HELSINKI – At-Large Leadership Work Session (Part 1)
Monday, June 27, 2016 – 09:15 to 10:30 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

ALAN GREENBERG: Can everyone please take their seats?

I'd like to welcome everyone to the opening meeting of ICANN56 in Helsinki for the At-Large Advisory Committee and for Regional Leadership.

You'll notice on the agendas we've coined a new term. Instead of "ALAC" and "Regional Leadership," we have "At-Large Leadership." Amazing no one ever thought of that before, but magically it has appeared.

Welcome to the meeting. I'll first turn the mic over to Gisella, I think, or somebody, who will talk about our normal housekeeping rules and procedures, and then we'll come back to me for a little bit and we'll kick off the meeting. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Welcome to everyone. Welcome to ICANN56 in Helsinki. I hope you all had a good trip over and are ready for the sessions.

Just a few housekeeping rules. If we could please request for people to come back on time after coffee breaks so that we can

EN

keep to the schedule. If we can also ask all ALAC and RALO members to be seated at the main table if possible.

Please do log into the Adobe Connect room. All the information is on the main schedule, and I hope you've all downloaded the ICANN56 app on your smart devices.

These meetings are all recorded, so please do use your microphones at all times, and please state your names before speaking, not only for transcript purposes so that we don't have MAN/WOMAN, MAN/WOMAN on the transcript, but also to allow our interpreters at the back to identify you on the other language channel, so either on the French or Spanish channel, as well as for our remote participants joining via Adobe Connect.

The At-Large sessions have live interpretation in French and in Spanish, so if you don't understand either of these languages, please do take a headset. Please use your headset. And if we could ask you to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

If you wish to speak during this session or to comment or ask a question, please raise your tent cards. If you are in the Adobe Connect room, please raise your hands.

The speaker list will be noted by the Chair or by staff. If we could ask the Chair of the session to please clearly state the action items.

Last but not least, if you have the tent cards after each session, if you'd either take them with you or hand them back to staff so that we can have them for the next session.

If you'll note, we are on camera. We have these new cameras in the middle of the room, which are activated by the microphones. It is always very useful for remote participants, as well as anyone in the room, to be able to see your tent cards and to be able to identify you.

Thank you. I'll hand it back to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Gisella. As was noted in general within the room, we use tent cards to identify if you want to speak. I am notorious on occasion for missing seeing tent cards or getting them in the wrong order. I ask your indulgence. It's not that I'm picking on you if I miss you. Just gently get someone to wave at me or something and I'll try to fix it. In general, the speaking order is not all that critical, but if you feel you were passed over and the order was critical, try to catch my attention, please.

We have regularly used timers in these meetings. We have a lot to discuss. There's a lot of people around the table. We will in general restrict interventions to two minutes. To start with, we will use a count-up timer, which will simply note how long you've been speaking.

If we find on a regular basis that we have people who are extending the privilege, we'll start using a countdown timer with probably a very annoying alarm at the end. We do ask people to respect the time so that everyone has an opportunity to talk.

Lastly, we do take attendance at these meetings. We generally take attendance at the beginning of the meeting. If you are somehow unavoidably detained and you come in partway through, please check with staff to make sure you're counted.

If you are going to be at another meeting, please check in with staff and let them know, partly so we can just know what people are doing, where we can find you if we need you, and just to complete our records.

I don't think there's any other specific housekeeping issues, except Heidi is looking like there should be.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Both Gisella and I have mentioned it.

The first item on our agenda is we are kicking off the At-Large review at this meeting. I will ask one of our Co-Chairs, either Holly or Cheryl, to introduce the Review Team members who are on the table.

Go right ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: You're going to have to put your hands up. First of all, Tom we can see. I'm not sure you've met him before, but many of us have. Next we've got Rosa. I'm not going to dare mispronounce your name, so I'm just going to say welcome, Rosa. Nick is the third person. I'm sure you've seen Nick around before, but they're all going to be talking to all of you. Do the three of you want to talk to us first? Tom?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Tim.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tim.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tim.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps Number 4, too.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tim.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Number 4 is Tim.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm not awake. Tim. Do either Tom or Tim or Nick or anybody want to start and talk about the review first and how you want to talk to us?

Okay.

TOM MACKENZIE: I'll just give you a very quick presentation of who we are and why we're here and what we expect to achieve this week and over the next year.

We are, as you've just seen, a team of four people. We are international, but we couldn't build a team that would cover every single region of the world. But we are a

multilingual/multinational team based in Europe and America. Rosa will be covering the Latin American region.

We kicked off about a month ago this review of the At-Large community. Now, those of you who've been in At-Large for several years will know that this is the second review that's being carried out. The first review, which was completed in 2008, focused mostly on the ALAC structure. We will be looking at ALAC, but the main focus of this particular review is on the community, the At-Large community that has grown up and developed considerably since the last review.

The way we're going to work as part of this review is, in the first phase, which we are now in, we're going to be talking and listening to the community. We're going to be carrying out a large numbers of reviews. We have divided up the work between the four of us so that I will be talking to the representatives of At-Large in the Europe and North American regions. Rosa will be focusing on the Latin America – the LAC – region. Nick will be looking at the Asia-Pacific region, and Tim at the African region. So that way, we have split up the work in that way.

I might as well just say straightaway many of you have already been contacted by us individually to set up interviews, or you will have seen announcements on the mailing lists. If you have received one of these invitations and you haven't yet got an

interview set up, please identify which member of our team that you need to see to set up a meeting. We're going to be here until the end of the week, so we hope to fit in as many people as possible.

So that really, I would say, is it. I would just add that, as we start this project, we come as reviewers, and reviewers are sometimes seen by organizations as a slightly hostile force that comes in and asks inconvenient questions sometimes. What I would say is that we come as people who understand that ICANN is not just any kind of organization which you can turn up in and apply ready-made formulas to help things get better. ICANN is a very unique kind of organization, a multi-stakeholder organization, and we are very much aware that you have spent the past 15/16 years meticulously building up this very careful model.

So we are not going to come in and apply or recommend some sort of dramatic changes to the way that you are functioning. We are going to try to understand what's working, what's working well, and what's not working so well, and then, over the course of the next year, produce our report, and, at the end of the process, make a set of recommendations, which we hope will be simple for you to understand and translate into real improvements for your community.

Two of us on this team are British passport holders, and I can tell you that we definitely do not think that Brexit-like measures are the reasonable way forward for any kind of organization.

I think, with that, I will just leave it to my team members to introduce themselves briefly. We look forward to talking to you over the course of the next week.

ROSA DELGADO: [inaudible] question [inaudible]?

TOM MACKENZIE: Oh. Well –

ROSA DELGADO: [inaudible]

TOM MACKENZIE: Well, yeah. No. Actually, Rosa is right. I will just mention that there are two parts to our review. The first is that we are carrying out these interviews right now.

The next phase will be – based on the results and the feedback that we get from you now, this week and in the coming weeks – we shall be building a survey questionnaire. That will be somewhat different because, basically, the point of the survey

will be to fine-tune, if you like, some of the findings that we will have found in the interview phase.

So we're going to have interviews followed by a survey, and then we're going to have a phase between ourselves of analysis. Then we're going to come back to the community with a presentation of draft report. We're going to wait for feedback from you, and then, early next year, we shall be starting to draft the final report.

I think, with that, I can now properly hand over to Rosa.

ROSA DELGADO: Thank you. Hello. My name is Rosa Delgado, originally coming from Peru and living in Geneva for many years now, and probably going back to the region in the next one or two years. I'm very glad about that.

I've been involved as ICANN, as I know many people in this area, since '98 before even the GNSO and the creation of ICANN, the White Paper, the Green Paper, and also in the creation of new TLDs with .[inaudible], . [inaudible], and also been participating in the 2012 creation of [our] two names, of which one is still about to be decided by ICANN.

Anyway, so I'm not new in ICANN. I've been participating in many meetings. I'm also very pleased to know that we have

some members of the Latin American region, the RALO. I would like really to meet with you. Anybody else who wants also to meet and discuss, you're very welcome. But in principle, I would like to meet with the people from the region. All your comments, all your inputs, are really welcome. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll just interrupt. We do have French and Spanish interpretation here. If anybody wants to show off their language skills, they certainly may.

NICK THORNE: I can speak in French, but I think it's better to keep with English. [inaudible] years past when I worked with the then ICANN CEO Paul Twomey as his International Relations Advisor, and I've been hanging around the corridors with various hats on since.

I just wanted to emphasize one particular point that Tom made. We've divided the world up for structural reasons and for common sense reasons, but you should all feel, please, free to talk to whichever one of us you feel most comfortable with.

We will all be talking to a pretty wide audience to get views from outside ALAC as well. So don't be surprised if you see us sitting in dark corners chatting to people.

I've given our e-mails to the staff. Perhaps at some stage we can stick that up on the screen. If you want to contact us, just drop us an e-mail or grab us as we walk down the corridor.

My only other point is that we don't want to take up any of your time and waste it this morning. But if anyone has questions, we'd be very happy to answer. Thanks.

TIM MCGINNIS: Hello, everyone. My name is Tim McGinnis, aka McTim, and I've been involved in what's now called Internet governance for the last 20 years. I worked for a wireless ISP in Africa, and I helped build exchange points there. I served as Policy Development Working Group Chair for the African Network Information Center. I worked at the RIPE NCC and the Internet Software Consortium. So that's two root server operators. I was an ISOC WSIS ambassador in 2005, recently launched a new top-level domain, and now I'm helping with the ALAC review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Does anyone have any comments, either from the At-Large review party, or does anyone else have any comments?

I will tell you I've been involved in a number of reviews over the years, both as a reviewer and a reviewee, and I approach this

with just a little bit of trepidation because it's not all that uncommon. Tom said they're not going to try to apply the last good answer they had to us just because it's easier than doing a new one. Luckily, we are so unique, even within ICANN, that it's pretty hard to apply the lasts answer. But nevertheless, hearing that that was not the intent, hearing that I believe this group has never worked together as a single team before also says that there's no preconceived glorious plan at this point in terms of the solution. Hopefully, there's a plan in terms of carrying out the review.

So I'm quite encouraged. I think the team we have here is a rather interesting group of people. I'm looking forward to working with them and ultimately seeing what they can come up with.

As everyone around the table knows, we are in parallel looking at what we can do prior to the review team coming in to try to address some of the issues that we think we have. It will be interesting to see whether they think we have the same problems we think we have, and whether the answers are the same or different.

But it's happening at a good time, and I'm looking forward to it and crossing my fingers that will not be like some of the reviews that have happened in ICANN, where the report gets put on the

shelf, and three or five years later we do another one. That certainly isn't what happened in the first review, and I'm optimistic that will not be what happens in the second review.

So thank you all for being here, and I look forward to a productive engagement.

We have hands up, apparently. I'm not in Adobe Connect yet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We can see people are carefully following the rules that people in the room use tent cards and outside the room use hands. I'm not in the Adobe Connect. We have Holly Raiche and Sebastien Bachollet.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Just a question. What about a small group? For example, I was thinking, with APRALO, there's a bunch of us here. Would it be useful to have kind of a brainstorming for all of us? A) It would make it easier – it would be less time for you – and B) you get some feedback.

So I'm just wondering if that's one of the formats that you'd be happy with.

NICK THORNE: If I may respond directly as the guy who's got the Asia-Pacific portfolio, as it were, I'd be delighted if we could organize that.

Can I leave it in your hands to grab me? I will fit in with whatever timetable suits you.

ALAN GREEBERG: Our [glorious] Asia-Pacific Chair has been volunteered. If you haven't met Siranush – wave your hand, Siranush. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bonjour. Thank you very much. I'm going to speak in French and use interpretation services. I just wanted to say something so everything is very clear. I've already said that, in a teleconference, I've been working for ITEMS for some years. I'm not working for ITEMS. I'm not working anymore for them, and

I've not taken part of the proposal made to ICANN. So I wanted that to be clear, and I want everything to be transparent on these ITEMS. I wanted to tell you that. I hope I will be able to work with the team that has been organized to help you work for At-Large in a good direction. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks, Sebastien. Any other comments?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yeah, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

TOM MACKENZIE: It was really just to say that that suggestion that Holly made just now is a very interesting one. Perhaps if other regions are interested in setting up a similar kind of meeting, a kind of group brainstorm – that's how I understood your comment – then that would be a good thing. Then we could all organize it with each corresponding member of the team during this week. But I'll just leave that just as a comment for now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tom. Any further? Gisella? Sorry. Gisella first.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Please state your names when speaking. I know it is tedious every time you speak, but the interpreters don't know who you are, and neither do the people on Adobe Connect.

Just with regards to the camera, they will be going towards the microphone that is actually open. So as soon as you've spoken, if you could just put your microphone off. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I hope that those group interviews will not replace the individual interviews.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you very much. I just wanted to ask a question to Tom about the main items of this review. What are the priorities for this review?

Second item: I wanted to tell you that, for Africa, we are ready to do a brainstorming meeting during this week. If you are available to work with us, it would be okay.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, Aziz. I'm going to answer in French. Yes. For the priorities for this review, what is really clear is that we are going to focalize on the At-Large community, the functioning of this community, the accountability issue in this community, in all the different parts of the community, and the regional At-Large organizations and their membership, also.

We want to see how those RALOs are made. We want to understand which parts of the community are active and which ones are not active. If there are some parts that are less active, we want to understand why they are less active. We want to know what the means are to participate. We want to understand better how it works.

With some luck, we'll be able to improve the representivity and the functioning of these structures around the world.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We're starting to get a little bit tight on time, so I ask that the interventions to be kept moderately short.

I have at the moment Kaili and Jean-Jacques. Holly, I'm not sure if that's a new card of not. Kaili first.

KAILI KAN: Also, to the review – because ALAC is a branch of ICANN – so I think that probably we can also look at the mission of ICANN. Especially, I've noticed lately some of ICANN's leaders talking about the interface between the real world and the cyber-world and whether in this regard what ICANN's position would be, whether that was related to ALAC. I think at least that is one aspect that I would have some interest in. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Kaili. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alan. I wanted to speak, even though I'm not an ALAC member. I wanted to highlight two items. When I was a member of the ICANN Board, I had been invited to participate in the review of the At-Large community. I'm one of those persons who had recommended at this moment the creation of two seats on the ICANN Board for the At-Large community.

Our proposal has been just half-applied, because Seat #15 was created, as you know, and we were happy about that.

I think the new review you are going to make is very important for two reasons. First, if we compare it to the last review, it will be difficult to have such an important proposal as it was at that moment. Secondly, I want to say that what was said just before me is true. I think the review can't be limited to the review of the mechanics of At-Large.

I think one of the challenges that we have today is to put the Internet user in the center of all the institutions and all the concerns of the Internet – the right to protection of the person and data, etc. So don't limit yourself to mechanic issues during that review. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Seeing no more hands – and we're running a little bit late already, but we did start late – is there any further comments that anyone wants to make, either from the Review Team or within our community before we'll go on to the next item?

Seeing nothing – and, hopefully, I'm not missing anyone – thank you very much. We look forward to the coming week and the coming months. I wish you luck.

We regularly use the analogy of herding cats in regard to this group, so enjoy.

The next item is the concept of dual membership. We have on occasion had situations where ALSes would join At-Large and are also participating as a group within, as an example, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. There are probably other similar examples.

The concept of multiple membership in ICANN is not particularly unique. There are lots of organizations that fit in many different bins. Clearly, right now, the same company can be a registrar and a registry. An ISP is often a registrar. The world gets confusing.

In general, within the GNSO, the rule is: You can be a member of multiple groups if you are so inclined. You can only be a voting member in one of them. That's a model that may or may not fit us, but Tijani has raised the issue and will take over and present what he believes is the issue or the problem and perhaps propose some solutions.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I'm going to speak in French. This issue about the dual membership is an issue which started not long ago in our RALO. We did receive a request from an organization already active in NPOC, a voting member. We were wondering if it's a good thing or not to give the same rights to a person or an

organization who's already a voting member and a decision-maker in another constituency at ICANN.

It's going to give more influence to that organization or to that person in ICANN. That person will be able to make decisions in several forums.

Therefore, my proposal, in my opinion, we have to leave it quite open. People and organizations should be openly able to become members, to come to any meeting, to come to any ICANN event. But, if someone is already a voting member or a decision-maker in a constituency, it's better that they only have this opportunity to make decisions only in one entity.

Therefore, I think the rights to make decisions or to vote should be limited. The same is true for them to become officers. That's my point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, have you had any discussion with the NPOC leadership on this particular case?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, I didn't.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I put myself in the queue because, as you were talking, you flipped back and forth between the organization and the person. Setting a rule about an organization is relatively easy. Setting a rule that may change its status as a person takes on a new role or not is somewhat more difficult.

To a large extent, I'd like to separate the issues, partly because we have individual members in some regions. We have people who are the formal representatives of an organization today, but they might not be tomorrow. So I'd like to try to separate those if possible.

Any quick comment on that? Then we'll go to the speaker queue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Alan. You're right. I'm not speaking about the representatives of ALSes as persons. I am speaking about ALSes or individual members. So it is the same case in my point of view. The member of the RALO can be an ALS or an individual member. My talk was about the member.

ALAN GREENBERG: The question that comes up is, if Tijani is the leader of a group which is part of NPOC, should he be able to be a voting member? Are you tainted because you happen to be involved in a group as

a member? So I think we're going to have to be clear when we write up any conclusions.

Speakers queue at this point is Cheryl, Aziz, and Sebastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Tijani, for raising this issue because it is one that, if we haven't had to grapple with it yet, we certainly need to now as we look at, in the next 12 to 18 months, an analysis and an exploration of the transparency matters – indeed as well as the accountability matters – within our advisory committee.

The reason I prefaced with that, Tijani, is because I think, whilst I am less fearful then I think you may be on some of these points, one way of reducing the risk associated with what you've identified as undue or extreme influence is to have an utter expectation and trust in the transparency.

It's very much a matter of, if everyone in the room and around the table knows that I am a card-carrying member of an organization which also has a significant role and influence elsewhere, they should be able to know and temper how they listen to my view at the table you're at by full knowledge of that and how influential I may or may not be in that organization.

So I think an effective and trusted transparency may be one way of managing some of these issues. While we're having this discussion, think outside of the rigid boxes, perhaps, of managing this.

Personal disclosure time. For a little over a decade, my husband served as a publically-elected official in local government in my country. So I do know a tiny little bit about politics, and a tiny little bit because he was an independent, an unaligned, with no political party backing, of how one can – let's be blatant – manipulate outcomes so that even small and underfunded influences can have a greater voice.

There's always a way of having more or less influence in things, and I really do think that transparency and a requirement for transparency is the only antidote to a number of tricks to the trade. If you want to know some of the tricks to the trade, you can buy me a drink later.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you, Alan. I would like to add a point after Tijani. As the President of AFRALO, I asked the staff and I was told that we already have some cases in the RALO where organizations or

people are in NPOC and ALAC. They're members of NPOC and ALAC.

My question is, if an organization is present in both, it's okay, but if the same person is in NPOC and ALAC, I think it's an issue. Let's look at the worst-case scenario. If all the ALSes go to NPOC, what is going to be the roles of everybody? So we have to think about it very closely. It's not a huge issue. However, the work of one person at NPOC is not the same as at ALAC.

We talked about the review of the ALAC structure, and we have to do it very carefully. At AFRALO, we're going to talk about this issue, about this request if the same person who is already an NPOC member and wants to represent his organization at ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clarification, Aziz. You several times said ALAC. Do you really mean members of ALAC, or do you mean an ALS?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: At-Large.

ALAN GREENBERG: At-Large.

AZIZ HILALI: Yes. [It's AFRALO]. Yes, I automatically said ALAC. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you [inaudible], but I just wanted to make sure we didn't have a misunderstanding. Sebastien next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think that Tijani has a very good question that was raised. It's important for all of us. It's not only an issue with NPOC and RALOs or one organization. It's at all levels of ICANN. According to me, it's something we have to look at with our second accountability review. This is quite important.

To be able to vote two, three, four, five times? This is quite strange. This is something that reminds me of a situation in France. At AFNIC, the members, the registrars, certain people had several requests to ICANN. They have several registrars. They wanted to get several slots, and many slots at the technical level. They were also requesting to have the same number of votes at the General Assembly. It was refused. It's only one person, one vote; one group, one vote.

This is quite complex. It's not as easy as it seems. We have to go far with that review with that issue. We cannot only say, "You're not allowed to vote here." We can let them choose where they

want to vote. They can only vote once, but they can choose where they can vote.

But I would say one person, one vote should be the rule. Thank you, Tijani, for raising that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The next speaker we have is Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I agree with the idea of one person, one vote. I just wanted to also say: is it really allowed currently that someone should have a voting status in one group – for instance, in ALAC – and another voting status – in SCSG, for instance? Is that really possible right now? Because, for instance, I'm an ALAC member. I have voting rights, but I also participate in SCSG, for instance. Does my comment, which is not necessarily a vote, signify that there is interference?

We need to actually just tell me whether what we should be addressing is to ensure that nobody has dual leadership. Maybe that is what we should be addressing: having participation rights in two different constituencies should be allowed. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll note that we have now drifted into people versus organizations, and I think the situation is going to be quite interesting if we talk about people. But let's go on with the speaker list for the moment. We have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. In ICANN, there is a lot of overlapping constituencies, and the trend is for increasing this overlapping. For example, the creation of the Civil Society Group is really overlapping with ALAC, with NCSG, with NPOC, etc. So it is a situation that we are living, so we have to address it now, today.

I don't think we have to speak about persons. We have to speak about members. A member may be an organization or a person, an individual. We have to address whether the organization has the right to vote here and there, even if it is different persons. We may have an ALS which has one leader here and one leader there. I don't think that they have the right to vote here and there.

So it is the member. If you are a member here, you have to choose to vote here or there. You may be a member here and there, but you cannot decide here and there. And you cannot be in the leadership positions here and there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll note when you added the words "leadership positions," you've now added people into the equation, and that's going to be potentially problematic.

I have a speaker list of Judith, Leon, and me. I'm closing the list on Sandra. I will close the list then and try to summarize where we are. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: My question is, how do we know who's voting in NPOC? We know what are ALSes are in both areas, but we don't necessarily know when they're voting in it because we have our voting and then the other people have theirs. But how does staff know which ALS is voting in which constituency and in which one they can't? Does the other constituency have the same rules as us?

In that sense, I see an incongruity between the two because if the other constituency has different rules, that's going to be a problem for us. So we need to make sure that whatever rules we come up with are aligned with the different constituencies.

Also, my other question is, an ALS could be in two constituencies but could have two different assigned representatives, each expressing different viewpoints, but they may be expressing them to different committees or working groups within a particular ALS. So they won't necessarily be voting one way, one

way, one way, and the other way, because it could all be representing two different parties or working groups. Some of the ALSes are broken out into different committees and working groups, and each committee is in different areas. Rather than creating a whole separate structure, they've decided to go with this path. So that also, I think, needs to be taken into account.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. While I embrace the principle of one organization, one vote, I'm not sure that we could definitely rule out having one organization having two or multiple votes in different constituencies for one reason. When you look at the issues that take place in different constituencies within ICANN, you might think that having a vote in one constituency and having a vote in another constituency might be a problem.

But that's not necessarily true because many issues have different points of view. Many issues have also different approaches. So it all depends, from my point of view, on what is your stand, or your stance, in that certain topic, so that you could of course vote one way or another.

EN

So what we should be looking at is whether that organization that is voting within the At-Large community and also maybe within the NPOC or with the NCSG or whatever other constituency we're looking at doesn't get in conflict with the votes that they're casting in other constituencies across ICANN.

That would be, for me, the key to actually define whether a certain organization or person, for this case, should be casting one or multiple votes; not only that they belong to one or two, X or Y constituencies, but as to how those votes that are being casted would go in conflict amongst them in a certain situation.

If I am voting in the ALAC one way, and that way conflicts with my vote in the NCSG, well, then that's a problem. If my votes in both constituencies or both bodies are on the same line, then I don't see why there should be a problem for my organization casting two votes or three votes, maybe.

Just to conclude, I think this should be studied further, and we shouldn't rule out the possibility of casting multiple votes just because we think that having multiple votes might be a problem. I think we have to find out more things than just feeling like we don't need many votes in many constituencies.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I can say with some assurance that we will not come to closure today, so if you feel you have to get your last word in, don't worry. This isn't the last word. The queue is closed. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Alan. Following the discussion here, I just can give you a very concrete example. It's myself and Wolfgang. We are in the same ALS. I was in the ALAC for the past six years, and he was on the Board. He was on the NomCom. He was on the NCSG, the NCUC. Would you really miss one of us to join this community and to work in these fora?

So I think we have to be very careful when putting up such rules because Wolfgang here is an individual expert. He built up ICANN since the beginning. He was there at the first ICANN meeting ever and missed only, I think, three of them. I've been here for quite a while, but I did some other jobs with the ICANN Academy and everything.

I don't think this is a lack of transparency. We were always very clear on this, and we always tried not to do the same thing or to work towards something. But if you're discussing rules like this, we should consider that this is a rather small community. When people are coming in, being ready to do the workload, then, yes, it happens that they're wearing multiple hats at some point.

I think Wolfgang and myself – and I'm happy to discuss this, also, with regard to transparency – are pretty good examples that we do our best to be as transparent as possible because we're also doing the other projects like the Summer School of Internet Governance. We are having relationships with sponsors here at ICANN.

Yes, this can be an issue if you make it an issue, but we can also demand ourselves and then put in some checks and balances and work very transparently. That's what we are trying to do and hopefully achieve over the years. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sandra. If I can try to summarize some of the issues presented, first of all, I'll note that we have continually flipped back between individuals in their roles either as individual members or as a member representing an organization. That has a completely separate set of problems with it, so I think we really need to separate the two discussions. It will require some discipline as we go forward with this. We are talking about, for instance, Tijani's organization, not the fact that Tijani is the spokesman for that organization.

If we were to worry about membership, individuals having a vote within organizations, remember, our rules for ALSes say individuals must be in control and must select leaders. We have

EN

no rule, nor do we have any way, of knowing that you are a member of four ALSes. We certainly have people who are members of multiple ISOC chapters that are in turn ALSes. We do not ask them what their membership is. We do not ask them to certify anything, and they have no way, often, of knowing whether there's any overlap. So be careful that we don't try to set rules that are impossible to enforce.

Cheryl made the comment that perhaps we shouldn't worry about voting but just declarations so we're unaware. If we were to worry about voting, we have to actually talk to the other people because, although we could say, "If you are a member of NPOC and an ALS, you can only vote in one," we can in fact take it on trust that, if they say, "Yes, I will do that," they will.

But there are some real severe implications if this becomes common. If you have an ALS that doesn't vote, do you count them towards quorum? Do you count them towards quorum in a vote? If you have a third of your ALSes that don't vote, you have a very significant problem if you don't recognize them and treat them differently. So there's a whole set of rules that we've never even contemplated that we would have to think about.

One of the questions I asked is, how big is this problem? It happens, but does it matter a lot? Do we participate in so many votes that influence things that someone is really capturing

something or other by having this double vote? I don't know the answer. I'm just raising the question.

Clearly, this is an issue which has a number of different points. There's some subtle aspects to it that are not really clear from our discussion. I would like someone who cares about this issue – I suspect not everyone around the table does – to take responsibility for putting together what I will call a short White Paper, not presenting your position, but presenting the composite pros and cons and what the issues are. We can bring this back to the table at some future meeting.

I would like a volunteer for that. It doesn't have to be putting up their hand now. Tijani is volunteering. I will take that then. We can talk about the details and how we come forward at a future time.

Thank you very much. Good discussion.

Next item we have on our agenda, if I remember correctly, is a prep for the sessions, both the engagement session with the NextGen people, which Dave is leading – we had on the agenda preparation for the Fellow session, but indeed the Fellow session has effectively disappeared.

The reason why is we initially thought that we were going to have a vast number of Fellows here. It turns out that we will

probably only have four or five, maybe. They're all people who have spent a pretty significant amount of time in ICANN before. We're going to have a short introduction, and then we will go into some discussions that we would hold with a normal At-Large leadership discussion and welcome them to participate.

One of them is the budget discussion of the projects that we have put forward this year and what has happened to them. I think that will give them a pretty interesting cross-section of the kind of things we have gotten involved with.

Despite the fact that this is called a policy forum, if you look at our agenda, we have very little real policy on it. We have an awful lot of work but nothing that one could consider policy. And that's not surprising. We're just coming off of accountability, which wasn't policy, of course, and we are starting several large PDPs and other working groups, but they're not a stage that we're going to be discussing here. So this meeting just turns out not to be a policy meeting for ALAC and At-Large. But it's certainly a very significant meeting for making decisions and for where we're going.

Dev, would you like to say a little bit? There is one issue before I turn it over to Dev that's critical. The session for NextGen runs in parallel with the discussion of ALS criteria and expectations. You can't be in both of them simultaneously, so people may want to

spend their time judiciously. If you're going to be in the NextGen session, make sure someone from your RALO or from your point of view can represent your point of view here.

I really don't want to have that discussion and then have it completely over again at a further meeting because someone says, "I wasn't there." Hopefully, you talk to people within your region and there are some shared views or, even if not shared, they can be presented.

Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Alan. We have done some work on the NextGen presentations: 15 slides based on the discussions in past outreach and engagement. We've taken those factors into account and we posted it to the outreach and engagement sub-committee and gotten comments and [took them]. So we think the presentation is concise enough.

Because it's possible there might be a lot of NextGen persons and a number of ALAC persons, by the time if we were to do introductions, which would be a good thing – not denying that – then literally the session would end. So what I probably would be saying is, whenever the person first speaks, we'll just introduce them; just say who they are but also saying where

they're from and what group they're from or what ALS they're from, so they get at least a brief introduction when they first speak.

Regarding the Fellows, I think it's a good thing, especially given that four or five Fellows and especially given that they are seasoned alumni, there's probably no need to go into what At-Large is and so forth. They've already have done those sessions already, so involving them in some sort of policy discussion, albeit not policy. But I think the two topics chosen, cross-community working group and the FY 17 budget requests, at least it shows, I would think, the work of what At-Large is doing. And I would highlight the diversity of At-Large and how it participates in other fora, etc. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have one other comment, partly on what Dev has done and partly on other things. But first, for preparation for the afternoon sessions, can we have a review of what the two afternoon sessions are? I should have memorized them, but I'm not at that stage.

We have the session on Next Generation data registrations services. I'm the second person today who has stumbled over what the initials mean. The second session is on the review of rights protection mechanisms. This is essentially the review of

EN

the new gTLD rights protection mechanisms, the Trademark Clearinghouse, the URS, and there's a registry appeal process.

We have not been actively involved. A number of us, specifically Olivier and I, participated in the group that created the URS and the Trademark Clearinghouse. We had moderately few concerns at that point, and I'm not sure there's anything that really warrants intervention today.

The only concern we had is there is a notice that gets sent out under certain conditions if you try to register a domain name that overlaps with a trademark. That's not forbidden, but it gives you a warning saying you might be violating rights, depending on exactly how you were going to use this domain. I don't think we have enough evidence at this point that I've seen to really say we blew it or it works fine.

So I don't think that is a particularly important session, but it should be interesting because it does show a whole bunch of processes we devised from scratch. This would be a discussion of it. So I encourage to go to it.

I had been planning to go to the RDS one, but another meeting was called in parallel with that. I sent out an e-mail to people about it, and there's an opportunity for one more person to go to the other meeting on essentially a discussion 0f trademark

rights and new gTLDs and its use for spam, phishing, trademark violation, and things like that.

Seun suggested that Olivier attend with me. There's two people who attend: the Chair plus someone else. I don't know whether Olivier is – Cheryl is pointing in that direction, but I don't know who you're pointing at.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If memory serves, Leon indicated on the list his interest to go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon? Okay. I had not checked my mail in the last hour, so I'll talk to Olivier and to Leon, and we'll discuss how to play that one.

Other than that, I'm not sure we have a lot of preparation. I will make a comment on agendas in general. This is, I believe, my fifth meeting as Chair. Prior to…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [We have stereo.]

ALAN GREENBERG;   Sorry. Is there a joke that I missed?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. We have a stereo.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Someone has their microphone on [inaudible] computer [inaudible]. They're hearing you twice.

ALAN GREENBERG: Should I make a comment about whether what I'm saying is so important that hearing it twice is worthwhile?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a declaration – not a declaration. I have to admit that, prior to being Chair, we held lots and lots of ALAC meetings and ALT meetings that I participated in to review ALAC agendas. I didn't pay much attention.

I've now been Chair for four or five meetings. The work was done well enough by Leon and by staff that I sort of looked at it, and occasionally I caught a problem. But it was just done well.

This meeting has been a real experience. Things have gotten changed, and I'm not talking about minor, little adjustments. Things have gotten changed and completely revamped as late as – I think last Friday we did the last one. It was a very substantial change from the previous version. And the agendas within the meetings have changed.

It's been a real experience. Dev is one of the people who has taken the bull by the horns on the outreach ones. He had put together a marvelous agenda for our Fellows. We decided at the last moment: "It's wrong. Let's scrap it completely." Not many people have the nerve to take days and hours of work and say, "Let's just scrap it." It didn't make sense anymore. But Dev did, and I thank you. But a huge amount of work has gone into this meeting.

Now, this doesn't mean it's perfect. This probably means it's going to have a whole bunch of faults because of that. So let's keep feedback coming. To the extent that we waste time in meetings, let's try to stop doing it. If you see things that are on the agenda that you think are really going to be a waste of your time, let's talk about before we actually come to it. It's easier to fix thing before than after.

But I simply will give the heads up that this has been a real challenge to schedule. We have twelve-and-a-half hours of At-

Large leadership face-to-face time, the most we have ever had, because in the past we've had similar numbers, but half of it was talking to visitors, and we have very few visitors this time.

So the B meeting is an experiment, but how we're running the At-Large meetings is also an experiment. As we go through the week, save up your notes, or give them to me individually. We want to spend some time afterwards doing a debriefing of: did we do a good job or not? Because this was done quite differently. Somewhat against the will of some of our staff members, who like to freeze schedules, translate them, and not change them ever again, we haven't done that this time. I'm getting the evil eye from a few people here, and I accept the evil eye. But I think we have ended up with a good schedule because of it.

Thank you all. We have a 15-minute break, I believe, that we've only used up three minutes of. We will meet again at 10:45. Gisella does have an announcement to make.

Please come back in time. I'm told this is a coffee break just outside, so you don't have to travel three kilometers to get to it. Let's try to meet again so we're roughly on time.

The next session will be the ALS criteria and expectations discussion. A document was set out very late last night. I

apologize for the lateness, but we'll be having it on the screen and we'll be talking about it.

Thank you, all.

GISELLA GRUBER: The At-Large outreach and engagement session with NextGen will be taking place next door in Aurora Hall as you exit this meeting room, just to your right. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]