COPENHAGEN – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 3
Saturday, March 11, 2017 – 13:45 to 15:00 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Is not about the new gTLDs. It's about the country code TLDs, which are written in local script languages. So this is a pure ccNSO issue, and it's being taken care of. And so in order to move forward with some confusability found in the first review panel, it was decided to have a second review panel with involvement of the applicant as far as I understand so they can agree with each other how they will deal with it, with confusability. And also, it went to the SSAC, so the middle of the story and the end of the story is to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. The end of the story is that whereas the ccNSO are happy to have the two different sets having each set having its own conditions and whether they're accepted or not. So if it's confusing, it's not accepted. If it's not confusing, it is accepted. Unfortunately, the SSAC say that if there's any confusion, the applicant should be thrown out. The application should be thrown out. Questions?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Maureen. Thank you, Andrei. I have Tijani, Sebastien, and Holly. So Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Leon. I remember when we dealt with the extreme similarity for the gTLDs, ICANN appointed two panels. And for your information, what one panel say that this string is confusing because of similarity, the others say no it is not. And we asked that at least one of the panels will contain a member from the community. ICANN refused. So I think that this time, it'll be the same if we continue in the same way. We need to have people from the community and from the language, the considered language.

It is not like [the gTLDs] where we spoke about Latin characters. Now we have IDNs and for IDNs, we need people from this original language. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Tijani. Next I have Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. It's an old and complex issue, and I don't think mixing ccTLD and gTLD will help us to understand the situation. I

understand why both Andrei and Tijani make some comparison and I am fully aware of that, but I think it's important to keep at least first part of the discussion just within the ccTLD and the IDN ccTLD.

Why it's difficult? It's because it's not just involving names, it's also involving policy and politics. When the name of EU in the Cyrillic character were denied, then it's become a political battle between the European Union and ICANN. And that was one of the reasons at the beginning of that. There was also something with Bulgaria, there were, and then ccNSO tried to get out of this trap in adding a second panel. But I think rightly the SSAC say, hey guys, we can't take into account just politics. We need to take into account really security issue.

Then what we have to do as end user is how we can ensure that end user have no problem. We understanding which TLD we are talking about. And it's why at that time we can say that unfortunately, in the world of the gTLDs, we already have done that. We have confusingly similar gTLD extension and the example taken by Andrei, even if it was just a joke, it's a reality. "Car and cars," There is no problem for English-speaking people. But if I say the same two word in French, "car et cars" because we don't pronounce the "s" there is no difference. Then we are in a situation where the similarity is even more important.

Effectively, in writing, there is just one additional letter, but when we talk about it in different language, even if it's ASCII character, there are differences. But now we are with that situation and as the ccNSO, as a cc can say, "Why we can't be as much as similarity than in the gTLD?"

It's why I think this subject, it's complex, but I think we don't need to align either with ccNSO or with SSAC. We have to take our own position on string with similarity, how we try to have less number of similarity within the extension for end user. Thank you. And thank you for bringing this topic here today, Andrei.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Our guests are here, so I would kindly ask you, Andrei, to be very brief, and so we can, as this is just a prep meeting for our meeting for tomorrow, let's just close this very briefly and then continue. So please.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: We can go deep, we can drill deep in this area, but I don't think that we should make it complicated. We should not go into the politics, we should not go asking the SSAC responsibilities, security and stability being confusability for the end customers and the end customers and users being a responsibility of the At-

Large. If we put it all together, it will be endless things. So I'll be short. I think that we really should support the final ccNSO proposal because it takes into consideration SSAC recommendations, which they were demanding, and just close this page and move forward.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Andrei. So our guests are here. I would like to welcome Sally Costerton and her team, the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, and I will now hand over the floor to Tijani to lead the session.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Leon. Let me welcome Sally Costerton, who is chairing the Global Stakeholder Engagement and the Development and Public Responsibility departments with her team. Sally is here. She is here with some vice presidents, and also with Ergys and Betsy for the Development and Public Responsibility. So, Sally, I will give you the floor immediately.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Tijani. Good morning, everybody. Lovely to be back with you. Welcome to Copenhagen. I'm sure you probably now all feel you've been here for ages. It's a beautiful city, and I hope that you're going to enjoy a good meeting here at ICANN 58.

For any of you that don't know me, I've now been at ICANN about four and a half years, and I spend most of my time looking at work that ICANN does with the community. That encompasses the Engagement function, the Public Responsibility Team, and the Meetings Team. So please [don't send me] things. If the room gets cold or warm, in theory, I look after that but there's plenty of people to help you here.

So I hope that we have a good session this morning. So we're going to cover two years. You've sent us some questions for both the Engagement function and the Public Responsibility Team, the DPRD Team, so I'm going to hand over to Patrick Jones on the Engagement questions and to Ergys Ramaj on the DPRD questions, and then we'll open the floor. Patrick?

PATRICK JONES: Thank you very much. We have a brief set of slides. We want to provide most of the time for questions from you. So if you go to the very first slide, a large focus for our Engagement Team since Hyderabad and actually before has been to start to concentrate our efforts in converting the engagement that we do with the community to increasing participation in ICANN's policy development and the work that's happening.

So much of this has been to look at the stakeholder journey that participants take when they come to ICANN, try to understand

EN

the entry points by new participants, where they go, how they can get settled and become parts of the supporting organizations, the stakeholder groups and advisory committees, and then see how that the engagement that we're doing is bringing in new participants into ICANN.

We have also created an engagement measurement and planning function within the GSE Team and the goal of this is to improve our data transparency, the types of information that we make available to the community on the meetings that we attend, where we go, where we do outreach, and how that starts to convert to bringing in new participants. If you could go to the next slide.

Currently, our focus has been in looking at the stakeholder journey of how participants come in, where do they go, how do they interact. What we're starting to do is to spend more time of how we can support stakeholders more broadly and better manage and support their journey at ICANN. Next slide.

Göran has asked us to also spend quite a bit of time looking at demand-led engagement, so looking at the delivery of the services that we as an organization provide to the community and see how we can best deliver those services using the regional offices that ICANN has and become closer to the stakeholders. One more slide, and then I'll turn it over to Ergys.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

This is some data that we make available on our dashboard. It's representative of engagement events that we've participated in, in the month of February. And it shows by region where the team has gone.

Actually, the next slide is an example of where we will be getting to, a deeper dive into our data. We're able to look at, by sector, how we are reaching different stakeholder groups. So this is an example of academic outreach and participants in the regions that have been at these meetings, and we're looking at ways to make this data more available and so that it's useful for the community to see how we're doing at reaching the different parts of the community. Sally, is there anything you want to add to this?

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Patrick. Yeah. I think just a couple of other comments. You will all know that there is enormous pressure and momentum inside the community with the new mission and Bylaws post the transition to focus on: how do we close the participation gaps at ICANN? How do we make sure, as it says in the mission, that the global Internet users of the world are represented at ICANN? Which, of course, is a core part of the At-Large mission.

So there's quite a large crossover between that effort, which requires us to understand better where are we now. And you all know that there is no magic measurement tool at ICANN that automatically tells us exactly how many participants there are, where –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. It works. Okay. Go ahead.

SALLY COSTERTON: Oh. Thank you very much. So we don't live in a world where everybody has a little RFID chip and wanders around tracking themselves in a database, and I fear there would be a great outcry from our civil society colleagues should we suggest such a thing. So we need to balance. We need to balance two things here and we would very much look for your help, not just today, but as into the future, to get the right balance between how do we track and measure who is ICANN because we want to help them become more engaged to freshen up the volunteer base, to make sure that people are being engaged from different parts of the world, different kinds stakeholder groups, different age groups, different attitudes. All these are things that we all want.

In order to do that, we have to understand more about who we have now and how successfully are we moving people into

ICANN|58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

becoming meaningful participators, if that's a word, in the ICANN work. And I know you all want this very badly, so I hope that you will see this as a supportive process for you.

Against that, we know we have to recognize that we don't go around asking people to give us enormous amounts of personal information. It's a different environment. It's not a private company. We're a community. We have open access. We have open rights and privacy issues to respect, so it's a balance. And that means we have to be patient and we have to build steadily by firmly over time a model that everybody is comfortable with.

So what we're going to show you over the next few meetings is kind of how we're getting on with this, and please share your feedback as we go along. So thank you for taking a look.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Okay. Thank you, Tijani and everyone, for the opportunity to participate in this discussion once more. It's too loud. It's good to see many familiar faces here. I will take just a few minutes to give you all a quick update on the public interest gender diversity pilot, which is a survey we're planning on rolling out over the course of the next couple of weeks and then on ICANN Learn. On the public interest, those of you who have involved in these discussions are probably aware that the main two events

to date that have taken place across the community have been at both ICANN 55 and ICANN 57.

At those two gatherings, the community got an opportunity to explore and better understand how the concept itself is both understood and applied in different contexts. There has been no agreement in terms of next steps for the community. At ICANN 57, there was a call to put together a loose structure of sorts that would be made up of individuals who wish to be more active in these discussions. There has been no update to date.

Staff, myself in particular, we've been active in the background and pursuing some of these potential options, and that conversation is ongoing. What I want to leave this group with is an observation that was made from one of the panelists at ICANN 57 about how the concept itself is applied at ICANN, and in a nutshell, the notion is that if the bottom-up multi-stakeholder process is followed and the end result of that is consensus-based by definition that is the public interest at ICANN. That is the articulation of the public interest at ICANN.

Now, in terms of next steps, we are at the disposal of the community to both facilitate and support these discussions, and we're looking forward to continuing engaging with those who are interested in pursuing this further. Next slide, please.

On the gender diversity survey, for the past two years at least, the minimum but I'm sure even before that, the community has been very actively asking for data to inform their discussions on gender diversity. A lot of these discussions are happening not necessarily in a vacuum, but there's no data to support either argument or multiple arguments.

And so part of what we are trying to do with this pilot is to issue a community-wide survey that will, hopefully, inform those discussions. This is not a decisional survey at all. This is something that once the community sees the output or whatever data is gathered as a result of it, then they can inform each other and the discussion as a whole and determine what the next steps may be, if any.

And we're planning on rolling this out in the next two weeks, as I said earlier. And of course, all the SOs and ACs will get a chance to see it before it goes out for their input. Next slide, please.

On ICANN Learn, I think the most relevant thing for this group is just the launch of the At-Large Capacity Building Webinars course, which will be going live on the 15th of April. Another thing of interest to this group is the expansion of the technical capacity for SSR training, which is something that we're working on right now and that's coming soon. So I'll stop here and,

hopefully, we can engage in a discussion. I'm happy to take any questions you may have.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Sally and Patrick and Ergys. Sally, you're right. The participation issue is our daily worry. We can tell you who is At-Large, who is the At-Large community. We know that very well. But as for the participation, this is the big problem and we are trying to work on it and we are working on it since years now. I hope we will find the right way to make people engage more in our work and the work of ICANN.

I am between two regions, Africa and Middle East, and I can tell you that your vice presidents are very well. We have very good work done there, the DNS Forum and other events that they organize there. They're also organizing capacity building in the regions. So thank you very much for the work done, and I hope we'll have more interaction between us and your vice presidents so that the synergy will be better and we'll have better results in the future.

Now I will open the floor for questions for Sally and her team. Please prepare the timer. We will see if we have problem, we will make use of the timer. Okay. Do you want to go first? Okay. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Tijani. Thank you, Sally and all the team for all the work that you do and the efforts that you carry out to better engage with all stakeholders. And my question or suggestion has to deal exactly with how we engage with different stakeholders. The At-Large review has brought to the attention that many in the community feel like there was not enough work being performed by the At-Large community, and we were discussing this before you came here. I was discussing [with Yrjo], and there is far more than meets the eye to what the At-Large community is doing within ICANN and outside of ICANN.

So my question would be how can we better communicate this through your team so that everyone is aware of what the At-Large structures are doing locally to engage with other stakeholders? Because we, at least in the LACRALO region, we have an excellent communications team. Your vice president, Rodrigo de la Parra and his team are excellent at working with all the stakeholders within the community, but I feel that there's also something that we can do not only in LACRALO but worldwide globally speaking to let the world know how the ALSes are engaging with other stakeholders locally and communicate it in a better way so that everyone is aware how we are performing works at different levels within the environment.

So that would be my question. How can we better communicate that and how the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team can help us. I mean, I am aware that there is an ICANN newsletter, of course, but how can we add that little spice into the different newsletters that circulate amongst the different lists to say, "Oh, you're a registry? Do you know that the At-Large is working on these issues that might be of interest for your stakeholder groups?" And so on and so forth. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Leon. Great point. We can always do more. We can always do more. We now have, I think, pretty good channels, so we have just for the benefit of everyone in the group, in terms of the resources available to you at At-Large for this, we obviously have the regional engagement leads, who you're all very familiar with. Each region also has a comms team that is regionalized as well as the global team. So each RVP has a comms partner in their region. Okay? And we have, as you say, channels. We have newsletters, we have Facebook feeds, we have Twitter feeds. We have Websites. We have quite a lot I know in multiple languages.

So we have people and platforms, people to help, platforms through which, and channels to communicate. I think what I would suggest is that you make the best use of that through your probably the best person to coordinate is your regional vice

president because that way, they can pull together those internal resources. But this is a team effort in the regions and the RALOs are very important parts of our regional engagement programs, the outreach teams inside the different SO/AC groups, including the ALAC. These are critical parts of the infrastructure, so it's not staff and community. This is one set of resources and we need to play, as we can, together.

So I would ask you, please lean on my RVPs in your region and ask for that storytelling. Find help. If you can explain better what you think you need, they have the resources to go and talk to the individuals, find the case studies, and suggest ways in which we can communicate that. So it's a really good question, and I understand why you asked it because it was very clear in the review. I thought the same thing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sally. We have only 25 minutes left, so Sally, you will collect the questions and answer them at the end, please. I will give you a paper, and the next one on the queue is Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Tijani. My question probably just follows up on what Leon was talking about. The perspective is, though, from the regional At-Large organization, the RALO perspective, how can

we support and sustain some of the relationships that the GSE team is actually developing within the region? How can our regional organization assist with the maintaining of some of those relationships?

I'm just being very general but looking at, for example, making more contact with ccNSOs and that sort of stuff, which we don't normally get a chance to do, as a regional, as a RALO, we'd like to actually be able to make more contact. So how can we work together to actually make those relationships more meaningful within our region? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Maureen. Please make your question very concise because we run out of time. The next one on the queue is Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I just wanted to intervene on two things, and they're not actually questions. The first one is to do with the regional outreach, and each RALO has an outreach calendar. I wanted to find out whether the VPs for GSE have access to this outreach calendar, and I also want to ask the RALO leaders to please fill that outreach calendar. They're linked from the ICANN website. I'm looking at the EURALO one. I don't know who's dealing with

EURALO, but they haven't updated theirs. So I'm going to speak to that person and we'll update our calendar. That's one thing.

The second thing is to do with the public interest and, of course, I'm pulling my hair out when I hear that the initiative isn't really moving very much at ICANN level. Earlier, I did make an announcement that there is a session from 5:00 to 6:00 for the At-Large Working Group on the Public Interest, but I wanted to ask Ergys whether he had any idea on how we can get that ball rolling. Because whenever I speak to someone in our community and, in fact, in a few other communities, especially the noncontracted parties in the GNSO, they tell me, "Well, of course. It's vital. It's so important." But no one's doing anything about it, so what can we do? And I know you probably are going to return the question and say, "What can you do?" But, hopefully, we've got some answer for you from At-Large. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Andrei, please. Okay. Thank you. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can I speak in French, please? Put your headphones. Thank you. I will be short about diversity and about gender. I think that to participate to the working group of the Work Stream 2 on

diversity, and I have learned that gender is not a diversity issue but an equality issue, and I think it should be good to see what are the data that we have before to do a study on that. We have some data and we can use those data. It is work that is made by the Diversity Group and I think their response, the people of this group should meet you to see what you can do with them, but don't speak about diversity when you speak about women and men. We need equality.

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: For the record, I have just a comment for what Sally has said about engagement. I think the engagement in the region is a long-term process, and it depends of the regions. For example, in our region, the MENA region, Tijani has already spoke of that. That [we note, we detected] that engagement [should] be in two layers, the academic and the government, and you have done good work with your team.

We have done workshops, and the best ambassadors will come and best engagement will come from a joint effort between your team and At-Large team because the regions are well-represented here. And we need to take some ambassadors here to make the work in the region. We have [met with the] academics in workshops, and we need to touch the governments also and this will be within the GAC.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Wafa. Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Good morning, Sally, Patrick, Ergys. Quickly on the outreach issue, I wonder, at the ICANN VP level or higher, the acknowledgement or cognizance of the issue of the asymmetry or the non – NARALO is North America but there's territories that are NARALO, North America, US territories in the Pacific, for example. There's this asymmetry of organization that makes it really, really, really unnatural and hard to reach out to really far away areas, which would be so natural under some other type of structure. I mean, we know nothing. I feel very little of Guam in ICANN, for example. Very little of the Northern Mariana Islands in ICANN. Maybe something like this happens with Canadian territories. So that's one thing.

The other thing, Ergys brought a comment on the definition of public interest that has to do with the process itself with the engagement process itself and the multi-stakeholder consensus-building process. I'd like to hear if that's something that's being made, it's crystallized to a real concept or it's just a working comment. Is that a comment or is that a definition that's crystallizing? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Tijani. Satish Babu, for the record. First of all, thanks to Sally and team for a very interesting update. In Asia-Pacific, we have been joining hands with the APAC Hub for various activities, particularly on outreach and capacity building and reaching the underserved regions and countries. We do hope to continue and deepen this engagement as we go forward.

I have a question for Ergys on the issue of data. We see that there is an [attempt to generally log data] on participation. I'd like to know if there's any plan that ICANN has to distribute this data under your open data scheme or initiative. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Next one is Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tijani. Talking about the At-Large review, there are a couple of very important things. First of all, we learned about what we thought of each other, not only us, but everybody. The first important lesson we got was an affirmation of the importance of ALAC in outreach. When you look at some of the

things like CROPP funding or some of the other funds, there seems to be a disconnect between is it important that we go out into our regions and outreach and ability to fund that because it's not easy for us to fund as volunteers what we do.

The second thing, we're not very good recordkeepers about what we do, so the impression is we don't do as much as we do. When we talk to people about the sorts of outreach events that we go to, all of the outreach that I know certainly APRALO does, and then you look at our website and try to find out what we do, you don't see it. And that actually is probably a reflection on us as to why that's not known and why we don't record it. It's an action item that we should record because it will provide, perhaps, for at least ourselves an idea of what we do.

We certainly welcome the website that has ICANN Learn on it, so we have the sorts of resources, but it seems to me there's lots more resources we could sit down together and say, "How can you better support us?" Because we now have a very clear statement that we are very important in the outreach.

There's a lot more in the review. There will be responses on the review, but I think it has been important in all of us to see how can we better participate and how can you better help us participate. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Holly. The last one before me is, oh, I have new hands. So now we have to make our questions really concise because we need to leave time to – yeah, I know. We need to leave time to Sally to answer our questions. Next one is Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you. Two points. First, I'd like to echo what Leon said about the importance of the ALSes in the local surroundings. They are usually established institutions, organizations, and if there is an ALS in a country, there is a friend of ICANN in the country. I think that's pretty important. There are some countries where the interaction between the GAC and ALS is extremely intensive.

The other point about engaging ALSes, we have a project in EURALO whereby we really try to ferret out the expertise available at ALSes. It's been, I would say, a success, but it had meant pretty much individual interaction with each ALS, which is some work. But anyway, I think that we begin to have [research]. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Yrjo. Next one is Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi. Glenn, for the record. NARALO Chair. I just want to respond to a couple of things very quickly and then my comments. Javier made mention of the 15 U.S. territories, which are a part of the legacy of American expansionism. In those locations, something may change a little bit because there's been adoption due to the Fellowship program to a little bit more inclusive. Those locations, Guam, American Samoa, Gilbert Islands, they were not eligible for the Fellowship program. Now they are, so perhaps we can get some leverage. But my colleague to the right here and I worked numerous years bringing up this issue: different time zone, disconnected to North America. Logically, they should be part of APRALO. We've been trying to dump them on Satish but he won't take them, but that's a whole other story.

Let me just comment. In terms of our strategy for outreach and engagement, we have limited resources. We have a CROPP program that is five trips, one person each, and we're just like a lone wolf in an audience. We're not on the stage, we don't have the equal access like the VP has, which is on the stage, which they speak for ICANN. We cannot do the outreach and engagement at the level that you guys expect us to do. And either we have the same resources or some fair access, we're part of a team, it's not going to happen.

Second of all, it's only recently that we're discovering what our North American strategy is from the VP. They have a lot of

different things they do, which are not in common with what we're doing, so we need some more commonality. One of the things that we worked on is to do a general assembly with ARIN, which is our local RIR in New Orleans. Thanks to the gracious support of ICANN and ARIN. But that's an example of reaching out to a natural partner and working very cooperatively.

My last comment is that on the survey issue, I think ALAC is probably one of the better gender balance group, but really, if you're going to do a survey, please ask us for the questions. I hate to see a lot of the surveys, they're asked after the question, why did you ask that question?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Glenn, but you were very long, Glenn. Sally will not answer our question. I have still Alberto. I have Garth and me, okay. So please very, very short.

ALBERTO SOTO: Two action items. One for our secretary here and the other one for GSE. It's the review we are doing of At-Large. [inaudible] that ALSes are working a lot more than what we expected and they would be surprised and working on the report and how our ALSes in LACRALO have approached the different multi-stakeholders and they're doing what they're doing. So what I

request is that our secretary take this as an action item to reactivate it and that we can report upwards all the activities that we are doing at the GSE. Particularly, our VP should work more cooperatively in this issue with us. That's all. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alberto. Now, I have some questions I will ask them so that you answer all the questions. First question is about the CROPP. We finished the pilot period. What is the future of the CROPP? The onboarding program, we need to know. It is also a pilot program but we need the committee to be involved in this program and the problem of the meeting organization.

The EURALO has a session today, which is absolutely in conflict with two At-Large sessions, so At-Large people will not attend it. It will be a big problem, and it is on Saturday and the Fellows didn't come yet. This is a big problem of programming. Is there a way to make this programming better so that we don't make things clashing like this?

And the last point is the strategy. Each RALO has its strategy, but our vice presidents are aware of since they are on the CROPP wiki and our vice presidents use the CROPP because they are obliged to agree on our trips, so they see them. And they say that this is in the frame of the strategy, so they know the strategies.

SALLY COSTERTON:	Thank you all very much. I think in the interest of time, I'll probably answer all the questions. Otherwise, we're going to and so stop me if I make a mistake. Okay. Maureen asked how can the RALOs be more active? I think was the question. In sustaining the relationships the GSE develops at a regional level.

Good question. I mean, I think as I said, this is a team. We're not different organizations. We're ICANN. We have different roles to play, but they are complementary and the role of the staff has always been to facilitate. That takes many forms.

So within the regional strategy in your region, and I think Xavier is probably your VP or is Calvin your VP? Calvin is your stand-in VP. Okay. So absolutely. I know that the team in Asia and the Singapore hub should and will take this very important role seriously. It's not enough to start relationships. We have to deepen and build them and somebody has to do that. And sometimes, you can't do that or you don't want to do that as volunteers. Sometimes, you really do and you have the best people to do it.

So I think it's different everywhere, but certainly that should be an integral part of the regional engagement work and the regional engagement programs, and we should always try to make sure the best person who's got the most skills and the

most time, the most availability is doing those roles. So you really, it's a good and very well-made point.

Yes, Olivier. They do have access to the RALO outreach calendars.

We have to be careful, Sebastien, on the use of the term equality and diversity. It's not for today. We haven't got time, but we use that term quite intentionally. We have to make sure that access is available to everybody, however they may determine their gender. It's quite a sensitive issue and we have to be very careful that we are quite precise in our use of language and that "we" being the whole ICANN community and that we are encouraging and following the same rules.

Satish. Sorry, I missed the NARALO question. Very good point. Tricky one. It's not actually just this specific issue where you have this kind of long tail when people feel like they're in the wrong place. I would make two observations. There are two issues. One is very remote communities. Even if they feel like they're in the right location and struggle with this issue. And I know Xavier and Maureen and people would tell you that this can be very challenging, for example, in the Pacific.

We have a very active, very active, well-financed, and well-run area in Australia and New Zealand, but you want to do something in the Cook Islands or the Marshall Islands, that's a

whole different ballgame and there are different priorities and different considerations. So some of that is very challenging. We have a small islands group and I know you're very active in that.

The other side of it, though. We can do more internally with our RVPs to help to think laterally about some of these places because these guys a part of a very small team, it's very close-knit, we work very regularly together. Every single week, we have an hour together without fail. So please do speak to Chris Mondini, who's not here at the moment. He'll be here. Actually, he's here later today.

And in your case, for example, there may be better coordination that needs to happen between Chris and Jia-Rong and his team or Chris and Rodrigo and his team. Because it depends which location we're talking about, but please do bear in mind that this is a team that all work with each other and with me, and they talk very, very regularly, so those should be more you can do to help with that.

Yes, Satish. Good question. Funnily enough, yesterday in this room, I had my team retreat and we discussed this very issue. I would expect that, I'm not an expert in open data personally, but I would expect over time as this community initiative evolves, which it is a community initiative, that we would be opening up all sorts of things. So what I would say is there is no

desire on my behalf to not do that, and we will design with that little in mind. So we would never capture very personal data about people because at some point, we're likely to have a very transparent data access policy. That would be my expectation. It's not up to me to determine that, but yes, we're trying to build that in as a planning assumption.

Yes, Holly. How do we work better with you to give you more support, more resources? Resources, of course, take different forms. There are function, there's time and energy from people. There's support dollars, so things like the CROPP program and the supported travelers and the access to the newcomer programs, and there are also really Leon's question, how do we use the communication channels better?

Again, I would hope that you do everything you feel you want to, to – I can't think of a better way of putting it – insert yourself in the working programs around the regional engagement plans because that is absolutely what we are all here to do. You should have awareness of what's there. You should have an ability to participate and engage with that, and we should do this collaboratively. There isn't any other ICANN. I mean, it's not like we're running another ICANN. This is the only one we have and we do it together.

So please keep that information flowing. The more we know about what you need on the ground, the better we can respond to that. If we don't respond to that, for some reason, and things don't work perfectly all the time, tell us. Preferably not on Twitter. I mean, I'd rather you came and told me. But really, I mean that.

You know where we all are, you know how to reach us, we all know each other, we're friends, we're colleagues. We really are here to try and solve problems where we can. We can't always. Sometimes, and this bridges to the next one of your questions, what about scheduling at ICANN meetings? A thorny subject.

What I will say on this subject is that we have now changed, I hope permanently, the way that we plan the agenda at ICANN meetings. So we had an experiment in Helsinki, our first policy meeting, where the agenda was set entirely by the community through SO/AC leadership structure. And the staff simply said, "Here's the boxes. This is, if you will, the laws of physics. This is the venue, this is amount of rooms, this is amount of time blocks."

We call that on the staff the block agenda. It was empty. And into this in Helsinki, we had a very successful mechanism that we established. We've never done it before; it worked very well. It was a very simple meeting. We didn't do it again in Hyderabad

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

and that probably was a mistake. And we had this big discussion in the public forum and we didn't realize that we sort of accidentally created some new best practice at Helsinki. To be honest with you, this is really what happened.

So when we got the feedback on the conflict on the agenda in Hyderabad, we had a discussion and I was responded in the public forum and we started a group, which is the same group. We went back to it and said, "Guys, please work with us." And this time, that is what we have done.

So from straight after Hyderabad, we convened – we being myself, Nick Tomasso, and David Olive, controlling the key parts of the meeting piece – convened that community group. It has met very regularly on the phone and on email over the last however many months it is, four months, to plan the agenda for this meeting.

Now, it is not perfect but it's not imperfect because the community hasn't had a say about the agenda, because it completely has. Every aspect of it. Because it's seen everything, it's debated the conflicts, it's tried to resolve those conflicts, and so forth. But the problem is, as any of you who are on the Meeting Strategy Working Group very well know, that wasn't ever really the real problem. The problem is we have 300-plus sessions requested at these meetings, there is not enough space

in any sense of the word to run 300 unconflicted meetings, so there are still some conflicts on the agenda and Tijani, you pointed to one.

And depending on who you are, those conflicts may be a really big issue and really distressing to you or not. So the goal that I have and we have, David, Nick, and I moving forward is to keep that group together because it is so much better than not having it despite the it doesn't give you a perfect answer, but it's much more collaborative and it is much better for the staff, honestly.

I think sometimes people think the staff want to set the agenda, that we want to sort of exercise power. I absolutely promise you we want to do this collaboratively. It is not in our interests at all to have unhappy meeting delegates, but we are not magicians. We can't make time multiply in the time-space dimension.

So I'm conscious of time. I'm going to wind up. So as we move forward, we've initially invited this group to meet us at this meeting to start the discussion about Copenhagen. And into that, I will ask the members of that group to feed in at the first session feedback from what didn't work about this process. The stuff that's worked, that's great, we keep doing it. But there are one or two things we just didn't think of like what do we do if we have something after the agenda's being posted that we want to change? We didn't agree any process for that. What do we do if

the Fellows don't arrive in time? We didn't agree a process for that.

So these are the kinds of things that were put into the discussion for Johannesburg starting later this week, so I hope that's a reasonable summary answer. Does that help? You didn't answer the onboarding the pilot question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah.

SALLY COSTERTON: Okay, so the answer to at the time question is that I don't actually know definitively the answer to your question, but I do know that it's being discussed in terms of the CROPP program. So I will undertake to come back to you with an answer to that and an update on progress. And with the onboarding pilot, we are, I can tell you because Ergys and I are involved in it, we are undergoing an internal review of that probably straight after Copenhagen only because it gives us some bandwidth. And we will come back to you and everybody that's been involved with it to ask, "What works? What doesn't work? Do we keep this? What do we need to do more of and less of?" Okay? Hopefully, that answers it. Did I miss anything?

ERGYS RAMAJ: I've got a couple I'll be very brief. Olivier asked how we can get the ball rolling on the public interest, and you were right, I will throw it back at you. But just a couple of things. I think the reason there hasn't been a lot of progress is twofold. On the one hand, you have the issue of bandwidth. There are many, many cross-community working groups, lots of working groups, and the community is just, there's a lot of work.

The other side of it is the complexity of the issue. It really is complex and the more you get involved in it, you realize how complex it is. And it's probably going to take a very long time to get the community to get to a shared understanding to begin with, let alone operationalizing it both as a concept and if it were to be a definition or not.

The other question related to that, Javier asked it earlier, the notion that I presented earlier is not set in stone. That is just an observation that was made at ICANN 57 that enjoyed a lot of support both at the particular session and in subsequent discussions and exchanges. But again, there are no set definitions, no set processes put in place, nothing along those lines. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Sally, Ergys, Patrick, the Vice Chairs, the Vice Presidents, and Betsy. I forgot to mention her. She's very

helpful with us. I am the Chair of the Capacity Building Working Group and I work with her. Really, it is very good to work with her. So thank you all and I hope that we'll continue working together. I prefer that we speak about the program because there are some things that we can interact on because some conflicts are really, really harmful and we need to avoid this, so we can discuss if you want. I have some ideas about that.

SALLY COSTERTON: Can I ask that you write them down? Can I ask that you write any specifics so that we, the staff, can feed that into that SO/AC discussion? Because we have to collectively look at those things. I mean, we have to and everyone else, we'll ask the same. We'll say, "Please give us the feedback about what still really is painful." And then we can try and help the group to solve those issues. So please, specifics are very helpful, and thank you for that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're a few minutes into the session with Rinalia. Is Rinalia here? No. Do we know if Rinalia is coming? We will have a slight

intermission while we find out if we have a session now. She's on her way.

Thank you very much. Thank you very much to Leon and Tijani for taking the previous sessions when I wasn't here, and welcome to Rinalia. We don't have a very specific agenda. We try to keep this open and flexible. Rinalia, do you have – do you want to spend a few minutes telling us about what the hot topics are or anything you want from us? Or do you want to just open it up for free and random discussion?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. Hello, everyone. It's nice to see you. Hola, Alberta, Silvia. No, no problem at all. I think some ALAC members went out to get something and they're on their way back. I understand that this morning there was a meeting on accessibility and the issue of the ALAC website that is meant to be universal acceptance-ready was raised. And I just wanted to know what you've learned from that, if you could tell me the status, that would be great.

The other thing is I just wanted to tell you that Heidi did a briefing as part of the policy team to the Board this morning about what's happening in the At-Large and in the ALAC, and part of the briefing was about the At-Large review. And she mentioned that the ALAC is supporting two-thirds of the recommendations. And when you meet with the board for

constituency day on Tuesday, it would be useful to assume that they have not seen the report from the examiners. And it is also good for you to assume that they have not seen any of your responses, either, so you have to really frame the discussion well for them to be able to engage with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That wasn't on either of our topics, I don't believe.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: One of your topics was what is the Board's expectations with regards to end user engagement? It's related to the outcome of the review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Very, very peripherally.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yeah, okay. So that's what I have, and I'm just here to listen to you and to discuss with you whatever it is that you feel we should be discussing.

ALAN GREENBERG: This could be a very short meeting.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: You could have lunch. Have you had lunch?

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't get lunch. Would you like to bring us lunch? It's a kind offer of you. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Rinalia. So maybe you can give us some insight into what the Board thinks about At-Large and how the Board feels about engagement, stakeholder engagement, user engagement. I think that would be helpful.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: The answer is I cannot because I can't say what the Board view is. And the question from the ALAC was for the Board to share their views, and you will get views from Board members. There is no consensus position on how the Board feels about end user engagement as of yet. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: For those of you who haven't looked ahead in the schedule, we do have a Board and GAC prep session coming up, and we will be discussing the questions and how we'll be presenting it and who will be doing that. So our prime question to the Board is: what do they expect of us?

It's quite clear from the At-Large review and from comments that were made during the At-Large review that many people have varying different expectations of us, some of which are completely unreasonable. It's fine to ask, "Why aren't you communicating with the 2 billion social media users around the world?" But if that's our job, I don't want it. Because that's not something that we can ever succeed at. But we will be talking about that in the prep session and then, of course, at the Board meeting itself.

We have two hands up: Maureen and Holly. I don't know the order.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I'll go first. Rinalia, I just wanted to give you a little bit of feedback on the accessibility meeting this morning, which I was sort of like dragged in at the 11th hour to chair because Cheryl had to nip out. But just very, very briefly, Josh and Jeff gave an overview of the transition of the Adobe Connect to a different platform, which apparently hasn't been as successful as they would have liked. And so there've been a lot of issues that they're still dealing with. And there was a discussion with amongst the team about issues that needed to be still addressed.

They went on to technical things, which I got a bit lost in. But later, Glenn mentioned that there should be a liaison person working with the from the Accessibility Group, perhaps, working with some of the Work Stream Working Groups, like especially Diversity and Human Rights to ensure that the issues experienced by the people with disabilities were actually impressed on them when they were actually developing some of their issues.

And Renata also asked about data, getting hard data on like what is the audience of people with disabilities who are actually using the accessibility tools and that, and that it we be good to actually get some hard data using a survey, some kind of survey or something. There were some other action items, but I lost track of some of those, but just a brief overview.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Maureen. Can I just ask Satish, were you present at the meeting? Was the UA topic raised.

SATISH BABU: No. I wasn't.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Did you want to redirect the queue?

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly next.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I realize probably they haven't read the review, probably a lot of the feedback or some of the feedback that probably is going to come from here is going to be colored by everybody having participated and responding to the review. So maybe the question that we're asking is useful insofar as it is, what is the expectation? And then when we respond to the review, it would be useful to know before the Board has actually looked at and thought about the review, what are the expectations quite apart from the normal conversation we have at every meeting? What are the expectations in terms of input, given that they've had to think about it in terms of the whole IANA transition thing? We're multi-stakeholder. What does that mean?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Holly, it's the day, I guess. I'm having difficulty wrapping my head around some of the topics being discussed. So are you asking what is the Board thinking with regard to the end user positioning within ICANN's multi-stakeholder model? That's the question? Okay.

I think that you will inevitably get the response that end users are very important to ICANN and that it is important to have end user engagement in ICANN, not just as an input for policy that's being developed here but also to enhance the legitimacy of the organization. That is how I see it. I know that some of my Board colleagues see it. I would be surprised to see Board members who would step forward and say we do not agree with that.

So we could have this discussion with the Board where, perhaps, it could be clarified. And it is a good time to have this discussion because the At-Large review report will be finalized, and then it will go to my committee, and then it will go with my committee's recommendations to the Board. And so the Board needs to be prepared for the decision that they will have to make.

So starting this conversation with them is timely and it creates a pathway for them to think from now onward until the point that they make that decision. Yeah? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to reiterate, the discussion that we were envisioning happening with the Board is not related directly to the review. I will be framing this introduction to it because it's a convenient list of things that happen to be extracted from the review, but I really don't want to talk about the review as such. Certainly not

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

at this point when most of the Board members have not looked at it, and I don't think that's a fair position to put them in.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I think that's a good way forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Rinalia, did you say that ALAC agrees with two-thirds of the recommendations of the report?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I did not say that. I said that Heidi gave a briefing to the Board and this morning, and I heard her say that there is support for two-thirds of the recommendations and Heidi can confirm or not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Confirmed.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Heidi says she confirms it.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may intervene, we're agreeing with them because, in most cases, we're already doing it. What the logic is of recommending in a review that we do something that we're already doing as if we're not doing it, we won't address right now. In one case, they say continue doing it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Why I ask this question it is because it is not an issue of number of recommendations. You may have hundreds of recommendations that we can agree on, but the recommendations on the structure of At-Large are the most important because this will change At-Large. And this is what, when we present them, when we present this in this way and say, "Oh, we agree on two-third of the recommendations," people will say, "Ah, it's very good." So they are in agreement with the report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or you can look at it as saying, "Ooh, we are very flexible and we're supportive of this review. Just a little one or two things we don't like."

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Just on what I briefed the Board, and I was working very closely with Alan, was that in addition to the recommendations,

there are also several implementation issues that relate to the empowered membership model, which is one recommendation. And most of those because the ALAC is not supporting the EMM, most of those implementation issues are not being supported.

So while there are about three that are in strong disagreement, some, again, status quo, those are the recommendations. Those 16 recommendations and then those additional implementation issues, the vast majority are not being supported.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks. And to follow on from there, I see Kaili in the chat. Is he not in the room? Oh, okay. Have a nice CCT meeting, Kaili. People are everywhere. They are watching you. Be careful what you say and do. On recommendations that come from independent reviewers, I recall the GNSO review where there is a set of recommendations and it was divided what is top priority, what is middle priority, what is low priority. And in some of that, the GNSO identified that yes, we agree and we accept this recommendation. In fact, we are already doing it. So we just need to confirm, check that what we're doing is aligned with the intent of the recommendation, and we can confirm that and move on to the next priority, so I think it's normal.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Just as a measure of how much we're agreeing with it, we currently have a response, which totals 25 pages from us. So and that's not finished yet. So yes, we may be agreeing with some of the recommendation. We have a few things to say. Anyone else? I have something to raise.

Oh, I see is that Satish or Javier? I don't know who's. Go ahead.

SATISH BABU: I'd like to respond to the point that is raised in the discussion on accessibility vis-a-vis the ALAC Webpage. Although accessibility and the universal acceptance are slightly different areas, there is a considerable overlap between the two. And earlier, a couple of weeks back, Rinalia had pointed out the need for [compliance] testing of the newly launched features of universal acceptance on the ALAC Webpage.

That process is not complete. We requested the community, especially the individuals and the ALSes who are working on language-related issues to help us with the testing process, but that process is still underway. It might take some more time for it to be finished. And the nature of coverage also is difficult to guarantee because this is a volunteer effort. There are multiple steps and multiple test cases to be kind of examined. That matrix is nontrivial in terms of effort and time. But nevertheless, the community would like to help out in this.

As far as accessibility is concerned, there are also issues that relate to the Technology Taskforce, which are actually considering some of this, some of the points raised. So I would like to say that the TTF should also, that's what I think Glenn was saying the liaison with the Accessibility and the other Technology groups.

This issue of universal acceptance, IDNs, emails, from the perspective of the accessibility kind of considerations and the Technology Taskforce, this needs to be sorted out so that we have clarity on who's going to do what. And there's also the IDN Working Group of ALAC, which is kind of dormant, but still I'm personally part of the IDN Implementation Group that is ICANN's GDD process.

So I think this needs to be sorted out a little so that there's more clarity, so that we get these things done. I completely agree that this needs to be done on a priority basis, but it is somewhat unclear as to who's going to be responsible for what. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Satish. In relation to this, there is a hot topic that the Board is looking into now that is on the EPSRP. That's the Extended String Similarity Review Process associated with the ccNSO. And the Board has been receiving some briefing

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

documents and within the briefing documents, it stated that the ccNSO final report has the support or endorsement of the ALAC.

And so I had posed the question to you before whether or not this is the case, whether you have re-discussed it after the SSAC advice came out, I think it was SAC 89. And I think that you may need to let the Board know whether the position is still the same or whether it has changed. I think this is important. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Garth, you had your card up before. Was that? Okay. I have Yrjo and Seun and I have myself briefly in the queue and Andrei wants to speak, and we have four minutes left in the session. So keep it appropriately brief, please.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah. I just wonder how much the Board is actually, how much they see of the activities of ALSes that are not that visible to ICANN necessarily. [That is to say] each ALS is usually an established organization in the context of its own country and since they are affiliated to ICANN, they are usually friendly sort of. They have a friendly attitude to ICANN. What I'm saying is that in every country where you have an ALS, you have a friend of ICANN when it comes to the local context and GAC and so on

and so forth. And I think that this should be taken into account. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Yrjo. I think you can raise this question, as well, in the discussion with the Board. And I know that when the regional engagement activities happen in the different regions with GSE or with governmental engagement, in some of those cases, ALSes are involved. I don't think that all the ALSes are involved and there may be a selection process related there, but I think it's a good discussion to have. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Thank you, Rinalia. Good to see you again. My question is in relation to your committee. I forgotten the acronym now. Your evaluation committee, perhaps, that's what it is called, what is the timeline like? When do you actually get the report, or have you actually started looking at it already? And when is it that your recommendation will be sent to the Board for consideration? Just a timeline. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Seun. It's nice to see you again, as well. I can't remember the exact month, but in terms of process. Oh, Heidi's giving me something. Okay. So the report will be finalized from the independent reviewer. I assume that it's going to be done after this public comment process. And then the Review Working Party from the At-Large will review it and make its recommendation and the ALAC, I would assume, will do the same. And then all of those will go to my committee. And then my committee will review it, and then we would make our recommendation to the Board.

So I would say, certainly, the Board will not be making a decision until after midyear. Yeah. So probably the decision will come in the last quarter of the year from the Board.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. And just for the record, that is when by that time you will be not on the Board again, right?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Correct. By that time, I would assume that Leon will have to vote on the decision.

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't know exactly when her committee will get to it, whether it will be while she's still there or not. We're certainly not going to do our best to delay things. Andrei?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Hi, Rinalia. Question about EPSRP. Is there a timeline the Board will consider this feedback from ccNSO and from other parties regarding this similarity report review? Is there any date for that?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: At this meeting, we are gathering information. For example, in the Board's meeting with SSAC on constituency day, I believe that is the only discussion topic. And then the Board will meet for one of this workshop in May where we will discuss it. And then after that, possibly we may be in a position to make a decision.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Okay, so we have two meetings. We have a meeting with the ccNSO I believe tomorrow. We have [it in the] schedule this subject. And also, it may arise in our meeting with the SSAC, also tomorrow I believe. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Just a question. You have a meeting? The ALAC has a meeting with the SSAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: It's in the schedule.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Perfect. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that will be probably our only topic on that meeting, also. Any final words? Thank you very much, Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. And just one last word. Don't be too discouraged by the recommendations from the independent examiner. I know there's been a lot of frustration, but it is a process. And also, there's a lot of learning that happens within the community, with independent examiner, even within the At-Large community itself. It is a process but we will get there, and hopefully we'll get really good outcomes for everyone. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia. Before we break, we have a little bit under an hour for lunch. We reconvene at 1:45. Can we have any comments from staff as to where we're supposed to find lunch? The GNSO room has a fair amount of nice food there. If you'd like, I can tell you where it is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: My understanding is that right outside here, there's a little restaurant that you can get food there. Also, obviously, the hotel just back that way a few minutes. A lot of food choices there. So then there might be some places that you can grab sandwiches, but you can.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There's also a bistro on the main area.

ALAN GREENBERG: And there's a supermarket a 30-minute walk away.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, everyone. This is Heidi. Just really quickly, Gisella is going to be putting in some food choices into the chat right now, so if you want to just stay here for a few months, she'll go ahead and do that for you. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you scroll down to the next screen, please? I wish we could get it somewhat larger, but apparently we can't. Don't try right now. That information will be larger on the next screens. The Board has asked us two questions. Let me pull it up on my screen so I can at least read it. All right.

The Board has asked us two questions.

The first one is: "To what degree is your membership actively participating in the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2?" and "What could the Board or ICANN organization do to facilitate participation and a timely completion of this work?"

The second issue is: "What policy/advice issues are top priorities for your group?"

We had a number of suggestions during the last ALAC and ALT meetings for possible answers.

If you go down the next screen…and the next one, please…All right.

The ideas that came out of this – and I think Olivier was the generator of a fair number of them – was to talk about what we do with the ICANN Evolution group; that is, that we review these

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

issues on a regular basis and that they get brought up periodically in ALAC meetings.

There was a suggestion to get statistics of RALO activities. We haven't done that, to my knowledge. But if anyone around this table can contribute, we could certainly mention that.

There was a suggestion that we might mention what is going in other groups. I'm not quite sure how that really addresses the issues, since the other groups will be asked directly. We can also talk about the ALAC briefings and any webinars we've done.

So, the question is: who would like to field these kind of questions? I'd prefer this not to be the Greenberg show where I'm the only one speaking.

Now, Olivier clearly is one candidate, since you'll be running the Evolution group. If Cheryl is going to be at the meeting – but I don't know if she is; I don't know where she is right now – she also clearly has been a major person involved in that. Would anyone like to take responsibility for addressing this issue?

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. The question says, "What can the Board or the ICANN organization do so that this work is finished timely? So, it

is not only about how we deal with it, how we'll make our community participate, but it is also how we can make it finish on time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. That is the second part of the first question. The first part is: "To what degree is your membership actively involved in the process?" We can certainly talk about the number of people that are actively involved in the active discussions. We can also talk about the fact that we involve other parts of the community in those discussions.

Then there's the second part of what they can do to help us. I'm not quite sure there's a lot of answers to that.

Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: I had a look at the web group lists, particularly due to the participation in LACRALO. The problem we have is that there is no active participation of most of those involved in each of the working groups. That is to say, when I was asked, I said, "We need to discuss this with each of the group leaders and ask them who is working actively." I have tried to attend most of the meetings, except when I had no Internet. That was the only case

where I did not participate. But I can really say that there are many who have enrolled and they're not participating.

So, I can do for LACRALO what you want. I know it and I actually do attend regularly. I can even talk to each of the group leaders to have an active participation list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think it's going to serve us really well with the Board to say we have a lot of people enrolled who don't show up if that is, in fact, true. So, the real question is: do we have people who are very active – that is, leading the groups – and vocal, or do we have people who are participating and then supporting us in our At-Large discussions? I think, certainly, you fall into that category easily.

But at this point – remember, we only have an hour with the Board. I don't want to spend two-thirds of that hour answering their questions, so I think we need one or two people to take the lead of answering each of their questions.

The first part is: to what degree is At-Large involved, either in the actual discussions or other parts of it? And the ICANN Evolution is the answer to that.

Then, is there anything they can do to support us? To be honest, I don't think the ICANN Board can do much.

The next question – certainly, the part of that that we could answer; and it's the last item on the list – is: to whatever extent we can get language support. We can get things translated into other languages; we can get documents; we could get interpretation. That would increase our participation, certainly. So far, they have absolutely said, other than final reports, there is no language support at all. So, that certainly is a point that we need to make.

And I think, Alberto, you're probably the best one to make it – to make it in Spanish. [laughing] Do we know if we're going to have interpretation during that meeting? Anyone from staff? Can you find out if the Board ALAC meeting will have interpretation?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other volunteers? Olivier? [laughing]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]. I have a question.

ALBERTO SOTO: I vote for Olivier.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ah. And my fingers died.

ALBERTO SOTO: Okay. The translation issue, I can deal with that. I can definitely talk to the Board about this, knowing what the conveniences are because we have a lot of experience in our region of people who don't speak English or cannot handle it.

The typical case is where there is the At-Large Review. People are not participating because the document is in English. I tried to have a non-official translation so that they can get more involved. That's the way. I have no other way to do it. So, I vote for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll call upon you. Remember, we're just focusing on Work Stream 2, not the At-Large Review. But I think you have a good statement to make there.

Olivier, can I ask you to take the lead on the first part of the question of: how are people active – or perhaps Sébastien – addressing how many people are active in the actual working subgroups? And Olivier can talk about the ICANN Evolution?

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Yeah, sure, I can certainly take the floor for 30 seconds/five minutes/ten minutes/20 minutes – any amount of time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. My thing cut out after 30 seconds. [laughing]

OLIVIER CREPN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'd be happy to do that. Certainly, I think that if Sébastien was to also speak to this and share – because he's been actively involved. I've not been actively involved in any of the subgroups, but I've been able to call on all those people that have been active in the subgroups and to explain that this goes into a regular briefing of our community with calls that are open for everyone to take part in.

We've had various people coming in and out. And, of course, they're all recorded, so people can quickly catch up on all of these subgroups, which is probably the hardest thing: being able to be aware of what's going on in *all* of these subgroups.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm not sure what you're asking me to do, but there is, I would say, a growing participation of some At-Large members in the ombud's…

Sometimes, we have people from Africa who can form one or two meetings. But I think, except the ones who are regularly members, it's difficult for new people to be engaged for the long-term. That's one of the difficulties we face. Maybe we need to take that into account in this ICANN Evolution working group: how we can help, really, the people to participate.

We do a lot of work with helping everyone to know what is happening in the other groups, where they're not participating, or in all the groups, but are not too much dealing with how to help one to be more engaged in one or the other.

Last time, I didn't participate in so many different working groups, but I got the impression that, in the end, we are more or less the same. People who should, again, and who are in this subgroup – I don't know. We can make a list. It could be maybe 10 or 15 people; but they are participating in different subgroups. And that's not too much new blood, from my experience, for the long-term: for coming to visit, yes, but not so much for real work. Maybe it's too difficult to answer now.

The other points we are trying to change – the Diversity subgroup requests interpretation, hoping that there will be

more participants from the Francophonie and from the Spanish-speaking countries to participate in this specific subgroup. I hope that it will work, but it remains to be seen.

I don't know if I answered your question, but if you have additional questions, I will try to. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. What I'm looking for right now is people who will be the point people – the people to speak, to address to the questions.

We'll have Olivier talk about the ICANN Evolution and trying to get other people informed, not necessarily active.

Alberto will talk about the need for language services. And as you point out, one of the groups has now asked for language services – the Diversity group. But the other ones certainly do not, and that has been an inhibitor to stop it.

If you can address to what extent there is regular participation in all of the working groups by At-Large people –

And, can I ask staff to go through those working groups, identify the At-Large people (looking at the attendance to identify the people that are active), and get that to Sébastien before the meeting?

Thank you. All right. I think we've addressed that one.

The next issue is: what policy issues are active in our group? Yes?

Oh, sorry. Seun, I missed you. I apologize.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Just along the lines of what you're discussing, I just wanted to post that I think it might be good at some point within the week to ask ourselves the question of: what is it that is actually affecting participation currently? Because, obviously, participation compared to what it is in WS 1 is different. So, it would be good to actually ask ourselves the question.

I personally have experience to share on why is it that my participation has been "reduced." It should be good for us to hear what the challenges are and [inaudible] can be addressed if possible. Thank you.

Of course, I know that may not be a Board thing, but I'm just saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's an interesting point. I think, if we look at the people who are active in Work Stream 2, it's pretty much the same ones who were active in Work Stream 1.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Slightly reduced. And I think some of us close to killed ourselves the first time around, and this is not as important. Getting the basic accountability things correct, I think, was far more crucial in our minds than these details.

Personally, I try not to attend meetings at three in the morning, if I can avoid; whereas, I did a lot of those in Work Stream 1. So, I suspect it's just a matter of exhaustion more than anything else.

Clearly, the people who were active in Work Stream 1 are the ones who are most knowledgeable to participate in Work Stream 2. There has been some new people coming into it, but not a lot from At-Large.

Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have the impression that one of the reasons is that they were a much smaller group, and what we are looking at today is people who helped to write something. To write something, you need to have much more knowledge than just even speaking English, and that's very difficult.

And when you have to compare yourself with people from some of the subgroups – I will name two of them: the Transparency

group and the Human Rights subgroup – where you have professional people who are used to writing reports, you feel uncomfortable when you have a little knowledge in English for writing.

But then, for somebody who doesn't even have the skill of English writing, it's impossible to be there. And it's what we need today, unfortunately. Yes, we need to participate in some discussion, but now it's a time to write those things. The power is of the one who handles the pen, and when the power is the one who has a very good command of English, you are lost and you are done. That's where we are and which is a problem we face.

Frankly, I don't know how to solve that. Yes, interpretation will be useful for discussion; but interpretation will not be useful for writing the document, unfortunately. But I have no solution. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll note, however, that all of the groups are suffering from large membership and very few people attending the meetings. So, that's a universal problem and it's not an At-Large problem.

I've got Javier and Harold and Tijani, if he wishes. But I'd like to close the queue at that point because we really do have to go onto other parts of this discussion.

Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Just quickly, Alberto, I can help you in whatever you need with translation and the Board issues – whatever is required or needed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alberto? Harold?

HAROLD ARCOS: Yes. Take off your headphones. With respect to these questions… Alan, can you hear that? Is that working?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just figured out where the transmitters are. They're over there, so, you have to aim your thing there.

HAROLD ARCOS:	Okay. I was saying, on this question that the GAC is asking – to what extent At-Large is participating. Well, we would need to see precisely the extent. What scale are we using to answer that question of: what is the extent of that participation? So, that' one scenario.

Work Stream 1 dealt with issues that were essential for the Transition, and they required the approval and the attention of our key point, which was the transition. Work Stream 2 dealt with those issues that contained a longer discussion.

Now, I'd like to add the perspective that some groups have also stated. What is the expectation of the Board? What are they going to do with the human rights issues? And what I'm doing – will that have an impact?

So, what is the motivation of bringing the question back to the Board of, "What are the expectations for ICANN on the functionality of these discussions?" And whether this could this encourage not only these, but also other discussion on this issue?

Because some did have expectations – that were not properly reported – that human rights would be the commitment of the corporation with respect to this global issue, and that's not the case. This is a framework of interpretation and we have been

hearing this among the groups. The same applied to jurisdiction, then diversity.

So, with these key issues, participation has been confusing. We need to see what these definitions are going to be useful. This is going to be useful.

So, based on informed participation, we should be able also to ask: what are their expectations? What is the product that we expect to have? Because this is factor that may have discouraged active participation that was openly expressed in different sessions of the different key issues of Work Stream 2.

Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure we really want to get into the discussion of the substance of the work streams. That's going to open up a discussion that we're just not going to have the time for. At least my feeling is that we should avoid that and just answer the specific questions.

I think there's certainly a relevant part; that it is less compelling and is of less importance. So, people have not put as much energy into it.

Tijani, you're last.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very quickly, Sébastien, you're right. People are intimidated. I am more or less active in three groups: Human Rights, Jurisdiction, and the IOT. For the three groups, all the work is more legal than other things. Most of the people in these groups are lawyers. So, sometimes you feel as if you are a stranger there; that it's not your place.

But I can tell you that, in the groups where there is a challenge, where the people have an interest, even if they are not lawyers and even if they cannot contribute written things as the others, they come and they discuss. The Jurisdiction group is one of those.

That's why, in this group, things are not going well: we cannot advance very well since there is an opposition and there are people who want to participate and want to impact the decisions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or impede the decisions, in some cases.

TIJAN BEN JEMAA: Right. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. The next question they're asking is: what are our priorities? If we could go down two slides, please. Thank you.

As far as I know those, at this point, are our priorities, roughly in the correct order – perhaps not exactly. Does anyone have any strong feelings that there's something missing, there's something that shouldn't be there, or that the order is incorrect?

Anyone want to take the lead in reading those off? I don't think it's going to be much more sophisticated than that. There may be questions, of course, on some of them. Anyone like to take the lead on that?

Alberto, you're already speaking for something else. I'd prefer to have someone different. Seun?

Alberto, did you want to speak or were you volunteering? Sorry. Do you wanted to speak?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: I believe that the second item is our responsibility rather than asking this of the Board. So, I would put this at the end of the list. Just that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you misunderstood the question. The question the Board is asking is: what are our priorities? What are the things that are important to At-Large and to the ALAC? Some of these should be of no importance to the Board at all. The last item? I don't think they want to read all of our statements. I don't know. Nevermind. [laughing]

All right. Seun, do you volunteer to do that? That's fine with me. Do you want to speak or we'll talk privately? [laughing]

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. [laughing]

Just to be clear, this is in order of priorities, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Roughly in order of priorities. I think there's no question that the first item is first. One can argue where they come after that, but it's rough order of priorities, I think.

All right. Now, Andrei.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Well, there's no question about the first two, but I would say that the next four are, how to say, in a dynamic order. I would put it like this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can support that. Javier, last person.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Just ignorance. Continual stream of PCs? What's PCs?

ALAN GREENBERG: Public comments.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Ah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Satish?

SATISH BABU: I'm not sure whether this list has been frozen, but I'd like to propose IDNs and universal acceptance also as priority areas for us.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would question whether we could call it a priority of what we are actively working on.

SATISH BABU: The IDN Implementation Group has been very active. The ALAC has put two people on the working group, and the activities are continuing on a weekly basis. Meetings are happening every week, and [the lists] have been published now. So, we have been participating there. It's also a big priority for Asia-Pacific, but I don't know whether it will rank with the rest. I'm just pointing it out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it happens to be an area that's rather important to me, that I'm personally concerned about. Let's make sure that at our monthly ALAC meetings we have a report. Let's bring it up in visibility because right now, for the vast majority of people on the ALAC and regional leaders, it's invisible. And that's not good. So, I take it under advisement. I don't mind adding it here, but I think, in reality, we need to make it more visible.

SATISH BABU:	I think it's a fair point that you've raised and we have to update the ALAC. Thanks.
ALAN GREENBERG:	And the very last one to Tijani.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much. I think, if we changed the fourth one to TLDs and not gTLDs, we can put inside everything, including IDNs.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Very good. Thank you. Done. Staff, please note that: an action item to adjust the gTLD item –
[YEŞIM NAZLAR:]:	– to TLD?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	TLD.
ALAN GREENBERG:	– to include IDNs and universal acceptance. Thank you, Tijani. Sorry, I'm just looking at where we are on time.

All right, we're just about finished with this section and we haven't done most of the items yet. We had an item to discuss At-Large mailing lists that, if you remember, was a hot topic a few weeks ago of what mailing lists we should have. Let's try to eliminate the duplication so people don't get what they perceive as spam and junk mail.

I think we'll defer that to a teleconference and continue on this subject. So we have another 30 minutes at this point.

Next slide, please. All right.

We've now done what we hope will be the very short part of the hour with the Board, so we can focus more on the issues that we want to talk to them about.

The first one is ICANN meeting scheduling.

Next slide. I think I have a – yeah.

Certainly, from a scheduling point of view – and that's largely been Leon and me and staff – it's been a real miss. Not only the scheduling of our formal meetings, but the agendas for these meetings have been changing minute by minute, literally. Some of them – well, as you know, there was a 30-minute session that suddenly opened up this morning. I am eager to find out what you talked about.

But more than that, the conflicts, I think, are getting larger and larger. I'd like to think that most of the people who aren't in the room right now are in some other session. I don't know that for a fact. I trust they've reported in to staff as they're supposed to.

There's a major problem in terms of the GNSO PDPs. I was out this morning because the gTLD PDP was working in that [inaudible]. It's a really important issue. I'm on that and I didn't feel I could skip it. I'm also on the RDS one, which is meeting this afternoon and I chose not to be there. Holly is there.

The fact that the GNSO PDPs run in parallel with our meetings makes it really difficult. There was an interesting discussion this morning that the GAC is heavily involved in, and the Chair had to say, "But of course, they're not here because they have a conflict."

So, they didn't have an opportunity to present their side of issues. Not that we're trying to disenfranchise them, but it's important that people actually speak and not just have someone else say, "They consider it important."

So, I think we're having a bigger problem. I don't know whether I attribute it to new Meeting Strategy or not. It doesn't really matter, but somehow I think we're worse off than we were even a year ago or two years ago. And I'm just curious as to whether they hear reports of similar things from other people.

So, that's the substance of this one. I don't expect a major discussion on it, but I just think we needed the visibility of saying it.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. The Board might answer one of two things to this. I'm not quite sure why you want to bring this forward to the Board. If you want to bring this forward to the Board and ask the Board, "Well, during your day, having spoken to all the communities, have you heard similar concerns from other communities," then that's absolutely fine.

But if you want the Board to do something about it, those aren't the right people to speak to. They'll just say, "Oh, well, thank you for the question. Yeah, go and speak to Meeting Strategy. Do you know who the people are in Meeting Strategy?" That's the most condescending I could imagine they could ask. We'd say, "Of course we do."

"Oh, well then why didn't you ask them? Don't ask us." So, we have to frame this question in a certain way to really focus on what we would like to find out from them. Is it something that they've heard from others? A yes or a no. But I wouldn't spend too much time on it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I hope we will not spend too much time on it, and I did try to phrase it properly. I'm asking Board members, "Are you experiencing the same thing?" Because they spend some of their time going to meetings. Are they finding conflicts, and are they hearing it from other groups?

I don't think anywhere there's an implication that the Board should take action. The Board should care if we're having significant problems, though.

We do have a queue. Olivier, if you want a quick rebuttal, go ahead. Then we have Sébastien and Tijani.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Alan. From having spoken to individual Board members privately, yes, they have conflicts all over the place. Everybody does. But then maybe the whole community should not ask for 365 or 368 meetings in five or six days that we keep on asking for. In the previous meeting, we asked for in excess of 400 meetings. Short of having a conference center with just one room and spending two months here, there's no real way to avoid conflicts.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. I will not enter into detail about new Meeting Strategy, but I think the last question could be rephrased to: "Have you heard something back from the other communities" because asking them about the Board experience – the Board doesn't have any problems.

They are in the Board meetings and the interaction is for three things. The first is the public forum(s); the Board meeting face to the community; and the meeting with the SOs and ACs. It's easier for them now [that] it's not just on one day, the Tuesday– it used to be the Tuesday – but it's in other places. It's as they wish, in fact.

Then the Board is not really facing any trouble with these meetings. Today an individual Board member can have some conflicts, but they are supposed to be on the Board. That's it. What's happening outside? They don't care.

But if they heard from the other part of the community, it's important. Why is it important to raise that to the Board? Because, in fact, the Meeting Strategy didn't get the possibility to have a group to help the implementation.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

But one of the members of this Meeting Strategy from the Board kept the will and he's still on the Board. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. My understanding was that the current Board schedule does allow them time to go to other meetings throughout the week, so that was the basis on which I asked that. But I will verify that before the meeting.

Tijani, last comment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with the question as it is asked here. As for how to solve the problem, we spoke with Sally for a few minutes and she said that they have a group working on that. When we told her that we have ideas, she said, "We are waiting for your ideas. Please send them to us." So, I think that is our issue, the issue of everyone.

Yes, every time we say, "Oh, they put up a schedule with a lot of conflict," it is impossible to have a schedule without conflict. So, we have to give ideas on how to avoid, at the maximum, the conflicts. There are ideas.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, I'm on that group and I think the RALO Chairs are also, though I'm not 100% sure of that. One of the problems is that each AC/SO schedules their meetings, submits their schedules, and, by the time they're public, they're locked in. It's too late to make changes. The process right now is completely inflexible. Even if we had recognized a conflict two weeks or three weeks ago, it's impossible to change it – or almost impossible.

We tried with the At-Large Review this time. There was a physical slot and we were told, "No, you can't change it" – or MSSI was told they can't change it.

All right. I think we've spent enough time on this one. The next one, I think, is the more substantive one.

All right. If you look at the At-Large Review, one of the questions they asked – if we can go on to the next page – was, "In your opinion, which of the following statements most accurately describes the role of At-Large within ICANN?" They gave five alternatives, and you had to pick one.

Now, we don't want to focus on whether this was a good question or a bad question or whether the reviewers knew what they were talking about or not. The real issue is, if you look at what the alternatives are and try to understand that these are perceptions that they thought were good measures of what the

At-Large community is or should be – and I have significant problems with that.

If we can go to the next slide. This is something I sent out a week or two ago, and you've all seen it.

"The At-Large community is made up of ALSs and individual RALO members that mainly act in their own interests."

Now, that's true. Our ALSs, for instance, are each independent groups. They existed before At-Large recruited them, in most cased. At-Large is small part of their life, and to the extent they act within ICANN, they act within their own interests. I think that's a completely true statement.

It's up to At-Large as a group, and the ALAC, to consolidate all of those individual opinions and hopefully have something that represents the overall community. So, that's a statement which was taken to be derogatory but I think is accurate, if you understand how we came to be.

Next one.

"The At-Large community is made up of At-Large Structures and individual members that engage in ICANN policy development on behalf of the Internet users of the world."

Well, I think that's accurate. Each of us are doing our best from our personal perspective to do it. Now we need more, but I think that is an accurate statement. So, so far we have two accurate statements.

Number three, please.

"At-Large is a body within ICANN that allows all Internet end users to engage in ICANN policy development processes in an equal and non-discriminatory fashion."

Now, I can't think of anything more ridiculous: to say that all Internet users, all three-and-a-half billion, are going to participate in a non-discriminatory fashion in ICANN policy development. But yet, somebody thought that was a completely reasonable option to give. And 6% of the respondents said that's what we do. A little bit scary.

Yes, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. It might have been the way the way that they phrased it. By saying – instead of "all," they should have said "any Internet users." There might be a language issue here if some of the Francophone components of the Review team voiced the question because –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: There is no Francophone part.

[ALAN GREENBERG:]   There isn't?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are two people who live in France, but they're not Francophones.

[Laughter]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. They're British.

ALAN GREENBERG: They're British, but they're not very good in English, are they? [laughing] Just kidding.

I'd prefer to go to the end before we open the floor, but if people feel really strongly that they have to say s0mething, I will allow them.

Sébastien – no, wait? Okay.

Can we have the next one, please?

"The At-Large community is made up of At-Large Structure and individual RALO members that effectively engage with the global community of Internet users in a bottom-up, consensus-driven fashion."

Well, again, if you are talking about "engage with the whole global community" – again, patently impossible. If you're talking about whether they engage with their local community and their local friends who they meet at the bar, yeah, they might do that.

So, that one becomes a little bit more subject. But still, the expectation that we are interfacing with the global community of Internet users? If that's the expectation, we're never going to do it. And we are always going to be subject to criticism for not doing it.

Next one, please.

"Elected members of the ALAC" – now I'm not quite sure what "elected members of the ALAC are;" I think they are the ten

RALO-selected members; some of which are elected, some of which are not – "have a mandate to speak in the interests and on behalf of end users in the ICANN policy development process."

Well, I don't think so. Each of us have a mandate to say what we think is right and perhaps, in some cases, we will go back to the ALAC and say, "Does the whole ALAC agree?" But in general, that's not correct.

We're acting as individuals trying to work on behalf of users, but we're not speaking on behalf of users. There's a big difference between the two. So, I think that also is an equally false thing, and I won't tell you how many people said "yes" to that one, but there was a fair number.

I'm going to try to summarize these so I don't take 20 minutes, and then I'd like to open it up to the Board –

Well, let's go to the next one, please, first.

Now, what's the reality? I think we will never get a *vast* number of people who are heavily involved in ICANN processes. We're not going to get tens of thousands. And if we did, I don't think we'd know what to do with them. But we need interested, knowledgeable people who are willing to put some time into it,

and a good smattering of people from all over so we get the mix we're looking for.

I can give what I think is reasonable. I want to hear from Board members on what they think is reasonable because, ultimately, they're the ones who are going to judge us and they're the ones who have to accept what we're doing as valid.

Why we didn't do this ten years ago, I can't tell you. But I think it's time that we started asking questions. If we're going to try to remake At-Large to be effective, we have to know what we're being measured against. And that's why the question is here.

I'll open the floor. Sébastien had his hand up to start with. Do you want to go? No? Okay. Then we'll start with Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I think that the second statement also isn't that accurate, even if you find it accurate, because it says that we are acting on behalf of the Internet users. We don't have a mandate from all Internet users, so we cannot say we are acting on behalf of them. We can say we are acting on behalf of our community, of our engaged community. But we are not acting on behalf of all Internet users.

ALAN GREENBERG: You've convinced me. Staff, can we note that that second one should be changed? Thank you.

Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: I agree with Tijani, but I think, at some point, we discussed this and we had changed this because there was a legal issue. We are not the representatives of end users, but we actually defend the interests of end users. With that idea, we see a very important change in all the questions and what we want to get. Either we define the interests of the end users or not.

If we then get 50 in one event or 100,000 – if we can reach out to 100,000 in many of our radio consultations, for example – we can reach out to a lot more people. Or if we can have a movie, we'll reach out to a lot more people. But as Alan said, we cannot reach everybody, but we can represent the interests of all of them because we collect that information through ALSs. All individual users bring this to us, and this is the feedback that is sufficient to represent the interests of end users.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? Javier and Andrei.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: In the slides, we see in the text used here the notion that we represent the interests of the individual Internet end users, but then it says "who are interested in ICAN processes." Is there anywhere in the bylaws or in any document that that qualification is made?

Or is the issue that the door is so open that it will always lead to this conception that we are some sort of representative of the universe? That phrase – "interested in ICANN processes" or "in ICANN subjects" – is a good predicate. It's a qualification of what's supposed to happen. But is that anywhere in legal documents, like in Board da-da-da and bylaws?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think there are any legal documents –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, I'm serious. There are words like "this is the home of Internet users for those who want a home in ICANN." That's unspoken. Every once in a while, someone shows up at ICANN and doesn't know anything, and that doesn't stop them from

talking and telling us how to do things. I don't think those are the best contributors to our processes.

The good contributors often have to spend a lot of time understanding things before they become good contributors. It's a difficult process, and not everyone wants to spend that time or has the interest – in my mind, anyway.

Andrei?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you, Alan. I would come back to what interests we represent. It's really hard to say "we" as a set group of people. What I know is that I was selected by the NomCom, and those guys are actually – while picking the people for the ALAC, for instance – they're basically taking into consideration basic criteria for the people who will be sitting at the ALAC and talk about "me," not "we."

I definitely represent and carry on the interests of the technical community related to the DNS, Domain Name Registration, IP addresses, protocols, etc., and the community which goes beyond Russia. It also includes the neighboring countries and many other countries in the world because we have connections. We're engineers. We do things.

I have no doubt that NomCom is doing a good job in this kind of environment, picking up us as individuals. So, there's my hope that we, as those individuals all together, definitely represent the interests of at least thousands of people who are really dealing with what ICANN does.

For me, that's the most important criteria to have: to represent the interests and carry on the interests of the people and the experts and the commercial guys and social activities and end users who are using domain names in the ALAC.

That's what my thought is. There is nothing wrong in representing the interests. It depends on how far you're trying to go with these interests.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the real issue is that the best we can do is get good, knowledgeable, concerned people who are concerned about user interests from a wide variety of areas so that, together, we can do our best to represent the interests. To pretend that we are going to get input from millions or tens of millions or billions, I think, is a dream that someone might have had once. But I don't think it's appropriate.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Question in the chat.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

ALAN GREENBERG: Question in the chat. Go ahead.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you. There's a question in the chatroom from Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. He says, "What are the difference between ALAC represent the interest of internet end user and defend internet users? Is that ALAC is home of Internet user worldwide home?"

ALAN GREENBERG: If I got the question, I don't think there's a big difference between "represent the interests of users" and "defend the interests of users." I don't typically use the word "defend," but I don't see a major difference.

In terms of the "home of Internet users," I'm not sure that's the best description if I would have come up with it because we're really only the home of people who really want to participate actively, as opposed to being a nice club to join. But those are the words that we have currently.

Tijani, go ahead. And then we have Alberto.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I think the question was: what is the difference between representing the interests of end users and defending

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

the interests of end users? This was the question of Bachar. In this case, I don't think there is any difference.

Another point – I forget. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree. I don't use the term "defend," but I don't see a big difference in them.

Alberto, go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: I don't think there is much of a difference, unless you really say that in order to represent, you need a mandate; or, to defend, you may also need a mandate as well.

I actually believe that, if, as we said before, it said "representing end users" is conflictive and then "representing the interests in general," I think, is not.

When we represent interests, we are discussing representing even the interests of those who are disconnected because we are the ones who have taken that interest that is not connected to be able to reconnect it. So, it's not only those who are intervening right now. We're actually involving all the rest.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's exactly what we are here to do: to speak on behalf of those who cannot represent their own interests in this forum. They are not connected to it. They don't necessarily understand some of the issues and certainly are not able to interact in these forums. But somebody should on their behalf.

Satish, last.

SATISH BABU: Thank you. On the issue of mandate that has been posed as to who has given us a mandate, are we self-mandated? Has there been an explicit transfer of mandate? It's an important part, but all NGOs around the world are self-mandated. There is no representational rule that any community gives to an NGO necessarily.

End users are self-mandated, and I personally do not see any difficulty in being self-mandated on this. We are diverse – we [at At-Large]. We value diversity. We've been talking about that.

What we imply there as an offshoot or outcome of the diversity is that we connect to these multitudes of communities around the world and we're able to understand their positions; thereby, even though we're self-mandated, we're able to represent their interests. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Last, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. I think one of the problems we face is that even the bylaws are just wrong. It's time to change the bylaws because it's not ALAC with the home of the end users. It's At-Large. We have to find a name for what we are because we know what we are. When we talk about ALAC, it' 15 people – full stop. But our organization is much more than those 15 people.

Those 15 people are, if I can say, at the top of the pyramid. But we are organizing the bottom of the pyramid with the ALSes. The fact that the bylaws are wrong creates enormous trouble in the understanding of what we are.

I would like to launch a – I don't know – a concourse, to find the right word to talk about the full pyramid. Then maybe we need to call us "Giza." Maybe people will have a better idea. But we need to start by changing the bylaws. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. I will point out that about a year or so ago, I went through the bylaws and the Memorandums of Understanding for the RALOs. They're all garbage. They all have relatively little to do with what we actually do. It was what

people thought we were going to do when the words were written. They all need revision.

But if it's any comfort – and this won't make sense to everyone here if you're moderately new – some of you may have seen Marilyn Cade at open forum sessions or something like that. She's been around for a very long time. I must have heard her at least 100 times over the last ten years explain the difference between the GNSO and the GNSO Council. And people still don't get it. It's the same sort of problem.

So, yeah. Changing the names may fix part of it, but we're never going to completely fix the problem. I think part of it is, yeah, we have to live with it.

We have Tijani, who really wants to speak. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Absolutely, because the GNSO is a supporting organization, so it is a structure inside ICANN. At-Large is not a structure inside ICANN at all. We don't have a structure named At-Large. There is only the Advisory Committee. The At-Large Advisory Committee is a structure. That's why, in the bylaws, they cannot say that "At-Large is the home of an ICANN of the end users."

The only structure where you have the end users is the ALAC. The difference between the GNSO and the GNSO Council is not the same as the difference between At-Large and ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, they're not the same, but if we had written "At-Large as the home of the Internet user" in the bylaws, it would be there. Those just don't happen to be the words that were written. So be it.

We're just at the end of this session. I thank you. We have a, I believe, 15-minute break, and they'll reconvene for work group updates. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry? Oh, we're not over yet, I say with a fair amount of shame. This was a Board and GAC presentation. I would suggest we take 15 minutes from the start of the [work group] updates and do the GAC, if that's okay.

[TIJANI BEN JEMAA:] Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, reconvene is 15 minutes. Please try not to be late. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]