HYDERABAD – At-Large Leadership Working Session Wrap Up Session 2
Monday, November 07, 2016 – 11:00 to 12:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would like to ask whether there are people from At-Large and ALAC going around. We have a very packed agenda. I would like to ask them to get into the room.

Can we count, please, how many ALAC members do we have in this room and from which regions?

She sent a proxy, but that does not count for quorum.

Very well. We´ll try to find other ALAC members. We need, at least, eight ALAC members from the three regions to make a decision in order to vote, and we have to decide on this agenda.

We will change the items order, and we will begin with the discussion about the ALSes expectations.

Very well. I would like to begin by discussing this document. You all have had it for some time now, at least, a week, and this is focused on the things we have been discussing for some time. Can you scroll up a bit, please? I´ll try to see my own copy so that I can read what we are talking about.

Thanks.

We had plenty of meetings about this issue. Some of them were meetings of the working group and some others took place with ALAC and At-Large as a whole. We haven´t made much progress. We are now in a position in which we have an ongoing review about almost the same topic, and I believe we need to make some decisions which may be supported or rejected by the external reviewers, but, at least, we will have a way forward, and we will not have to wait for others to tell us what to do. Instead of seeing what we can do, I have tried to analyze the general situation to see where we are now and how we got here.

The original concept of At-Large is that we would have this hierarchical structure and maybe, by magic or something else, we would have a lot of people in our community who would contribute to our policy discussions and who would feed our processes. To a great extent that has not happened. Looking back, I think this is not a surprise. We talk about issues that are not necessarily of great interest to many people, and we focus on topics for which great knowledge is required. We use acronyms and a technical language that can even confuse that elephant everyone seems to be talking about. And we are talking about people whose mother tongue is not English or who do not speak English at all. Nor is it surprising that anyone who has generated this plan for 2002 has not done what he/she has been expected to do or what would happen.

I think - if we could get that image of what we are supposed to do, and that is an image that has much merit --We have to be much more proactive in presenting information so that people may have the chance of drafting their own comments. We have concentrated to a great extent on the ALSes from their representatives´s perspective. When we talk about ALSes, these are organizations that have members, and those members are the ones that control, and we want their feedback. It is not an issue of making the 200 ALS representatives to participate more actively, although this is an interesting problem in itself. But how do we then get other people in organizations involved? We do not know how many of them there are, we do not know what their interests are, we know practically nothing about these people. These are the issues we must address if we are to expect them to give us their feedback.

Moreover, we talk a lot about public interest. The other expression used in ICANN is public responsibility. There was a strategic initiative a few years ago, carried out by [Inaudible], which took into account ICANN's public responsibility, and an important part of the group's conclusion was that we, as ICANN, have a responsibility to communicate what we do, and to ensure that if we expect the rest of the world to trust us, the first step is to have an idea of what we do. It is very difficult to trust an organization where there is no connection with reality.

EN

So what we were saying about facilitating participation with our ALSes has the additional goal of meeting some of ICANN's public responsibility goals.

Let´s consider the steps, please. The part that reads "steps". Let´s scroll down in the document. Scroll up a bit more, please. Let's look specifically at the part of expectations. I try to attribute with some characteristics to what we should be doing. The one on the top has to be believable and realistic. We can set the expectations we want, and if there is something clearly not happening, then we would have to be honest. Now, I could say that no matter what proposals have been made, whether in the group as a whole or in the workforce, someone should at least say this is impossible.

We will not have unanimity, but there has to be something generally accepted. We must focus not only on the ALS representatives, but also on the wider group. And thirdly, I think that I did not write well, sorry for that. If we can talk about ICANN's public responsibility issues, that would be a good thing, although I do not know if it is our responsibility to do so.

We must also believe that what we do will increase, perhaps substantially, the number of people in our community, who are - as you can see - the people at our table are convinced that working with ICANN is a good thing. We are doing a public good

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

in doing so. We need to have more people who believe that this is so, and who dedicate time and effort to what we do. That's what we are aiming at. We have already discussed these steps, but we need to generate adequate synopses of ICANN's problems. We also have to describe what we do and make it clear how we help people. We sometimes complain about participation in our webinars and other issues related to education and processes, but the amount of people who gets to know about this in advance is very small in comparison with the members of our 200 ALSes.

If we can get those invitations sent, invitations from people who are not in the community and who can [inaudible], there we are going to improve participation. We must also confirm and understand what this extended community is like. And receive feedback regarding the messages being delivered. We have no control if we send a message to 200 ALSes, and each of them sends it to 220 persons in average. We have absolutely no control over how many of those 2400 people will receive it. We can expect them to be a few, some of them could be representing and others could not. That is the point, how many people can be passionate about what we are doing so that they can devote their time.

Now, I give the floor to the people in the room. There were several comments on the list about this. In at least two cases,

this was perhaps because I did not write it very well or I was not clear enough in the sense of the question to which I was referring to, but it was to present information. And that's not the next steps, but the goal of doing this is to try to capture more people and get them involved and more interested in what we do.

We also have to understand what the competencies of our ALSes are, for example, we have a small number of ALSes that have a very specific focus. And let´s remember that ALSes are generally organizations already existing before becoming ALSes, and some of them have very straight and specific objectives. Many of them will not get involved in the ICANN processes, but when we review overlapping issues, we need to ask them to get involved. In order to do this, we have to know the topic.

Now, I give the floor to the people in the room. Olivier, I want to ask you to manage the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I do not see any card raised. I'm not on Adobe Connect right now. I do not know if there are hands raised.

Alan, it looks like there's no one online. May be I spoke very fast.

Seun, go ahead, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much, Alan. Yesterday there was a session --I'm trying to remember the acronym, that´s why it takes me time. I think it's TPP, someone from the Staff spoke about how we can generate better information for the community. I think it was DDPP, a high-performance document drafting program.

I am thinking if this could fit into what we have identified as step one, that is, to recognize the issues raised in ICANN. Is that what you have in mind, or do you think that you have to establish a separate process for that?

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is yes and no. This program aims at helping part of the community to draft documents, that is, there may be such an element. Although I did not say it explicitly here, if we assume or suppose that - let´s say, there is already a lot of documentation being created each month, then if we assume that a synopsis written by the staff regarding the different activities is something that already exists, it is highly probable that in AFRALO, for example, you would have to focus on something different or on something additional to that. The idea of said drafting program is to help you draft something similar to this. It is a pilot program that can be extended or canceled, but undoubtedly this could help individual groups,- and in our case

RALOs-, to generate additional documentation. But I'm thinking of something on a more global scale than that. That will allow us to produce one document per year. If we do not improve that, people will get bored. But yes, it is a program that can help us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have Sébastien Bachollet, Dev Anand Teelucksingh and [Inaudible].

Sébastien has raised his hand. I can not see him. Very well. Next speaker is Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank You. I would like to say that I appreciate the intent of this document, but one of the obvious challenges with this that I would like to raise is that if I have to forward every email I receive about ICANN, At-Large, to disseminate information, I´m sure I would give up and go another organization.

The challenge is to divide it in order to share it. I think that is one of the main issues. Much of the material we produce is easy to share on social media. I think, in the social media working group, we have discussed how to make these things more attractive, how to make calls more attractive. The challenge is to make our content more accessible. You need a computer to participate in ICANN, At-Large and ICANN processes. Mobile

devices are in secondary place, and I think it is something that we need to improve in order to send messages, and for people be able to answer them from their mobile. That is something not easy.

If you look at the Wiki, it's pretty inaccessible, you have to click three or four times to load a whole page, and there's a challenge there, right? We have to see how to make the At-Large community work accessible through mobile devices. These are the two issues.

I think the title is somewhat related, but we want more people in the organization participating and more involved. It's kind of hard for me to separate what we think is happening in At-Large. On the one hand, we see there are people who have to get involved in working groups, etc. But these groups, in my opinion, are not receiving enough attention.

Within ALAC, for example, there are policy issues that are ready to receive public comments, - and I know it is somewhat sensitive and we need to do something -, but the policy working groups cannot begin with the discussion. The same goes for other organizations such as technology, outreach and engagement, social media, capacity building organizations, etc.

Secondly, RALOs themselves do not respond and respect working groups. They are basically ignored by RALO leaders,

EN

that is, they do not even include them in their monthly calls. I think that in RALO calls they should say, well, there are two or three members, so how many members of this RALO belonging this working group can tell us what's going on?

But if we do not do it, and if the RALO is ignored, if the RALO ignores the people in the working groups, and because of time constraints they are not communicating well with the working group, and do not do what the group should do- policy discussions- why should anyone get involved?

That´s all on my side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. [Inaudible] has the floor.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Two months or one month ago, I received an email from Olivier saying, "Dear ALS member, what is your expertise? What do you do? How can we help you? How can we create an interesting group?" This is a normal human approach, that is, addressing personal messages to an ALS which is being asked about what it does. My question is how much effectiveness there is in that. You send 100 messages, for example. How many answers do the different RALOs receive? Is it an effective tool? Is this approach okay? It is also very interesting that it took us six years to be able

to send a message to the general public, to the media, to the government and to people who deal with articles in the media, in the news. Nobody knew about ICANN. The success of the story was based on a very strong IDN domains launching with strong support by the government media.

And I wonder,-- the ALSes involved in this type of ICANN promotion, ---what is ICANN? Is there any tactic ALSes have to present this mentoring process to a general public in certain regions? These are the two questions, the first one on effectiveness, and the second one is whether the ALS is the instrument to circulate the message to the local audience.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's see, there are some comments that are being made, and I think we have to agree on some issues. With a few exceptions, there are few people who think that we are doing a real and wonderful job in order to get our message delivered to the ALSes. Many of the members are not even on the lists. So what we can do is not to delivery all the RALO messages to every person, because if this is the case, we would be stuck; maybe what we can do is to send one message per month, and then inform them when the meetings will be held. That is, very focused messages in the corresponding languages, something that when sent by email can be understood.

Many of our groups work, with some exceptions, -- many of them are in a standby mode because, in this case, it is the RALOs that have to be actively involved in the processes. So it's something we have to sort out, that is why we are debating the issue now. We can not say that we are doing a very good job right now.

Olivier, who is one of our oldest members, wants to respond, so I'm going to give him the floor, but I want his interventions to be of two minutes, and for that we are going to set the timer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I wanted to respond to [Inaudible]'s first question regarding how many ALSes responded to our personalized email. The first group of participants were more than 30 ALSes and then there were about 11 or 15 ALSes which responded. Then we sent a second email and then there were three or four ALSes which responded. We were insistent in this regard. There were some which did not respond, and we will take the corresponding actions, because after sending them five emails, if they do not respond, we must take action on this matter.

Ok. Now I do not know if you, Alan, want to close the queue here or not. We have a long queue in operation.

ALAN GREENBERG:	We will close the list of speakers and then we will continue. Next speaker is Ariel Liang.
ARIEL LIANG:	We have a comment from Sébastien as a remote participant. Can we add in the document the idea that we are working to have one ALS per country, if it has not been added yet?
ALAN GREENBERG:	We can gladly add it, this was what we were talking about. We are talking about how we can add already certified ALSes, but also about how can we make them more active, so I don´t oppose to this.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Next speaker is John Laprise.
JOHN LAPRISE:	For me, as a new ALS and RALO member representing and ALS, I want to echo the comments made by Dev about the website. That is our window to the rest of the world. It is not a very friendly interface. The website cannot be viewed correctly. The next few billion users are going to access the Internet through mobile interfaces, so we have to see how we approach them

EN

effectively through an accessible interface. So we have to work in that sense. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have two suggestions and another item on our agenda. We probably will not do it at this meeting, but the idea is that our working groups be in good shape. Sometimes when you click the name of a group, it reads, "Sorry, you cannot join this group now," or the last meeting was in 2012. John also volunteers to deliver courses on how to have access from mobile phones. Maybe he reads documents that are very long, and then the document reads at the end, "Sent from my mobile phone", then I think he is an expert in this regard.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now, the next one in the queue is Yrjö Länsipuro.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: I was one of those two people who participated in the discussion by email, and maybe I did not understand well, for me we were putting aside the initial goal. At EURALO we are focusing on this issue of sending personalized emails, as Olivier mentioned, but I also understand that it is necessary to continue this debate face-to-face, and that this is something that we have to carry out to fulfill the original mission we had.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The next speaker is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank You. For your information, this issue has been debated for a very long time, and we have never reached any consensus on it. This is basically because when you talk about expectations, people immediately tell you, "We are volunteers, we have no obligation." So this is the source of the problem, and we were really stuck. Then I approved this proposal because it is a way of moving forward. It seems to me a very general proposition. It needs further and more detailed development. I have ideas, I can contribute to developing something that is more elaborate, because here we cannot measure or evaluate anything, they are simply ideas about how we are going to move forward. I appreciate this, but this work has to be completed, and I gladly volunteer to contribute to this task.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry for interrupting. I want to make some comments. Regarding to what Yrjö has said, it is possible that this or another proposal involves returning to the community and asking it for feedback. This may also involve substantial changes to our bylaws. And that's where we're going to have to work, and

maybe it's not just me who has to write or draft a document for this. Tijani, yes, we are all volunteers, and what we want is to look for more of us who have a passion for this work. Now, whether more work is needed, certainly yes. But we all have to agree on the principles, not to continue debating this issue forever.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I totally agree, and I propose that we answer all the questions together once we have finished the debate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The next speaker will speak in Spanish and this is Humberto Carrasco.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you, Oliver. Since you have already warned the audience, I´ll start right away. Well, I really wanted to address two topics. The first one is a response to a comment made by Dev in the best meaning of the word, because he said sometimes working groups are ignored by RALO leaders, and the truth is that I tend to believe that if that sometimes happens it is because of the lack of communication and the lack of understanding - sometimes about how this multi-stakeholder model operates. Please note that just to avoid such problems, we, as RALO, have

scheduled a meeting with all Latin American and the Caribbean members with the aim of trying to coordinate a joint action and avoiding this type of situations. So I take it rather as a positive review.

I just wanted to clarify that point. And I also wanted to take this opportunity, -because there is something that I have learned in these years, both in my capacity as secretary and as president, and this is that each person has his or her own way of doing certain things, and that the only way we can move forward to get most of the ALSes involved is to talk and invent new things, so much so that, for example, in the case of Latin America and the Caribbean, we were talking about how to improve the participation of our members in webinars, because we have realized that there were very few people; and in the last meeting we had with Rodrigo de la Parra and Rodrigo Saucedo, we said, well, why not taking advantage of our monthly meeting, - which has a more or less relevant number of participants, 30 or 35, - then, we reduced the amount and took advantage of that time to do capacity building.

So, you may realize that when there is a dialogue, when there is a conversation, when you understand the problem, you can try to come up with solutions. We believe that this is the only way to improve, for example in this case, point 3, which states, spreading the word for what ICANN does.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now, the next speaker is Harold Arcos.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Oliver. I will also speak in Spanish. As far as the criteria are concerned, it seems important to me what was said --that is, to set some general criteria for not going over and over the same thing. On that respect, I wanted to speak about the fact that we cannot control what the answer of ALSes will be. Obviously we must generate some criteria for our outreach to be as strong as possible in order to reach what is called the critical mass, so that the more stimulated and involved people we have, the greater the participation. Actually the statistic we can generate will contain information, but we cannot control all factors. In that sense, one of the initiatives to take into account is the [Inaudible] on which we are working with the AFRALO leadership, and for which some of the pioneer leaders have been consulted, understanding, for example, processes such as the fact that in our RALO there is a great need for feedback, and that seems to be a very important necessity. And I believe this is also extended to ICANN as a whole.

People react when they get to know ICANN for the first time, and then they disappear. So, this has to do with the difficulty with understanding ICANN.

So they don't know what to do, what to say, and that is the informed opinion, the informed input that we need. So, by using, or doing outreach, we can achieve that goal. So, I wanted to say that, and of course, I would like to offer myself as a volunteer, as Tijani said, because we need to go back to the earth, if you will, and to start working. But we have to create realistic criteria. Thank you.

SUEN OJEDEJI: Suen Ojedeji.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was advised to wait until everyone spoke before responding. I will.

SUEN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you very much. This is Seun Ojedeji for the transcript record. Just a first response, I mean, John you mentioned, I think you were talking about a website, the At-Large website itself. And I think, it will be good perhaps, [At-Large?] area, who can actually, [inaudible]. I think there is a working group, there is a mailing list where we discuss, where we provide recommendations, or perhaps we will send it to staff, because I think it's interesting if the new website is not mobile friendly, why is it new and different please?

So, we definitely need to fix that, even though I think it's looking good on my mobile phone now. [Inaudible], yes, I appreciate this document. It's good, expectation is good. At the same time, I think we, there is no one size fits all. This still needs to be done, actually [inaudible]. We can have a general overall statement that you set here, but I don't think we can necessarily have a general measurement, overall measurement that we can put.

I think, at that level, we should probably leave it to the RALOs to determine. And I would also like to just state a part of caution in the extent of expectation which we are setting. I know we are not discussing the details of that now, but I would be willing to be part of the discussion when it happens. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And we have one person who is hanging to the back of the train with their nails, and that was Dev Anand Teelucksingh, who arrived, put his hand up immediately after the queue was closed. Will you allow him?

It's my call, goodness. Okay, let's be nice. Dev Anand Teelucksing. Ariel, you already spoke earlier, did you not? Okay, again. Would you allow Ariel?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for clarity, this session in half an hour. We have another item, which hopefully will not take more than 15 minutes, so we have a little bit of time now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Dev Anand speaking. Just to clarify, when I was talking about the mobile accessibility of all content, I was referring more specifically to At-Large Wiki, which is not very mobile friendly. You have to render the pages repeatedly and so forth.

Another aspect of webinars and capacity building sessions, is that they simply would not load on mobile devices. It's completely inaccessible. So, and so if you share something, and somebody says, well, I can't play this, you know, we've lost them. So, that was my key concern in making our content more accessible.

But just to bring back something, we have to look at communicating our topics a little bit better internally, often, and I mean, I have to say often, I was disappointed to see happen repeatedly, often I see agendas from the ALAC level, or that makes references to, I would say, that's in the remit of working

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

groups, but that the working groups themselves don't get a heads up as to this issue is being discussed at this level, or something is being presented that deals directly with the remit of the working groups.

So it's, I know everybody is busy. I know that it is a challenge, but what I think you have is like, when we plan our agendas, when we start, you know, is there…? You have to do some sort of talking exercise. Is this also of interest to this particular working group? Point it to them to say, hey, this is heads up. This is happening. Instead of like, literally going over the working group's heads.

So, just work smarter, as they say, not harder.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. Tijani Ben Jemaa in direct response to your first point.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Yes, Dev, you're write. The Wiki is not easily loadable on the mobile phone, but starting from the end of this year, everyone can achieve all of the webinars, through ICANN Learn, which is on the website. So, it will be possible to do it, but under [inaudible], not in direct. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. In the queue we still have Ariel and Alberto Soto. So, Ariel Liang.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks Olivier. This is Ariel for the record. Just to respond to John's comment about the responsive design of the website. In fact, the team made a great effort to make it responsive, but there is limitations to make it extremely responsive, like another best practices, because of the limitation of the web.

So, but I think, one key point is the content on the website, if you see something that needs to be changed, or going to be promoted, please contact me, and we'll try our best to accommodate. And then, although the [web project?] has ended, doesn't mean we cannot keep improving. So please, contact me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Alberto Soto, speaking in Spanish.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. I've been listening to you, and we have been talking about the capacity of ALSs to reach end users in terms of web tools. Well, I believe we are talking about

strategies, but I think we have to speak a little bit about tactics, because in Uruguay, has been working with this.

We had an event in Uruguay, and there was an advertisement there. The advertisement had all, not all of the words, but perhaps the key words to reach people. So, we had very good presence, particularly on the governmental side, because they had to decide on issues, important issues.

And then we also reached the end users and many other participants. There was a speaker, and we started talking about an information system, and we spoke about system safety and security, and we also spoke about security in ICANN ecosystem, and we also talk about DNSSEC. So, in only one meeting, we were able to cover those many topics, and we spoke about ICANN does and what ICANN does not. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. There were two more people in the queue, but it appears that they put their card down. So, back to you Mr. Chairman.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of comments on what a number of people have said. On the website, whether it's a mobile issue, or the Wiki, we have work to do. You know? But, if we say

because the website isn't good right now, or isn't sufficient, we should not try to do our overall consciousness raising, and try to get more people involved, then we're never going to start.

So, I think we have to start chipping away at the things that we can do. From my perspective, one of the first things we have to do, is start trying to reach the ALS members, not just the ALS representative. Because we didn't design At-Large to have the ALAC, the RALOs, and then a couple of hundred people.

Our target is a couple of hundred organizations, and we have to remember they have members. So, I think we have to be conscious of it. There are all sorts of details we're going to have to work out, there is no question about that. But, the question that I'm posing to the group today is, is this a good basis from which we can start fleshing out the details? Okay?

There are implications to it. It says we're going to be measuring success, not just by how many ALS representatives that attend our webinar, but ultimately how many other people attend it. How many people do we think can spell ICANN? And I say that with a bit of a smile, but it's important that we understand exactly, that what we're doing is trying to raise the consciousness level in enough people, that ultimately we will capture.

I use that word deliberately, because everyone around this table has been captured. Okay? You think what we're doing is important. You're putting your own time and energy into it, and we're looking for more people like that but there has to be a level of comprehension that proceeds that. We have to be very pragmatic.

It is true that if we can get people to an ICANN meeting, some of them will go away understanding us. And as Harold says, some of them will walk away and never come back again. We are never going to get the vast majority of our ALS members to an ICANN meeting. It's not going to happen. You know? We have trouble funding 27 people to this meeting, and to a summit we may fund 175 or 200 people. We're never going to fund 24,000 people.

No. So, our target is, how can we do a credible job, understanding we have to do it all remotely. And there is lots and lots of things to do. On the subject that Dev raised of involving working groups, I guess, first of all, in some cases, we need to get the working groups alive again. In other cases, they're alive. I'll use the same statement I've used to staff that I've employed over the years, and to my wife, I'm trainable.

I won't do it all right the first time, but I will try to catch it. When we blow it, when we don't, you know, go through a working

group that is alive when we should, call us on it. Hopefully between me and staff, and the other people on the ALT, we'll catch it. Occasionally, we'll blow it.

I'd like to… Before we end, would like to actually take a vote of this group, that this is the way going forward, so we don't re-debate the same issue again. Olivier, you have about five minutes or so if you'd like to address any people who are in the speaker queue, including yourself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I just wanted to mention that I shudder at the use of the word capture. The reason being that capture, in the ICANN context, often has negative connotations, and I did have yesterday, someone coming to me who had listened to the discussions here, I can't remember if it was yesterday or the day before, saying, "How has At-Large been captured? Goodness, I thought the process was there for At-Large not to be captured."

And I, having not struck the similarity between what you had said and what they had said, now I understand why they got concerned about ICANN At-Large being captured. So, I would urge that you use another words perhaps, rather than using captured.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was, of course, talking about us capturing others, but point taken, and what I said before about being trainable, I'll try not to use the word.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There appears to be… Well, there appears to be no one in the queue.

Humberto? Okay. Humberto Carrasco.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto speaking. Thank you. I was thinking about target two, which is focusing on the ALS members more than on the formal representatives. I actually believe this effectively happens in practice, at least, in LACRALO, but it goes hand in hand with the possibility to include members of the ALSs to just give them more participation.

If we cannot include individual members, even though you can have as a final target, what this RALO limitations that we still have not included individual members, may be a barrier. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I must give an anecdote. If it's happening in LACRALO, congratulations. I will give a NARALO example. We have had individual users from a long time ago, and our rule says you cannot be a member of an ALS if you want to be an individual member. We had someone apply, go through the process, which includes them certifying they are not a member of an ALS.

Turned out they were a member of an ALS, not only that, they were the chair of the board of that ALS, and they weren't aware that their organizations was an ALS. We have a way to go with some RALOs, if not yours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No one else in the queue for the time being, Mr. Chairman.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Do we have quorum right now?

Can all current ALS ALAC members please put up their hands and hold them there? I want to verify we have at least eight members here, and all RALOs represented.

We need a yes or no. Current ALAC members, not incoming.

We have nine ALAC members and all RALOs. I'm told Sébastien is behind us.

Harold has a question, he'll ask a question in a moment.

A proxy. No, no. Quorum, we need quorum of the people in the room to hold a vote. Okay. We have quorum, all RALOs are represented. Thank you. Now, rules on proxies. Whose proxy are you holding? For who?

Vanda, thank you. I'm holding the proxy for Tim and for Sandra. And Jimmy is holding the proxy for Garth.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Sorry. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel for the record. Alan, you're also a proxy for Leon. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Luckily, I have three proxies and our rules limit me to three proxies. So fortunately, we are not over that. Thank you. All right. I would like to have a vote of the ALAC, the current ALAC. Is this document a basis for going forward? Understanding it has to be refined, and understanding it's a communal decision, but we're not going to revisit the concept again, unless we find something radically wrong with it in our implementation.

Well, first of all, anyone here object?

Sorry, Sébastien would like to make a comment.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, I was in the [inaudible] meeting, and it's difficult to speak, but I tried to follow the discussion. I understand why we are doing that, but I don't understand why we rush. We get a document just before the meeting, and we have to decide here to something. It's not the way we are supposed to work.

We need to have come time to reflect on that. You get a lot of pushback on your document, you say maybe it was not written well, then what we are voting here, to accept the document? To accept the ideas that there may be something to do with the member of the ALSs? We are running in the same time the review.

I already think that we are doing things in the wrong way. And not talking about the idea it's wrong, but the way it's done, it's not the one I will support. And I think that we really need to maybe just have three people to revise the document, and to have the real agreed document that we can vote on, and not something, okay, we have not write, maybe not write correctly yet.

It's why I think we are going too fast here. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. What it is, I believed I asked, is this the basis for going forward? That is an overall principle that we work to ensure that the larger part of our membership, that is our ALSs, including their members, have more understanding, or are provided with information to give them more understanding so ultimately, they can participate should they choose.

That's the level of detail we're looking at. Sébastien, at this point, you certainly can have your opinion, and you may vote as appropriate, but I would like a general consensus of this group that this is a reasonable way to proceed. If they don't want to proceed, we… I will follow. I'm only a chair. I don't set the rules.

In terms of the At-Large review, you weren't here at the beginning of the meeting, where, from my perspective, if we simply sit back and wait for the external people to tell us what to do, I think we're absolving ourselves of our duty. I think we have a responsibility of setting a direction. They can say we're wrong, they can say we agree with it, but I believe we have to take responsibility for our own fate.

That's my personal position. I would like to carry on with the question, everyone is free to abstain or vote no, and if the group says that… Seun, yes, go ahead. We can have a discussion. We

do have another item on the agenda, which we are hitting into, but we might be able to do that one quickly.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, this is Seun for the record. Just a quick one. Why are we voting? I thought we said we always do things by consensus.

ALAN GREENBERG: In this case, I'd really like it recorded that people are agreeing.

Is there a general feeling we should do this by consensus instead of a vote? I'm happy.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Consensus are recorded, by the way. It was consensus.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. I want to make it clear that we are discussing, and approving, not a program or a plan. We are approving a way forward. We are approving how we will proceed. We gave up the old manner to proceed, because we didn't advance at all. That's why today we have a new way to go forward.

This is what we are approving today. We are not approving any plan, any particular action we will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does the group prefer we do this by consensus? I'm happy to do that. We've had a request. I'm willing to honor Seun's request. This is a consensus decision of the ALAC. Is there anyone who wants to not participate in this consensus decision?

I understand, but I really would like to follow through and then, okay. Humberto, go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: This is Humberto Carrasco for the record. I have no right to vote because I'm not an ALAC member, but this document does effect the RALOs and the ALSs. So, in the understanding that this is a principle, and that it will be a document that will be continuously reviewed, and that we can give our input, from that perspective, it should be approved by consensus.

Now, if it is a document where we cannot have an interference, if I can vote, I would oppose.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. What I'm trying to achieve, and what Tijani, I think, was trying to say is, we don't want to reopen the discussion next week that only our representatives count, and we're not to expect anything of our members, and we don't have to send any

information out to our members. A position that has been put forward by people within this group before.

That's the general overall intent. Back to the consensus decision, is there anyone on the ALAC that does not feel that they want to participate in this discussion, or participate in the decision? Is there anyone who is opposed to proceeding in this general direction, as outlined by Tijani?

That is now a consensus decision of the ALAC, thank you.

Can we have the charter, the motion associated with the charter of the auction funds CCWG on the screen?

Okay. To quickly review the history, the gTLD program had a number of mechanisms to resolve contention. That is when different organizations applied for the same TLD. If, by the time it came close to delegation, there was still more than one applicant for the same string or strings that were deemed to be confusingly similar. There were a number of processes, including a private auction, negotiations between the individual parties, and any normal business process.

If none of those were taken, then an auction is held by ICANN, and the proceeds of that auction, less the costs of running the auction and the auction process, were put into a special fund. At this point, the fund has about 240 million, or $35 million in it, a

significant piece of change. Of that, 135 is for dot web, which is currently, I won't say being contested, there is some discussion on whether that process was held according to the rules or not.

So, that amount may or may not end up being in it. And I think there are still some other auctions that might come our way, but of course, until they happen, we don't know for sure. The original applicant guidebook had a footnote talking about how the auction funds would be used.

And, in short, said it would be used for good stuff for the internet, good things for users and for the internet community. Since then, we have revised the ICANN bylaws substantially, and tightened significantly the ability for ICANN to do anything, including give away money, outside of its mission.

So, the potential uses for this money are probably narrower than they were before, but we don't know to what extent they are narrow. A drafting team has come up with a charter. That drafting team included two people from each of the ACs and SOs that chose to participate. In our case, it was myself and Leon.

And we have a draft charter. The charter has gone out to the ACs and SOs for any comments. No substantive comments were received that would cause the wording to be changed. It's now going for approval of the ACs and SOs, who choose to become chartering members of the CCWG.

And it is before us in that light. The CCWG will not give out money, to make it clear. The CCWG is charged with setting up a process under which the money will ultimately be given out. The CCWG may choose to limit the ways in which that money could be dispersed, or may choose not to limit it, in which case, the ICANN mission limits it, and the interpretation of the mission.

That will be a discussion for the CCWG. According to the charter, the CCWG will have up to five members from each chartering AC and SO. Each chartering AC and SO may also name a chair.

I would like to suggest, as a chair, but we could choose to not name the chair today, but I would like to suggest as a possible chair, Evan Leibovitch. Evan is a long time member of At-Large. He was an ALAC member for a number of years. He was the chair of NARALO for a number of years. Is very well, very knowledgeable of ICANN.

The kinds of things that we are talking about, auction money and doing, are also very near to his heart, in that he's been working for the last two years, I think, for the UN Commission on Refugees. His term is up at the end of this year, and has expressed an interest in returning to ICANN in a more active way.

A co-chair's position is interesting in that it cannot be credible and advocate for outcomes. So, Leon had been, I think, a very

able co-chair of the CCWG, but because he was a co-chair, we lost one of our voices on the group. We only had four people effectively speaking on the group instead of five. I'm suggesting we identify someone as our co-chair, who is willing to be silent and just be a responsible co-chair.

Evan has indicated he is interested in that. So, we are looking for two things today. First of all, is there general agreement that we should name a co-chair today. We don't have to. And if so, that co-chair be Evan. If there is any level of discomfort with naming that individual today, then we can change the wording of the motion very slightly, and simply say we will name a co-chair, but not name the person today.

…the floor for any discussions.

I will try to manage the queue until we, unless we have someone else doing it, but we'll start with Judith and Seun.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. I'm a little confused in why we're naming a co-chair now, because things could change. I think once we… I think we can [inaudible] and say we'll name one later, and then once we can have a vote on it, or we can see what happens. I think ending it prematurely is a bit much.

I would prefer just to say that we will name a co-chair later.

'

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, if we do it later, it should still be before the working group is convened.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, I… But the problem is, is that I feel that, while I think Evan would be a good person to do it, I would rather we wait, either… We could always put a co-chair in later, I think. I would still rather wait until we go through a full process. And also he has returned and is able to assume a more active role.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just in terms of process, we are obliged to identify now whether we will name a co-chair or not, and if we are going to name a co-chair, it should be prior to, or very soon after, the process is started. That's number one. So, we can come back three months from now. It will come up at the next ALAC meeting, in other words. We can't defer it much.

That's number one. Number two, it would be unfair to not know who our co-chair is before we solicit members, because someone who is interested in being a co-chair, whether it's Evan or someone else, should know whether they should apply as a

member or not, because we don't want to disadvantage the person of, they don't apply as a member, but they're not the co-chair either, or they're both, which disadvantages us again, in that we have one fewer person.

So, it's going to come up very soon. I'm asking the question of the group, we've heard Judith saying she would prefer not to name someone right now. We have Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you very much. This is Seun for the record. I think the first thing needed to do was to actually, whether we want to… I don't know how you're going to do it, Mr. Chair, you're going to do this separately? The approval of the charter? Or everything is going to go by one motion? As currently presented. I think we need to approve the charter, before we go to naming co-chair so on and so forth.

But, in terms of the co-chair naming, I thought we had this selection committee. Why isn't that going to be applicable in this particular case? And then the other thing I wanted to ask as a question, did the co-chair, is it a separate position, aside the five members that will nominate? Or it's still going to be a member of the five?

And you suggesting Evan, has Evan written you an express, a formal request, or a formal EOI saying that he is interested in this particular position? Or are you just suggesting it without consulting him? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. You proposed, you asked two questions. The first one, should we have a co-chair? Yes, my answer is yes. Should we nominate him now? My response is no, because we have, and Seun read my mind. We had a formal process of selection. We have to make use of it, even if it is in short-term, we can make a process of selection by very, how to say? Expedite way.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, I agree with Tijani as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: One speaker at a time, please. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I would like to suggest that we call for candidates for participate in this group, and at the same time, we ask them to declare if they are willing to run, to be co-chair on behalf of ALAC, with substantive elements you put in this document about the behavior, and what they have to do, and how they have to the time they have to do that.

And with that, whatever committee, the selection committee, or the ALAC, or whatever, make a decision. But I feel, I will feel more comfortable if we can have that [inaudible] candidate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Judith.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. I have nothing, it's nothing against, personally against Evan, and your proposal. It could be a very good co-chair, but I think we need to have some process here to follow. I'm sorry for that, Evan.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. And I agree with everyone. That's what I was saying is that, yes, we should have a co-chair. But yes, I really think we have to use our committee,

and I would like to see it open and transparent, and everyone who wants to have a call for nominations, people submit their nominations, a statement of interest, and EOI, other people look at it.

The selection committee interviews and reviews and decides a rating on what type of, who they think they will nominate. And then that person will be. It may turn out to be Evan, but without that whole process, I think what we are jumping the gun is wrong.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else want to speak? Seun asked the question of whether we have two motions or one. I must admit, I presumed that the ALAC was going to participate as a chartering organization. Does anyone here feel that that was an incorrect assumption?

Okay, thank you. Can we…? Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. This is Seun for the record. I'm not saying that… I'm just saying that formally, we need to approve it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course, that's what we're going to do. I just wanted to make sure there was no one who disagreed with the concept to begin with. Can we scroll down to the resolves?

That's sufficient. The second one is, and I will read it, the ALAC appoints name, as the ALAC appointed co-chair. This seems to be an extra word to at the end. I presume that should mean to the CCWG. I propose that we replace that clause, with the ALAC intends to name a co-chair to the CCWG auctions.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak to this motion before we have a decision?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Excuse me, Alan. You didn't answer the dot [inaudible] question, about whether the chair position, is it different?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you ask different people, the answers are different. Because if you look at the examples we have had to date, in the two CCWGs, the GNSO co-chair is a fifth person. Is that the fifth member? Or a co-chair? Well, you can't tell the difference, actually.

I don't actually know what happened with the CCWG, and we'd have to check. The wording in the charter, the two sections are

completely separate. That is, in one section, it says we may name up to five members, capital M. Somewhere else, it says, each chartering organization may choose to name a co-chair.

I am choosing to interpret that as they are completely separate and not connected. Now, that does imply that should there be any travel associated with the CCWG, which there might not be, there could be five slots which would have to be funded, unless of course, we say co-chairs can't come to the meeting. There is a number of stories in the world, which all could be summarized, which with, it's better to ask forgiveness than ask permission.

I have chosen not to formally ask ICANN management which interpretation is correct. I think we are on strong ground of saying the two options that we have are completely separate, and choosing to interpret it that way. Should we be stared at and told we're wrong, we will take action at that point. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, with the experience of the CCWG accountability, and you were on the chartering team of this CCWG, why didn't you make it clear that the five members include or doesn't include the co-chair?

ALAN GREENBERG:	We chose, and remember, I was on the group but I was not the king, even though I was vice-chair of the group. We chose to follow the overall guidelines of the then unapproved CCWG on CCWGs. And it chose to keep them as separate items, and we just followed their template for the charter.

Any further discussion?

I'd like a consensus decision on the charter, as amended, that is replacing the resolve number two with the intention to name a co-chair as opposed to naming a co-chair, with the understanding that has to be done…

I don't know who is calling.

Where was I? I lost track. Is there anyone who chooses to abstain from this decision? Is there any who chooses to object? It has been adopted unanimously by consensus. Thank you.

We are seven and a half minutes past our deadline. I understand, but I'm allowed to finish the sentence I started before he raised the card. When and where do we reconvene? I understand the housekeeping, if you could just answer the question.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Gisella for the record. We reconvene for wrap-up session three at 15:15. And yes, I was going to announce that in the housekeeping. Just while I've got the microphone then, if everyone could also please be here, we actually have Göran Marby, Steve Crocker, and David Olive as guests, and we also have David Conrad for an update on the DNSSEC key [inaudible].

David Olive, Steve Crocker, and Göran Marby will be at wrap-up three here at 3:15 in hall one. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In between, we have a NARALO and a LACRALO meeting, which I presume a fair number of people will be attending.

Fine. Thank you very much for working on this session. I'll turn it over to Gisella for wrap-up, and please, the…

In a moment. One day I would like to finish a whole sentence. The session with our guests is a very tightly packed session, and each one of the sections always runs over. So please, let us start on time. Thank you. Olivier has something to do, then I'll turn it over to Gisella.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking for the transcript. And I'm going to make you ever so happy for your wrap-up three session. In ALAC decisions to be taken, there is one decision that needs to be added there, which is the review of the charter of the cross community working group on internet governance.

The other supporting organizations and advisory committees have performed the review, and the ALAC would have to, according to the charter here, decide the following. At each ICANN annual general meeting, starting 2014, the charter and deliverables of the working group shall be reviewed by the participating SOs and ACs to determine whether the working group should continue, or closed and be dissolved consistent with ICANN community practices.

The working group will continue if at least two of the participating SOs and ACs extend the charter of the working group, and notify the other parties participating SOs and ACs accordingly one month after the annual review date. So, my recommendation, I guess, as a co-chair of the working group on behalf of the ALAC, would be to continue its operation.

My understanding is the other supporting organizations and advisory committees, are likely to recommend that the charter be tightened. So, some work being done on that. We will only

find out when the actual meeting of these other supporting organizations and advisory committees takes place. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We do have an item on decisions in the next meeting. So, we have a slot for it, if we can make sure to preserve the time. If anyone in this group, and particularly current ALAC members, have a reason to believe they would vote against continuance of these CCWG, please make yourself known to Olivier or me in the period between now and then. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Oliver. Gisella for the transcript. We're going to keep this brief….

ALAN GREENBERG: Hold it. I'm told we didn't finish.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond again. I'm sorry to be delaying the closure of this meeting, but I do recall that there was a statement on Middle East strategy which was drafted by a couple of your constituency community

members, and the aim, if I recall correctly, just from memory, is that they should be ratified here.

So, I just wonder whether you've tabled that in your future wrap-up as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: When is the deadline for submitting that?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel for the record. And the deadline is November the 17th.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If we can do it in the time allotted, we will. If anyone feels uncomfortable with it, we'll do it after this meeting. Thank you.

I think it's now you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. Very briefly, just a reminder, the interpreters are on an extremely tight schedule, so they now, 11 minutes after their lunch break, and I think we really need to take that into consideration. The next session in this room is the capacity building session for the APRALO at 12:45 to 13:45. A reminder

that we have LACRALO at 13:45 in this room. So, again, capacity building and LACRALO, we have a tight turnaround.

NARALO is at 13:45 in Granite. That is in the [inaudible] hall, just opposite the little café up the stairs. And as we said earlier on, please all be back at 15:15, that is 3:15 PM for our wrap-up session number three. There are also three HIT sessions. They're all on the main schedule this afternoon.

Briefly, Q&A with ICANN General Council on the legal advice that ICANN receives, and how that supports the ICANN mission, that is running at the same time as the wrap-up. So, for the ALAC members, I think you need to be at the wrap-up instead.

17:00, we have the HIT on underserved regions in ICANN. And at 18:30 we have the HIT on internet governance. And then this evening, for all of the ladies, we have the DNS women's cocktail out on the [inaudible] lawn. Thank you. And for the capacity building people, you can stay here. Thank you very much.

And thank you to the interpreters, and sorry for taking another minute.

And to tech for another 11 minutes out of your lives. Thank you for all of your help. And thank you Derrick.

EN

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]