
PRAGUE – GAC / ALAC Joint Session
Tuesday, June 26, 2012 – 00:00 to 00:00
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good morning, again, everyone.

If we could take our seats, please, for our session with the ALAC. Please take your seats.

So we failed in avoiding having our coffee break at 10:00. But that's okay.

So we're meeting now with the ALAC. So I suggest that we go a bit beyond our original slot, because we had an unexpected break just now, and run until 11:15 as a result.

So we have a few items on the agenda. And I'll actually ask Olivier to go through those.

We've tried to prioritize among those issues so that we can make the best use of what time we have available to us this morning.

And thank you, as always. It's a pleasure to meet with the ALAC. So I'll hand over to Olivier who is the chair of the ALAC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I'm Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Thank you to all attendees here. And thank you to the GAC for receiving us in this beautiful room.

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.

We had five items on the agenda to start with. But, due to time constraints, we'll stick to three at the time being. The first one is the GAC -- the ALAC and GAC early warning objections process. The second one being the -- is there work the ALAC and GAC can do together to study the demand from and impact on Internet users from the gTLD program launch. And the third one being speaking about the capacity building at ICANN and the ALAC academy proposal.

If we have a bit more time, we'll follow up on other matters. But I suggest, since time is constrained, that we start with the first -- the ALAC and GAC early warning objection process.

Now, as we all know, both the GAC and the ALAC have some certain amount of operational requirements with regards to objections, early warning. The ALAC has, for the first time, been afforded the ability to be involved in an operational manner in ICANN operations. And that's something which is very, very important for us.

A working group has been put together and has also then created a subworking group. We call it a review group. And chairing this review group is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I think I will probably give the floor over to Dev. I don't know where he is. Oh, he's right here. Always the corner one doesn't look at.

So Dev is going to be able to take us through our process. And I do have to thank the GAC in advance already for the amount of work -- or discussion that has been taking place in order to be able to -- for us to be able to build this process as well. So, Dev, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier. Dev Anand Teelucksingh here. Good morning to you, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I'm from -- a representative from the At-Large structure from Trinidad and Tobago Computer Society from the country of Trinidad and Tobago.

As a member of the new At-Large new gTLD working group, one of the tasks that that working group had to come up with was to look at the objection process. And the reason why we had to look at the objection process is because, in the applicant guidebook, one of the operational requirements was that the funding from ICANN for objection filing as well as for advanced payment of costs is available to the At-Large advisory committee. And it is -- at a minimum, the process for objecting to a new gTLD application will require a bottom-up development of potential objections, a discussion and approval of objections at the regional At-Large organization level, and a process for consideration and approval of the objection of the At-Large advisory committee and also contingent on a publication of this process. So, when we looked at this - - and there are at least two things that has to happen within the new gTLD program.

When the applications are published, it starts two things: A 60-day application comment period which is from June 13 to August 12th, and a 7-month objection period.

So what we did was to really break down on a week-by-week basis to look at both submitting comments during the application comment period and to file an objection during the 7-month objection period.

So -- and it's -- and we've combined that into one procedure.

So I believe the document has been circulated to the members for scrolling. So, even if you're not able to read the chart on the screen, you can look at it on to your screens and review it.

So, just to get an idea how it works is that on figure 1, which is like the first week or even before the application comment period, is the creation for a new gTLD review group or the RG group.

And what this review group does, it's tasked with receiving the comments from At-Large either directly via e-mail or through the various RALO conference calls and so forth, creating and updating the gTLD Wiki comment pages, giving status updates on which gTLD application received comments each week to the RALOs, in other words, keeping them informed and also informing the RALOs of the deadlines for when things happen, you know, like such as the deadline for the application comment period, the deadline for the objection period, and so forth.

So the figure 1 starts off with the -- before we started the application comment period, which is there's been a call for persons to join the -- to join the new gTLD review group. And I'm happy to say that this task has been completed. We have at least two members from each RALO as well as a representative from the ALAC from all five regions.

And what also the review group has is we are also focused on is a stricter conflict of interest regarding the review of these applications.

So that's -- that has now been set up.

So, when the actual first week of the applications are published, we then had to look at how do we incorporate that data on to our Wiki

page. And this has also been accomplished. And we'll go later on to what we have as our dashboard for how we look at the applications and look at the comments and so forth.

So after that the figure 2, which is up to week 4 within the application comment period -- yeah -- so the review group, basically, tries to, you know, alert the community of the opportunity to comment -- to review and comment on the applications. And, if there's a need to create Wiki pages, do that. Attend the RALO conference calls, get the feedback from the community, encourage people to actually submit the comments onto the Wiki, and so forth.

So after that, figure 3, which is like the week 5, and -- yeah, keep going. Because there is a lot of information. I don't think I want to go through every single thing.

So, during the week 5 of the application comment period, what happens then is that the -- there is a conference call where the gTLD RG group will then review all the comments on the Wiki and decide whether it wants to draft a formal comment for the various initial evaluation panels. And, as you already know, there were six evaluation panels -- string similarity, DNS stability, financial, and so on.

So, once a decision is taken based on the review of the comments on the Wiki page to draft a formal comment, ad hoc working group comprised of the review group members and possibly the persons that actually submitted comments, we would draft a comment and, you know, submit that on the Wiki page for feedback and then finally have a final comment.

So on -- that's on week -- figure 4 -- thanks -- Which is the last two weeks of the application comment period. The -- yeah.

So, as I was saying there, so once it -- once the draft formal comments are published, more feedback is obtained. And then a final comment period is then submitted.

So then on the next week, which is the week 8, there's the -- the ALAC then has to look at these comments and decide what it wishes those -- it then wants to start a vote of whether to accept the comments for formal submission to the ICANN public comment period.

And, once -- if it's approved, then ALAC formally submits it as it does a regular formal policy statement. And, if not, well then RALOs and At-Large structures can still decide to actually take that information and still submit it as an independent organization to the public comment period.

So after that, then the next figure shows the application objection period. And this is like the 2-4th month. This is the same thing now. At this time we're now focusing on comments on objection grounds. And the ALAC has standing to object on two particular grounds -- the limited public interest grounds and on community grounds.

And this is also happening during the application comment period. However, it's anticipated that the emphasis will be focusing on comments during the application comment period and not so much on objections. However, the comments can still come in during that time. And this is just a continuation of that process.

But, you know, update the RALOs, attend the conference calls, get feedback, and post comments onto the Wiki pages that we've set up for it.

So the next figure will be like figure 7, which is the 5th month of the objection period.

And what happens then is that there is a conference call again by the review group, and the review group then decides whether to draft a formal objection statement by RALOs -- sorry, for RALOs to approve to get advice to the ALAC.

Now, the objection statement has a very particular format. It has to be within, like, 5,000 words, 20 pages. The dispute resolution service provider has now published its documents and its guidelines of how it should be submitted. So it has to follow that format.

So the review group, working with the persons that have made comments on the Wiki, will now really work to draft that objection statement.

And that takes us to, like, week 8. So a draft objection statement is published. It is then reviewed by the community. And then, at the end of the 6th month, that ad hoc working group would then file an objection statement, would post the final objection statement ready for RALOs to review the -- to review the objection statement.

And that takes us to figure 9, which is the last chart. Yeah. So that takes us to the last chart. So what happens now is that, once the objection statement is posted, all of the five RALOs can now vote on the objection statement.

And there is -- by whatever process each RALO decides. And, once three or more RALOs votes to send advice to ALAC to consider the objection statement to the gTLD application, then the ALAC itself then has to now vote on whether to accept the advice from the three or more RALOs. And, if it does vote yes, then the objection statement is then filed in coordination with ICANN.

And that's an overview of the process. Again, it's a very bottom-up process from the At-Large to the RALOs to the ALAC.

And I think that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. I think the helicopter view and whole process shows that great care and detail has been undertaken to design the process in order for it not to be capturable and in order for it to be fair for applicants and, of course, fair for those objectors in the community.

Heather?

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that presentation. Quite comprehensive. I don't know whether GAC members maybe have questions about the process that the ALAC and the At-Large are undertaking in relation to new gTLDs.

Ah, I do see questions. I see Italy and U.K., please.

ITALY: Okay. Thank you, chair. I would like to know, it is a very good organization to organize the evaluation. But I'm curious to know if you already evaluated after two or three weeks after the list has been known typology of problems. Because, of course, one can object and see one by one all the 1,930 applications. But, certainly, there are a class of problems that I'm curious to know if you already did something and have an initial evaluation of these categories.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Italy.

Actually, for the transcript, my name is Olivier Crepin-Leblond. I've not transformed to Stephane yet. But I noticed -- okay, that's me. Thank you. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you for the question. I'm Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Sorry. Generally, no. The way the gTLD public comment period works, you have to make -- you have to file a comment in the application comment period, specifically on application and also specifically directly direct towards the either one of the six initial evaluation panels. And then, otherwise, if the comment is not filed properly, it will be ignored by the initial evaluation panels. So no, not really.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you.

U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you. And thank you for a very clear presentation. It's very impressive all the planning and thought that's gone into this. It's -- obviously, a lot of thought has gone into it. And it's good to see.

My interest is whether the GAC and individual GAC representatives do have the opportunity at points here for some at least information exchange throughout this period, the objection period.

And I note the possibility of regional meetings, the RALOs. Is there potential opportunity for some information sharing when those meetings take place? Given our shared common interests, if you like, the interests of users, consumers and public interest, generally, I guess, there might be value in knowing how it's going in terms of assessing applications and identifying potential issues relating to those particular areas of interest and concern. So I just wondered if there is something we could do in terms of identifying opportunities for some interaction at the GAC level or regional level or for individual GAC representatives. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, U.K. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. My name is Evan Leibovitch. I'm vice chair of ALAC. And I've been involved with the gTLD process. I would -- there is opportunity to participate pretty much everywhere along our chain of working with this. We've tried to design this to be as much of a community-driven bottom-up process as possible with the intention that ALAC is the

collector and processor of objections rather than the initiator of them itself.

So the intention was that we would receive community objections, and we would implement the process that Dev has so well put in place here with the team. But, essentially, the idea being that we were to be the place where community objections from the At-Large community would come in as a bottom up process, not for us to impose those, which is why it's so difficult to ask whether or not we've done an initial evaluation of the strings so much as we are hoping that, if there are objections from within the At-Large community, not just within the 15 people of ALAC, that we have a bottom-up process that allows us to evaluate those.

I don't know if that's answered your question. But, in terms of the opportunity to work together, there's many different levels of this. But we're trying as much as possible for this to be bottom-up as opposed to imposed from the top down.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Australia, as our lead on the early warning process.

AUSTRALIA:

Thank you, chair. And with that reminder, I'll perhaps make my introductory remarks a bit more comprehensive.

So, as the ALAC is no doubt aware, the GAC has a similar operational role. It's new for us as well. So we've been putting some time into it as well.

As it stands, the GAC has essentially two ways to provide input about new gTLD strings. So the first is early warnings, which are a new type of input from the GAC.

They are informal. The first thing to say is they are not GAC advice. That's the most fundamental thing.

What they are is informal. They can come from one or more GAC members. And they are partially intended to provide an early warning to applicants that there may be a sensitivity from one or more governments and to allow them to withdraw, if they so choose, and receive a significant refund.

That said, early warnings may take many forms. It may not simply be objections. It may be noting a sensitivity and seeing if there is a way to address that in a sensible way.

As you may be aware, the GAC wrote to the board suggesting that we're looking seriously at providing early warnings in a single batch at or around the Toronto meeting, so allowing for also four months and providing in October sometime.

And then the second type of input is GAC advice, and the Applicant Guidebook spells out three types -- three forms that that advice could take. And the GAC is still discussing the timing of GAC advice, as I understand it. But one thing we were looking at was potential -- the

potential for providing advice in the April meeting. I'm not sure if I'm overstepping the mark there, chair.

So there's two types. There's timing considerations.

So I guess I was going to follow up from Mark's question in that the GAC and the ALAC, there is the potential for shared concerns or I guess the potential for coordination of concerns, particularly on community strings, or those that relate to limited public interest.

So I appreciate very much that the ALAC is designing its processes open as possible, but for GAC members who have an interesting in following this, I'm just interested in the best way of seeing when objections come into the ALAC system. Is the best thing, for example, to follow the Wiki space? Or just to make it simple for GAC members who may have an interest in community objections and so on, is there a relatively straightforward way, a place for us to look or -- I guess it's a follow-up in that question.

And I'm not sure if the ALAC is interested in also contributing to the GAC's discussions, and it may be interesting to pursue that as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Australia.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you for that question.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

With regards to being able to track all the comments and so forth, that was a big concern as well, and that's why the Wiki, we have a dashboard. I don't know if it can be shown on the screen. I think that link has also been shared. And the idea behind the dashboard is that it gives us a quick review of the stats behind what is happening and the comments.

And the dashboard shows, like, the number of comments related to the evaluation panels and for the objection grounds.

So the idea would be that as pages are created, the table is automatically populated and then you can see the number of comments. And then what happens then is that as each -- well, as time goes on, more and more, the number of comments in the table will increase due to, you know, community interest and what the At Large feels is important and starts commenting on, and that table will be sortable. So you can see which one rises to the top as which one is getting the most interest.

So in the weekly updates that the review group will then take, it will be looking at the changes from the previous week to the next week saying okay, this Wiki page was opened up on this application, and this one has received 30 more comments from last week and so forth. And that will be an e-mail that will be sent to all of you -- that's sent to all of At Large and to the At Large public list.

And so it's -- And again, it's all open. Anybody can access it, and you can bookmark it and track the changes on the Wiki and so forth, so....

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that reply.

Okay. We are ready, I think, to move to the next agenda item. Oliver.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Chair.

The next agenda item, is there work the ALAC and GAC can do together to study the demand from and impact on Internet users from the gTLD program launch?

Who wishes to start? Evan Leibovitch, perhaps?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. There's a couple of different things that ALAC has been working on and has been concerned about in regards -- sorry?

Sorry, in regards to the gTLD launch.

One of them has had to do with issues of contractual compliance. We had a meeting with the compliance staff on Sunday, and I'd say the results were mixed in terms of the response we received. And so one of the concerns we have is the ability to have a solid RAA that supports and asserts the public interest on the expansion of the program, and as well as empowers ICANN staff to be able to suitably enforce it.

And so one issue of ours that we hope you may have common purpose with us is ensuring that there is a robust process for ICANN to enforce its RAA even for the existing top-level domains, let alone expand it to the extent that's being anticipated with the gTLD program launch.

The other thing is we have a number of members on the GNSO committee on consumer choice, confidence, trust, innovation, and some other things. I forget exactly what the name of it is. But there is a committee of that that's going on to create a set of metrics to define the amount of consumer trust and confidence.

There has been some concern also that that committee, in fact, does not have a broad enough scope to study choices of confidence; that it does that totally within the ICANN sphere and does not deal with issues of consumer trust of domain names as opposed to other ways of finding contents such as Internet searches, QR codes, et cetera.

And so we have been asking to expand the scope of that study of consumer confidence and trust to go beyond the very narrow scope that the group has right now and, in fact, to more broadly measure the success of the program not only against existing TLDs but also against other ways by which end users get Internet content.

And, also, at a higher level, ALAC has created something called the future challenges working group that is co-chaired by myself and Jean-Jacques Subrenat to try and almost take a think tank, long-term approach to things and has been studying other ways to try and reform things.

So we would like to try and find out ways to work together with the GAC on trying to move some of these things forward.

Thanks.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay.

So are there any comments on this topic? United States.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Excuse me. We're having a bit of an operator problem over here, but now we've corrected it. Thank you.

I wanted to thank you for that presentation, Evan, and just to sort of point out we do have very, very similar concerns, as we covered some of this territory in some previous meetings. But I think you can tell from our Costa Rica communique, we have come out, as you know, very, very strongly on the linkages we see between improving -- the need to significantly improve the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the need to move quickly on the WHOIS Review Team recommendations to implement those and to incorporate those into the RAA and elsewhere, and the critical need, then, to ensure that the contract compliance function is effective.

So I think that is -- we'll be singing from the same song sheet for quite some time.

We're probably going to include similar comments in this meeting's communique as well, and do feel strongly about that.

So it's good to know that the two primary advisory committees are on the same page.

Thank you for that.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, United States.

Australia.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Evan, for the presentation.

I, first of all, just agree entirely with my U.S. colleague. I think we share some, it sounds like, very fundamental shared interests in this space.

I'm really interested in the idea that there is some long-term work going on as well. I mean, as you will see from the GAC's interventions and for some time now we have a particular interest in the law enforcement amendments in the RAA negotiations. There is interest in the compliance function as well.

But I'm particularly interested in the long-term strategic approach that you mentioned. You may not have seen, I'm not sure who was in the room, but the GAC had a discussion with the Board and staff and registrars and registries on Sunday on the structure of the domain name industry, and the GAC flagged that discussion and requested that discussion in Costa Rica. And I think it's raised a number of interesting issues from our perspective. And I certainly hope that it's part of an ongoing discussion which we can have about ICANN's role in overseeing the domain name industry and how it chooses to do that.

Some particular questions which I have coming out of that is it's clear that ICANN has chosen a particular approach to this, having targeted contracts with some players; indirect relationships, it would seem, with

others. It has accredited some players and not others , and so on. And I'm particularly interested to have examine that at a very high level.

So it seems that there is a role that ICANN has in overseeing the industry, in taking a broad approach. And then there is the detail. So there is the particular contracts that it has taken -- it has and whether they're enforceable and deal with the appropriate issues and so on. And then there is the particular issue of enforcing those contracts in a clear, transparent, independent and consistent way.

So I'm very interested in this work, so thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Australia.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Chair. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat speaking.

Two remarks, one about vocabulary, the other about structure.

Vocabulary. I'm a bit puzzled and worried that the word "negotiation" is still used. As one member of the Board said this morning in another venue, it's not about negotiation. It's about enforcement.

Actually, it's about meeting or not meeting requirements for accreditation.

So I think we should be clear about this, and perhaps make sure when we meet staff or among ourselves that we get our mental frame right. We're not in the process of renegotiating each and every contract. There is a rule. Conform to the rule. That's my first remark.

My second is about structure. What I notice over the past months and years, actually, is that compliance is a very tricky business, but it's tricky because, also, the structure within the ICANN staff and the organization is perhaps ambiguous. I'm not sure it's meant to be that way, but the final result is that it is ambiguous in that if we, for instance, go to legal staff, they will say, you know, enforcement is actually by the compliance department, and then compliant department will say at some time, well, when you come to -- I mean when push comes to shove, there is a point where you have very, very tricky legal aspects and then it shifts to legal department.

So what I have been calling for in ALAC when we had these discussions is that we could get together and take the opportunity of a very important fact which is happening in ICANN just now, which is the nomination of a new CEO, and use this opportunity to impress upon the new CEO and his interim CEO that we need one window system so that members of the community, whether it's in GAC or in ALAC, when they do have concerns, they can be voiced and addressed and answered to by one single firewall, one single window. Because after all, I think that neither in the GAC -- and, after all, I'm a former ambassador. I think I know your work -- nor we on the ALAC should be concerned at all about whose job it is. We just want the result there.

Thanks.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you for that.

Were there other comments or questions on this topic?

Okay. Evan, you would like to provide a reply to Australia's comment.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Yes, on the subject of the long-term approach that we're taking, with the establishment of this working group that we have called future challenges, the first deliverable of this group has been a white paper that has been presented to the ICANN community for the first time within this week. And we'll be forwarding this to the GAC and to members, anybody that wants to work with us on it; again, specifically as a white paper, not as ALAC recommendations at this point. We're trying to start a conversation about a longer term need to fix ICANN and to present some kind of a middle ground between the status quo and tearing it down. The multistakeholder model is very important to us but has some significant public interest issues that need to be addressed. And so this working group has been taking a very high-level approach to what's necessary to do this.

So rather than have GNSO reviews and ALAC reviews and everybody going in their own silos, we're trying to figure out how to get all these pieces to work together properly in a way that better asserts the public interest within ICANN's function.

And so like I say, we'll be sending this white paper to you, and I really hope that we can engage the GAC either with -- at the level of the GAC itself or with individual countries that would like to engage working with us on this.

Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. We look forward to receiving that.

I have New Zealand, please.

NEW ZEALAND:

Yeah, thank you, Heather.

I just wanted to comment very briefly about what Jean-Jacques was saying, and actually it's relevant to the question of your white paper because at our meeting in Costa Rica, we raised the issues with the Board about the need for a structural approach to enforcement of contracts. We're not to in a position as the GAC, I think, to provide information or advice on what sort of structure is appropriate, but that there are structural issues involved with contract maintenance and oversight. And I think your point is extremely pertinent, and I would look forward to the opportunity to read and comment on the white paper, too, because I think there are structural issues within ICANN that do need addressing. They are relevant to the oversight and enforcement of contracts.

Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you, New Zealand.

So perhaps we can spend a few minutes on the last agenda item. This concerns a proposal from the ALAC to have an ALAC academy, and I

thought this would be a good opportunity to hear a bit about what the ALAC has in mind and what's behind this proposal.

So, please, Oliver.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chair. And I'm spinning my head around at the moment trying to look for Sandra Hoferichter who is leading on this issue, but I'm not sure that she has made it here.

Oh, Jean-Jacques -- Tijani, sorry. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If Sandra is not here, I can perhaps cover the subject.

So as you all know, ALAC has initiated, has proposed to establish an ICANN Academy to organize all the learning activities of ICANN. In the meantime, the staff asked for a pilot action concerning a training, the leadership -- the future leadership of ICANN. Means that people who will be appointed by a NomCom now and all the new members of the GNSO Council, ALAC, ccNSO Council, et cetera, and even the board members.

So ALAC worked on this subject in this way. And starting from Costa Rica meeting ALAC called the other stakeholders of ICANN, the other constituencies, to participate in this work since it is an ICANN Academy and not an ALAC or an At-Large academy.

And now we have an extended working group with -- and we will have a meeting I think tomorrow to constitute an extended program committee for this activity of capacity building.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani.

Now, that's just one part of the capacity building that is going on and that has originated in the At-Large community, the other one being -- having general assemblies and a set of events taking place in the region where the ICANN meeting is taking place.

For example, in Dakar, we had all of our African At-Large structures that met, and that followed an extensive capacity-building program every morning, I think, from 7:00 a.m. till 9:00 a.m. when everyone else came in and a follow-up later on on the mailing list.

Similarly as well in Costa Rica, we had ALAC RALO, At-Large structures that met and also followed an extensive capacity-building program. And it was very, very successful. The return we have had so far is that it really helps to come to an ICANN meeting to actually understand what it is all about. Reading about it, listening to it remotely is not the same thing as actually being part of it. And the capacity-building program is designed for that.

We have plans to extend this, but as with everything, there needs to be a budget set up for this, and we're well aware that this is probably something that needs to be done one step at a time.

So there is a lot of work being done to build on this and be able to bring more people into ICANN. And this is, of course, closely linked with outreach but there is also a close linking within reach. In other words, keeping those people who have come, actually getting them to understand what is going on and get them to actually take part in the discussions and bring the input from their stakeholders and from their community.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you.

Are there any comments on that? Kenya, please.

KENYA:

Thank you very much, ALAC, on that presentation on capacity building.

I'm curious, though, and this might actually perhaps be an obvious question is how different is this new ICANN Academy and capacity building you are trying to introduce, how is it different from the fellowship program that has been very successful?

And, also, wondering whether you are aware that the GAC itself has its own capacity-building strategy, especially for new members. And we are looking at it as a continuous process.

So I'm just wondering how different it is and what you are proposing here. Is it going to be a long-term -- yeah. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

We'll start with thank you, Kenya. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you very much. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro, for the record. And warm greetings to everyone.

In relation to the question that was just posed, it's a very relevant question. In fact, it's something we are raising within the At-Large community. We need to identify existing capacity-building activities that are already being facilitated. We know that the ccNSO has an ad hoc working group. It's a close group assigned to developing, you know, capacity building.

We know that the GAC is also involved in capacity building and that sort of thing, and also the ICANN fellowship.

One of the things that we have committed to doing at this particular meeting is to work on a survey to assess -- to assess the level of works -- of work that's on the ground already. And we recognize also that there are instances where there may be duplication of resources and that sort of thing and the need to minimize it and work effectively.

We also recognize that global partnership, which does excellent work through the network operator groups which the GAC, through its government ministries and that sort of thing, is closely involved in training regulators.

We also recognize that even across the region, Africa, Asia, I will speak for Asia-Pacific -- Asia at least, the Pacific at least, because I am more familiar with the terrain. Take, for example, in July, a few days from now, there will be an APT regulatory forum. There will also be a Pacific broadband theme, and that sort of thing and also recognizing even within ICANN we have the ASO with, you know, organizations like

APNIC, RIPE NCC, are doing work already on the ground, either through the NGOs, the network operator groups, in terms of building capacity.

So the idea is to assess, to assess and also to put forward and consult the community on what we think should be the way forward, how we can cohesively work together to build capacity. And when we say build capacity, it means meaningful participation in the technical policy processes within ICANN.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Salanieta.

Next is Fouad Bajwa.

FOUAD BAJWA: Thank you, Olivier. Fouad Bajwa from the APRALO, ALAC.

To address Alice's question, I have been a twice fellow from Pakistan. My first fellowship was from 2009 and the other fellowship was to Nairobi, actually, in 2010.

The fellowship program itself achieves a significant part of introducing developing countries' participants to the ICANN process. And the capacity building which happens within the fellowship program is -- it is broad, it is focused, and it achieves a significant amount of actually getting fellows into the process as soon as possible. That's the beauty of that program. And that's how I became part of the APRALO activities and ALAC.

This capacity-building program which is in discussion right now is a broader program. It -- for all the new people that joined the various sections of ICANN, their capacity will be built; right? So they enhance their capacity, get into the process much quicker. Time to participate in policy processes, it reduces that.

So that's a significant difference between the fellowship program and this, the ALAC academy program. So because it's broader, you have people participating also from non- -- sorry, from developed countries as well who are not part of the fellowship program.

So it's a broader program. It's significance is also larger. We cannot really compare to the fellowship program. The fellowship program, already important, significant program, is achieving its objectives. This is a bit separate from that.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Fouad. And I think the view is it's a little bit like a pyramid where various little parts fit, and just the ICANN Academy, as we call it, is just one of those cubes that fits in the overall scheme of things, specifically to make those future leaders or people taking on leadership positions to be operational from day one. And I know some people have been in ICANN for a re very long time but still only know about one part of it. And being able to provide a broad view of what -- everything about ICANN in the few days is something that would really enhance not only the operational side of the leaders taking the position but also their

view across the whole community rather than a silo'd view that we try to avoid as much as possible.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for that, Oliver.

Are there any final comments on this topic?

U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Yes, thank you, Chair, and thanks for introduction of this topic. This is a very welcome initiative, I think, in terms of both capacity building and providing a location for information about multistakeholderism in practice.

So I think that's very welcome in showing people have a proper understanding of how this model works and how to engage and so on and who is doing what and what their respective mandates, roles, responsibilities and mechanisms are and so on.

And I note the potential for some kind of course to be held in the autumn ICANN meeting, if that's right. I mean, if we're given early notice through Heather, obviously we would like somebody to speak about the GAC; you know, to contribute to the holding of that course by the academy so that we can give some insight about how the GAC operates, how individual GAC reps work, how they relate to capitals, how they engage beyond ICANN, beyond this meeting of ICANN. You know, how we go beyond that into other fora and so on.

So welcome this very much.

Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

All right. Thank you, U.K.

So I think at this point we can perhaps close the session with another thank you to the ALAC for coming and meeting with us today and presenting on a number of issues where, again, we find we have shared objectives and shared concerns.

So I look forward to continuing to work with you in the same manner.

So thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, and I hope this has been as productive for you as it has been for us.

[Applause]

HEATHER DRYDEN:

For the GAC, we have a briefing now on IDN variants. So we will move directly into this briefing, and then we'll have a longer lunch break, perhaps.