COPENHAGEN – Joint Meeting ICANN Board & At-Large
Tuesday, March 14, 2017 – 09:45 to 10:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay, folks, please take your seats. Let's get started.

Good morning, everyone. My name is Rinalia Abdul Rahim. I'm an ICANN board member. This is the meeting between the ICANN board and the at-large community, and in terms of how we'll proceed today, we will address the questions that have been sent to the board from the at-large, and after that we will address the questions that the board has sent to the at-large, and if there are other questions from the floor, we will entertain that after.

And I'd like to welcome all of you. Please feel free to speak up during this session.

Can I have the set of questions that the at-large sent to us, please, on the screen?

ALAN GREENBERG: But before...

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. You have some introductory remarks to make, Alan?

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I do have --

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Please do so.

ALAN GREENBERG: -- an introductory remark to me. I'd like to introduce --

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: But do make it short.

                         [Laughter]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Two ALAC people discussing things. It's lovely.

ALAN GREENBERG: My introductory remarks are to introduce two people. We've had two new ALAC members appointed since the last time we met, and we have Javier Rua, a NomCom appointee from North America, so why don't you stand or wave or something.

                         [Laughter]

And somewhere we have Bastiann Goslings, who is there, yeah. I can't see. Bastiann was just appointed by EURALO to replace Veronica Cretu who had been selected to be the EURALO member but then had to resign within a couple of months. So just so you recognize the new faces. That's it. Back to you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks. So to follow your lead, in the event that there are people in the room who don't know who is up here, perhaps we should go around and state your names, starting with you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi. I'm Maureen Hilyard from the Cook Islands, and I'm ALAC rep and ccNSO liaison.

KAILI KAN: Kaili Kan, NomCom appointee and also from Asia-Pacific region. China. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, ICANN board.

SEUN OJEDEJI:	Seun Ojedeji, pronounced S-h-e-u-n, Seun Ojedeji, from AFRALO, ALAC.
HAROLD ARCOS:	Harold Arcos, ALAC member from LACRALO, Caracas, Venezuela.
ASHA HEMRAJANI:	Asha Hemrajani, ICANN board.
KHALED KOUBAA:	Khaled Koubaa, ICANN board.
ALBERTO SOTO:	Alberto Soto, ALAC member for LACRALO.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC vice chair from Africa.
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Good morning, everyone. Chris Disspain, ICANN board.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. Alan Greenberg, ALAC.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky, ICANN board.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, ALAC.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Bastiaan Goslings. It's wonderful to be here. Thanks for having me. ALAC member for EURALO, and I'm from the Netherlands. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez, ALAC member, LACRALO appointed by the NomCom.

STEVE CROCKER: Steve Crocker, ICANN board.

RON DA SILVA: Ron da Silva.

STEVE CROCKER: Are you sure?

RON DA SILVA: No, I'm positive, but there was a typo earlier. It's Ron da Silva. ICANN board.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, ALAC, North America.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Good morning to all. Javier Rua-Jovet, NomCom appointee for North America. My hometown is Puerto Rico. Good morning to all.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. And I also just wanted to note that the rest of the members of the board are in the audience watching and listening intently and they will participate as appropriate.

So let's begin with the questions.

And I see Olivier Crepin-LeBlond just made his way here and I'll make that introduction for him.

So why don't you start, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just notice there will be some people speaking in various languages, so if people need headphones, they should use them.

All right. The first of the board questions was: To what degree is your membership actively participating in the CCWG accountability work, Work Stream 2, and first I'd like to call -- excuse me, call upon Sebastien Bachollet to talk about the people that we actually have working within the work stream itself. Or work streams.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien at the mic. Thank you. There are members of ALAC who are in the room, as well as some members of the board. I am one of these people. There is -- there are nine subgroup, working group.

On the second work stream of the accountability of the CCWG, I have to say of the whole ICANN organization -- and there are about 30 members of at-large from different region who participate in some of the work group, they are between 5 and 10 participants in some of the groups. In each group, there are five people working. We have to understand that some of the groups have a person who make a report from each team. It's the same for SO/AC accountability. It's also for the ombudsman and some other groups. And the participation from our members is therefore very important. Of course this is the hidden part of the iceberg, and the other part Olivier will address it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. I think it's worth noting, you know, we can count how many people we have in each group and we can count how many active, by some measure.

I think in each group, we have one or two very active people, including rapporteurs running the groups, so we're not quiet people in these areas.

Olivier, if you could talk a little bit about what we do within at-large to shadow all of the work that's actually going on within the Work Stream 2.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. So I'm the chair of the ICANN evolution working group which actually started its life as the IANA coordination working group that was dealing both with the IANA stewardship transition work in Work Stream 1 and the Work Stream 1 accountability work. We renamed it when it became the work stream -- well, focused on Work Stream 2, and the way that we do things is to have biweekly calls or at least regular calls whenever there's something that's happening with an absolute update from each one of the work streams.

As Sebastien said, we have members that are in each one of the work streams. I think Sebastien didn't mention that it was actually well covered geographically as well, so we have people from all of the different RALOs and the different regions that are present in each one of the sub-streams.

The way the work takes place is we have the updates from each one of the -- of our representatives, if you want, or liaisons, call it whatever you want, or ambassadors, perhaps, and afterwards there's a discussion as to whether there's any action that is required, whether we need to put any of the work into one of our working groups, or whether we should inform the ALAC itself through the ALAC chair who does -- who's present in all of the calls, actually, to take action. If there is a response to a comment, whether it's an official public comment or whether it's just an informal survey that one of the work streams is circulating to its members, then we as a group work together to provide that response and to then send it either via our representatives in the group itself, in the work stream group, or via the official channels if it comes down to needing to be an actual ALAC response.

What's important is that it's just not a one-off occurrence. It's something that is ongoing. Some of our calls are attended by a lot of people, depending on what the topics are. Some of the other calls might have less people. But of course because these

are conference calls, they're recorded, so all of our members -- and I'm talking about at-large structure representatives and individual members throughout the world -- are able to listen to the recording and to see all of the documents that are forwarded.

We don't just point people to the work stream pages, which are sometimes difficult to navigate. We actually make a copy of some of these documents and put them in our agenda so that there's easy access by all of our members. Access to the information.

Further than that, I don't think we can go any more than this, really, short of quizzing our ALSs and saying, "Well, how much do you know about what's going on?" But I think that the input that we've received so far has been very useful and so the people that are in those work streams are not just speaking on their own behalf, but, in fact, they know that they have the backup from our community to be able to say what they have to say, even if sometimes what they have to say might be counter to the general feeling in the work stream itself. And that's an important thing for them because sometimes you might feel a bit isolated when you're in these groups.

That's all I can really say at the moment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you, Olivier.
	In some of our RALOs, we also have work going on within the RALO. Sometimes just in the form of reporting at their -- at their monthly meetings and sometimes more active work.
	I'd like to call on a couple of people to make very brief statements.
	Tijani first.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you, Alan. Tijani Ben Jemaa speaking.
	In AFRALO, we are active in this work, in the Work Stream 2 work. I am a member of ALAC appointed to the CCWG. I am the official member in the CCWG and the Work Stream 2. I am active -- I subscribed in four subgroups, but I realized that it is impossible to be active in more than one or two subgroups if you want to be efficient, so I focused on only two subgroups, which are human rights and jurisdiction, two controversial subgroups, and -- but I am not the only one active in Work Stream 2. We have Seun Ojedeji, who is one of the most active persons in Work Stream 2 and we also Barack who is active, and some other members active.

We make a report in our monthly calls to our community about all the activities we do in Work Stream 2, and we -- we made some statements about the finding of Work Stream 2 during our extended meeting, AFRALO/ICANN meeting during those meetings of ICANN, so we -- I think that AFRALO is very involved in Work Stream 2. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And I do have a volunteer from LACRALO, Alberto Soto, who will speak in Spanish to --- within LACRALO associated with Work Stream 2.

Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: I will speak in Spanish.

Thank you, Alan. At LACRALO we have several people working actively, and we have been working in Work Stream 1, some of us as participants, some others as active members. Most of us have moved into WS2 and we are working in different groups. How are we doing this?

Well, we take back to our RALOs the concerns, the things that are being discussed, the issues that are being discussed in the group. We do consultations. We get their feedback from the

RALOs, and the RALOs are active members from the ALSes that are carrying out activities with the end users.

So we are really showing that the bottom-up model is working properly.

We take the information, we communicate it, we get the feedback, and we move it -- and we submit it with necessary suggestions.

I don't get much sleep because I am participating in several working groups and I have eight or nine weekly meetings, some of them at 2:00 a.m., some at 2:00 p.m., so we are trying to get Australia, for example, Sharil, to get some sleep at some time and I want to get some sleep, too, at some time. So we are trying to balance the workload we have, but those of us who are more active and who -- and there are many people who are very active, fortunately. We always meet at 2:00 a.m. or 2:00 p.m., working hard. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

Olivier wanted 20 seconds more.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Alan. It's Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. Just two things regarding the ICANN evolution group. If I can pass my 20 seconds, I'll try 30.

Two things to add.

One, I did say that we have biweekly calls, but when there is something that -- like a crunch and there needs to be something done -- and we've seen that in the IANA stewardship transition -- we've had two calls a week.

The other thing is, the calls are usually one hour, but recently they've become one and a half hours and they might well go to two hours.

And the third thing is I've heard, I think yesterday, someone say, "Oh, it's absolutely impossible for a single person to know what's going on in all of the work streams."

Well, thanks to what we're doing here, somebody at the end of each call -- and I think we -- I was just calculating here -- we had 30 people on our last call, those people are aware of what's happening in all of the work streams and that's really what's important. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier.

The next question was: What policy -- sorry. No, no. I -- I've got it. Thank you.

Is: What could the board or the ICANN organization do to facilitate participation in a timely completion of this work? I'm not sure what you can do for the timely completion of the work other than cattle prods or things like that, but in terms of -- in terms of facilitate our involvement, there is one item and, again, a very short intervention. Alberto, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto. I will speak in Spanish.

What might the board do? Well, you know, to explain that, I will have to explain what a RALO does, and to explain what the RALO does, I have to explain what the ALSes do.

Right now, before the 24th, I'm going -- in a public comment period, I'm going to share some figures of what our ALSes are doing within LACRALO.

What are they doing?

Well, they are carrying out many activities, such as the Internet Month, the Internet Day, radio broadcasts, TV programs. They are sharing digital books at high schools, getting into agreements with universities, making talks and presentations at

the universities. We are being invited locally and regionally, as well as intentionally, to give talks. We have talked quite a bit about Internet governance. We have one ALS which is organizing the Internet Governance School of the South. In a few -- in only a few years, 7,500 students have participated, as well as over 50,000 remote participants. We have some ALSes that have over 7,000 members and they are organizing workshops on line or face-to-face workshops at universities, associations of lawyers, accountants, et cetera. So they have quite an intense activity, and some of them -- and we were not aware of some of those activities ourselves. What is the RALO doing? The RALOs coordinating everything those ALSs need, so as to keep with their activities.

And we are also coordinating a strategy to give them the training they need to carry out their mission regarding that coordination. The RALO also coordinates the use of the CROPP program and the travel that allows us -- has allowed us to have an ALS in Haiti, one in the Dominican Republic, through the CROPP program, but it also helped us to -- sorry. Not through CROPP, but the ALS by itself traveled from Argentina to Bolivia, and there we held two conferences on Internet governance at these.

Within each of these -- at most of these meetings, we're talking about LACRALO, ALAC, ICANN, and very often we describe the ecosystem, the ICANN ecosystem.

Lately as we have already -- as we already do have some experience, we are trying to communicate on the issue where we -- on which we have been asked to talk about.

The last time we talked about the ICANN ecosystem in Uruguay. I gave that talk at (saying name), an organization of lawyers. I'm a member of that association. And I explained when I was coming to the end of that IANA subject, I talked about the IANA contract from the point of view of -- from the legal point of view considering all the legal issues that have cropped up.

These are the kind of conferences we are giving. LAC RALO is coordinating all this, the relationship, and the link we have with ALAC to take up all our concerns. How might the board help us?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you can go on what the board can do to help us to make sure we're doing more work on Work Stream 2.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay. We need the translation of documents, not all of them but the vast majority because the people working in the field requires the documents in writing so that they can participate in calls with translation services.

I think that's the best of the services we could get to attain one of the diversities that we respect and request. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto.

I'll point out interpretation would also be nice at some of the main meetings. Again -- again, to allow other people to listen to them even if they are not active at the time.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So I would like the session to be more interactive. It's good to hear the input and comments from the community. But if you want interaction with the board, you need to be a little bit shorter so that the board can ask you further questions about your answers. Otherwise, we're not going to go through the rest of the questions.

I'd like to ask the CEO to comment on the request about interpretation, additional interpretation, and translation. Do you have a comment?

GORAN MARBY: Well, this is a subject that has been asked many times, especially in the working groups as well. It's a multilayer question.

Basically we would like to do everything for everybody, but we also have a cost restraint how to do things.

We just did a very short calculation, which is not in any way too scientific. If we would like to add one more language with full support, that would cost us approximately $700,000 per year. So that is the sort of cost we're talking about for the full support. And that is, of course, something that the board -- sorry, the community could look into also in the budget process.

When it comes to having more in the actual working groups as well, we have to look into that when it comes to costs and availability of staff. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Goran.

Tijani, you had a quick response or question?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: A quick comment. I understand very well your concern about the cost of the translation and interpretation. But the work in the Work Stream 2 is very important for the future of ICANN. And if you have only English-speaker people participating in it, I don't think you will have the full image of the opinion of the community about it. Thank you.

GORAN MARBY: I don't disagree. I learned about this very -- very late, about this proposal. And I said in another public comment that we will look into it, if it's possible to do from practical points of view, because it's not always easy to pull out translators and transcripts. We don't have them on the shelf, so to speak. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Javier.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Good morning, Mr. President. Javier Rua Jovet for the record. Question for the CEO and/or the board. Are there other levels of support that are identified that are not only the full support? I mean, you mentioned several hundred thousand cost for full support. Is there a 75% bracket, a 50% bracket? Thank you.

GORAN MARBY: As I said a couple of times, this idea, if I may call it that, has come to my attention fairly late. And we haven't done that analysis yet.

We have -- we don't have a structural saying no to everything. We just have a practice of trying to figure out how to do the best

way. So it's not that we are trying to prevent it. Personally I think it's important for us to figure out new ways to support people coming in and participating. And the more and more Internet users that comes out of the existing world -- I talked about that in my opening speech. We have to figure out ways of getting better.

I have always to say the word "cost" in every sentence when it comes to new things because it gives you also an idea how important comments in the budget period now is because there you can actually help from the community to tell us you want to spend more money on these things because you actually give us guidance there.

On this specific thing, I need to look into the mechanics of it. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So with that, I think that's constructive feedback from the CEO.

Shall we move to the policy question?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: The board posed this question to the At-Large: What policy or advice issues are the top priorities for your group?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm going to read this out. But for the next section talking about our questions, we will need the slides that we provided. So if we can get those ready.

However, I'll read it myself on this one. Oh, there they are. If we can go to slide Number 3.

That's it. Thank you.

These are roughly in priority order. It probably varies from week to week and day to day. Certainly the, first and foremost, effort work that we're doing right is on the At-Large review. There's a public comment that terminates next week. And certainly because of the nature of the review and the contents of it, we are putting a huge amount of effort into it. And when I say "we," that's going all the way down to ALSs and such.

The second one is actually to address some of the issues within the review but not driven by it. It's a process that we've had going on for about a year now to try to increase effectiveness of people at the periphery of the organization.

Work Stream 2 is a major focus. All of the aspects of new gTLDs, the new processes, the CCT review team, IDN issues are a major focus, WHOIS/RDS, of course, we can't ignore it. And then there's the ongoing stream of public comments that continually come in with deadlines. We don't answer every public comment. But if it's something we think is relevant, we have to do the work on it. And that's …

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan.

Goran, you have something to add about the previous issue?

GORAN MARBY: Yes. Because I just got an update from one of my team. I'm sorry I don't know everything. We are actually in the FY18 budget have put in a proposal to provide captioning options on English-speaking calls. So that way to be able to have non-English people to some extent participate in calls. Sorry that I didn't know that until about 30 seconds ago.

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to augment what you just found out, we're also doing captioning in some other languages.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're welcome.

GORAN MARBY: Good morning.

[Laughter]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Good morning. And we do appreciate the effort.

So Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Rinalia.

I wonder if I could just make a suggestion in respect to the At-Large review. I understand that there's a number of people in the community, At-Large community, that are concerned about the report and the recommendations and that there's a lot of -- a lot of discussion going on.

Two things I wanted to say. The first is, it's really important to remember that reactions -- the organization that's being

reviewed pretty much always initially reacts to any review with sort of consternation and amazement and so on. So that's a perfectly normal reaction.

But what I would encourage you to do, if you can, is to try and split your responses and comments into two things. What I hear is everybody focusing on one recommendation. What I would like to see is: What do you think about the issues that they've raised? Forget the recommendation for the moment. What do you think about the issues that they've raised?

If you focus your whole thing on this -- we don't like this recommendation, that actually ignores a fundamental piece of the report which is, "We think there are these issues." So we would really appreciate it if the -- if comments and feedback could be on the recommendations by all means but also specifically to the issues. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: You've clearly been reading our response.

[Laughter]

We are very clear on what we support in the analysis, what we don't support. And there's -- in many cases, we are agreeing strongly with the analysis. And, in fact, we're agreeing with many of the recommendations. But there are -- the

implementation on a couple of the recommendations, we believe are problematic, and we're talking about it.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So there are two people in the queue. There's Holly Raiche, who is chair of the At-large review working party, and then Sebastien Bachollet.

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Chris, thank you very much for the comment. And I very much stress I agree with Alan on what he said.

What we are doing is we are looking at the issues that have been raised. And in some cases we will say, well, what you have proposed is not necessarily appropriate for our structures. But we think that to address those issues, we would like to address those issues in a particular way. So what you will see from the response is not negative; it's going to be, yes, okay, you've raised legitimate issues. We're very interested in them. And we actually think there are better ways to do this, and that's what we will be focusing on. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Holly.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Chris, for your remark. I think that it would be interesting for the group within the board that takes care of the reviews takes this into account. I think that the review should be on facts, not necessarily on proposals because how is it possible that four people, even though they might be very intelligent, how is it possible that they are more intelligent than a group of hundreds of participants who have been involved in the work?

The fact that they make proposals is fine but not recommendations. It is way too strong for a group of people, even though they might be very intelligent people, that are coming anew -- who are new to this topic. So I think that -- I think it is not a good idea to just have a few experts work on this.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: -- Organizational Effectiveness Committee that oversees the organizational review, I would like to say that we actually do take these things into account and that organizational reviews have a learning component to it. So subsequent reviews will benefit from the challenges that happen in the previous review.

So from the experience of the At-Large review, moving forward, the OEC had a meeting on Sunday where we decided that we

would split the review into two parts, an assessment part and a recommendation part. And that the recommendation part would actually be coming from the community once being reviewed once they have seen what the assessment is. And the NomCom review would be the first one to benefit from this experience.

And I think from my understanding, based on talking with the NomCom review working party members is that they even would like to go one step further where in between, between assessment and recommendation, there is a problem definition phase so that there is a scoping of what the recommendations would address. And I think that's quite constructive and very good.

And I'm sorry that you had to go through this painful experience, but that's actually going to be an improvement going forward in the future. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia.

We deliberately did not put the review on this agenda -- well, no, no, if I may finish -- because it could eat up the whole time. So I'm not sure how much more we want to go into that.

I just will point out the second bullet on the slide is -- addresses the core issue of the recommendations. And it's something that we have actively been working on for well over a year, well before the review started.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks. So I would like to open the session to any questions from board members on the policy and advice priorities from the At-Large, if you have any, based on the bullets that are listed. If you have no questions, we can move to the next set of questions.

Olivier, you have a question from the board to the community?

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Rinalia.

I've got to make it to the board first, but I'll pretend. No, I'm not going to do that.

No, just one thing to add. I think it's important to note that this review has actually also served as a wake-up call for many of our At-Large structures. We all live sometimes in our own bubble and think, hey, we're great. Aren't we doing fantastically well? And pat each other on the back and so on.

And I think that a lot of the stuff that's in the review has really gotten us to open our eyes in thinking, well, maybe we're not as great as we think we are. And certainly it looks as though that as seen from outside, from other parts of ICANN and the outside world, we're doing terribly bad, in which case we really need to do something about this.

The RALOs had a call -- a meeting yesterday, and many of our -- of the attendees who were there said, you know, there are At-Large structures -- we saw huge participation because they really woke up to this and thought, okay, let's get all of the stuff that we are already working on go on a faster track than what we have been doing so far. And, most of all, let's talk about what we're doing because it appears that the stuff we already do and that we're working on -- and a lot of is very complex. It's not just like, hey, you know, silver bullets in air that say we have solved it all. A lot of this stuff we are doing but we're not talking enough about it. So that's what we have to work on in addition to, of course, the review itself. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. So I think that's a positive side effect of what's happening. Very good.

So, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Alan, from that list, you used to have in the past safeguards and PICs as very high on your agenda. Is it included in one of those, or it's not there for a reason?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it is there because I should have put a "et cetera" on it to start with. And right now it's quite clear there is nothing going on on that activity. It's essentially died. The responsibility was given to the PDP on future processes and the CCT to come up with something. It's on both of their agendas, and we're waiting for their interim reports.

The PDP process, which I happen to be actively involved in, has not really talked about that yet. It is an issue within the CCT, and we'll see some parts of the report on it. But we haven't been putting any action ourselves into it. You know how many meetings have been called on that discussion recently, so...

But our interest has not waned. It's just been through mutual agreement we said to transfer it to those two groups for the moment.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So I have a question regarding the extended process for similarity review that came out of the ccNSO. And I know that the At-Large had a position that supported the ccNSO position and report before. Is there an update, as I know you've had an interaction with the SSAC as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: We interacted with the SSAC. We interact with the ccNSO. It is on our agenda for Thursday morning to be -- to discuss it. And we will be coming out with a statement of where we are, that either we're staying with what we said or we're going to be saying something else. I learned not to predict what the ALAC will do.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's dangerous to my health, even if I'm right.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Shall we move to the next topic?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's do that. Would be delighted.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Let's go to the next set of questions, please. And these are from the At-Large to the board.

Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Two ones. The first one, again, the intent is that it be very short. We don't want to focus on it, but we do want to raise issues. To the extent the board wants to respond, fine. But really it's a waving of what we believe are some red flags.

Next slide, please.

We're finding the meetings increasingly difficult to schedule, and I say "we." The prime people who are involved in detailed scheduling within At-Large are our staff, myself, and Leon. And it has gotten measurably more difficult and closer to the wire over the last year than it has been before.

The number of last-minute adjustments, both in our formal schedule plus in our agendas of our internal meetings to try to fit into the -- what we see, it's just getting a lot worse. The conflicts are getting worse.

Part of it, I think, is that although the community participates in setting the block schedule, when all the ACs submit their detailed schedules, by the time it gets back to us and we see it, it's too late to make any changes. So it's a real catch 22.

The particular problem -- a particular problem we're having is now that with the new meeting strategy that the GNSO is holding its face-to-face PDP sessions within the bounds of the meeting, they are explicitly conflicting with our meetings. It's fine to say GNSO PDPs are open to everyone. But when they're open to everyone but they can't actually attend the crucial face-to-face meetings, it's somewhat problematic.

I was at -- I did skip out of all of our meetings on Saturday morning to attend the GNSO PDP on future gTLDs. And I was -- I'll use the word "amused" -- it wasn't quite -- it's not quite the right word -- to hear someone say, you know, this is such and such a subject. The GAC has some very strong feelings on this. Unfortunately they're not here to talk about them.

And the same is true for others. I don't know how to resolve it, but it's a real serious problem, and it is inhibiting our participation. And face-to-face meetings are held for a very good reason. They're a good time to try to address major conflicts and resolve issues. And if we're not in the room at the time, that's a real problem.

And the question for the board -- and really, we could have left this off but we were asked to ask a question, is, are you hearing -- you know, I know you have some of your time where you're allowed to wander around and go to other meetings. I use the word "allowed" care -- it's under consideration. And are you finding more conflicts than before? And the second thing is, are you hearing this from other AC/SOs, that the scheduling is becoming a real nightmare? Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Rinalia. So Alan, I know you don't want to necessarily go into a huge amount of detail, but I think it's important to level set what we the board understand the current position is so that we can move on from there. My understanding is that -- and the board's understanding is that as a sort of pilot in Hyderabad and here and presumably going forwards, there has been a significant increase in the interface between staff and the community in planning these meetings and that there is now a committee or whatever you want to call it, working group, of leaders from each of the SOs and ACs who participate significantly in the planning for the meetings. As an example of how that has -- the results of that, I am told that

there was significant feedback that there were far too many high-interest sessions at the last meeting and that is set by agreement with the community. Not only were the topics of those high-interest sessions agreed, but also that they would be limited to three.

Obviously it's -- this new interface is a work in progress and clearly things will need to -- to change and improve over time. I understand also that this -- for this particular meeting the At-Large had a last-minute -- I'm going to use the term "last minute." It may not be last minute but had a late, shall we call it, request for a movement or change of a session. I don't know the details. I'm just told they did. And that that was put to this -- to the community working group committee, and everyone said no, they didn't want it to be moved. So I understand some people are annoyed about that.

I think that -- it's clear to me that the best way of dealing with this is for the community to work closely with the meetings team and Sally's group and it's clear to me that there is an awful lot of stuff that needs to be, quote, fixed, unquote. Some of it may actually be unfixable, and it may be that what we need to find is work-arounds. So to give you an example, and this is perhaps a question for you, you talked about the GNSO PDPs and not being able to have -- attend those. I'm not sure what you mean by that in the sense of surely you must be able to at least designate

people who can -- like you do with liaisons to different groups, who can actually be the attendees at these sessions, or is there some feeling that, you know, At-Large en masse has to go to them.

And lastly, I just want to say that we acknowledge the difficulties. It's tough for us, too. I think we all need to work together to find solutions. But I have to say that we haven't had -- at least as far as I'm aware -- very much pushback from anyone else. The only time that this has come up at this meeting, as far as I'm aware, is a request in the GNSO for -- from the GNSO, from a part of the GNSO, for a session in Johannesburg that is totally cross community to do with geographic names and would we please ensure that there is no competition with that, and our response that yesterday was, actually that's for you and the team to sort out. But if -- pretty much guarantee you if each of the SOs and ACs says there should be nothing competing with this, then there won't be. Thanks.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Alan, you have a response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two things. No, we don't want to move en masse. There's only a limited number of people in the ALAC or in At-Large who have an interest in each of the PDPs, but it would be nice if all of our active people could go to that. And for instance, this case, although I'm active in the RDS PDP, I just couldn't skip another half day of ALAC. And there's only so much I can disappear and still pretend I'm chair. So there are complications.

Regarding the session move, just to be clear, we requested a move -- well, MMSI requested a move that we supported after one of the high-interest topics was canceled and a prime slot was opened up on Monday. The response was primarily one group said, we will have some conflicts but if this is the way to address their problem, we'll live with it. That was the sum total of the negative responses. So not quite everyone said no.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Cherine, would you like to weigh in on this topic?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. I think, just on the point, has the board experienced any similar thing, we, too, have found some restrictions on our time. So I'll give you an example. We usually meet for three days, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, prior to commencing. On Friday we have all committee meetings. We had to cancel those

because the CCWG Work Stream 2 plenary was there and a lot of our board members wanted to attend. On Sunday there were a lot of other activities, so we had to curtail Sunday to half a day. So we ended up having one and a half day instead of a three-day meeting. So we're feeling the pinch as well from that regard. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So I think it's clear that it's a problem that needs work and attention. It's not clear what the solution is immediately. I think the community and board need to get together and work this out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, the work that the community is involved in is working. We did manage to go down from nine high-interest topics to about five and then two of them are canceled after the fact, which was -- pleased me no end. But it's the next step that seems to be the one that's not now problematic.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So let's go to the next topic, because I think that's the most interesting one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Can we go to the next slide, please? And this is the one that I wanted to spend the majority of the time and we now have 12 minutes left or something like that. What we're showing is based on an At-Large review survey question. This is not about the review. This is just an interesting set of examples -- set of examples of what people who spent a lot of time studying us thought might be the right answer. And the real question is, we long ago stopped saying we represent three billion users and explaining how we send emails to each of them and read the answers. So we represent the interests of users. But still, that doesn't mean a lot to a lot of people. Just how do we do it? What is success? So we're looking right now at the five options that were given to this question, some of which don't really answer the question but give some measure of what our processes look like or what our -- our components look like. Next slide.

So that was the question. In your opinion, which most accurately describes the role played by the At-Large community within ICANN. Next slide.

The first suggested answer was, the At-Large community is made up of ASALSs and individual RALO members that act mainly in their own interests. Now, that sounds very negative but, in fact, that's true. Each of our groups is a preexisting group that exists on the ground, before ICANN existed in many cases,

and all they can do is say what they believe is the right answer. And the same for individual users. The RALO's and ALAC have responsibility of drawing those together and hopefully averaging out to something that does represent the interest of users. Next question -- next slide.

The At-Large community is made up of structures, ALSs and individual members that engage in policy development processes on behalf of the Internet end users. Again, not quite sure how that answers the question but it's generally correct, except we operate on behalf of the interests of users. We're not agents of the users. Now, we certainly need more people to get involved, but the description essentially describes who we are, so it's an accurate statement. Next slide.

If we can just go through the five and then open it up. At-Large is a body within ICANN that allows all Internet users to engage in ICANN policy development processes in an equal and non-discriminatory fashion. I cannot imagine anything more ludicrous. To say all users can do it and everyone will immediately have the ability, ignoring our language issues, to understand everything that ICANN can do and be equally heard, no. Never. Next.

At-Large community is made up of At-Large structures, individual members that effectively engage with the global

community of Internet end users in a bottom-up, consensus-driven way. Well, it's impossible if we're talking about all of the users, it reverts back to the three and a half billion. If we're talking about each of the groups interacts with their own little community in whatever way they -- they deem optimal, then yes, that is, in fact, how we try to get -- get -- get some input from the periphery. Next slide.

The elected members of ALAC have a mandate to speak in the interests on behalf of end users in ICANN policy development processes. Well, first of all, most of our members aren't elected but ignoring that, it's false. None of us are given a mandate by our group to speak on behalf of. All we can do again is try to assimilate what's being said, pull it together into some uniform fashion that we think then represents the global community. Next slide.

All right. Now, if you're going to ask me, and my answer is very quick, we're never going to get a vast number of people participating in this process. It's just too arcane and not directly connected to their life. But we do believe we can get a moderate number of people who are champions in their local area who care and can feed into the processes to make sure that what we're saying has some relevance to their world.

And now the question is, what do you think? What can we do? How can we explain what we're doing so that, in fact, we don't have unreasonable expectations? Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So I have two board members who will respond to this. Chris first and then George.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Rinalia. And Alan, thank you for that clear set of slides and explanation. I want to perhaps say something slightly controversial and lift -- lift up a little from where this is. The CCWG -- transition CCWG spent a huge amount of time looking at, discussing, and refining ICANN's mission. And making ICANN's mission clearer. And ICANN's mission is clearly limited to the DNS and to the names and numbers and protocol parameters. And so for me, users doesn't mean Internet users. Users means the users of what it is that we are in charge of. In other words, it means registrants or -- I'm not sure if the right term for numbers is registrants, but anyway, it means the people who use the names and numbers.

I believe that trying to represent the Internet users is far outside of ICANN's mission and scope because we do not, in fact, have -- we don't run the Internet. What we run is the domain names

system and therefore, as I said for me, users are the users of the Domain Name System and the numbers and protocol parameters. Thanks.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Because that was controversial, I'm going to get George to come in and say his piece before the At-Large community has requested to comment. Go ahead, George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Well, I'm not going to comment on Chris' selection of the answers, but the question is pretty fundamental. What is the ALAC all about, what is its purpose, and how should it organize to meet that purpose. It's really difficult for the ALAC, no matter what your -- what the population you want to address consists of, to engage. It's a challenge. We have specialized topics in the ICANN world, there is, for a few of them -- well, for many of them, there's complexity. There's depth of knowledge required to speak to them well. And that's true not only for ALAC members and maybe registrants or Internet users far away, it's also true for those of us in this room. At least I feel that way.

So I was talking with Holly before the meeting and she said, you know, if you really want diversity, you've really got it here. You have diversity of -- you know, be careful of what you ask for. You

have -- whether you're speaking for Internet users or registrants, they're all over the world, they speak many different languages, they live in societies that have different cultures, different interests, different degrees of development, and that may affect how they -- how they respond to any kind of a request for -- from an ALS, say, to speak to policy issues. Policy is a luxury in some countries where basic needs aren't being met, and people spend more time on access, education. Policy comes later. Whereas in other parts of the world, policy is really important and people want to engage in it.

 So let's start with the fact that we live in a very heterogeneous world and the ALAC is -- has to deal with that. So that it's quite possible that some of the five options that Alan put out apply to some parts of the world and not to others. And so ALAC may have a differentiated set of purposes, depending upon the population that it's addressing.

 So what -- what becomes reasonable here in terms of expectations for the way in which ALAC can -- should proceed, and let me suggest that clearly ALAC has as one of its mandates outreach. It has to make itself known and the issues known to people who are interested in them and to collect, synthesize, evaluate, and act upon the wishes of the people who do respond. So if there's effective dissemination to the RALOs -- through the RALOs to the ALSs, and based on Alberto Soto's list

of things that some of the ALSs are doing, it sounds like that is being done in a wildly successful manner, at least in some places, then it seems to me that what one should expect is that to the extent that we can -- we can identify, we can encourage self selection on the part of people interested in things that ICANN is involved in, we should -- we should -- we should do that and we should -- we should make it possible for self selection to occur, to be recognized, and to be supported through appropriate degrees of contact, both impersonal and personal. We can't demand that people are interested in ICANN's issues. Very few people in the world are. And probably half of them are in this -- are in this convention center now. But we can -- what we can do is say, when people are interested, let's figure out a way to include them in the conversation that's meaningful and let's make sure that -- that our catchment area, the area in which we disseminate our information about who we are and the -- the issues that we are involved in, that we disseminate that as widely as possible so the self selection becomes an effect -- excuse me, an effective means of enlarging the conversation. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, George. That's one of the best response I've seen to this question. So let's -- there's a queue, and I'll start from there. So we'll go from Tijani to Alan to Holly and Sebastien. And just

note that we don't have a lot of time, so try to be brief. Thank you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very briefly. It is really controversial, Chris. The ICANN bylaws says that the home of the Internet end users and not the DNS end users is At-Large. So -- and during the update of the bylaws that happened recently, it wasn't changed the mission of At-Large -- of ICANN. ICANN has -- had always the same mission. And it isn't changed. So I don't understand how you changed your mind now and you want us to be all representative only of the interests of the resistance.

And George, everything that Alan presented here wasn't the -- wasn't the idea of Alan alone. Not from Canada at all. It is the fruit of the whole At-Large. So it is true for the whole -- for the whole world, not only for some part of the world. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not as worried about what the bylaws say because the bylaws can be changed if they're wrong. I do disagree very strongly with what Chris said. We were asked early about our

position on the SSAC ccNSO discussion that is ongoing of the potential for user confusion. We submitted one of our very few advice -- advices to the board was on user confusion. The protection of registrants in sensitive areas is a user issue. All of these are user issues. Yes, of course, registrants are involved, but we are looking at it not from the point of view purely of registrants, which we do on occasion, but from the global use -- the global position of looking at the impact on users, all of those people who don't care about ICANN but who we can affect by making dumb decisions. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Very much a repetition of Alan. If you think about user confusion, if you think about the -- the discussions we had with PICs, if you think about the ccNSO discussion with SSAC and surprisingly SSAC coming out and talking about users, if you think about some of a lot of the RDS stuff which talks about privacy, in respect of the groups that actually may be affected by some of the privacy rules, there are a range of things, even though yes, the remit is about domain names and IP addresses, what happens in terms of policy for those areas can have a

significant impact on users. And I -- that's where ALAC comes in. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks. We're going to take a little bit more time to finish this discussion. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Rinalia. I don't know how to express it, but George, after so many years with ICANN we are still wondering what ALAC is. ALAC is 15 people. It's very easy to define. It's 15 people elected to by region, one by NomCom and there are 15 people. What is difficult to define is At-Large within ICANN. It's not ALAC and we all together in this room and outside of this room, if we are not able to use the right word for the right organization for the right structure, imagine outside of ICANN. It's very -- it's quite impossible to understand. What would be good member of the board is when you talk about At-Large is At-Large or we talk about ALAC, it's 15 people. It's very, very important. It's not maybe me who doesn't comprehend English, but I think it's a problem of comprehension of the structure of the organization. It is therefore important that the ICANN board understands that as well. I am so sorry I was inconsiderate with you, the members of the board. Rinalia, thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: ... first and we will come back to the board members.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Thank you. This is Seun for the record. I just want to make a general comment, especially in when it comes to volunteering in ICANN. A couple of times we hear staff or board say things in the line of how can we help you to get your work done. I think it should be good to start hearing things like, how can we support you to help us in getting our job done. Because in the long run it's -- it's volunteer community. It's people trying to volunteer their time to help ICANN in getting their work done.

You're not helping us. You're supporting us to help you to get your work done. So I would like to see the board and staff start acting or thinking in that line, to further help our volunteer community, especially which at-large community falls into. People are volunteering their time. It's an option. It's not compulsory. But ICANN wants its work to be done. So please, let's think along these lines in engagement with ICANN and other like communities. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Seun.

In the board, we've had discussion about establishing working groups on getting stuff done. Javier, a short equipment.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Really, quickly, thanks to -- Javier Rua-Jovet, for the record. Thanks to Sebastien Bachollet my intervention will be even shorter, so +1 to him, but the other thing is that, you know, in terms of the definition of Internet end user, we have to agree that the concept, Internet end users, seems really, really broad, so my position is that there should be some sort of qualification that we can agree to. It can be all Internet end users. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I'm going to let Cherine have the last word and so I'm going to go to George first because he wanted to respond. Just hold on a second, Cherine.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you, Sebastien, for the correction. I tend to be a little bit sloppy in how I think about these things, and when I think of ALAC, I think of at-large and I think of all the people in the world who are using the Internet. And I couldn't agree more with Alan that I think that -- that you really represent directly and indirectly those Internet users.

I want to point out that in the articles of incorporation and in the bylaws, there is an explicit mention of ICANN's responsibility to the global public interest, and I can't think of any other organization within the ICANN structure that is so close- -- more closely connected to the global public interest than ALAC and At-large. I think I'll stop there.

[Applause]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, George. There's a reason why he's up here.

So Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. This is just a personal view here.

I agree with all the statements that were put here, and notwithstanding the bylaws, I cannot see how we as board members do not have the end user at the forefront of our mind in every decision we make.

It may not be practical in the way we pass that in a resolution and action, but we must always have the public interest, the users at the forefront of our mind because every decision we make eventually trickles down and impacts those end users that

frankly have no one to defend for them. So that was my personal view.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I just want to say that you have a board. It's a board of 20 members. And you may -- you will get diversity of views amongst them. And there may be differences of views on who are the end users, but I think there is general agreement that end users are important to ICANN and it enhances the legitimacy of the organization to have end user engagement looking at our accountability, participating in our governance, as well as in the policy development processes.

So we have to come to a close because the next session will be starting, so I'll give you a moment to say farewell.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll make two comments.

I should point out the personal relationship between Chris and me is we both have an obligation to disagree with each other on a regular basis, so --

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: And sometimes I think we each say things just so the other one will disagree.

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much for this session. This has been one of the more both participatory and interesting things. We have to learn how to get down to a smaller number of topics so we can actually perhaps get into a little bit more depth and not run out of time or maybe you should realize you have to schedule two hours with us. But thank you very much. It's been a really good session from my perspective.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, everyone.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]