HYDERABAD – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and At-Large
Monday, November 07, 2016 – 09:45 to 10:45 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay, should we get started? Please take your seats.

Good morning, everyone. This is the At-Large meeting with the board.

And, Alan, how would you like to begin?

ALAN GREENBERG: We should probably begin at the beginning. Could we have the slide with the initial questions on it? Good, perfect.

The process for this meeting is that we -- actually, I'd like the previous slide that just disappeared. Thank you.

The process normally is the board, if it wishes, will pose questions to At-Large. We may pose some questions or add statements or whatever to the board.

This time Rinalia, as the director selected by At-Large, also added a few items that might warrant discussion should we have enough time. So they're at the end. I'm hoping we will have enough time because I think they're particularly

---

interesting. So I thank you for adding those. We do take off marks for not adding them three weeks ago.

[Laughter]

The first is the question from the board of what do we, the board and the ICANN organization, have to do to make the transition work -- make the transition work for you? First an editorial comment, as we have said a number of times, we believe the term "organization" as referring to the employees, contractors, staff of the corporation is a term that yields confusion to a lot of people. But we understand it's used there and we'll respond to that, but that is a point of contention.

That question confused us in that the transition itself is the transition of the IANA stewardship. And as far as we can tell, it's working just fine so we can stop talking there. We suspect the question really meant the other parts associated with it; that is, all the accountability measures. And from that perspective, that really is the same as the next question adding At-Large or us into the parenthetical "the Board" of what do we need to enhance trust by the ALAC. So we're going to answer them both at the same time.

Essentially, what does the board, the organization, whatever, need to do to enhance trust and confidence in ICANN and the constituent parts? Do we have a speaker for that? Leon.

Leon, go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. This is Leon Sanchez.

We've discussed this in the ALAC and the At-Large community. And the answer to this question is that the board needs to act not only in compliance with the bylaws but also in line with the spirit that the community had in mind when drafting this new version of our bylaws.   And these can be accomplished by enshrining their intent in all its actions.

Added transparency on an ICANN-wide perspective would also contribute to this end as well as fostering diversity by continuing to promote outreach and accessibility to programs for all stakeholders.

The community on its side needs to remain open to working in a cross-community fashion as this has been proven that getting out of our silos produces outstanding results for both the organization and the multistakeholder community.

We also need to raise the bar on transparency and accountability, both to our respective stakeholders and to each other as a community. So the powers, should they need to be exercised any time, are used in a responsible and effective manner.

We see communication as the base to accomplish this trust enhancement and actions as the bricks to building it in a consistent and a durable way. Openness, inclusion, diversity, and respect must continue to be the pillars of our foundation. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Leon.

Is there anyone else who would like to add anything to that? I'll add just a very brief comment. Just as -- the question was: What do we, all of us, have to do to make sure the larger world has faith in us? And, of course, anything that we're expecting of the board we expect of ourselves as well. And we'll do our utmost to make sure that we are at least as transparent and open as we expect anyone else to be. And I think in general, we are; but it always warrants thinking about.

Anyone else?

Okay. The next item is on the question that are issues that we raised. And the first one is the ALAC position on new gTLDs and it says "subsequent rounds," although admittedly the issue of whether it is a round or not is still up in the air certainly within the PDP -- GNSO PDP.

Do we have anyone who would like to speak to that? Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I would have to say we're in the process -- "we" being ALAC -- are in the process of a lot of thought. Two of our members have been involved in the CCRT. There has been a lot of information that's not only been generated but is being generated now. We will be called upon to respond to the first sort of paper that's come out. Unfortunately, it's between sort of mid December which is unfortunate. We will respond.

The difficulty with that is some of the very interesting statistics, information that we would want to be available to comment -- to use for comments won't be available. So, in fact, some of what we say is going to be provisional. We will be looking for another round and more information to actually make that assessment as to the effectiveness of the first round in the terms of the metrics that we've actually started to look at in terms of consumer trust, in terms of competition, moving from an ALAC perspective. It's going to be a very big job. We have some positions that are very similar to GAC, but at the moment, there's still a lot of information that has to happen before we can come up with a final opinion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly.

One of the troubling things is that in talking to Jonathan Zuck, the chair of the CCT review committee -- review team, sorry, not unexpectedly he's saying they're having a significant problem that there's not really much data at this point. In retrospect, the AoC which said the review should be launched a year after the first gTLD was made available perhaps did not envision how long it would take to launch the last one. And certainly no one envisioned -- or some people did not envision how slow the uptake would be.

So a lot of what they're finding is, gee, we need more data. And it sounds from what he's saying that they're going to make some good recommendations on what data to collect over the next five years. But that doesn't necessarily say a lot about how successful or unsuccessful or whatever the current round is. So it's going to be an interesting decision point that you, I guess, the board is going to have to make at some point, even after the GNSO PDP completes of just how do you proceed given the lack of real understanding perhaps of what the first round did.

Interested if any board members have any insight as to that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Bruce and Cherine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Bruce and Cherine.

BRUCE TONKIN: I think, Alan, you have to sort of put some of the time frames in perspective. So .COM was launched in 1985. Probably didn't have a significant impact in the community until about ten years later, in about the mid '90s. We have seen .BIZ and .INFO, they were introduced in the year 2000. They are probably the most popular names from that era. So it's 16 years later.

I mean, it would be an interesting thing just to study .BIZ and .INFO because there is quite a bit of data available and that has taken over 15 years. So I think there are long time frames involved.

Probably what's more important -- and I see that in some of the work that the review team's doing -- is actually just establishing metrics for the market as a whole and then monitoring what's happening in that market. Because if you look at any other market, if you're looking at the market for phones, for example, you know, people monitor that market. It evolves over time. And then policymakers in the telecommunications world make decisions based on that market information.

So I think it's a continuous process is really where I'm getting at rather than thinking this is our one chance to do a measurement and we have to make all our decisions based on that. I think it's an evolving thing. We should monitor what's going on in the market.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's no doubt true. But we have been talking about the CCT review as the magic bullet which would give us wisdom, and that's probably not true.

BRUCE TONKIN: And then just to put perspective on that review, it's looking at three things. So this was a review that was requested by the United States government in our Affirmation of Commitments. And if you look at that whole section, it's actually about competition and customer trust in the market as a whole. It's actually not really just about new gTLDs.

So the three things the review is looking at is, one, what's going on in the market; two, what's happening with consumer trust and the system as a whole, not just the new name but the whole system. And then the third thing is how well did the application round go. And I think that's where it can provide the most value because that's concrete, right? We had a round in 2012. We've

got documented reconsideration requests. And so we've actually got some issues in that round. That's probably where the review team can focus and provide guidance to us.

But other than that, it's just general stuff. Like consumer trust and competition, what, you know, government bodies in the past would look at in a market over a period of time.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Bruce.

I saw Cherine's hand and then Sebastien.

Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Happy to go after Sebastien so it's not two board members in a row. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I use facilitate we have with the interpretation and ask the people who need to put your headset? Thank you.

Thank you, Cherine, for letting me speak before you. Maybe will you have more answers to give later.

I think this organization lacks memories. We talked about .COM, .BIZ, and .INFO which started in 2000. We analyzed these new

gTLDs in 2000 and then we proceeded to a second round of TLDs sponsored in 2004. Why did we do that? Because we didn't have any sufficient data after the first series. And we had to find a way to get these datas, so we started this second series.

But ICANN didn't learn anything at the time, and now we find ourself in the same situation and a solution that is much more complicated. It's not just ten new extensions that were introduced in the roots but hundreds. So it makes things a lot more complicated. In order to study the market, this time I hope ICANN understood that these datas have to be set on the side so they can be studied further along. We're not going to study them right now. But this way we won't have that next-step question in the next series or the next series or in 20 years from now. We'll have the information for the next generation. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Would you like to respond in French?

CHERINE CHALABY: Thanks. Thank you, Sebastien. I think you're right more or less. I'm not against this. But I want to go back to the question Alan submitted earlier about the date of the second series. Alan, at some stage the board -- I don't know if I got you wrong -- may

have to make a decision about the second round or the next round.

I don't think from where we stand today that the board should make that decision personally. I think this is -- you know, a community has to come around and say we need that and put a couple of options to the board. And then we can talk about that. I don't think the board can impose a top-down approach on that or a certain deadline for this.

I know that there are a variety of views. As some people says, forget about another round, do it on a rolling basis. Some people are saying, well, let's have a special round for brands. Some people are saying, no, you can't do anything forever. I think the community has to get its reviews done.

I don't think -- I agree with Sebastien. It's going to be very difficult to make a definitive decision whether the past round has increased competition, consumer trust because it will take time. It will take time to see the effect of these. So at one point, a decision has to be made. But I don't think the board would want to impose this on a top-down basis. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Cherine.

Alan would like to respond.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a nice world you describe. But I think the reality is the community will not come to a single recommendation, and the board may well be in a position to have to make a decision and weigh the various decisions on how to proceed -- if to proceed and how to proceed. We're going to have fun.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Right, not today, not in a position to make that. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I think we know this is coming. And in the past, there has been feedback from different parts of the community about how they feel about the new gTLD subsequent rounds. It will be interesting in moving forward.

Are there other points of view on this topic? Okay.

Yes, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a very brief note on one of the issues, I think if we're talking about competition, one of the issues is going to be what do you

mean by "the market." And I think that's a really big question that we will have to grapple with.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you for that comment.

Okay. Before we go forward to the next topic, my coffee just kicked in and I was listening to Leon on what the At-Large community's expectations are regarding what the board should do to make the transition work and to enhance trust. And I noted down all the points, and I would have to say that based on my understanding, the board has a similar understanding and expectation regarding what we have to do in moving forward. Okay?

So, next topic, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: As many of you are aware, there was an At-Large Summit held in London in 19- -- I was about to say 1914.

[Laughter]

In 2014.

And the summit -- the participants in the summit made a large number of recommendations that have come in various forms to the board before. The board wisely in the past has said, well,

exactly what do you want us to do about it? And we have taken them back. We have done -- well, I'm not sure how much work, but I will turn it over to Olivier first to talk a little bit about the process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond for the transcript record.

So the At-Large Summit was quite a long time ago. It was over in June 2014. The London meeting where we brought our then 150 At-Large structures to come and work together and ended up writing a very large statement which was sent over to the board with 43 recommendations, recommendations that were aimed at the board but also aimed at our community, aimed at our own At-Large structures, aimed at our Regional At-Large Organizations.

There is one slide which actually shows a cycle of At-Large Summits and General Assemblies which has already been agreed on and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the board for having approved this to go into the ICANN budget. But if you see the large summit having been in fiscal year '14, the next one is likely to be in fiscal year '19. So that's a five-year life cycle. And that, of course, provides the At-Large community the opportunity to review itself through its recommendations in a

bottom-up way. That's interesting because it actually then syncs with the bylaw-mandated reviews which are also five-year reviews and as you might know at the moment, the At-Large community is going through an At-Large review. And, therefore, you could say that the At-Large community is looking at itself every 2 1/2 years with recommendations each time improving the work of the community and how it interacts with other parts of ICANN.

So the 49 recommendations underwent some work with an implementation task force that looked at each recommendation, expanded it. And I'm glad to announce that 80% of the recommendations -- so that's 34 out of the 43 -- more than 80%, have been implemented. They will be marked in the report as implemented. We've got still nine which are in progress. In fact, out of those nine, one of them is -- has been discarded because it didn't fit the ICANN mission. But the other eight are in progress either through some internal work that is taking place in the At-Large community or thanks to the Work Stream 2 groups of the ICANN accountability thread that we're all well aware of.

There are four tables that are provided in the report itself. They are just a summary. Each one of the recommendations has a link to Appendix 2, I believe, which has implementation details and next steps. This work is extremely significant in that it

basically brought all to have different parts of the ICANN At-Large community together. The number of groups that worked together included the ALAC leadership team, of course, but all of our working groups that we have in At-Large, the accessibility working group, the At-Large structure, criteria, and expectations working group, the capacity building working group, the finance and budget subcommittee, ICANN evolution, which is our working group that tracks the work -- or started first by the cross-community working group on IANA stewardship transition but it's now focusing on the work on ICANN accountability and the Work Stream 2 work, the outreach and engagement working group, the social media working group, and finally the technology task force, which looks at new technologies to enhance participation in ICANN processes using all of these new gadgets and gizmos and so on that are out there.

So that's the overall work that has been done. I am so pleased to see the work having concluded, and I would like to take this opportunity now to ask our chair, Alan Greenberg, to pass on this report to Steve Crocker, the chair of the board. And there is no -- there's nothing for the board to do rather than just read all the work that has been done, and I just would like to thank the board for all of the support that you have shown to us over the years. Thank you.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is a paper report I'm handing over. I have discovered at the last moment that the hyperlinks don't work in it. So we will be providing you with a machine readable copy. Steve.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: I think we have a photo op here. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Steve, do you have remarks to make? There are also other board members who would like to make comments or ask questions.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Rinalia, yes. I appreciate the -- the spirit with which this was put together, and one of the themes that we've been pressing on over the past few years is to get to be more effective at processing, if you will, advice, receiving it, reading it, acting on it, and responding to it. So I'm actually quite pleased that you put all of this work into it. We will give it considerable

attention and make sure that we're kind of prompt and timely in our response. You have other people to call on? Good.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Steve, for all of those remarks on behalf of the board. We have incoming board director Khaled Koubaa next.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Rinalia. Thank you, Steve. I'm Khaled Koubaa, for the record. I'm incoming board member appointed by the NomCom. But I have a sensible background about the At-Large. I was part of it. So I'm happy to see all this result. I'm happy to see things have been done in a great way. I still remember the excellent work as well that we have been doing since the first summit in 2009 back in Mexico that was the beginning I think of this cycle, and I'm happy to see that there is a good understanding that we need to do that in a frequent way. The next round I understand is in 2019, which is a good -- good cycle for us. So congratulations for that great work.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Khaled. Are there other comments? Okay. Seeing none, let's move to the next topic. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The next ones were a number of issues that were raised by Rinalia, and I looked at them, and my first reaction was, it's too late. We have a process. We can't change it. It's, you know, too late. Too late. Sorry. But I actually read them, and I thought they were really good questions. And not only were they good -- the board might be -- answers be interesting, but the process of figuring out what the answers were I thought was interesting. And actually caused me to go back and look at a few things I haven't looked at. The first one is we're on -- we're -- we're in the process of an ongoing review. What improvements were implemented from the last one that made a real difference and what did we learn from that process? Do we have a speaker? I'm going to call on the speaker. Holly Raiche is in charge of the -- is in charge of the work party that's doing the current review.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm happy to talk about the current review. I'm not going to sort of go back and look at -- because if you look at the results from the last review, you can look and say ah, look, there are 13 topics and then you look at the 13 topics and they are broken down and broken down and broken down and they wind up to be an awful lot. There are some outcomes that I think Alan can summarize. I think this review is going to be very timely I think because we -- we now have -- we are an entity that is not

contracted to anybody else. It's very -- very much based on a multistakeholder model. We are very much a part of that and a very important part of that, we being the At-Large community. So it's fairly timely to say, we have to look at the effectiveness of the At-Large community which is essentially the main term of reference. The structure, the effectiveness of the structure, the way that we actually engage with other parts of ICANN, all those things are on the table. I've been having a lot of discussion and I have to say I've had more than a few beers on the terrace level of the Radisson Hotel in thinking about what are the really top level issues that we have to face. And I think the top level issues are about what role do we have to play, are we organized in a way that does that and does it effectively, how do we communicate with the community and are we doing that effectively, are we communicating, and in fact, I had a conversation with a lot of students but Heidi corrected me to say well actually, the role of At-Large is from the bottom up. And I said no, actually it's a two-way communication. It is us that actually understands the acronyms reaching out to explain but then listening to the explanations and getting the feedback. So it's a two-way -- it's a two-way role. And I think that you have to say how effective do both of those roles play in what is our own and new multistakeholder model. I'm waiting very much for the results, and I'm waiting very much for the way in which to implement those reviews to make this structure more effective.

Now, Alan, you're going to go back and say what happened last time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, since you have made comments on where we are today, I think it only appropriate to ask Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who was the person who oversaw the last review to make a couple of brief comments, and then I'll perhaps add my own perspective.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can stand back. Any microphone open I could be heard in the room. Don't worry about that. Thank you for that question. I think it's really important, Rinalia, to recognize something that has actually had systemic outcomes for ICANN as a result of being the second of the first run of reviews that was ever run. So to answer specifically, with almost no exceptions and in those exceptions that have not been fully implemented, we can measure up to 80% progress in their implementation. Let me give you an example. The matter of regional At-Large organizations, which was one of the very important recommendations, and there was triple digits' worth of recommendations from that first report. And that's an issue in itself. With -- with -- for example, the ability for a RALO to have individual members, of our five RALOs, three do and is operational and have individual members. One is about to

implement the rules. They've been working on that program and are about to, as part of a normal RALO review process, have that. And I believe the other is engaged in continued discussion. So that's the extent of non-implementation that I'm proud to report.

However, it was like trying to eat an elephant. It was a ludicrous, obscenely ludicrous amount of detail in those recommendations. And it was a huge impost on our community to then try and get even the implementation planning done. It took away from our work, and I want to say huge thanks to the way that the -- the reviews are now being managed. And as you know I'm involved in others with Holly as a co-chair on the ALAC review but also with the review of the nominating committee, it is a breath of fresh air and an exercise in professionalism to see the change that have been systemically wrought out of what was a positive but nevertheless trying experience the first time around. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Cheryl. I think that was a huge compliment. Alan, you wanted to add to that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, a couple of things. For those who weren't around in those Dark Ages, I should mention that like we do now, we went to -- for a contract with an external provider to do a review. Like the previous one for the GNSO, that was then largely scrapped by ICANN, and the ICANN board put together another committee to do a review of the review and of the recommendations that weren't being accepted from the review and came up with a brand new report, which is the one that was actually implemented. This time around we're -- we understand this review is the review.

The amount of effort that went into that one was, as Cheryl said, I can't match like eating an elephant but when recommendations not only are very, very specific but include things like you should form a committee, the name should be, and then these are the details of what it should do and who should be a member of that committee, that's not what a review should be doing. And we're optimistic this one will not do that. But we did learn a fair amount, and the fact that it should be high level is certainly one of them.

There have been a few other results, other than what Cheryl mentioned. Two of them are sitting at this table. We have Sebastien and Rinalia who are -- who were -- was and is a voting board member, which we didn't have before. We started off at that point with a liaison like the other advisory committees. I

will tell you the external report said, they don't want a voting board member, don't give them any, keep the liaison. The internal board committee that was chartered reversed that completely and said give them two voting members. The board in its wisdom cut -- cut it in half. Yeah, there's some story about Solomon, I think, in some religions, and split it in half and gave us one board member.

STEVE CROCKER: Does that make Rinalia the baby?

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: No one is going to touch that, Steve. One of the other recommendations was the ICANN Academy should be implemented. The ICANN Academy was the concept of we should actually educate people coming into ICANN about what ICANN is. And that not only was implemented for At-Large but ICANN wide and is one of the better programs around for -- people who have gone through it, anyway, feel it is a really great thing.

So there's certainly been a lot of things that have come out of it. The process was far too painful, and we're optimistic this one won't.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So I just want to say that with reviews ICANN has done a lot of work to standardize the process, and I think it's more streamlined now. There's a lot more work to do moving forward so that it becomes more effective and efficient for all of the community, and we'll come back to the community when we're ready on those moves. How about the second question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just on the first one, just to be clear, ICANN didn't decide to do an external review and then tear it apart. That was a decision made in sequence. The original intent was we believed we would implement the first review.

So just to be clear.

Second question is: What accountability mechanisms exist in at-large that are important to you -- well, to us -- and we'd like the board to be aware of.

Anyone like to speak to it? Actually, I think we decided I'm going to speak to it. I'm getting tired of my own voice, but I will answer that.

Well, there's a number of things. Certainly we have our rules of procedure, you know, referred to by some groups as bylaws, but

ROPs are what -- the term we use. We rewrote them a number of years ago and put an awful lot of effort into it. That was probably -- and Cheryl ran that officially, and I ended up doing the final drafting. That was probably the most inclusive process I can remember because it wasn't just at-large, it wasn't just ALAC, it wasn't just the RALO people. The number of people involved in the discussions and the level of detail of the discussions was -- I found amazing, and what we ended up with was very much a consensus view of the entire community.

But we have provisions in it, among other things, to remove anyone from the ALAC chair on down to any liaisons, so as you look at the accountability pro- -- provisions that were put in in the new bylaws, don't feel we picked on you. We -- we -- we have similar rules for ourselves.

We have performance expectations of people. We track voting records, attendance records, and things like that. And I must admit we're not as good as we should be in publishing them and pulling them out, but we do have expectations of people, we do publish them, and we tell people as they come into positions what we expect of them.

And of course pretty much any decision ALAC takes -- and certainly all of the policy-type recommendations we make -- are as open as possible. They are all subject to, with very, very few

exceptions -- every once in a while we have a tight deadline, but in general they're all subject to public comment by our communities, comments are factored in, reports are change- -- or rather recommendations are changed, and it's a very inclusive process to those who choose to participate.

Of course like anything else in this community, getting large numbers of people to actually participate in the process can be a painful experience, but it -- we certainly try to be as open as we can, and I think we succeed. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else from ALAC want to add anything to that?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: I have a question, but I -- I don't know if you'll be able to answer it in this session or not.

So during WS1, the whole focus was on accountability, very much the board's accountability to its stakeholders, and there

was a sharing of new powers, and now as we go forward, if, for example, the board doesn't meet certain requirements or certain behavior, there is a recourse that the stakeholders can take and either remove a board member or remove the board collectively. So we are accountable to the stakeholders and the stakeholders have powers to act.

When you come to the ALAC -- and that applies to all the SOs and ACs.

And my first question is: Who are you accountable to, not that you have accountable mechanisms. And are you accountable only to your community or also to the -- there's mutual accountability with the other SOs and ACs and do you believe that this is enforceable and are there recourse mechanisms that you think could exist outside the ALAC.

So that -- that's a very interesting question, and I wonder what -- if you have any views on that.

And it's not a -- kind of a -- I'm setting the stage for anything, but it's a discussion that should take place, especially in WS2, but I'm -- WS2, but I'm welcoming any input or any ideas from your point of view or...

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks, Cherine. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'll give a very brief answer and then open it up to see if anyone else does. And I am part of the Work Stream 2 group that's looking at AC/SO accountability.

Some AC/SOs are very easy. You know, you could take the ASO that's made up of people who are appointed by the RIRs and they're responsible to the RIRs. You can't get more accountable than that.

In our case, one could claim we are accountable to the 3.6 billion Internet users, and that clearly is a stretch. So just defining who the members are, who the -- the group you are accountable for, is a real challenge, and each of us are going to have to do it in different ways and the Work Stream 2 group that's looking at that does understand that.

The concept of mutual accountability is on our agenda. There are some -- and I'm one of them personally -- who support the concept, and there are others who will go to the grave fighting it that no one can tell one AC or SO what to do, no other AC or SO can do -- can tell another one what to do. It will be interesting to see how that one plays out.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Rinalia.

This is Leon Sanchez, and I think that we, the at-large community and the ALAC, are mainly accountable to our -- to our community in the first place, which is formed by our ALSes, which is the ground roots of what we are. And as far as mutual accountability, as Alan has just said, there is an ongoing effort as part of Work Stream 2 work and this is why Work Stream 2 is so important to ICANN. Not only the organization, but the community.

There has been a discussion on mutual accountability, and this has been happening since Work Stream 1. So our task now in Work Stream 2 is to develop this idea and to see how the different SOs and ACs should be accountable first, to whom, and then to each other and within the ICANN organization and community.

So I guess this will need to be fleshed out through the Work Stream 2 work, and to the first part of your question, I reiterate we are accountable to our community which is formed by our ALSes.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Leon.

Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. This is Seun Ojedeji, for the record.

I think Leon has actually mentioned the most important part of it, which is the fact that we are accountable to the ALSes.

Perhaps for the mutual part, I think it's good to note that the level of transparency from each of the SOs and ACs will really determine how the mutual accountability plays out.

For the ALAC, for instance, all our meetings are open. It's transparent. People can come from other SOs to participate in it. We do hope that things like that could also play out in other SOs and ACs as well, so that through that, perhaps the mutual accountability can be -- can be observed. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Seun.

Looking around the room, I don't see any other hands, and I think Seun's comment is a good lead-up to the third question that I posed, which is: What additional help do you need to enhance the effective engagement and participation of end users in the at-large?

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm going to call on Tijani to lead that one, and I suspect other people will have some comments following that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan, and good morning, everyone.

ALAC is doing a significant effort for the engagement of its community. This effort is done through actions such as outreach, such as capacity building and mentoring.

For the outreach, we did the outreach since very long, but it wasn't very effective, and each year we make a request, a special request, for budget for the outreach. ICANN felt that this can be done in a program, in an organized program, which was the community regional outreach pilot program that has now three years of life, and this program helped us very much to make the outreach.

And to give you an example, AFRALO have already doubled the number of their ALSes, thanks to this program.

What you can do to help us to improve the outreach, you can make this program not a pilot anymore, to be a standing program, continuous program, and to improve it.

There was improvement through this three years, but we need it to be more improved to be more effective and to make us -- make the outreach better.

The second action for the -- for engagement is capacity building, and at-large has a working group on capacity building. We are doing face-to-face capacity building and we are doing online capacity building.

The face-to-face capacity building is done normally during the ICANN meetings and it concerns especially people from this -- ALSes from this region, and the online capacity building, we do 12 Webinars a year about all issues discussed in ICANN.

The face-to-face capacity building is effective, but not enough because it concerns only the representatives of the ALS. We need it to concern all members of the ALSes, so to go to the -- to the ALSes and to make a face-to-face capacity building. But we know that it is expensive. That's why the capacity building working group asked before, through the special request, for a face-to-face capacity building in the regions where we never go. Regions we -- that really needs this kind of face-to-face capacity building. But our request wasn't accepted.

We will do it again in FY18 and you can help us in making it accepted so that we can go, for example, to the -- to the Caribbean countries, to the small islands in the Pacific, to go to

some regions in Africa, and to make a capacity building for them for our ALSes there.

The third action that we do for engagement is the mentoring.

We had some programs of mentoring, and we are still making programs of mentoring but we want it to be something standing, something continuous, so we need a program, a program inside the budget of ICANN, for mentoring.

And I think it is -- the results wasn't bad. We had good results. We had some leaders now that went through the mentoring program and I hope it will continue and you can help us in making this done. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Tijani. Are there other comments on this point?

Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. As you've heard from us a number of different ways, the process of engaging ALSes -- that is, not just one person but whole groups -- is really difficult. We speak in arcane languages. For those who -- even for those who speak English, it's arcane. And of course physical actual language is a real issue.

We are addressing the issue head-on. In fact, the session after this, we'll be having a substantive discussion on how we can address some of the problems we know we have had in the past, and the external review is indeed looking at that very same subject.

I suspect that some of our enhancements to address the issue are going to require support, certainly in terms of staff support, perhaps in term -- in other ways as well, so you will be hearing more from us in the future. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan, and I think I saw Xavier listening very intently on the resource yes.

Yes, Khaled.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Tijani, for this presentation. I think it's great work that's been done since years now.

One of the good work that I listened to one of the community members yesterday was the multiplier effect. I think this is what we should focus on, how we can make sure that the effect of any initiatives to empower the end users have a multiplier effect,

and this -- this probably will come over in the reviews and in the recommendation as well.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Khaled.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Rinalia.

One of the main goals of at-large is to have at least one ALS at-large structure in each country. I am sure that the board, the staff, and the other part of the community can help to achieve this goal. It's important for at-large but I think it's important for the overall ICANN community, for the footprint of our organization.

On the other hand, the at-large structure can be of important help to disseminate any information, communication, from ICANN regional or global to the local stakeholders, not just the end users but all of them. Thank you very much.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Sebastien.

Any other comments? Okay. Thank you very much.

I actually have -- want to raise a few things.

The first is just a random thought. This morning, the board had a meeting with the ccNSO and someone mentioned pachyderm in the room. It made me think of an elephant. And then Cheryl stood up and said, "It's really hard to eat an elephant." And I was -- I'm wondering whether the theme of elephants will come up in the RSSAC meeting and moving forward throughout the day. Who knows.

Anyway, I wanted to point out two individuals on the ICANN board to the at-large community. The first one is the IETF liaison to the ICANN board, Jonne Soininen from Finland. Could you raise your hand, please? Higher.

This is the individual who produced that report on user experiment that I shared with you, and in case you have questions for him or want to engage with him, you know what he looks like. We may have some time left, about -- a few minutes, and you can do so as well.

I also wanted to point out the GNSO appointed board director, Bruce Tonkin, who is also at the table, and he is a colleague that I enjoy working with very much. Sometimes we stand at polar opposites on issues, and he says a lot of extraordinary things, which is good for learning and I note it each time.

But yesterday I heard him say the most extraordinary thing and I took note of it and I wanted to share it with you.

The board had a meeting with the contracted party house yesterday, the registrar -- registries and registrars, and Bruce said the following, and I'm paraphrasing. The ultimate test of value of the policies that we generate here is in the improvements that have been created for end users.

And I listened to that and I thought, "Wow, Bruce! You're the man! I salute you!"

Thank you.

[Applause]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So any questions or other thoughts, because we have three more minutes.

Alberto Soto.

ALAN GREENBERG: While Alberto is coming to the mic, I'll point out Alberto is a former chair of LACRALO and an incoming ALAC member.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alan asked us to be concise and concrete in our requests. We have -- the other RALOs have this too. Countries such as Haiti, which has suffered due to nature, and we have to pay attention to them because this is the Latin American country with the lowest penetration index, and we know that the way to achieve social evolution is to increase penetration. We have to make -- to take measures. We have to cooperate. Same thing with Nicaragua.

And remember that -- and I insist in this -- we have -- that the greatest propaganda apparatus for ICANN are our ALSes. Thank you. They are our advertising engine.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Questions?

Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. This is Seun.

My -- a few days ago, my attention was drawn to an announcement that was made some time ago by ICANN about some agreements that were -- that were disengaged after 12 months in relation to the new gTLDs, and I checked the list and I

saw that most of them were from developing countries. Especially Africa, for instance.

It's not necessarily a problem of whether ICANN did the wrong thing; it's just a concern that those guys may have wasted their money in the fact that they do not really understand what they are getting into before they actually invested and perhaps the money will have been used differently within the community.

So I'm saying this just to perhaps provide more justification on why we probably need to not rush the new -- the next phase of the new gTLDs so that we can build capacity in those developing regions.

It's important that those that get to operate the new gTLDs also come from these regions because that is how the economy will develop globally. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Seun. An important point indeed.

Other questions or comments on what has been raised so far or anyone want to raise new issues? No? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have nothing. I've spoken enough at this point --

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: -- and we're just about out of time.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes. So thank you very much. That was a very good discussion. I think having the board hear you in terms of your responses to the questions posed and also the concerns within your community, to my mind, has been very valuable. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

                         [Applause]

                         I think this may go on record as the best ALAC board meeting we have had in terms of substantive discussions, so thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]