PRAGUE – ALAC and NCSG Meeting
Monday, June 25, 2012 – 11:00 to 12:00
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, well good morning everybody. Everyone is welcome to go and sit at the table; we're not waiting for crowds of hundreds of people, at least I don't see them queuing outside, so please take your positions. Alright welcome to this ALAC meeting with the NCSG. The time is 10 minutes past 11 and today we are very pleased, I'm the ALAC Chair, Olivier Crépin-Leblond – I should have asked for the recording to start; I hope that it's perfect. And well I'm going to give the microphone over to Robin Gross from the NCSG.
Robin Gross:	Hi, my name is Robin Gross, I'm the Chair of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group and it is our pleasure to be here today. I do want to apologize, a number of our members are not here because this meeting was scheduled opposite the law enforcement RAA negotiations meeting, so we've got a lot of people over there right now who want to stand up and say some things. So we apologize that we're not here in full force, but there is a good reason why.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much Robin, it's Olivier Crépin-Leblond and of course the house rules as per usual are to say your full name, with or without "for the transcript record" after it if you wish to, so as to be able to have

this understood on the transcript record, but also we have interpretation for this meeting and when interpretation takes place it's the same person doing the two voices so it's good to have the name when you start speaking.

I have to apologize as well for having to leave a little bit early, well about 20, 25 past; I have another thing to deal with as well.   But anyway, let's go on right away into our agenda. We have four agenda items which we'll just take in the order that they're listed on the Wiki site. I don't know whether you all have the link to that page. The first one is perspectives on conflict of interest; the second one is improve outreach and engagement of ICANN participants; the third being IDNs and globalization and the fourth one being the R3 paper.

So, perspectives on conflict of interest – there was a big subject recently of course with the Board with several people who raised questions and were quite displeased with the amount of conflicts in ICANN. The floor is open for discussion, does anyone wish to start banging the ball? Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Chair. Good morning, this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat speaking, member of ALAC. To follow up Olivier on what you just mentioned, I notice that on the automatic adoption, although that's not the word, part of the Board agenda there is an item on conflicts of interest which goes some way along the path we are advocating. So I think we have to, in our discussions, take into account the existence of that. Actually it says, I don't have it in front of me, but it says from now on Board members, especially Board members but also other people from the

community, I'm not so sure about that, will have to refrain from joining any organization involved directly with let's say new gTLDs for 12 months.

So that's a clause I think which is interesting. It doesn't cover the whole subject of conflicts of interest, but it does go some way. I just wanted to point that out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Jean-Jacques, Alain Berranger?

Alain Berranger: Alain Berranger, President of the Constituency NPOC. That's a question more than anything else. I filled up an SOI when I joined and I noticed that it's a voluntary process. Is there a reason why SOIs aren't compulsory?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, this is Evan Leibovitch. First of all Alain if you wish to speak in French we do have interpretation in the room I believe. But also to answer specifically to the question, I believe it's necessary to submit statements of interest but not declare conflicts and resign yourself. So we have circumstances in which somebody can come in, be transparent about all their conflicts of interest and then immediately proceed to try and influence policy having stated that. So that in fact is where some of the difficulty lies, in that the multi-stakeholder model allows you to try and influence things in your own interest so long as you make that interest public up front.

Alain Berranger: I don't have a problem at all with that because if the SOI was compulsory then we could at any time check on that particular person. The conflicts of interest would; I'm not too worried about policy influence because that is what multi-stakeholder process is all about. What I'm concerned about is one could, has better chance to read, to suspect certain potential conflicts of interest, and you know in conflict of interest, perceived conflicts of interest are as important as conflicts of interest.

So it's not too difficult, if that SOI is complete, it easy to connect the dots as far as I'm concerned and this is kind of a preventive measure rather than finding out there's a conflict of interest after the conflict of interest has occurred.

Robin Gross: I think, I'm not 100% sure of this, but I think that in order to do some things you have to file the SOI. For example, be on the GNSO Council, participate in a working group. I believe it's compulsory in those cases, but not simply just to be here and stand up and speak and get your point across.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Robin. That was Robin Gross. Next, Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah my understanding is the same as Robin's. I believe for the GNSO Council it's compulsory. I know for the it's compulsory for most working

groups and I believe the ALAC just voted to make it compulsory for ALAC members and regional leaders. It covers most of the places where you can have a strong influence on policy, obviously not just making a comment but I think we're pretty well covered. Now the current statement of interest may not be as exhaustive as some people would like, but it is there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan, this is Olivier. Well as you know the Board has had to grapple with this problem and has actually created a non-conflicted part of the Board that is dealing with the new gTLD process. In there, parts of it was to do with the perceived conflicts of interest as Alain just mentioned. Do you believe that it was the right thing to do and where do you draw the line as to when one is conflicted or one is not conflicted? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Just one further thing, in terms of policy setting, the very model of the multi-stakeholder group implies people will be conflicted because you want participation from all the parts of the body including those who are going to be impacted perhaps in a negative way by the policy. So that's almost an integral presumption that there will be conflicted people working on policy. The trick is to get enough other people involved so that they don't simply lead it on their own.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Bill Drake?

PRAGUE

Bill Drake: Bill Drake. When we were batting around ideas for what this session might cover and it was suggested by ALAC that we ought to cover this item, I pointed out that I wasn't clear what the distinctive value added would be in terms of are we trying, are we considering that NCSG and ALAC might make some sort of coordinated intervention is some context about this or not? It just seems to me that this is sort of a generic issue everybody throughout the organization is aware of and dealing with that the other parties, and particularly the contracted parties are acutely focused on this question with regard to the Board.

I'm not sure what exactly we have to add to this relative to the other items on the agenda. So I just, we could bat it around for another 15 minutes. The question of yes it's all very complex, but do we have something that we want to try and do about this or are we just sharing some thoughts and then moving on?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Bill, I think you hit the nail right on the head here. He question being do we want to do a joint statement about this? The ALAC has actually released a statement about conflict of interest, has been pretty tough in its stance, but at the same time, as Alan mentioned earlier there's an understanding that in such a setting as ICANN because of the requirements for knowledge and all of the history of it all, you do need to have some people who know what they're talking about. And often when they do know what they're talking about it's because they're actually conflicted somehow.

PRAGUE

So does anyone feel or does the NCSG feel that we would should pursue this further or perhaps I guess just move onto the next subject if there is no such interest.

Robin Gross: Yeah I think it's safe to move on now. This is Robin Gross.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alright, great. Next one, improve outreach and engagement of ICANN participants. As we all know, we really rely on our volunteers to fill those benches that we have around us. And it is extremely hard based on the fact that we are dealing with an issue which might not make everyone so excited or at least not as excited as we are. So the idea really is the At-Large Advisory Committee and the At-Large community has been working to try and bring more people, both with outreach and inreach, and that unfortunately often requires having to ask for finance in order to be able to go out there and not only speak to are little group within those walls at ICANN meetings, but also try and go to other places like IGF and other fora that are out there where we might be able to find more participants that would be interested in joining us.

I wonder whether anybody wishes to start the discussion here and whether NCSG also has similar problems of difficulties. Bill Drake?

Bill Drake: There are a number of different levels to this question. Outreach means different things to different people. Different conversations have been had for a long time within various parts of ICANN and I think that this is

an area where we have a fairly strong joint sensibility with you on the number of points where I think we could actually contemplate some joint statements. Just starting with the most immediate thing that of course we're all acutely aware of, the outreach in the new gTLD program obviously was wildly suboptimal. The results of the bringing in developing country applicants and the results of the JAS process were very, very disappointing, and I think it wouldn't be bad for the two organizations to have something to say about that.

I have had conversations with people from contracted parties who've made the arguments that "well if nobody really applied that just shows there isn't that much interest," "what do they need gTLDs for anyway" and "gee we spent millions of dollars on this silly JAS thing and we only got three so this shows that the whole thing is silly." So number one, I would think that we could make some sort of joint intervention on that particular point.

Now going to other layers of the onion, in the GNSO Council we had an initiative, which was part of the GSNO restructuring plan that called for the GNSO to adopt a coherent approach to outreach. We had a several year period in which a drafting team put together and proposal, as it was asked to do, establishing a charter for an outreach task force, but when it came time to actually approve that charter we were unable to do so because one stakeholder group decided that it would rather just ask ICANN for money directly and then go off and do its own thing and didn't want to coordinate or share information with other stakeholder groups.

And hence, we had a several year process of trying to figure out what do we do, are there alternatives, and at the end of the day what we decided yesterday was to just give this up and report back to the Board that the GNSO is basically unable as a community to come to any agreement on how it should do outreach. Then we have a next level, which is the fact that while that's been going on the staff has been developing concepts for a ICANN wide initiative of some sort, and there's a meeting on Thursday morning that I'm sure many of us will attend.

That's a staff driven process. I have always felt outreach needed to be a community driven process, but in any event, we might want to consider whether we want to have any kind of coordinated approach visa vie that initiative. And then finally I would say, widen the optic a little further. Outreach to me is not just about bringing people into ICANN. It's also about outreach in the wider global polity and having people understand what ICANN is and isn't, and adjusting attitudes and so on.

I spend a lot of time around developing country governments that are very hostile towards ICANN. The NCSG has asked the Board in its last two meeting to explain more about what the global strategic relationships – is that what it's called – group in the Board is doing and asking for how can the community help with this, how can we weigh-in and provide support. And it seems to me that the Board has just very much wanted to just manage this on its own, "don't worry we got it." I don't think they got it.

And I think the evidence for the fact that they don't got it is that a lot of us spend time in UN meetings where everybody's jumping up and down

about ICANN, including just a month ago in the Commission on Science, Technology and Development. So on the broader stance of ICANN in the global community, we have a workshop on this also this afternoon at 1:30, on ICANNs position and the global landscape of internet governance, I think there's an issue where we may have a shared view with you about how ICANN can better position itself and interact with the world, and on the specific case of the new gTLDs I think we also have a shared view with you.

And so I would suggest that those two items might be something where we could contemplate joint statements or something.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Bill. Jean-Jacques, you had put your hand up; Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you, this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat speaking. I'd like to build on what Bill has just pointed out. I think that there's not much use, at this stage at least, of constructing something permanent between our two elements within ICANN. However, there is a question of timing, which is that there is a new CEO coming in, etc. And that's one element we should make use of. We either consider that business as usual is fine, or we consider that perhaps this is the right opportunity to give an extra push and to state what Bill has so aptly formulated.

Which is that, the community element or input into this should be greater and should be identified. The second thing is that we consider that outreach is part of a global strategy for ICANN, or should be. And

PRAGUE

does that fall within which Board committee would that fall under? Would it be the public participation committee with whom we should be in relation? Or would it be the global partnerships committee?

These are the questions we have to look at carefully because the point is not whether staff is piloting this thing instead of community. The point is how do we as noncommercial or as ALAC think we have to deliver something at this point in time to the new CEO and to the acting CEO. So it takes a very limited agenda, we don't have to many points we want to bring up, maybe two or three and to aim that very carefully at probably the CEO and the Chair of the Board rather than any element within staff. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Alain Berranger?

Alain Berranger: Thank you Alain Berranger, NPOC. I agree with – thank the previous two speakers for information that's very valuable for a newcomer at this table, and I also agree with the tactical and strategical aspect of it. I wanted to add perhaps what could be called a short term suggestion so that we can walk that talk right away. I noticed that the At-Large and the NCSG are going to have a number of outreach events in financial year '13 and I don't know if that's been the practice because I'm new, but it would be good if we invited colleagues from At-Large to NCSG events and perhaps more than just invite, bring them in on the outreach event planning and vice versa.

So that actually the message may not be in a policy statement or a joint statement but we would be showing interconstituency collaboration right now. And it makes a lot of sense because we are the two groups that not only are interested in international outreach in a broad sense to development countries, but we also have expertise. And I think we can help ICANN help us and vice versa by doing that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Alain. Adam?

Adam Peake: Good morning, Adam Peake. I wanted to come back to Bill's first point about the outreach in the gTLD program as it's rather current. I think it's very difficult to know, I think everybody would agree that the communications and the outreach plan was extremely poorly executed, we've got Board members on record saying the same, and there was agreement largely that there was a problem during the Board's meeting with the GAC yesterday.

Of course what we don't know is had there been an effective outreach program whether or not there would have been an increase in the number of applicants. So I think the first stage, and something that was started to be suggested is that an evaluation of what was done in communications and outreach would be a good thing. And then some discussion and perhaps investigation within developing and emerging economies about how much is known within say an entrepreneurial group of people, and there are enough entrepreneurs throughout every developing country in Africa, South America and Latin America now that

you could find a reasonably substantive and representative group and to find out did you know about this program, do you know about ICANN, what is your knowledge of the DNS.

And it may be that perhaps they did know anyway because the internet is going to reach them and they'll understand these programs because it's all over our ICT press and media. But we might also find that they didn't know enough. So I think the first stage should be some degree of understanding what happened and what is the knowledge that's out there at the moment.

Later in the week there seems to be a meeting, I think it's on Thursday morning, and I keep on screwing with my schedule which is why I'm late. But there seems to be a meeting about participation and outreach and the new effort that is starting in earnest within ICANN. I think it's led by Kurt but also I don't know what level within ICANN it is, but certainly participating in that and putting input into that process – is it Thursday morning? I think so.

So contributing to that is an obvious way forward. But on the TLDs I think there's a lot of investigation that could be done and that the GAC in particular is going to be interested in that because they were championing emerging and developing economies, of which there were virtually zero, whether it was Asia-Pacific, Latin America or Africa. You can look at that Asia-Pacific as well and you will see none from any economy other than the more powerful OECD type. Yeah, it wasn't very successful at all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much Adam, it's Olivier here. I unfortunately need to go so I'll hand over to Robin; Robin also wished to resume this so I'll hand over to Robin and Evan you can take over for my representation. Thank you.
Robin Gross:	Thanks so much Olivier. Yes what I wanted to say on this point about outreach is we shouldn't wait for ICANN or for the Board or for the staff or anyone else to figure out how to do outreach. I think irrespective of what comes out of these different groups we should continue, we should be doing our outreach irrespective of that in an ongoing, continuous way. So the kinds of things that bring in more members, I think we all agree that we want to bring in more members, we want to reach a much larger segment of the population than we currently are.

So we need to start thinking about how do we do that, how do we get those folks engaged. And I don't know that what works for the business constituency is going to work for the noncommercial users. I'm a little bit concerned about a one-size fits all plan, which it sort of seems like what ICANN is heading into. So again, I would say irrespective of what they do there let's take it upon ourselves to figure out what we want to do on outreach. What do we think we should do to bring in these new people and these new perspectives and voices?

And of course we can funnel that into these other groups at ICANN that are doing that, but at the same time I don't think we should wait around. I mean as Bill said he was on this group for nearly two years and then at the end of the day nothing was decided. So if we wait for that to happen we're not going to be able to really do the kind of

PRAGUE

meaningful outreach that we want to do. So, that was all I had to say on the matter. Did anyone else want to get in the queue on this? Bill?

Bill Drake:

The point I would make, this is Bill Drake. The point I would make about what you've just said Robin is the same one I made yesterday in the Council. And that is sure, we all have our own individual outreach to our particular constituencies. So the registry people may be talking to potential registries and noncommercial and ALAC people talk to the people that they think would be good members for them, and that's fine, that's ongoing.

The point is the larger framework within ICANN, because we're not just trying to reach out to get new members for our particular groups, we're trying to improve the interface between ICANN and the world more generally. And what the outreach task force proposal was intended to do was to get sharing of information and experiences and cooperation across the stakeholder groups and the GNSO, not so much to recruit stakeholder groups X people or stakeholder group Y's people, but rather to work on the broader outreach to whomever.

And so the point is simply yes, we continue to do our things, but there does need to be a framework and the framework has to be one that is not just defined by the staff. It has to reflect a lot of community input and it has to go beyond simply trying to get new bodies into ICANN rooms. It also has to go to explaining what ICANN is and isn't to those who are skeptical of it. So these are things that I think can be done, but are best done at a community level.

It doesn't seem to me that that's going to happen within the Council, but I think noncommercial and ALAC could, having shared views along these lines, try to do something in the way of at least number one calling attention to the failure of the gTLD process and as Adam suggested calling for an evaluation. And then number two I would say trying to push the Board on the operations of this global partnership committee and how we can participate and lend some input to it.

Robin Gross: Okay did anyone have anything to add on outreach? Yes Wolf?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Wolfgang Kleinwachter. I just want to continue what Bill Drake just said with the broader environment in which ICANN exists. Being involved in this process this 10 or 15 years I feel that we are entering a similar phase now that we had in the year 2002, 2003, 2004 when ICANN moved from a very unknown body into the spotlight of the World Summit of the Information Society and the whole model was challenged. And there was an effort by government to say "okay, what this body is, why we need it, we can do it in an inter-governmental environment."

And then ICANN was really an irony because ICANN first abolished the At-Large elections but them immediately realized that the only field to protect as a new model was to make clear that the At-Large and the civil society community is a special partner in ICANN which was the case in inter-governmental organizations. So this was the most important argument truly to defend ICANN within the United Nations context

because if we are just a private organization then you know if it's a shareholder corporation it's managed under national jurisdiction or whatever like Google, Intel or NASA Corporation but the special element was it's a multi-stakeholder model which is different from a fully private corporation.

And the multi-stakeholder model is includes the civil society, At-Large community as a special element. This is the special selling point and he was successful in doing that. If we see now with the new gTLD program and half a billion dollars coming in it would be not a surprise for me that a lot of governments would say now we have problems with the financial sector and with others. We have to have a deeper look what this private corporation is doing. And I think it's very important to brief as quick as possible the new CEO who is obviously supportive of the multi-stakeholder model.

In his speech he made this very clear this morning. But to make clear that the At-Large and the noncommercial user constituency represent civil society and they can make ICANN [unit]. For us it's also a new window of opportunity let's say to strengthen our own role by making clear that this is the difference, what ICANN as a stakeholder corporation makes the difference to a shareholder corporation. And I think this should be very clear otherwise you won't be surprised that more and more governments say "Okay they are not able to do this and this and this things; why we should have this."

So that means, to defend ICANN means to strengthen the role of the noncommercial and At-Large sector within ICANN.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much Wolf. Did anyone else have something to add on this topic of outreach? Okay well then I will suggest we move on to the next agenda item, the R3 paper making ICANN relevant, responsive and respected. Evan do you want to speak to that please?

Evan Leibovitch: Sure. Essentially what's happened is a group, a working group called the Future Challenges Working Group was started within At-Large to try and get out of the hamster wheel of constantly running after public comment periods and reacting to the agendas of other groups within ICANN, and to try and start looking forward and creating an end user centric vision of ICANN and future of ICANN. And to start to do things that would try to create initiatives and set agendas to which other people would have to comment on as opposed to us constantly commenting on others.

The R3 White Paper is the first product of this effort and essentially is an attempt to create what it's authors are thinking to be a third path. In seeing that the status quo is not acceptable as a way of representing the public interest and governing the things that ICANN needs to govern, and the alternative proposed by the ITU and others of burning ICANN to the ground and reinventing it by governments is also not an acceptable solution.

And so what we're trying to do is envision a third path in the middle, and that is suggest some significant, if not radical, changes to the way ICANN operates in order to better represent the public interest and realign the balances between public and private interest within the governance of that which ICANN regulates.

And so the white paper that you have in front of you is intended to be a starting point. It is not intended to be ALAC advice to the Board. It is meant to me a starting point, a stake in the ground if you would, as the beginning of a discussion and a framework around which a re-envisioned ICANN can take place. And so as of right now, after comment within ALAC was received, this has been put out for public comment. Jean-Jacques, who is my co-Chair in the Future Challenges Working Group posted the link to the R3 document from Circle ID and it's our intention to get it more widely circulated both inside and especially outside ICANN.

It's already been translated into the five UN languages, so we're hoping to get champions for it within carious regions and to try and get this disseminated and provoke community both inside the ICANN bubble but especially outside it.

Robin Gross: Thank you Evan. Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Robin. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. The reason why I suggested to begin with the formation of a Future Challenges Working Group when I was invited to join the ALAC was that I found, as Evan just mentioned, that the proportion of things which were related to procedure, and which of course is essential was perhaps very great. And that we perhaps should spend more time looking at wider topics, including subjects which are not specific to ALAC or At-Large. That's some background I thought I'd give you.

The other thing is why the R3 paper as now it is known now, perhaps it's worth concentrating on this a few seconds. R3 is making ICANN relevant, responsive and respected. I should add H – R3H – H meaning hopefully. We'll see. But it's because we're coming into a new period of ICANNs life. Of course there's the appointment of a new CEO and that's important. But in addition to that, there are some things which are less obvious, which I would like to point out. One is that for all sort of good reasons, this organization is becoming more and more perceived, whether that's true or not is another point, perceived as an industry association.

Whereas I think it was stated very clearly, both in the President's Strategy Group paper a few years ago and more recently in the Affirmation of Commitments, it is stated quite clearly that the whole operation should be for the global public benefit. So I think there is a mismatch perhaps between the perception of ICANNs role and how it is perceived by the general user across the world, but perhaps also in the reality of its operations.

And one of the purposes of this paper is to ring an alarm bell and say "look, let us not neglect the element of the global public interest." We have a fundamental duty towards that. And not only to corporations however legitimate that may be of course. So that was the starting point of this joint work we have done and which is the product of six co-authors. Thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you so much Jean-Jacques. Yes, Alain?

PRAGUE

Alain Berranger: This is a question on this, did you, the six authors are all At-Large or was there a call to NCSG to participate in this? In other words did we walk our own talk?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you for your question. This is Jean-Jacques replying. Well frankly, initially we had thought about this as a necessity, not an institutional necessity. Frankly when Evan and I got together on this initially we were not thinking "oh should it be an ALAC paper or GNSO or some other paper"; that's not our problem. Our problem is that there is some fundamental truth to be reinjected into the whole debate about ICANN and about the internet. So that was our starting point.

Now future contributions we will see; at this stage we would be grateful for reactions, suggestions to the paper which you can find online very easily. But beyond that I think it's premature to say exactly what kind of rubber stamping will be on that paper.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. I've got Bill and then Evan and Adam.

Bill Drake: Bill Drake. Well then behind this paper lies an essential insight and sensibility which we strongly share, which we all know, which is that we all believe that ICANN is or should be a global public interest organization. That it should not be purely a place where commercial

interests come and hash out the details of how they're going to make their markets work, but also, a place that has a broader sense of its obligations to the international community and the internet. And the problem is always in ICANN finding any kind of a space to even begin to have that conversation in a meaningful way. Because normally most people from the industry kind of look at you like "what are you talking about."

And I know that when we've tried to raise these kinds of issues in the Council we get blank stares. I actually had a conversation over drinks of course with Bertrand and some others the other night in which I was suggesting a couple of other options. Like for example, the possibility that we could use Friday's as a voluntary kind of bar camp type birds of a feather type meeting where people who are interested in getting together and brainstorming about particular issues could spend some time together and talking outside the boxes of the highly constraining meeting formats that we have, whether it's Council meetings or whatever else.

I also suggested that it would be nice if ICANN had some staff, some sort of a strategic planning unit or something that was interfaced with the community that could do some longer term visioning addressing issues with like real research reports and so on. And my point was simply, in both cases, to try to create spaces within this highly constipated, densely packed ICANN meeting structure where one could even begin to ask these kinds of questions and think them through as a community.

So I think anything along those lines that we can do is useful. Now as to the particular paper, I mean the chief recommendation about moving

the GAC and At-Large from purely advisory to involvement in policy formation, there we might have some issues. Some of us wouldn't necessarily want to see the GAC role changed. That's the kind of thing we could talk about. But the point is, there's no place within ICANN now to really have – the best conversations are always in the hallway and in the bar.

You find you're at this meeting with a lot of really smart people who've got interesting things to say and then you go into some unbelievably dull meeting, in a windowless room where you're weighed down by procedures and you just want to kill yourself. So creating some space within the ICANN structure where we could think about these broader issues and how do we do the balancing of public interest I'm all for. And if this paper can serve as a starting point for a conversation, that'd be great.

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan. I was just going to intervene very briefly to answer Alain's question about how broadly we started with the authorship, and while this started as an ALAC document or an ALAC working group document, essentially we took some pains to make sure that at least as a starting point there were a significant number of different points of view in this. So in this document you have participation from a former GAC member, a former ICANN Board member, and somebody with extremely deep civil society background. And so again, this was meant to be a starting point. We're welcoming a community engagement now. But in terms of trying to make sure that there was a very broad perspective in the

original document we took some pains to make sure that was done at the beginning.

Robin Gross: Thank you very much. Adam?

Adam Peake: Adam Peake. I think it's a very good document and extremely timely as well. Sorry, very good document, extremely timely and I think with suggestions like the reforming of role of the GAC and ALAC, it's timely in a sense that I think we're approaching the need for ICANN – is it 3.0, Wolfgang you're the master of 3.0's and 4.0's and wherever we are in the evolution of ICANN – but if it's 3 or 4 I think this is a time where we're probably approaching a major review on ICANN that goes beyond whether it's ALAC's role or GAC's role. It's what is the role of the Board and what structure should it have in its independence from the policy development process and implementation, which we've heard very strongly over the past, I don't know, nine months or so coming out of GAC.

It's a major opportunity because we have a CEO coming in who will probably have different ideas, hopefully. There's the ATRT review, second round review which begins in January of 2013, which is a way to operationalize some of these things. And other than that, it's a great document and congratulations to you and it doesn't matter who did it, it's just volunteers in ICANN which is the important thing.

PRAGUE

I mean there's a lot of nits with it, you can pick on little things that I would add to it and disagree with, but that's not the point. The whole point is the document is excellent and very timely and thank you.

Robin Gross: Thank you Adam. And I will echo your remarks, thanking you for your work on the paper. Did anyone else have any comment on this?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, just a quick thing about the timing. In another room right now there is an ALAC Improvements Committee that is just now finished and is delivering a completed ALAC Improvements Report to the SIC, just in anticipation of the next round of ALAC improvements about to happen. And again this is the continuous wheel of you're barely finished the report of one improvements and going on to the next. GNSO is about to go into this cycle anew. And so one of the things in fact we talking about briefly about in ALAC yesterday was perhaps basically saying "okay now it's ICANN time to review itself and stop getting all the constituencies to keep in their silos and start having a little bit of a higher level view of how this all fits together."

Robin Gross: Thank you very much Evan. Was there anyone else who wanted to get in the queue on this? Bill.

Bill Drake: Just real briefly I just wanted to endorse two specific proposals because they relate directly to what we talked about before. When you're

saying "the Boards Global Relationship Committee include non-Board members with experience in external forums of internet governance as well as international affairs"; this is precisely the point that we pressed with the Board when we met them the last couple of times, and it fits exactly with what we were talking about in outreach.

Similarly "providing qualified, stable staff and resources for a permanent, trustworthy relationship with other agencies like IGF, ITU, etc." Again, these are things where I think we could do something now jointly because we're both saying this to the Board. And I think it would be a good moment to do that.

Robin Gross: Thank you Bill. David?

David Cake: David Cake. I think I'll agree with the general comment that it's great to see the document, great to see people actually thinking about broader reform and that there isn't a space within it. I found the recommendations sort of veer between some are very specific and could clearly be raised within ICANN now and some are extremely broad and could essentially, like "transform the roles of the GAC" is almost like a global discussion that needs to be had. Some of the, if we were to move – we should perhaps look at this document and move forward, divide it into things that we can actually start talking about that change now and other things that are a whole review process in themselves.

Robin Gross:	Thank you David.

Evan Leibovitch:	The process is just beginning. This is not, like I said, a specific recommendation from ALAC. This is an intention to put a starting point and start a conversation going, so this is exactly the kind of thing. We want to hear from people that hate everything about it. We just, we want to get this conversation going.

Robin Gross:	Thank you. Does anyone else want to get in the queue on this? Alrighty, its' three minutes before our final time – Adam did you want to?

Adam Peake:	Yeah just Adam again. I just wanted to say you've got a meeting on, is it Thursday morning, something horrible like 8:00 a.m.; I'm not going but that's lovely.

Evan Leibovitch:	Sorry, there's a public workshop on this at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday and so it was only really released publically last week so we'll see what we can get. Amongst the people that have promised to show up have been ICANN communications who actually came to an ALAC meeting yesterday and has given us their word that they will help us actually get the word out. So rather than this being a piece of corporate communications they've offered to help us get the word out to the

broader community using ICANNs own communications mechanisms, which to us is quite gratifying.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Is this At-Large Future Challenges?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes.

[background conversation]

Robin Gross: Okay. Well we had one additional item on our agenda and we've only got about two minutes so should we skip it – IDNs and globalization of ICANN operations because I don't know if we can really do anything in two minutes, put it to our next meeting. What are the views, anyone think we should…? Okay, well then let's skip it then and I will call this meeting to a close and thank – yes, Bill.

Bill Drake: Sorry, before you call it to a close can we agree that we're doing anything? We've talked about several options for doing together are we going to call the meeting and walk away or are we…

Robin Gross: No I don't think we can come to a decision right now but I think we've begun a conversation and we've identified a number of issues that we

share and now what I think we need to do is we need to go back and get together and say "okay let's go forward on this, we can go forward on this one"; that would be my suggestion at least. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, especially on things regarding R3, the idea is to have this on a public Wiki so that if you want to have public comments you put them on the Wiki, but also there is going to be accommodation for people who for various professional reasons want to send in comments but need to have their name withheld, or for very sensitivity reasons. But the intention is to have this as an open forum, an open discussion going on. The current forum for this is the confluence Wiki being used by At-Large; that may or may not change depending on circumstance. But the intention is to have this as a very open, transparent forum to have NCSG comment as a group or as individuals or – I mean right now we're not laying artificial boundaries on who or how participation can happen.

Robin Gross: Thank you Evan. And thank you all for coming and participating and I will call this meeting to a close. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]

PRAGUE