EN

COPENHAGEN – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 10
Tuesday, March 14, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good afternoon. ICANN58, March 14th. This is the ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 10,

ALAN GREENBERG: Folks, we are reconvening. We are restarting, if everyone can take their seats really quickly. I just love when I speak how quickly everyone moves.

We do not quite have quorum but we do have all regions represented. We have RALO officers from one of the five regions which I guess will have to do because we're only talking about ALSes and RALOs, so I guess they don't really need to be involved. Thank you, Humberto, for representing all five RALOs to us. Then we'll blame it all on you afterwards.

Alright. A little bit of history. We've been talking about we've had a Task Force called ALS Criteria and Expectations for something over a little bit of a year now. We talked about the ideas and we've gone back and forth many times. In Hyderabad I made I guess a proposal based on what we had been talking about for

the last year and to try to put it into a concrete form. The recommendation of the ALAC was to take that not as a formal proposal or plan but as a framework that we did approve, so we obviously can go back and undo anything, but we did agree that that was a way forward and we put together a small ad hoc group of effectively anyone who volunteered within a certain reasonable timeframe. To my great pleasure, most of the people in that group when I recirculated the same document from Hyderabad, contributed and came up with some really good ideas that I had forgotten – either not forgotten that I hadn't put in – no one had thought about in the previous year, and albeit somewhat late because I was just a little bit involved with the At-Large Review. I did get this document out to that group about a week ago. I got very few comments back in but those I did get have been incorporated into this Version 2 document and unfortunately it was only sent out to you last night so I don't expect people to have read it and thoroughly absorbed it.

If we could end up approving this document or some version derived from it this week, that would be delightful. To be honest, my target is to discuss it thoroughly, give people a little while to think about it, and try to get it further refined if necessary and approved at our ALAC meeting on the 28th of this month.

As you'll see, it's not something that we can simply say snap our fingers and it's done just because we've approved the plan.

There's lots of work to be done. I can say luckily most of it's by staff but actually pulling that off is going to be a bit of a challenge also. But what I'd like to do now is go over it and, to the extent that we can agree as we're going over it, let's see where the questions and comments come.

Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan, I'd just like to make a comment that I actually commented on it in the Google Doc when you put it into the Google Doc.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And I don't think you noticed. But I did comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: I, to be quite candid, I didn't know there was a Google Doc for this. Staff put it out in Google Doc? I certainly didn't. Maybe you can point us to where you commented because I'm not aware that there was a Google Doc. Let's do that offline, but if there were comments that I ignored because I didn't know they existed we'll look at it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [Inaudible] they didn't know it existed either.

ALAN GREENBERG: If anyone else is aware of a Google Doc please tell me.

Alright, let's put it back up on the screen if we can.

The background is the design of At-Large presumed that we have ALSes and every ALS had some number of members – whether it was 10, 100, or 1,000 – we would have these vast communities on the ground that would act as our extensions of our arms. That's never happened. We have rules in place. Among other things, the very first presumption is an ALS will redistribute to its members things we send it. We have never sent things with the explicit instructions to redistribute and if any ALSes redistribute, then I'm not aware of it. And certainly none have pointed it out.

It was a communication path that was foreseen but as far as I know not implemented. We have a reasonable engagement with our ALS representatives. And yes it varies. Sometimes there are two or three people from an ALS who are alternates and they all engage, and we know there are some where the number is effectively zero. But we have reasonable engagement. Not necessarily a lot of involvement in policy issues, but at least they

know how to spell ICANN and they occasionally come to meetings or webinars or things like that.

That's where we come from. The hypothesis is, if we can come up with understandable, readable, information about what ICANN is doing and what we're looking for to help us go through those processes, and if we can actually get it distributed to the ALS membership, then we will have a small number – and maybe it's one in 100 – who will say, "Hey, that's interesting and I want to engage and I want to participate." And that's essentially the crux of this whole thing. So if we're going to do that, we're going to have to send out information that is concise, palatable, catches people's attention. If it's 17 screens long and we finally get to the interesting part in screen 16, it's lost. Whether we do this with fancy graphics or whatever, people have hypothesized, we have to presume that a vast majority of these people are probably going to scan it on their mobile phones or tablet or something, but probably mobile phones in many cases, so you have to be a little bit careful of what renders well on mobile phones. For the last couple of weeks as I've been thinking about this, as I get e-mail, even for mail I wouldn't open up normally on a phone, I do to see just how well does it render. And it's amazing how many times I get a blank screen or something like that that when I open it up on my laptop it works. So we're going to have to think this through carefully.

We really want to cut to a minimum the number of things that will be perceived as junk. We probably want to think about notifying people not only about a once a month blurb about what's going on at ICANN, we put on webinars, we put on professional development sessions of various forms. Some of them are aimed at people with specific knowledge. Some are aimed at people who basically know very little about ICANN. And those kind of things we want to advertise and we want them pushed out to the membership. And we need to have some sort of – and I hate to mention the word but "metrics" – we need to measure what we're doing to some extent. It's not going to be numbers that we can stand up at a forum and say, "We have reached 14,276 people because we're never going to have anywhere near that level of precision. But we need to have a level of confidence that isn't all getting hit with [it] that not everybody hits the "delete" button or that it's not even getting out because the vast majority of ALSes are not forwarding it.

There's a section – if we scroll down – on rationale. I'm not going to spend a lot of time going into that here. I think we all know why we're doing this. As I said, we already have the rules in place. When we started having this discussion there was a great concern about how can we retroactively apply this to all of our ALSes? And it turns out that since we already have one of the core responsibilities of an ALS is to pass information onto their

members, we also have as a core rationale for ALSes existing, to assist the RALO in performing its functions. So if the RALOs decide this is a good thing to do, then it is the responsibility of the ALSes. So we don't have any real legal issue on doing this retroactively. That was a comfort when we found the correct words.

And then it comes down to – okay, we all think this is a great idea – which we may not but if we do – then how do we actually carry it out? And if we scroll down to the action plan, I've tried to put here – and this again was aided significantly by the contributions of the other people and they're listed at the end of the document, by the way, if you haven't looked – just what are the steps we have to do? And I've tried to divide them into manageable chunks that can be allocated to different people, different groups of people and among other things one of the points that was raised is there may be some types of ALSes where this doesn't apply. There may be ALSes which have such a specialized focus that they are a resource we can draw upon if we're looking, talking about phishing, but they have no other real interest. And as long as it's a resource that we can draw upon when we want to and they agree to that – which is presumably why they joined to begin with – then I think it's reasonable we may exclude some ALSes from the "distribute to all of your members," because it just isn't a target.

Now, we may not end up with any like that, but that was one of the thoughts. We need to spell out to the ALSes what we expect of them. We need to communicate that to our ALS reps in a way that's clear. And just developing these communications, these messages, are things we don't want to dash off in five minutes. We really want to think about them and make sure that when they go out they will not be ignored. We may need webinars and things like that talking about them. Probably one per region.

This may well require on the long term additional staff, which we don't necessarily have right now, and there's clearly a timeline associated with that. But we are just going into a budget cycle and we're going to have a budget comment in the next couple of weeks presumably, and that's going to be an opportunity for identifying that if necessary. We're going to have to look at just how we communicate the types of messages and how we measure whether we're successful or not or how we measure whether we're doing anything or not.

A concept that we've had from the beginning that has had some objection in some circles but generally accepted as being a necessary evil, is we are going to have to have reporting from ALSes probably on an annual basis. It's going to have to be really stripped down. We're going to have to think again about the forum and the way to do it so we minimize the impact and time, but on the other hand we really need to know they're still alive

out there. And that will, of course, help some of our other problems of keeping track of reps and making sure we have current information on them, but will also allow us when people ask the question, "Well, just how big are these ALSes?" to have some measure. It's not going to be an accurate count.

One of the real challenges is going to be if we are successful, we will get people from ALSes participating in our working groups, other ICANN working groups. How do we recognize them? Right now periodically people say they're affiliated with At-Large and we don't go any farther in and question. Sometimes we recognize their name. Sometimes we don't. But we're going to have to sort of somehow identify that and exactly how to do that's not going to be, again, 100% clear. We know we cannot ask the ALSes to, "Give us lists of all of your members." That's not going to fly for a whole bunch of reasons, including – going back to our previous discussion – privacy issues. On the other hand, we do need some level of information.

A couple of questions at the end. We've been talking a lot about individual members. I'm presuming if we send information out to ALSes, we also send it out to the individual members. Makes some level of sense. We have talked a lot about member skill surveys. Do we want to incorporate that as part of this or is that something else we need to think of separately? My personal

feeling is we have enough to do with the core work. Let's not complicate it.

We've been talking in relation to the review if nothing else about individual members in all five RALOs and do we need to or want to try to have more uniform rules or processes? And again, I think we need to talk about that. Do we want to link it to this project? Again, my inclination is keep it separate. Our life is complicated enough as it is. But other people may have other ideas.

That's the whole document. We have already approved the concept that we're going to do this. How much do we need? I think we need people to look at this. And when I say "people" I mean not only the ALAC members who are going to vote to approve it. We've got to get input from our RALOs.

I don't think we need to ask the ALSes, although you may choose to. But we really need support from RALO leadership that they're 100% behind this because if they're not, if people are fighting on this, then we're really lost. And from my perspective, if this is something that we can say we're actively working on and all support, that's the strongest argument we have against a massive change in our overall At-Large structure as has been suggested in the review paper.

This isn't a be all and end all. It's not going to solve all of our problems. But we will start utilizing the ALSes that we've had there for 10 years and hopefully get some more benefit from having them. We may find out along the way that some of the ALSes think this is garbage and don't want to play anymore and that's fine.

I've spoken long enough. Open the floor.

Tijani.

Excuse me for a moment. If people come up with suggestions, whether it is something we all agree to or just something we need to discuss further, can we take notes? These are not necessarily action items but please take notes so we can go back and we don't all have to read the transcript again when it finally gets published. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I think that this is a good document and I read it very well and I commented on it, that we need to use now immediately and to work on it so that we can go ahead. But we have to be aware that this will not solve all the problems. It is only to make our structures, our ALSes, our basis, if you want, more involved. But it will not solve the effectiveness. It will not solve the participation. All those questions are to be solved. So

this is first step that we have to do and then we have to continue, in my point of view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. No, certainly there's no way we can solve all the problems. Most of them are out of our control in an absolute sense. But it's quite clear that if someone doesn't know they exist, we're not going to get them interested. I think we can assume that.

I see – I don't know the order. I didn't pay attention. I'm sorry – Sebastien, Maureen.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I'm going to speak in French.

I'm sorry to disturb you and to oblige you to wear your headphones so I can speak to you. But I just wanted to show you one of the difficulty we have in this work. We can have the best intentions in the worlds and the best letters in the world but if these letters are not written in the language of the person we address, the message will never reach the person.

So it's difficult for me to imagine in all the world where the language used by the people is not English or where the people don't speak very well English, I don't know how this information

is going to arrive. So if we need to translate information – and when I say "translate," okay, we can image we are going to translate that in the seven languages of ICANN – but if we want to reach the users, we need to do it in their language so we have a big difficulty and it's not only the difficulty of At-Large and the users. It's the difficulty of our organization and of the means we have in that organization. First problem.

Second problem, we need to produce this information. NARALO has a lot of tools for communication. For them it's not going to be a concern. But I don't know if the rest of us is going to do that. And if at the global level in ALAC we need to do some communication work also. I don't know if it will be between three or four in the morning that our Chair is going to do that, but I don't know when we are going to do that.

I have a suggestion. Why don't we use first the letters published by the Vice President of the regions for the part of engagement of ICANN. I have seen that letter and know it exists. We can ask them to add a small part related specifically to the final users and so we don't have to draft a letter. And the same for other regions. We can work that way to have a system working.

And secondly, maybe it should be more interesting to have a test. It should be better to have a test than to work with our two and 200 and some more ALSes. Maybe we can try with five ALS in

one region and see how it work if we have a better participation, etc. [a test].

And then about individual members, we can send to the Structure who are the Structure of these individual members or directly to the individual members when there are no Structures as in North America because in Europe we have an At-Large Structure for these individual members and it's an ALS as other ones, it is why in Europe we don't have any problem of differentiation. I don't say it's better but it's easier for our new system.

Thank you for all those who work on this subject. I think the document we have now is a very good document. We can go ahead with that document. I wanted to do some more suggestions to help you working ahead with this document.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. A number of things, and there may well be things left out of this document. Certainly the assumption all along has been we will publish this document in all of the languages that we typically use within the RALOs. Now, that doesn't cover the language of every organization but it does cover the languages that the RALOs use and that pretty well maps to a subset of the standard ICANN languages. So in terms of language – yes, understood.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

The presumption is we would base this on the monthly documents that already come out but they maybe need to be tailored to our specific audience and again, if the report doesn't say that, earlier versions did and I think we need to capture that, that language [is] based on things but it may be augmented or changed based on our targets.

The test one, yes there is a description there of a prototype of let's go through the process of building something, test it out [with] some people, and make sure we know what we're doing before we use everyone as a guinea pig. So I think most of that is already factored in. We're going to find out some of this is wrong and just won't work, but we have to try it at some point.

Maureen, go ahead.

Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: I read the document, Alan. It was 4:00 or 5:00 in the morning. Alan released the document at 4:00 a.m. and I read it at 4:00 or 5:00 a.m. and I hope that I had understood the document, and I replied to you very quickly and made some observations and I can talk about this.

I believe that this structure has a structure problem, and the solution to structural problems is addressed by determining

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

what we should do. Like managing a project, we have to provide numbers without turning them into priorities and then create a plan by saying Task #3 can be started right now and Task #1 should be done at the ending of Task #3. And this is the way it works.

I may be very optimistic maybe, but I believe we can start at once. I believe that we have many ALSes working with a lot of things and they just need some indications, only one indication perhaps, of adding something in what they are doing and they will continue working perfectly well. You might have heard in the Board meeting, what I said is not wrong. It's true. And we have many things to say. And if I may, if the LACRALO Chair allows me to say this, I would offer LACRALO to start working with the active ALSes, and this would be the testing group. Why do I offer this? Well, because I know that we have plenty of material and that we have many things to do with annual events with things that are particularly done and they all have the content that we want, and I'm sure that nobody will reject that request. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I will give you an apology. The lead-in to this list of things to do says "the plan will include." I did mean to go back and point out that the first step is to write the timeline

and the plan and how are these things related to each other. So thank you for reminding me of that.

I really don't want to get into today deciding which RALO are we going to use as a test and that [exactly]. I think we need to all start agreeing – hopefully by the end of the month but we'll see – that we're going forward on this, that it's in the overall game plan, and then we need to start, between volunteers and staff, putting together the detailed plans and procedures for how we're going to accomplish this.

And next we have a comment from Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. We have a comment from a remote participant, Dev Anand Teelucksingh: "The Outreach and Engagement Sub-committee has been putting together documents that will assist the ALS inreach for community onboarding. Currently four documents have been produced. The first one 'Approach for Community Onboarding for ICANN58.' The second, 'What is the DNS?' The third, 'Key Policy Issues of the At-Large Community.' Fourth, 'Presentation on Introduction to ICANN At-Large' " – All of these slides are at the link that Dev put in the Adobe Connect chat room - "And it would be great if persons review and assist in further developing the documents."

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you and noted. We will make sure we reference those documents when we start developing the detailed plans, use them as appropriate. Thank you.

Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I'm going to speak in Spanish. I also see the RALOs should agree when it comes to this plan. So LACRALO is being impacted by this plan and as it happens to the other RALOs. This morning At-Large was meeting with the Board, one of the issues being discussed was how to facilitate the work of At-Large, and we came to the same problem that has to do with the translation interpretation services. We have a restriction in terms of costs and this may be a barrier to achieve in a more effective way to end users and this can be seen particularly in the case of Latin America where is a great amount of Spanish speaking and Portuguese speaking people. We also have French and in the Caribbean region we have English, French and English and Spanish as well.

This is something complex. I have the feeling – and of course, this is the effort that might be made by ICANN – but when we see this issue of the additional budget request for the Fiscal Year

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

2018 I received one that unfortunately was out of term but it was requesting that members of ALSes be trained in other language. And whenever I hear people speaking in French, I envy those who speak French because my great grandfather was French and I don't speak French, for example, so shame on me. But perhaps we might incorporate or add a plan to see if we can be trained in other languages in a serious way with results that may be measurable with metrics upon ALSes and perhaps those members may be able to receive a certificate and, of course, being able to speak another language. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Humberto. Certainly, as I said before, there's no question we have to do these in a variety of languages. My gut feel is if we ask ICANN to train people in ALSes in other languages, that's going to be deemed to be out of scope. I may be wrong but I find that a real hard sell. Maybe a use of auction funds but for ICANN proper I think that's going to be quite out of scope. But if everyone [thinks] I'm wrong then we can pass it on.

Next we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Sebastien, you know that I really, really, love languages and diversity and language diversity and how I

am really obsessed about it. And you were right in saying, Sebastien, that if you translate a document it's not like it's written in the original language. When you speak with someone with an interpreter it's not the same as direct communication. But there's no solution to that.

We have to use what we have and we always try to improve the situation. We talked about it this morning with the Board but let's be realistic and know that we'll never be able to fully resolve that issue. We can only find the best solution and I think that as of today we are one of the few constituency with simultaneous interpretation in all of our meeting and for our ALSes for our documents in the future yes, I agree we should have three languages spoken by the ALSes and all the documents should be in those three languages. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next I have Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Thank you, Alan. My opinion might be a little bit controversial though. What I feel is that indeed the effectiveness of ALS needs to be improved and also the communications could be further improved, no doubt about that. However, would communication solve the problem of ALS effectiveness? I serious

doubt that. Why? Well, maybe 30 years ago the DNS Internet addresses will take a central stage for the overall Internet development but 30 years later now, that as I see it is no longer the case. For Internet governance there are still tons of problems – spams, cheating, privacy – you name it we have [there are it].

However, very little that is directly related to DNS especially with widespread application – apps – everybody downloads the apps without using the DNS. From an end user's perspective, I would bet that nine out of 10 end users wouldn't even know who is ICANN or what is an DNS. They just download the app. And more and more younger people do that. So that is ALS as NGO NPO, if it does nothing but the DNS I would really seriously doubt how it would continue to exist to survive because there's not enough public attention to the DNS issue.

What I see in China is that the China's maybe the Internet ALS. Well actually they are fully comprehensive. They have I believe 26 committees and dozens of working groups dealing with all the Internet issues faced by end users. And then not only they're strong, they're fully backed with the government and also the industries will [inaudible] with them.

Therefore, I would say that probably in order to have the ALSes be effective is to broaden the scope, not to only limit to DNS users but on overall Internet governance issues, and then DNS

only be a small factor within the overall Internet governance. And then we as the At-Large, we will can have effective the ALSes will be much more effective in every single country around the world to be the organization for the overall Internet and also especially for the end users.

So I think then only by thinking that way I think we can further the effectiveness of ALS and how to further do that, I think that might need some fundamental thinking out of the box. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have less than 10 minutes left in this session. As a quick response, a year ago if we had suggested that it would not likely have been accepted. With the new Bylaws, there is no chance at all that we are going to get agreement that our scope is much wider than the ICANN scope as limited by the Bylaws. The current Bylaws are very restrictive and were written that way deliberately. So as good an idea as it might be to get ALSes interested in us it's not within our scope.

KAILI KAN: I fully agree with you. So therefore, probably what we're going to do is to have further cooperation or even engagements with other Internet organizations, for example, ISOCs. ISOC Chapters

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

have already become a natural ALS for us, and so we have the merging or further cooperation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no question there's lots of paths we're going to have to go down to become a more effective At-Large. We're looking at one aspect of it of how can we reach out through our ALSes to some of their members and we know it's only going to be a small percentage that might be interested, but that small percentage is better than the zero we are reaching now in most cases.

I have Heidi and Seun and Humberto is back again. A very short one and I am closing the queue. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. Just a couple of comments on this. Just as a reminder, ICANN Communications staff have the expertise to work with you on developing documents for this kind of engagement to make it relevant, culturally sensitive, issues, and also focus on the target audience that you're looking to engage. We also have very multilingual At-Large support staff, many of whom can relate to younger people. So that's something else that you could possibly engage a little bit more in.

Also perhaps the Social Media Working Group can work on how we can use social media both, again, to attract the younger

people as well as in different languages. We've just now started tweeting in foreign languages that we have within our staff.

And then finally, in the next six months we're going to have three General Assemblies – NARALO in April, AFRALO in July/June, and APRAO in October/November. So a really key time. You have all of your ALS reps there. That might be a good time to address these sorts of issues. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And just for clarity, when I said staff I wasn't restricting it to At-Large staff. We're going to get as much as we can out of the whole organization.

Next we have Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. In response to Kaili, I think if we recall what happened with NETmundial that we probably should not even bother talking about extending or looking into ICANN becoming Internet governance [stuff].

I personally would like to see At-Large remain within the remit of ICANN but I want to emphasize that the At-Large role is not just about the DNS. It's also about the numbers and the protocol side of things. And I'd like to see that more in our discussions. So

as we engage, even when we have these meetings I don't think we have ever invited ASO to our meetings so I think we need to start considering that. I'm sure we only saw [Andrew here perhaps] because of the WHOIS thing. Maybe we need to also invite the protocol side as well occasionally. So we need to communicate that we are not just about DNS. Our scope goes beyond that and how we will react to policies, share the numbers policies [inaudible] RALOs should also be an indication of the fact that we are within ICANN and because we have those RALOs in those regions they are able to participate in those policies in those regions, not just the global policy of numbers community and we should be able to take record of those things as part of our efforts on outreach to the global community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Seun. Yes, we have met with the ASO a good number of times, perhaps not since you've been here. But I'll note there's very little done in ICANN on the numbers side. Most of the work is actually done within regions and, in fact, we do have MoUs in a number of the regions and it may well be that each region adds in something periodically associated with the numbers activities associated in their region in this kind of distribution. So yes, certainly we have to get that out.

I don't think – Sebastien, you may know better – I don't think the IETF is within our mandate other than IANA serves them. I don't think the protocols are within our role. If Seun would like to tell me I'm wrong then we'll go to our last speaker.

Go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. The intention is not to tell you that you're wrong. The intention is just to say that what I'm just talking about is the ability to just hear updates from the IETF, not necessarily because it's a policy thing for the IETF [is not here]. In terms of the number community, it's also about hearing – because one of the times you went you came to AFRINIC you said you liked the fact that they presented updates in certain [matters]. That would be good if we would have something like that presented here so and hear how various regions are participating in their relevant areas.

I for one know that the AFRALO does that and it would be good that we share those things globally when we meet like this. That was just the point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I suggest as we schedule future meetings you suggest that we have some RALO – perhaps the one in the region we're

meeting – make a presentation like that. That would be delightful.

Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Very quickly. Just to tell Kaili that in LACRALO we realized when we were holding meetings and we invited people to discuss Internet governance issues that go much beyond the scope of our mandate we started to have more people attending. And when we only discussed DNS issues or IP issues we had 40% of attendance. And when we started to mix the issues and we started to add Internet governance issues that go beyond our scope, we doubled the attendance. So we decided to continue mixing so that people would get more interested and more involved in the issues that we discuss. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

Yes. Go ahead. I had closed the queue but go ahead for a very short intervention.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. One suggestion. Alan, you talked about the issue of ALSes and we only know the main representative

and assistant maybe, and I have an idea to answer this idea of how to get the list of members and have a platform. We could have an At-Large platform that would enable any person from the entire world to register as an individual member at the ALAC level and asking to be integrated into one ALS from the country where he or she resides.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we generally decided we shouldn't talk about how we deal with individual users in this project, but that's a separate one that I think it's a delightful even if if the regions may have somewhat different rules associated with them, that's not to say we shouldn't have a common entrance into it and I really like that. I thank you for that.

Okay. I'd like a general sense of this group. Are we feeling comfortable enough about this? Clearly we need to revise this document a little bit. There's a number of areas that people have identified clearly we were not clear about or needs additional words. I don't want to try to rush it and stay up until 3:00 in the morning, as someone suggested, to rewrite it today so I don't think I really want to put it on the agenda – 4:00 in the morning. Thank you. It was 3:30, by the way, when I went to bed in this time zone anyway – I don't want to try to rush it and approve it on this Thursday, but I would like to get any

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

comments people have, to submit them, and the ALAC list or personally to me. Whatever you feel comfortable doing, and let's try to get it approved so we can start all this work going at our monthly meeting on the 28ᵗʰ unless I hear any strong opinions against this.

Now, since this is going to be approved by the ALAC, it's really up to the ALAC members from each region to at least have talked to their regional leadership and make sure everyone feels moderately comfortable. We're not casting details in stone right now but we really want to make sure that we don't have any big surprises going ahead.

So I think we've come to closure. We are a few minutes early and Yrjö has asked for a few minutes to talk about the GAC session which comes up immediately after this. And I'll turn the floor over to him.

Sorry, I didn't give you warning.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. The session with the GAC we have from 5:00 to 6:00 in the GAC room. I would say the main items for the agenda – the first item is the proposal by the GAC Working Party on the Protection of Geographic Names. The idea of the proposal is quite simply to avoid the problems there were in the first new

gTLD round with names that were not geographic in the sense that they are protected by these relevant stipulations In the Guidebook but that have, as they say, geographic significance. And of course we talk about rivers, mountains, whatever. You remember "Amazon" and "Patagonia" and all those.

So this is an attempt to deal with those problems beforehand. One of the elements is a repository where all governments could send their literally rivers and mountains and whatever, and also they were thinking of the obligation to consult the government or local authority about these sort of names.

Within the GAC when this proposal was talked about in the full GAC the opinions were divided. Many people thought that this was just too cumbersome and would not work. But that discussion continues and, of course, it will be one of the elements in the webinar and in the cross-community discussions in Johannesburg that GNSO has proposed.

The second agenda point is the Council of Europe study on how the community-based applications heard in the first round and then suggestions how to eliminate problems in the second round. I've sent the recommendations to the ALAC list and they are just so many recommendations that when the GAC was dealing with this in the Plenary session, it was impossible to start going through the recommendations one by one. So in the

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

end the result was that this document – and you all have received I hope the document in hard copy – that it will be sent to the gTLD PDP Group for consideration. That is to say, not endorsed by the GAC but anyway with the suggestion that they take a look at it.

We also have suggested – that was actually Maureen's suggestion – that we would ask the GAC what is the status of their Working Group on Underserved Regions. So that is number three.

And if we have time, we are of course if there's interest in the GAC, if they want to ask questions about the At-Large Review, that's an opportunity. And finally if there are items concerning Work Stream 2 that would be of mutual interest, that's also on the agenda but I doubt that we ever get that far during that hour. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Is Jonathan here? He is. Why don't you come join us at the table? We will just wrap up this discussion.

Anywhere you can fit.

Anyone have any quick questions or comments for Yrjö before we go on to the next topic? We have formally discussed none of the issues that he has raised and so there are no formal ALAC

positions. Anyone is free if we go into these discussions to give your own positions or ask questions of the GAC. I know I certainly have my opinions on some of them. But where the ALAC ends up, if indeed the ALAC ends up, is not clear and I don't think we're trying to come to closure on those this week. We may have a little bit of extra time on Thursday at our wrap-up session so it's possible we could go into one of those topics and have a interesting discussion if it's on anyone's agenda.

We now have Jonathan Zuck. We did spend a little bit of time with Kaili and Carlton earlier this week so they've sort of given us an update of where we are right now. I'd like to welcome you. The floor is open for you to talk and [give] any questions. We have about 25 minutes I think. Is that the right time?

We do have a meeting with the GAC in the GAC room and that's A2 and, as you all know, the seating is always at a premium there so you really want to get over there quickly and try to find a seat hopefully with a microphone.

So I'll welcome Jonathan. I'll welcome you on two different levels – first of all as Chair of the CCT Review and second, I've been told you're applying as an individual member for NARALO so you're going to be one of us. Welcome.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Thanks. I'm stepping down in my role of 19 years as Head of ACT and running a non-profit focused on global unemployment and future of work. So that's what I'm going to be doing next.

But until that point, Competition, Consumer Choice, and Consumer Trust – so you've gotten somewhat of an update already so I apologize if what I came prepared to say is redundant. Feel free to speak up and tell me to hurry along if you've already heard it. But let's just go through. I don't have a clicker. I'll click my translation thing to say…so next slide.

As you probably know, we were tasked to evaluate the degree to which the New gTLD Program enhanced competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice, and then in addition to that we were asked to evaluate the "effectiveness" of the application and evaluation process and the effectiveness of the safeguards.

And so a lot of our work has been definitional in nature as well. What's a consumer and things like that. But one of the things we really tried to do in this review is be very data-driven. I know that will come as a big surprise to all of you that that was a big goal but we wanted to make sure that we only said things that were really supported by the data, and as is always the case, the community's pretty evenly divided between those that believe that the New gTLD Program is a smashing success and those

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

EN

that believe that it was an unmitigated disaster. I just came out of briefing the ccNSO and you can imagine where they are.

So I have the undeniable pleasure of telling everyone that they're wrong, that in reality the truth is somewhere in the middle. There's been some incremental competition without much of a degradation of consumer trust and that it's too soon to tell on the effectiveness of the safeguards and there's some indicators of some increased costs on the trademark side but not at the levels that people were talking about beforehand. And so the truth is hovering around the average point more than it's at the extremes.

Next slide.

One of the biggest things that you might imagine is that getting data is harder than it ought to be. At almost every turn there's somebody that owns the data that doesn't want to give up the data that's proprietary data, that's bad data, or somebody else's data's worse than my data, and so it was an interesting exercise and a big part of our recommendations are aimed at ICANN becoming a better kind of data gatherer and provider to the community so that these reviews going forward, work groups going forward, strategic plans going forward, outside reviews that are happening, can all be better informed because an amazing number of them end with the line, "This would have

been better if we'd had better data or more data." And so that's a big part of our recommendations.

I also want to alert you to the fact that we're going to do a couple of webinars on the 29th. So if you've had a chance to get through the 150-page report by then, we'd love to have you come onto the webinars and ask questions and we'll have two different webinars on the 29th and we'd love for you to come on the call and ask questions because we are in now a comment period that began on the 7th and goes through the 27th of April and we want to hear everyone's feedback on the report and make sure that it's the best that it can be.

Next slide.

So what we've found is it's been somewhat successful in mitigating the impact on consumer trust. We had a consumer survey that basically at its core suggested that nobody knew there were any new gTLDs. And so that made it interesting in that there wasn't a demonstrated degradation in consumer trust for that reason. So instead what we got out of the survey had more to do with preferential data. In other words, we saw that familiarity or perceived familiarity bred trust which is interesting going forward what that means and one of the findings is that consumers really believe that what's being created is a kind of semantic web, that .photos is going to mean that I can reliably

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

find photos on a photo site or, more importantly, that .pharmacy means I'm going to find real pharmacies when I go there. And so there's an interesting set of expectations being created by this rapid expansion of the DNS, and that is that there's going to be more predictability of where to find things and what to expect there. And in the more regulated areas there's an expectation that there'll be some enforcement about who shows up in those strings.

Yes ma'am.

HOLLY RAICHE: Does that bring into question the PICs, and given that there are the expectations, does that back on to [well] is there any commensurate responsibility if that's the expectation?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess that's an open question for the community. Yes, that is one of the conversations that we have is about the PIC specs, etc. and the degree to which they are effective, and one of the things that we put into our recommendations is actually auditing them to see how they're doing and how they're being enforced, etc. That's part of our recommendations because there is that expectation among end users that this broad expansion means a greater predictability about what they'll find

when they get to a particular second level domain based on what's in the top-level domain. So I do think it increases scrutiny generally on how those PIC specs perform.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, do you want to go all the way through and take questions or be interrupted?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I am completely open. I'm happy to be interrupted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you as expediently as possible go through it and then we'll [open it up].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So the caveats here is that the program should only be regarded as a good start. Most of them hadn't even been delegated [in entire] years we were studying them. Historically it's taken three years for new strings to reach their stride. So everything is very at the beginning, early innings, as we say sometimes in American-centric idiom.

There are a number of policy issues that should be addressed before further expansion of gTLDs that we're trying to pass to the Subsequent Procedures Working Group and we really need

more data, particularly out of Compliance, to better understand the effectiveness of individual safeguards, for example.

We made 50 recommendations, which I imagine will be consolidated by the final report but it seemed to make sense from the standpoint of generating conversations in the interim to keep them granular, and we ended up ranking them, not just binarily which is the requirement of the Bylaws of prerequisite and non-prerequisite, we left prerequisite in there but also then created these three other categories of high, medium, and low, priority which wasn't so much about importance as it was about where they needed to fall on the timeline.

So low priority doesn't mean you don't have to do them. It means that it only has to be done in time for the next CCT Review, for example, which probably five years out. And so it's 18 months, 36 months, and roughly five years, are sort of what the high, medium, and low, priority refer to and ironically the prerequisites may take longer than the high priority items. But that's how we chose to divide them and we welcome feedback on what things we put into what categories as well because to some extent we all got together on the phone and just tried to spitball where things should fall.

You can see a distribution here across different aspects of the report. That's probably not worth dwelling on, so next slide.

And this is the timeline at this point. We have a couple of important studies that are still out. One is a survey of trademark owners to get a real assessment of the costs of the New gTLD Program. We found that there weren't a whole lot of defensive registrations or at the very least, it was kind of bimodal. There were a few brand owners that were registering across a very large number. But the median was more like three or four. But we also noticed is that there was a different distribution of what might be called more generally defensive costs because now there's blocking as an alternative to defensive registration. There's now a URS proceeding, etc. The Trademark Clearinghouse generates more cease and desist letters. So there's a different kind of curve associated with how those costs are being spent and we're hoping that we'll better understand that after the survey.

And then there's also a DNS Abuse study that is aimed at looking at whether or not there's a greater degree of DNS abuse among the new gTLDs than there is in the legacy TLDs. I can report that in our meeting with the SSAC, they felt very strongly that there's much more going on in the new gTLDs, and as one example they said the top 10 things at Spamhaus were new gTLDs. Interestingly enough the bottom 10 i.e. best TLDs at Spamhaus are new gTLDs also. So it behooves us to look at both ends of the list and try to make a balanced assessment and we hope the

data will win out over everybody's sort of inflamed opinions when all is said and done.

That's our objective. That's it for my slides so I'm happy to take questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll put myself in the queue. We have Garth.

Holly touched on it and you touched on the expectations of users based on the semantics of the TLD, and as you know, we had raised an issue with the Board along with the GAC that was delegated to be looked at by the Review Team and by the GNSO PDP. Did you explicitly look at any of those regulated TLDs where the registries have said they're not going to do anything, that they're treating it as a completely open TLD? Was there any real focus made specifically on that subset?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks for your question, Alan. I don't think that we did. I think we looked at the ones where promises were made and beginning to try and figure out what the interaction is between, say, the industry that is regulated and the promises that were made and whether or not there's a connection there that makes sense. But I confess that I don't know that we looked hard at a regulated industry that made no promises. So that's an

interesting question and I'll raise that with Laureen Kapin who's the head of that group as we're moving through some of whatever these new issues are in the next few months here before we do a final report.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can expect a comment from us on that. One other observation that you were talking about the need to have data. I won't comment on how it should be viewed, but you will note that there was a session at this meeting toward a data-driven ICANN which was cancelled.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, it's coming up. It's tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was told that session was cancelled. I got a message on it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Pardon me?

EN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, we just told Alan it was cancelled. No, we're still doing that. Jay and I are presenting along with ICANN, talking about their Open Data Initiative.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did get a message from ICANN saying that session was cancelled. Never mind.

Garth.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: They really wanted to get rid of Garth.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think it's cancelled.

GARTH BRUEN: I was, in fact, told it was cancelled. Or at least they don't want me on the panel anymore.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Well, I missed the memo. I'm going to be there so if you want to talk about it we'll talk about it. We'll just find a room that's underpopulated and take it over.

GARTH BRUEN: People will sit and listen. That's the funny thing.

I submitted a memo yesterday to ALAC and the rest of At-Large. The details concern a case study that I've just completed that demonstrates that ICANN's WDPRS Complaint System not only can be theoretically but has in fact been gamed by criminals and that the system has already been defeated and criminals have figured out how to keep sites online and thwart it. And it's all explained in rather long detail how they've managed to do this.

But fundamentally, the problem is that the system as it exists cannot handle the complexity of human behavior and changes in data. It does not anticipate any of these things. ICANN's ticketing system seems to be focused on closing tickets and not issue resolution. In your experience, do you believe that ICANN's core enforcement is actually prepared to deal with these complex issues at the top level? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks for the question, and I mean that sarcastically.

I try to wear a neutral hat as the Chair of the CCT Review. I personally and as a member of the IPC have always believed that there was not sufficient operational readiness for the New gTLD Program and that they were, in fact, overwhelmed. I note that eight years ago we were shocked that the Complaint database was a folder in Outlook. So they moved to a database and now the Complaint database is a single text field in a database. And so there's still not very granular capture of the types of complaints that are coming in, etc. We have Jamie Hedlund on our Review Team and so we're beating him up pretty hard to try and get them focused on managing the ticket system in a more data-driven way. But no, my personal impression is that they're not ready yet.

GARTH BRUEN: Just a follow-up. Wasn't that a requirement before the new gTLDs were supposed to be launched that this thing be fixed and ready?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Senator, I do not recall whether or not it was a requirement prior to the…

ALAN GREENBERG: There were words saying Compliance had to be geared up. I don't think [we] were specific.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think there's a lack of specificity floating around the organization generally, as you probably heard me say before.

Anything else?

What's your new question and who are you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Actually Seun was next. I'm slipping here as Chair.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Jonathan. I wanted to push a [tricky] question at you. I hope it's very straightforward and easy for you to answer. I notice that you were very careful with your choice of words in the recommendation, especially towards giving any kind of indication on the next round of the new gTLD. My question is, based on the current report which you have, do you think it gives some level of indication whether for or against the next round of new gTLD happening any time soon?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I love these politically loaded questions. I'm excited to spend more time with you guys.

So yes. I believe that the Subsequent Procedures Working Group is operating on the assumption that barring anything dramatic, there will be a reopening of applications in some form or another. It may not be a round. It may just be an open process. Or it may be some hybrid or something like that. But I believe that presumption exists that there will be further applications for new gTLDs.

And when you say "any time soon," I assume that you mean sort of in the opposite of dog years which is ICANN years, and I would say yes because by 2020 my guess is that there will be some – and that's fast in ICANN time – so any time soon if that means to you 2020, then I think there probably will be.

As far as our report in particular, we weren't tasked with asking that question but trying to do a cost-benefit analysis. And I will say that at this juncture in our report, the cost-benefit analysis seems to be heading toward benefit- not in an enormous way and there are some, as I say, negative indicators like an increase in UDRP proceedings, an increased density of domains in those proceedings that have to do with costs associated with the new program. We'll see what the DNS abuse survey returns. Obviously if SSAC believe that it's a disaster, again, I believe the

EN

answer will be much less dramatic than that. And it'll be difficult for the community to make a decision of go forward or not because I think it won't be dramatic one way or the other. And I believe in the absence of drama, but with a prerequisite for a little bit more rigor before there's a new reopening of the application round, that it's likely to happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you much. Holly, and we have three minutes.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to pick up on one aspect of new rounds. There were very few community applications, and particularly applications outside of say the U.S. and Europe. Do you think there's going to be any kind of process in place to say, if or when there are new rounds, there would be some kind of prioritization in that regard?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. I think prioritization's kind of a hot topic. One of the findings that we made that is not surprising is that the program wasn't very successful in reaching out to the Global South. So we not only conducted a survey of those who did apply, we conducted a somewhat meta survey of those who ought to have applied – sort of applicant cohorts, if you will – in

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

the Global South to kind of ask them why they didn't apply. And again, the biggest answer was, "What are you talking about?" which suggests the outreach program wasn't successful. And then of those who were aware of it, weren't very aware of it. In other words, they didn't have a good sense of what the real costs were associated with the program, they felt like the information came too late for them to marshal the forces they would need, maybe form partnerships, etc. to raise the money, etc., and there was a real lack of understanding about what the business model of the New gTLD Program might be. And frankly, I think there's plenty of existing applicants who are wondering what the business model really is probably still.

But I think at this point we do have more case studies. We have more information we can bring to bear. And so I think the community has to make an affirmative decision that applications from the Global south are a priority and there's a lot more we can do if we decide they're a priority. There's things that we can do to kind of eliminate inequities, but I think that we could go beyond eliminating inequities if we decide that it's a priority of the community.

HOLLY RAICHE: A follow-up question. In the comments, is that the place to say, "Hey, look. The Global South left out, this is what we think you should do?" or address those problems?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Yes].

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, definitely. The comments are the place to make any comments and things you think we should do. And again, I think there needs to be a community discussion because some people could argue that the local penetration at the second level suggests that there isn't a market and that it would be a con job to talk somebody in the Global South into having a new string, right? If that's the case, then maybe we ought to be putting our efforts into building up participation at the second level before trying to build participation [at the] first level. I don't know but I feel like we need to have that conversation and make a decision, and if we do, there's a whole list of things that we could do to better encourage those players to participate in this process.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Last question, Sebastien. Very brief please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I don't know if it's in your review team, but do you have study or do you know if somebody is studying the one who gamed the system?

JONATHAN ZUCK: In which way?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just one or two example is I decide to apply in another country or in another continent to be sure that if there is something done at the level of the regions there will have put in different places or they participate to the definition of the community TLD, for example, to have a very difficult situation for all the community but not for them because they will apply for the same TLD but not as a community. It's just two example amongst many other, I guess.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know that there – thanks for your question, Sebastien – I think that the Subsequent Procedures Working Group are going through a lot of those type of scenarios and we didn't in particular. We looked at community applications, and there

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

EN

certainly weren't very many that made it through and so there is an open question about whether it makes sense to have the community prioritization and if we do, what we should do to make it more effective than it was certainly.

But as far as looking at individual players that may have gamed the system in the way you describe, we were looking much more at a kind of macro-economic level about competition numbers and things like that and concentration on numbers globally because we couldn't even get regional data so most of them were global numbers that we're looking at.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We actually finished on time almost. And we reconvene in the GAC room, Room A2, in – and it starts in theory in 14 minutes. See you there.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]