
COPENHAGEN – Joint Meeting: ALAC & ccNSO
Sunday, March 12, 2017 – 17:00 to 18:30 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

ALAN GREENBERG: Welcome to everyone from the ccNSO. I should have said that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. As always, it's great to be here. And right before the meeting, Alan reminded me of the fun we had in Hyderabad and just expressed some hopes that this time, it's going to be just as fun as the last time. And I certainly hope so too.

As I know, we have agenda in front of us. The first one is EPSRP. And by now, I've almost learned what it stands for. It stands for Extended Process Similarity Review Panel. Yes, thank you, thank you. Actually, the moment we closed the working group, I finally learned how to spell it out.

So, yes, as you may know, there was a working group which was tasked by the Board to review findings of the DNS security panel and this Extended Process Similarity Review Panel thing and come up with a recommendation how to improve the process and especially how to address split recommendations.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So there was a working group. We had experts and participants and observers from GAC also participating. I think we had some from ALAC as well. This is the group that came up with the draft report which was published for public comments. We received support from GAC, received support from ALAC.

And the SSAC provided negative feedback. After some consultations, they improved the quality of their feedback. But still, they think that it could be that we are planning to break the Internet, which probably by now would be a good thing. But that was their concern, that we're going to break the Internet.

Do you want me to continue or you already don't like what I'm saying here?

ALAN GREENBERG: I love what you're saying. I guess I can tell you...

KATRINA SATAKI: No. Okay. I will just finish.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just continue with it and then I'll [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes. So, in a little bit, our working group changed the wording. They believe that all the concerns expressed by SSAC were already addressed by the working group in their report. But to make it clearer, they spelled it out specifically that it's not our intent to break the Internet. And, of course, this DNS security panel, it still remains an integral part of the process. So it's not that we're proposing to get rid of it.

But the main idea that we propose is this split recommendation should be resolved in favor of lowercase strings because in some cases, security panel, they found that strings may not be confusingly similar in a lowercase but are confusingly similar in uppercase. And in that case, the proposal was that to be in favor of lowercase strings because it is consistent with RFC6212 and because it's permitting only lowercase letters and not uppercase. And it's also consistent with IDNA 2008 standard.

So, after tweaking the report, it was submitted to the ccNSO council. The ccNSO council adopted it and finally submitted it to the Board together with explanation and how we addressed some findings of SSAC if I may call them.

But now, if there's a question. Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me recount what has happened in ALAC. As you said, we did participate in the process. When it went out for public comment, with no surprise, we have a heavy interest in IDNs. And trying to get IDNs delegated seemed like a really good idea. And we supported the overall statement.

Sadly, SSAC came up with a report the date after we submitted our comment and pointed out that they had some concerns. And that's where it stood. We said maybe we should relook our statement and we never actually got around to it. But things clearly have gotten hot enough now that it has become more important.

We did meet with SSAC and they still believe they have a concern, just in case that wasn't clear. And we're in an interesting position. If you look at the new gTLD process, probably the only reason ALAC ultimately sort of supported the new gTLD process, and we weren't all that hot on it, was IDNs.

If there hadn't been IDNs in that process, we probably would have rejected it categorically as it just wasn't important right now. But IDNs are really important to us. Lots of our communities, it's their life blood. And it has opened up the Internet to people who wouldn't easily have had it otherwise.

So that's one thing. But if you look at the advice we actually gave to the Board during the new gTLD process, we didn't formally give advice. We've participated in lots of discussions and made lots of comments. One of the few pieces of advice we gave was on the plural-singular issue that confusion for users is our life blood. That's why we're here, to worry about how users interact with the Internet.

And to be honest, it's really encouraging to hear the SSAC using the word “user confusion” right now. We'll get to that. And we do have confusion. Although we understand that lowercase is the standard, no one stops you from sending an uppercase address in an e-mail that you may want to click on it. So the potential confusion is there.

There's no question that some of these strings from a user perspective are confusingly similar. That's a pattern matching issue and they look the same. And if you look at the one that was in the first round of Brazil and Bulgaria, if you look at them, they are confusingly similar.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

If you look at the findings of the EPSRP itself, how they did this and the method they've been using to distinguish whether to find whether they were confusingly similar, they found they were

not confusing similar. And that's because that was a methodology based on scientific evidence and scientifically vetted. That's directly in say in the reports.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If I may continue. The two-character string may be confusingly similar. That does not mean what the user ever sees as in a URL, it may be confusingly similar. And I'll tell you my perspective, and it's not necessarily held by everyone on ALAC. I have deep concerns about lowering the standard of [residing] on whether two-character strings are confusingly similar or not.

On the other hand, I have and I think we have a very strong interest in seeing many of the TLDs that are associated with those strings delegated. And the question is: how do we split the process between the evaluation of the two-character strings and the decision to delegate so everyone can walk away from the party happy?

That's where I stand, but I'd like to open it up to the floor for ccTLD – oh, sorry. Katrina, go ahead.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes. Thank you. Yes. By now, I've learned a lot about all these things and I could talk a lot about confusing similarity and things

like that. Not as long as our members on the EPSRP working group, but still.

And first of all, the working group reviewed two historical DNS security panel findings. And those were reports relating to IDN ccTLDs, those strings. And both evaluations, despite they being failed on the ground of string confusability, both these findings said that the string presents none of the threats to the stability or security of the IDN identified in [module four of the FTIP base].

So the DNS security panel found that there's no threat. And DNS security panel is a subset of SSAC. That's my understanding at least. And now, SSAC comes up with something that contradicts this finding. That is definitely very confusing to us.

And at the same time, we haven't seen any evidence, neither provided by SSAC or otherwise, that that these previous IDN things or even applications we're finding on confusing similarity has been made that they create really threat to security [inaudible] DNSO.

So, before we continue with our discussion, let me show something. I came prepared. These two strings, are they confusingly similar?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think so.

KATRINA SATAKI: But they are in the root. So they are on the Internet. Did they break the Internet? This one, it's .IT/.LT, Italy and Lithuania. At some point, Lithuanians saw loads of registrations from Italy. Why? Because it looks like if you write it with a big letter I, in that case, yes, it looks like Italy.

I have more: [CO]. We have .SU and that is .SV. According to the findings, they shouldn't be on the Internet because they are confusingly similar, they confuse the users.

.CT/.CD, still the Internet works. .EE/.EC, very confusing. These definitely confuse me a lot. I know that for some, it could be just, yes, exactly, nothing confusing about it. But it definitely confuses me.

And now, what we hear that, for example, Epsilon Tau, whatever, how you pronounce it, is confusingly similar to .EU even though they are supposed to be run by the same institution. And this string is confusingly similar to .EV and .EY, which are not even delegated.

So this is basically what we're talking about here. Now, it's not our intention to break the Internet, but we definitely would like

to see similar or the same approach to new gTLDs, to ccTLDs, to IDN ccTLDs which, as you rightfully pointed out, are very important for the users.

And, yes, confusing similarity is a very difficult concept. And it's not technical. So, technically, it will never break the Internet. So, yes, it might confuse users, but that is the thing that there are mitigation strategies to make sure to mitigate the risks that users get confused.

And this is the main idea that, yes, registries, if they want to have to something like Epsilon Tau, for example, they are supposed to provide mechanisms to mitigate the risks. And it has always been the case, and it should be the case for all ccTLDs not just Latin.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just a couple quick comments, and I'll open it up at that point. I don't think anyone's talking about breaking the Internet. We are talking about user confusions. And you're not going to find a lot of people here opposing the singular-plurals that were allowed in. And it's refreshing to hear that the gTLD registries are now suggesting we don't allow singular and plurals of any forms, not just "s" in the future rounds.

So maybe we won't make the same mistakes that we made previously. And I think the crux of some of our concerns and our answers is if we talk about the mitigation parts as part of the process, then it becomes very simple. And I think we can easily delegate them. It's the separation of the mitigation from the evaluation that's problematic in my personal mind. Andrei is first.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you. I'm not going to advocate the SSAC statements but I'd like to just put them on the table just to remind what their concerns are. The first concern is upper-lowercase, they think it's a equal confusability being upper or lowercase. The second one is a different interpretation between the working group of ccNSO and SSAC of the RFC6912 in the item number six or the paragraph number six, so they understand it differently. And the third one is, definitely, the registry mitigation. They claim that there must be a mitigation.

So, in order to be constructive and there should not be a divide between opinions, I actually proposed. It was a simple proposal like get together, get some beer. All the working group, the SSAC guys, the At-Large guys get together, discuss this issue, come to the solution.

But I'd like to repeat that it's definitely the confusability. It should not be the stop sign for the delegation. And the solution for that is a mitigation process for the registry so when there is a confusability, it will be under the control of the certain registry of the delegated string. And I think it will be a good idea just to have it in the process for the fast track. I don't know if it's still called the fast track. It's probably called some – still? That's lovely. So that's it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Andrei.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Sorry. Katrina, you came prepared.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, I hope so. Yes. Thank you. Yes, okay, Wafa. Sorry.

WAFDA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: Yes. Just a little question. I don't think if I have missed something. But here, I think, Alan, we are speaking about ccTLDs. The confusion, what's the problem of confusion for users? If ccTLD is given, it will be given for a country. The

problem of phishing or other similarity problems, it would be in the second level, not in the top-level domains.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

WAFI DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: Yes?

KATRINA SATAKI: That is true. In any case, that string...

WAFI DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: You can't make phishing for these TLDs. These TLDs is delegated for countries. And there are authorities and the registries and many, many organized structures behind.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you very much. And just from my personal experience last week, last week, there was a regional meeting in Europe and we listened to a presentation from our Bulgarian colleague on the implementation and launch of .BG in Cyrillic.

And if you look at .BR and .BG in Cyrillic, you might find it confusingly similar. But when you look at the string and it's

always a string, you never can look at TLDs as such, you look at the string. And if string is in Cyrillic, there's no way you can confuse it with something. But confusability is really a very difficult concept. Yes.

WAFI DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: The problem here when we are delegating for countries, what's the problem for the end users when you are confused in the code country at the top-level domain?

ALAN GREENBERG: The potential confusion is if you have ALAC.eu and we delegate the Greek version which could potentially look like .eu and they allow ALAC to be...

KATRINA SATAKI: That's mitigation.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: No, no. May I?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: And they allow ALAC.GreekEU, then they would look the same. And they might go to two different places. The mitigation that we're talking about in that particular case is the GreekEU will only have Greek second level domains. That's the mitigation. And that's why I said if the mitigation is included in the request, then there's no problem. It's completely secure.

The potential is some other ccTLD-type thing be delegated in the future that doesn't have such protections, and then there is a potential for the problem. That's why I said, in my mind, you have to link the two together.

WAFI DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: Yes, you have the problem in the second level. And the practice here, when you have a new gTLD, all the concerned bodies have to protect their domain names. For example, let's have the case of .tn. If you feel the confusion between .tn, .europa or .tn, another character, that I have to protect it. If I don't do it, that's the market.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you. I'm going to try and make this very brief. I think there's a real danger here of unconscious cultural bias in this discussion. I used to live and work in this town. And one of my regular lunch time haunts was a restaurant that was just off Kongens Nytorv. It's not there anymore, sadly, called KGB. And it sold Russian-themed experience. And it was a great little place.

Now, as you know, the G looks a little bit like an R in Cyrillic. What you're actually suggesting by this imposition of mitigation rules on non-Western scripts is that people in other parts of the world are subject to different and more onerous requirements than people in, let's say, .com. You have IDN.com. You can have it in various different scripts.

And this restaurant that I used to go to used to make a big play of having the Russian and Cyrillic and the Latin and so on, and people do this. So what you're actually saying is that one alphabet is better than another. One alphabet has more freedom of expression than another. And I just think that's wrong. People will get confused about things.

You'll be surprised as a ccTLD manager some of the support calls we get, the strange things that people get confused about. But you cannot legislate or litigate for human stupidity. I'm sorry, you can't protect against everything. And the attempt to do so, as my view, inhibits people's freedom of expression.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Nigel. Yes. So our belief is that ccTLD should be treated equally as gTLDs, that's one thing. And other thing, Latin scripts and national scripts should be treated equally. And we believe that if somebody who read our report, they would definitely notice that we're talking about compliance with RFCs, we talk about compliance with different other standards. And we specifically stress all the mitigation strategies that have to be in place there.

So, therefore, yes, it's difficult to say what we can discuss here because we believe that everything is in the report. Just I would really urge you to read it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll never get that right. Just a question. Does the report and I read it a while ago but I've learned a lot since then. Does the report actually talk about linking the mitigation solutions with the TLD request or simply saying, "Trust the registry. They have mitigation"? Because I find those somewhat different.

KATRINA SATAKI: I read it also sometime. I cannot quote it by heart. But, yes, in any case, it's clearly said that this DNS stability as a security

panel which reviews applications. And I think actually, yes. In application, the registry should provide some mitigation strategies. I think that's what it said. Sorry? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think Alan's question is, is it something that you're saying, "Gee, that would be really nice but you can go ahead and do what you like," or are they tied together such that the avoidance of confusion is they're going to be mitigation strategy as well and it is built into the process? That was the question.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think I...

ALAN GREENBERG: [Bart] [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, [Bart]?

[BART BOSWINKEL]: In the report, what you will see, there is no direct link between say the way you phrased it. On the other hand, and this is going along the lines of what Wafa is saying, is given the nature of

ccTLDs and especially given the nature of IDN ccTLDs where you talk about the country and territory name itself, there needs to be support of the relevant government.

And one of the arguments used by the working group is that say, user confusion, user protection, especially in the case of country codes is first and foremost a national government issue. And ICANN should not put itself in the place of a national government. That's the argument that's being used and, therefore, it needs to be on the national level and dealt with. The second thing that they say is there should be at least a conversation around mitigating factors.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you. Are there – yes, please.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Hi. Just first to thank all the panelists from ccNSO, especially Katrina and Nigel for their clarity. Nigel, thank you for your comments regarding this how some sort of overzealous paternalism by ICANN might cause these unwanted messages out there of linguistic superiority. That really drove it through. They were [taking] a strong message.

And what ICANN needs to do, I think it should direct its efforts to promote the use of as many languages as possible. And in the case of Spanish, my mother tongue, there are not a lot of special characters. There's some but some of them define the language itself like the N with the tilde, the Ñ. That not even the Spaniards are using that much because people are afraid to use IDNs or special characters. So thank you very much for teaching me a lot.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. And if there are no more comments on this, we can move to the next agenda. Yes. Please.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Very quickly. I'm going to speak in Spanish. I apologize for not having read the reports. For this reason, if you can send us a link, I'm going to ask this also from the other band. And at the same time, I would like you to send us the same examples with the rationale, the same examples exactly, this and this from both parties so that we can read both reports and see the same rationale for the same registries and then also to be able to confront those opinions. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Yes, of course, the report is public and we'll send you the link. So, if there are no more comments, let's move to the next agenda. Okay, Seun. Yes, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Sorry. I just wanted to ask before we move to the next agenda item, what do you consider as the way forward on this because on the long run, the bodies in this situation whereby they don't know what to do based on the fact that two communities are not agreeing on a particular thing. So what do you consider as a way forward? Are you actually open to this discussion that Andrei suggests in terms of the three with ALAC also comment in a discussing what is the solution to this issue or you just like to be hellbent on your reports because that's what it looks like I'm hearing. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, well, the report is already submitted to the Board. SSAC's advice is what it is. It's advice. And in this case, as I already mentioned, it's not technical thing. And we believe it can be just disregarded. But, okay, that just adding fun to our conversation. Yes, of course, we are going to talk. We're going to talk and have meeting. But basically, the Board asked for input from us. A working group delivered. And now, the report is sent to the

Board. Now, it's up to the Board. It's for the Board to decide, listen to all the parties, organize discussions, hear and everything.

And I cannot say I'm very envious of this situation. If I was on the Board, I wouldn't be particularly happy. But, yes, we delivered but we're open for discussions and ready to explain our position and to defend ccTLDs, basically, yes. Yes, please?

SEUN OJEDEJI: To defend your position or to discuss perhaps you may change your position.

KATRINA SATAKI: It is highly unlikely. But no, we're ready to discuss and show in our report where all these questions are addressed. And we believe they've been addressed properly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If I may?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, sure.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think it is in the benefit of the community at large in general and the interest of the ICANN that you discuss with the SSAC and you find a coming around.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you. But perhaps to tell you that they frankly admitted that they are not experts in confusing similarity.

ALAN GREENBERG: But they are interested in finding common ground.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Let's move to the next agenda item. No, don't scroll because it's still there. It's EC AC/Empowered Community, all the processes and procedures. But when we came up with this agenda item, there was a silence. But my understanding is that there had been a significant process since this morning. This morning? Yes.

And I would like to give the floor to my colleague, Stephen, who is our representative on EC administration. Actually, I have to introduce him properly because he is the guy who reads the Bylaws and translates the Bylaws for the rest of us. Yes.

[STEPHEN DEERHAKE]: We have, as a community, across all the SO and ACs a tremendous amount of work that we need to get cracking on both with regards to the organization of the ECA itself and development of some lightweight policy/procedures for the ECA to follow and also for the SO/ACs that make up the empowered community.

We will have in Johannesburg a public forum that will be run by the ECA to handle a fundamental Bylaw change known as an Approval Action in the lexicon of Annex D in the new Bylaws.

Subsequent to the ICANN Johannesburg meeting, we will go into a rejection petition period due to ICANN Board tentatively planning to approve the ICANN budget on the 24th of June, I believe it is.

In other words, we have to have in place – and I speak for the ccNSO as a supporting organization – and ALAC has to have in place and the numbers people have to have in place and all the other decisional participants have to have in place procedures and policies by which they will handle both approval processes and rejection petitions coming from their community members in place by the Johannesburg meeting. And to do that, we've got a lot of work to do.

I've done a fair amount of work on this. I would be very curious to know where this organization is in trying to put together policy/procedures for how they will handle the approval process as well as the petition rejection.

And as I said, I've done a fair amount of background research and translation from lawyer language to something that is understandable by mere mortals. And I'd be happy to share that with whoever within your organization is on point trying to come up with policy/procedures. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We had rules in our Rules of Procedure in place actually by the transition, by the time that Bylaws were in place, that set out the infrastructure. So we have a decision process. We have voting thresholds and things like that associated with the Empowered Community actions that cover that.

We don't have any explicit procedures. But on the other hand, there doesn't appear to be any reason that our normal procedures would not work in those cases. As we go forward, we're likely to see some recommendations coming out of the CCWG specifically on director removal where we may have to have a little bit more specificity.

But the decision to approve a fundamental Bylaw is not much different than a decision to hold a meeting or to submit a statement. Conceptually, it's just the same. We happen to have a different voting threshold because it is something that we consider quite crucial. And we have a higher threshold. And it's a higher threshold not just of the quorum but of the whole ALAC, again, because we put high importance on it.

But it's not clear that we need specific procedures in place to, for instance, approve the fundamental Bylaw changes that will be coming to us. So we have taken a very minimalist position on it, and we hope it won't come back to bite us. But I'd very much like to see what the kind of things are you were talking about to see if in fact we've missed something that we need to think about.

[STEPHEN DEERHAKE]:

I'd be happy to share it with you. If you could give me a quick overview as to how ALAC is planning to handle a rejection petition submitted by one of its members with regards to: who they submit it to? Is there a review process within ALAC to see that that rejection petition satisfies the requirements for its acceptance as outlined in Annex D?

ALAN GREENBERG: The rules say not only an ALAC member but actually anyone in the world is allowed to submit a request to us to reject the budget or to remove a director or whatever. And, in fact, those rules were put in place to counter the fact that we're a completely closed group.

Nevertheless, if someone does submit a petition and whether it is someone within our own committee or someone disjoined from it, we would be obliged to look at it within the timeframes that are specified in the ICANN Bylaws and come to a decision on it. But, again, maybe I'm missing something but I don't see that that is different than any other decision we might have to take in a specific timeline.

[STEPHEN DEERHAKE]: With regards to the timelines, how comfortable are you guys with some of these?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not at all. We're a pretty agile community. Unlike the GNSO for instance which traditionally only votes at meetings, teleconferences, or face-to-face, we vote electronically. We have pretty good rules. We normally will do it for a week, but we'll do it for a shorter period of time if necessary.

So our rules are flexible enough to handle it. Will it be really easy? No. But we can meet the deadline if it's something that really stirs us. But Stephen and I were both at the same meeting this morning talking about how the Empowered Community itself would, just who do we call to tell them that we have a petition or something like that.

And it's not going to be easy, but the rules were set up so it wouldn't be easy. And if we don't feel in our hearts that this is really crucial, we're probably not going to take action. On the other hand, if we feel this is really important and something horrible is happening that we need to react to, we'll react.

KATRINA SATAKI:

So basically, what you're saying is that you will deal it case by case basis, and it's going to be the council who decides without consulting?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I didn't say that. We have 15 members, 10 of which are appointed by RALOs. They may choose to consult as deep as they choose to. They're not required to by ALAC rules. The RALO may compel them to do certain things or their conscience may compel them to do certain things. So those timelines are going

to be real tight, but we all knew that when we're approving them. There's just no question. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. As Alan just said, our rules have been modified so that we will manage so to be an Empowered Community member that may decide on anything. But I am sure that in exercising those powers, we will certainly face some perhaps special cases. And in this case, we will arrange our rules to address those cases. But now, we tried to look at all the landscape, and we didn't find that we need a special kind of rules for those powers. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you very much. I'm glad to see that everything is under control.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, okay. Because we're pretty stressed out. Realize the number of guidelines that we need is actually growing day by day. And another one, just a few hours go, we learned that apparently at

some point – quite soon, this point is going to be very soon – we will need to appoint together with other SOs/ACs, we need to appoint people to independent review process standing committee. Yes.

So it came as a surprise and it's not just that we need internal processes in place. We also need to understand how we're going to work together with other communities. And if there are no other comments, let's move to the next agenda item. And it's a jolly one, your review.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, lots of drawings.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It'll raise the stress for us.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. The thing why we're asking about that is that there's an upcoming ccNSO review. Yes, hopefully we will postpone it a little bit but not for eternity. At some point, we will definitely need to start it and we would love to learn from you, hear your feedback and see what are the pitfalls that we might be able to find.

ALAN GREENBERG:

On the positive side, we've had a number of comments that we have never seen an issue in ICANN, and this accountability in IANA transition notwithstanding, that has motivated as many people within our organization and in the periphery of the organization to get involved.

From those of us who are always regularly involved, I think the expression is a blackhole for energy and time. This particular review, we were quite optimistic. And we're a little bit disappointed. I think we can summarize that of the 16 recommendations, we're probably going to accept about three-quarters of them. And that's really easy because they're recommending things we're already doing or they're recommending things that ICANN has to do by spending more money which is fine with us, and things like more support of our website which we don't have access to. We're not allowed to change our website.

And then there's a small number of recommendations which we can almost completely, not universally, agree with the analysis of the problem and believe that their recommendations exactly as stated would please much of ICANN in that it might completely take any power and authority away from ALAC and we would stop annoying you.

So we're trying to deal with that and see how it comes out. I'll open the floor to other people. I see Sebastian.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. It was not totally a joke when I say postpone it. I have the impression that those reviews were built for the previous ICANN and nothing was changed with the new ICANN, with the new power of the community.

The review is to be done request by the Board, the result go to the Board, and the Board decide about that. What the hell? We need to Board to decide about how we are organized? If you or if other part of the community disagree with how we are organized, let's talk together. We don't need a supreme judge, the Board, to decide about that.

And I am not joking here. I am saying that the way the review is done needs to be reviewed definitely and urgently before any other new organization within ICANN, sorry, organization, [it has a staff now], okay, any part of this structure, any part of ICANN be a review again. It's really a serious matter from my point of you. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Sebastian. Actually, before I started reading ALAC review, I had an impression that the aim of a review is to help us identify things that we're probably doing not as efficiently as we could and help us to grow. Now, I'm not so sure. So anyone else would like to share a view?

ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly, the aim of this review is to show us how badly we're thought of by the rest of the organization, and it has done a really good job of that or at least by individuals within the organization.

The concept of them quoting people who have said things which are demonstrably absolutely false – now, that doesn't change the fact that these people believe it, but it's not based on any reality that I live in – is interesting. Tijani and Ariel after that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Katrina, you've said exactly the right word. The review of At-Large was supposed to be a review. It wasn't a review. It was a reform of At-Large, and this is the problem. And this is what the review team understood it. They wrote it in their introduction. They spoke about reform, a reform and not review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel and Cheryl.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. Just a quick reminder, please state your name before speaking. It's late in the day, we understand, but for our transcription purpose. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I note it's nine minutes before the hour. I among other people, I suspect others have to leave sharp on the hour. So you all can continue. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I'll do my best not to continue on so many levels. But just, I used to have a badge, it's somewhere in my collection from ICANN meetings, that says "ask me about reviews" and "I'm a fan of reviews" because I am a fan of reviews. I do think the process of having external examination and independent reviewers look at the component parts of ICANN, and most importantly ICANN as a whole and that's certainly overdue, is a very important contributor to a model that we should be trying to run under continuous improvement. So, first of all, I'm a fan of reviews.

I've seen a number of changes even in the comparison between the 2009 review which I just inherited and what has happened in even the other organization reviews that happened since that, and there has been continuous improvement in the way they've done reviews.

Only in the last couple of years have they come under a new. Since the second review of the GNSO, there's been a relatively new and still misunderstood change in the way that the reviews should be going on. And the structure and function of a review team is much more important.

I'm sure I can project and have the microphones on the other side pick me up if we're not hearing me loud enough, I can fix that.

And I'm unsure that in the specifications and the interviews with the potentials for doing the review, the external examiners, the role of the review team is made clear enough because some of the angst in this process is a product of misunderstandings and the lack of taking up opportunities that existed for communication.

And so I think if you're not able to totally, and I agree with Sebastian, put it off would be a very good idea, for a lot of reason because there's something like 11 reviews going on the

next two years. I mean, it's just silly. I think we should have a moratorium on them for a while.

And yes, we do need to look at the whole way this process could be better done and better managed and more clearly understood by community and people who are responding to the expressions of interest. But I do think if you've got a powerful and effective and good communication with the review team and the external reviewer, you shouldn't be too fearful.

That said, you also need to make sure that, and this is really harder than it should be, whoever is the independent reviewer has a broad understanding of the ICANN entity. And we really thought that that as a critical aspect was made very, very clear. And it was and looking at the CVs in the background even our current reviewers should have that. They've gone the street cred, they've got their experience. And yet, something as simple as clearly not understanding what the process is for PDPs in the ccNSO world and in the GNSO world, the depth isn't there. And so, recommendations based on that, we can very easily get annoyed about.

So it's not the end of the known world, but with some adjustments I think you should be able to get through it relatively unscathed probably thanks to us not doing so.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the interesting things is Cheryl just said something interesting. She said if you have good communication with the reviewer. But the current process that the department that runs reviews takes is you should have no contact with the reviewer other than when they interview you for your 30 minutes. And they should have literally – there's no one in the room listening, is there? No, I won't go into it. That there is supposed to be a hands-off relationship because we can't be trusted to try to sway them. And that has generated a large part of the problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not true. Big red X on the screen. That's not true.

ALAN GREENBERG: What's not true?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What you just said.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: What is the truth, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. That maybe how some people and indeed sometimes the review teams have taken it. But the process as she is writ, and Holly and I will provide for the record the PowerPoint slide that explains this, has very clear and specific requirements for interaction and for modification and for being able to be used as a resource to correct records.

What does happen and what's supposed to happen, I'm not saying, is the same but I am saying what is supposed to happen should offer lots of opportunity for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't disagree at all.

HOLLY RAICHE: There was one occasion where, in fact, we understood there were to be a nature of more communication than there was. And that actually turned out to be a disappointment probably on both sides. I think what they have learned as well as we learned is that that was a really missed opportunity. And in fact, that lack of communication fostered a level of distrust that should not have been there had that communication happened.

So it has been a mismanagement. But as Cheryl has rightly pointed out, they missed an opportunity that was written in and should have happened. So it is not true that we are supposed to be at arm's length. The fact that we don't communicate as well as we have and now everybody's trying to mend fences, the trouble is actually, somebody has taken away the poles and the wire. So that's hard.

The fact that we are not or have not communicated as we should and as was expected we would have stems back a couple of instance where there wasn't a communication. But I think there was certainly a learning. And I think what you need to do is make sure that the lines of communication are open so that you're listening to each other because unfortunately, there has been a lot of bad feeling because on a couple of occasions, when they should have, they didn't. And maybe part of that fault is ours.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It has to be some of ours, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have to leave. I'm turning the chair over to Tijani.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much for sharing your views and some lessons learned. Yes, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: In the first opportunity you have, the first thing you need to discuss is the timelines. The first opportunity you need to discuss the schedule, the timelines. You need to review that to see if this is convenient for you because you may find a surprise right there.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you very much. And I completely agree with Cheryl. It looks like we're turning into a review community. We do not have much time. I think we have only one minute left. So, about the last item on our agenda, again, it was proposed before some recent developments occurred.

And on Thursday morning, there will be breakfast during which all SO/AC leaders will come together and start discussing planning for the next upcoming meeting in Johannesburg. We definitely are going to propose to ccNSO, we're going to propose to have a smaller, a small and efficient program committee. It'd be seven people, one per community that would be able to communicate back just to make the process not as messy as it is at the moment.

And with that, I would like to thank you all for being here, for your valuable comments. So thank you very much and see you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Katrina. Thank you very much. And thank you all the ccNSO people who came to our meeting. I would like to thank our interpreters.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And our technical staff. And, of course, our wonderful staff. Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]