

---

HELSINKI – At-Large Leadership Wrap Up Session Part 1  
Thursday, June 30, 2016 – 10:45 to 12:30 EEST  
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning. This is ICANN 56. The At-Large Leadership Wrap-up Part 1, June 30<sup>th</sup>.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are reconvening this meeting. If anyone cares to participate, please take your seat.

Thank you. We are honored here to have the Chair of the Board, the President and CEO, and I have to remember David's title. Senior Vice President –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible], how about that?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, we're doing title. Senior Vice President, Development Support and General Manager. Far more impressive than names.

This is a relatively wide-open topic, wide-open session. We have expressed some interest in discussing the issue of consumer confidence – not confidence; consumer issues within ICANN,

---

*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.*

---

which directly relate to compliance and have a relevance going forward towards a potential New gTLD round or non-round.

Holly, we'll come to you.

There is also the issue that was raised in relation to future gTLD rounds, that there is some concern that the Global Domains division, which should be taking its message from the community and from the Board, seems to have a proactive stance in favor of a New gTLD round. That is the perception of some people.

So those two topics are on the table. Certainly interested if Göran or anybody else wants to raise anything else. Our meetings tend to, if we allow them, run over by very significant amounts of time. I suspect this one is not going to be allowed to run over significantly, based on time constraints. So I'm going to turn it over to the man at my left – right.

GÖRAN MARBY: Start with the left.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll turn it over to the man at my left then.

---

STEVE CROCKER:

Good morning, everybody. Thank you, Alan. Pleasure to be here. I'm trying to sort out the distinction between this meeting and the one that's scheduled for me at 8:00 tomorrow morning with many of you, all of you. And I feel like I'm being set up for being grilled and re-grilled.

Thank you very much. On the issue of protection of consumers and the like, I've been paying attention to some of the correspondence. And there's correspondence being written for my signature that has caused me to say, "Well, wait a minute. Let me really try to understand what's going on here." So I'm going to say some things that are perhaps not exactly the party line, but intended to stimulate some constructive discussion and, hopefully, some constructive work. Not very much, but...

There are multiple aspects of things that can go wrong with respect to the way people use domain names, the way people use websites, and so forth. We all know this. And there are multiple views as to what should be done in various cases. And so you have the natural tension between, "We don't do content control," versus, "But what happens if it's infringement of copyright? And what happens if it's pornography? And what happens if it's other forms of abuse and so forth?"

What I think would be helpful would be to have a relatively clear and balanced view of what the problems are and who you go to,

---

to get these problems fixed. Now, who is the “you”? Well, these are the people who complain. Not necessarily us, not necessarily you, but the people that we think we’re serving. And who should they go to, to complain, in my view should not be cast as, “Well, this isn’t an ICANN problem,” or, “This is an ICANN problem,” in terms of an ICANN-centric view of the world. It should be a more neutral and more encompassing view, of which ICANN will have a role within what turns out to be a relatively narrow and well-defined portion of it.

Well-defined. Well, not everybody is going to agree as to exactly where those boundaries are. And so another complexity, another thing that adds a lot of complexity to the attempt at writing down what I’m talking about, is there’ll be differences in points of view. And I don’t mean in any negative way when I point to a particular group or another particular group. But we fully expect that some members of the IPC, the Intellectual Property Constituency, will take a stronger view about what ICANN should be doing than some other portions, like maybe ALAC or maybe NCUC might take with respect to where that boundary ought to be. And rather than try to sort that out once and for all, I think we may have to live with some differences in perception. At the very least, we can mark what those differences are at this point in time and then not have to go round and round and round and round and round and round

---

and round and round on the same point, just repeating each other, and just agree that we've at least heard each other and set those forth.

So I don't know if that's helpful, but that's, from where I'm sitting, would be a way of setting a plateau for these kinds of discussions. And then we can choose which pieces we can move forward and which pieces are insoluble, and which things can be done quickly and which things might take longer. So that's my plea for structuring that dialogue.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just for information's sake, the ALAC and IPC have worked together moderately closely for the last ten years that I've been around. We hadn't met with them recently. We did meet with them at this meeting. And although I suspect some people around this table may not agree with all of them on just how much we should enforce movie and music copyrights, we're generally in agreement.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Without going into any specific part of discussion, just coming into this job and building on what Steve talked about is that in my job today, I'm responsible for everything my organization has ever done. I take the cumulative. You take it with a smile. It

---

is that, and I'm responsible for whatever we've done, right or wrong. And we probably have done some right things and some wrong things over the years. But it's also very hard to be [just] on history, which also is natural that I have to be that, but it's also hard to be it. Because going into specific and hearing things that may have been wrong, it's history.

My intention, as I've repeated over the last couple of days and for the last couple of months, is that we are trying to make things more clear when it comes to how we do things. And I will try and be as transparent as possible in that. Because with the Bylaws, with input from the community and the Board, we have to make a stronger positioning of the role of the ICANN organization. And therefore, I always use the word "the ICANN organization" to make it clear, when I speak, I speak for the ICANN organization and I don't speak for the ICANN community. I don't speak for you, if you haven't asked me to do it. Because there could be instances where the community and the Board tells, "This is what we would like you to do." For instance, "Go out and talk about the multistakeholder model," and then I will talk about the multistakeholder model.

And I hope over time – this is not a change that will happen over a minute or a month or six months. And maybe that's because the Board hired me for five years, so I can be accountable for my own mistakes and not only my predecessors' mistakes. It is a

---

change, because it involves people. And people will take time. And we have to learn to work with each other. And there's a lot of legends in all those discussions. Everybody heard something or said something or seen something, like the, "My [GDT] teams should be..." or, "I heard that."

And my notion is the way it's done is the community makes policies, and through the Board, who tells me to implement those policies, I will implement those policies. We will be as transparent as possible in that process. The only way we will interact in that is we are obliged to say a couple of things. For instance, "We don't have the money." I think you care about that we don't spend money. In the Swedish Constitution, it says you are not allowed to waste taxpayers' money. And that's just – you're laughing at me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Only because "waste" is such a subjective thing.

GÖRAN MARBY: It is in the Constitution. So I have to say that, "Yes, it will cost money," or, "We don't have the data system," or, "It's against the Bylaws or the Mission or against the law," because we have a law that surrounds us, which is positive here. But that is to the extent we will interfere. This is a new approach, and it will take

---

time, and you have to work with me on that. And as you know, I'm open for – you probably realize that I like debating, and I like discussing, and I will not always agree, and I will walk away, respecting your views. But you have to give me some time.

I heard from people during this meeting that they have – some people have actually come up to me and said they see a small change – not a big change, but a small change – in how we do things. And I hope we can build on that and do that together. I don't ask for your trust. The only thing I ask for is the right to serve, because I have to deserve that right to serve in anything and everything we do. And now you are thinking, "You have to prove yourself, Göran. We've seen other CEOs coming in and going." But give us time and work with it, and hopefully sort it out. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

David, any introductory comments?

DAVID OLIVE:

Yes, thank you very much, Alan. And I enjoy these meetings I have with my At-Large colleagues and friends. The number that comes to mind is 200. And to that extent, a very good number. It reminds me of Sparta and the forces, to be a classical allusion to



---

that. So congratulations on the 200 ALS Structures. That's a very good thing.

Secondly, I think I'd like to talk, we hear more and more about diversity. And when I think of diversity at ICANN, I think of this group. And just look at the people around this table, and the RALOs, and At-Large Structures in general. So that is really a good indication of our diversity.

And finally, I think I just want to stress, I think, the review session. And the reviews that are coming will strengthen At-Large and the RALO structures. And that, I think, is important.

And finally, I do always look forward and rely on the active inputs of the At-Large community in the policy development process. Please continue that. And this afternoon, please make sure you're at the feedback session to comment on this policy forum structure, going forward. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm going to open the floor. I will note that I had an item on the agenda originally, which has been overtaken by one suggested by others. And that is the issue of transparency. If we have any time at the end, we'll go onto it, but I suspect we will not.

Holly was the first person.

HOLLY RAICHE:

First of all, I'd like to say I do like this new format. I like the cross-constituency. I like everybody in the room, trying to understand policy and what's being developed. For my mind, it's moving from a multi-siloed structure to a multistakeholder structure. And I actually find that really heartening.

But a suggestion in structure – and this is something I put to ATRT too, and I suppose other people – the ombudsman gets complaints that are 85% out of his jurisdiction. I've said to him – and I've said before, and I haven't got a response – “What are the other 85% that you are throwing away, what issues do they raise?” And should they actually be put into the organization, put to us, or whomever, so that we can understand what's out there, what's troubling people? Is it something that we can do, as not only ALAC but others, so that in fact we can be more aware of what the community out there is involved in and worries about, in terms of us? Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY:

I think what you're saying is very important. How do we pick up things that people are concerned about? And during the Board meeting over the weekend now, I asked the same question. I used to work strategic outlook, or “things that could go wrong” list, because we need a format to be able to plan ahead. And

---

we're starting a discussion from my organization perspective, together with the Board. And we also said we need to figure out a way to do this together with the community, to pick things up. If you run around, take out fires all the time, it's actually meant that you haven't planned and thought. That's where I come from. Remember, I'm from Sweden. I like processes. Shit, I love processes. Is that on record now?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's on record.

GÖRAN MARBY: I have to learn that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Recorded and translated.

GÖRAN MARBY: Yeah. This works very well, doesn't it? But anyway, so we have to find a format to handle things that doesn't belong to a format. We are working on it. I start with the organization, to find a format for that, and then involve in the Board in that format, and then finding a way to do it with the community.

The risk I see, which I haven't proposed anything, is I don't want us to be seen as we steer it, that we come with, "This is what we

---

think, and now we should react,” kind of thing, because it has to be a bottom-up process. Haven’t figured that out, but we will come back to you and discuss it. Because what you’re saying is about, how do we know, so we can plan ahead? That’s what I’m looking for. I call it strategic outlook right now, with things that could go wrong. I also use some other words, but I don’t want to use in transcript. But that’s intention.

Could I pick another point, which is about transparency? I come from a government sector where, by law, everything is transparent, to the extent that I could have people civil people coming in the office and asking for all my e-mails. And they are allowed to see it, by law, as soon as you can. That’s the law. Anyone could get anything you need. Anything. The only caveat, if it’s about people, individuals, or business secrets, there has to be a process to approve before you send it out. You will get the documents, and some things will be out.

That’s transparency. And the reason why it works is because it’s put in a narrative. Transparent is not the same as disclosure. Disclosure is very simple, because you could see anything, but you can’t have a context. My organization has to be better of putting a narrative around the information we send out. A PowerPoint document about the budget won’t help. So therefore, I don’t use PowerPoints anymore. We write written documents, the next step of that, so you, in two years, can come

---

and ask me, “Why did you make this decision?” I will hand over a document, rather than 50 PowerPoint slides.

The next side of that is we have to put a narrative into it so when you ask information about something, you will have a full file, rather than having using Google to find 150 documents. This is a big challenge, a big opportunity for us, but it’s important that we find this way of getting away of the word “disclosure,” rather going into transparency. Because it’s when you find the material in a file or anything else, you get a full picture at the same time. Then we achieved it. Will that be an easy task? No. Will it cost money and resources? Yes. Do I have the complete answer how to do it? No. But the organization has already started working on this by investing in new [ITA] systems that will give at least a basepoint of that.

I happen to think, coming from the background, I think transparency is important. Disclosure could sometimes be a little bit... Information without a narrative, information around the whole thing, could be confusing, actually. So I just answer to the transparency thing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We have a queue at this point. We have Olivier, Sebastien, Garth, Aziz. Have I missed anyone?

---

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Göran, I have been able, in the past week and actually a few months, in fact, to meet with you on a number of occasions at various fora on various occasions, and I like your style. I like the approach that you're taking into ICANN and that you seem to be taking into emphasizing the neutrality of staff and the ability of your crew that is with you to support the community. So that's a really great thing, and I'm really encouraged to see that.

On the neutrality of staff, I do have some concerns though about a few things. First one, of course, is that I guess that in your job and in the job of everyone in this community, but staff in particular, comes a certain promotion of ICANN, which I believe is the right thing to do. There's also promotion of gTLDs, promotion of the New gTLD program. But then it goes into promotion of the next round, or the potential next round, or what we call the subsequent round of New gTLDs.

And in our community, we might have slightly different views than some other parts of the community. And certainly, there is an understood commercial push from some parts of the community to go for a next round sooner, rather than later. The concern that I have is that ICANN does have a separate division,

---

called the Global Domains Division, the GDD, that is more focused with the running of all the commercial side and work with the registries, registrars, contracted parties, etc. And I have seen over time the concern that there has been a, sometimes, sort of willingness to say, “Oh, yes, the next round, the next round,” rather than saying, “Well, we haven’t actually chosen on whether there will be a next round or not.”

There is a review team looking at this. There is a PDP that has to take the input from the review team. And because of this, I have the concern that the outside world might think that ICANN is already set on another commercial round before even looking at the interest of end users.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have four speakers in the queue. We have seven minutes left. I’m closing the queue. And I don’t know how much flexibility you have on your time, so.

GÖRAN MARBY:

[inaudible] but this is a short answer. The only time we said anything since I joined is when Akram got a question about the earliest possible date for doing anything, which was like 2020 or something. They didn’t say that we plan to do a 2020, which I think has been misunderstood. It was the answer to the question

---

of when the earliest date we could do it. The reason why he answered that question, because he got the question and then he said, “There is a lot of things to be happening before that decision could be made, and it’s the community who sets that.”

We don’t have any agenda in this one. We had a discussion over the weekend with the Board. I said, “Where are the pros and cons? Where are the things that’s happening?” And that’s where we are. We are awaiting the community’s input to proceed.

I think Steve would like to say something, as well.

STEVE CROCKER:

Olivier, thanks very much. Let me stir the pot here just a little bit and suggest that in addition to raising the formal question of – taking note that we have not yet decided whether to have one or not, there is an awful lot of dialogue on the side of having another one. And the questions then are, underneath that, when and under what circumstances, and whether it should be subdivided by brands or something else.

And so I have not heard any comparable next layers under the “don’t have it.” Although the question that hangs there is a formal question, I haven’t heard anything put forth as to what an argument would be not to have it. And if there are people who are seriously interested in not having that, I would say that the



---

time to start socializing the reasons for that are upon us, rather than, “You just haven’t had that discussion, so we don’t know what it is.” That won’t fly after a while.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It turned out we had someone else in the queue who I hadn’t seen, so we have Sebastien, Garth, Aziz, Kaili, [Siva]. Keep it brief, please.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Usually I talk in French, but I will make an exception for you, Göran. One of the reasons – no, it’s not a joke. I’m sorry. But I think our common language, it’s English. Then we are equal. It’s why I think it’s important. When we are not equal, it’s important to use my mother tongue.

I would like to thank you, because in very short time – when thinking you, I guess I thank the Board too. You make some changes, and I will say I was struggling when I was Board member. For example, the CEO of the organization is not the CEO of ICANN. And I wanted the Board to have some other voice than just the voice of the CEO and of the Chair, and didn’t succeed in that. But this first step, it’s very good. It’s not to say that you are not allowed to talk, you are not allowed even to talk

---

for the whole organization. But it's a posture, I think, very useful. I was thinking for before, but now it's really very useful. And we have to see how we will be able to have the voice of other members of the community, raised and held by the organization to be listened around the globe or in some region.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I've lost my list. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. So I'm just going to jump right into it. ICANN has no real consumer end user agenda. It has no agenda to consumers or end users that any consumer I've ever spoken to can see. Generally, like any organization, it has a self-preservation agenda. I mean, that seems to be the guiding principle. And I don't want to shackle the new CEO with history, but I'm shackling the organization of history. And we have a lot of history, particularly in terms of the way that it deals with end users, specifically in terms of the Compliance department.

Several years ago, we spent quite a bit of effort to get Compliance moved out from under Legal department, because we thought that was hampering their ability to enforce the rules. And we thought we had some success in that when it was moved to report to the CEO. But then we found out, through document

---

review, that it in fact reported to the GDD, to the Global Domains Division. And this was denied for a while, but it was a fact. And now, Compliance has been formally moved under the GDD, which is honestly a gross conflict of interest. It has no business being there whatsoever.

And for me personally, there's no point in coming to these meetings to be ignored. I can be ignored from home. Okay? So in order for us to have value, we need to have some results. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY:

One thing that I think is [strange] in discussing, I am responsible for anything that ICANN organization does. And that is, I think, if GDD or any department whatsoever doesn't behave, it's not their fault. It's my fault. I can refrain myself from any mistakes we can ever do. I want to make that obviously clear, that anything that is wrong, any mistakes we do, anything that my team does is my fault. And I will take that very, very seriously, because that's what I'm paid for.

Unfortunately, the things that goes well will probably go to you. But it is an important statement that if any misconduct by any part of my team is my fault. And I will enter that discussion by myself. I don't know why that disappears, it's like if anyone ever doubt that. With all that said, I will also protect my team in that

---

sense, that I'm also responsible for having an organization that works well. There are people working there, but the responsibility always lies with me.

To on your comment now, to be very transparent, I started five weeks ago. I'm not smart enough to know everything. It's now on record. I have some very important tasks to do, and I won't shy away from them. One of them is to get to know you, to understand how the policy work does. Another thing is to get to know my team and start to do things to make sure that I get all those dots connected together.

There is the transition. Not the political part, but the fact that I have deliverables in the transition. So for that reason, and also because I happen to think contractual compliance is extremely important or any reason, it has to be. I asked Akram to continue. And I could have actually said, "I haven't said anything." But I decided to share with you the fact that until now, when Alan is leaving, they continue to do it. I'm still responsible. If anything goes wrong, it's my fault, not theirs, because I need to find a replacement for Alan. And I want to do that in such a way that you feel confident, because I think that Alan has been a very good person.

So for me, it was a practical one. It wasn't my intention to change everything or do anything. It was a practical thing for

---

me, with five weeks on the job. So, Garth, I appreciate, as you know, to have the discussion. And thank you for bringing up the question, because it gives me the opportunity to answer to you. And I have no intention to change the thing we did. It's just a practical matter for me, because I know I don't know the issues well enough right now. You have to give me another week.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me chime in. Göran has just given you a long answer to the smaller part of what I heard you say. I want to respond to the point that you made about, where is our agenda for dealing with consumers, with end users, and so forth?

I had a reaction, as you said that. And Lousewies, sitting next to me, whispered precisely the same thought to me, which is this. You guys have developed an enormous amount of breadth and depth over a long period of time. It's been astonishing and heartwarming to see how vibrant and how robust an organization you have. So that's the positive part. And you know what's coming next.

Where is that agenda that you want us to pursue? It is your job to produce that agenda, your job to say what it is. And then we put it on the table, and then we have a discussion about it. Much of it, I suspect, will be controversial as to whether it belongs in ICANN or belongs elsewhere in the world. But it's your job to

---

initiate that, not to come and complain that we haven't given it to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the right answer to that is, "Noted." Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: For my part, I will speak in French, if you...

Very well. I would like to go back to what Steve said. You talked about intellectual property and content, and I am glad that ICANN works on those themes that are very complex. We have many, many questions regarding – before Marrakesh, we had many questions from students, from journalists, asking those questions. And we always say that ICANN doesn't work on content.

You talked about a balanced approach now. We're trying to think in terms of what can be the role of ICANN in the future, because we have many issues with the blocking of VOIP, sites that are illegal, illegal sites, very, very complex issues, issues with content, illicit content. The question is, why ICANN doesn't intervene when terrorists use sites, when pornography is all over. So I think it's time to start thinking about those issues, to see what the role of ICANN can be. Thank you very much.

---

STEVE CROCKER: [inaudible] trying to increase the transparency and accountability of ICANN. One of the major results of that process has been to turn an aspirational version of the Mission Statement into a prescriptive document that is actionable in court. So as you raise issues like that, think also about whether or not the community, which you're part of, has already circumscribed and limited what the scope of ICANN is, to the point where if we did some of the things that we're being asked to do, we would be subject to recall.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, I lost track. Kaili?

We do have a bit more time. Göran has rescheduled his appointments. Go ahead.

KAILI KAN: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, just mention that because our goal is for the multistakeholder structure of ICANN. And that is what we strive for. Within this framework, I would ask the leadership, as well as the administration, to consider the balance between the interests of the [DNS] industry versus the end users, consumers industry. That's not a question, just a comment. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And for brief comments, since we have a bit more time, I will reopen the queue. I saw Jean-Jacques had put his hand up. That's fine.

[Siva] is next.

[SIVA]: Okay. This is on the content regulation issues that Steve was talking about. In respect of the complexities, it may be necessary for ICANN to look at content and the issues surrounding content, not in the manner of expanding the scope of ICANN complaints, but by forming some kind of a multistakeholder committee for looking at content, or even progressing that towards forming community directorate on content regulation. Because if we leave it as a [recom], then governments would step in, and that would hurt the security and stability of the DNS. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: This is a very reasonable subject to take up. And I urge you to do this. Talking to us on the Board is the slowest possible way to do this. Talk to your colleagues. Talk to the community. Talk to the other SOs and ACs. Put together a sensible proposal, sensible in the sense of one that has consensus and one that stands the test



---

of being within the Mission of ICANN. And then we're off to the races. Then we can make something happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Sebastien, is that a new hand? Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alan. May I be permitted to put a question which is not directly related to the discussion so far? Okay, thanks.

Good morning, Steve, Göran, and David, and Board members. It's a very simple question, and I'm putting it as in my personal capacity. I am a member of the ICG, and therefore co-author of the transition proposal. But I don't live in North America.

I'd like to get from you a sense of, what is the likelihood of transition actually starting to be implemented, and when? Because being from Europe, it looks like the electoral process in the US might perhaps derail, but more hopefully just retard, the thing until after the Presidential election. And yesterday, a friend from the United States in this meeting was telling me that, in his opinion, it could occur before the Presidential election. I'm asking not for an institutional response, but just for personal opinion, or personal opinions. Thanks.

---

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me give a quick answer. A large portion of the transition is taking place. If the big thing of saying yes or no turns out to be no or is delayed, then certain specific aspects of the transition will not happen. But an enormous portion of what has been put in place – you mentioned ICG. For background, that’s the portion of the work related to the names, the numbers, and the protocols in dealing with the IANA function. That’s sort of the front half of the work. The back half was all on the accountability and transparency. All of the last, and a great deal of the first, is either in place or is being put in place as we speak. And only a very small portion is actually dependent, although the political effect would be very large if it were changed.

With respect to watching the electoral process in the US, I can’t tell whether or not you’re in a more advantaged or less advantaged position than I am, living in Washington. But more seriously, the scheduled sequence is that this will take place at the end of September. The certainty or watching of this process, mid-August is the nominal time when it should be clear whether there something is going to erupt or not, although you never know until the last minute. But end of September is a great deal before the elections in November, and we’ll see.

My expectation, and my fond hope, is that the transition takes place at the end of September. We arrive in Hyderabad, and that’s all behind us, and the only focus of attention is, just like

---

World Cup soccer games, some of us will be watching television to see what happened in the election.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're saying it's all entertainment? Sebastien?

STEVE CROCKER: As we say, for selected values of entertainment.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But in addition, we will have to [play] the Work Stream 2. This afternoon, there is a wrap-up session about how this new meeting organization went. And I hope that we will have feedback also from Board members and from staff on that. I think it's important to have the point of view of everybody, to get that on board for future evolution. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have no queue. Tim?

TIM DENTON: Thank you for showing up and speaking to us. You probably will be hearing more about consumer protection, but I don't want to talk about that. I'm relatively new, in my first year in this. I just want to say that whatever's happening in this particular format

---

of this type of conference, I have felt that to be more productive, quieter, and that whatever you're doing is right in relation to this format type of conference. I don't know. I'm not knowledgeable enough to know what exactly has been done, but I feel that the atmosphere –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

TIM DENTON: There we are. Take a compliment while you can.

STEVE CROCKER: Somebody here worked on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We let the community take credit for this.

TIM DENTON: Were specific things done at this type of conference to eliminate a lot of the showbiz around other conferences? What happened?

---

GÖRAN MARBY: [inaudible] shorter.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just I can give you a very short answer. We had a cross-community working group on that issue. And we came with proposal of a new meeting strategy, with Meeting A, Meeting B, Meeting C. We get through A in Marrakesh. We are currently in a B Meeting, named policy meeting. And we will have a C Meeting, a little bit longer meeting, with wrap-up possibility on Friday. And that's come from the work done by a real worldwide cross-community working group, with participation of Board member, I was at that time, with Chris Disspain and with people around this table who participate as At-Large representative, and from other constituency. Then now we didn't participate to the implementation, but the idea, the way it's done, came from you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not quite finished. Göran has postponed his meeting, which was with me. So we can continue with a little bit. Steve and David may well have to leave, and you have our thanks for participating. And don't feel awkward if you have to leave.

---

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, all. And I have a feeling that when I come back tomorrow, for those of you here, it's going to be an even more interesting session for me. I can hardly wait.

ALAN GREENBERG: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, just about the meeting. I do believe that the idea – we are testing this model anyway. And I believe, all of it, that the idea to have cross-community working, it's much more even though productive. But we need to think ahead and try to go more deeply into the conversations. What we have no is someone just make presentations, and they [all] have two, three minutes to talk a little bit. And huge part of the group have no chance, really, to debate the thing.

As we are talking here today, my idea is to have more time for whole discussion around tables. Let's say [moot] stakeholder tables around, where the issues that are in the screen must be discussed really in each table and given more opportunities for people to express their ideas. And in the end, what they get over there, someone from the staff, get the main points. And then the group that is in charge for that committee can get really large

---

feedback from the audience. Just a suggestion to improve the model. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Leon next.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. So we're all friends, yes. So Steve spoke about the timeline for the transition and, of course, the uncertainty that we have on whether it'll actually be fully concluded or not. So what's plan B for the case, should the transition actually be delayed? I mean, I understand that there are parts of the Bylaws that will be implemented regardless of the transition taking place, and that's what Steve just said. Part of the transition has already been implemented. But there is also part of the Bylaws, of the new Bylaws, that are dependable of the transition actually happening. So what will be the future of those Bylaws if this doesn't actually take place?

GÖRAN MARBY: First of all, there's something I would add into my answer, and sorry if it becomes a little bit longer by that. The process in the US is done by people who are appointed by the people. They're elected people. And they are asking questions. And some of them are asking questions because they are concerned and

---

want to find out more. And I think it's very important that we respect an elected parliament.

And my job is to answer those questions without adding views to it. And that's what we are in the process. And I get a lot of letters, which I'm replying to. Personally, maybe I don't agree with some of the assumptions, but it's my job to enlighten them and not have views on that political process. I just want to have that on record, that that's how I see myself.

Second part of it, as Steve said, a part of the plan B is that we have new Bylaws which, whatever happens, are there. And I like them, because, as we talked about, it strengthens our alliance between the community, the Board, and my organization I run. And that's going to be there. So the ones that are dependent on the transition, that's community again. That's something that I will not say, "Okay, we will not do anything now." We have to start a new working group to figure this out.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Which you have to run.

GÖRAN MARBY: And it has to be the community that comes up with that. What worries me is one misunderstanding what people always forget. Internet is run not by ICANN, not by anyone. It is really a



---

partnership, a voluntary system that is built up on the presumption that this small thing is going to go away from you, as government. It's a trust thing. It's checks and balances. And ICANN is one of the partners. The numbering community is another partner. You are a partner. Everybody's a partner.

And if that trust disappears – and we use the word “fragmentation,” which is a strange word, because it actually means that our Internet gets smaller, physically smaller, because the trust disappears. I'm not afraid of any other organization coming in, because no one can tell the numbering community that they're going to do this, or the names community to do something. But I'm afraid of that.

So if the transition doesn't go through, I believe it's going to be bad for US. I think it's going to be bad for everybody uses Internet. So it's essentially important to do it. And we have, together with you and the community, has to figure out how to do it. How do we regain that trust component? I'm not as worried about the Bylaws. I'm worried about the trust component. How did this partnership that we are a part of exist in that world?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Göran has about four more minutes. We have a queue at this point of Holly, Chris, and Olivier. It's obviously closed. I've put

---

the timer down to one minute, but that's not going to be sufficient if Göran leaves while you're speaking. So please.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just to add to what Vanda says, I think that we're on a really good road, in terms of having a policy framework, this framework. It is a little bit difficult for newbies to walk into a room full of people who know all the acronyms, all the whatever, and then contribute. So the next step is figuring out how to make it a lot easier for some of us to understand and to participate.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Thank you for bringing that up. I'm respectful of history, and I'm respectful of how this is brought up. What I cannot understand is that every time we even figure out something that makes sense, we change it. And I'll give an example.

I asked my team, "You're not allowed to say Meeting B anymore," because we invented a name that makes sense, policy forum. It actually makes sense. It's not even an acronym. It actually tells what we do here. And then we go around and call it Meeting B. I will let you in on a secret. Will it be a secret if I say it on record?

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Yeah.

GÖRAN MARBY:                    Okay, good. When I was in Hyderabad, I went to a meeting, and everybody was talking about Meeting B. So I turned to [Cassie] and asked, “Which room is Meeting B?”

Outreach is important, to get more people into this. It’s extremely important to have everybody’s views, regardless of where they come from, regardless of language, to be able to make their point. It’s the point of the multistakeholder model. And we are experts on making sure that it’s very hard to [come in]. I don’t know all the acronyms. I think the only one who really knows them all is Steve. We have to figure out a way of talking so that it makes sense. I know there are technical things, and I’m asking my team to help me, to instead of talking about acronyms, we actually say all the full names. It’s complicated to say all the full names. Sometimes when we put the whole thing up, people don’t know what it is because they only know the acronym.

We have to figure out a new language, not because of the transition, because Internet now has 3.2 billion users. That was yesterday. I don’t know how many it is today. And we are helping them to get with our partners, and we have to figure out a way of communicating this so we don’t close this to an exclusive club.

---

And I really would like to support you and help you in that process. I have absolutely no clue, apart from the fact I'm refraining from using acronyms as much as I can, probably because I don't know what they mean anyway, so. Thank you. Thank you for bringing that up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Chris has ceded his position to Olivier. I know what Olivier is going to say, and I will say it to you when we talk later. Thank you for joining us. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: The psychic, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have this thing called Skype. We'll tell you about it later. Thank you very much for giving us so much time. We appreciate it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Now that the CEO has left...

GÖRAN MARBY: If he says something, please let me know.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Two things I wanted to say. One, Leon, on your point, speaking as a lawyer – and I know you’ll understand this – if the actual thing doesn’t happen, what we will have to do, and this is a legal task, is to go through the Bylaws and take out the interdependencies, right? I mean, there’s still going to be a US contract. So there’s a heap of stuff that’s in there that doesn’t work. It doesn’t work, for now. So that is a significant amount of work that needs to be done, but it’s legal work, and that needs to get done by the lawyers.

The second thing I wanted to talk about was the meeting strategy. And I just wanted to ask you a question. You won’t be surprised to hear that the Board is obviously collecting feedback and wants to know. So I’ve had a couple of pieces of negative feedback, the first one of which is, “Where’s my t-shirt?” which I thought was fascinating, absolutely fascinating. And the backpack, yeah, and the backpack. Exactly.

But I want to ask a question to have you think about. We’ve got a lot of feedback from people saying it’s great because we’ve actually made the meeting longer, even though it’s shorter, because there is more time and all that. Think about whether or not we could – and this would be another step in some time, once this is bedded down. But have a think about the possibility of a Meeting A without the opening stuff, but with a public forum. So you get two public forums a year, but you only get one

---

bells-and-whistles opening thingy with people striding about on the stage. It's just a thought. Have a think about it. But please do.

And I know I don't need to say this, but please do provide us with feedback on this and how you think it's gone. And, yes, Riverdance every time, Holly. Okay, thanks. That was it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can comment on that right now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Of course you can.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would love it. The opening session has a number of benefits. A significant number of people get to sleep in. We occasionally have something like Riverdance, which is worthy. We could have it some other time. To be honest, although it gives an opportunity for local officials to strut, it doesn't add an awful lot to the meeting, in most times. There's been a rare occasion when some public official says something that actually is worthy of note, but there are very few of those.

Tijani would like to speak.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Chris, you are a member of the working group that [started] this new strategy. And I understood from what you said that you are trying to change Meeting A even before – what you said? Think about –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm asking you to think about that, because the feedback that we've had is much the same that Alan has just said, is we don't necessarily need to have the opening ceremony. I'm not suggesting making any changes at all. I'm saying, this is an experiment. This year is an experiment. And then when we come to Meeting A next year, which is in Copenhagen, having had a full year, we'll all be able to sit down and talk about it. And I imagine we'll put it on the agenda. And it's just a thought, that's all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: My response was to have at least one full cycle to think and to try to think about other things. We have to try all the cycle and then...

ALAN GREENBERG: He was talking about a Meeting A, and we have gone through that part of the cycle though. So he's... I personally strongly support the concept of Board members thinking and the

---

concept of them asking us what we think. So I like that. It may even happen again one day.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'll think about that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else? We have a captive audience here, a surprise captive audience. We do have a part of the agenda that we haven't done that we probably should get to sometime, but it's only reports and things like that. And we can do that electronically if necessary. It's good discussion. Anyone else?

Nobody? Okay. Maybe we can afford a sign for Holly? No? No? Okay, no sign for Holly.

Holly, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Give her a piece of holly. She could wave that about.

HOLLY RAICHE: It kind of drills down to what I was talking about with Vanda. She and I sat through the subsequent procedures on New gTLDs. It was... I don't know, I'm [time poor]. So is Vanda. You feel as if the train is kind of almost steaming out of the station. You feel a



---

sense of, can it possibly stop? And if so, how do you do it, and how does one of you do it, or two of you do it, or ever five of you do it? I was reassured by what was said today, which is a decision hasn't been made. I don't know the possibility, or sometimes I despair of the possibility, of doing anything other than kind of waving at the train and saying, "It's a pity." So I don't know. Any response?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I can do it. Alan, is that okay?

Thanks, Alan. Holly, yes, speaking personally, I was at the GDD summit in Amsterdam. It was a very interesting morning on the first morning, because the first hour or so was spent with the registries and registrars, discussing the fact the New gTLDs haven't exactly been a raging success and that there's not that much money being made. And then the second hour was spend discussing the fact that we need more of them, which was slightly weird.

But the reality for me is that there are two things that need to happen. The first thing that needs to happen is that there are some reviews that we're just doing, but there are some that we've committed to get done before we move forward. So that's clear, and everyone understands that.

---

The second thing that needs to happen is that we've written to the GNSO and said, "Here are all the gaps that we've found that you called implementation, because you couldn't agree. And we ended up having to deal with them as policy to fix them. And we never want to do that again, so please, for any subsequent round, fill in these gaps." And that's what the subsequent procedures PDP is about.

That has to happen before we can move forward. And unless the GNSO, with all the input from the other people they need – ALAC, GAC, etc. – unless they can reach consensus, my personal view is I will not accept proceeding to the next level of gTLDs unless we're comfortable that the gaps have been filled.

Now, will there be other gaps? Of course there will, because stuff will happen that we have no idea about, and then we'll have to fill them. But the stuff that we know about has to be dealt with. Singles and plurals and all sorts of other bits and pieces, appeals mechanisms for independent panels, all of that stuff has to be dealt with. And until it is, we can't proceed. So I said to them, "Instead of telling us to speed up and speed up our reviews, get to work."

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a queue of, I believe, only Vanda and Seun. And the list, we are going to have to cut – and Kaili. We are going to have to cut it off at that point.

I will report an interesting dialogue from a GNSO meeting yesterday or two days ago. There was someone who was commenting that it's fine to have the GAC participating, but then they come back and want more and more. And at some point, we, being the GNSO, have to just say, "No, too much, too late." And I pointed out that this was effectively a poker game, that we're staring each other down but one of the players at the table is wearing a mask. That's the Board. Because ultimately, we don't know whether the Board is going to listen to the GAC or not. And if the argument the GAC makes – no, no. No, covering the eyes. The eyes are the critical thing in poker. If the Board is ultimately going to accept the GAC's advice, then it's going to go back to the GNSO again, and it's going to delay things a lot. So you might as well incorporate at the beginning. But it is a poker game, and let's admit it.

We have Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. I'd like to raise something very different about the GNSO that I have opportunity to talk with Steve. It was the reality that we are seeing, in developing areas, about the New gTLDs that

---

may demand different kind of process. And this will be a very difficult change, because we are used to provide a general process and equal for everyone. And all we said, all we made for those round of New gTLDs are not working for the vendors. And it's leaving users issues to participate with no chance to do so. So it's something that of course is not for discussion here, but where I am heading here is that we need to think that probably general solutions will not work for this round, and will not work for the next round.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Does anyone want to respond?

No? Thank you. We have Seun next.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you very much. I just want to speak about something entirely different from gTLD. I understand that in the past there was a request for two Board members from At-Large, and one was approved. Considering that post-implementation of the CCWG proposals and post-NTIA as well, it could be said that some part of the proposals will actually put some representative expectations on the members of the Board, even though I recognize that the Board is supposed to act as one. So my question to Board members is, do you personally think it's good

---

to bring up that request again? Is that something that we could pursue at this time? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll let Chris respond. That's a question I'd never ask, for fear of having the answer no. But please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, if you can guarantee we get two Rinalias, then there'd be absolutely no problem. I can't answer yes or no, but I can tell you that you can certainly ask. And if the ALAC wants to come and say, "We think the time has come for us to have two Board members," then I personally don't have an issue. I don't see why there would be an issue with that. I can't, for the life of me, remember why you ended up with one. Does somebody have a longer memory than me? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. There were some Board members that demanded – said zero was the only possible answer, and some who said two. You averaged it.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think it would be fair to say that – the best way for me to put it would be we’ve moved on a long way since then. So you guys decide, and we’ll go from there.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I would be delighted to have a second At-Large-selected director in the Board, actually, because the workload is quite immense and intense.

On the question of whether or not you can raise it, you can certainly raise it with your peer community. There is also another venue right now, which is the At-Large Review. If it were to come up as a review recommendation, that would go straight to the Board for implementation, consideration, and decision. So that’s another path. And then it would of course be up for public comment, etc., and you would get community feedback on that. Nothing is stopping you from initiating it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unsurprisingly, that discussion has been had.

Kaili withdrew and then put it back up again. And we have Sebastian, and then we’ll close the queue.

---

KAILI KAN: In lieu of just the discussion, may I formally propose that ALAC consider submitting that request to the Board? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: At some future meeting of the ALAC, you could suggest that. Our agenda is a bit full at this point.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I agree with Rinalia that a second Board member coming from our community will be a good thing. I agree with Kaili Kan that we need to do it now. I will be somewhat reluctant to see that coming out from the review. We know what's happened with the previous proposal from the reviewer. And I think we need to concentrate on this review to the edge of this organization. And if we spend too much time to the core, we will not get the edge. And that's what we need to concentrate. Then I hope that the suggestion of Kaili will be following one of our next meeting in ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. For the record, both the mandate of the reviewer and the instructions and requests they have gotten at all levels says the focus will be on the edge. There's absolutely no question.

---

That doesn't mean they don't make a random recommendation in some other area as well, but there's no question the focus is on the edge.

Any further comments?

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Can I [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, ma'am.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: So as a new Board member and having kind of observed the Board work, I just point out to the people who are – whether or not –

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. For the recording and the translation, you must give your name.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: I'm sorry, I'm still not used to it. I apologize. So this question of how many Board members there are, I think if you have one Board member like Rinalia, who works hard and who's well prepared and whose voice is heard, that'll be much more impact



---

than if you have two who don't have that. So I think the quality is the key thing. By all means, go for quantity, but quality is really the thing that makes the difference. Plus, if you have two and they fundamentally disagree on everything, that's also something to look out for.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would never happen.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: So I'd just like to say that. And I'm sorry if that embarrasses you, Rinalia. But this is the way you guys have done a great job, so.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You mean that we have to replace Rinalia by two persons?

ALAN GREENBERG: A clone was suggested along the way, but I don't think we're going to go in that direction.

I thank you. Our Board members are welcome to stay. We do have a few minutes of other things to do.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You are welcome.

All right, to recap where we are, we have a session ending at – 30 minutes. The schedule called for 30 minutes of reports from liaisons, 30 minutes of reports from RALOs, 15 minutes of review of action items. So we have 30 minutes for what was scheduled as an hour and a quarter. I don't think that will really be a problem. I think we can pretty well go on with that. Just everyone has to be brief. And I think we're just fine.

So first thing is report from liaisons. Are there any liaisons who wish to issue or give a report?

MAUREEN HILLIARD:

For ccNSO report, can I give mine as a written report later?  
Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I think it's noted, Maureen. And obviously, you'll update your wiki, which is regularly and continuously updated anyway. I used to do that job.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Having been asked to listen to our senior staff member for a while, I missed your report.

---

MAUREEN HILLIARD: I was taking my lead from our leader.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We next call upon Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Thank you, Olivier, for your report. No, Olivier did give his apologies. He had to be at a GNSO meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Wolf is here.

WOLF LUDWIG: I am here too, if I'm allowed.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're here as the GNSO liaison?

WOLF LUDWIG: As the EURALO Secretariat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, we will get to the RALOs in a moment.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: But have a seat, please. You can become Rinalia.

WOLF LUDWIG: Oh. This is too much of an honor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, you're not Rinalia.

Julie is also not here, and she also announced ahead of time that she would provide a report through other means.

I think we're now, unless I've forgotten a liaison...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The GAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The GAC is a little fresh to be here, but...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, where's Yrjö?

ALAN GREENBERG: I do not believe he is here. And I will confirm that I gave him complete instructions that if there's a GAC meeting in session,

---

that's where his priorities are. We will work around him. That's the same instructions I give to the other AC/SO liaisons.

Having no more liaisons, we will go on to RALO reports. No, we have another –

JIMMY SCHULZ:

Sorry, but I do have a different view. Their priority should be to be here and to report, because we don't have any – I think liaisons, for that 15 minutes, could be here to report, because that's why we have these liaisons.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Our practice has been – and it could change, but our practice has been that we are flexible with when the – I don't know why this isn't working. We are flexible with when our liaisons can give their reports and, if necessary, will give them electronically, although we prefer in person at some other time, in that they are very often in important wrap-up meetings running in parallel with us. And to miss those may well be missing an opportunity that we don't want them to miss. That certainly has been the instructions that we have given to liaisons over the eight years that I've been around. Or ten years, I'm sorry. The group could change that, should we wish.

I have a request from Cheryl and then Ariel.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. And I've had the honor of serving in the liaison role of two of the what is now three positions. And it's at these face-to-face meetings that it is slightly different with our expectations for reporting from the liaisons, only because of the parallel work that is going on and, quite often, because the closing of business and outcomes from the group we are liaising with is not completed at the time of our meeting. That said, all that means is that, at worse, we have a two- to three-week delay in a full and formal report, because your liaisons report to you at every monthly meeting.

More importantly, within the next 24-36 hours, the liaison reporting wiki page will be updated with the "what's happened to the end of this week," because that's the type of commitment they've made to you, to make sure they keep you up to date. And ultimately, they use effective back channels, Skyping, and contact staff with a phone call if needed, if something time critical is happening that you need to know about. And you've seen that happen on e-mail lists and, indeed, at these meetings before. So I'm less fearful about not having them here for 15 minutes at these face-to-face meetings.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: And just for the record, Cheryl, four liaisons now, not three. And also, Cheryl did preside as the Chair for three of those years. So she's seen it from both sides.

Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Murray McKercher, a remote participant, just reported that .mobi had no meetings in the last quarter, and he will update the wiki as required.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. RALOs?

Wolf, would you like to go first?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, if you like. Well, since Marrakesh, we had to select a new ALAC member for the succession of Sandra, who is fortunately not leaving us. But she didn't want to continue in her ALAC position for another term. Therefore, we had to look around for a replacement. And fortunately, Sandra will stay on as our next delegate to the NomCom, and she's already approved.

At this opportunity, I would like to thank Sandra over the six years since you were seated in Colombia at the time, in [inaudible]. And in my opinion, you did a marvelous job. You

---

brought the ICANN Academy project, which is now Leadership Program, on the tracks. And you developed it in an inclusive way, and outside ALAC to a success program, in my opinion. And I think EURALO, we owe you much gratitude for your work.

Okay, so we had to select a new ALAC member. And it was a difficult process to contact, identify, find people. And one thing was we did not want always to ask the same people, so we contacted young people, to coach them and to bring them in. And finally, we found two candidates. One candidate, the older of you may remember, which is Veronica Cretu. And then we had an incoming candidate, which is Bastiaan, here at the table. It was a tough selection, so we had to do, of course, a voting. And according to the result, you always have to consider gender and regional balance criteria. And this was, in my opinion, an important element that Veronica was chosen, and she will be seated in Hyderabad. But I am pleased to have now, as a new active member, Bastiaan, on board.

Well, then we had to prepare our General Assembly, which we conducted on Tuesday. We had to write an annual report, which is on our workspace. EURALO was again heavily involved in the last EuroDIG in June in Brussels. And it was another highlight, in my opinion, in Brussels, and it was a 9<sup>th</sup> edition. And next year, we will have our 10<sup>th</sup> EuroDIG in Estonia, just one hour here, what will be our next challenge. And this year, a lot of EURALO



---

members there. Olivier, as well, was closely, as the subject matter expert, involved in organizing and conducting EuroDIG.

I think that's all for the moment. The rest of the regularities you can find in our monthly report. If you have any questions, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you, Alan. As you all know, my main activities over the past few months were very intense, because I remind you that our ALS was in charge of the Marrakesh meeting, which was a great success, especially as far as African participation is concerned, because we ended up with a record, in terms of African participation. We had about 1,000 people from the African continent, and it is something that we are very proud of. To have that many of them present is wonderful. The Moroccan government helped us tremendously with the visa issues. As you know, participants in our region are not well represented, so this was a good thing.

We also used the opportunity of that meeting as a RALO to organize capacity-building sessions. And thanks to the help of the staff and ICANN, we were able bring five NGOs of the area, of North Africa, to the meeting. Those sessions took place between

---

8:00 and 9:00 in the morning. I don't want to add much more, but if you need more information on that, don't hesitate to ask.

At the level of universities, because I work at the university myself, I was able to bring students from [Robert] in order to also train them. And with the help of the Marrakesh University, not too far from the meeting venue, we set up an experiment. And I would like to invite you to repeat that experiment, especially if the meeting takes place in Asia or in Africa, or even in Europe. Why not?

And then in April, there were elections for the NomCom position for AFRALO. And Kissoondoyal was elected again for one year. And my friend, Tijani Ben Jemaa, was also asked to stay, with a unanimous vote. And for the Secretary General, we actually had three candidates. That was the first time that happened. And so we had to do an election: Beran, Michel Tchonang, and Sarah. And Sarah, I don't know if she's here, but she was elected as General Secretary for AFRALO.

She is a Fellow. That is true. And she young, and she is a woman. So that is wonderful for us. So I do hope that we keep getting young people, because at one point or another, us old people need to leave. Correct? And I am not pointing any fingers here. As you know, it's Tijani and myself. We are the old people within AFRALO.

---

As far as the work that we did, as you know, we are very active and involved, and we were the only RALO that provided comments over the past two years on hot topics. That is, accountability and the transition. And I would like to thank Tijani, Mohamed, and Seun because they did a tremendous amount of work. They were involved in teleconferences in the middle of the night. And thanks to their work, I think that we provided four comments within the public consultation process. And I don't know if it was four or five. Tijani, tell me if I'm wrong, but four or five statements were provided – five, okay – within our African AFRALO meeting. The last one was yesterday.

And I would like to end very quickly and say that we launched a small office, but it is very important. It is the first one in Africa. And I was very pleased to do this with Pierre and Sarah. Just to finish up, we also gave our positive opinion on two new ALSes, one in Chad and one in Mauritania. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

[inaudible] issues anyone wants to raise for either EURALO or AFRALO? We are very short of time, and we cannot extend because of interpretation.

Tijani, quickly.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to add that AFRALO participated actively in the Africa Internet Summit in Gabrone.

ALAN GREENBERG: APRALO?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Chair. I will try to be brief. Actually, in May, APRALO run the new election. And unlike all previous years, we decided this time not run just consensus call, but to do an election. And there was obvious support from ALSes. And we received the current members of those who were eligible to be reelected got real support from ALSes. So I just would like to congratulate that all of us will stay for another term.

And some highlights of during this year, we really expanded our partnership with our local I-stars, like APNIC, APTLD, .asia. And we started to move to another level of getting real support from them as well. So they supported a couple of members of APRALO to participate in different regional activities, like APRICOT. And also we have now Maureen Hilliard to be a part of board member .asia. And we are looking forward to the next meeting, because APTLD next meeting, Maureen will be co-Chair of that meeting. So there will be more support coming from them.

---

During this period, the partnership between APAC Hub and APRALO was moved to another level. We started to conduct capacity building on two-month basis. And also now, all those webinars, there is two ones with captioning. And we started also to produce, with the support of Maureen, e-books based on those. And they are all available in our old transcripts, old records. Our e-books are available. So we'll continue using that experience.

And we finalized probably the end of the fiscal year with the highlight of visit of APRALO, four members of APRALO leadership, to China to participate in China Internet Conference. And we were invited by the new ALS, Internet Society of China, to do the presentation there during the workshops and to come up with the closing remarks during the closing ceremony. So this was a real unique experience for APRALO, and I hope that this will bring another floor for involvement of ALSes. So we have another kind of – I am not going to provide some specifics here because APRALO is coming up with the report of our visit. And we will be sending this soon, and we will post this in our APRALO monthly space, as usual. And we just finalized this year here with the preparation of new strategy for fiscal year '17 and looking forward to the implementation of it. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Siranush. Any quick comments? Questions?

Seeing none, we have LACRALO.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I apologize, but I'm going to talk in my native language, which is Spanish.

Okay. Thank you very much. I intent to present the report of LACRALO events in general terms. Everything that happened since our last face-to-face meeting in Marrakesh, it's been a great time because the Secretary, Maritza Aguero, she's present here, has taken office. And this has been a great opportunity for the region, because she brought new ideas. A region that had no contribution from that region, she comes from Peru, very good ideas.

And it was the start of my office was a very difficult time in our region. As you know, we are facing some issues in our region. And in that respect, I want to thank those present here, because they have helped us to start an ideation to work out what has happened with the Latin American and Caribbean conflicts. So I make this recognition public. The initial results will be public in the next two weeks. We are expecting the independent third-party mediators will delivery to us the roadmap for our work in the next few months. So that is the general work we've done.

---

We've been much focused on that. So thank you again for the support given.

We're also very pleased that despite the special situation we're going through, in our monthly meetings – whoops. Yes, I'm going to include that in my list, Vanda. Thank you very much. We've increased the number of ALSes. I don't know if it's 26 or 27. Maritza, please help me if it's 26 or 27. We've reached record participation in teleconferences, out of 26 or 28 ALSes participate. We've invited also others from the region and outside the region to give training to our members. And we've also worked a lot on the reports, on the LAC reports, so that we can become truly aware of what is going on.

We are also working, as Vanda has reminded me, on the mitigation plans. As you very well know, as the Panama and Puerto Rico meetings have been cancelled, we've implemented mitigation efforts so that the region was not prejudiced. This plan is very good. We're very happy about them. And it coincides with the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of LACRALO. In that respect, we've organized a preparatory meeting, the first one in Uruguay, August 31<sup>st</sup>. We're going to participate in [LACSYS] and the IGF in San Jose, Costa Rica, and the LAC DNS Forum in Santo Domingo, the LACNOG, again in Costa Rica. And we're going to focus most of our efforts in the Guadalajara IGF, to be held in December. That's when the official 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of LACRALO will be celebrated.

---

Very briefly, a new ALAC member was elected, who is Alberto Soto, who will take office in the next meeting. And we've also adopted [Chris Salguero] for the NomCom. And that's all, and I'm open to questions if there's any. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone?

Then we go on to NARALO.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Good afternoon. My report is going to be fairly quick and short. A lot of our energy right now, we're focused on the preplanning of our General Assembly, which we're planning for April 2017. We're collating it with our RAR, [ERIN], which will be in New Orleans. This is all pending budget finalization. But sharing with the community, we're documenting all the processes, and we're using Trello, our project-management tool, in terms of the outreach and planning strategy for the event. And we'll be appealing to the community for the topics that we'll be doing, including lightning talks, at the event.

Another outstanding issue that we're working on is our mail card versus a brochure. A mail card is similar to what Judith has, with the captioning. A smaller card, much more punchy type of



---

messaging, much more marketing targeted material, with a QR code. And she should share some of those cards, if she has them.

One of the other new things we implemented successfully, which we'll share with the community as well, using Constant Contact, is our NARALO newsletter. It's edited by Eduardo Diaz, very much focused on social media, harmonized with Facebook and Twitter. Lots and lots of pictures. And we tried to summarize our activities to the rest of the community, especially since our community can't be here.

We also had an election. And myself and Judith and Eduardo continue on. And the election results is Alan Greenberg for ALAC representative, and Garth remains as our other NARALO rep.

Tribal Ambassadorship is a new pilot project, which we proposed from Loris Taylor, which we will be seeing two individuals going to Hyderabad.

Our strategic plan for CROPP was submitted and approved, which aligns with what we're doing in 2017. Five of us will be at the IGF USA, of which only two will be funded by CROPP.

New ALSes, the ISOC North Carolina is coming on board now. They were recruited through the SSIG event in Washington. We spent a lot of our time outreaching to existing ALSes and actually getting them engaged. And we had roughly, I think, 22.6

---

average attendees to our calls. Considering our size of our RALO, that's a very high percentage of people on our calls.

Outstanding issues, like all of you, is always active recruitment of new members. Definitely be more active in submitting comments on policies, and recruiting two new volunteers for the new pilot on policy development.

Okay, and, Judith, you had a comment? Yeah, that's the card, yeah. All right. I can't hear you, Judith. All right. She is saying, with the card, that the captioning pilot has been extended for a second year. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any comments? Questions?

Thank you very much. Review of action items? Review of action items. All right. I just like some acknowledgement of what's going on. I couldn't see anybody.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Can I apologize? I need to run to my next meeting, and I just want to say it's been a real privilege joining in and being able to be here. And I'm leaving a stash of business cards. I should be pretty easy to reach, because I'm on Facebook and Twitter, and

---

whatever. But anybody who wants to do it old style, I'm leaving them here with Alan. And I really look forward to being in touch.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So we had them up on the right screen, and we're about to put them into the AC chats. Apologies for the delay.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello. I am going to read the At-Large Leadership Work Session 1, Monday, 27. Introduction to ITEMS. Siranush Vardanyan, from APRALO, offered to meet with the ITEMS team informally for a brainstorming session. Aziz Hilali from AFRALO offered to meet informally with the ITEMS team members if they wish to do so. Dual membership discussion, Alan Greenberg requested a volunteer for a white paper on dual membership issue. Tijani Ben Jemaa volunteered to draft the paper.

Next. At-Large Leadership. I am skipping all of the RALOs and other working groups, so we're going directly to the – you want the regional leadership meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: Could I interrupt for a moment? The sound was cutting out for a while. Could you read the last ones again? I heard my name mentioned, but I don't know what it was I was mentioned for.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

The dual membership discussion. Alan Greenberg requested a volunteer for a white paper on dual membership issue. Tijani volunteered to draft the paper. ALT GAC, At-Large staff to contact Sally Costerton to get information on plans for the public interest within ICANN. The GAC Secretariat will draft a summary of the issues discussed at this meeting, to be sent to the Board and At-Large.

Next one would be... Where is it? At-Large Fiscal Year '17 Special Request Review. Rob Hoggarth, Heidi Ullrich to organize a call with Rob Hoggarth and the FBC in July to discuss fiscal year '17 request.

Which one? Skip all of this? No, there's... At-Large review working party? No. NARALO. That's it. That's it until today, the last one.

At-Large Leadership Work Session, address the implementation team to review the draft final address to recommendation report, followed by a review by the ALAC before sending them to the ICANN executive team. Following incorporation of comments, the final report is to be present to the Board at ICANN 56 – 57. And the other action items, you can review. And they are all meetings that took place here. They are different working groups and RALO meetings. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Plus out of the last meeting, staff to arrange a briefing on DNSSEC key rollover with David Conrad. Any further comments, questions, suggestions, whatever, before we wrap for lunch?

Sorry, is someone – sorry, Seun has his hand up. Go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Just a quick one. I just breezed through the agenda, and I didn't see any item for AOB. So when do we have that?

ALAN GREENBERG: AOB is any other business. It has not been our practice to have an AOB item on these items, because we regularly call for suggestions of what we should be talking about. If you have an item that needs to be added, please see me immediately and we'll see if we can add it. We're rather tight for time at the moment.

We reconvene in one hour – 55 minutes. Can we leave your stuff here? I would not suggest so. Reconvene in 55 minutes. Thank you, all. Thank the technical staff and interpreters. And we will start again shortly.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**