some other entity, or suddenly controlled only by those components of the Internet that make a lot of money and would like to control it, perhaps. At least some people might. So we also had to come up with an accountability mechanism to make sure that ICANN, and specifically the ICANN Board that controls ICANN, does not do something really stupid.

We, the multi-stakeholders in ICANN, select the Board, but nevertheless, once they're there, they're on their own. The question is how do we make sure that if, in the view of the community, they're not doing things properly, we have some recourse.

There's an accountability that is, in fact, being ratified at this meeting. There was a 15-month effort to create the accountability plan, and I'm happy to say that as of yesterday at about 4:00 PM, the At-Large Advisory Committee, which is one of the major parts of the CCWG, the Cross-Committee Work Group on accountability, ratified it. As of yesterday, we now have three of the six organizations in ICANN who sponsored it have ratified

it. We're hoping the other three do in the next day or so. You'll hear about it one way or another.

Assuming they do, ICANN, in a formal process on Thursday, will be turning over these reports to the NTIA, the part of the U.S. Department of Commerce that oversees this. They will be analyzing it and making a recommendation to the U.S. government on whether to do a transition or not. It's going to be an interesting couple of months. It's happening, of course, right in the middle of a U.S. election. Timing couldn't be worse.

There's also a competition consumer trust and consumer choice review going on. This is a review mandated by the Affirmation of Commitments. Remember I told you that was the current agreement with the US government that said after the new gTLDs are announced, a year afterwards, we had to look at them and see. Are they helping? Are they causing problems? Are they doing the work in the way we wanted? Maybe a bit actually premature to be doing it only a year later, but we are starting the process now, and over the next year, we will be looking at these kind of things.

We don't only criticize things after they happen. We try to get involved and move things in a direction that we think are good for users. And one of the things where we've worked is in privacy and proxy services. Now, everyone familiar with that term? It's a

complex one. When you register a generic TLD name, a gTLD .com, .org, .photo, you have to say who you are and how to contact you. Because if you're doing something wrong or whatever, we want to be able to contact you. The we is very generic. It may be your local police force. It may be one of your customers.

However, there are some people who don't want their names displayed there for very good reasons. If you're running an operation which is trying to protect freedom of speech in a country where freedom of speech is not particularly honored, you may not want to put your name there, saying, "I'm the one who's saying all those things." There's lots of reasons. In many cases, when you acquire a domain name, you can say, "I don't want my name to show up. Someone else's name will show up, but they will send an e-mail on to me. We'll communicate. It's just not going to show up in public." That's a proxy service. A privacy service is slightly different. It's just my name shows up but not my address, not my phone number.

These services have grown. They were never designed into the Internet. When the Internet was only people working in university labs, there was no private information there. It was the name of the university. We knew where it was. But when people started getting involved, individuals started getting involved, the world changed a lot.

These are services that grew without any rules associated with them. There were, for instance, proxy services in some parts of the world where if you looked them up in the phone book, you wouldn't find them. As a matter of fact, if you looked them up on Google Maps, you wouldn't find them because their address didn't exist. Their phone number didn't exist. If they said they were in a particular country, their postal code didn't exist. Not only could you not find the real users, you couldn't find the proxy service. That's about as anonymous as you can get, but it was not illegal because in some cases – well, it was illegal, but it was hard to find. Not illegal, it was against our rules.

We, in a recent iteration of the agreement with registrars, said, “If you're dealing with privacy or proxy services, they're going to have to follow some rules.” This PDP, Policy Development Process – you'll hear that term a lot in ICANN – was put together a group of interested people to come up with some rules. It wasn't easy because clearly, some people want privacy to be as private as possible. Other people, your local law enforcement, perhaps, obviously didn't want it to be private. They want to be able to trace people down. It's an interesting world.

That's it. All sorts of fun things going on. I encourage you to get involved in ICANN. The Fellow program is a marvelous program. It takes people who have an interest in what we're doing and actually tells them what we're doing by people like me coming

and talking to you, by exposing you to the ICANN meetings, giving you access to people who will follow up with you and answer questions. It's one of the greatest inventions we've ever come up with.

I encourage you to ask questions now, if we have any more time. I think we have all of two minutes. I've spoken just a bit too much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Three minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Three minutes. I'm around.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Our next speaker's not ready.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can get my e-mail address, and there's lots of people around the place who will be glad to talk to you. ALAC and At-Large will be delighted to have you come join us for the next 10 or 15 years of your life. We'll use all of it up if you allow us to. Not only have fun, but affect how the direction of the Internet goes, and hopefully for the best. Thank you.

ARSENE TUNGALI: Thank you. I'm a second-time Fellow from the DRC, Democratic Republic of Congo. Thank you so much for the presentation. During the presentation, I heard that you say there is up to 200 ALS all over the world. You've been claiming that you represent the views or the interests of end users. My question is, at some point, I went through the website trying to register my own organization as an ALS. I found the process very, very difficult. The process is very long, and I couldn't go until the end. I'm wondering, why do you make it that hard for an organization to be registered as an ALS? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I could joke and say we deliberately make it as difficult as possible. We don't. There are two things. Number one, we have just replaced the website about two weeks ago. Therefore, I won't say it solves all the problems because any new thing like that, it's been in development for a year and a half, and there's plenty of little things wrong with it and probably a fair number of big things wrong with it. That's number one. That didn't make it any easier.

The process that we are using to certify ALSs, is also changing. You won't find that on the website, but there's a lot of work going on. Part of what I've been saying is the, in fact, truth. Part

of it is aspirational in that it is a nice theory to say that we have 200 ALSs, and each of them have people just eagerly waiting for information from us. And as soon as we send it to them, they get it, and they read it, and they come back with comments. It doesn't necessarily happen like that.

ICANN is responsible for a rather unusual set of things. If you talk to someone who has never been to ICANN, they may not even know what a URL is. You'll say domain name, and they'll say, "Huh?" If you give them an example, they'll know what it is, but they've never heard the words. They don't care. If you start talking about IP numbers, their eyes will really glaze over. We talk about arcane things, things that are not of interest to everyone, and we use a whole specialized vocabulary. And we talk largely in English, which is not the first language of most of the people that we're dealing with.

There's multiple steps of difficulty, and we're doing a lot of work to try to make sure that the people in all the countries we deal with, in all the ALSs, who have expressed an interest have a chance of actually understanding what we're talking about. We're trying to remove some of the technical jargon. We're trying to do a lot of translation. A lot of that's been happening already, but you'll see it happening even more.

The process itself, however, to certify an ALS is somewhat obscure. We are doing our best. You'll see rolling out, over the next year probably, because some of what we do is controlled not only by our own rules, but by ICANN by-laws. We're going to hopefully make it better, but don't let us get away with making it impossible to work. There are people named in each region. There are people who are contactable, I hope. Certainly with a new website, I hope they will be. When you find problems, find a human being. We sometimes can help.

Yes, we do have some problems. It's not as easy. 200 organizations have managed to do it, so it's not impossible. Thank you.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN:

Good morning. All right. Adetola from Nigeria, first time Fellow. Thank for the presentation. I'm a bit confused when you said the Board is not from the bylaws, the Board is not mandated to accept your advice. I was wondering if you take it back to normal businesses, whatever the customer wants is what the company produces. You may produce some product, and at the end of the day, [inaudible] market doesn't accept it, you want to redesign or modify the product you release on the market. Then there is this cliché that says the customer is the king because you want

to make sure that the money you're going to be making is from what the customer wants.

Now, if ICANN is doing all they want to do, they spend sleepless night every time trying to do something on behalf of the customers, and the customers say, "This is what we want," to the At-Large. Then, whatever they say they want is not mandated for the Board to accept. But like you said, they have obliged you to now create some time to think about it, but not just accepting what the customers want. I want just to be clear about that procedure. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The world is a complex place. I periodically, dealing with real companies, I've found that they've stopped selling something I liked, and they've made the decision to replace it with something they think is better and more interesting to their customers. This customer didn't agree with them, but that doesn't change the world sometimes. ICANN's world is much more complex because you are presuming the end users are the only customers we're talking about. That's not the case.

Remember we went back, talked at the beginning about multi-stakeholders? Why do we have multiple? Why isn't one enough? I'll ask a more interesting question from a personal point of view. We always talk about the fact that diversity is important.

Diversity in gender, diversity in language, diversity in all sorts of things. Why? I'm pretty smart. I'm old. I've lived a good life. I've learned a lot. Trust me, I'll be the stakeholder for everybody. You don't need diversity.

We want diversity. We have multi-stakeholders because they have different positions. I talked about the CCWGs in IANA to the transition and accountability. They have been a very ugly process because we have a lot of people who care passionately, and differ with each other a lot. Not just on the details, but a lot. The Board has to balance all of these things. The registries who run the top-level domains are customers. The people who sell the domains are customers of the overall Domain Name System process. The regional registries are customers. The intellectual property people who worry about people infringing their trademarks. It happens a lot on the Internet. People register a name that looks a lot like someone else's name and pretends they're someone else. Very hard to protect that when the Internet is a worldwide resource.

There are many, many customers, and ICANN has to balance the needs of those customers and the desires of those customers. That's what makes it difficult and makes it controversial. And hopefully, that's what makes it good because we are balancing the various needs. But you're right. In fact, from my perspective,

I'm the only important customer, but ICANN can't take that perspective, unfortunately.

Do we have time for one more? I know we're over time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: One more.

ALAN GREENBERG: One more.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Go ahead, Alagie.

ALAGIE CEESAY: Thank you. My name is Alagie from Gambia, second time Fellow. My question is a bit related to Arsene's question, but I would just like you to clarify or explain who can be an At-Large Structure. What kind of organization do you think is eligible to be an At-Large Structure? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It's an interesting question because we're in the process of discussing it right now again. We had a very significant discussion about eight years ago when we started actively pursuing ALSs, and we're doing it again now. The

answer is we don't have a lot of formal restrictions because if you went to some parts of the world, they'll say, "Well, it's users, obviously, because we're focused on users. There can't be any companies involved or government involved." Other parts of the world, if there's no companies or governments involved, you're not going to exist. Some people say, "You have to be formally incorporated." There are parts of the world where to be formally incorporated takes a lot of money and a lot of time.

So our rules are moderately flexible. You have to be controlled by individual users. That doesn't mean you can't have other people in the process, but they have to be the controlling ones. You have to have an interest in what we're doing. Up until recently, we've been largely assuming that anyone who had an interest in the Internet has an interest in ICANN. Turns out that's not necessarily the case. What we're doing is so obscure to some people that it really doesn't matter. We're adding rules about that, but currently, the rules are you want to be an ALS, you are controlled by individuals, you're not asking us for money to do it, minor little things like that.

There are very few rules, but you have to have a passionate interest of interacting with us, and you have to be a real group. You can't just pretend you're a group and say you and 100 of your friends are going to be here. We're not asking you to name your friends, but it would be nice if they really did meet once a

month or something like that, or meet on the Internet. If you had a web page, it would be nice. That kind of thing. There are very few formal rules. There are a couple which are really important. We're probably going to be adding a few more, just because of problems we've found over the decade.

Done?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. Thank you so much, Alan. First of all, I want everybody to go look at the new At-Large website. Some of my colleagues and some of Alan's colleagues worked very hard on it for a very long time, and it looks absolutely fabulous. I'm really pleased with the work that went into it. And I'm only saying that because we're working on another website project right now, so everything is following some of the models that were there. That's just a side note. Go look at the new At-Large website, for sure. Alan, I assume if they see you, they can stop you and ask you all kinds of new questions, as long as you're not running too fast.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I'm not running too fast. My schedule tends to be tight, but if you can stop me and ask me a question, please. Otherwise, my e-mail address is very readily available. I get a huge amount of

spam because it's so readily available, but please contact me. Remind me where I met you or who you're from, and I'll do my best to help.

We're not actually giving prizes, but please, if you look at the new website and find we've done something really dumb – there's a couple that are still there that haven't been corrected that I've found – let us know. We'll try to fix it.

Thank you all. Enjoy the week. Learn a lot. Have a bunch of fun. We're holding a huge party this evening.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: The African showcase. We have showcases which show off some of the features of each of our RALOs, depending on what region we're in each time. This is a very special one because it has been widened significantly to become a farewell party for Fadi Chehadé, our CEO, who, of course, is from Africa and this is Africa, and it seemed to be quite appropriate.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much. To move us quickly, we've got just about 19 minutes left. Our next speaker has apparently another

engagement this morning, but that's okay because he was scheduled to talk about the GAC. The Governmental Advisory Committee is something that I can talk to you about at great length for much longer than 19 minutes, but since we only have 19 minutes, I'm going to keep it short because I want you to be able to ask questions that I can hopefully answer for you.

A little bit of my background at ICANN. I spent three years as the secretary to the Governmental Advisory Committee. For those sins, I'm going to go ahead and give you a quick briefing about the GAC, and explain to you what the GAC's role is here at ICANN, and how they operate within ICANN. Mostly, I just want to be able to just keep that part quick and take your questions. How many of you here are from government? Wow. Excellent.

Have you been to the GAC?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No? How many of you have been to GAC meetings?

[off mic speaking]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Here. Come talk to the microphone so the interpreters can hear you. I just want to get a little bit of a feel for the room.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Last ICANN meeting, I made attempts, but the fellowship keeps you so busy that I couldn't get out to any of the meetings. This time, I have intentions to go to as many as I can.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Excellent. This is a very interesting meeting for the GAC, this ICANN meeting. They're having their high-level governmental meeting today, and it's got everybody quite busy. Anybody who's ever been to a GAC plenary meeting – the GAC meetings with the Board, those are always standing room only. The GAC meetings with the other SOs and ACs here at ICANN, those are always very interesting dialogues to watch and listen, but the GAC plenary sessions, they're run in a very interesting way.

The GAC's primary role at ICANN is to provide advice to the ICANN Board on issues of public policy, and that's it. If there's an

interaction with ICANN's activities and policies with national laws or international agreements. If the ICANN Board gets a policy that's been the result of a PDP that has implications or will interact in some way with national laws or any other kind of international agreements, the GAC has a strong interest in that. It's the GAC's role to meet, confer, discuss, and come to consensus.

The GAC doesn't generally come to rough consensus. The GAC will meet for a very long time. I can tell you I have spent what I would call more than 10, 15, 20 long nights meeting in GAC meetings. When I say long nights, I mean until 2:00, 3:00 in the morning while the GAC discusses how best to advise the ICANN Board on these issues.

It's a really fascinating process to watch, and it's not because they don't necessarily disagree viciously. It's just it's a process that has to evolve. They can come to agreements, and it's actually really interesting to watch that. I highly recommend going to not just the GAC sessions with other SOs and ACs, but if you're interested, go the GAC plenary sessions and watch how they interact with each other. It's quite fascinating to me. Maybe I'm just a little bit of a nerd, but it's actually quite interesting to watch.

The GAC, when I first started at ICANN, had maybe 60 governments on it. When I first started working for the GAC, the GAC had about 120. Right now, there, I believe, is 161 national governments and I think 36 international governmental organizations as observers. That's a huge leap. In the three years that I was with the GAC, they went from about 120 to about 145. That's in large part due to the new gTLD program. The observers jumped as well in numbers.

The GAC meets face-to-face. They do almost all of their work face-to-face. Other groups at ICANN, they work really well offline, they can get a lot done. The GAC really benefits from these meeting weeks. They work very well face-to-face. They rely on meetings just like this where they can talk, and they don't generally come to consensus offline. They benefit mostly from coming together in person. They meet only at ICANN meetings. They have had an intersessional meeting before, and that was during the New gTLD program, to come to agreements on some of the outstanding issues with the applicant guidebook.

The GAC does discuss issues intersessionally. They have conference calls, but that's to help them prepare for ICANN meetings and what they're going to discuss. They have an ICANN website as well. They post all of their meeting agendas there. The only sessions that are closed these days – and it wasn't

always this way. When I first started with the GAC, a lot of their sessions were closed – are their communiqué drafting sessions.

That's basically the broad overview of the GAC. The members of the GAC are national governments. The country itself is the member, and the ministry or the governmental body is who comes. That's the broad overview of the GAC and how it works, but I really would just like to take questions and encourage discussion. Please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My name is [inaudible], a second-time Fellow. It's rather unusual looking at the schedule for today. During ICANN 52, the Public Safety Working Group, which is a subcommittee of GAC, their meetings were somehow open, but looking at the schedule today, I've seen all their meetings are closed.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It may be that they're drafting something. It may be that that's up to the individual working groups. I don't have any insight into that, but I would recommend that on the website, they have information about who's in those working groups. I would recommend that you can seek them out or speak to the Secretary online to find out.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is a very special meeting. It's the second time. The first one was in Toronto a couple of years ago. This is a high-level ministers meeting today. There are representatives and actual ministers from about 50 governments that are meeting, and I suspect that's why some of them are closed.

Sorry, I thought we were talking – never mind.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I was talking about the Public Safety Working Group because I'm law enforcement, basically, that's my area of line, why I'm here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. You can e-mail gacsec@icann.org and find out about that. They'll be able to help direct you. It's really up to them what meetings are open and closed, and they don't really say why, depending on what they're discussing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

ADETOLA SOGBEGAN: I'm a bit confused about the role of the GAC and what ICANN is doing. I'm wondering how it's like United Nations now but there's no permanent members that are going to veto certain

things, but 160 nations. What guide were to do, and they have various divided interests. Whether China want to control the Internet, or Iran, or if another country want a free society, somebody wants Internet freedom. Other countries that don't want Internet freedom. [inaudible] guide, how would they be able to contact consensus so they will now come back to the ICANN Board?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's actually a very interesting question, and it's a very interesting process to watch. The things that they discuss are only based on what's within ICANN's remit, and only based on what is on their agenda, and only based on the PDPs that are coming to their attention. If they want to advise the ICANN Board on something, it is generally, generally only within what has been brought to their attention. If the GNSO has proposed something to the ICANN Board, and it's a PDP, then that's what they're advising the ICANN Board on. Does that make sense? They're not advising the ICANN Board on issues that's going on outside of the ICANN world. The ICANN Board's not making decisions on what's going on, so they may tell the ICANN Board that there's opinions within the GAC that vary, but they're not telling the ICANN Board what to do about –

ADETOLA SOGBEGAN: It's clear. I'm okay. I'm okay now. Thanks.

NAVEED SYED: Just to add on that, it is important that the GAC appoints a member on the Board that doesn't have voting rights, but the GAC advice has a very special status for the Board. If they want to reject that advice, they need a very strong reason to do that. Otherwise, they generally have to follow what the GAC has to offer.

ADETOLA SOGBEGAN: Once the advice comes, it's binding?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

NAVEED SYED: Not binding, but they need to consider that very, very carefully.

ADETOLA SOGBEGAN: Okay, so the advice rule is a bit different from that of At-Large?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: When you get GAC advice, they have to consider it, they have to look at it, and they have to provide a rationale.

ADETOLA SOGBEGAN: Okay. It's clear.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If they decide to reject it, they have to provide a rationale. Please go ahead. Alan, you can go ahead with the –

ALAN GREENBERG: If they want to reject it, they actually, before they reject it, must discuss it with the GAC and see if they can come to some common ground, which is unique to the GAC.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. That's what's unique. If they reject it, there's also a discussion that has to happen after they've rejected it.

ADETOLA SOGBEGAN: More like a negotiation though, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: It is exactly a negotiation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning, everybody. I think you just a little bit answered my question. I have two small questions. The first question is

how the actual context of the IANA stewardship transition, what is the reaction of the government to that? The second question is can you tell us more about the process of compromise? Because ICANN takes decision in the multi-stakeholder fashion, but government, generally they take top-down decisions. Can you try to tell us more cases about that fantastic compromise that we see unfolding in the ICANN space?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

The first question, I actually have been out of the Governmental Advisory Committee long enough to not know as much. That, we're going to have to look and just wait and see. They're still actually talking about that. We'll wait and see on that, wait and see approach.

The second question, it's actually an interesting process to watch. They do take a top-down approach, and it can be really difficult for them. There is that, "We're governments. We're here. We're participating, but we're governments." But there are a lot of governments who also understand this is the multi-stakeholder model, and they do support the multi-stakeholder model. They are part of the multi-stakeholder model. They also want to support that, and they want to feed into that as much as possible. When you have that sort of discussion happening at the same time and that understanding, that's when the

negotiations and the discussions around consensus really start to build.

I've seen so many wonderful discussions happen in that room, as tired as I've been. I've seen the doors open up over the years. That's what's been interesting to me. The most interesting thing is that when I first started, those doors were closed all the time. Watching those doors open up, even for their plenary sessions, and allowing other people to come in and watch their process, that is what I find to be just fascinating.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So you advise people to go and see that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Go watch the GAC. It can be a little dry. A lot of things at ICANN can be a little dry, but go watch the GAC. Even if they're not meeting with a constituency that is interesting, go watch their plenary sessions. It can be interesting. There's only a few that I think are closed, but this is an interesting meeting, like Alan was saying. They have their ministerial, so that's a little different, but the plenary sessions, go check those out.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You're welcome.

We've got just probably time for one more, as long as it's not a long-

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's a short one.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Please go ahead, my dear.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you. I'm a Fellow third time. My question is when there is a lot of talk of diversity going on at ICANN, bringing in more voices, at all the SOs and ACs. How about GAC? There are various governments that are still not on board. Putin, for example, is not there. There are many more. What's GAC doing about their outreach in terms of reaching out to all the governments?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: As far as what the GAC is doing, when I was on board, there was a lot of outreach going on, but I know that ICANN's governmental engagement team is doing a lot of outreach to bring more people in. And the global stakeholder engagement

team is also doing a ton of outreach in their regions. I actually believe that the Oceania region just got 100% representation for the GAC as of this meeting, so that's huge. That's an interesting region to have 100% representation at the GAC. From our side, there's a lot of outreach happening to bring more people in.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This process helps.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, this process does help, this fellowship process. Raise your hand for the governments again.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We have seen this in the past. Many fellows went back and had their government being part of the GAC. I've seen a number of examples of that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely.

Did you have a question? One minute.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I was about to ask the same question because I am representing Bhutan and I'm from an ISP at a semi-government. We were

discussing all the governments. I think our government is not participating, so I need to reach out to my communities, really, because almost all of the world is resting here and I think I need to reach out to my government. Maybe next ICANN, our government can represent as well, so thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Absolutely. Absolutely. If you need any more information on that, I can help put you in touch with some of our –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, support, too maybe.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, absolutely. Yes, great.

We have one minute left. I just want to remind everybody to please be on time tomorrow at 7:00. We are going to start at 7:00 a.m. Our first speaker starts at 7:00 a.m.. Our first speaker tomorrow –

[off mic speaking]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, we've got two sessions tomorrow. We have a speaker from the NCSG. We have a very full day tomorrow. We've got Tapani from the NCSG. Rudi's coming in from the NPOC. Are we having fun with the acronyms yet? We learned them all yesterday. Everybody remembers them, right? Then we're also going to have a presentation from the NCUC, and then the – this is my favorite. This one's my favorite. Are you ready? I'm going to tell you what it is – the ISPCP. Internet Service Providers.

Did you have one thing? Oh, okay. Just stretching.

It is exactly 8:15. The opening ceremony starts in 15 minutes, so please take a quick break, stretch, and go enjoy the opening ceremony.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Has everybody signed the sheet?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Did everybody sign the sheet?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes? Alan, thank you so much for coming, and everybody have a great day. I will see you this afternoon. Does everybody know where the room is?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]