
CR - ALAC: Policy Discussion

Tuesday, March 13, 2012 – 10:30 to 11:30

ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

...in Tienda; that is not going to take place. Everything will take place in this room. But it does mean there will be no lunch break. We will finish at 14:00. Actually before 14:00, 13:00? 13:00, thank you Gisella. That also means we will have to squash a little bit of time here and there. Okay, could we have the recording on please?

Well good morning everybody. Welcome to the At-Large, ALAC policy discussion part one. The time is 10:52. We've had, as I just mentioned, a few changes in our timing, so let's move immediately to the RAA negotiations update. We have our guest Margie Milam who is from ICANN policy staff. Welcome and without any further delay, and as more members will be arriving in the room, please go ahead with your presentation. Thank you.

Margie Milam:

Good morning everyone. It's so nice to visit you all every meeting and give you updates on the work we're doing on the policy side. Specifically I'm going to talk to you about the RAA negotiations project. It's a project that affects both the contract negotiations and policy work that would be initiated, so I'll give you an overview of what's going on. Matt, next slide please. Next slide.

So essentially, since Dakar, you may recall there was the Board resolution that called for immediate negotiations to commence on the RAA. And in these negotiations several issues have been tackled trying to address the concerns from multiple stakeholders. So we have recommendations from the law enforcement agencies that are being negotiated, we've also got the recommendations from the GNSO and the At-Large Joint Drafting Team that made certain recommendations on topics to be explored in the negotiations.

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.

In addition, ICANN staff and the Board, as well as registrars have also introduced topics to amend the RAA as well. So as you can imagine, there are lots and lots of topics under discussion, something like 30 plus topics are being explored with the idea that we're trying to advance topics that specifically deal with registrant protection and DNS stability. And also, because there's been so much visibility on the law enforcement requests, particularly as you may recall, the GAC endorsed the law enforcement requests in the past, there's certainly been a priority in the negotiations to focus on those first.

Next slide please. And so, since Dakar, staff put together a negotiation team, and so did the registrars and we've been in very active negotiations. There's been several face to face meetings, including weekly phone calls. Some of these face to face meetings are all day negotiation sessions, or half day negotiation sessions. So as you can imagine, there's been a tremendous amount of energy and attention on these important topics.

We've also published a Wiki page on the community Wiki that identifies each of the amendment topics that are being explored, and provides you with a snapshot of where the negotiation teams are on some of those issues. And in advance of Costa Rica, we published a status report, and I've provided a link on this slide that shows you specifically where we are on some of these issues. And if you take a look at it, you will see that it gives you an idea where there may be an agreement in principle, for example, on certain topics, or areas where they're still working on language, but at least it gives you a snapshot as of beginning of March where we are on these negotiations.

And it's been, I know there's been some criticism that we didn't publish an agreement before Costa Rica, but it is a difficult process, because there are many parties involved in this. As you can imagine, to try and understand the law enforcement requests, some of the requests might be overly broad or vague, and so we've actually had sessions where we've invited the law enforcement representatives to provide background on why they made a certain request, to try to really understand the problem they're trying to solve and whether we can

draft language that would be acceptable to the negotiating teams that could address their concerns.

And because we're not done with that process, it's very difficult to publish a partial agreement at this time. There's a lot of inter dependencies on some of the language, and we felt that it was better to wait until after there is agreement on language terms to be able to publish that for the community to evaluate. And there's certainly a lot of issues in there that may require additional consultation with the community, and I think you saw part of that yesterday if any of you participated in the WHOIS verification workshop we had yesterday.

That's an example of one of the very complex topics that we're exploring in negotiations that really gives you a snapshot of how difficult it is to figure out what language to put into the agreement and what type of verification processes might be acceptable to the ICANN community since this is a new thing that is being tackled for the first time. Another example is there's been a request that with respect to proxy registration, that there might be a revealing of that personal information at some point. So these are all difficult issues that raise privacy concerns and are things that we're trying to understand and decide whether it is appropriate to include them in the RAA at this time, or if it's better to wait and have a policy discussion with the broader community and the GNSO Council to address them.

But I also want to point out that even though it is difficult both parties have been negotiating in good faith. I mean clearly the registrars have come to the table trying to find solutions. They're working very hard. And in the same, staff, we have executives that participate in the negotiations because it is such a critical project for the ICANN team as well as the registrar negotiating team.

And so this slide basically talks about the next steps. There's been questions over the weekend at the GNSO Council as to what will happen if an agreement, if the terms if it's agreed. And essentially what this slide identifies is the process that would happen once the agreement form is agreed to. And essentially the agreement would need to reach a consensus among internet

stakeholders, as demonstrated – this is from the current RAA – by a vote of two-thirds of the GNSO Council. So at some point the Council will be presented with the form of the RAA and will be asked to take a vote, but we’re not quite there yet; that’s still a ways away since we haven’t formally agreed to the terms of the agreement.

There would also need to be a written report that documents the extent of agreement or disagreement with respect to groups that might be affected by some of these changes. And then if the GNSO Council approves it, then it would go to the Board. So that’s the process that’s been identified with regard to the new agreement once we’ve concluded this process.

And then once the Board adopts it, there’s a process for actually getting the registrars to adopt it. Because many registrars have five year agreements, and this agreement, if you follow this format, would be the new agreement that they sign on renewal. So there may be various times that registrars come on to this new agreement, but ICANN certainly can consider incentives to try to get registrars to adopt the new form earlier. We did that for example in 2009, when we offered financial incentives to registrars who chose to adopt the new agreement, and that’s certainly something that could be explored.

In any event, if there’s policy aspects that are embodied in the new agreement that could be implemented sooner through a policy development process, and so that’s also something that could be explored once the agreement form is agreed to. Just to give you an example, for those of you who were not in the WHOIS validation session yesterday, a topic like WHOIS validation is very complex. Even the idea “what does validation mean,” what does it mean to validate a WHOIS record. That is something that isn’t obvious and yesterday we explored various ways of validating and various definitions of what “validation” means.

And also, in trying to identify what would be the validation obligations, you really have to take a look at what the benefit is of doing that versus the financial and social costs. In the industry there’s an expectation that a domain name registration should be done fairly quickly, and if validation is required before

registration, what does that do to the time it takes to register a domain name. And also, recognition that there may be increased costs associated depending upon how much validation is required.

So if you weren't in the session yesterday for example and you heard from the experience of the .cn registry where when they changed to a verification model they hired 700 employees to do validation. And you can imagine the cost associated with having 700 employees manually verify every record. And so that's the debate that the community needs to explore to see what is the right model for the gTLD space and what would be a reasonable cost associated with doing that and how it would actually impact the domain market.

This is just to give you an example of the kind of complexity that we're dealing with, and this is just one issue out of 30 plus issues that we're exploring in the negotiations, which kind of gives you a flavor for why it takes so long to get an agreement done, notwithstanding the fact that we've had all these resources dedicated to this important project.

Now, the other part of project is when the Board requested that when the negotiations start it also requested an issue report from the GNSO Council to initiate a policy development process on what it called the "remaining issues." And I think the background behind this request was that there was the recognition that maybe some of these topics won't be successfully negotiated through this process, but that there's still topics that should be explored through the policy process.

And so by asking for an issue report, the Board essentially kicked off the process so that the GNSO Council could focus on these remaining issues, if they aren't part of the negotiations. And so at this time, staff has written a final issues report that asks the GNSO Council to wait on commencing a PDP until the negotiations conclude, because that's when we'll know what topics are appropriate for the policy process. At this time, since so many topics are still on the table, it's premature to start a policy development process.

And so we can go to the next slide. Where are we? GNSO – okay, so the recommendation in the issue report essentially is that the Council acknowledge receipt of the final issue report and then just wait until there's a report that identifies that the RAA negotiations have concluded and that there are still remaining topics. And then if the Board believes that at that time these issues need to be addressed, they can instruct the Council to proceed with the policy development process on these amendment topics that were not part of the negotiations.

Next slide. So on this slide I have information that the final issue report is provided there as well as the link to the status report, and a link to the community Wiki that I mentioned earlier, that identifies each of the main topics in the negotiations and the current status of them. And then the WHOIS validation workshop link is there if you'd like to get access to the links to some of the presentations that were made yesterday. And with that, I'll answer any questions from the group.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Margie and I already see a queue in operation. We'll start with Beau, and then we'll have Alan. So, Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler:

Morning. Who is on the registrar negotiating team as it stands now?

Margie Milam:

Matt Serlin from MarkMonitor, and he's on the Executive; he's one of the officers of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. Jeff Eckhaus, Rob Hall, Tim Ruiz, Volker Greimann, who spoke yesterday; and Mason Cole.

Beau Brendler:

Is that list published anywhere? Where can I find that because I'd like to figure out what the backgrounds of all those people are?

Margie Milam: Sure. I don't know if we've formally published it, but it is in the meeting reports.

Beau Brendler: I can't understand why.

Margie Milam: So if you go to the Wiki and look at a meeting report and the affiliations.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay thank you. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Two questions, both related to follow on activities. You mentioned that after approval by the Board there's then a five year period where it will kick in unless incentives are offered which convince registrars. Has there been consideration given to dividing the results of the negotiations in two sections – one set which are clearly within the picket fence, and one which are contractual terms? If you were to do that the GNSO approval and Board approval would make them consensus policy and would kick in immediately.

So that's question number one. I'll give you the second question. Last time this came around, the GNSO was asked to – I'll use my term – “rubber stamp” a set of negotiations that they had not been party to and they basically refused until a lot of things were gone through. Do you see any reason to believe this is going to be different this time, or are we going to go through that drama again? And by the way, dividing them also may not solve that problem, but may make it a little bit easier. So, two questions.

Margie Milam: I don't know that we've explored all of the options on how to get all of the registrars all on board at the same time. We'll certainly take that into consideration as to whether dividing it up and sending some to the GNSO might make it faster; we'll certainly explore that. I don't have an answer specifically to that question.

Alan Greenberg: Just a clarification – whether everything goes to the GNSO or not is a separate decision, but if you bring them to the GNSO separately they end up being two GNSO decisions, two Board decisions, but the Board decision on the picket fence issues becomes consensus policy which is enacted immediately. So I wasn't debating whether you bring them both to the GNSO; that's an issue ICANN and registrars need to settle on. But just the simple act of dividing means you take the picket fence issues, and some of them are critical, out of the five year plan.

Margie Milam: But following your logic they would have to do a PDP on those items; at least that's my understanding.

Alan Greenberg: Not according to the current RAA. As we said last time we are applying the rules that were in place then.

Margie Milam: Okay, well like I said, we'll take it back and look at it. I don't have a specific answer to your question. And on the other one, it goes to the Council so the Council can do what the Council needs to do with the understanding that there will be a PDP kicked off on the remaining items. So it's not as if the Council won't have a role if they're unhappy with the agreement because the issue report that was published could lead directly into a PDP to address those concerns. So it's more of a timing issue.

Alan Greenberg: Just to be clear, I wasn't expecting, Margie I wasn't expecting you to answer on behalf of ICANN; I was raising the issue.

Margie Milam: Yeah, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. Next we have Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi Margie. Could you go to the very second slide please? Yeah that one. No back up, okay. Think of the room you're in and tell me if there's anything you see missing from that list. By that I mean you're in an ALAC room and we haven't been involved in this. And when you talk about multi stakeholders, you're talking about leaving out a really, really big portion of that if ALAC isn't involved in the beginning. Having something where the negotiations are done and then they're brought here sort of as a done deal as a report doesn't really give a whole lot of chance for us to cook things in at the beginning.

For instance, one of the things that's been expressed is the role of resellers, and that's something that has been brought up and it's one of only many issues. And there hasn't really been a good channel for At-Large to be part of this process, being cooked in from the beginning as opposed to being tacked on from the end. And here we are, talking to the Board and to everybody else about cross-community working groups or whatever, this isn't a place where you need a cross-community working group, but I think it's a part where rather than just saying "Well we heard from the GNSO, which has registrars in it, and we heard from law enforcement" – and I don't even know how that channel was done – and here you have a body that's supposed to represent the interest of internet end users and I'd like to find out where you think they fit in, in the process of putting this together?

Also keeping in mind that this isn't all policy, this is not implementation; this is writing contracts. So this is going beyond simple policy issues and into the actual operations. And ALAC, in its Bylaws, has an ability to talk and comment and give feedback on all of this, and I'm sorry the question is so long, but it's been a really, really big concern to me. Where we're talking here about conflicts of interest; we're talking here about how to get cross-communities working not in silos, but together. And I'd like you to tell me how the multi stakeholder is going to cook in, not just the GNSO, but all the other stakeholders of ICANN together in the process of doing this. Thanks.

Margie Milam:

A couple of comments. The slide should have been more clear. The set of recommendations that they're looking at include the ones from the joint ALAC/GNSO drafting team, so ALAC was involved at the very beginning coming up with those recommendations that are high priority and medium priority, and those are being negotiated. The problem is since then you're in the dark. I understand that.

The other thing that we didn't really clarify is that when the agreement gets published it will get published for public comment. So that's the opportunity for ALAC to participate and provide information and feedback, along with the other stakeholder groups. But even with the having just the two negotiating teams and the occasional discussions with law enforcement, it's a tremendous process and I honestly don't know how you could manage a larger process than that with other groups – I assume GNSO and others would want to be involved if ALAC was involved.

But I certainly encourage you to use the public comment forum and remember that the recommendations did originate from a joint drafting team.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, just one thing going forward. It's clearly too late for that now, but the whole issue of registrant rights has now started up again within ALAC. S if

there could continue to be a channel going on between the ongoing work in the RAA, this is one more rev, it's not done forever. So if there would be some ongoing communications going so we know when are the tight times to come into the process and try to say "These are some ideas that we have about ensuring that these particular rights and responsibilities are sort of baked into the system." Is there a way of having that channel open so we know when to come in so we're not caught unawares after?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. We have a queue in operation at the moment, so it's going to be Garth Bruen, Holly Raiche, and Beau Brendler, and I gather Carlton afterwards, and I'll probably have to cut the queue after that since we are running already late. So Garth.

Garth Bruen:

Thank you Olivier. This is Garth from NARALO. Margie I'm hoping you can clarify something I asked to compliance the other day, they didn't seem to be able to answer the question. It does not appear that in the current RAA that not deleting a domain with false WHOIS is a breachable offense. I also do not see this in the recommendations or drafts for the new RAA. Can you confirm that this is actually not enforceable and if there are plans to make it enforceable? Thank you.

Margie Milam:

I can't comment on what's enforceable now because that's not my role, but that issue is on the table. If you look at – the status report is only a snapshot of some issues. If you go to the Wiki page it's actually, I believe part of one of the recommendations that came from the drafting team; the high priority and the medium priority items, I believe it's one of those. But I can confirm that to you afterwards, I just don't have access to it right now.

Garth Bruen: Okay, that's fine. I'll look at it afterwards. And by adding this to the draft, it's obviously not in the current one, but I understand that you can't address that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Garth. Next on the list is Holly Raiche.

Holly Raiche: Evan, first to clarify, actually we were involved. I've got to tell you a lot of 5:00 in the morning conversations, as Margie knows, were recorded. But one thing we did ask, and that was to at least have observer status on the negotiations; never happened, wouldn't happen. So there was a very strong recommendation that we would be involved and that was not taken up. So that's the answer to your question having lived through that debate.

I would hope that in fact there are continuing discussions about what else has to happen, but we were told at the time this is actually a contract negotiation and we're a third party.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Holly. Next on the list is Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler: Thanks, Beau Brendler from North America. I wanted to ask the Chairs permission to possibly ask, I believe Rob Hall is in the back of the room, if Rob would be willing to – it occurs to me this question might be best posed to Rob – and that is Rob, we understand that you're also on the registrar negotiating team as well as Chairmen-elect of the NomCom and obviously you've had a historical role as an entrepreneur and CEO. Are there any rules or is there anything in place to present a situation of conflict of interest for you? Because it must put you under a lot of pressure to be wearing all of those hats and I hope that the organization has taken the appropriate safeguards to protect your reputation.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Beau, this specific session is about the RAA. We will be speaking...

Beau Brendler: This question is about the RAA negotiating team which I think is quite relevant to the discussion.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But we also have a session right after this one dealing with the NomCom. I was going to suggest that perhaps we deal with it and discuss this in the NomCom.

Beau Brendler: That would be fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Great. So next on the list is Carlton Samuels.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Chair. Carlton Samuels for the record. Quick question – to what extent does the work or the output from the compliance team feed into the negotiation strategy?

Margie Milam: I believe I mentioned it on one of the slides. It might actually be this slide – go back to the slide we just had. See where it says “ICANN Board and staff providing input prior to the negotiation starting?” As staff we had internal meeting with the compliance team to identify issues that they wanted to see in the agreement to enhance their ability to enforce those obligations. So that very much is part of the negotiation topics, and compliance fed into that as part of kicking off the negotiations.

Carlton Samuels: Can I have a follow up?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes absolutely.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Chair. So there is a strategy, a negotiation strategy that is communally developed internally? Would any of the issues that the compliance team thought should have high priority for negotiations or objectives, would those be disclosable under present rules?

Margie Milam: They're posted on the Wiki page that I had the link to on my last slide. And so as you go through them, I mean they're not identified specifically as "compliance asks," but that was the origin of some of the requests. And if you go through the Wiki page it actually identifies where each topic came from, so when it refers to the drafting team it's there, if it was law enforcement it's there, and if it came from staff it's also mentioned on the Wiki page as well. So I invite you to take a look at that.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Carlton. And next in the list is Sala; Salanieta.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the record. Hi Margie.

Margie Milam:

Hello.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro:

How are you?

Margie Milam:

Excellent, thank you.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro:

Alright. I just wanted to ask, in relation to this particular policy, I'm just wondering behind the lens and that sort of thing from a macro perspective, do you have some sort of illustration schematics in terms of overlapping dependencies and that sort of thing, but in terms of illustration.

Margie Milam:

No, that's too difficult to identify.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro:

Okay, no worries.

Margie Milam:

But yeah, there's certainly, as you can imagine, each team has issues that are very important to them and if they agree to certain changes they want to see their requests also incorporated; so it's a give and take, but I don't have any specific examples I can cite.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro:

Sure. The reason why I raised this, and I'd like to make a proposal, it would be interesting if this were done, just like a page or so, and it will show the conflicts or the dependencies areas of coordination and that sort of thing. Perhaps if it were not done from your section it could be something that's developed from

the At-Large bottom-up, and then sort of flick it to you; that sort of thing. It could, I think in terms of efficiency, address and cut through a lot of the hurdles.

Margie Milam: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Any other questions or comments? We are very tight on time. It looks like now we finally have a full lineup; everyone's made it. Well thank you very much Margie for joining us here and for your presentation. If there are any further questions is it possible for them to be directed at you?

Margie Milam: Yes please do. I'd be happy to answer them.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay great. Thanks very much for joining us.

Margie Milam: Thank you everybody. Bye-bye.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. And now we are quickly moving on to the next part of our meeting. We are running very late. There are three items on the agenda – the second one starting at 10:50 and finishing at 10 past 11. It's already 11:22. The hot topics, which were supposed to start at 10 past 11 and finish at 11:30 will be scraped, and we'll be taking until 11:40, which gives us roughly about 15 to 20 minutes, which is the allocated time for the discussion with the NomCom Chair, Vanda Scartezini, who is also joining us with the NomCom Chair-elect, Rob Hall. So welcome.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you. We will not take much of your time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And Vanda I'm not quite sure whether you wish to first do your schpiel and presentation and then, since we already have a question from Beau Brendler to Rob, it's up to you; you structure it yourself. Start with the presentation and then we'll do the question.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay. Thank you for taking us here. Well as everybody knows, we have this mandate from ATRT to make this match from what we got from the community as could be the profile from the Board members. And in the end of the year what we have chosen as selected new members and how they match with this profile information that we got from the community.

So, last year we made this circulation, I came here with Adam and Rob and we talked about what was your opinion about the profile, what did we need to look for to identify the best candidate that we could have as a Board member. So, this time we came back with information about what we, as NomCom members, understood for all community about which is the best profile. And I would like to share with you this information and ask you if it's good enough, if we need to add something, to withdraw something; that's our intention here today.

So let's go ahead with who is taking the lead of the next slide. Okay. It's just information about what we have in front of us. As a NomCom this year we have three positions for the Board members. We have two positions for ALAC; just for North America and Europe. We have one position for the ccSNO and one position for the GNSO. So, next slide please. So there is the timeline, to be more transparent for the community and for the applicants, what is going to happen there.

In the second of April, this window will be closed. So it was important issue to remember that we need especially a member from Latin America and Caribbean area. So please pay attention to help us on that. Next slide. So those are the

members profiles that we got from this time. During last year we talked with each community, ACs and SOs and got those profiles; those are there. SO I cannot read from here really, but there is nobody can read it I believe. So I will use your...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Pull your mic over.

Vanda Scartezini: Okay. So we divide from experience that we need to look for technical; we need someone that at least has a general idea about the major technical issues. They don't need to be an expert in technical issues, but need to have a general idea about what we are talking about. Second is policy; must be aware about many policy issues, but also understand that it is not the job of the Board to make policy, it's just to understand what's going on and how is the process to do that.

Governance; not only management skills but Board experience and especially Board experience in similar or larger organizations, because ICANN is growing. So we need people that understand these dynamics inside the Board of big organization. And the ability to easily communicate in English, but more and more, more than one language is becoming relevant. Because people need to address to the community, talk with the community and a lot of time there is no way to talk clearly and openly if you don't know other languages. So it's become more and more important. May I? How are you?

Okay, go. Okay. So general skill set – we listened from the community that what they expected from a Board member is the ability to listen, good building relationships, diplomatic attitude, and we have problems with that when you addressed government, when you address some other cultural people.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If I could say – ICANN has problems with that when they address governments. For the record.

Vanda Scartezini: Yeah for the record. Well, I completely agree.

Evan Leibovitch: It's very fresh in our memory.

Vanda Scartezini: I know that. But anyway, it's very important to have diplomatic abilities to address issues clearly and in an elegant way. An executive mind, decision maker, capacity to learn and assimilate a lot of information at the same time and make decisions over that. Of course, integrity and honesty, and then be confident, but of course we don't want an arrogant people; an arrogant person sitting there and facing the community like they are the enemies. Next slide please.

And accept public critics with elegance. Everybody in the community is there and needs to be open and express their opinion. And the Board needs to know how to accept those criticisms with elegance. And the ability to delegate, because it's not the task of the Board member to execute things. A strong understanding and belief in ICANN multi stakeholder model, because you cannot defend a company if you don't believe in that mission, in that vision, in that principle. So no one sitting there must have other kind of mind.

Understand that clear communication with the community is an important part of the consensus building process. So it's important to respect the community and the information they can get from the community. And finally time, availability is really important. So, that's our – go ahead and suggest. What I expect from you is there is other suggestions that we could receive from you, you could add or think about or talk now in a few minutes, or send us later, whatever. And pass one more please.

Is just to remember that 2nd of April and that was the address I'm going to send to you all this information, this completed slides, and we're going to post this for

the benefit also for the applicants. The general idea that we got from the community, and also the timeline, because it was the transparent process that NomCom is demanded to have. So that's it, thank you very much for your time. If you have please anything to add to us, please, the floor is yours back.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Vanda, and thank you for your extensive presentation, which certainly I did notice quite a few suggestions from this community making it to the presentation. So, very good to be listened to in this instance. I understand that you are this year you are looking for applicants particularly from the LACRALO region, and I'll give the floor over to my colleague and friend.

Vanda Scartezini:

There is someone that wants to make a question for me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Do you wish to speak first? Oh before, okay fine. So before the questions then, Rob Hall.

Rob Hall:

Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt. My name is Rob Hall and I'm the vice-chair-elect, and that's a new title this year. The Bylaws changed last year. In the past there was the Chair and the pass chair, and through various iterative processes the Board decided it was more wise to have a vice or a chair-elect that sat and learned for a year before they were actually Chair. So I am the first person to ever hold that position.

What does that mean? It means my job this year is to prepare for next year. So you'll see some changes coming from me to your community because you have five members on our nominating committee. The biggest change you'll see is I'll be asking you to identify who those are earlier in the process than normal. So typically, because the outgoing chair, the responsibility right through the

Prague meeting, they weren't able to concentrate on the next year. And my job the is concentrating on what, planning for next year.

So you'll be getting a request from me between now and the Prague meeting, to identify your members for the 2013 nomination committee, so I'd ask you to start thinking about who they will be. And we'll hope to try and get them identified right around the timing of the Prague meeting, as opposed to waiting until the October meeting, which is when they actually sit for the first time in Toronto. So that's a bit of a change this year.

I've been fortunate enough to start working on budgets and have the luxury of some time rather than just walking into the job as has poor Vanda had to do this year. So I'm happy to take input, if you have it, on any structure change. One of my goals is to make the NomCom much more transparent than it is. I feel that the secrecy that has been attached to the candidates has extended beyond that into the process of the NomCom, and I'm not sure there's any reason that can't be fully transparent. It's really the identities of the people that apply that we are trying to protect, and we shouldn't be trying to protect what the process is, what our agendas are, when we meet, whose on it; that type of thing.

So you'll see, from me, you'll see starting in October, or as we run up to October, much more about what we do and how we do it, as opposed to the past. And Vanda has already started that; we have a NomCom blog that we'll starting to be posting to after this session. We're going to start to see some of our agendas and that type of thing as we try and become more transparent. So I think I'll take any of your questions as your Chair desires.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Rob and I see nods of approval around the room to this more transparency. So we already have a queue in operation, in fact I wish I had filled it out. First was Sergio and then we'll move over to the other people, so we'll have...go ahead Sergio, and everyone else, keep your hand up.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Okay. Thank you, I will speak in Spanish. You may want to put on your headphones. I will wait for Rob to wear his headphones as well. Thank you Vanda and Rob, this is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. There are members of our RALO that had the initiative of involving people in the NomCom so that they could apply for the position open in the Latin American region. We have contacted at least 10 people. I remember people from Ecuador, Argentina, Venezuela and probably they may be applying as we speak or they may have applied already.

Although some of them met all the requirements, except when it comes to understanding ICANNs intricate world, and they have little knowledge on that subject. So we thought that perhaps we might do some outreach in our RALO and we might explain to them what ICANN structure is all about before they apply, so that their recruitment or their participation in this process might be easier. I want to know if this is possible, and if so, we will start working so that we can meet these applicants and then they are ready to apply for the position. Thank you.

Vanda Scartezini:

This is Vanda. There is no impediment preventing you, as I said yesterday, no impediment preventing you from calling any person that you know, any acquaintance of yours or any other applicant that you think meets all these requirements and has experience as a Board member, etc. So personally, I have been speaking about outreach for quite a long time now.

To my mind this is all about using the RALOs, because the RALOs are the ones that reach people in the community. So if you do have time of course, but remember that as Rob was saying, we will start a little bit earlier on for next year because the next year in terms of ALAC, entails Latin America, Asia and Africa. So it is the RALOs that reach people in these areas because communication with people in each region is hard because we do not really see outreach, or ICANN outreach in these communities.

However, when it comes to searching for qualified applicants, until you finish explaining to them what ICANN is all about, well that is really time consuming and we need somebody that is already doing this, that is already here and understands why he or she is here. Well that kind of person is the one that can explain this to the future applicants. So the simplest option to me is to speak with people in our region, especially in our region, given our culture we have a need for face to face interaction. We need to phone people. We need to chat over a cup of coffee and explain what we are doing.

This is what I'm doing myself, but I cannot do it all by myself, so I appreciate your help. Anything you can do is more than welcome. Thank you Sergio.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Sergio. We have a queue in operation and I think it's closed because it's pretty busy and we're running out of time, so it's Alan, Siva, Fatimata and Holly and with Beau also who will be able to ask the final question in the whole discussion. I haven't forgotten you Beau. So, Alan.

Alan Greenberg:

It's not a question, just a comment. It's delightful to hear Rob's statement that the protection mechanism is to protect the applicants and not to protect the NomCom, and not to put things in a veil of secrecy so no one even knows what's going on. There has been no cause for much of it in the past, and I'm delighted to hear it's not going to be.

Rob Hall:

I think it's a huge detriment to the actual function of the NomCom. I think it just leads people to start speculating about things that they should just be releasing and saying this is what it is as opposed to having people speculate. So that's what we've started to do and it needs to improve much faster. There's two things I think need to remain secret within the NomCom, one is certainly we need to protect the applicants identities and any information we gather from them. The second would be, I think it's important that the discussion that

happens about the candidates between the NomCom members not be public as well. But other than that, the process of how we get there and anything else should be free and open and as transparent as possible.

So it was interesting that John Jeffrey and I had a long discussion about ICANN's new philosophy on how they look at something, and I think we should be embracing it, which is, rather than looking at a document and saying why should we release this, we ought to be looking at a document and saying why shouldn't we. And if there's no reason not to then we'll try and release it and post it. So you'll see things from us, like agendas and that type of thing.

Alan Greenberg:

Just one anecdote – when I first applied to the NomCom I asked the question “can I see the questionnaire that goes to the references”; the people that I've asked to refer. And it took a lot of to and fro before they said “I guess we can show you the blank.”

Rob Hall:

Yeah, there's no reason that should be a secret document. Once it's filled in it should be, but not...

Alan Greenberg:

We're violently agreeing with each other, but it had to be debated. It's good to see that gone.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. Next in the queue is Siva.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy:

One complication in the NomCom practice is that you don't just look for the best candidate but also look for a gender balance and regional balance. what happens when in a particular year for some strange reason there are no good

candidates from a certain region, or if the woman in the forefront is not the ideal candidate? Would you rather chose from the available pool of better candidates for the year and then maybe say okay this region had an opening last year which was not filled, so we'll take two from this region next year, and postpone the gender balance requirement for the next year.

Vanda Scartezini:

Okay, thank you for the question. Certainly the answer is the Bylaws do not allow us to do that. So we need to have good candidates. If we don't have, it will be a disaster. Because we need to fulfill when is the condition that we are facing this year, this year we are facing to go for one representative from Latin American/Caribbean area to zero in the end of...so zero is not allowed. So we need to fulfill this at least one position. So that's why I'm trying so hard to talk all the time and with everybody and asking if you know please help to select people, to help to select the people, to have a bunch of candidates that could give us the opportunity to select really, not just put someone just because it's the only one from that region.

We cannot do that. It's not in the best interest of ICANN. So we need a group of persons, yeah a pool, but high quality to at least have some discussion about that and chose the best one. That is the main challenge for the NomCom, because it's tight scattering of people in may regions, like even in LACRALO, it is not interested, has not enough knowledge. So when this for other opportunities like we have one or two or three, so we can change, there is no problem with the regions. We have the limit to not overpass five persons from the same region. So the idea is to have a balance, the best we can have for two or three or for each region, could be the best.

That is the main goal of NomCom. But we are tied in this framework of Bylaws, you know, in some ways it's a challenge for us to find out how to deal with if we face lack of good candidates. So there is no way to go out of these boundaries; that is the problem.

Rob Hall: If I could just add to that, the Bylaws are very clear, you mentioned a couple of different criteria – we're not allowed to ever have zero candidates from a given region, so this year we have to add one from Latin America. Part of our frustration will be that we will have to pick from the best of the pool we have. So right now our focus is how do we make sure that pool is large and has the best, because we have to pick the best. We can't have more than five as Vanda said either.

Although we try for gender diversity, we will still tend to pick the best candidate. That's not mandated in the Bylaws that we have to have half and half in the numbers. Certainly it's something in consideration, I can tell you in the two previous NomComs I've been on it's always been discussed, it's always one of the factors. But it's not at the same level as a Bylaw that says we must appoint someone for example, this year from the Latin American region.

Vanda Scartezini: That's it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you.

Rob Hall: For the Board, yes that's correct.

Vanda Scartezini: For the Board. For the ALAC it's mandatory to have those...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you and may I just add Latin American and Caribbean region, and mentioning this, I notice a lot of our Caribbean friends are sitting currently, from Caribbean ALSes are sitting here. So you have to search for people in your

region that would be able to assume the Board position. It's not an option, it just has to be done.

Vanda Scartezini: It's mandatory, so go there and do that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, we have next on the speaking list Fatimata.

Fatima Cambronero: Thank you Olivier. Thank you Vanda for your presentation. I would like to put emphasis on one of the important selection criteria you mentioned, among many others. It is about respect of the community and of the community's opinions. And my question will be how would you select the right candidate if the NomCom members are not from different backgrounds? This is about sensitivity, it's about knowing how to say this is the right one. It is about knowing how to ask the right questions to the candidate. If you don't have the same sensitivity, if you don't have – I mean not the same sensitivity but different sensitivity from different backgrounds. And this is where I would say that we definitely have to do our best as RALOs to involve members from our different communities in the NomCom. Thank you.

Rob Hall: I think that's a key to your participation in the NomCom and why you have five members, one from each region. We have quite a process of interviewing and that type of thing, but at the end of the day it's often the person from that region that has the best sense of what to ask the candidate. And we try and interview every Board candidate certainly in person to get those questions and allow that feeling, or that gut feeling if you will, to come out.

Vanda Scartezini: The idea of respect is over there, but I will certainly add in that at least specifically respect to the community. Thank you Fatima.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Vanda, and actually to the question which was asked earlier by Shiva, with regards to choosing between the geographical, or the diversity on one side and on the other side skills. Having been on the NomCom I can share some of my knowledge. It's interesting because it's a real struggle to be able to balance the two out and it's something which each individual NomCom member has to struggle with and thinks about. I know that we spent a considerable amount of time discussing this in the NomCom, and certainly not all of us thought in the same way. It might be because maybe because of our cultural background or because of the way that we do things. But there's no right or wrong answer about that, it's just in between the two.

Vanda Scartezini: And we try to reach consensus on that and we debate all the issues, certainly we balance how many people are there, what the skills are there in the Board, so we could choose and compliment our skill that they needed. It's all over the table you know, gender, besides regions, and also with skills, different skills and to fulfill all those positions. Because any time we are choosing someone, we have some lack of capacity from the people that are leaving the Board, so there is holes to fulfill to. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Vanda. We've got two more questions, one from Beau and one from Jean-Jacques Subrenat and I apologize to Filiz. I was looking around the room and I couldn't find her, and I just understand that she's hidden behind the interpretation booths. So sorry about that Filiz, I thought we had plenty of time. Okay, so Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler:

Thank you. My question involves conflict of interest in the NomCom, especially in light of what Rod Beckstrom said in his speech yesterday, and sort of putting aside that he's a lame duck and all that, but he said something to the effect of "NomCom structure is a significant threat to ICANN. In future all of NomCom's Board candidates should be financially independent of the domain name industry, as should NomCom members themselves."

So Rob, I'm wondering, I'm a little bit concerned to find out that you're on the Registrar Accreditation Agreement negotiation team. You're Chair-elect of the NomCom. You also have a registrar company that brings in \$30 million in revenues. It's difficult for me to see how the organization of ICANN is protecting you from potential accusations of conflict of interest, and I wondered if you had ever considered stepping down from your position on the NomCom in light of that?

Rob Hall:

Sure, let me answer it this way Beau if I can, and I think it would be important to take a bit of history in account of how I came to this position. Let me treat them as two separate, because you asked earlier about the negotiating team. So yes, I've been attending ICANN and been a member of the registrar constituency since 1999; this is my 36th or 37th ICANN meeting. I'm no longer sure that's a good thing.

But I was on the 2009 negotiating team for the registrars. When this came up to negotiate this new contract the registrar community asked me if I'd sit on this negotiating team. So, Tim Ruiz and I were the only two members that were on the last team, and they wanted some historical presence there as to what happened in the last round of negotiations. I have been part of the team that's been meeting, I think upwards of 15 times. Those of you that heard me speak yesterday on the verification issue, I should preface this by saying my comments on anything about the negotiations are my own and don't reflect the stakeholder group or the negotiating team. Even within the negotiating team there's often six different opinions.

I'm happy to talk about anything you want to know about the negotiations and I'm kind of surprised to be honest that this group didn't ask us to come and present, because a lot of the other stakeholder groups have asked me to come and speak to them about how I think it's going, and I'm happy to come back and do that at a later time. I'm not sure this is the appropriate time to get into the details of the negotiations because I know you're pressed for time.

I think that's a very different thing than the nominating committee. So the way – I've sat on two previous nominating committees, I sat on last years as a voting member of the nominating committee on behalf of the registrar stakeholders group, and two years previous to that, again, representing the registrar group. So I've sat on the nominating committee – slow down, I'm sorry. Okay. I apologize translators; I know how hard your job is.

I've sat on two previous nominating committees as a voting member of the nominating committee. I was returned again by the stakeholder group to this nominating committee as the voting member for the registrar group. It was in the middle of that process that the Board took applications to be the Chair or Chair-elect. I applied saying I would be happy to serve in either position and I was informed in the middle, like after being informed that I was the voting member for the registrars that the Board asked me if I would consider being the Chair-elect and I said yes.

Part of that application process was – it's a public process, the application form is public – were questions about conflict of interest, specifically to “was I an employee or consultant to ICANN and had I ever received money from ICANN” and of course the answer to that is I have never been a consultant of ICANN, I don't intend to be. And I haven't been in the past and I certainly don't intend to be in the future. So I believe there is no actual conflict with ICANN; that's what they define the conflict as being that the Chair or vice Chair is.

I gather your question goes more to within the committee and how the committee operates. I will point out that the interesting point of making me Chair-elect or Chair is it takes away my vote, so both Vanda and I don't have a

vote on the nominating committee any more and my role is much different not. My role is to try and gather the consensus of those that do have the votes and are members of the nominating committee and remove any barriers they have to getting to consensus. So it's a much different role I have now as Chair-elect or Chair then I did as the voting member last year.

Within the nominating committee the big concern of course is conflict of interest with any candidate, and that applies to all of us, including the five representatives from the ALAC. We have, one of the first things the nominating committee does is it establishes a conflict of interest committee. If at any time in the process any member of the nominating committee feels they have a conflict with a candidate, either they know them well, they're an employee of theirs, there's a financial incentive; there's many different criteria of what might be a conflict between a member of the committee and a candidate. That would also apply to the non voting such as myself and Vanda.

We would go to the conflict committee and disclose this, and then the committee would decide are we part of the discussion. It's made aware to all the committee that this conflict exists between this candidate and this member. The head of this year's conflict committee is Maria [Farrell], so she'll be running the conflict committee within. It's got nothing to do with Vanda and I as Chair and Chair-elect. So I think there are adequate safeguards certainly with conflict of interest, both within the committee and prior to be appointed as Chair-elect and Chair as Vanda and I have been.

You commented briefly on Rod's statement and I don't feel it's the nominating committee's position to comment on that. I serve at the pleasure of the Board – oh sorry, slow again. I'm sorry. Vanda and I both serve at the pleasure of the Board or Directors. We were asked to sit by the Board of Directors. The construct of what we must do and our positions and what the nominating committees job is, is a function of the ICANN Bylaws. And certainly no one the nominating committee has the ability to change those.

There's a process to change Bylaws. If the community decides the nominating committee is not the way to go; that's their decision. My job is to operate within the existing Bylaws and try and help the nominating committee which will be appointed for next year; a point that we don't even know who's on it yet, come to some types of consensus about the candidates there and help them through the procedure. And I think I'm well suited to do that, as I've been on two previous ones and I get to watch Vanda this year as Chair.

So I'm happy to answer any other questions about it, but I hope Beau, that addresses your question about conflict and process.

Vanda Scartezini:

Just quickly Beau, just a comment the question regarding Rod. It was he last year that asked us to test his idea about to select someone completely independent from the group to make outreach, so we did. And the result was not effective. So we got eight names and besides those eight, just one, I believe it's just one really applied and was not really much qualified with Board experience. So it's hard for the people outside this community to make outreach as you really know, because they need to have a deep knowledge about what is the community, what is the ICANN, what we are talking about. So it's quite difficult.

But we have tested and the test result was negative. That's why we didn't pursue with this same idea. Okay? But in the end, we just answer to the Board and therefore NomCom, the Board position was not that, so we are easy to go under the Bylaws. Thank you for the question.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Vanda. We're really running over time. We've got two people who wish, please, the best of 30 seconds Jean-Jacques and Alan.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

A word of caution – it has become fashionable over the past few years to mention on the Board discussions the necessity of having a skill set on the Board. I consider that grossly over done. What is necessary is independence of mind, a capacity to analyze, character, and also an ability to learn fast. I'm completely impermeable to the qualities of someone who has spent half his life doing audit. We are not into the business of micro-managing the CEO or the staff. We want judgment. We want an ability to decide. And therefore, I would say very strongly that the notion of skill set has been brought far too far, it is even dangerous. I caution against it.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Jean-Jacques. And finally, Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg:

Rob, your comment about the Chair not having a vote is laudable, but there's lots of anecdotal evidence from years past with the Chair without any votes significantly influence the outcome through whatever means. Anything you can do to make it clear you will not do that – and when I say “make it clear” I mean in a public way, you will not do that – and you will encourage members of your NomCom, and the same goes for Vanda, to rat on you if you're perceived as doing that would calm the waters a bit.

Rob Hall:

I don't view my job as picking the new candidates; that's the job of the committee. My job is to help them get through the process and understand; often half the committee is new and has never done this before. So my job is to remove the barriers to kind of get them consensus, not to direct them in one direction or another. So I don't view my job as trying to say “Here's the candidate I want” and pushing everyone to that. And I can tell you on past

committees it would be impossible. These are very strong personalities and people that tend to be on this committee, but I will say they tend to act as one for the betterment of ICANN. I've never seen anyone from any stakeholder group act in the interest of only that group and not in the best interest of ICANN.

Alan Greenberg:

And that I was not accusing, but Chairs and other non voting members have wielded influence before.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, well thank you very much to everyone, and thanks Vanda and Rob for visiting us here and being in the skillet I guess and being able to answer our questions, so thanks.

Vanda Scartezini:

Okay thank you, thank you for your time and please help us to find the right persons. Thank you.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Oh God, the clock; how can we stop the clock? Okay so, whilst Filiz gets ready; we have Filiz Yilmaz, Senior Director of Participation and Engagement. Excuse me, could I please ask for some quiet? Thank you. We're continuing our session with Filiz Yilmaz, Senior Director of Participation and Engagement. And apologies to Filiz; we didn't see her earlier, or rather I couldn't see her earlier. She was hidden away. I hope you're not hiding from us, but welcome and I'm afraid we'll have to probably sort of squash a little bit the presentation that you might have, but we look forward to listening to you now. So Filiz, the floor is yours. And yeah, there are about 20 buttons, of which only one works. There you go.

Filiz Yilmaz:

Thanks for the warm welcome. Thanks for the introductions. I walked in the room but I'm rather tiny I guess in size, so maybe you didn't catch me there. I'm here for you actually this time; I don't have any presentations. I hear that; I know that you have been following the stuff I'm doing, the stuff I'm working on quite regularly and intensely, and you are very aware of the developments already. So I'm here to hear you out and maybe this time it's working better because we won't spend time with the slides but I will take your questions and answer them and we will have a more interactive session, hopefully.

As I understand it, my colleagues from ICANN briefed me or noted me that you may have some questions regarding public comment enhancements recently done, so I'm happy to take any questions, remarks, further comments, what's coming up; all of that. One tiny little thing before I leave the mic to Olivier, is that there will be an update about this on the PPC, public consultation session on Thursday. Now it is a tradition that public participation committee is having these consultation sessions regarding their recent work, separately from the Board committee reports, and that session will be on Thursday at 9:00 am I believe. So we hope you can make it there, or at least some of you. I know there are conflicting meetings again, but I hope to see some of you there. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Filiz, and so the floor is open for questions and Jean-Jacques Subrenat is the first in the queue.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you Chair. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Filiz, thank you for being here. I have a question which is quite general. I'm trying to get a sense of where the average opinion is on staff and ICANN leadership on the following question – should we continue having three ICANN full meetings a year, or is there a

sense that, for all sorts of reasons, we might be going towards lesser number of meetings a year. Thank you.

Filiz Yilmaz:

This is a great question. ICANN meetings are our main medium, main fora to interact. We all use online tools. We all use distance communication tools to communicate between things, but face to face meetings, they are so powerful in their means of bringing people together. So this is why, as you also know, Josef and you were Chairing the PPC, this has been always in the agenda of the public participation committee.

They have done some work recently on this, which they will also report on that Thursday session. My understanding, so far from the general feedback that I received regarding the subject, there are varying views within the community itself, there are varying views among the staff. And it is not personal views I believe; they are linked to very fundamental facts or choices. People want to come together more often, obviously this is one argument. The other argument is the time between meetings is so short it is hard to get the real work done following the meetings. Okay, you have to balance that out.

There is also the cost issue. Bringing people all together, there is some benefit there because you reduce maybe the time; in shorter time you get more work done, but everybody getting into different locations as well, that's another subject. So all these will be raised in the PPC session and I think to talk to the Board, and the specific sub committee they have formed on this subject may give you a much more wider view on these issues.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Filiz. Next is Evan.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi there. A couple of questions, first of which, in relation to meetings, is there any update on the way that ICANN handles its regional meetings, the ones that

have typically been done with registrars and contracted parties alone? Some time back we raised the issue of either opening them or using those as an opportunity to have other stakeholders participate in a very cost-effective way since you've already booked space, you've already set up logistics; having a little bit extra time to engage other stakeholders as opposed to only the ones that normally brought to those regional meetings. Oh sorry, too fast.

And this was brought up long ago; this was brought up after Rome and Toronto meetings where there were issues both with the transparency of what happened in those meetings, and the missed opportunity of not engaging local communities where you went, because these are also in different places around the world, places where you don't have regular ICANN meetings. So this is both an issue of transparency and an issue of missed opportunity. Is there any update on what's happening with that? Will these meetings be opened in the future and will the opportunities be taken to engage local communities when you set up further regional meetings?

David Olive:

This is David Olive, Vice President of Policy Development and Support, let me answer that Evan. I think the issue was at times there were these regional meetings, I think there was a desire to open it up to others to have that as part of, if you will, outreach or engagement where the regions might be. That is all now being under discussion by the PPC and others, so that model will likely change to something more broader.

Evan Leibovitch:

Sorry, I don't think the issue was totally a matter that it wasn't opened, we realized that there were certain things of confidentiality that may need to be done with contracted parties, but that there was also significant part of the meeting that didn't have such confidentiality could have been opened up, and we actually had observers turned away from some of those meetings when they tried to even just observe; that was the concern.

David Olive: Since those meetings will be a new consideration going forward, we'll work that out so that there's not exclusion.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much David, and for the transcript of course it's David Olive who has joined us as well at the table next to Filiz. So we have a queue in operation and next is Sala.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the transcript. Good morning Filiz. Good morning David. Good to see you this morning. First of all I'd like to congratulate you on the excellent work that you guys are doing. I recognize that we can only go and move from strength to strength. Just a few comments. I happily thank ICANN staff, especially the At-Large staff in relation to the translations that have been ongoing in terms of requirement in terms of feedback from within the RALOs and that sort of thing and getting it out.

And one of the things that we continued to see within the RALOs, and I speak for APRALO because I'm familiar with our region, is that there's a sort of very poor feedback and I'm not sure what the reason is, and I know that it takes four days to have any statements or whatever to sort of translated, trickled and we sort of distribute it. And I know that's something that At-Large and especially the RALOs have to fix on their own in terms of how to encourage participation, but I think at the same time, quite aside from the existing webinars, policy webinars, there's room to coordinate and collaborate better and improve on things.

And I think this, the participation and engagement sector, or section in particular, is a good example of something that should be enveloped within the cross-constituency working group that we were sort of thrashing out with the Board this morning. And I recognize that global partnerships already engages the presence within the NOGs all around the world, we can engage with the

ASOs, the RIRs, I think some of them are in the room, and that sort of thing and sort of coordinate better, and its' something that I would suggest and propose that should come under cross-constituency working group. Thank you. To answer the outreach aspects.

Filiz Yilmaz:

Thanks for the comments Sala. I agree with you, I mean there is more work to do and we are all open for suggestions. I think there is so much you can do within your own regions as well, and where you want ICANN to go and have a speech here and there, make a presentation, please let us know. I myself, I often go to David with requests like "Oh I received this request from this particular network operators group, or training program. Could I please go there and say a few words on ICANN and our activities." And David is generally very supportive of that idea.

So we try our best, obviously we cannot go to each and every meeting. But I think there is good enough synergy here between groups, if you can't go there will be somebody else. On this issue – okay.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:

Just to respond to this particular issue, and recognizing that yes, face to face it important and it's something that you guys are actually doing. But I would also like to encourage and put out the need for web based platforms, this would really save on costs, and that sort of thing.

Filiz Yilmaz:

Sure, I think the policy team is very proactive in webinars, maybe we can also look at the frequency of them and maybe adding some extra translation services when we get back home, how we can disseminate this information in several different languages; that's a good suggestion, we'll look at that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Filiz, and certainly translation is a very important for our regions. We are in LACRALO region, translation in Spanish is vital for some of our delegates. We are running out of time already as we have been for a while. Sandra Hoferichter first, and then Sergio Salinas. Sandra please make it a quick comment or question.

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you Olivier, it's Sandra speaking and everybody knows I'm always quite quick in my comments. I just want to emphasize and catch up what Sala just said. I see that more and more sessions are being offered on the newcomers track, which I think is very much appreciated and it's a good thing for the newcomers to come in. As you know, we are currently working on this ICANN Academy Proposal and we had various intense discussions about how broad the Academy should be.

And the final conclusion, which is also in our proposal included when we present the ICANN Academy to the broader community, one important conclusion is that all provisions, capacity building provisions already offered by ICANN should be somehow harmonized and brought under one umbrella; whether the face to face meeting which is currently called ICANN Academy, is only one element within this overarching umbrella. And all the existing provisions webinars newcomers track also things other constituencies offer like the Tech Day from the ccNSO, they should be included in such a capacity building overall, all-inclusive effort.

And this is one of the recommendations At-Large figured out during their discussion and we would be happy to collaborate with some stuff and the community of course, because this is a community project, or this becomes a community project for the future. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Sandra, and it's on the record, so Filiz if you do need to review through this we can always get the record to you. Oh, you wish to answer? Yes, sure.

Filiz Yilmaz: I agree and we are taking baby steps at the moment in that regards. What we do is at the newcomers lounge, we actually tell the newcomers who drop by there which sessions they may want to be attending. And all these ones you have mentioned are part of that list. What we don't have in the meeting guide, we don't have it so explicitly listed. This is what we are missing. And the reason for that is actually a logistical problem; we need to print the meeting guide some time in advance due to some technicalities that I don't want to get into detail here, but my hands are bound there.

So, what we have there, we can't print it by the time the sessions are clear, the Tech Day is confirmed, we already have the meeting guide out. So we tried to fill that buffer in through the newcomers lounge. So I also look up to your help, where you see the newcomers with the green badge, send them to the lounge because we have a lot of information disseminating through that one meeting point, which is great I think. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Filiz, and next in the list, and the queue is closed, but last but not least, we have Sergio Salinas.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I am Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Just a brief comment, and I would like to echo some of the issues posted by Sala. In LACRALO when we receive documents to this task in our region, they come in English and we wouldn't have the problem of having them in English if at least a PDF would be open to be translated. We cannot translate them, therefore we cannot work.

So, is there any possibility for these documents, PDF documents to be opened, be transferred to a Word document of any other document so as to be able to work with them?

Filiz Yilmaz:

Well for that, I understand the problem and I see where you are getting from. I will carry it back. I believe this is due to some documentation policy that we have to abide with. PDFs are not editable, so we have to follow certain rules. But I will carry it back and we will try to see if we can help you another way without breaking our own policy about the documentation. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Filiz, and one last question before we let you go, and you had been forewarned earlier. With regards to the public comments, there has been an extensive discussion taking place within our ranks, both in recent ALAC calls, but also on the list. The new system of an official minimum comment period being 21 days, and official minimum reply period being 21 days, and the fact that if no substantive comments are received during the comment period there will be no reply period, is one which has brought some improvements I guess, but at the same time has brought some disadvantages.

Of course, for those comment periods that needed to be rather short, it has made the 21 day period really good in those subjects which needed to be expedited through the process. However, in an organization such as ours, where we have to go all the way to the edges, 21 days, bearing in mind that each region only has one conference call a month, which usually is either 30 or 31 days, or 29, depending, or is 28 as well. Anyway, it's more than 21 days and it's particularly hard therefore to gain the full input from the edges at that rate.

Now, I understand that the system is still under test. One thing which we would be doing, and this is just because the ALAC can and is able to comment in a comment period or outside a comment period, we do believe that it is better to comment within the comment period so as for our comment to be publicly

displayed on the public comment form, or list of public comments. However, if we are not able to comment on a subject within 21 days, what we will be doing will be to send you a note that we will send you a comment but within the previous time scale. Or even within the 42 days. And what we do ask is for that comment period to therefore be kept open during the additional 21 days for us to be able to formulate a reply.

We could have requested this from you in writing, but the request is coming to you here during the meeting. We don't require an answer right away of course, but I do hope that you will be able to satisfy to the request.

Filiz Yilmaz:

Okay. I'm not going to answer in the detail of the specifics of the request for that one; I just want to point out some general remarks. I understand 21 days can be challenging in collecting the data and the consultations you want to have in your groups. First of all, my first remark is, this is minimum. And the reason we designed this as minimum is exactly due to the reason you described. There are some issues which are very specific to some certain groups, where they need a check, looking at the issue and then get back to work. It is like a milestone for them to do a rather quick relative check.

And I also want to remind you that while we did not have a consistent period set before these enhancements were made, people often used 21 days for a practical and very interesting reason – GNSO and ccNSO PDPs are referring to that. So as policy making bodies generally using that date, while unwritten, I think there was some kind of understanding around the community, or acceptance of the 21 days. This was one of the reasons we chose it.

You may remember at the beginning our staff recommendation to have for these periods was 30 plus 15. And when we consulted with the community on this through the focus group, which ALAC member and At-Large members were also contributing, and we received public comments through a separate period on this issue. The feedback we got was 30 days was fine, but plus 15 days is short for reply, for exactly the same reason you are describing, because they

need to consult within their community. Fair enough. Then our option was to do it 30 plus 30 maybe. But the other opposing or challenging argument was that it is too long. If you left an issue for two months, for 60 days just open for consultations and we just receive, on average, 10, 15 comments, then we are really delaying work.

So, I understand this “finding the medium way” through consensus. Our way was okay we will shorten the 30 days a bit, we will get from the first period and edit up to the other period, and the overall elapsed time is not going to change drastically; it still stayed at 42 days. And the reason we chose 21 plus 21 instead of 25 plus 25, it is easier to remember. We have to think of those things too. And now, I just wanted to give you a few examples – these are minimums. If you have a request for a specific topic that you have high interest and you feel that you didn’t get the necessary consultation from your groups and you will be delayed, please ask for and request an official extension.

The groups are there to address that. If there is a need, some part of the community is feeling “we are not there yet, we need more time,” please submit that. You can do this through the staff comment listed per public comment. One final remark before I finish. I just looked at it before I came here, there are currently nine open public comments and most of them are using actually more than 21 days for the reply comments. Total times were between 62 to 81.

So, we are actually using more time already in advance, considering the complexity of the issues and diversity of the issues, budget framework is open for 36 plus 30, just to give you an example for general things. The universal acceptance of IDNs, which we know that it speaks to a diverse community; it’s about 81 days in total, with a 60 plus 21 period. So I think there is consideration in those things and the flexibility is there to be able to answer that varying demand, as you already made your in short remarks about. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Filiz. The examples that you provide of course have closing times after the ICANN meeting. Generally the length of the comment period shortens

just before the ICANN meeting, so we had several of them that were only 21. But the concern with asking for an extension of course is you might have the extension plus the 21 day reply, which might be detrimental. What we were asking for is to be able to submit an initial comment within more than the 21 days, so within the 30 days, which will be well within the 42 days of a initial and a reply comment period. But I'm afraid we're running out of time, so perhaps we should have to put it down on paper so as to make it clear.

Okay, well thanks very much Filiz. And we'll move quickly to David Olive who has joined us, and thankfully – well we're really very late on our schedule. Thank you. David you have a few questions that were sent to you, and I'm afraid, because I was just speaking about them with my colleagues, I don't actually have a record of those.

David Olive:

I have them.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

You've got them. If you could read them through and reply to them that would be really appreciated.

David Olive:

I will be happy to do that if I could just take one quick moment as a preface. Since joining ICANN about two years ago, my first challenge and priority was to make sure that the policy staff, in support of the various SOs and ACs that we do assist and facilitate, be up to a full compliment. That was not the case with At-Large and others, and of course my first hire was Filiz Yilmaz, the Senior Director for Participation and Engagement. Luckily I had a very capable and able head of At-Large in Heidi, but we were able to add Matt and Silvia and Gisella to the policy list. Needless to say that through the process we have some excellent staff people from the policy team supporting your work, so I wanted to just mention that and proceed to the questions that you had.

The first question related to silos – “What is policy staff doing in terms of measures to help break down silos among the SOs and the ACs they support, as well as internal silos.” The policy team, we have 18 full time members of the policy team in support of the various SOs and ACs, and some consultants. And in that sense we do try to focus their talents and skills to the various staff of the particular support organizations or the advisory committees.

So to that extent, and also in terms of Secretariat support, we try to have that varied across that so that they have experience in other areas. So Gisella for example also supports the GNSO. And Christina supports the ccNSO and at times At-Large and others. And so there is a cross-experience in the work. But of course what we do every Wednesday, we have our global staff call for all the members, all 18 plus of them get together and we exchange information and inform each other on what’s going on in other groups that we are facilitating and assisting in their work.

So that is one way that we try to keep people informed. We also have periodic staff meetings where we reflect and exchange information, hear what’s going on and making sure that we can connect the dots when we can, of what’s going on in one group or another that may be linked and are active. Of course you have the biggest silo buster in Alan over here, who has been participating very actively in the GNSO. And to that extent, that type of active participation does help break down those silos.

In terms of internal silos, obviously we work with the community, the support organizations and advisory councils, but also some of the questions relate to other elements of ICANN that we are not primarily in charge of – IT or communications or legal or compliance and the like. And so we do have interactions on a regular basis, if you will, joint staff meetings with these groups to exchange views, hear information and present problems and issues that come up.

So, for example, Filiz will say “Ah there’s a translation question,” we of course try to work with the group that does and works on translation, or legal or

compliance and the like, or passing them your concerns or questions, since we don't have answers to everything. So that is our efforts to do that. In the second question you had – “How is the staff, policy and other departments, working to support the cross-community working groups and to make them effective.” To that extend it really depends on which SO or AC organizes it or is leading it, that we will have the policy team be helpful in that.

So in the question of the Security and Stability Cross-working Group we have support teams from the ccNSO, from the GNSO, and also from the security team helping to support those activities. With the Joint Applicant Support, that was mostly related to new gTLDs, the Services Department, Carla was in the lead, but we also were assisting her in that process as well. And so to that extent that's how we and other departments work to support the activities of the community in that regard.

In terms of the At-Large improvements, the question was – “Current improvements will conclude in Prague, however At-Large and ALAC might wish to consider steps for the next review process to ensure that the At-Large and ALAC evolves as its scope of activities expand.” To that extent, the review process is an ongoing process at ICANN. You've just completed yours, but I'm sure Ray Plzak of the Structural Improvements Committee would want to hear more about some of these ideas, and I encourage you to start talking to him about that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much David and thank you for the speed at which you have managed to deliver the answers to the questions, whilst at the same time not stressing our interpreters too much, hopefully. So, any questions? I see Sebastien Bachollet who has just stepped into the room; Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Yeah, sorry I will have to leave, but just to let you know that I am involved in the Structural Improvement Committee.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay thank you. Any questions? Okay, I see no questions. There was one comment which I was going to make with regards to communication among staff. We did speak of silos and what to do to break silos or to dissolve them somehow between the different communities. But I certainly have found that there are sometimes certainly difficulties with communication between staff, especially in the run up to this meeting, with communication just not coming through. So perhaps that would be something to address.

David Olive: Any more specifics on that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Being more specific in the fact that for example we had this room booked for the two sessions and we need interpretation and we were sent to somewhere else as well – communication breakdown. It was a case of “the left hand didn’t know what the right hand was doing at some point.” These are independent occurrences, small glitches on the horizon, but it certainly is very full of consequences when this happens.

David Olive: And that I understand fully, but I don’t think I can start a policy development process on it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That’s true yeah. Jean-Jacques, and then Evan. Okay, so Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: I just want to follow up on what Olivier was saying about some of the breakdowns of communications. Just before you came in we were talking to Margie about the RAA stuff. And so we had some involvement in the beginning

with the drafting team and then a long period of silence, and then a release of something upon which we were asked to comment. And so I think part of the problem is we have these long periods of silence where we don't know what's going on, and by the time then "okay, here's a statement. Do a public comment" and there are parts of At-Large that feel that we're in this constant stimulus response cycle of "here's something, respond," "here's something, respond." As opposed to more often getting involved in things at the very beginning and being an integral part of the process as opposed to just being bolted on afterwards and "hey can you come in and say something about this."

There is progress happening, there's some very good progress happening. But there's still an awful lot of gaps, and I'm just wondering if you could keep your eye on that.

David Olive:

Thanks Evan. We try to be very sensitive to those points noting the comment periods, the need to consult with other networks to know that. In the official policy development process that is fairly straight forward and known, and we try to keep to that timetable in a strict way. In some areas where it just comes up or it is part of a negotiation that is asked to move forward, we don't always have that advanced information, or how to put it out, except through the public comment period when it's ready.

So to that extent we have to balance off the official processes that we have through PDPs for GNSO or ccNSO and other issues that are being addressed at the moment. But I think we should be sensitive, and we will be sensitive to the timeframes needed to respond correctly and appropriately. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you David. And finally, Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you Chair; this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. David, I'd like to put a rather general question to you and ask for a personal answer. Now you've been on the staff in a very important position for about two years, and I'd like to have your sense of what is happening with regard at the risk of being in permanent review mode. I mean we've had this going on in ICANN for the past few years all the time and the intensity has increased even. For instance, the affirmations of commitments engaged process and then the ATRT was a huge thing which pumped resources away from other things which were equally important.

So my question to you is very simple, what's your feeling right now? Have we drawn away from the brink of being drowned in constant review? Is it sustainable in the present stage? What's your feeling?

David Olive:

When I first came of course the normal review periods at the time were every three years, now it's been extended to every five years, and that of course I thought as a healthy way to have a check to make any changes that were needed based on the community reactions and feedbacks to that. Of course we added two layers of complexity with the affirmation of commitments and the ATRT reviews, but that is all in the step of transparency and greater accountability, of which I can only say we have to do that.

But I think there should be, in terms of reviews of the SOs and the ACs, I think there's an acknowledgment that we have to try to streamline that process. And the elongation of that process to five years is a good one. But also to have a feedback loop of when one implementation plan has been done on that, that body of information should not be lost and can be readily reused as the next, if you will, criteria or preface to the next phase of reviews. But it is, I know, a task for everyone, and I think the Structural Improvements Committee is trying to look at that and how best to deal with that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much David, and before we let you go, Sala alerted me to the deepest thanks for, and acknowledgment of, the amazing amount of work that policy development staff has done, both within our ranks, but also in the GNSO Council when we take part in working groups, it's quite incredible how much work staff does. So thank you very much. Well done to them.

David Olive: And may I also say that our policy update in six of the UN languages I hope you do use. Just to let you know that the recent statistic we have over 3000 subscribers to that, in addition to when it becomes live people do access directly, but in terms of the subscription rates, it's over 3000, so I thank you for that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Okay, as we have Louie Lee and John Curran joining us, I will make a brief introduction about them. If you can take a place on the table. Louie is the Chair of the ASO Address Council and John is Chair of the ASO. And the ASO is the Address Support Organization and I believe, in memory, this is the first time that we're meeting with you. And I do have to thank, well I do have to thank the suggestion that was actually brought by Ray Plzak to introduce us, well Lee and I quickly in the tent in Dakar and said "You guys need to work together" and we'll be discussing how we can actually work together. So, welcome Lee, welcome John.

John Curran: Thank you for having us here. I would also like to recognize the ASO is the structure within ICANN that handles address numbering issues. We actually have an informal organization of the regional internet registries, the RIR; we call it the NRO outside of ICANN. In here, it serves the function of the ASO. You'll hear both terms used interchangeably.

The Executive Council of the NRO is composed of the leading executives of each of the regional internet registries. I'd like to recognize with me in the room

we have Axle Pawlik to our right, Paul Wilson of APNIC, and Raul is hiding somewhere, but I think he is either outside or nearby.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Raul spent plenty of time yesterday with us at the showcase as he was our keynote speaker, so we don't allow him in the room anymore.

John Curran: We also, AFRINIC is run by [Deal] and he is not able to be with us, but he's with us obviously online and remotely. So, we're happy to come here and happy to work with your folks as ever you see appropriate. We are probably one of the quieter portions of the ICANN organization, but that doesn't mean we don't want to work with anyone, we're happy to figure out what manners we can engage to do a better job and help support you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you John. Louie, would you like to say a few words?

Louie Lee: Sure.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Because I think there's one confusion, of course. We've got two Chairs and one supporting organization, so perhaps it would be interesting to discover the different functions, the difference between the two of you – apart from one wearing a that and the other not wearing a hat.

Louie Lee: And here it is. So, within the ASO there is a group with very specific functions, this is the Address Council. The Address Council is an elected body from the members of the region, not necessarily though, and some are appointed by the ASO itself. And this body is charged with looking at global policy proposals

that are coming up from all the regions making sure that they have followed the policy development process from within each region, and that all the significant viewpoints were considered.

And beyond that, we have the task of appointing ICANN Board seats nine and ten. And also – what else do we do? We do something else. We send somebody to the NomCom. We also have somebody on the WHOIS Review Team. I served on the ATRT. And we also have somebody on the SSR Review Tem at this point.

John Curran:

To elaborate a little bit, the way that the regional internet registries working together at ICANN as the ASO, working together for policy development occurs is slightly different than the domain side. We actually follow the original ICANN blueprint. The original ICANN blueprint called for policy development bodies that were working on complete policy development separate from ICANN. And we do that in regional meetings around the globe, each RIR has its own meetings held several times a year and distributed across the globe.

That's where the policy is actually developed and people are welcome to participate. We would love to have ALAC membership and the people you're associated with come to those meetings. Those meetings are where regional policy development occurs, but also global policy development. Global policy development occurs when all five regional registries agree on the same policy text. Then it goes to our elected ASO AC, which Louie leads, to make sure it's actually identical and the fair process had been occurred.

The role of ICANNs Board in this is that when we're convinced that the same text is the same, when we're convinced an open and transparent process is followed; we send that to the ICANN Board for ratification. And so the policy development occurs within our body, but in many meetings throughout the year outside of ICANN itself. And ICANN serves an oversight of the transparency and accountability process.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much John. Question, and this was actually based from a suggestion that Ray again mentioned today in the meeting that we had with the Board. The regional internet registries are I guess, in the same way as At-Large, divided among the five regions, and one of these suggestions was closer work between the RIRs and the ALAC, and perhaps involvement of ALAC members, as you just mentioned, ALAC members in the RIRs own policy development process. How would you see this being able to fit together?

John Curran:

So I think that's a wonderful idea and I think some of the outreach for example that happened yesterday with LACNIC and the At-Large is a great first step. We need more steps like that. Recognize that while the regional registries are the ones, the actual organizations while we administer the policy process. The policy processes that take place in each of our regions are open to everyone. So in fact you don't have to be a member of something.

In each region, in the ARIN region when we have our meetings, we do have many network operators and hosting companies who use addresses come and talk about policy. But we also have representatives of government, civil society, academics, law enforcement come and they talk about the issues that they face and try to come up with common policy.

We don't have constituencies per se, we actually just talk about the issues and try to come up with what makes sense, sort of in a meeting such as that framework. So the good news about that is that all of the meetings that the RIRs have are open for you to participate. I think we need to get you information about when those are occurring and how you can marshal your membership to get involved, because I think that would be wonderful. We encourage participation from everyone in this process.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much John. We have a question from Sala and then from Rinalia. And I was going to call upon Sergio, because I know that in the region, and we have heard earlier that there are already a lot of links between LACRALO and LACNIC due to many LACRALO members going to LACNIC meetings. So let's first start Sala and then Rinalia.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the record. I am the Asian-Australian Pacific Regional At-Large Organization rep. I thought that it would be useful to spell all of that out because we have some newcomers at the back, so that's APRALO. One of the things that I would like to commend the ASO on is the invitation to work together, and that's something that is strongly needed because a lot of the sentiments that have come from the bottom-up is the need for capacity building.

I'm also happy to say that if ever an organization were aggressively building capacity within the APRALO region, it would be the RIRs. And not only for APRALO, not only for my region, I mean in terms of our RIR, but also the other RIRs. So effectively the ASO is aggressively building capacity and the work that they do speaks for itself.

One of the things I would like to strongly encourage from a consumer-centric end user perspective in terms of coordinating, in terms of synergy. Yes the RIRs have your meetings, yes you do host your meetings and yes you do host NOG trainings on DNSSEC, and IPv6 and that sort of thing. Yes it is open to civil society, it is open to academics and the rest. It would be great if there could be increased dialogue to explore potential mechanisms where there are trainings for the ALSes, which make up part of our At-Large organization. The ALSes at the end of the day are part of the fringe, so to speak. And it's critical to get that level of policy immersion in terms of capacity building.

So not only for the network operators, but also for the ALSes; because as we know, the internet ecosystem is far more than just numbers and far more than

just domain name spaces; it's a way of life. It's a philosophy, it's more than that; it's an ecosystem. And again, congratulations.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Sala. Also Matt alerted me to the fact that there has been very little activity on the Skype chat of the Adobe Connect. So it is nice to see discussions going on on there as well, with regard to the subject being discussed. I don't know. There haven't been any questions from remote participants have there? I know there are a number of remote participants and I have actually received emails from England telling me they are participating remotely over there, although I do wonder what time it is. Yeah, it's pretty late. Yes so, Rinalia.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim:

Thank you Chair, Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the record. It's a pleasure to see ASO at our meeting. I have to say that I think you guys are probably a fun bunch to engage, but we just know so little about you. And I have a few questions which may appear to be a little bit basic, but I wanted to know how technical are your meetings? You say that you are open to participation, but what kind of people or groups would most benefit from engaging and could also contribute to it?

The other question is, when I looked that ASO profile, particularly the page on your policies, I noticed that compared to other bodies like GNSO, there are very few policies. And I was curious to know how often do you actually develop policy, and when I tried to look at what are the descriptions, the descriptions are so very, very brief. So could you explain a little bit? Thank you.

John Curran:

I'd be happy to. With regards to who would participate in our meetings, I will say like in the ARIN region we actually do have a fellowship program available for people who want to attend and we sponsor a certain number of attendees travel and participation. So we've had people who come from a wide range of backgrounds who have participated both on their own and in that program.

There are some basic concepts on how number resources are managed in terms of the hierarchy. Blocks are given to regional registries which in turn are allocated to ISPs or local internet registries, which in turn allocate them to smaller ISPs or organizations and eventually down to the IP addresses that we all use in this meeting room have come from that hierarchy. So there's some basic concepts, mostly RIRs have newcomer sessions that go through these basic concepts to help explain how the system is set up.

It is true that there's a hidden technical issue that goes on in the registries in that we talk about address policy but it has impact on how the networks are routing and configured. And so that can take a while to understand the relationship. Having said that, we have had very good success with people coming in. There are some policies that clearly don't – someone will say "I don't see any obvious issues, I'm not sure how that affects us," but when we start talking about policies such as what fields occur in our WHOIS database, and privacy issues or access to it in law enforcement.

Or when we're talking about things like how we manage, as we get to the end of number resources, how we manage the scarce IPv4 resources that are left. Some of those are common, more social issues that everyone has a view on and doesn't take a lot to understand. So I will tell you that at the RIR meetings you'll find there are things that are going to be fairly specific, but a lot of the issues I think people are more than happy to help explain and help out with.

With respect to the number of policies, now, we've been doing address allocation since the first host connected to the first network. That history of that predates a lot of this, it's the beginning of the origin of the internet; those records are what we maintain. And there haven't had to be a lot of policies. We need basic policies for how to get IP address blocks to the registries, and that's a common global policy. But then each registry has its own policies that are regional in how it allocates that.

So a lot of the policies you'd expect to see are regional, because how you allocate in one part of the globe based on its economic factors, how the

industries are structured there, are different than how we'll do it in another part of the globe. So the only policies you really see are the global policies that affect how ICANN, acting as the IANA, allocates the top blocks of numbers and manages those; those are generally what we call global policies and there's not a lot of them. But we welcome participation because helping us with our regional policies is just as important as helping with the global ones that occasionally come through. Okay?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you John. We actually have a queue, and it's Sergio Salinas who's going to be able to speak to us about his region.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Thank you Chair; please put on your headphones. Thank you Chair; I'm Sergio Salinas Porto for the records. I am really pleased to have both of you here and I'm sorry because I am such a fast speakers. As I was saying, regarding the experience in Latin America, when it comes to working very close to LACNIC. No doubt when we in our RALO were very fortunate to have a very active member in our region, Andres Piazza, who is currently working at LACNIC, and that resulted in working closely with the ALSes in LACRALO and we work very close to the RIR.

And we are discovering new world that used to be very far away to us, and that resulted in interesting meetings with LACNIC people, we are holding teleconferences. We have opportunities for new job creation. And we want to hold a debate with the ASO and make our voice heard to share our experience with you and work together for the benefit for the internet and of the internet stability. Our experience is really good and we hope we can replicate this within ICANN on a global scale so that we have a better internet for us all. Thank you.

John Curran:

Gracias.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Now, I did ask for Sergio to explain this because this is a particularity of this region that has made quite great advances because of one person who was the Chair of LACRALO having being poached by LACNIC. I hope it doesn't take having the Chair from every region being taken up from their regional internet registry to be able to establish such links in every single RIR. And I wonder if you'd suggest a path or if we could perhaps put our heads together to suggest a path as to how we could actually have the similar type of interaction and collaboration in all of the regions.

Just adding on to that, tagging the fact that one of the main aims of At-Large is to have one ALS, one At-Large structure in every country. We are present in a lot of countries around the world, but there are some countries where we are not present and where the local RIR might have members that will be able to help on this. So, these are just things I'm throwing in the wind at the moment. I just wonder if you had an idea on where to go from here.

John Curran:

We need to know who your contacts are who are the coordinators for the various countries. Because every RIR has a team that does outreach and capacity building and if we know who we're working with we will give you a flood of information. We just need to know contact information and what you want to hear about and we would be happy. The mission you're doing is our mission as well, so we're happy to work with you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Sala.

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro:

Yes, Sala for the record. I'd also like, just to assist my colleagues, speaking from somebody who's involved on the ground in terms of capacity building with other people of course, I've really truly seen APNIC, you know. As soon as the

call for capacity building happens, they immediately put their hands up. And they not only just say yes they want to help, but they match what they're saying with financial resources, or if not financial resources, they literally send trainers and their people who give up their time and their resources and that sort of thing.

Now why I'm speaking is because I've sort of been pushing development and capacity building within ALAC and within At-Large. And I think ICANN, and not only ICANN, particularly the outreach component of ICANN, we have much to learn from the ASO. And it's only a matter of coordination as John had mentioned. And one of the things that I continue to be amazed at is the flexibility. Even if they don't come, they're prepared to dial-out to you, they're prepared to host particular conferences it doesn't matter if there's only two or three or four of you or five of you and that sort of thing.

And so that's something that we can learn from and I think the partnership is something that's going to be really awesome, especially for the building of the At-Large community. So I particularly the Chair of the ASOs.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Sala. And I just wondered, looking ahead, there has been demand or request; we have made requests in the past from the finance department to have greater ability to participate in the IGF, or local IGF. I know this is something which we resounds in many people's hearts. But I wonder what the ASO, well the RIRs, well involvement with the IGF is. I know that there has been some, so I just thought John; you could share a few things with us about that.

John Curran:

You can say the ASO or the RIR, that's fine. And you also can say the NRO; we're very flexible on this. The fact of the matter is that we've been heavily involved in IGF since the beginning. We've provided funding every year. We've had members who are associated with the RIRs participate in the MAG. We've been active in CSTD, with respect to the planning of these and will continue to do so.

I noted in yesterday's internet governance session we've actually increased our funding for IGF as a result of the fact that IGF is now becoming its next phase and needs a lot of support. With respect to engagement, this means that in addition to policy development, the RIRs usually in every RIR meeting have a session where we talk about internet governance issues. We are active in working on positions to bring to organizations like the IGF. We do submit proposals for workshops and those proposals are often accepted. We often run IGF workshops.

So, also by participating in the RIR meetings and paying attention to the RIRs, there is an engagement path there; we're trying to get everyone in our regions engaged in internet governance at-large, and that particularly includes the IGF.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much John. And we have been trying to run IGF workshops, but what ended up was that members ended up running IGF workshops and paid for it out of their own pocket – just for the record. Shiva, one last comment and then we have to finish this meeting.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy:

I just wanted to congratulate you on your decision to increase your contribution to IGF and set in motion a chain reaction that will probably see IGF having a couple of million dollars a year. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, so maybe as a takeaway – oh, did you want to say a few words on this?

John Curran:

I just wanted to say thank you for having us here today.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, well thank you very much John and Louie. And one last thing, maybe as a takeaway, outreach is certainly something that looks as though we can work together on, and let's take this as an Action Item then to continue the dialogue and perhaps even maybe should we have a task force or – we do have an outreach task force on our side. Perhaps we would invite you to take part?

John Curran: How about let's start with a list of the contacts and the countries they're in, and we can begin – because we work regionally and we will break that up and that will get very quick engagement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Excellent and I believe we have that, so this is an AI. I hope you've recorded it. Super. Thanks very much, and hopefully – yes, Louie?

Louie Lee: I just wanted to add that from our side we can send a list of the upcoming RIR meetings to help you guys.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, onsite or remotely. Thank you. So this session being now closed, we have to vacate the room pretty quickly because the BC, the Business Constituency is taking over this room and they'll start in five minutes. However, just a little announcement – there is at 14:00 a ccNSO internal government session, which will speak about SOPA, ACTA, and a whole lot of other government control things; very interesting session actually. That will be in the Bougainvillea room, which is, if you go over to the restaurant and you take the lifts, of the elevators, depending on whether your English or American, to the top floor and then you go up the stairs, I think it's just one flight of stairs over in that room. It's like to be quite well attended so arrive there early. 14:00 is the time in Bougainvillea, and that's session run by the ccNSO. Thank you and thanks to the interpreters.

[End of Trnascript]