
HYDERABAD – At-Large Leadership Working Session Part 1

Thursday, November 03, 2016 – 09:00 to 10:30 IST

ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

ALAN GREENBERG:

Can everyone please take their seat so we can begin? ALAC regional leaders around the table. If there are other seats, that's fine, but make sure that all of those do have seats and other specially invited guests. If our GNSO liaison can take his seat – if our GNSO liaison can listen to the Chair.

Thank you, if I can call this meeting to order and welcome you to Hyderabad. We have a few new people in the room, some of whom are known to us and some of whom aren't, and a few people who are missing for various reasons.

Incoming ALAC member Veronica from Moldova is not here. She had previously made a commitment to speak at – I don't remember, I think it's a World Bank conference – and could not be with us today. Javier, who is our new NomCom member from North America I believe he's not in the room yet but presumably will be here shortly.

We have Andre Kalashnikov – who is not a rifle – over there from Russia and Alberto Soto who had some travel problems and I believe he will be here later today. I'd like to turn the

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.

microphone for a moment over to staff for a bit of housekeeping, and then we'll come back to me.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You mean turn it over to Gisella.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're going to turn it over to – well, I think she meets that qualification.

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to Hyderabad. Just a few housekeeping for the day – and I know that you're all aware of this, just for the new ones who are maybe not used to having interpretation at all the meetings: at the At-Large meetings, we usually have a French and Spanish interpretation.

The booths are behind you, so if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for the transcript but also for the interpreters. They can't see your name tags, and it's actually literally every time you take the microphone to please say your name. They can then tell the people on the other language channel who's actually speaking.

It really helps to speak at a reasonable speed, to allow for accurate interpretation, and also, if you could – Alan, sorry, did you mention – [inaudible]

HEIDI ULLRICH: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have not yet. You were going to.

GISELLA GRUBER: Okay, I'm going to. Sorry. We do take attendance at the beginning of each session, so if for whatever reason you're not going to be attending the session, if you would be so kind as to e-mail staff, and that way, we can record your apologies. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A little bit more housekeeping: as Gisella said, we do take attendance. There's a large schedule, you've been given paper copies, there are electronic copies. I think – have they been given paper copies or not?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, it is on the Web. To be clear, because we always have some cases of people saying, “I didn't know I was supposed to be there,” if it is an At-Large leadership meeting, then we expect ALAC members, RALO leaders, liaisons, and other people who we have explicitly brought on ICANN funds to the meetings to be there and present.

If there is some reason, as Gisella said, please let us know. We do count. I'm going to be gone most of today because in ICANN's wisdom we have two major GNSO PDPs running, of which I'm a participant in both, so I will be here for a few minutes now. I will be gone for the rest of the morning until the very end of the morning and then most of the afternoon.

I will be replaced by – varyingly – the two Vice Chairs, León and Tijani, and Olivier for a number of things related to the GNSO, and I have told both León and Tijani to the extent that they need a break, they may call upon other people to chair. So it's going to be a little bit different than normal.

In terms of participation within the group, there's been an ongoing problem of speaker lists, and certainly when I'm chairing, I don't always notice things. I think we're going to try something different, and again, it's at the discretion of each Chair to do it, but when I'm chairing, I'm going to ask someone

to be sitting beside me keeping track of the speaker list. Then, at least when we miss you, there's someone else I can blame. But hopefully, it'll be done a little bit better than right now. We'll see if that works at all.

Standard rules apply. Please be brief, listen to what other people say, don't repeat it just because you agree. You can say, "I support it," you don't have to say the same words again. And we will ask people to be brief, we will start using timers and clocks if necessary, but it's nicer if we don't have to. But if people start going on, then we will start using the clock.

I'm trying to think what else have I missed. Maureen, can I call upon you for one minute to tell us about a new initiative we have going right now and maybe make an introduction or two?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes, I'd like to do that. Thank you, Alan. Okay, good morning everyone. I would like to just very quickly introduce you to April Tinhorn, who is the tribal ambassador from Arizona, and we have another ambassador arriving. She's just touched down, so she'll be arriving later on, and I'll introduce her, but yes, we've adopted her. We've adopted April into APRALO, so she'll never want to go back to NARALO again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the other tribal ambassador is named...?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, Valerie Fast Horse is the other, and I will introduce her when she arrives.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Before I run off to the GNSO room, are there any other housekeeping issues that you would like to address or questions about this overall meeting?

We have a very packed meeting. It's quite curious, this is the longest ICANN meeting ever held. It is seven full days officially, but because of how the days are allocated, it's probably the shortest week we've had in a long time in terms of how we are using our time and what we're competing against.

The meeting was scheduled very late. We were still moving sessions around as late as yesterday, I think, so the meeting is a bit in flux. We will try to keep you up to date if we have to make changes as we go forward, and there may well be some new changes that have to be made. But it's a busy meeting, it's going to be really important that we start on time.

We have a history of not actually getting going for 15 minutes after the start of the meeting. We managed to match that for this

meeting, but in the future, we will do our best to start meetings even if everyone is not here, but it's really important that people be here. So coffee breaks and lunch periods and mornings, please try to arrive on time.

It always takes a bit longer with the busing situation here. I understand there are some things that are out of your control, but do your best to try to do it. We have a lot to accomplish. There are a lot of things going on within ICANN right now, and it's really important that everyone within this group, within the At-Large leadership group, understand the issues and are in a position to both participate themselves and encourage other people within the group to participate.

I sent out a number of documents in the last 12 or 24 hours that will be discussed. If you have briefing documents about things before a meeting, please try to read them so we don't have to spend the whole meeting reviewing what was already said in writing. Other than that, I'm going to turn the meeting over to – I think Olivier is the first one up, is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

No, León.

ALAN GREENBERG: León, and I wish you a good meeting for the rest of the day. I will be dropping in periodically, but have fun.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan, and I see two people with hands raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, they were hands that I missed, of course. Who were the people with hands?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Sébastien and Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien and Olivier. Olivier first, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Olivier was going to alert you that Sébastien had put his hand up, hence it's just one hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and Sébastien – for those who haven't heard – was in a rather rough bus ride today and is not in the greatest of shape, but he's not following doctor's advice to either go back to his

room or go to a hospital, and he's with us at the back of the room. Sébastien, the floor is yours.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. First in English, and just to ask one question, you were talking about running the queue. Do you want us to use Adobe Connect, and that means that you need to ask all of us to be in Adobe Connect to run the queue or not? That's your question, and then I will turn into French for the second point I want to make.

I would like to mention that when Gisella said that there is interpretation into French and into Spanish, it is obvious that there is also interpretation into English, which means that you can actually speak in French or in Spanish. It will be translated into the other two languages, including into English. There are three languages, and it goes every which way. There is not one language that has priority over another. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I presume you all had your headsets on, so you all understood that. Okay. The acoustics in this room are not great, so you may want to use your headsets just to hear, even if the person is speaking in the correct language. But we will be using the

interpretation and keep your headsets around, so don't be surprised when someone speaks.

It would be nice if people don't have to say, "I am going to speak in Spanish," and then give people three minutes to find their headsets. That's not a really good use of time. Thank you very much. Have a good day. I'll see you periodically. León, it's all yours.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. Our next agenda item is to actually do a brief review of what we're going to do throughout the week. For that, I would like staff to please show us the overall agenda. I believe that the ones who are in the room have already taken a look at that, but I'm not sure if those who are participating remotely are able to actually have a look at the overall agenda that is being projected in this room's screen.

On Thursday, November 3, we will be having four At-Large leadership working sessions, and we will also be having one At-Large review working party session. No, I apologize, it was six At-Large leadership working sessions, a coordination meeting of schools of Internet governance, and – no, my apologies again.

This flu has me a little bit out of my normal concentration. It's four sessions of the At-Large leadership working, and as I said,

the At-Large review working party. And of course, through these many sessions, it is important that we address some points like, for example, the Work Stream 2 subgroups. We will be talking more about the Work Stream 2 subgroups on our session tomorrow, I believe.

But for those who are not familiar with what we've been doing in the CCWG on Accountability, a fast update is that the Work Stream 2, which is the second phase of the work that has been undertaken in order to carry out the IANA Stewardship Transition as far as enhancing accountability and transparency [inaudible] has begun already.

It was kicked off in our meeting in Helsinki. Throughout these last months, each of the subgroups has held many meetings already on the different topics, which I repeat, we will be going through tomorrow. I won't get into details at this point, but tomorrow, you will have more details. It would be, of course, good for you to get familiar with the topics of the Work Stream 2, so tomorrow, we can have a more fruitful discussion.

There is a wiki page for the Work Stream 2 subgroups. I will kindly ask staff to post the link to the Work Stream 2 wiki page so you can all get familiar with the different subgroups and, of course, prepare your questions for our session tomorrow.

Then, we have also the At-Large review. I think this is a topic that, of course, concerns us all in this room and in the wider At-Large community. We are undergoing a review of the At-Large community, and for this we have received in the previous months a survey that has been answered already by many people. I believe that we still have some more time to answer to the questions in that survey, so I would kindly encourage all of those who haven't already filled in this survey to take a look at it, and of course, fill in your answers to that review as this is, of course, crucial in order to have a better outcome on this review.

That is also one of the goals that we would be trying to achieve throughout this meeting to better help those who are carrying out the review to actually produce a good outcome from this review.

Another topic that is, of course, important for this At-Large community is the ALS expectations. We have circulated, we have discussed ALS criteria and expectations for the last previous months, and it would be great if we could come to conclusions on the ALS expectations.

And this refers, of course, to the work that the heart of the At-Large community must carry out in their respective communities. This is the ALSes that form the At-Large

community are expected to actually do some work on behalf of the users, because that is what we're here for.

We will be reviewing these ALS expectations, and of course, it would be best if we could achieve consensus on how we are going to actually ask out ALSes to cover these expectations. So, at this point, this is a very quick review of what the main goals should be.

We will be having, as I said, during this day, four sessions, and we will be also listening to the BCEC, the BMSPC, which are undertaking the process of selecting our Board members, the 15th seat in the Board, which is for the ALAC representative. These two teams are in charge of running this process, so we will be hearing from them. We will be having an update on where we're standing on that process, and of course, next steps.

Then, we will be having a discussion where we will be welcoming Xavier Calvez for an update and next steps on fiscal year 18 budget, and we'll be hearing, of course, from our Vice Chair, Tijani Ben Jemaa on this issue as well, and we will also be reviewing some specifics on the affirmation of commitments update.

Then, we'll have a lunch break, and then we will be coming back. As Alan said before, we would kindly appreciate if we could be in

time for all of the sessions that we have throughout the day, and after that, we will have an At-Large review working party –

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible]

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes, of course, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, León. Hi everyone, welcome. Just to let to know that for the lunch today, there will be a meeting of the At-Large review working party. There will be lunch served, it's a buffet in this room, and the ALAC members and the RALO Chairs and secretaries are invited to stay and eat their lunch here as well, but we ask that priority at the table be given to the members of the working party. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you for that, Heidi, and whilst I was saying we will be having an At-Large review working party session, which, of course, will be related to the review that is being undertaken. Then, afterwards, we will have our third session in the day, and this will have an update on the At-Large review, provided by Holly Raiche, and we will be welcoming our friends from the

Global Stakeholder Engagement and Development and Responsibility department.

Sally Costerton will be with us as well as her team, I believe. This is always a good discussion with them. They are good friends of the At-Large community, so it will be quite nice to receive them here. Then, we have our next session, which is session four, and for this, we will be having some working group updates.

We will have the capacity building, the technology taskforce, and the usual suspects reporting on any updates that they might have. We will be also speaking about a subject that might seem thorny to some, that is the revitalization of working groups.

We have had some working groups that have been standing by for too long. They are alive, of course, and we want them to keep alive, but the truth is that there hasn't been so many activity in them. That is something that, of course, could vary because of the needs of the community itself, but that also may cause some confusion to those people who are approaching to the At-Large community for the first time, and when they see that there is a group whose last wiki post or last activity is from three or four years ago, well, they might be discouraged to actually provide any inputs to those kinds of groups. I think it's healthy that we speak about either revitalizing or archiving some of these groups

in order to better provide our mission to the At-Large community.

Then, we will be having an IANA Stewardship Transition update, which will be quite short. The transition has been made, so that's all we need to know. Then, we'll be having a preview of the ALS database that will be provided by Ariel Liang and Nathalie Peregrine. Afterwards, we will be having the ATLAS II implementation update on the recommendations by Olivier, and lastly but not least, the housekeeping items by our kind staff.

That is an overview of what we will be doing today, and of course, we have a full agenda as Alan said. I wouldn't like to go through each of the days' agenda because I don't think that actually adds a lot of value to our session, but I would say that there are, of course, some points to be highlighted throughout the different sessions during the week.

For example, we have the CCWG on Accountability Work Stream update and next steps, part 1, which is tomorrow. We have the ALS expectations and the ALAC response to both questions, which is also tomorrow. Then we have the CCT RT update and next steps by Kaili Kan and Carlton Samuels and the discussion with the SSAC, for which we will be hosting Patrik Fältström with us here. Afterwards, we will be, of course, talking about outreach and cooperation and a database comparison between ALS and

ccNSO members. We will conclude the day speaking more about Work Stream 2 activities.

This is going to be on Saturday. Saturday, we have the opening ceremony, which, of course, is always good to be at. The first high interest topic on how to outreach within each SO and AC. And I think that this is a good time to hear from Satish on how they have managed to actually come to do outreach in the APRALO region.

I think, Satish, if you could speak a little bit to us on what is the role, of course, of APRALO now that you are hosting the meeting in your region and what will be the expectations and a little bit of what you've done to make this happen.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, León. First of all, a very warm welcome to India and to Hyderabad. The APRALO leadership team has been working for several weeks on the different programs that we are organizing here. The first program that we have is the APRALO showcase, which is scheduled for Sunday.

The showcase is basically a networking event with the rest of civil society entities within ICANN: NCUC, NCSG, NPOC, and so on. We hope to be able to provide an evening's networking

opportunity for all of you, not only the At-Large community but also the community of ICANN dealing with civil society.

It will also feature a little bit of music and a little bit of food. This is also the festival season in India right now. We just had a festival called Diwali, which will get reflected in maybe the snacks or the lighting ambiance in the showcase.

We are then having several outreach programs with the universities around Hyderabad, which is well known for its educational activities. The last three days, we had the first India School of Internet Governance, where some of the ALAC members as well as members from other parts of ICANN participated.

It was a very successful program, it had 44 participants, of which 15 were international participants, and overall, it turned out pretty well, even better than we expected. So that's over now in the last few days, and then today, we have an outreach program in the Indian Institute of Technology, where some of us are going for that.

That is actually a very well-known premier institution in India. We are going to talk about ICANN and the technology aspects, including things like IDNs there at the university.

Tomorrow afternoon, we have again an outreach program which will be held here in the convention center. We'll be getting a bunch of students from different institutions, particularly the IIT, the IIIT, which is the International Institute of Information Technology, which is another institution which is also incidentally the venue for the India School of Internet Governance. They're also joining us. Several of us from this group will be speaking at the outreach sessions tomorrow.

These are basically the programs that we have planned out, basically for outreach to the local communities here and also the internal communities, the [inreach] or the showcase kind of a thing.

I would like to, on behalf of APRALO and my colleagues on the leadership team, invite all of you to these activities. If there is anything that we can do for you, any help in getting around or whatever it is, please let me know and we'll be happy to help out in any way we can. Thank you so much.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Satish, and thank you for hosting us here to the APRALO leadership and region, of course. It is a pleasure to be here with you in your region. As you know, we have a new structure of meetings, and this is the first in its type. I believe it's a type C, right? It's a session C?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, officially, it's the annual general meeting. I think the terms of A, B and C will be going away, and we'll be –

LEÓN SANCHEZ: We'll leave that in the past.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We'll leave it in the past.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay, so we have a new general assembly structure, and for that, I would like Heidi to tell us a little bit more about it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, León. Basically, again, this is the annual general meeting. It is the longest of the three meetings. What I actually wanted to speak to you about is just the new agenda format that we have for the At-Large meetings. There is, as you see on the screen, what we call the one stop shop, where all of the meetings are there.

But what I've just put into the Adobe Connect room, the link to today's sessions, and you will notice – for those of you who have

been to ICANN meetings before – that the agenda looks a little bit different now.

We have the three languages – English, French and Spanish – but what we have done in the English is that we have added more information in terms of who's going to be the moderator for the sessions, who the staff will be leading the sessions and what their responsibilities are. These are the staff here. And then we've also added a column for the objective and additional information, so you can get a better sense of what that particular session's aim is.

What we also have done, and what will be filled out as you do your work and it will be filled out as we go along through the week, is the outcome and next steps. We just thought that that would be a way for you to get more engagement into the session and have a better understanding of what each session has accomplished and what the next steps are.

In terms of next steps, we've also agreed with the leadership is the action items, they will be stated very concisely and stating a person's name who is responsible and a date where the completion should be noted.

Staff will be asking the Chair of that session to ensure that those action items are stated in that format just so, again, when we return back to our homes, we understand what those action

items and what the next steps are. That's what I wanted to say about the new format.

Again, you'll see on each of these agenda pages the tabs for English and French are at the top of the page, so you can just switch to that if you need that. Thank you very much.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Heidi. Very useful information as usual. At this point, I think that we have given a brief review of the agenda for our activities throughout the week. We do have some more agenda items for this session, so I would like to turn the microphone to my colleague Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the next agenda item, which is the new gTLDs update and next steps. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, León. I guess this session has now given us nearly 45 minutes to discuss topics of policy. I know that in previous meetings, there have been complaints that we never have enough time to discuss policy. The new gTLD process is one of those items of policy that has been ongoing for quite a few years through the launch of the current round of new generic top level domains, over 1,400 of them being released into the wild, to the starting discussions – well, discussions that have

started a while ago actually – on the new subsequent round, the potential for subsequent rounds.

Just as a sort of rundown on where we are today, my understanding is that most of the new gTLDs of this round have been launched. There are still some which are somehow stuck in specific positions. Some of them are still objected to and so are on this list and have not really moved much forward.

There's very little information that we have on those. I'm aware personally of a couple where negotiations are still taking place between ICANN and the applicant. Some applications have been accepted and then rejected and things.

But anyway, these are sort of isolated cases. But for the most of them, they have been all queued up. In fact, some of the applicants have been given the green light to launch their new gTLD, generic top level domain – and by the way, maybe now is the time as we start the day to remind you that there is a tool, I believe, on the ICANN website which will allow you to type in any type of acronym.

The acronym soup is a very deep well in this part of the world, so there is a tool that you can use to change the acronym into the actual name of the thing, and we're going to be using a lot of acronyms today. We try not to, but we still fall into this.

Yes, the current round, there are still some applicants that have applied that have been given the green light to launch that have not launched for reasons that are their own. One has to remember that the major part of costs of this new gTLD process in most cases is marketing.

You have to sell your domain name out there, and registries don't sell their domain names directly. They have to go through registrars, so there's a whole host of agreements, etc., that the holder of a top level domain need to go through before offering it out there.

I'm not quite sure what the status is with regards to those domain names that are geographical in nature. I know that a number of them have been launched, have done quite well. Others are in various stages of development. But really, looking at the current round as far as we're concerned, we don't really have direct work to do except to take part in the review of the current round. This is what I hope we're going to be able to discuss around this table until 10:30.

We're talking reviews. There are two current processes dealing with the topic itself. There are two main ones, and in fact, there's one minor one on the side, which we'll be touching on as well. Let me just quickly let you know what the different processes are.

First, there is the Consumer Trust and Consumer Confidence Review Team, the CCT RT. That's an affirmation of commitment mandated review of the launch of the new gTLDs. We have two people who are on this committee. It's a small committee of people with members of various parts of ICANN. Our two members on this committee are Carlton Samuels and Kaili Kan.

You will look around the table and find that neither of them are here, and that's due to the wonderful scheduling of the work of the CCT RT taking place today, at this very moment. They're spending the full day to try and move forward some of their work.

They have expressed already some of their thoughts on the mailing lists. You will have read this in the past few weeks. As León said earlier, they will be coming to speak to us later on this week so that you will be able to have the latest news of what's been happening today here in Hyderabad, but the idea really is for us to kick around a few thoughts as to what we want to tell them tomorrow.

I think it is tomorrow that we're seeing Kaili and Carlton, or when we see them, because we will not have a full hour with them. We'll have slightly shorter time. So first, perhaps, an update on where we are. That was the first thing.

The second process is the policy development process – commonly known as PDP – on the subsequent procedures and new gTLD subsequent procedures. That’s a Generic Name Supporting Organization, a GNSO working group, which is open for everyone to take part in.

We have a few people in the room, I see one shaking her head, probably in that working group. I would imagine that she is. It's too tempting to pass on that one. That working group is led by, I believe – oh, yes, sorry, the CCT RT is led by Jonathan Zuck, who is from the GNSO, and the next subsequent round PDP is led by Avri Doria. We know also Avri pretty well.

Okay, right. Sorry, that was just a little note. We basically have a number of people who are also following the subsequent round working group. The current status of it is that they're pushing forward. That is the working group that will decide on whether there should be a subsequent round and that will address all of the points which have been pointed out by the CCT RT, plus all of the other points which have been identified so far. In a moment, we'll go very quickly through the way that a PDP works because I think it's something that we also need to know if we want to be involved in policy.

The third thing that is taking place at the same time is another project which looks at the – I think it is called the metrics, or

some kind of metrics that are being developed to track the success of the competition, the growth in competition, and the growth in choice in new gTLDs.

There was recently a public comment period that had been opened for us to comment on. A couple of us, I think, are on that working group. It is meeting here in Hyderabad as well. It's just looking at the metrics to find out if there are better ways to measure things.

Do we need further surveys and so on? You can make nice pie charts of, "Has competition increase? Has consumer choice increased? Has consumer confidence increased?" etc. That's the sort of more technically minded group. There are not many people on that.

If you are interested, then please come to me and I'll point you to the right people to be able to subscribe to this. It doesn't have any power of decision, but as you know, often it really is what you track that determines what your answer is in some cases, so it's really important that we track as much as we can.

Let's start first with the CCT RT, the review. Kaili Kan has sent two notes to the – well, he's sent weekly notes to the mailing list. I just looked at the last two that he sent to us just a few days ago. The 21st conference call happened on the 20th of October.

It further discussed preliminary findings on basic market share, industry structure, benefits versus confusion to end users, concentration ratios. It also discussed an overview of amendments on the registry policies, the brand top level domains, the registrar composition, the competition with the registries because these days some registries have the ability to also have their own registrars allocated with them, and price analysis.

They also looked at a number of papers that they're putting together at the moment and there was discussed high level meeting on the competition and choice sub stream. So they also have a competition and choice sub stream. They also work with sub streams in their group.

They discussed the overview of consumer safeguard and trust papers. What is the level of consumer awareness of the new gTLDs? I think we might have a few words to say about this here. Has the consumer trust in DNS improved overall since the introduction of the new gTLDs, and has the new gTLD program put mechanisms in place to improve trustworthiness in the DNS?

That was the penultimate meeting. Then the last one was the one on the 26th of October, and it reviewed the competition and consumer choice high level findings, reviewed safeguards and consumer trust high level findings, reviewed application and

evaluation findings, discussed any topics on the road to Hyderabad, and they reviewed the suggested agenda and program for Hyderabad. So they basically prepared for the meeting here, and we'll know a lot more about it when we meet.

At this point, I'd like to open the floor to see if there are any questions or any comments on the work that they're doing. You've all read the concerns that have been expressed by Kaili and by Carlton. One of the concerns that they have expressed is that they believe maybe the scope of the CCT RT might be somehow restricted in a way that would make the overall review look good – or should we say look better – than what the actual situation is.

This is very important, because obviously, yes, when you have a more narrow scope, you can pick the things that look better and you can put to the side the ones that might be a little bit more controversial in their ways.

The work of this review team feeds into the PDP, and therefore, there is a lot of pressure for this review team to complete its work sooner rather than later, since the PDP will then have to address the findings of the CCT. Have I lost you now? Not yet. Okay, let's try and get worse then. Let's get more acronyms in there.

Cheryl, I'll need your help to add more acronyms to this, please. But okay, I see Barrack wants to jump into the pool and Tijani as well. Sorry, I was reading the e-mail. Let me start then with Tijani, because I know that he was already waving a bit earlier, and then Barrack. If you keep your card up, thank you. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I used Adobe Connect as advised by Sébastien because I think that it is the best way. We will have the order of the queue, and we will not miss anyone. So, Olivier, you made more or less a summary of what is going on now about the new gTLDs. A lot of things, all together and at the same time.

I think that you said something that I don't agree with. You said that the working group will decide. The working group cannot decide. They propose something that will go to the public comments and then go to the Board. But their work is very important.

As you said, we have to [influence] it by being there, by participating, and as you know, there is a lot of pressure from the registries and registrars for opening a new round or an open round. Our position as end users was always to wait for the end of the reviews.

All this work which is going on now should be finished before we decide whether we have to open a new round or not. I think that our participation should be better. I agree with you. The working group is very important, but the participation also and the metrics which is now going on should be better from our side. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Tijani. Tijani, you disagreed with the fact that the working group would make the decision. Yes, of course, they would make proposals that would go for public comment. Then they go back, they write further proposals. But it is a policy development process working group, so it is there that the policy will be made.

Then, of course, the GNSO will be voting on it. If it votes on it and decides to pass it on to the Board, then it lands on the Board's lap. And you will have noticed recently the amount of noise as to the Board not following the PDP process, so it really is a case of a lot of pressure.

We have to get involved sooner rather than later, and that's the place to get involved in. Next is Sébastien Bachollet, and then I'll come to you, Barrack. Sébastien, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. What Tijani just said and this request for us to enhance our participation, to have more end users participate and feed into all these processes is, of course, paramount, but what matters is knowing who will have this power. If there are only a few who have to do all the work, they won't have enough time to do everything there is to do.

Now, I'd like to stress the fact that if you are not up-to-date on this matter but if you're interested in the subject all the same, I'm sure we can find a way to give you all the necessary information to put you up-to-date, and that would be a good way to invest your time.

I would like to know what the five main points of interest to end users, what the five points they would like to defend in the system are. Because, of course, we can follow different tracks. One of the tracks we're following right now is saying, "Well, the different companies that submit applications for extensions with their names should perhaps have them granted. Why not?" But we should consider what we, end users, need. That's what matters to us.

What have we asked for in the prior different proposals to have new rounds? There are three main topics, three main points of interest that didn't take place. Firstly, I think we should need to have applications in all regions. That was not the case in the

past. There are some regions that are underserved. I'm not going to deal with the reasons for that here today, but we should consider what we're doing for those regions in order to ensure that they're better served.

Secondly, we did everything that we could for the extensions that were applied for by communities not to be possible for them not to be granted to others. And when you read some people's comments, they say, "Well, I participated at that application series because I knew that there would be a competition later on and I didn't want someone else to get the name before me." So how can we make sure true communities can get their extensions without having to face the competition of others who have more funds?

And then the third topic of interest which I think would be useful and important to us end users is to consider what we're doing for geographic extensions, for geographic names, because those names are of interest to our communities. They serve our local communities, and that's what would be important to us.

They should then be more open than they were in the past, and they shouldn't have to face the same competition by more powerful players. So I think rather than following everything that's being done, we should first define what the main topics of

interest for us are, where our different representatives should focus on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Barrack Otieno now.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, León. I just wanted to weigh in with a few comments from some experiences I had this year. I conducted a training for a number of resellers and registrars in Nairobi, Kenya, and I realized that for about 60 participants in the room, less than three were actually exposed to the ICANN process or they could actually understand what ICANN is.

The interesting thing is that quite a number of major resellers were in the room, and the fact that they did not understand ICANN made me question what are they selling if they don't understand the ecosystem or the environment?

It led me to a conclusion that we probably need to encourage through our ALS networks more dissemination on information pertaining to ICANN because unless the resellers understand the ICANN ecosystem, then they really cannot sell the product and we'll have problems with the new gTLD program.

It would be worth reviewing the impact of the current process before we embark on the next round of new gTLDs, especially insofar as the understanding of the community is on this program. That's what I wanted to raise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Barrack. The reason why we're having this discussion here, actually, is to also add to any questions that we might have to the Board when we meet them later on this week. There might be points that we wish to specifically emphasize. I see Sébastien has listed three points.

I was going to ask, since we have so many – well, we're all around the table – if we could perhaps have a straw poll on the issues that came on the table because we haven't had a chance to have a straw poll on this, how we feel about this.

The first one, which was, I think, the most blatant and that we had for many years already pointed out was the lack of engagement from some of the regions. With very few applications coming from at least two of the regions – the African region and the Latin American region – compared to the other regions.

There are calls by some to say, "Well, the next round should be exclusively about those regions." I wondered how we feel about

this. Do we support this? Do we support that the next round should be exclusively about those regions, or do we support something else saying that the next round should perhaps promote those regions but not be exclusively about those regions?

Or should we, type C, say, "Wait a minute, we don't want a next round"? I know that there are also some in our community who don't want a round at all. So that's the thing. Vanda Scartezini, you're next in the queue, and then I'll continue through the queue as it goes. Vanda, you have the floor.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yes, thank you. What we've seen in our region – and I have been involved in the new gTLDs since the first round – is two important points: one is the lack of knowledge around. That is not new, but one thing that we are focused on now is mostly when the new string that is already in place is working out there, there is a lot of problems with the registrars.

I haven't seen other discussions, even in our groups. I have sent some e-mails for the GNSO subsequent procedures. The registrars have a lot of problems when we are dealing with the strings that are focused on communities. Why? The issue is the community strings needs to have some demands from the applicant, from the users in general, to identify themselves as

members of that community itself. This means that in the registrar process they will need to interrupt the automatic process, and nobody wants to do that.

Most of community applicants are facing this kind of challenge. This is something that not only for the future rounds. We need to figure out how to make it happen, but we need to solve this before we go to the next round because there are a lot of new gTLDs over there, and people cannot really apply because the registrars are not interested in serving that community because we will have cost on that. That is the reality.

One solution that I had the opportunity to discuss inside the former Board members and Board members [last] meeting was maybe community registries must have the opportunity to be their own registrars. There are a lot of things that we need to focus because it's exactly community groups that are in prejudice here. That's my [first.]

I have been involved in making a survey around my region and, because it's an unserved region due the lack of information and lack of promotion of first round, everyone but one that I have contacted directly and interviewed in my region are quite interested in having their names or having a new string for them.

So we need to balance those situations. It's obvious in Africa and Latin America, there is a lack of participation, there is a lack of

knowledge, a lack of information, no promotion around, so there are a lot of things that we need to fix before we go further. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Vanda. We have a long queue now. I've got, in order, Seun, Tijani, León, Sandra, and Sébastien. Let's go for Seun Ojedeji. Seun, yes, I know you put your card. I'm actually using both the cards and the queue as well, and you had put your card before up as well.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. I think one of the major concerns for me is in terms of how the current new gTLD program went. I'm checking the statistics, application status page. I'm not able to really see the status how the ones that have been delegated, how are they performing? Is there an new site or reference where we can actually track their performance? Because it looks like this is just a show of getting money from these guys, and then we don't see an impact on the gTLDs. Personally, I think we need to really determine if it is worth it to continue putting out strings that would just be in the root and will not be used. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Seun. The data on the current round was put for public comment. I'll put a link into the Adobe Connect in a second. Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Shall I speak French, for diversity?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, you may speak any language you wish, as long as it's interpreted. It's not translated, by the way, it's interpreted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know. I am preparing people to put their headset. So, Olivier, to answer your question as far as the underserved regions, we did not ask to have a restriction on the next round for those countries. However, what we asked is to have a dedicated round for the underserved regions.

Dedicated means, as far as the fees, as far as the administrative support and legal support, and as far as a very large outreach specifically dedicated to those regions because in the framework of a general round, it wouldn't really be useful, even though we dedicated to those underserved countries.

What we need is to have a specific round dedicated to those regions with specific special conditions. That was the proposal

that we had put forward. What I notice is that it hasn't really moved forward, that the other communities, registrars and registries don't really buy into that, and even within your working group, I believe that this proposal is not really being well received.

So what should we do? Well, I was in the working group that you are a member of. I don't really belong any longer, but what we did is we managed to express the situation of those countries, and we included it in the different points that need to be addressed.

Now, what we need to do is go right to the heart of the matter. We need to make sure that it is a well-known fact that those regions do not have a good opportunity to get their TLDs accepted, because they cannot enter into a competition with wealthier countries.

I think as far as that point, what we need to do – first of all, we have support. We are not the only ones who are asking for that. Other countries within the GAC are asking for the same thing. Other groups in the community are asking for the same thing, so I think that we need to do more outreach, work with others. I don't think that we can do it alone. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. The next person in the queue is León Sanchez.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier. I'm going to be concise. I don't think we have elements to either support or deny that there should be another round of new gTLDs. I think that we still need to analyze the performance and the delivery as Seun stated. I don't think that there is enough data at this point to actually evaluate whether the new gTLDs have served the purpose that they were created for.

Once we have that analysis, if it comes to actually having a new gTLD round, I would say that this new gTLD round shouldn't be directed only to underserved regions, but certainly, those underserved regions should have some special criteria that would support their participation in the domain name space.

I think we need to support anything that is as inclusive as possible but also recognizing the different leveling in the ground for different players. That is my comment. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, León. Andre, I'll put you in the queue. Or is that in direct response to what León was saying? It's in direct

response? Okay, I'll hand the floor over to you then. Andre Kalashnikov?

ANDRE KALASHNIKOV: I'll be short. I just want to recall a few years ago, before the new round of the gTLDs, this issue of underserved regions was addressed by the GNSO. It will be useful to come back and recall it and read what was said, what was stated in this. It was actually the question: Is it relevant or not relevant? There's a lot of data in the previous discussions, so not to spend a lot of time trying to invent a bicycle. There is a lot of discussion in the past.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks, Andre. Indeed, there was, but it failed. It appears to have failed [inaudible].

ANDRE KALASHNIKOV: But there are reasons, there are strong reasons behind it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There are strong reasons behind it, yes, that's correct. León, you mentioned here the idea of special criteria. An applicant support program was in place, so why further criteria?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Well, I think that the applicant support criteria as you state didn't go quite well or it didn't go as expected, so I think that we should review what went wrong, and of course, try to amend those special criteria so that whatever went wrong in the first round, we are able to fix on the second round or the next round.

Yes, we did have some provisions for that, but clearly, they didn't seem to actually serve the purpose that they were designed for. So, with the experience of this first round, I think we should be able to actually run a review of those criteria and be able to enhance them so that they better serve the purpose that they are created for.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, León. I have a queue. Tijani, was that in direct response to – okay, Tijani Ben Jemaa. I'm sorry for those people who are patiently in the queue. I won't accept any disruptors. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry to jump in. Just to say that the proposal that I spoke about to have a dedicated round was the result of the failure of the applicant support program because the applicant support program – and I was part of it – made very tough conditions so that no one will succeed to get in and the result is zero now. Do you know that? It was one, but now it is zero.

So the applicant support program was good, but it was done in a tough manner because we have people with us who were against the applicant support program and they were with us saying, "No, we are sorry, but we have to put a good criteria so that people will not game the system," and the result was zero.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. In the queue, we have Sandra Hoferichter, Sébastien Bachollet, Mona Al Achkar, Maureen Hilyard, and Yrjö Lansipuro. I think that will fill the rest of the 15 minutes we still have. Sandra Hoferichter?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. I was not so much active in the new gTLD program, but I was watching and observing it from a distance and I have many friends who are active in this area. While I think that, in general, the new gTLD program was of great value for the Internet as such and it might need a while to evolve and to get more accepted among all the regions of the world, we must admit it was not a huge success program.

Those new gTLDs who are online now doing fairly well for what they invested, I'm not sure if they have the revenue already. There are some which are really doing good, but there are not

too many. I'm really wondering if we should ask or if we should push for underserved regions to take that risk.

Even if the applicant fee is way less than the normal fee, as Vanda said, awareness is not there in these regions yet. Barrack said they don't even know what it is, how it works. So with all these conditions in place, yes, of course, we need to do more outreach, but it was not the way that there was no outreach at all.

I think ICANN did quite a lot with the road show and everything, and they visited all these countries. Could have been more, okay, I agree, and we have to work on this, but there was quite a lot of effort. I'm really hesitating if we should – I would be totally against making a round for underserved regions only. I think that's out of the question here.

But even pushing too hard and saying, "You must do it, you should do it, it's a good thing," I'm not sure, because spending \$40,000 in an underserved region is quite a lot of money, and taking that business risk – and that's just my personal view. I expect for the second round, it will be good corporations who just experienced or who just discovered the value of an own gTLD, building their own digital environment for their company.

I think that's what we will see mainly in the second round and maybe some of the Geo TLDs. Personally, I think that's a really

good thing to do, but also, even then, they are not performing extraordinary good. Some of them are doing quite well, but they are far from being a huge success model. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sandra. If I could ask staff that we actually have the gTLD marketplace health index into the other pod so that people could actually flick through it because looking just at the front page doesn't help too much. It would be helpful. But there is a link to this gTLD marketplace health index, and we could actually also scroll to page number four on that page. That would be helpful.

Sandra, you made an interesting point here. Are we setting up developing regions for failure by pushing them to apply for new gTLDs if absolutely no one is aware of those new gTLDs and if it would be an uphill struggle for them. There's no answer yet, but let's continue in our queue. Next is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Unfortunately, I was not able to hear everything because I was not present the whole time. I hope I'm not repeating anything that was said previously, but one of the questions is that we blamed the JAS program. What we end up

doing is to game the system, that's what we're saying. What really happened here?

Big investors, the ones who had 300 applications, those who applied or were candidates in order to exchange positions. "I will sell you this TLD and you will sell this one to me," or "I will give you \$500 so that I might be able to use it, or \$500 million or \$1 million or whatever it might be, and I will take the next one."

When you consider the applications, where was the money made, really? It was not by applying, it was not by financing an extension. It was in exchanging. Who was able to do that? The ones who had money, so everybody else is faced with a wall. We need to open the door for them.

Let's be careful. Let's not say, "Okay, let's open it to one region," because if you really pay attention, for the previous round, you have American companies mostly that applied for other regions. Why? Because they knew that at one point, there would be a round by region, and so they realized that they would be at the top at the right time, at the time when we would go around the world and choose certain applicants over others.

People have thought about this, so what we need to do is to think about how do we open the door for extensions that are really needed by users. What we need to pay attention to is the big money players. TLDs have to have as a purpose to help the

community, to help end users, to help the geographic regions where we are present.

So very briefly – Olivier, I'm sorry, I'm a little bit lengthy – but we have an issue with memory in our organization. I would like to say this officially again: in 2004, there was a review of the first introduction of the new extensions in 2000. A working group worked on that. I can find you some links on that topic.

I was in charge of the work related to the users. I was the president of the evaluation committee that worked on that. The staff decided to publish only part of the result of the work. When I hear what is being talked about today as far as, "Well, is a new domain name going to another?" Those were questions that we answered back in 2004.

At that time, the data had to be collected and they were not collected, so we're in the same situation today. That is too bad. I think that our organization at times can be schizophrenic. I don't know if the data was kept, the analysis that was done after the first round was kept. I don't know, maybe ICANN has lost it all, but I have the data.

MONA AL ACHKAR:

Hello, everyone. First of all, I would like to say that the discussion that we're having today is extremely interesting for

me. The first time that I was involved in ICANN was thanks to the digital French-speaking world, but I basically just discovered this on my own.

First of all, what I noticed is that Lebanon is not present here, so I asked about that in my country, and now we do have a representative at the GAC. Afterwards, thanks to our network of associations that is very active with representatives from the government, from universities, from different Arabic-speaking representatives, so when we organized something on the DNS, on ICANN, what I noticed is that deans of universities, different representatives of the telecommunications authorities or other technological representatives didn't really know anything.

What we managed to do is to wake people up a little bit, to make them aware, to raise the interest within certain circles in Lebanon. We put together different meetings on DNS security and other topics, but I think it is not enough. I think that French-speaking countries is one thing, but there is the rest of the world as well.

I think that what we need to do is to consider including a position that basically helps candidates to be involved. I think what we need to do is to really make people aware within each country. For example, for .ld, something needs to be put together as far as the importance of ICANN, of domain names,

because lately, we had been in touch with the industry minister in our country, and we really had a hard time to make them aware.

They're in charge of the information systems, but they don't realize how important it is to be involved, to be trained on the importance of domain names and the impact that this all has. So I do hope that you will take this into consideration.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just in quick response, actually, to what you're saying: there are limitations as to what ICANN can get outside organizations to do. When it comes down to country code top level domains, I think that ICANN has probably got very little it can tell the country code top level domain to do things in their own country.

It's been a very touchy point in the ccNSO. I'm sure Maureen would agree with this. But when it then comes to other organizations that run generic top level domains, it would probably be the same thing as their contract with ICANN does not actually – if I recall correctly, and this is just from memory – say that they have to promote ICANN. It's a commercial agreement, so it could be wishful thinking. But obviously, it would be in their favor. Did you want to say a couple more things, Mona?

MONA AL ACHKAR:

Yes. Actually, I know this. I am aware of what you are saying. It is exactly right. However, because the financial powers are the ones who have the money, who want to make money, so what they need to do is to commit. They do have obligations towards the people, and so that is the trend. Of course, a lot of large corporations have a commitment to the people they serve, so we should really consider that proposal.

I was interested in At-Large at first because what At-Large focuses on is end users' interests, so I do think that this is part of the discussion within At-Large. It is important for me to think about that topic, because that is what serves my country, Lebanon.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: People, we're supposed to have a break right now, but we did start a little bit late. We had five minutes shaved off by León, so let's blame always someone else. And maybe Alan shaved five minutes off your time, who knows. He's not in the room, so we can say anything we want. Maureen Hilyard, Yrjö Lansipuro, Wafa Dahmani, and Seun Ojedeji. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Olivier. A lot of the things that I wanted to say have actually been raised, but as much as I would like to engage people in my region – and I am, of course, referring to the 22 Pacific Island countries and territories, which are very much an underserved region and within APRALO – I am a little concerned about encouraging underserved regions to enter something that they're actually not completely prepared for on a lot of different levels.

And as Sandra raised, within the Pacific, I acknowledge that there's very little information that goes out. There's probably a lot of information going out about new gTLDs, but whether there's actually any real understanding – and I think taking into account what Barrack hinted about AFRALO – understanding about what it's all about.

Before they become more involved, they want to take on something that perhaps is a little bit bigger than they can actually chew. There's a lot more training and information needs that have to get out there. There's a lot more support that's required and a lot more understanding so that they can really appreciate the opportunities that are available to them.

As León says, we need to review those needs and identify and specify what those needs are, what the gaps are, and how we can address those things within the region itself. The new gTLDs

require a major investment. As Sandra said, if you're going to be pouring money into something like this, it's a major business risk if it's going to go into an area where there's still not enough understanding. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Maureen. Next is Yrjö Lansipuro.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you. We are not alone in having concerns about the new gTLDs, especially from the point of the end user. The end users are called citizens by the GAC. The GAC has expressed similar concerns about the necessity of the second round and also whether we should first get the lessons of the first round before we rush into the second one.

This item will be on the agenda of the joint ALAC/GAC meeting on Sunday. I think that it's the main item. That's an opportunity for us to seek for common ground with the GAC, and maybe that could lead to some joint action. But before that, of course, it's good that we refine our own thinking so that we know exactly what we – as ALAC – want to achieve here. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Yrjö. Could I just ask staff to check what were the topics that we were going to touch on with the GAC? And in the meantime, we'll have the next person in the queue, Wafa Dahmani.

WAFDA DAHMANI: Thank you, Olivier, I will be brief. We are speaking about new gTLD programs for the underserved regions, but I want to speak from the African countries' perspectives. We know today that many countries in Africa have difficulties [inaudible] TLDs moreover to become also ICANN registrar. I am for the support of these countries for the new gTLDs, but it's not the support only for the support.

You want to support these countries to apply for new gTLDs, but also as was said by Vanda, they perform behind the new gTLDs. I don't think that the new gTLDs program is a priority or a focus in many African countries today, and you know we have to see the reality. I join also León when he said that the review of the first program is critical to decide about the next step and what are the priorities and what we should do in the next step. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wafa. Closing the discussion is Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl, okay. I'll – If you can squeeze in a few words after. Go ahead, Seun, sorry.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you very much, and thank you for sharing the documents. Yes, the documents kind of help us to appreciate the distribution of registrars, registries, and makes it obvious that developing countries are lagging behind in terms of that.

But in terms of actually analyzing or having enough data to determine if the new gTLDs actually [inaudible], this particular document is not providing adequate data for that. For instance, I would like to see how much second level registration happened within the delegated new gTLDs.

This document is not addressing that, so I think we need clear data for those specific new gTLD that were delegated. It's over 1,005, as I checked on the website. How much of it is actually having even 10 second level domains, for instance, and how are they doing? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. There are two meetings of this working group in Hyderabad. I really invite you to come to these meetings and raise these points. We have made the same points in our response to the public comment because this document went up for public comment, but it's important that we make our voices known.

I don't have it in my head, and staff will probably have to tell everyone when that's the place. Ariel Liang, you had an answer on the GAC questions.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Olivier. For the ALAC and GAC meeting, we will discuss the new gTLDs, [general] process and timing, review of public interest commitments, and second topic is diversity, and it's the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 topic.

The third topic is the CCT Review, and the fourth topic is implementation of new Bylaws. And at the end, there will be an academy pilot [sharing] skill program that Sandra is going to announce. The meeting will take place on Sunday, and it's in the afternoon. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Ariel. If you could please check the meetings of the marketplace health index, that would help. CCT Review is on

our agenda with the GAC, so we can tell them what we've been discussing here. Finally, Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Olivier. I just wanted to thank you for this session. As one of your members in the Subsequent Procedure Working Group, and I'm a participant in all four work tracks, this is exactly the sort of feedback from our community that I need, and I know Alan will appreciate.

I wondered if we could think about an action item out of this session to see whether we could have these sorts of touchpoints during our work because this is extraordinarily valuable to hear from the regional leadership, and perhaps it will give the regional leadership an opportunity to reach out to their At-Large structures. Those of us who are in these rooms trying to best represent the best interests of the community at large could feel a little more confident about exactly where the diversity is and exactly where the views are. So, thank you for that.

I also wanted to note that while I've been here in today's session, I've also just finished watching the transcript from the GAC room that was actually the working group on underserved communities. A number of the key points that are in this room and this discussion are being echoed in the GAC room, so I think we should have a very profitable conversation.

But I just want to say thank you and suggest that we bring an opportunity for this very important topic for this wider group to get together, certainly before Copenhagen, and at various points in time. Happy to work with you on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Would bi-weekly calls be palatable? Biweekly as in one every two weeks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, once every other week, not twice a week. Once every other week or once every three weeks, or once a month, perhaps?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Once a month would be reasonable because the work teams themselves are on biweekly calls, so we would be very much in the wrong synchronization if we would have that. But I think monthly calls could certainly be of some advantage.

They don't have to be long calls, and we could in fact have a wiki where we can take continuous input from regions or At-Large structures as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. So, two action items: create the wiki for tracking, and two, a monthly call to track what's going on in the new gTLD process. That's an excellent thing. Ariel, your card is up.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Sorry, Olivier, that action item is for staff, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is for staff, yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Olivier. Just to answer the question about the marketplace health index meeting, there are two in ICANN 57. The first one is on Monday, the 7th, at 9:00 AM to 10:15 AM, and the second one is Tuesday, November the 8th, and it's 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM. I will paste the links in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Ariel, and with the apology to our Chair, we are late by 15 minutes, but back to you, León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Olivier, and now we have a break, a coffee break. I would please kindly ask you to come back in time for our next session. That would be at 11:00. So we have 14 minutes for a coffee break, and we can blame Olivier for having less time for our coffee break. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]