
HELSINKI – At-Large Leadership Work Session
Thursday, June 30, 2016 – 09:15 to 10:30 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning. ICANN 56, June 30th. This is the At-Large Leadership Work Session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ladies and gentlemen, we are one minute past starting time. We have a very tight agenda today. For those in the room, please have a seat. We will start in one minute.

Thank you all very much for being here. The first session, this is the ALAC Working Session Number 7. The first item on the agenda is Rinalia, the item.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I'm the topic of discussion?

ALAN GREENBERG: You are the topic of the discussion. And you're also the discussee.

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.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So I'm discussing myself, basically.

ALAN GREENBERG: As you wish. As I was about to say, the topics that we have listed on the agenda are hot issues with the ICANN Board. That is, Rinalia telling us what's going on and what she needs input on. And we have a brief presentation on ATLAS II status, recommendations, implementation. There is a stakeholder journey item which I don't remember adding to the agenda but seems to be there. And anything else Rinalia has. And, more important, anything else you have.

Now that being said, we are now six or seven minutes late into the agenda. The next session, next part of this agenda, is the continuation of the Rules of Procedure which are a time-critical issue so we're going to keep to the clock. We won't restrict Rinalia from using the full 30 minutes. But on the other hand, if it gets boring, then we may cut it off. But I don't think it's going to get boring.

Rinalia, it's all yours. You can use it as you wish regardless of the items on the agenda with the exception of the five-minute presentation on ATLAS II. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. Good morning, ALAC and At-Large leadership. It's a pleasure to be here and I've looked forward to this interaction with you. I have a few items on my list that I would like to raise to your attention. Some of them I just want to put on your agenda as something that is worthy of end user attention. Some of them are just topics that I would like to get feedback from you to inform my position on the Board. And other issues are basically possibly things that you want to talk to me about.

So the first item that I would like to raise to your attention is something call the Key Signing Key rollover. Now, I know that it is technical, but it is actually quite important, especially for end users. So to just simplify it – and I apologize to the technical people in the group – what's happening is that the Root Zone Key Signing Key is scheduled to be rolled over, and the target date is March 2018. That's the completion date. It's actually a process that will span multiple years.

And the reason that you need to have it on your agenda is that as they roll over the key, the technical community knows for sure there will be breakage in the Internet. That means that Internet users who are behind specific resolvers that have not updated their password, as they say, to the Root Zone Trust Anchor, you will not get access to certain domains. That means your DNS lookups will fail.

And so the question that you have to consider is, what is your role in informing the end user community? Is there something that you can do to support the ICANN outreach efforts? And my suggestion for you on this topic is to ask David Conrad and his team to come and brief you on what the issues are and whether he needs your help, and you, yourself, decide what you want to do with the issue. So that's just me flagging a topic. We don't need to discuss it, yeah?

ALAN GREENBERG: Rinalia, what timeframe?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: What do you mean, what timeframe, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: When is this likely to be happening?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: It's actually happening now. They are discussing it right now. The completion is in March 2018 but they are starting the prep process and communication. There is a communications plan but you might want to be part of that plan. Is that okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep, thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. So the next topic is – and I know you’re really interested in this – is the New gTLD program, next round. And yeah. And I don’t know if you looked at my mail this morning. I sent you a mail about the decisions or resolutions from the ICANN Board meeting. And there is a topic on New gTLD program, next round resolutions, and it says, “Item removed from agenda”. And that is actually an outcome of Board deliberation before the ICANN meeting week started, where they listened to the views from various communities and I channeled your input. And the Board also basically asked staff for clear information on what is involved in terms of preparing for the next round, what has been completed, what hasn’t been completed, what’s next, and how much time does it need to get to the end of it.

And we all agreed, and I also stated this very clearly, the timing is not right for a Board resolution on this topic right now because the sense of the community is that the review, all the reviews, must be completed and that we need to have all the improvements and lessons learned from the current round to be embedded into the next round before we can proceed.

So I have, do you want...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm quite happy to have you manage the queue unless it gets overwhelming.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. Burning question. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: The meeting is today of the subsequent procedures on New gTLDs. Somebody's got to tell them that they're not going ahead because of they're planning. And I sat there while they're planning. We're just dealing, they're dealing with issues but the language that was used yesterday in the subsequent procedures is, "Well, we're going to call this rounds moving on to just continuous allocation." The language does not reflect what the Board decision is, at least what I heard yesterday. Okay?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So what's been made clear to me in the discussions among the Board and staff clarification is that the policy is we are committed to next round. So unless the PDP that's ongoing right now on subsequent rounds says we should not have a next round...

ALAN GREENBERG: When you say we're committed to next round, we're committed to issuing more New gTLDs or doing it in the form of a round?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Doing it in the form of a round. Yes. So the policy is we should be having rounds of TLDs being launched. So if anyone wants to stop that, it has to come up from the PDP process and you need to have community consensus. That's all there is. Kaili? And I see Garth.

KAILI KAN: Thank you, Rinalia. But that means that our ccTLD has no voice in that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Well, Alan, who is the policy expert here, says no. So you could potentially get ccTLD to participate in the GNSO PDP process.

KAILI KAN: So why am I still going there? There is no voice. It doesn't matter.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's be clear. There is an AOC Review going on. The Board is bound to consider the output. There is a PDP going on. The

Board is bound to consider the output. It has been suggested that the two groups actually talk to each other, and there are liaisons between the two. If they end up going in different paths, the Board will have to resolve it or bounce it back one way or another. If they end up making comparable recommendations, then so be it. That's fine.

But they are two independent processes. It may make no sense to have done it that way, but the GNSO chose to start their process before the ccTLD review stopped. They were allowed to do that. That is within their domain. We may consider that a rational decision or an irrational decision but it is the decision that was made. And both processes will ultimately go to the Board to the extent that they end up being coordinated and say similar things, so much the better.

KAILI KAN:

But just a current analysis or explanation that PDP has a voice to be heard and taken seriously by the Board. But the ccTLD is not.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. Rinalia did not say that. I did not say that.

KAILI KAN: Oh. So maybe I misunderstood. Thank you very much. So I will still go there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Kaili, it's very important that you're continuing to participate in the CCT review. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Does the review include, one, whether or not Internet users and consumers know about this or want it? Two, will it show who is the biggest beneficiary of the New gTLD program?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Can I ask Kaili to answer that question, since he's on the team?

KAILI KAN: Sorry, I was distracted. Can you repeat the question again?

GARTH BRUEN: Yes. So there were two questions. The two questions were, will these reviews show us whether or not Internet users and

consumers know and care about the New gTLD program and will it show us who is the biggest financial beneficiary of the New gTLD program?

KAILI KAN: My current understanding, the study is not focused on the two issues that you raised. However, just my personal intention is to, indeed, to go to that direction. Whether it will be adopted by the Review Team, I don't know but I'll try. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Just a note before we go to you, Holly. What was very useful to the Board is actually to have a common understanding of what's going on right now and what are the rules. And I think it may be helpful for the ALAC as a whole to get that kind of briefing as well because otherwise we're always going to ask questions where one side of the room knows and the other side of the room does not and then we cannot progress forward. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I have a lot of reading to do and I was not in the first couple of meetings on the subsequent procedures. But looking from yesterday's meeting, they've got sort of five work streams I've got to get my head around.

Garth, I don't think any one of them actually considered about end user interest or anything like that. It's much more a focus on proceeding in all of the issues and addressing all of the issues that came up. Some of it looks as if they are actually taking on board some of the complaints we have raised or the issues we've raised, the new guidebook, the participation of developing countries, the money involved, those sorts of things. But I didn't actually see a kind of [aim], what are we looking for.

So Garth, to answer your question from the PDP, I haven't had a look but I will and will be able to answer that question better.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: And in your view, Holly, do we need more end user participation in the working group? Please use your microphone.

HOLLY RAICHE: There are five different work streams. I can only be in one place at one time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: I know. This is something that is very important to all of us, so any and all people who are interested in it, really, your support will be really welcome. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Regarding the CCT review, there are two work streams within it. There's essentially a competition one and a consumer issue one. Kaili is on the competition side. Carlton is our representative on the other side. If we have concerns, we should be talking to him. We should set up a teleconference with him. With both, of course, but certainly not without the other representative. That's number one.

Number two, on the PDP, I can't remember a meeting where we talked about policy where I didn't say we need more participation in that one because coming in afterwards and complaining is not going to do it. Sadly, this process is not just starting. The PDP started, but the PDP's essential list of topics was generated by another group in another process which we did participate in. And if we didn't put the right items on the list, there's no one to blame but the people in this room and their predecessors. Getting new items on the agenda may be difficult

at this point. That doesn't mean we shouldn't try. But they're working under a charter which was driven by a process that's been going on for nigh on something well over a year and a half or so at this point, maybe longer. So I can only say once more and clearly, if we don't get in now, complaining later that they didn't think of something is going to be an interesting argument. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Just about the super segue into procedures. I'm [in it] also. The issue of the work is just organizing now the work. And they will really divide in five groups. And like we talked yesterday with Holly, we need people. Each one of us should be inside each group. This is the best way to coordinate our position in those groups because if everybody goes to one group, you never know what happens in the others that is not convenient for the users. So that's the general idea. We talked yesterday to make it happen that each one of us, if there is no other, we push someone. Okay? That's the idea. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Vanda. Olivier and then Garth.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Rinalia. One of the concerns that I've had looking at how ICANN works over the years is that often you have a process that starts and then it becomes a bit of a runaway train. It's the sort of thing that you cannot stop and it just keeps on accelerating because some people keep on pressing the acceleration.

The start of the PDP coinciding, I guess, with the CCT Review that hasn't finished yet was something which was discussed a lot in the GNSO Council and there were, of course, the two points of view being mentioned. And I, on behalf of the ALAC, as GNSO liaison to the ALAC, did press on with the fact that we wanted the ccTRT work to be concluded and taken into account by the PDP on subsequent procedures. We were told that while there was a huge opposition to waiting until the ccTRT was complete with its work before even starting on the PDP.

And the concern that I have, I guess, is that the PDP is trying to push so hard because, of course, there's a commercial implication to it and there are some people who basically wish to cash in on the next round. It's quite obvious. And at the end of the day, ICANN has to look out for the public interest. I think it has to weigh in between the public interest on one side and the push from those people.

And I have absolute concerns that the Global Domains Division, the GDD, which seems to have quite a significant influence in ICANN appears to be non-neutral in this matter. And I, certainly, I would like to raise this with you and see if this is also being recognized, perhaps maybe not willingly, the GDD not being willingly non-neutral because, of course, their business is to run the global domains and so on.

But, yeah, you can see there is this sort of angst that we have in our community about this and so whenever there is a thing of saying, “Well, you know, the next round, we’ll be doing this, and this, and that,” the moment you start saying, “the next round,” then somebody is going to ask for a date for the next round and we’re going to be back into this absolute hell which basically says the date is going to be this date and everything needs to be finished by this date. And then we’ll have volunteer overload and we’ll do things half-baked and half-cooked and we’ll end up in another disaster.

And I’m saying “another disaster” because we ended up with an applicant guidebook that was done in 2000-something. There is a 2007 guidebook version and then a whole lot of things had to be added on afterwards, and some are even threatening to go back to the rules of the original applicant guidebook which was a catastrophe because it didn’t have applicant support, it didn’t

have a number of things on there, including safeguards for gTLDs. So thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Time check. If we give Rinalia her full half-hour, we have about 12 minutes more to go, and Olivier has said he wants five minutes for an ATLAS summit discussion, so take that into account with your interventions. Can we please have a timer, one minute? Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Olivier, everything that you've described, I echo. And I have also articulated that to the Board. I would suggest that you repeat the comment regarding GDD when Göran Marby is here because I think he needs to be aware. And beyond that, I won't say anything because you are right. There are strong pressures and the Board is susceptible to that pressure. But it is up to the Board also to self-correct itself. And that is why I came to you with a request for input because that helps reinforce a balance.

Okay. Garth, you still had something to say.

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Olivier, for bringing up the GDD. I would like to put forward the radical suggestion that anything this organization does or plans to do start with the question, “How will this affect or do good for the end user?” And if we are not willing to answer that question, if the question can’t be answered, then not a single penny and not a single minute should be spent on some adventure without answering that question first. And this should apply to everything, not just this program.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Garth. I think that’s a good criteria. I think it’s a question of whether it could be done or would be done. But please repeat that again when Göran Marby is here.

I would like to actually move on to something that I’d like your feedback on and that’s pertaining to auction proceeds. It’s a hot topic and a lot of people are interested in it. The Board is monitoring this issue closely. The Drafting Team has been at work and the Board was consulted in terms of what are your views regarding A, B, C, or D.

When the topic of “Do you support prioritizing the needs of underserved economies or regions?” I find that I am the only one

who says yes and I am little bit concerned about that. Well, at this point in time. Perhaps some see that it's not within the scope to actually go into that but since the question was posed. So I want to hear your views in terms of any input or view regarding auction proceeds and where you think the ALAC and the At-Large would take position.

Sorry, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Please put your headphones. I am very sorry. I'm very sorry to oblige you to put your headphones in the morning, but I think it's very important for us to use the tools that we have to improve diversity and comprehension in our organization.

Now I'd like to speak about the debate on the staff function and highlight what Olivier just said because I don't believe, I don't think that if we had worked six years more on the first version of the guidebook, we would have had a better guidebook just for one reason: the role played by the staff team in charge of this program, and I won't give any name, but clearly at the moment, things have changed because of the changing of some people in the staff. So I think it's not good to be in this situation again, so I think it's good to say that, to speak about that. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Sebastien. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think [inaudible] has her hand up first.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. So Kaili, you wanted to speak also. Is this about auction funds or are we back on New gTLD program? Auction funds. Okay. So Judith, Kaili, Holly, even though she's holding Maureen's card, Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like to get in moderately early, however.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. You can intervene any time.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do have something relevant to say on the subject.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. I very much liked – I listened to the discussions on the auction proceeds and I very much liked the idea of using it for underrepresented areas that you were mentioning, and especially also with the changes in the Fellowship, looking at the different criteria and looking at different people. So it could be looking at the indigenous populations worldwide. It could be looking, as they say in the Fellowship application, disabilities, looking at maybe low income populations, low income areas in developed countries. In the US, there are a lot of low income populations that have not been engaged with. And so maybe using some of those proceeds to increase the Fellowship. Once a new Fellowship idea is passed, to increase the Fellowship funding for that so that they can target these areas with that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Kaili? I'm sorry. Alan wanted to make a relevant intervention.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Currently, there is a Drafting Team on the charter. The Drafting Team will not impose specific restrictions in the charter. It will be up to the CCWG to delineate to what extent and to what functions, if any, it chooses to restrict the use of the funds are. We have a multi-step process. We're drafting the charter now. It will come back to this organization as one of the

chartering groups. Then it will go to a CCWG which I would encourage anyone who cares to participate in. That is the group that might put restrictions or target certain amounts of money on certain things. There's no point in having that discussion right now because that's not where the decision is going to be made. So let's keep our discussions on focus in ways that can help right now. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Kaili?

KAILI KAN: Thank you. Well, first of all, I fully agree that a large part of the funds should go for underdeveloped and so forth. However, I also notice, I think we all notice that after the New gTLD program was introduced, there is a large portion of valid registrations, a large portion of that, is for defensive purposes. And presently, I believe that that kind of defensive registration is because of the internal fundamental defect of the design of a New gTLD program. So therefore, I believe ICANN is obligated to provide refund, at least a partial refund, for those registrations that can be identified as for defensive. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Kaili. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I support Alan says in one sense, which is maybe it's too early to make specific recommendations. I would be really upset to think that those proceeds do not go to a number of things, which would be to underrepresented areas, to things like assisting people in... Well, the cost of registries is so expensive for if you look at the people who actually applied for New gTLDs, to actually correct the balance in terms of the applicants for New gTLDs, to assist in the whole process so that, in fact, the outcome is a much more balanced one geographically, linguistically, culturally.

Also, I would also then – Edmund may be the best person to talk to – is there any point in looking at support for [audience] as well. I realize that's very generic, but it would be horrible to waste the money. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you. Alan wanted me to say the queue is closed and Cheryl is the last one in line. Thanks.

CHERYL LANDON-ORR:

Thank you. Pardon me. I just want to declare that I believe we should definitely push and make sure that a sensible discussion and debate is on the agenda about the use of auction funds

being dedicated at least in part to underserved communities, using that language “underserved communities,” because I don’t want to get into particular economies or particular issues. So I’d like to think that was a basis that our group within ICANN would be pushing.

But I want to make sure we do it on the foundation of the work that was done with the applicants’ support, Cross-Community Working Group, that only admittedly came up with a system to help in the last round from a financial position. But the discussion, the debate, that went on early in that group looking at all of the ways we could aid and assist to plan for success, not just throw cash and compensation here but help to plan for success, should be looked at.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Cheryl. Sebastien, it’s always in my blind spot from sitting here. Sorry. Please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am sorry. Next time I will sit in another place. I am going to speak in French, but there are some actions that we, as final user, we would like to fund that would be useful for all the users of the world. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. So, Alan, did you want to comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one sentence. I will point out that when we come to the time for this discussion, it is not at all clear that all of this money is going to go into New gTLD-related issues. There's lots and lots of good things we can do with this money so let's keep our minds open.

I think, Olivier, you have about two minutes to do your five-minute presentation. Go for it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. You are going to see on the screen the follow-up work from the ATLAS II Implementation Task Force. If you recall, the At-Large summit in London two years ago had about 30, well, nearly 40 recommendations for the ICANN Board, for the At-Large community, for the ALAC, for the RALOs, etc. That was the whole At-Large community that came together to put these recommendations together.

What the Implementation Task Force group has done is to take each one of these recommendations, look at them, expand on them, refine them, and act on them. It acted on them by either taking on the task of doing it itself, so the working group itself, or passed it onto various working groups of the ALAC. And we

have several At-Large working groups, including the Technology Task Force, the Outreach and Engagement Working Group and several others, and the Capacity Building Working Group. I think these were the three that were mostly involved with things.

Ariel, along with Heidi and I, continued to put this follow-up work on the wiki. We have a wiki with each one of the recommendations having a wiki page dedicated to it and all of the work that has been done by all of these working groups ever since, including the RALOs as well.

Of course, we're not going to give you, the Board, a report which is about 500 pages in length. I don't expect everyone to read it. In fact, I don't expect anyone to read 500 pages, you included, and I know that you read a lot. But 500 might not be the greatest thing you could do for your summer holidays, or indeed, winter holidays by the time we'll have this thing finished. And therefore, we have put together a summary and that's sort of a sample of the report of how it will start looking. You have some nice little colors on the right-hand side. The Board loves colors. Everybody likes colors. It's nice, it's beautiful, and there's a lot of green in there which is even better. There is one red one which has been discarded because it was a little bit out of the way or things had changed. The public campaigns on using the Internet are probably not really within ICANN's mandate to do public

campaigns on how to use the Internet. But certainly, many of the others are complete now and are marked as such.

If you click on one of these, and so the document that will be given to you will be in electronic form. The hyperlinking within the document will work if you have it on your laptop. It will not work on a paper copy. But you will be able to flick to the correct pages if you wish to. And if you click on the electronic version, you will reach, let's say, recommendation number one, you would reach a little bit further information that goes further than just a two-line summary on the table. Here it provides you with a full set of implementation details, or should I say a summary of the implementation details, and further down, you'd have the next steps. Whether it's next step as in, "This recommendation has been passed on to this group and this group has now got to [watch in brief] to continue working on this," because some recommendations are ongoing to reflect the public interest in everything we do, for example, is an ongoing thing. I don't expect it to have an end point.

So that's how it looks at the moment. We have, I think, 12 recommendations that are completely completed with all the summary and stuff. But Ariel is working on filling the rest of it. We've actually worked together on having all the information ready so it's just a case of formatting, and hopefully by Hyderabad, we'll be ready to pass this on to the Board. We'll

probably send this to the Board before Hyderabad and then we can talk about it when we meet in India. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier. It's great to see progress. I have a suggestion. Before you submit it to the Board, I would recommend that the ALAC or you have a discussion with management to see areas in which they are already doing work in that either are in sync with what you are trying to do or maybe they have started something, maybe just to connect the dots and align. So that when the picture goes up to the Board, we can already see completely what's already in the works that needs extra resources or what really is completely completed. And I think that would be a great picture to show to the Board.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Rinalia. That's a very good point. We will be passing this by our working group, so the final report by our working group by the ALAC, by the RALOs, by you and when you mean "management," who is the management?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Göran Marby and his Executive Team.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Rinalia. You're welcome to stay for the discussion. Thank you.

All right, in the previous review of the Rules of Procedure, we got up to but not yet including 19.10.5. I am assuming that in the interim two or three days, everyone has had the chance to do their homework. We will not read sections out one by one, but I will group them together with a quick summary.

If anyone has any comments, and comments specifically that there is some major reason why a change has to be made, we did ask for comments to be made all along. They have not. There has been virtually nothing raised. So I will hope there won't be many. Otherwise, we will not get these adopted this week.

19.10.5 is a section that allows an elector who knows they will be incapacitated, out of contact, whatever, to identify a proxy to cast their vote. This would typically be used if you're going to be in an airplane, for instance.

May I ask that staff, number one, have the Rules of Procedure up and at the right place? And number two, have the other two documents ready to display if necessary, the addendum and the change log? Thank you.

The previous version allowed each BMSPC to create proxies. The concept of proxy, we've removed that and replaced it by a very specific one. Is there any comments on this?

Seeing none, we'll presume it's okay.

The next section is 19.11.3. This is the section that deals with the first level of voting, should there be more than three candidates identified by the BMSPC. The rules call for whatever the number to start with, which could be 15 or could be four, be reduced to three. We were somewhat unspecific in terms of the voting method. That has resulted in a different method being used last time than was expected because of the lack of precision.

I have consulted with Big Pulse, our normal vendor of voting, and ensured that what we're talking about is something that is possible to do. And the recommendation of the subgroup that built these revisions is that we use a form of Single Transferrable Voting, STV. STVs come in virtually infinite number of forms. You can presume that almost every jurisdiction or place that uses an STV vote uses a slightly different form of it.

The version we're looking at is very simple to explain. Essentially, every candidate is ranked by all the electors and you count how many first ranks there are. If someone gets more than half of the votes, they win. If they don't, no one gets more than half of the votes, you take the candidate with the least votes,

drop them off and look at what their second preference of what those electors were who selected them. So we promote. If a candidate disappears because they're dropped off, anyone who voted for them, all of their preferences get pushed up one and you do the calculation again. And you keep on doing that until you eliminate enough people that three are eliminated.

There may be places where there are ties in the process. If there are, the Big Pulse system has an internal mechanism to try – not to try – to eliminate the tie. It looks at how that voter – sorry, that candidate – was handled, the number of votes they got in previous rounds. It tries to find some logical way using the voter input to do the selection. If it cannot find one, it does a random selection. And that process continues until there are only three voters, three candidates left.

Questions? Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. I just wanted to get something that you mentioned clear. Did you say if a candidate drops off and he has been voted for, the votes will be assigned to the next person, one of the candidates? Is that what you said?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Now, when I say “drop off” – is that the end of your question?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, the question, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. When I say “drop off,” I don’t mean they withdrew. I mean they got the least number of votes. They were the least preferred one. So if, for instance, there are ten candidates, you are only selected by one of the voters as your preference, as their preference. If that’s the lowest number that anyone got, you will be dropped off – nothing personal – and the person or people who voted for you, if they said Dave is our second candidate, then Dave gets promoted to now being a first candidate. Everyone gets pushed up in the list and the calculation is done over again.

Further questions? Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Yeah. Thank you, Alan. Yeah. I think just you mentioned about the random process, that whatever mechanics we were talking about. Just in principle, I do not agree with random processes in our election process. The reason for that is that we’re not

deciding who is going to pay for the dinner. We're deciding on much more serious issue, because as I understand, ALAC, we represent the opinions of end users of the Internet today. And we cannot make that kind of random process. It actually makes our election like a joke. So especially regarding to the Board member, even more so. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Kaili. In all of the decision processes we have, we try for other mechanisms. Random is a last resort, and as you'll see as we go forward, we go to extreme pains to either not use random or make it a process that is verifiable by anyone that it is not hooked up. One intervention per person at this point, please.

So, yes, we try to avoid random. But we do have an even number of electors and we cannot guarantee that we can convince everyone to change votes. Remember, this is the first stage reducing to three. We are not at the stage where we're selecting the director at this point.

If we had 15 people, which the original group designing this voting mechanism suggested we do, and we only have 20 electors, we're almost guaranteeing there will be ties along the way. We don't have six months to vote, so this was a process. We are not going to change the basic process at this point. Some day, we should have the discussion of, do we have the right

electors, do we have the right selection process. All we're doing is fixing the problems we found in previous rounds right now.

So let's restrict the discussion to those kind of topics. Is there anyone else who would like to intervene on this item? Seeing none, we will go onto the next item.

The next one is the reduction of three candidates to two. Now, the STV process we're looking at could take 15 or 300 candidates and reduce it to the winner. It does it through a process that is less than transparent to someone who is not familiar with STV processes. It's documentable, but less than transparent. And it could end up making the final decision by random choice. We do not do that. We reduce to three. Then we reduce to two.

Now, the problem with reducing from three to two is it is possible, and in fact has happened, to have a tie for the bottom candidate. There are a number of processes which one could use to get from three to two. We outlined four different processes. The drafting group outlined four different processes. The processes are:

Number one, as a first step, we re-run the whole three-way election and see if there's a different result. Because people have seen the results, they may change their vote.

Option number two, take the two people who were tied and have a runoff between them. That has the issue that the people who voted for the leading candidate now have a vote and they can decide how to use it for the two candidates they didn't want to begin with. They could pick the best one of they could pick the weakest one, their choice.

Option number three, there will be no re-run. If there is a tie, it will be resolved by a random selection.

Option number four, we use the same method as for the previous step to eliminate from three to two. That means we may end up with a random selection and, if we do, it is done internal to the system. It is not auditable.

In the discussion online, I went on record as saying I prefer option number one. The majority of people who spoke up selected option number two.

I would first like to ask, is there anyone who needs any clarification of what the four options are? And I see two hands up. Kaili. This is not to voice your opinion of what you prefer. It's asking for clarification questions. Seun. So we have no one asking for any clarification. We do have someone asking for clarification. All right.

At this point, I believe through a completely unscientific process, that the majority of this group would prefer – and when I say “this group,” it is the ALAC members who are voting or who are choosing – I believe I heard one person agree with me on option one. I heard at least five or six people say they prefer option two. I heard no one voice anything for option three and four. Does that coincide? Does anyone think that I have misread the situation? Kaili?

KAILI KAN:

I believe in the e-mail exchanges, there is the fifth option could be decided by the ALT and that is, I am for that option.

Also, I would want to remind everybody that Ariel’s theorem, the Nobel Prize theorem, has proven theoretically that democracy can only go so long, so far. So when democracy cannot decide, it’s not by flipping a coin, but that is why we have republics for the Congress to decide for the people and so forth. So I am for the fifth option. Please include that, and I do not agree with all the four of those that you mentioned. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Kaili. I did err that you had raised that issue and I didn’t note that.

I would like to take a quick straw poll. When you say the ALT, I am also presuming that we will have to have the discussion on what if one of the members of the ALT is running and things like that. So if we prefer the ALT as the option to reduce, to eliminate ties, we will have to have that discussion. I would like to have a straw poll of the audience, of the ALAC right now. Is there anybody who supports Kaili in saying the ALT or slight modification of it be used instead of random choice to resolve ties? Can we have a count please?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Five.

ALAN GREENBERG: And how many ALAC members do we have in this group?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We have 14, including the proxy of Wafa. Oh, and Jimmy just left. Oh, and the proxy for Jimmy has been given to Sandra.

ALAN GREENBERG: Was Sandra one of the ones with a hand up? No. So we have five out of 14 who would prefer to see that.

KAILI KAN: Can we see hands against?

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we see the hands again? Is that what you asked?

KAILI KAN: Against ALT deciding. Some could be...

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. You're correct. Against. The question is anyone who wants to restrict it to the four options and not add a fifth. My hand is up.

For the record, I would like to say why I voted that way. I personally think that would not be a bad way of doing it. If any race were to be determined by that, we would be inundated with statements of favoritism, the old guard wins, people only keep their friends there. As much as I dislike using a random selection, the repercussions of having the ALT do it, I think, would be worse not for valid democratic reasons. I believe you are exactly the correct. The people that we appoint should be able to make decisions. But the way it would be perceived, I believe, would damage us.

Okay. Sorry?

Is Sebastien on this particular question? You want to make a statement? Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: As you may have noticed, I pressed five [inaudible] and I didn't participate for the vote and I will not participate to any votes relating to election of the bottom member as I was a candidate and since the beginning, I have decided not to participate to any things relating to the organization of the election of the Board member by At-Large. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Noted, I presume.

Any other issues related to the fifth option that Kaili had introduced?

We are back on the four options. Any request for any clarifications on them again now that we have only four? Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. I just wanted to be sure about option two because it's different from what is detailed in the e-mail you sent. I want to be sure that after the runoff, the initial runoff, if

there is a tie, the random selection will be done, because it's not notated in the edits.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We are talking about the situation where there are three people. There will be a three-way election.

I guess I really care about that part.

There will be a three-way election. If there is a tie, if there is time, it is a BMSPC decision. There will be a runoff. In option two, there will be a runoff between the two candidates who tied. If there is still a tie, it reverts to random selection at that point, an auditable random selection. Auditable means that it's not someone flipping a coin and you have to trust them doing it fairly. A random method will be used such that you, yourself, can verify that we did the random selection according to our rules. There are such methods.

Do we have any more questions for clarification?

All right. I'm going to try to do this easily. But if not, we will do it in a more complex. I sense that option two is the preferred option. May I see a show of hands of those who prefer option two? Tijani doesn't prefer it with either of his votes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Please repeat. I was...

ALAN GREENBERG: I know.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can you state what option two is for the record?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Option two is if there is a tie in the three-way race, if there's a tie for the bottom, then there will be a two-way race between the two who are tied to decide the outcome. If there is a tie again in a two-way race, it will be a random selection.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. May I?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Option two in the edit says replace – I like that sentence – if there is a tie for last position and if sufficient time remains, the [inaudible] will have the runoff election among the tied candidates. That's what it says.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That is correct.

SEUN OJEDEJI: But where is the second phase where you just mentioned? The second phase of if the tie also exists the second time, they will have a random selection, verifiable random selection.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is section number 19.11.6. If there is no time to run the tied election over again or it is still tied, then a random selection will be used.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Verifiable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Verifiable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Verifiable, yes.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. The difference between option one and option two, we are speaking here about we run the tie-breaking between all the candidates or between the tied candidates. This is the difference. So after that, if we still have a tie, the random method we have, [inaudible], etc. This is the other thing. We use it for any tie. But here, the difference between one and two is that. Shall we hold it between all the candidates or only the tied candidates? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I ask the question again. I believe the sense of the group is option two is the preferred one. May I see a show of hands of those who prefer option two? And Sandra, you're holding up two? No. Oh sorry, I didn't notice Jimmy was there.

I presume someone is recording who these people are, not just counting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, I am. I'm just trying to...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm just asking.

Okay. We have an absolute majority of the sitting ALAC, and certainly of those here who are voting, selecting option two. Does anyone see a necessity of going through the other options one by one?

Are you saying yes by raising your hand? You would like to see the other options, select, voted for one by one?

KAILI KAN:

I would like to have a chance for me to cast my vote as being abstain. Thank you. Actually, that was my first time not to vote yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. My mistake. Is there anyone who would like to abstain from this vote? I believe Sebastien has already recorded his decision to abstain. We have Kaili. We have Jimmy. Our rules for abstention allow people to give a reason if necessary, if they feel it is appropriate. I would ask you to convey that to staff and it will be recorded in the record.

Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Just half a sentence. If you want, technically, I am abstaining but I am, my wish is not to participate to this vote. That's for me in a

French election type. I am not here if you want to imagine that.
That's my, no participation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for that clarification. My misunderstanding. Thank you. Appreciate that. Sandra, go ahead.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sebastien, why are you not participating? I mean, you are a fully elected ALAC member and what's the... I don't see the conflict of interest. I would like to understand it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe it's not the right time to do that because we are short of time, but I am ready to explain that. But it will not change from now to next meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: He has chosen to recuse himself from the discussion. He is allowed to do that. Kaili, go ahead.

KAILI KAN: I fully observe and the resource of the voting and I go with that. However, I'd like to point out, again, I believe that we're leaving

some pitfalls for the future that we, I hope not, but I believe that we may regret sometime in the future. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I, too, do not want to be around the day we use a random selection. But so be it. That is a purely personal vote.

Tijani, go ahead. We have nine minutes and we still have a way to go.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry, Alan. We didn't vote about the random selection. We voted about the tie-breaking should be run among the whole candidates or only among the tied candidates.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted.

The next change is a very minor one but an important one, and it re-emphasizes something that was in the original plans but wasn't documented in the rules. That is at every stage along the way, we publish the output, we publish the results of intermediate stages so electors can perhaps change their views based on how their candidate fared in that previous round. And that change is made at all of the levels.

The next change is 19.11.6. It is the paragraph that specifies that in the event that we have no time or we have exceeded the reruns, that we will use a random selection. That part is not up for question. The change only says that the method will not rely on trusted agents, but will use verifiable methods. Any comments? Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Just mine, I would prefer the word “verifiable” be added.

ALAN GREENBERG: It says “can be independently verified.” Is that not sufficient? Thank you. Any other questions on this one?

Next one is 19. Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Dev.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hi. Just a clarification. Why is 19.11.4 struck out or is that an old version of the text? It’s redlined but I thought it should be back in.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not quite sure what version you're looking at. The number is struck out. That's an anomaly of Word when you eliminate. It's not struck out. It's underlined which means it's new but that's an anomaly of Word, just like the highlighting of it when you incorporate the changes, it all becomes right.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: So they're saying that if there's not time to run for the tied election over again as called for in 19.11.4 and 19.11.5.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. We'll make sure that if there is a random selection necessary, that it will refer to it.

Yes, you're correct. Sorry. In the previous version, that was not applicable before we had the options. And I will note that we need 19.11.6 should make it correct, whatever correct is. Correct means it applies wherever there's a random selection. I'm sorry, wherever there is a rerun. Thank you, Dev.

The last one in this section is the one that says, "If multiple voting rounds are necessary and if the schedule permits, there should be time for discussion between the rounds." In the past, we have for whatever reason at that time, the rounds have

immediately followed each other. Since in at least some cases and specifically, the RALO Chairs, they may need an opportunity to discuss with an electorate, and even for the ALAC members even though their vote cannot be directed, there may well be a reason either to discuss with their agents or to discuss with other ALAC members.

So this says, again, it's a discretionary thing of the BMSPC. But if we're not tight against the target for having to submit the results to the, what was the Chair, the Secretary of the Board and will now be if the transition goes ahead to the Empowered Community, then there should be time allowed, a breather to allow people to discuss things. Is there any discussion on this? Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. A minor point, but as a non-Northern American, I'd just like to point out that the concept, but also the expression "random" is connotated. It sounds like you flip a coin or you go through a calculation machine and you take whatever it is. Yeah. But so that means two things. Either you have to change the expression because you think the system is valid in any case or you have to tweak the system and choose the appropriate expression. But I'm going to say that coming from, let's say,

Europe, it doesn't sound like the most democratic procedure.
Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. What doesn't sound like the most democratic procedure?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Random.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have already determined that it is not the most democratic procedure. We have voted on that already. We're not going to go back, not today. There's an opportunity in the future to revise this whole thing. Some of us find parts of this overall procedure completely inappropriate. It was the result of a very major compromise, [inaudible] compromise after a very spirited discussion a number of years ago. We are making the adjustments we can. If there is a will to revise the whole procedure, we will do that, but not time-constrained as we are today. Thank you very much.

We are effectively out of time. I believe there are only two places where there are changes that must be made – one, two – if necessary on careful re-reading to make the correction that Dev

pointed out. And I'm still not 100% sure, but I'll do it when I'm more calm, and anyone else can do the same.

And Tijani requested that, and I don't believe anyone objected to it – I don't know if we actually had a vote, but let me repeat the request. The original text for 19.8 says that the BSMPC and the BCEC will essentially create the rules, procedures, guidelines under which they will work, and they will be ratified, they need to be ratified by the ALAC. Tijani's version is silent on who creates the original rules and simply says they must be approved by the ALAC. That doesn't preclude the ALAC asking those committees to come up with the first draft of those things, but it doesn't mandate them to do that.

One of the effects of that, and I know the one that Tijani is aiming at, is that it implies that each BSMPC and BCEC does not necessarily come in cold and just re-determine their rules. So the previous rules will be used unless they can show cause why need to be changed, in which case, we can go through the process. Tijani, do you have any input on this? We have one minute left.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Very, very short. What I understand is that the guidelines must be the accumulation of the experience of the whole round. So we have to establish guidelines for all the rounds and those guidelines can be updated, modified any time we need it, so

BMSPC and BCEC can ask to modify the guidelines. That's why I prefer that the guidelines be done by the whole community, ALAC, and according to the experience we have already. And if there is something to add or to change, yes, we can change it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will note in this. We've only had two of these selection processes. And in the second one, which Tijani, he did run the BMSPC for, we had some problem identifying the older, the rules and guidelines that were used in the previous selection. That will not happen again. But the point is still taken.

In any process to create a set of rules and guidelines, you can say it's determined by a group of 15 or 25 or 400 people. The actual drafting has to be done by two or three people, with other people commenting on it. That's the reality of drafting. All we're doing here is making it slightly less specific to give more flexibility, but saying the ALAC has ultimate choice.

Holly, I don't know what you're asking.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Do we need to vote on that or can we just [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not voting. We're only voting when there is disputes. I don't here anyone disputing. We are done.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible] housekeeping.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are done on reviewing these processes. The two paragraphs that need to be revised will be revised, and a revised motion will be put to the group, to the ALAC, under our section later on today on decisions to be taken.

We did not go through the sections that preceded number 19 that there were draft changes to. The motion will suitably note that. I do note that I will be bringing those back to the ALAC very soon, so you may want to take the opportunity to look at them and decide how we're going to have that conversation. That conversation will be had electronically and during an ALAC meeting. We will not have the opportunity between now and the possible transition of IANA and therefore, any further changes will have to be done remotely.

I thank you all. Sorry, I'm just trying to see what we have. We have a break for 15 minutes and when we come back, we have our CEO, Chairman of the Board, and David Olive here. We will start on time, even if the room is empty, because the room won't

be empty. I'll be here. I don't mind dominating the conversation. But if you choose to participate in the conversation, you will be back on time. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, that 15 minutes is actually 10 minutes because we've run over by three minutes. So just if we could all be back at 10:45 sharp please, as we have our senior management joining us. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]