
BARCELONA – Joint Meeting ICANN Board and ALAC
Wednesday, October 24, 2018 – 08:30 to 09:30 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

LEON SANCHEZ:

This is Leon Sanchez. We will be beginning our meeting between the ALAC and the ICANN board. It's three minutes past the allocated time. So I would like to welcome you all to this meeting. As you know, we hold periodic meetings with each of the constituencies and each of the SOs and ACs in the community. We sent you a couple of questions to be answered. We are in the process, as you know, of building and designing the strategic plan for the next five years. As Cherine, who will be joining us shortly, said in his opening speech, this is a very important exercise and it's also a plan that for the first time has been paired with the costs to actually implement the strategic plan. So it's not just a list of wishes or wishful thinking but it's also a list of concrete actions that are paired with the financial needs and the financial support that they will actually be needing to be implemented and carried out. So do we have -- the slides, who's controlling the slides? Can we go to the first slide, please.

So the board would like to know, of course, which would be your main priorities for 2019 and after we hear from you on that, we'll go to the next question, which, of course, relates to the way the multistakeholder model within ICANN is evolving and the need for continued evolution and to make it efficient as -- as an ongoing basis. So I would like to

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.

welcome you all again, and for the benefit of those who are joining remotely and our scripts, I would like to do a pretty fast roll call for those who are seated at the table. And so could we start with you, George?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky, ICANN Board.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Bastiaan Goslings from The Netherlands, ALAC member for EURALO.

AVRI DORIA: Avri Doria, ICANN Board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain, ICANN Board.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, ICANN Board.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez, ICANN Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg, ALAC, outgoing chair. And for any other ALAC members who plan to speak to one of these two questions, there still is room at the front table.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Maureen Hilyard from the Cook Islands, incoming ALAC chair.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet, ALAC.

RON DA SILVA: Ron da Silva, ICANN Board.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise, ALAC.

LEON SANCHEZ: Welcome to the rest of the ALAC members I see sitting in the audience. So Alan, would you like to take us through your answer to the first question which is the main priorities for 2019.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Leon. As outgoing chair, I think it's fitting for the incoming chair who's going to have responsible for carrying out what we're doing to turn this over first to Maureen for her thoughts about what are the priorities, and a few of us may have one or two other short comments.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, yes. We've sort of like made -- started to make some plans for the coming year, and it's looking quite exciting. Already. Of course, the first things are sort of board-driven

activities anyway. The first being the At-Large review, the implementation that we're directing our attention on improvement that focuses on the end user experience and the impacts of the work that we do on ICANN policy development. But we will be working on efficiencies. Some of -- you know, and some of those may -- there are some requests that may be made within the plan in relation to staffing as well as our online presence and communication channels that will enhance our role within ICANN.

ATLAS III, of course, is another focus area, and we'll be ensuring that we pay attention to the fact that any future gatherings will positively impact on end user participation and the work of At-Large and to support the work of the SOs and ACs within ICANN. And with that in mind, because policy is -- it's like a major emphasis for us, there will be -- you know, we're looking at ways of engaging the community as much as possible and we have -- have within our structure a consolidated policy working group which is a dedicated channel through which we will be encouraging community participation.

Of course, the ALAC and At-Large will be watching the progress of ICANN's strategic plan and as a group and individually no doubt we will be contributing to -- our comments to anything that we think is of importance to us.

We've recently been heading -- working with ICANN Learn because one of the important things for us, and especially in our collaboration with the GAC, is actually creating resources that actually enhance understanding by our end user community about what it is that ICANN

does and that if they actually do understand exactly what -- you know, what their involvement implies. So if we -- so, you know, we'll be looking at our capacity building programs and ensuring that we are actually targeting end user needs in relation to what we're doing.

So that's sort of like the main thrust of it, I think. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Maureen. A point has been made periodically, a meeting a year or so ago Goran asked the chairs of the SOs/ACs what are your priorities. And the GNSO came up with this big scary list, that was their name for it. My answer was, we don't really have a list because ours is the union of everything else. To a large extent the ALAC is driven by the rest of the community. We could actually have our own initiatives and work on a number of things, but rarely do we have the luxury of the time over and above what we have to do to work on those. So if you look at the list Maureen gave, to a large extent -- and there's one exception in it -- it's driven by what is happening in the community or what we have to do internally to be able to respond properly on behalf of the needs of users. The one initiative Maureen mentioned -- and she didn't say what the acronym was -- is ATLAS which is the At-Large summit which we try to hold every roughly five years to bring people in from the periphery and acquaint them with what ICANN does and equip them with tools to better be able to support ICANN and the At-Large, even though we don't see them very often physically.

Anyone else like to make any comments on where we're -- John, please, go ahead.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. I'd add to Maureen's comments that one of the things that we're looking at in 2019 is doing better outreach with the other SOs and ACs at ICANN and building bridges for cooperation/collaboration there. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, John.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? Then let's go on to number 2, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, before we go to number 2, I would like to say that I -- it's great to see that we do have priorities on the ALAC. As you said, there used to be no -- not a list of priorities because the work of the ALAC is depending on whatever is happening in the rest of the ICANN community. So I think it's good that you actually have a list that deals with capacity building, better outreach, concentrate on ATLAS III, and I -- I think it would be also good to include if that list maybe the General Assemblies that each of the regions hold periodically. And it's great to see that you have a consolidated policy working group. I joined some of the calls of this consolidated policy working group, and I think it's -- it's proof that the ALAC is a vibrant community and it's taking part in the agenda and in developing the difference -- the different policy advice that they're charged with in the bylaws. So --

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, before we go on to the next one.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Your comment gives the impression that we've never had a priority list before. We've always had priority lists.

LEON SANCHEZ: I was just repeating what you were saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: No -- well but we've always had priority lists. Often they are completely dominated by things out of our control. In the middle of the IANA transition that one was so far on the top that it took a number of other initiatives, including ones that we're hoping to work in '19, and just put them so far below the bottom that they didn't exist in terms of practical things. So -- but it's not an issue of never having a priority list. It's just much of it is out of our control because of the environment around us. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. So the next question is -- has to do with the multistakeholder model of governance and its evolution. ICANN has

evolved since the transition. We have become an organization that is fully independent, that has new challenges to face, new problems to solve, and we do this with our multistakeholder model of governance. This multistakeholder model of governance has apparently grown too big to manage. Some seem to see it as growing inefficient, and the question that the board would like to pose to the ALAC, and as it has done with the rest of the community, is, how we can evolve this process. I'm going to read the question, so it's clear for everyone what we're talking about. So this is "How should ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance and policy development process evolve to balance the increasing need for inclusivity, accountability, and transparency with the imperative of getting our work done and our policies developed in a more effective and timely manner and with the efficient utilization of ICANN's resources." So you can see that we are concerned about being inclusive. We are concerned about having diversity in the views that feed the policy development process, but we also are concerned about the resources that are needed to carry out or fulfill the multistakeholder governance model that we have within ICANN. So I will handle this to whomever wants to comment from the ALAC and wishes to answer the question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Leon. I will use chair's prerogative to start off the answer. I am delighted to see this question. It's not a new problem. It's been a problem with us for much -- most of the time I've been with ICANN, and that's a fair number of years now. But whenever it was raised, it was told no, there's no real problem. You don't understand. So the fact that

the board is asking this question, the fact that the GNSO later today is approving a whole set of changes that they hope will be addressing issues like this within the GNSO is marvelous.

However, there's a downside to it, and the downside is in making things efficient and perhaps even effective from the view of the people making the changes, there is a danger that the balance which in ICANN is never all that good. You remember at one point we tried to call it the multi-equal stakeholder model. We don't use that term anymore because it's not -- it never was a reality. But we need to try to make sure that we're somewhere in that ballpark. And there's a danger of taking groups like the ALAC which don't have a formal voice in policy development and relegating us back to where we were ten years ago and back to where the GAC was, and we tried to get them away, of just giving advice after the fact. And there's a real danger of that. As we go forward, we have to make sure that that is not one of the end results of making the process more efficient for those who are actually developing policy.

My only one other comment is, and I do this having, you know, almost finished chairing a review group and being more than a little involved in a number of activities like the IANA transition, the CCWG accountability, and the EPDP now, we tend to discount the benefit of face-to-face meetings because of the cost. My review team is developing -- is delivering a product on time. It would not have been possible without significant face-to-face time. It would not have been effective or as efficient and we probably wouldn't be delivering a good product. So that's taking off my (indiscernible) hat. We cannot, despite

the cost, ignore the benefits of face-to-face discussions. Thank you.
Anyone else in my group? Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sebastien Bachollet. Thank you, Alan. Thank you for the question. For those who already heard me speak, you know very well that it won't be new subject but you know as things go really quick at ICANN. We always say that it's always the same people who occupy the same position. Nowadays we can see there are new faces.

So first of all, in order to respond to this question, we have to minimize the complexity of this organization. Even we do not have this in mind, we will not be able to keep that multistakeholder system. We have to stop at some point, but we know we have worked through the silos a couple of times. Now we have a global vision of the organization. The last time we did so, it was 2002, 2003 with ICANN 2.0. So it's been a long time. Many, many years.

And secondly, I would like to reinforce what Alan said. We are not talking about equality between the different players. So it would be good to try to be equal once again. I will choose a couple of examples. They might not be the best example, but even though we are happy when there are more than 100, 150 government who gather, we are not able to put together an objective for the next ATLAS and have 140 countries present to that meeting. So now we can see that there is a difference in the objectives. We have to take this into account. I don't know how we can solve this because the financial questions are always there. They always are obstacles. But we are ready to gather

representative for -- from 150 countries in the world for ATLAS III. We just have to figure out a way, find the resources to do so. This would be a good solution in order to enhance the multi-party system.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the transcript record. I'd like to pick up on a point that Maureen way. We are reforming the way we do policy. We now have the consolidated policy working group, yet another acronym. But when we were talking through how we make policy, if we are to actually listen to the constituents, which is our job, what we have to do is meet a timeline that is very tight. We have to educate ourselves, we have to perhaps have a webinar or whatever but go out to the regions and listen and then bring that back in. And the time frame for that is very short.

Now, I understand that the GNSO would like to be more efficient. The danger of being more efficient is that you stop the ability of the various constituents of ALAC, which is what you have to listen to anyway, or are supposed to be listening to. How do we allow both the time? And I understand it may be a resource question, but we also have listened to Xavier and understand that it's not going to happen. So the other thing that we're doing is trying to work with resources, redo our resources so we have at least one staff person who is exclusively policy and a function -- sorry, a focus particularly on more how do we do the outreach -- and John, thank you very much for some of the discussions

we've had on use of tools to do the outreach -- to get out to our constituents. So it's going to be a combination of reforming how we get out to our members, how we listen to them, what tools we use. But we are against constraints. One of them is the process that's in place for GNSO policy making and the time that's involved. And the other is how we actually get the resources to listen. The challenges, I think we're working through how we can meet them, but it's not going to be an easy task. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anyone else? Vanda?

Be careful, we don't run out of time. So, if we can keep it concise.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. Just to see that our region in general, not only LACRALO. But it was an initiative of our region to sit together yesterday and discuss the PDP process and how they affect us and how to involve our people.

It really constrains we have in the region in general, how to get together and put those people aware about what is going on in ICANN and how they can participate.

Some of our suggestions came out. And I hope we can have this year, this next year, time to start some of those processes to include those people into the PDP process in ICANN. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Vanda. Is there anyone else who would like to speak on this subject? John?

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise, for the record. Looking at the question, I'm going to take a little aside on the multistakeholder model and policy developments.

And I want to draw the Board's attention to the RSSAC 37 document, which is really powerful. Some of the -- and I mentioned this in the strategy session that was held a few days ago. It's one of the best policy documents and planning documents that I've seen come out of, ICANN. And I am thrilled to see it and I'm fully in support of it. And I hope the Board takes it very seriously and moves forward with it. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, John. Is there anyone else who would like to speak. Okay. Khaled.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Leon. Just to come back on what Sebastien said -- and, when we talk about the ATRT3, and I hope it will start.

I would like to read a status.

It shows that the ATRT3 is mandated to figure out how everything functions. I think it will be a very good opportunity for the community to work with this review, this particular review, and enhance the model of the governing model and the development of politics. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Anyone else want to comment? Good. So, Cherine, did you want to say something?

CHERINE CHALABY: Good morning, everyone. And thank you, Leon.

I just wanted to put a perspective on this question so that everyone in the audience understands why the Board is asking this question.

This is not a question that the Board has thought of in thin air. This really has stemmed from the strategic planning work that has been going on in the community since Puerto Rico with 700 man-hours of work and many consultations with the community. And the community has come back to all of us and the Board saying that there are five major trends that they believe should inform the strategic plan and that will have an impact on ICANN's future.

One of those trends is governance.

And, within that governance, this is the way the trend has been articulated.

The Board does not have an answer to this, and the Board is not going to produce an answer to this. We are going to issue a consultation paper around the May/June time frame where we are going to ask the community for their input on these issues and how the model should evolve. So this is now a period between now and the May/June time

frame where we are engaging with the community and listening to what the community has to say.

And it is wider than policy development. It's more -- it's much wider. It's to do with the overall activities of ICANN.

So just give you some indication of things we heard from different part of the community. One is that there is an increasing demand of inclusiveness across the whole spectrum of our activities.

That comes with it -- there are roles and responsibilities when you include that.

There is demand for increasing the policy -- improving the policy development process to achieve consensus in a more timely manner;

concerns about progress being ground to a halt because of polarized interests; concerns about volunteer shortages and fatigue; concerns about the inefficient reviews; concerns about the ineffective involvement of the technical community; concerns that our ICANN meetings are getting larger, more expensive, cluttered with a lot of sessions and it's difficult to keep pace with what's going on.

But the other message we're getting is the multistakeholder model is really what brings us legitimacy. And it is something that has suited us and is fitted for our own purpose. And it works very well for us. And it has served us well for the last 20 years, and we need it to serve us well for the next 20 years.

All we're doing here is, as a group, taking a mature look at it, because it has grown up. And, when things grow up, naturally, they go through a cycle where you need to look at it and start thinking what do we need to do to improve its efficiency so that for the next 20 years it serves us as well.

And we should have, really, the will and the courage to do that.

And it starts by being honest with each other and saying is there an issue here or not. A lot of people are saying there is, and some people are trying to avoid it.

So I think we will see through the process what is the will of the community. But so far, we've had discussions with many constituencies. And, by and large, they do agree with the ALAC and your initial statement by saying we're very glad that this has now been brought. And the community is really engaged with this.

So we're not in the design of a solution, because we cannot do that. We can't do that. That is the community that is going to do that. We may have to go through various consultation papers. The first one would be seeking input rather than seeking a solution, right? Then, after we see that input, we may make suggestions to the community with another consultation paper and seek input on that.

This is part of our DNA, and it's not something that's going to change overnight. It's a big tanker going in one direction. And, if you want to turn it, you're going to do that carefully and deliberately with the approval of everybody.

So that's why we've put that question to you.

Thank you. And to every constituency.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Cherine.

Alan, do you have any other comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: I do not.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. So may we now, please, put the slide with the questions posted by the ALAC.

So, Alan, I would like to hand you the floor to ask the questions that we'll be answering accordingly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Leon.

This is a question, by the way, that I'm not -- we're not -- I'm not sure the mechanism allows it. But it's -- it was really targeted at board members and not the Board. Because it's an issue which is difficult. And I would hope the Board has not come out with the answer regarding new gTLDs before you've seen the results of the PDP. Because, clearly, it's going to depend on that.

But, to the extent people can answer on behalf of themselves as opposed to "the Board" that would be nice.

The real issue that the PDP -- and I happen to be one of the people heavily involved in the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. And, as you know, Cheryl is one of the cochairs of the PDP. So we have just little bit of involvement. Just a bit.

That's focusing largely on how to do it. The charter did include should we do it. But, to be honest, a process run by the GNSO largely with a significant participation by many parts of the GNSO, the answer is almost a foregone conclusion.

There is no way that that PDP, in my mind, could come out with an answer saying, "No, don't do it." And I don't think the PDP could come out with an answer saying, "Yes, let's do it, but let's restrict it to only one type of TLD" or something like that. The community is not going to reach consensus within the PDP on doing that.

The PDP is also charged with an issue of pricing. Because the first process said it must be a cost recovery based on the cost of processing the applications.

That's a decision I don't believe the GNSO should be making. Because the premise, when we first went into this -- I don't know when it started. When I got involved in 2006 it as well on its way as the PDP that led to the last round we did.

The premise was there's going to be such a great uptake that there's no question that the revenue associated with it will cover all of ICANN's costs and then some.

I don't know to what extent that's true, because I don't think it's measured, you know, how much an increase in cost in GDD or an increase in cost in contractual compliance was -- is even measured right now. And how do we know to what extent it's attributed to that round.

But I really worry that, if the uptake is high in the number of TLDs but not high in the number of registrations, that we may have a problem in the future covering the costs.

And the real question is: Who's thinking about this? If all the -- and, unfortunately, all -- the Board can not take half of a PDP result and say we'll implement that half. The decision has been made that we can't do that. The Board can't have that.

So how do we come out with a -- something which is a good result for the community. And there's certainly a strong pent-up demand in certain parts of the segment that we know -- well, we don't know. But past experience indicates that it will likely be quite successful by almost any definition of success. And how do we go forward and cover all these issues and act responsibly on behalf of ICANN the organization and ICANN the ecosystem? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you so much, Alan.

So this is definitely one of the top priorities for the community, I think. I'd like to ask Avri, I think, Avri, if you can comment on this?

AVRI DORIA:

Sure. Thank you, Leon.

Obviously, I've been paying attention to the new gTLDs for quite a while. I'd like to go back to a couple of the things Alan said.

First of all, it is actually quite possible that the GNSO PDP could have decided not to do any more. The GNSO is split. There are people that want new gTLDs yesterday. There are those that want to see this program completed properly and have it. And there are those that are more sanguine about whether we should have new gTLDs or not. So I think it is actually quite possible that the PDP could have come out otherwise.

You're correct. After the discussions that went on at the beginning of the PDP, which were as diverse as the PDP is now -- this PDP has included people from ALAC, from GAC, and from other groups. I think there's other groups in it beyond those of the community -- did have a lengthy discussion on this, did come out to the point of saying, yes, they believe that the recommendation would include a recommendation for continuing the program.

And I say "continuing the program" because the idea of the program that we're in was that it was the new gTLD program and it was in its first round.

And, at the end of that round, we were supposed to pause, stop, look at every issue there was.

And we spent a year -- the community spent a year collecting issues before starting with a PDP and had about 90 some-odd issues that had to be covered by the PDP. And now we have a CCT that has given us another -- I think it's 37 issues that the PDP will need to look at.

So I think that, you know, I tend to see this as we have a PDP program. It had its first round, which is blessedly almost complete.

We then, as a community, went into let's review this in every gory detail way possible. Let's resolve all the issues that can be.

So, in some sense, I think part of the reason this is taking so long -- and yesterday, as an aside, was interesting in that I had as many people come and say, "Why is this taking so long? Can't the Board do something to hurry it up?" as I had people coming, "Can't the Board do something to stop this?"

So there is an interesting dynamic there.

And, of course, the Board can't do either of those things. The Board can wait for the recommendations. The Board can ask questions. And then -- when the recommendations come.

You also said that the Board can't take part of a recommendation and accept the others. And that's true.

But, when recommendations come -- and we've seen the Board do this several times already -- the Board can look at recommendations that

may not be sufficiently founded, that may not have taken the advice of ALAC, SSAC, or GAC sufficiently into account and can ask for further review, further questions, et cetera.

So it isn't just the recommendation will be thrown over the wall, that's the end of it.

The other thing I would look at is that they've just done their first review of part. They're going to do review of more.

Then there's going to be the work track 5 on names review, which is an extraordinary experiment in PDPs in that, you know, they're, basically, trying to make sure that all interests are cared for by having a diversity of chairs across all the groups and dealing with the complexities that that gives.

So I do think that, as I watch this PDP -- and, obviously, as board will then have to review.

But, as I watch it, I see them making every possible attempt to cover all the issues that people are bringing up. And those -- and, of course, as I say, they have the 37 new issues from CCT which they saw in draft. They've worked on some, but they have more work to do

I don't know if I covered everything. But I could keep talking forever on this issue. I love this issue.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Avri.

Alan, you mentioned also the costs and whether is someone looking at it on the different financial implications that this issue has.

So I'd like to ask Xavier if he could comment on this.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Leon. I just wanted to provide a quick clarity on the tracking of the costs of the program that we are doing maybe that would inform further the group.

As you may remember, the program was designed to be a cost to recovery -- the current round launched six years ago was designed to be cost recovery. And it was very important that the costs of the program are segregated so we have separate accounting systems. We have separate ledgers. We have separate bank and investment accounts.

And we produce on the quarterly basis specific information relative to the costs of the new gTLD program separately from the costs of the ongoing operations of the organization.

And there's also in the budget documents an entire section on the costs of the program. And we measure the efforts of all the departments of the ICANN operations that are provided on the new gTLD program. And we, therefore, allocate costs accordingly to the new gTLD program.

So the ongoing activities of the organization over the past six years are segregated out and allocated to the program's costs on an ongoing basis. I won't go into further detail, but I'm happy to address any further questions, if there's any, offline. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Xavier.

Alan, do you have a follow-up?

ALAN GREENBERG: I do have a follow-up on Xavier's comments. You say you're tracking the internal costs. But my understanding was you're tracking and what you report separately is the costs of the process of approving gTLDs and putting them into the root, not the ongoing costs due to them after they are already there. Am I mistaken?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I think you're probably -- you're right. The -- once an applicant in an application has been the subject of a contract with ICANN, it becomes a registry operator. From that point on, the registry operator operates in the TLD. And what we have then is all the activities that support the ongoing contract management. And that's costs that are in GDD. Those costs are not necessarily specifically identified by a TLD operator. I don't necessarily think it's very relevant or possible.

But, up to the point of an application, all the costs pertaining to application evaluation and risks are allocated to the program's funds and accounting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To be clear, the question was about the cost after that. It is understood the program was designed to be self-sufficient and that is being tracked, but it's the process. We are looking at the cost of GDD and contractual compliance once test delegated. That was the focus of the question.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay. The costs of GDD and contractual compliance are completely isolated and visible in our budget documents on an ongoing basis.

ALAN GREENBERG: But we don't know what costs are attributable to the new one.

CHERINE CHALABY: I think what Alan is saying is that if you were to launch a second new round and there are, say, 2,000 more applications, does this mean or have ICANN taken into account whether GDD ought to increase in size, whether compliance should double? That's the basis of the message.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you.

RON DA SILVA: But I think -- Can I just chime in? I think a relevant -- Goran, over here. It's Ron.

I think also a relevant, Alan, comment is the revenues are increasing as well, and that's not being tracked separately. So if the question is, you know, can we -- I think what you're getting at, can we identify what the incremental revenues and the costs associated with those revenues are with the new program and then from that take a guess at what a subsequent round would look like, that's the essence of what you're looking for; right?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's exactly the question we're looking for.

GORAN MARBY: I often get this question, both on the national cost and the initial cost, and the -- and it's a little bit hard until we actually know how it looks. It's a little bit premature because we don't know -- we don't know how the next round would look.

So the way we try to do things now is when we actually know more, so we can calculate it, we start doing calculations. And we think that should be part of the decision-making process.

I don't know if you have seen for the last couple of years, every time the Board gets something sort of initially, like work Stream 2, we put in things like this has to be worked into the budget. So we're trying to get that process statement.

For us, for org right now, it's sort of too early to come up with potential costs where we know so little. It would just be an exercise in vain.

But I do agree with you on the principle, because that's how it work.
But you do agree with me, we sort of have to have more meat on the
bones before we do more calculations.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Goran, I understand completely the difficulty of doing it, especially at
this point in time. But we weren't asking what was the result of the
analysis. We were asking how is it even going to be done or if it's going
to be done. And it's not an easy answer because at the same time as we
are -- as compliance is doing with new gTLDs, compliance has also been
ramping up and changing its method of operation. And I don't know
how you determine how much of that was due to the new gTLDs and
how much just due to the maturity of contractual compliance, because
their whole methodology and how they work has changed radically in
the last five years, which is coincident with the new gTLD program.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Alan.

I think, Maarten, you want to comment as well.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yes.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Xavier.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Alan, you have a very good point, and it's basically how, over the coming years, the whole model we are working in will evolve. And I can assure you that this is one of the key elements that we put into the strategic exercise as well. Comes back very clearly. We need to have a better understanding of how this will develop. And we've seen that the first round hasn't developed in the way that we thought in the beginning.

So it's clearly in the scope. And as Ron highlighted, we have uncertainties on both sides of the economics. This is also why we added the fifth point of -- focal point of attention which is the financial stability of the whole system.

So just not the answers, but for sure foreseen and something we need to take forward as the Board and org, but also in interaction with the community.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Maarten.

Ron, you want to make a final comment; right?

RON DA SILVA: Yeah, it's -- Alan, great topic. Thank you for raising it. I would like to take it back to the BFC and work with the organization to see if we can come up with, because it would be great to have, you know, what's the average incremental cost to add another -- and also revenue associated

with adding yet another TLD. That's, I think, the essence of what you're looking for, and it would be a really good metric to have.

So we'll take that back to the BFC and see if we can work with the organization and try to come up with some numbers around that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Ron.

ALAN GREENBERG: The question was asked with the full knowledge that we don't know the answer and we can't do the analysis today.

Since we posed the question, the CCT review has come out, which has identified abuses, a (indiscernible) problem which clearly somehow makes its way into the costs of ICANN. And those things are still changing and are going to continue to change. Our concern was is someone thinking about all of these varied aspects?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

LEON SANCHEZ: Cherine, would you like to make a comment on this?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. I just want to -- reading those four questions, I keep on asking myself why are those question being posed? And I can't help myself

thinking is there a message there saying that perhaps some members of the ALAC or the ALAC is not extremely supportive of another general round except perhaps for -- for brands? Is that -- Is that a message I'm reading from this or not at all?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would not restrict it to brands. Those were two examples I gave. There's clearly a potential interest in IDNs, there's an interest in community TLDs.

CHERINE CHALABY: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: But is there question that should we open another general round for everything? Yes, there certainly are people within At Large who ask that question. Strongly.

LEON SANCHEZ: John, do you want to make a comment?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah, I just want to -- John Laprise for the record. I definitely want to support Alan. There is considerable discussion within ALAC that another full general round is -- at this point we don't have strong evidence to suggest that that's a good idea. We need more analysis to even go forward with that.

There may be targeted -- a new -- targeted new gTLD program for specific -- in specific areas, but a general one is -- at this point we're decidedly dubious.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, John.

Avri, you want to comment? Goran?

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Did you want to go first?

GORAN MARBY: I would never be able to go before you; only after.

If we want to continue, I can take this offline. I just had a question about when you say that -- Alan, take the question. I can take the answer later. But when you balance things like we've got to do a new round or not, I'm interested in the factors on both sides. Are we talking, you know, the ability for people around the world to create more domain names which is good for the people of the world, sort of, against potential abuse by people, is not that's good. Or are we talking about, no, no, it's too costly to do it and, therefore, we shouldn't do it because it's so much (indiscernible).

Depending how you balance those things, then you end up with certain answers, and I really would like to understand, because I'm not part of the policy-making process. I wasn't here last time. But I'm trying to

understand the different sides of it. But we can take that offline. Over a fika, for instance.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Goran. Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. We have to discuss the notion of before and after at some point.

[Laughter]

Okay. I just wanted to point out that, indeed, the group -- and this was before I joined the board and while I was still with the PDP, did actually take that issue of should we have a general or should brands go first, should this go first, should that go first. And there were strong arguments for each of the discussions. So I think that's one of the things that comes out in the commentary, that comes out in the comments that it isn't a foregone conclusion what the PDP is going to come out with. So this is the kind of discussion that, you know, the PDP can still take and still make a recommendation on.

But as I say, for each of the categories, there is a strong argument within the PDP group of why that one has to be first.

So when you put them all first, you kind of have a general round.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Avri.

I think, Alan, you want to follow-up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, just one small comment.

The new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP has to date involved about 225 teleconferences. I just added them up. I've only attended about 60 to 70% of them. It takes a lot of stamina and a lot of real interest in the subject to participate in the process and see it through to this point, and it's not finished.

So implicitly, the community that's having the discussion are those who have a real interest in the subject. Just pointing out the numbers.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks. One last comment. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just very briefly. Look, the final CCT report has just come out. We're still looking through it and it actually raises questions that we haven't had a chance to look at and think about. So yeah, we're still thinking about it.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Holly. So I would like to wrap up the session thanking you all for being here. It's been a very fruitful discussion. We have very positive

from the ALAC. This of course will be very useful to feed into the processes that we are running in the Board for our strategic planning, and you'll see this input reflected in the document that will be coming out in the time may-June as Cherine was highlighting.

But before we go, I would like to welcome Maureen as the incoming ALAC chair.

[Applause]

And of course I would like to thank Alan for his service as not only ALAC chair but ALAC member for all these years, all the experience that you've brought, all the work you've done. I think -- no one will replace you, of course, but we have big shoes to fill in. So thank you, Alan, for your service.

[Applause]

[Standing ovation]

ALAN GREENBERG:

But before we leave, I have a closing comment, too. Thank you, all.

We started these Board AC/SO -- I'll give you a moment. We started these Board AC/SO meetings about five or six years ago. I've lost track. So I have been at, I don't know, 15 to 20 of them at this point. For the first several years they were about the most useless waste of time because instead of addressing problems, they caused problems. The last number -- The last two years, perhaps, or so have been really effective meetings. Maybe a little bit longer. These meetings actually

accomplish something and allow some level of dialogue, and for that I am very grateful. And it's made my serving as chair a lot easier because there is an opportunity for dialogue as opposed to either confrontation or largely -- well, the original ones were focused mainly on establishing miscommunication and misunderstanding, and I think now it works in the opposite way. So thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: On behalf of the Board, thank you, Alan, for everything you have done, for being engaged in almost every aspect of our community, not just the ALAC. And your voice has been heard throughout the years. And we're very, very grateful for everything you have done. So you will be missed thoroughly. And we wish Maureen a successful tenure, of course.

Okay. Thank you, everybody.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, everyone. This meeting is adjourned.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]