
BARCELONA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (5 of 13)

Sunday, October 21, 2018 – 08:30 to 10:15 CEST

ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

ALAN GREENBERG: May I call this meeting to order?

HEIDI ULLRICH: You might want to introduce everyone to everyone. We didn't do that yesterday.

ALAN GREENBERG: For those of you who don't know me, I'm Alan Greenberg, the current chair of the ALAC. Some people felt because I wasn't here yesterday I just disappeared off the face of the Earth, but I'm back! For a few days, anyway. For those of you who don't know, I was at the EPDP on the GDPR PDP yesterday all day next door.

We've all done welcomes, but I was told that we didn't actually go around the table yesterday to have people very briefly introduce each other.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We did.

ALAN GREENBERG: We did?

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.

MAUREEN HILYARD: There were some people who arrived late.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry. We did not introduce Joanna.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we did forget Joanna.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, Joanna will introduce herself now briefly but everyone else will not introduce themselves to you, so you'll have to figure it out.

JOANNA KULESZA: thank you, Alan. I enjoy a challenge, so I'm going to do that. But I've been doing a pretty good job introducing myself around the table yesterday. Those of you whom I have not yet the opportunity to introduce myself to, please allow me to do that now. My name is Joanna Kulesza. I work at the University of Lodz at the Department of International Law. My research focus is on international law, Internet governance, cybersecurity, and human rights.

I'm very much looking forward to participating within the ICANN community, and within ALAC in particular. I'm hoping to facilitate consensus with the research that I do and the work that I do. So, I'm looking forward to learning more about ALAC, about At-Large, about the policy agenda that is being pursued within this group, about its

[inaudible] composition. I've had a few conversations yesterday already about how diverse the group is in itself and about any policy that it is pursuing.

So, I'm looking forward to learning more about At-Large and about ALAC and I hope that the work that I'm doing professionally and in other forums will help facilitate the work that's being done within ICANN. Thank you very much. Thank you, everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Joanna. The first part of our session today will be on the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group. I've heard a number of different pronunciations for this acronym ranging to ARWIG to ARIWIG. I like EARWIG. Earwig, for those of you who don't know, is an extremely annoying little insect that crawls in all sorts of places and looks scary and I think it's a really good name for this. I'm going to turn it over to – I'll manage the queue but I'll turn it over to Maureen to manage the content. Maureen who happens to be chairing the At-Large Review Implementation activity.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, everyone. Just as a start off, I think we're going to go into the original, the main work space, which really just introduces the whole purpose behind how we are actually ... Why we are actually working on this particular program. And if you'll just bear with me – sorry, I thought I had got it up.

The page that we've actually got most of our work on is the prioritization and dependencies work space, which is why the introduction is actually on this space and it's really just to explain the process.

Now, in order to give you a really good background, for those of you who haven't been part of the regular meetings that we've actually already commenced, I think it would be good if Cheryl ... Because Cheryl and Alan and Holly were the key leaders of the initial review and the developers of the proposal which is what we are currently working on. I think just a little introduction into how we've actually ... To how we got to this proposal stage and why it is that we're actually working on these what is 16 items, but in fact what we're going to do is we're going to actually be focusing on eight. But more on that later. Cheryl, could you just do that for me, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure! I'm perfectly happy to filibuster while you get yourself organized, Maureen. I'm Cheryl Langdon-Orr and I've got the dubious honor of having sat in the chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee seat during the very first of the ALAC reviews. So, this being our second time in a cycle, I come with a tad of background, I guess. Also, the implementation work that we did after the recommendations of the first ALAC review, there are many lessons learned on how we can hopefully work smarter and indeed not harder in the challenge that we have in looking at now not what we should be implementing, but how we can best implement it in keeping with the board's resolution. And

the resolution regarding a document that I actually suggest, Alan, you may want to briefly speak to in terms of its history.

Without putting too fine a point on it, a number of the recommendations and observations that were made during our second cycle review process, we flat out rejected. We tried nicely to help the powers that be understand what the issues actually were as opposed to what were, in some cases, observed. We pointed where errors and omissions may have misled the independent examiner on a number of points. So, we prepared a document which is the one that the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and then the ICANN board has agreed what we now need to implement.

So, we are not re-litigating issues. We are not creating Santa's wish lists or Fairy Godmother wish lists. Pretty much I think the decision was eight of the 16 recommendations, a number of clear tasks that Maureen has already assigned leads I think is the term we're using. Leads who should be key facilitators of small groups who will literally be now getting text together, looking at specific key steps that is required to implement each of these recommendations. [The] choice in how and when these are implemented is also limited by the board resolution because the board resolved that we are to do the simplest and least expensive things first. So, regardless of where they are on our desirability order, we are duty bound to attend to those things which are the least complex and the least costly.

When we have a number of the recommendations that will have either greater complexity or significant cost, then we need to approach

costings and seek financial support to implement those through the normal ICANN budgetary process. So, I think it's really important to have that framework clear in your mind, especially if you're not an active member of the implementation working group because it will come back to the whole of the ALAC and obviously regional leadership is an essential part of all of this, but we are duty bound to take certain prioritized orders.

I don't want to speak any more than that, but Alan, you might want to just briefly do a pre-call and then I notice I we do have at least Marita as a question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll comment on what you just said first and then I'll give the little bit of background. Cheryl is correct. We are supposed to do the easiest and cheapest ones first. But that doesn't mean ... As Cheryl also said, of the eight issues – of the 16 issues raised, we are addressing eight of them. Some of them are really going to be trivial to address because they had the issue wrong, for instance. So, our answer was, "You're wrong. We're not going to do anything related to what you said, but clearly, you were wrong because our documentation was not up to date and we will fix the documentation." So, really easy things to do.

There is one recommendation which is 'the' recommendation and essentially says make At-Large more effective. There are easier parts of that and harder parts of that. Some of the parts of that we will be starting on right at the beginning. We're not going to claim success of the whole proposal at the beginning, but there are parts that we will be

starting on. So, the granularity is more than just each of the eight issues when looking at what we started on first.

The background – and I won't belabor the point. It was a painful couple of years. For reasons that we won't go into, the reviewers identified a number of issues which were not necessarily relevant. The real core issues they identified, we told them about it and there was no secret. Getting lots of involvement from people who don't have money in this game is difficult and ICANN getting people involved who do have money in the game is difficult. So, no particular surprise.

They came up with a number of recommendations, and of those 16 recommendations to go along with the 16 issues, we rejected eight of them I believe outright and accepted eight of them with changes. That put the board in a rather awkward position, for what were they going to approve that we have to implement. It took a long time to get it finally addressed, but we finally agreed. Actually, the board subcommittee recommended and we agreed that we should look at the issues raised and what we proposed to do about them. And notice the word recommendations from the reviewers is not mentioned in that sentence. So, although there's lots of documentation and you can go read them, they're of academic interest only.

So, through a long and painful process, we ended up saying what we're going to do and that is what we're going to do right now. Because there are 16 issues raised, there is a tendency to say, "What are we going to do to each of them?" But, several of them we said are not applicable at all because the issue raised did not exist and other ones, the answer

was this is an ongoing effort. Some of the recommendations even said “continue doing such and such”. Well, we will. But, that’s not an implementation issue. That simply says in our regular business, we will continue doing things, and of course we will enhance and change things as we go along.

There was a lot of pain involved in getting to where we are right now. That’s behind us, but let’s make sure we have to focus on the things that we did commit to the board which are the important things. As I said, lots of pain, lots of stories. For those of you who didn’t live through it, I’d be glad to share them over a beer or wine, or better still, a very large scotch. But that’s where we are right now and I think we’re in a good place. What we have to implement are indeed things that must be fixed. We may even be successful. We’re hoping so. Marita?

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you. Hello. I was just going to [encapsule] what I think I heard Cheryl say which was if it doesn’t cost anything, fix it now, but if it does cost something, ask us for some money and if we don’t give it to you, you don’t have to fix it. Is that what I heard?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I can try and politically correctly answer that, I’ll do my very best. It’s not my forte, as you well know. We are duty bound to find a way wherever possible, wherever it is feasible, to implement these recommendations.

If there was no cost-effective way to do something, there was no way that ICANN could agree to what we say are the bare essentials on costings to do that, then I would suggest it would need to go back to a discussion with the Organizational Effectiveness Committee because, at the moment, our job is to implement these recommendations.

We already went through as a first cut and established that there was a degree of feasibility in what we said we would be able to do. So, whilst it's a hypothetical possibility that there would be no ability to fund it, I don't think it's going to be an actuality.

But, more importantly, when we have done effective costings, the request for that needs to go through normal ICANN budgetary processes which means we have certain cycles that we need to fit into, so there's timing as parts of the project management that we must be aware of because it's no good saying just after the ICANN board agrees to a particular fiscal year budget, "Oh, but hang on. We needed this, that, and the other to implement recs 1, 5, and 7." So, we need to have 1, 5, and 7 costings in for consideration, due and proper consideration, hopeful support, if not perhaps staged implementation or some other negotiation. So, not quite as dire as how you described it.

While I have the microphone, though, the implementation review working group has a very important and time-critical task and that is well before calendar end this year – and I believe, Maureen, you're trying to make it in the week of the 18th or 17th or 16th of December to provide to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the board a project timeline and plan. So, we should have done our triaging, done

our sifting and sorting, had our basic steps put together and be able to say, “Here is what we are forecasting. We need to do when we need to do it and how we need to do it.” Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I’ll follow on just slightly before going down the queue. There are relatively few things in our proposal which we know are going to cost a pile of money. We believe ultimately we probably need another staff member and that’s going to be difficult. But there are no really big-ticket items in the implementation review. There are some big-ticket items in our overall continue business usual. As you know, we have received funding for the At-Large Summit a year from now. That is an out of order allocation because there is no provision for doing that within our normal budgets. We also, on a regular basis, have been holding general assemblies and it’s not clear how those are going to be funded. But that’s the business as usual part. Our biggest problems in fact are on our business as usual, not the implementation. There are no big-ticket items there other than some staff work, perhaps. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I don’t want to overstep here and I guess I’m just concerned that this victory that you accomplished has the risk of being a [inaudible] victory if perceptions and optics aren’t fundamentally changed within the organization. As we continue to have budget battles and things like that, having escaped and gone [swoosh sound] kind of thing for people’s concerns might not service well in the long term. I was just wondering if you have a sense of the things to which we agreed that are

designed specifically to address that brand, if you will, within the ICANN community. Because right now, I think there's a lot of impression that, well, we did a review and the At-Large just rejected it. It's a different perception than I think is held in this room.

So, the question is are there enough things on our implementation plan that are aimed at changing our brand? One example is there's a lot of criticism around ATLAS and our ultimate board-approved response is we will proceed with it as planned. That's what's written in the document and that doesn't sound good from the standpoint of addressing a concern. Legitimate or not. I'm just concerned about this being a short-term victory rather than a long-term one as it currently stands.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The victory was not having to spend the next two or three years doing things which would not work at all and would be a waste of time and expensive, so let's be clear. There are two parts to this community, of our ICANN community, that have been very vocal. They didn't do their homework really well because if you look at the recommendations we didn't implement, that we're not implementing, one of them for instance was we should fund At-Large from the auction funds that we have from the last gTLD round. Well, that's against the rules. We have to be funded by operational funds. We're a part of ICANN.

So, yes, we rejected a number of recommendations. The core one, as I said, is the recommendation number two that is make At-Large more effective. We hope we will be successful. You can't go anywhere within

ICANN where people do not say we have trouble getting people to work. Well, we have trouble getting people to work and it's not surprising, given that none of our people are doing it for their living, whereas they are in most other parts of the organization.

So, yes, we will have critics. I believe, to use an English expression, the proof is in the pudding. If we end up a year, two years, three years from now with significantly more active workers from At-Large participating in the various policy and other activities in ICANN, we will have proved ourselves.

Sorry, I'm giving a speech. But as outgoing chair, one of the questions that people have asked me is, "What have you accomplished? What happened over the last couple of years?" And when I look back, I look at the At-Large involvement in the IANA stewardship transition, in accountability, and in a number of other effects where At-Large made a major contribution, both in time and effort, but also we impacted the outcomes very significantly. That's the reason I think we have support from the board among other places because they actually watched what we're doing.

So, yes, there's criticism. Yes, there will always be criticism. Just like we criticize other parts of the organization on a regular basis. But I'm not really as worried about that if we are actually making a contribution to the organization, and right now, we are.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Tijani and then Sebastien.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I understand very well what Jonathan said. He didn't say we have to get rid of the summit. He didn't say that we don't have to continue like this. He said that we are saying that we will do our summit as planned and this will not change the mentality of those who are always criticizing us.

We can say, instead, that we will have our summit and this time we will not have everyone [in this]. We will have those who contribute, those who are involved, to show that we are evolving. We are not doing things as we were doing them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, the same people who have criticized us for what we're going to do also told us that we brought 1500 people to London for the last summit, slight exaggeration by over a factor of ten, and that we were planning to spend \$5 million this time. So, some of the criticism is going to be there and facts don't alter it. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Merci. Thank you. I'm very happy to speak in front of 300 persons this morning. I'm sorry. I'm also speaking for the 10,000 people online listening to us. Well, about what I understood about what [inaudible] just said, it makes me ask this question. We are always working on

tomorrow and not enough on the day after tomorrow. The review was made two years ago. A lot of people work a lot and fight a lot for its implementation. We are still working on things that we need to do like this and like that.

I'm going to give you an example. Maybe it's not the best example, but I need an example. While we say we want one ore step, okay. At the same time, we are expressing very strongly the fact that 400 persons in our staff is too much. How can we work together with these two ideas? I think we need to ask ourselves how do we want to organize ourselves? What can we ask to the staff? Maybe it's another profile, a different profile, or part time? I don't know.

I think that if we work like that on everything I think we are going to implement things that we already know we need to change. So, yes, I know there is a process that we need to work on and we need to work on the future. It's very important. I think we need good discussion with time on the summit issue. I don't want to speak about that now, but it's a very important item and I think it has nothing to do with the implementation of the review. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sebastien. I will note that part of the review talking about summits and GAs is one of the ones that we are not talking about because it's business as usual. Business as usual doesn't mean it's the same as last time. We are making very significant changes, but the concept, the overall envelope, is the same. Do we have anyone else who wanted to speak? Back to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, everyone. Thank you to Cheryl and Alan for that introduction. One of the things that I want to look at is – Alan, I hope I put the right [inaudible] – is the ARIWG plan development page. It's the one that's actually got the issues and descriptions and the actual proposal text in a table that showed how they were ... What we did first was looked at what was perhaps low needs, medium needs, and high needs of the various sections.

I don't know – it doesn't seem to look as though it comes up there. But, if you're looking at the page, it should have the sections and the categories and text that is actually highlighted in blue font because they're the ones ... And they've got support in the second column. Those indicate the eight areas that we are now going to focus on an try to get ... Oh, and this week, if at all possible, to try and have everyone have some input into it and to evaluate the steps that have actually been developed already, so that we can actually start putting the official document together as soon as we possibly can because as soon as we get that in, the sooner we'll be able to implement it and just get going and carry on with, as Alan says, business as usual.

I agree with Sebastien in that the proposals that we're working on ... Because we've been involved in this process for over two years, the proposals we are working on were things that were identified as things we needed to amend to make it more effective – what it was that was the issue probably all those years ago. We're doing catch-up.

So, if we can get these proposals done, fix these issues up, then we can actually look at moving forward. It's one of the reasons why I sort of thought, "Really, when all said and done, if we can get these things done right, we can actually move forward and it's continuous improvement from then on."

Of course, continuous improvement as looking through some of the suggestions that have been made, it's a little bit of a wish list, but we've got budget things, budget opportunities to be looking at after we have, as a group, decided on what are the areas in which we're going to follow up on. Do you have a question?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have a comment. If any of your eyesight is good enough, the cover of the report is on the screen there. You'll notice it says ... I think it says May 2017. So, the report was issued a year and a half ago. The report was written basically six or nine months before that because we went through a number of draft iterations.

But, what we're implementing, what we hope we're going to be implementing, are things addressing today's world. The world has changed significantly from that point and we're not just going back and saying, "Hmm ... What did they think was a problem two-and-a-half years ago and let's fix it."

So, although we are responding to things that have a long history at this point, we're working in today's world. At-Large is very different now than it was two years ago, and for the better, I believe. It's that world

that we're addressing today, not the way it was before. I'm not as worried about not looking forward. I think we are looking forward and not backwards. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. If we're looking at which ones are those issues that we're going to be focusing on, particularly this week, there was – in the order that's actually on this particular page, which is not the original order of the items. Oh, my gosh, I've lost it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The original report is [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Issue number one, which was the quality versus quantity of ALAC advice, that was ... The proposal said that we're ... Actually, it focused us on staff, under the direction of At-Large leadership has already begun to rework the website and Wiki to ensure that our policy advice pages are accurate and understandable. This will continue as volunteer and staff resources allow.

So, the focus on this was on addressing the issues related to how our ALAC policy advice was actually structured on the website and there was apparently some misunderstanding, some misinterpretation of what it is that we did, in respect of what was being shown on the website.

So, in this respect, the proposal focuses us on that issue. Jonathan has been – was assigned ... Yeah, voluntold – that particular item. I just wanted to ask Jonathan the recommendations that have been made on the prioritization page, which is the one that's actually shown at the top, what issues do you see as the key – what are the key steps that you ... I mean, there's actually quite a lot there considering we're looking at those issues. But, can you explain what you've got there as proposed steps for moving forward? Probably just using this as an example of how we move on to the others.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Pitch the exemplar.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess this is sort of what I thought I was presenting on at 1:30 or something and I don't know whether it actually represents a good example because of the conversation we had on the most recent CPWG call.

In a sense, it's over-jobbing what is otherwise a simple recommendation. So, some of that is personally motivated which is this notion that we have a brand issue to address and one of the things we can do to address that brand, which might be a separate parallel exercise that should take place from checking the boxes associated with the simpler portions of the review implementation. So, I'm hesitant to forge ahead with these continuing steps, but they're in this separate box because they're intended to be ideas that are designed to

solidify the brand of the At-Large as a voice of end users and looking into the ways to go about doing that.

I think one of them is to figure out how to communicate out to a larger community more often when it comes to policy development. So, I think the people in this room play a critical role in potentially socializing ALAC policy to the broader At-Large community so that what we bring to bear is something that has some rough consensus associated with it and not just the ruminations of the people in At-Large leadership. So, what could we do about that?

Does it make sense to use our social media capabilities to do activation, to get a bunch of people? What if we had 500 people sign a document or something like that to show the sort of oomph that this organization has that other organizations within the ICANN community do not have? Is that a differentiator and a brand builder?

So, those are the kinds of things that I'm very interested in as part of a reform effort. Whether or not it is in fact checking this particular box I think is a question that Alan had raised in the last call, to which I was sympathetic, that we shouldn't promise more – to deliver more than we already promise we would do when it comes to this box item. I don't know if what I just said was helpful. But that's what I'm interested in discussing this afternoon is this idea of really strengthening the At-Large brand to improve the overall optics in the organization so that when it comes time to, for example, organize a budget veto because we feel like we've been cut back too far, do we have the support we need from the rest of the community to do that? Things like that.

So, that's where I am on a broader picture, but right here, the actual proposed implementation step is really about, as Alan mentioned, documentation, better presentation of what we're already doing and we should probably focus these items on executing on that very specific promise that we made as part of this implementation.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Jonathan. I take your point. This particular item focuses on website and the branding. That's very much part of it. That whole perception I just did, perception on optics. If we can be seen to be providing that information in a way that people actually understand what it is that At-Large is actually doing, that makes it a very successful presentation about what it is that is the work of At-Large and how we're actually presenting it to the public. I can see that is a very excellent way of doing it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I've got myself and Hadia in the queue and Sebastien. This particular recommendation or issue is one of the more intriguing ones because it's talking about our creation of policy advice, of comments and things like that. It's an area where we have had very, very significant problems and it needs a lot of work.

What they focused on was something else. They missed the real problem and focused on the public relations part of it or something like that. So, yes, we have a lot of work to do in that area, but it's the business as usual work because that's not what they raised. They

ignored completely the real problem we had and raised a very peripheral one that they misunderstood because some titles on some pages were wrong. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I would contend we still have the public relations problem as well, as whatever we've identified as the actual functional or substantive problem. This reflects a PR problem that exists in conjunction with a substantive problem. I guess that's all I'm saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I do agree with Jonathan, of course, that it is a public relations problem, but also I am not sure if it's only that. I'm not sure if actually the topics we use to pick for commenting on were the extremely important or relevant topics to end users or not. If this was actually the case, then we need to show that.

Among the metrics I think should be a list for the topics, for example, which we choose to comment on, like documenting the topics that we ... Well, it's documented of course on the website, but we need to mention clear the topics that we choose to comment on and the relevancy of these topics to end users.

Another thing, also, could be that those that we choose not to comment on, we could also put a statement or something saying why we didn't

comment on these topics and why do we think that they irrelevant to end users.

Another metric could be also we are saying that we are going to not rebuild the website but work on it to represent our work in a clear manner and documenting also the changes that we've done to the website and how we see those changes relevant and are going to make changes. I think this is important as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. We're starting with a two-minute timer. We're going to run out of time at this point. But we'll start with a two-minute timer right now. We right now. We right now have Sebastien, Cheryl, and Jonathan.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you to start the two-minute timer with me. No problem. I don't think I agree. Please don't add [inaudible]. We need to do comments, we do comments. And which one we choose, sometimes it's because we have the knowledge. We have the people with the knowledge to do it and sometimes we don't comment because we don't have the knowledge and we don't have the people to do it. Therefore, it's one way to take into account. Maybe we don't find the right people to do the comments.

My main point here, maybe it's time to rethink and we just talk about the ALAC advice. It's not ALAC advice. What is ALAC advice? It's not a comment. It's when we send an advice to the board. That's ALAC advice. The other things are not ALAC advice and maybe it's time really to think

about what the ALSes, what the RALO needs to do and what ALAC needs to do and maybe we need to say, “Okay, from now on, the comments must be done by the RALO and ALAC can help them to do that and we, as ALAC, we [inaudible] on doing advice to the board.” It’s not to say that, as ALAC member, we will not participate to policy development, to working group, to some other stuff. But, when it comes to comments, we ask the region to do it and maybe they can do it cross-regional with our help as ALAC, but it’s just to try to sync a little bit in advance, not backwards once again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I’ve been asked to note to people that if you’re speaking, take your headset off from around your neck and make sure there’s feedback. It’s causing problems right now. Next we have Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to briefly remind you all we had the report up, for example, earlier. The ICANN board did not endorse or approve the report that we’ve had discussions through today, so as interesting and academically rewarding as that may be, that is not our job. Our job is to look at the implementation of what was in the overview document on our feasibility of what we believe can be implemented. That is what the board approved and it’s those recommendations that we need to act upon. So, let’s just make sure we don’t spend too much time naval gazing on what did or didn’t happen. We also need to be moving forward.

The other thing is what Sebastien says is very important inasmuch as the advisory committee role of advising the ICANN board but also having a role, as we are mandated to do, into policy of the development of the support organization. So, what is unique about us is the At-Large Advisory Committee does have necessary interest in what is going on ICANN-wide. It is not an SSAC that is simply giving advice to the board and the board takes it on board – pardon the pun – or not. It is not a GAC in the way it responds and reacts. We do have a mandate to respond as an advisory committee to other parts of ICANN when that is called upon.

Now, public comments, of course, may or may not be declared as whatever level of advice, but what’s important is an understandable nomenclature. That probably needs to be developed.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. I’ll be brief. I guess I continue to believe that we need to be very careful of a work process that’s, “Hey, whenever we’ve got somebody that knows something, they should file a comment, and if we don’t, we don’t.” I think that’s a very dangerous way, if we’re talking about building brand as the voice of end users. I think a little bit of rigor in applying some end user perspective, public policy positions, socializing that in a group so that the people that are going out into working groups are representing a consistent point of view instead of their

personal point of view. I think that's critical to this organization, At-Large as a whole being regarded as a voice of end users, rather than a bunch of random people that get funded to come to ICANN to give their personal points of view. I think that, together, and as a unit, we have a lot more ability to influence policy inside ICANN, more ability to improve the reputation of the At-Large than we do if we continue to be dispersed and individualistic in the way that we approach both public comments and work group participation. So, that's something on which I continue to feel very strongly.

Again, I don't think it's about having expertise. I think it's about having a unique perspective that the end user – it's a perspective not addressed by the parties of the dispute. If there's a big discussion going on between the IPC and the contracted parties and they're having a debate about their interests going back and forth and there's an opportunity for us to raise our hand and say, "There's something you're not thinking of. It's the end user." Then that feels like a real opportunity for us, that if we are just making it based on when we have expertise or mood or availability of volunteers, it becomes a missed opportunity. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll point out that, at this point, we have about 30 minutes left in this session. We're only on item number one and we have a speaker queue of six people. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

So, I do agree with what Jonathan just said, and if I understand Sebastien correctly, he said it's basically advice to the board and not really comments. I actually think it's both because it represents our role as the voice of end users, so it needs to be both. And not ignoring what he said, but yes, we should also focus on our comments.

And as for putting a simple statement on why we choose or do not choose to comment on a certain topic, this is not necessarily for the review implementation plan, but it's also good for us. So, we can always go back and look at what we did. It's not necessarily for others. It's good for us to be able to evaluate and go back to our work, and maybe also, as Sebastien said, that the contribution of ALSes is also very important. Yes, definitely, it is and maybe this also can be one metric. How many people from ALSes come to comment? And this could guide us on how we can evolve or work on these issues if we have members saying we have none of the ALSes, for example, come to a meeting or two or three, and who are the people?

Again, if we just commented on a topic just because we have the capacity to do that, I don't think it's the right thing to do, but even putting a simple statement saying that, it could help us later in evaluating ourselves. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Gisella, please?

GISELLA GRUBER: I know we mentioned it a short while ago. When you are speaking, please just avoid having earphones around your head. The interpreters get a huge amount of feedback. Thank you. And sorry, while I'm at it, I know if we've got a two-minute timer, please don't speak any faster. It won't allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would be nice. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: I'm not going to refer to the issues that we need to make advice on. If we are asked today in those issues that you provide advice what is your justification, what is your rationale, the 15 of us, it's only us. We don't have the RALOs, but are we really complying with the fact the RALOs need to give us the information, the necessary feedback from the end users so that feedback really reflects the opinion of end users? This is not really being done and I think this is what we need, as it was said here.

The most important for us is this. If we didn't lose time in saying something and we don't give an opinion and generate a recommendation, this is not relevant. What is relevant is to have the feedback from the end users and that's why we need to use the ALSes. We need to make the most of them. I referred to this yesterday and I can talk about this a little bit more. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm next in the queue. A couple of very quick comments. If you look at board motions, board motions are now accompanied by a very extensive rationale of why they did it or why they didn't do it. That's new, relatively speaking, in ICANN. The number of support people who support the board in creating those documents has grown significantly in the last few years. The board members don't write that.

So, yes, maybe it would make sense to have us have a rationale for why we're responding, why we're not. I'm not seeing a lot of volunteers who are saying they're going to put their time into that and I don't think we should be putting our volunteer time into that. If that's an area that we want to demand staff for, we certainly can, but I would be strongly reluctant to ask volunteers to do all of that background work and paperwork. It's hard enough getting the substantive comments out of people.

With regard to Hadia's comment of be more selective, go back to the documents of this review. We have cut in half, I believe, the number of things we responded to. Yes, not everything is advice. The problem was when the reviewers looked at the webpage, it was all culled advice, even though very little of it was advice.

Just for the record, again, I'll look at my history. One of the things that I'm proudest about, honestly, is we have given very little advice to the board because we are managing to influence outcomes before it gets to the board. Giving advice to the board where the answers are already presented to them and they're supposed to override the community's answers, is a really bad time to do it. Traditionally, that's where the GAC

gave advice and the GAC has more power than we do and even then it wasn't always listened to.

So, the fact that we have had very few times where we felt the need to give advice to the board, I'm proud of that. Next we have Marita. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. I would like to thank Jonathan for raising this issue regarding that we are not expressing the opinion, our personal opinion, but we are expressing the opinion of At-Large and At-Large is not the 15 members of ALAC. At-Large is not the members of the CPWG. At-Large is all the RALO members, plus all the ALAC members.

So, when we have an issue on which we are more or less agreeing, perhaps we can go ahead and not go to the RALOs and ask for their opinions, but when we have an issue on which are divided, we have two opposite opinions, I don't think that we have to go and express the opinion of the majority or of ALAC or of the CPWG or the opinion of the most vocal people. We have to express the opinion of the At-Large and we have to go, in this case, to the RALOs and ask for their opinion. It is compulsory for, in my point of view, we don't have the right to express an opinion that is not sure the opinion of At-Large, that is the opinion of the most powerful or the [inaudible] or the most vocal people. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And our challenge in number two is to get people out there who actually have some opinion who know what we're talking about and can contribute to that. That's the real challenge. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Merci. Thank you. I'll be speaking French. We can always see that as soon as there is a topic, we have a common opinion and that we should express it. Diversity in our group makes it so that we don't have a common position. So, do we keep the discussion within our group or do we participate in working group?

There are many things that I would like. "Oh, it's not good. He speaks in his own name." No. It's diversity. That's what diversity is. That's where we come from. We come here not to express the opinion of the chairman – please excuse me, Mr. Chairman. It's not the voice of the majority because it has a power. Our strength is diversity, and if it's not expressed, we lose.

At times, we are together and we have a common position – if we have done our homework, of course. No problem there. But, before that homework is done, it is absolutely crucial that we do express the positions of all involved in all of the fora that we're involved in, and that little by little, we will get to a common position. And if we don't get there, we have an issue with consensus, so then we can talk about that, about consensus.

But, I don't think that there is necessarily just one voice that needs to be expressed. Please, that's not my point of view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I didn't put my card up. I thank you. I know that we have concentrated on this particular issue and perhaps deviated a bit, but I think that this is an important discussion to be looking at why it is we do what we do and how would be a more effective way of getting the opinions from across the region. It's really good that we're actually saying how important it is that we get the RALOs views and it's one of the ... Looking at that At-Large leadership model that I've got, the reason for that was so that we're actually bringing the opinions of the regions into the discussions that we have with the ALAC and I think that's probably, for me – and from the discussions that we have, it's really encouraging to see that that sort of support is being voiced. Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maureen. That's an introduction. I've got a better one for you. Just very briefly while we're talking about Regional At-Large Structure, and indeed individual member contribution, let's not forget the fact that one-fifth of the At-Large Advisory Committee comes from each of the regions, at least the last time I checked. So, this is not something that should, in fact, be happening in isolation. If you have effective coordination, collaboration, and efficiency and effectiveness between that regional representation – notice I'm not just saying RALO representation, I'm saying regional representation – in the component

parts of the ALAC and the regional leadership team and, dare I say, an effective and vibrant region should be engaging as At-Large Structures. The At-Large Structure component parts, be they organizational or members of individual status and indeed the region's now individual members.

Part of the experimental solutions may come from what's happening with consolidated policy working group. It is a test and try before you buy model. It's building a plane, as Jonathan and Olivier are trying to fly it. But there could be some very valuable learnings from that.

But we do still have to do the business of why we are all here, while we are making it more effective and efficient business to conduct. So, let's not build false differentiation between the At-Large Advisory Committee, the regional sub-structures that support and should be acting as conduit for information exchanged between ICANN activities and the end user community. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And I will point out, just looking around this table we have a number of people here who were not put into official positions of responsibility and then started working. They actually just started working and miraculously we managed to get a lot of the meetings like this. Our problem is not that we haven't consulted with anyone. It's there has been very often a dearth of response when we do do that consultation and ask questions. It's a difficult problem and hopefully, again, when we start looking at the number two issue, that's the whole thing. The whole thing is how do we get constructive contributions from

people all around the world, not only the ones that we provide travel support to? That's really difficult.

As Cheryl pointed out, we use the term RALO a lot. A third of the ALAC is not from a RALO. They may choose to work with the RALO, but they're appointed by the NomCom explicitly to be independent. And as I said, I believe once you're here, you should work with your RALO but you're not representing them and that's an important part of how we're constructed. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I think that yesterday when we had some discussions when the GSE teams were here, it was quite obvious that the different RALOs work in different ways, of course. I guess I take it from the viewpoint there are RALOs that work together incorporating [inaudible] and if we're going to include other teams like the GSE into it, I think it's really important that, first of all, the RALO itself is actually working as a cohesive body as well and I think it's an extremely good model and especially probably if you can get your NomCom person actually really feeling like they're part of the team, that actually does make a pretty good model for working together and getting other ALSes and the individual members and other people also feeling comfortable enough about contributing and there's got to be a level of comfort within the RALOs themselves to actually feel that people can actually contribute.

It's actually trying to find ways in which you're actually going to engender that comfort level for people to want to contribute. But it's not just contributing, because again, as we've said before the capacity

building, making sure that they understand what it is that they're contributing to, understanding what it is that ICANN is doing.

But the ultimate thing, for this particular issue, just drawing us back to that, is how do we convey that information in our submissions and on our website itself so that we're actually – this is the brand. The fact is that we're actually conveying it because, in a way, that reflects our intent, our purpose, which is to represent the interests of the end user. Excuse me, Ms. Langdon-Orr, would you like to say something?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I would love to say something. Thank you, Madam Potential Chair, Incoming Chair. It's alright. At this stage, if we can't have fun, why are we doing it?

We have less than four minutes in this section of time allocated for the discussions of this review implementation working group, so I just thought I might see if we can bring this baby home. First of all, let's see if there's anybody with any other business and I'm glaring at you all hoping that there isn't, but I guess I have to ask. Do any of you dare have any other business? Okay, great. That's a little bit of time gained back for us.

Before I [inaudible] back Maureen so she can do whatever it is that makes it end sweetly and with a great "yay team" remind you that in round figures, if we assume none of us will be working the first couple of days after we return from our ICANN 63 experience, there is about four-and-a-half to five weeks of time before this working group needs

to have its documentation finalized and put together in a sufficiently polished format that we can be giving it to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

Therefore, if you are a lead or one of the leads or any of the now eight issues that we're paying particular attention to, we've drilled down a great deal on the one that Jonathan is working on. But I know a number of you, including Holly and Tijani and others around the table, have done – and Olivier obviously with the ATLAS and General Assemblies questions. And of course social network, etc. – just what's done here with social network is proof of the pudding of the type of things that, what John and the issues team that he's working with are putting together with social network.

So, a bunch of stuff is happening. We need to record it, put it into steps, fit it into the template. Why don't you plan on four weeks' worth of work and give yourself a week's grace? Back to you, madam.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Just to finish off this particular session, there will actually be other opportunities for us to discuss and update some of the other issues that are ... I feel really good that the leads are ... I mean, I'm hearing discussions all over the place of people who are working on these steps and it's really important. Taking into account the discussions that we've had today, I think it's very positive and, again, just sticking to those ... The eight. If you're one of the eight, really focus on those. If you're one of the eight-plus – so, 9 to 16 numbers – that just means that you are ... We're probably after just a statement. Just a

statement of continuous development. But we will work on those on the times that we actually meet with regards to this. And there's going to be several opportunities between now and of course 12:00 on Friday. I'll now pass over to – I think I'm right on top for passing over to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And our next item is a prep session or the beginning of a prep for the ccNSO meeting later today. I'll pass it back to Maureen. Sorry. The schedule was changed when I wasn't here. I was told you're doing the next session.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. This afternoon we have a session with the ccNSO and they gave us a set of questions. We didn't actually have any questions to give back because we looked at their questions and decided that, in fact, a lot of it was they wanted to know from us how we felt about these particular issues.

One of them was: does ALAC view activities in the area of Internet governance as part of ICANN's mission and a strategic priority? I think in relation to the fact that the board is actually looking at the new strategic plan, the ccNSO is also looking at how they are going to incorporate their recommendations for ccNSO.

So, I think it's a good thing that they're probably going to pick our brains about what [inaudible] that we're planning on doing and to give them some ideas of how they may want to go about addressing.

So, what they wanted to know is what are the ALAC's views on the roles of different groups of ICANN and respect to the board, the staff, communities, and the CCWGIG. This is of interest to us anyway. We have someone who can represent that view.

Has the ALAC considered possibilities to consolidate and coordinate all the different activities? Not quite sure about that one. And how do they see the interaction between global, regional, and national IG-related activities?

To be honest, I haven't actually had a chance to go over the proposals for the board strategic plan, but I'm actually getting some documentation. Staff is going to coordinate that for me.

But the other two questions. The second one was: what does the ALAC consider strategic priorities for the upcoming strategic plan? I'm looking at it from the perspective of what would our priorities ... if we were asked to state all the strategic priorities for At-Large to put into the board strategic plan, what would they be? The third one was real interesting. What do you consider possible ways to organize the ICANN budget spending?

So, those are the questions that the ccNSO has given us to discuss this afternoon. What I thought that we might do is we have a lunchtime working session, sort of like team building kind of thing. So, what I'm going to do is I'm going to get you into groups [inaudible] with the documentation that we're going to have to discuss that, so that we can come up with some answers as a team to present to the ccNSO as well as get their – elicit from them what they're thinking of talking about. So,

if I worked in four groups, it would be – we’ve got our own budget people. I’m sure they can come up with some creative ways of telling ICANN how they can spend their money. Looking at the strategic priorities.

Obviously, a strong interest in Internet governance, their question about how do you think Internet governance fits into ICANN’s mission and strategic priority. That’s quite a biggie. So, that’s what we’re going to be working on during lunch. I hope it doesn’t give you indigestion. So, you’ll have to be nice to each other while you’re talking about it. We have some questions. Who was first? I think I might go with a lady.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. I’d be interested in asking them, given that one of the important things that ALAC does is contribute to the development of policy, what is the response of the ccNSO to policy developed by the GNSO? In other words, it’s ccNSO. They’re all country code. They’re not in any way contractually bound to ICANN, but there’s a whole discussion within ICANN and its various component parts as to appropriate policies in different areas. To what extent do they read the stuff, think about the stuff? Does it apply? Does it not apply? I’d be very interested. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you for that question. It’s a little bit late, but we can probably pass that over to them and hope that they’ll, on the spot, be able to

provide us with some answers. I'll send it to Katrina and just give her a bit of a head's up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think some of that answer might be somewhat intuitively obvious for those who have been around for a while, but I won't go into that.

Those of you who have been around the last year or so know that there's been significant discussion on what strategic forces and what things are influencing us that we need to consider in the strategic plan. By the way, it's not the board strategic plan. It's the ICANN strategic plan. You'll hear, if you go to the opening session, what the conclusions of those studies and discussions in the community have been on the strategic forces that are influencing us and that we must consider in our strategic plan.

I hope one of the documents staff is pulling together is that list of five issues that the chair of the board will be talking about in his session tomorrow because that is an absolutely critical part of what the things are that the community, including the board, has decided are important and they are all important, so I do hope that will be one of the documents that you'll be providing.

For those that aren't familiar, I can talk a little bit about it if we have a few minutes, but I'm not going to do it now unless asked. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. First of all, I was looking at where are the questions from the ccNSO to us, if we can have them on our screen. My second point is that within the members of ALAC and [inaudible] of At-Large, we have some good connection with ccTLDs and I think it will be important to know that, for some people here in this room it's obvious, but for others who are new, it's maybe not. I will start saying that I am board member of AFNIC. AFNIC is running the dot-FR but is also the backend registry of some French new gTLDs. Not so new now, but still, we call them new gTLDs.

At the same time that we have this lunch, I have a commitment with other ccTLD board members, therefore I will not be with you and I would like to apologize for that. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. Thank you very much. I'm just sending a message off to Katrina of the ccNSO one.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have four more minutes in this, but we can go on to the next item if there are no questions.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No more questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, is that new?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was a question. I think it's important to know whether the links of [inaudible] with the CC world, not because we are in conflict of interest, but I would think that it could be for the landscape useful. But if you don't think it's interesting, then ...

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't realize you were asking for answers from around the table. Anyone around the table have any links with ccTLDs? We have several.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you want us to put our hands up if we don't have a link with our ccTLD? That might that be easier. Who doesn't have a link with their country-code top-level domain management? There you go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does going to a dinner they provide count?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Beyond dinners. So, there you go, Sebastien. They're the ones who don't.

ALAN GREENBERG: We seem to be out of speakers on this. The next session I'm told is a prep session for the RSSAC meeting and I honestly have no idea what it is because the RSSAC ... We invited RSSAC to come and have them tell us about themselves and what their plans are because most people around this table have had very little interaction with them, so I'm not sure what the prep session for a prep session is, but ... Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: During the last meeting, we discussed the issue and we decided to invite them. I think it's important that before the meeting at least all of you read the executive summary of the document RSSAC 037 from the 15th of June. It will be a good preparation for that because you may not have the time to read now the 50 pages of the document, but I think it's a very interesting move from organization, from root server, people who were saying, "Okay, we come to ICANN to discuss, to meet, but we have no link with ICANN. We don't want to have any process to know how we could replace one manager of the root server and here they come with some proposal to be more integrated. I think it's an important step, evolution for them, for ICANN, and for us and therefore for end users. That's all I can say in the short term now, but I really think that if you can at least have a look to the executive summary – it's a half page – it will be useful for the next session. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. John?

JOHN LAPRISE: I must disagree with Sebastien in the sense that I think it's absolutely essential that everyone on ALAC read the full document. The executive summary does not do it justice. It is a transformative document on what RSSAC is and what it proposes to do in the future and it is perhaps one of the most thoughtful pieces I've read that has come out of ICANN. It's really valuable reading, so I encourage everyone to find some time and read the document in its entirety. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Let me try to summarize very quickly because there are not many people here who are going to read a 50-page document in the next 20 minutes or possibly even the executive summary.

The root servers – does everyone here know what the root server system is? I'll summarize anyway, because I suspect some people don't want to put their hands up. if you type a domain name in, the root server system, if you type icann.org, the first thing you have to do is find out where's dot-org. The root servers tell us that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It's numbers. [inaudible] numbers.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. We address things on the Internet by numbers. We have to translate it. The root server system tell us where the highest level domain is. So, where is dot-org? Where do we go to find out where dot-org is, so that we can then ask, "Where is ICANN?" That's the core of the addressing

system and it has to work. There are currently 13 root server operators around the world. Many of them have many incarnations, many copies, but they're run by 13 organizations. Why are there 13? Because the size of a packet when they designed the system would allow 13 pointers in it and no more, so 13 is the right number.

They are independent operations. They fund themselves through whatever means they choose and they run themselves without reporting to anyone at the moment. I see that. Thank you.

There have been some root server operators who have basically said, "We want nothing to do with ICANN. They have no control over us. We have no obligation to them." The proposal that is on the table right now essentially says the root server system needs to be revamped in a variety of interesting ways and ICANN should be a major part of that. How that came about that we have complete reversal on some people's positions is largely due to a number of people I won't name, but who have been working very hard over the last number of years to change the philosophy of some of these people. That's the [inaudible] of it.

But that's the reason we brought them in. We're asking RSSAC to come and talk to us about what they are and hopefully, I think, how they see themselves evolving. It's not clear it's an evolution of RSSAC as opposed to revolution of the root server system. Remember, RSSAC does not run the root servers. There is a root server group that actually works together to run the root servers, but it's not RSSAC. It's an entity that's completely unaffiliated with ICANN and they're now talking about affiliation in various ways. It is a revolutionary thing, but that is indeed

why we're giving them a fair amount, a chunk, of our time. We have Joanna and Olivier.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. I just have a very simple newcomers question. The first specific question is: is ALAC commenting on the draft? It was distributed [inaudible] on the mailing list. Thank you. So, is ALAC going to comment on the draft? If so, is there a drafting team? How is the selection of the drafting team going to follow? I understand we work on volunteers and I presume there's going to be or there has been one that I missed, a call going out on the mailing list. And more generally, is there a process for selecting volunteers for comments? Is it just a call-out on the mailing list? Is there a pool of volunteers that is there? And this is a newcomer question. I understand that this is an answer that's obvious to everyone, but I'm going to grab this opportunity and ask it anyway. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The answer to the last question is essentially what we spent 45 minutes talking about before about how do we organize comments and how do we get input and who does the drafting and how do we do it in a timely manner. Talk to Jonathan about it. He has some ideas and he'll be presenting those ideas later, just after lunch I think.

Whether we will comment ... Now, the RSSAC proposal is to the board. It's not out for public comment. That doesn't stop us from making a comment to somebody. I'm not quite sure who we would make the

comment to, but I honestly feel that things are at a very preliminary stage right now, and other than us saying, “Yay, let’s get together and talk,” I’m not sure we have ... I don’t think I have a lot that I would contribute. The details are going to be heavily influx. There’s strong debate about whether this should cost \$15 million or a lot more or a lot less. It is equally unclear who would pay for it if it’s going to cost money.

So, I wasn’t planning to try to organize a comment on it. The next chair may. Olivier and then Jonathan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is a sick microphone. You mentioned earlier on the root servers that there are 13 copies or 12 copies of the 13th original. It’s actually not copies. You have to be very careful. You used the word copies. It’s not mirrors, either. I was chastised a few months ago for saying mirrors. It’s instances. They’re entirely independent. They may or may not choose to make a copy of the A root, but they may choose not to. They’re run by 12 different organizations and there are 918 of them at the moment

. The number is increasing. 918 instances and many, many countries around the world are actually electing to have a copy – sorry, there you go. Done it again. Chop. An instance of a root server in their country, and in fact a number of countries where we have actually helped, as At-Large structures, to bring an instance – that copy word has to be deleted from the vocabulary. An instance in their country. I’m speaking of Armenia, for example, has now more than one instance from various organizations. It’s quite straightforward process to get an instance of a

root server in that country and I actually wanted to just take this opportunity to mention it before our meeting with the RSSAC that there are several operators that would be more than happy to put instances of the root server in countries that are not currently served. That, by the way, brings more stability to the local network.

ALAN GREENBERG: An unpaid advertisement. Thank you. Or maybe it was paid. I don't know. Anyone further have any comments? Sorry, Jonathan, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I'll just say that [inaudible] as an answer to your first question. I guess I want to say something unpopular here. I'm having a great deal of difficulty identifying what the unique end user perspective is on the root server system. In other words, what is it that we bring to the table as the voice of end users, as opposed to the business community, the contracted parties, everyone else that's engaged in this issue? What is it that's special about us with respect to this issue? I don't mean to be the jerk in the room, but I'd be interested in what that analysis looks like in the context of the root server system.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me try answering that. I'm not sure there needs to be a unique position from everyone. In the cast of root servers, for instance, we all have a very strong vested interest in making sure they continue to work and that they are resilient and they can respond to the various threats, and presumably the architecture will evolve over the next few decades.

I'm not sure why that has to be unique to At-Large in this particular case.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess so that we're saying we're bringing something to the table that's different than what everyone else will be saying about their proposal. What is the end user perspective on this issue as opposed to just everyone's perspective? What is it that's special about why are we talking about this? Why are we bringing the perspective of the end user to this issue? I guess that's what I'm trying to get at. You're saying we don't have to. I guess I'm trying to push for a framework in which we actually make decisions like that, rather than we should be interested in everything because I could make a case for literally every discussion that happens inside ICANN that it affects end users in some way. But, the question is, if the debates or discussions that are going on are addressing those issues in a comprehensive way, what is it that we are bringing that's special to that discussion? That's my question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess there are some things that are important to ICANN and we may choose to comment on it, and whether we comment on root servers or not is a question we have to ask. But I wouldn't say that we must be unique in order to comment. Depends on the issue. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Jonathan, for your question. I think it is a technical issue and, yes, we as end users [inaudible] root server

function. [inaudible] for company and for registry and registrar, of course, but that's one point.

The second is that it may come with a big change in ICANN and that's why end users care because we care about ICANN. The last point is that discussions [inaudible] not just for end users. Of course, it's why there are [inaudible] root servers in the US. The day we will have one root server saying, "Hey, guys, I will stop to run my root server," who else is willing to take it? How we organize the way that it be taken, I hope that we will have a voice for that saying you need to take into account the fact that there is no one root server in Latin America or in Africa. That's a good time to have one from Washington to go to Africa or to go to Latin America. That will be ... It's not today. It may never happen. But it's one possibility [inaudible] with this document. Therefore, we need to be there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have five minutes left in this session and we have John Laprise, Hadia, Marita, and Olivier.

JOHN LAPRISE:

I think I want to reiterate something. At this point, to my knowledge, we aren't being called upon to make a decision about this document. This is merely a planning document at this point and ideas that are being floated. It's, in a sense, an interesting thought document and a think piece and it's something we should be aware of, but I don't think we're

necessarily called upon to make any sort of remarks or comments on it.
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's going to evolve heavily over the next little while. I think we're going to have to end the queue at this point. Hadia? Marita?

MARITA MOLL: I see this also as an information session and I'm looking at the document. I think they're looking at setting up a structure within ICANN. We should know about this. Public comment system. They'd like to take advantage of various types of groups that might be convened to develop the model. I could also see ... That's the sort of stuff that you'd want to know about in advance.

I can also see that, if this were to happen, potential impact on the budget and we do actually look at the budget and we'd want to know a little more about what's behind that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, back of envelope calculations, some people have set the implementation costs at about \$100 million and operational costs \$30 to \$50 million a year. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to respond to Jonathan Zuck's question as to what do these root servers have to do with end users. Twofold,

within the frame of our organization of the ALAC and the At-Large community.

First, we have a number of At-Large Structures, a large number of At-Large Structure, that are involved locally, technically, in the development of their local Internet and that includes the DNS servers. That includes the top-level domain in some cases, country code top-level domain. It is all about building more bridges to have more instances of these root servers locally. So, we are a very good channel for those root server operators that might not have a channel to the local people in charge in order to bring that essential stability, or enhanced stability in the local Internet.

Second, outside these walls there are some governments, several governments, many government actually that call these resources critical Internet resources, and critical Internet resources are resources which are so critical that it's better that government runs them. So, we are basically faced with a growing number, in fact, of governments that say this is so important, those root servers should be run by governments instead of being run by these root server operators, and therefore as end users we need – we absolutely need – to show our support for the current root server system and this is why it's really important for us to be there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Item number four of the strategic areas is geo-politics.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can't comment on that. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: You just did. Alright. I know we have one or two other people who put their hands up, but we really need to break at this point. We will reconvene when? 15 minutes from now. It's an area that has some interest – me, because I'm running the session – on our rules of procedure. We will try to start on time, so please be back in 15 minutes. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]