
ABU DHABI– ALAC & ccNSO Meeting
Sunday, October 29, 2017 – 17:00 to 18:00 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Sunday, October 29th, 2017 in Hall B Section A ALAC for the ALAC and ccNSO Meeting 17:00 to 18:00.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can everyone please take their seats? We would like to start. It is on the hour and of course, as everyone knows, we always start all of our meetings exactly on time. Can we start the recording and have confirmation it started please? It is started.

I'd like to welcome you to the ccNSO-ALAC joint meeting. I'd like to welcome all of our ccNSO colleagues. Sitting to my left is Katrina Sataki, sitting to my right is the anonymous, Nigel Roberts – I always get confused, but I'm on his left so it works out okay. I will turn the meeting over to Katrina to start on the first item of the review and we'll do a tag team. We'll go back and forth.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, we will. Thank you very much, Alan. Thank you to ALAC for having us. It's always a pleasure. We have four items on our agenda but before we start, I'll add another item and we'll start

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.

with that one. I assume that some of you might be interested how the saga around EPSRP is evolving, and I'm pleased to say that today, if you read today's Board resolution, you will see that the last resolution of today was about EPSRP so they adopted our joint response for the SSAC. So if you're interested, please read everything about the resolutions and you will get full insight into the issue. I saw that Sébastien showed something about time out but –

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:: Not time but... please, people who doesn't know a lot about ICANN, just don't use too much acronyms. And this first one, I don't understand what you are talking about. Even me and I am sure that I am the only one and I am sorry about that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Would you [inaudible]? Okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, no. I will not. You mean EPSRP is not clear? EPSRP? Okay, that's Extended Process Similarity Review Panel. I'm not sure it's helpful but that's what it is. Anyhow, if you don't know what it is, probably you're not interested in this particular issue, so let's move to next one.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll do a very quick summary. We do have some new people in the room. This had to do with confusingly similar IDN top-level domains that were deemed to be confusingly similar by some and not deemed to be confusingly similar by others. There was a disagreement between the ccNSO and the SSAC and, well, we didn't agree.

KATRINA SATAKI: We read it differently.

ALAN GREENBERG: We read it differently, all right. There has now been an agreement.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. With that, we move to the next agenda item. It's on specific review of process and operating standards and everything around that. My understanding is that you met with the SSR2 Team. We haven't met with them so maybe you could share your views, your opinion how you view the process and how you think we could improve it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will summarize the meeting and we haven't formally discussed it but we were given a presentation by the Chair and one of the members of the SSR Review Team. The whole issue of the disagreement of the SSAC letter and the Board communication was saved to the last minute or so. At which point, one of the co-Chairs, Denise Michel, gave her position. Geoff Huston, who was the other presenter pointed out that this was the position of that co-Chair and not necessarily of the Review Team and we left it at that. We do need only one of the two ALAC endorsed people is at this meeting and I will be attempting to meet with him and if not that, we then will be speaking after the fact.

In my viewpoint, the actions that had been taken are not unreasonable, that hasn't been discussed by the ALAC in general, however, and I won't pretend that's a general form. I have a particular vested interest as being Chair of the RDS Review Team where I can see at least some of these things lurking in our future. So it should be interesting.

I don't know if anyone else around the room got any impressions of that meeting they want to share with us. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I think it's worth noting that we also had a meeting with the SSAC and we get that point of view about the situation and we also have some inputs from Board members, the

committee in charge of that who have pushed the button to decide to stop the review and even if it's — I will give you my point of view here. Even if it's interesting, the way it was done, it's not the best way. I think that now, we are supposed to have an Empowered Community but the SSAC say, "Oh, but we are advising the Board and it's why we sent a letter to the Board." Then its question the way we want to organize our Empowered Community. What we have really done with Work Stream 1 and what we are doing with Work Stream 2 and accountability and what I concluded is that I hope that this situation will be as short as possible because it jeopardizes to review but it will also have consequences on the other review if we follow this path, if any SO/AC can say to the Board, "Stop it," and it stopped immediately. It's a little bit strange as a way of doing the work within the community. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Anyone else? What were your impressions from the meeting with the Review Team members and the Board members? Okay, if no other views on that one — today, we had a consult prep meeting and we decided to invite our members on this Review Team to our Council face-to-face meeting on Wednesday, hope that they can make it so that we will ask for a brief update and their views on this matter. I have spoken to them and on Friday, they had a meeting right before they

received the Board's letter that their work had been suspended. For them, that particular meeting went really well. They thought finally things are moving forward into the right direction and they did not expect this move.

On the other hand, if you talk about SSAC, yes, that's what they do. They do advise the Board and we learned it the hard way ourselves. That's the process they have according to the Bylaws and apparently they cannot address the Review Team. Every document they prepared, it must go to the Board. Anything?

ALAN GREENBERG:

One of the things that became clear, I've talked to a number of people about the review and it seems clear that they have broken into a number of subteams and some of them apparently are making good progress and some are completely stalled and it's not clear whether it's because of this item that they selected within their scope or because of the skills of the people who are being assigned to that team or perhaps on the Review Team altogether. So clearly, it's not working perfectly but having been on Review Teams, that's not atypical. So whether that's a problem [alone] is not clear.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Another thing that, well, our position being that the scope should be defined before a call for volunteers to this Review Team is issued because otherwise, people, first they sign up for something they are not clear about, that's one thing. Another thing is that they need to commit their time to the review and if the scope is not clear, it might be difficult to assess the time that will be necessary for the work on this review team. And third thing, if we as ccNSO have to select people to work on the Review Team, we also need to know the scope. Otherwise, it's difficult to assess if people who have put their names forward have the necessary skillset and can commit the time to do the work.

That's why we also sent a letter some time ago and we deferred our participation in the RDS Review Team. Now, when the scope is more or less clear, we are going to discuss the document that Alan sent to us and the Council will look into the issue and decide on our further steps with this regard.

Next, about the operating standards. So it looks that now we're moving to the right direction. So we are going to have operating standard that had to be, well, according to the way I read the Bylaws, I think the operating standards have to be in place before we started any work around forming Review Teams.

Now, we have these operating standards, we at the ccNSO, we have Guidelines Review Committee which is tasked to work on our internal documents. The Guidelines Review Committee is asking the Councilor, maybe the other way around, the Council will be asking the Guidelines Review Committee to look into operating standards and work on the comments to help to make these operating standards work better for the reviews.

Have you also discussed how you're going to review operating standard – the draft – are you going to propose your changes and comments?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. We haven't either discussed it or charged a group with doing it. I suspect we will charter a small group of volunteers to look at it.

It's one of these interesting things that we want detailed standards and rules. Along with the detailed standards and rules comes our workload and I know from my personal point of view, I'm a little bit concerned that the level of documentation and transparency that we are now expecting in this new ICANN is going to put perhaps a somewhat unreasonable load on our volunteers and related to the SSR Review Team for instance, the SSAC identified a number of things that from the tone in their letter, that the Review Team had wasted it's time on instead of

doing real work, and yet a lot of these things are things that are now mandated by operating standards.

So I have a little bit of a concern of how we are going to integrate these things and with a volunteer community that already is somewhat stressed to adapt to them but on the other hand, I can't really see that we're going to say, "No, we don't want transparency and clarity." But we have not done much work on it at this point.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Alan. Yes, it's a very complex issue, actually. I [didn't] go into much details. We just have some general guidance on the process. At the same time, another thing that we are now thinking about is institutional knowledge, institutional memory. So again, something that we learned the hard way that apparently, not everyone has this institutional memory, and if you do not document your processes properly at some point, this knowledge you have accumulated within a group, it can be lost and you just have to reinvent the wheel again.

So I think documenting the process is a good thing and it needs to be done, the level of details, yes, that's perhaps something else. But anyhow, I will be very interested to know how your work on the review of operating standards is progressing. So thank you.

If there are no more comments on specific reviews and operating standards, we can move forward, it's Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance charter review. So currently, as you know, Generic Names Supporting Organization has withdrawn their participation in the Cross-Community Working Group because apparently, they believe that that is not the correct form for this effort but still both ccNSO and ALAC still are chartered organization of this Cross-Community Working Group but apparently, this group is ready and they understand that, yes, they should change the way they keep calling themselves and probably look for another framework. My understanding is that they have come up with proposals, solutions the way forward.

So we certainly support the effort. Yes, probably Cross-Community Working Group is not the right format. So your views on this?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I was part of the original group that started the drafting. I wasn't involved at the end that drafted the new guidelines for Cross-Community Working Groups and I certainly, at that point, tried to put through the view that guidelines should be just guidelines and if you start making them too rigid, you may find that we're

going to have to invent new vehicles each time and that is indeed what happened.

When the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance was re-chartered a year or so ago, something like that, I won't quote verbatim because I don't remember it but our motion said we support this charter or any other group no matter what it's name or exact format that does the same thing, because clearly the writing was on the wall that the GNSO was very unhappy that this group did not have an endpoint and dissolve and yet the intent when it was created was not to have an endpoint and dissolve.

So we are quite delighted that everyone now seems to be agreeing that if we change the name and keep on doing the work it's doing or some evolution of it, so I think we are quite content and are happy to see if the name changes, the name changes. I personally would have been quite happy if the name stayed the same and we don't worry about it but that isn't the way that the world has unfolded.

Olivier, as one of the co-Chairs, do you want to say anything at this point?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much, Alan. I must admit of doing something very naughty at the moment, which is to actually be on the Board Working Group on Internet Governance discussions, which is saying pretty much the same thing as what Katrina has mentioned a bit earlier and they are discussing the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance as we speak.

The working group itself has been putting quite some time on drafting the terms of a different vehicle, which would likely be called – that’s the proposed name at the moment, Cross-Community Engagement Group, CCEG. We haven’t had that acronym taken yet so we’re laying claim to it and the working group itself, well, a formal vehicle would effectively provide the working group with the ability to continue to have staff support, perhaps even increase staff support because we have very minimal staff support at the moment and this is one of the main problems that the group has had to deal with, but also having the formal relationship with the Board and with the different communities in ICANN.

From what I’ve heard here, Matthew Shears, the future Board member has made a case for the Board to continue its support for some kind of a vehicle so it really, I think, would probably be up to the communities themselves to see if they would wish to support a vehicle in that case.

The charter itself, there is a draft charter at the moment that we will be discussing in a face-to-face meeting. I think that you must have received their report of the working group's activities this year. [inaudible] shared a report of the working group's activities since the last meeting with the ALAC. It is in their mailbox. I'm not sure if everyone has read it yet, but there are further activities that are going to happen until the end of the year with the engagement at the Internet Governance Forum that is there plus of course, the finalizing of the Cross-Community Engagement Group Charter, which we will have ready by ICANN61 in which hopefully, SOs and ACs will be able to consider for approval.

I don't think I have anything else to add apart from perhaps inviting any ccNSO members that will be at IGF to come to that workshop. The workshop will be about capacity building in ICANN and elsewhere, I think. I'm doing that from memory but if I'm wrong, I'll come back.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Thank you, Katrina. Just some more clarification as to what Olivier has just said. The word "working group" basically

assumes that we are trying to do something within ICANN. But actually what this group is doing is actually it is – that is why we have been talking about the word “engagement” because we are trying to engage with groups outside of ICANN and trying to enhance their understanding of the Internet governance structure. So although this group has a name Internet governance, we are not involved in anything to do with actually the governing of the Internet. We are actually trying to enhance the understanding of external bodies outside of ICANN so that’s why we can’t come up with a definite timeline of our activities because outside, things are going on constantly and so I think a new vehicle is the way to go. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Young Eum. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Katrina. Thank you for bringing this up, Young Eum. That is indeed one of the constraints. Internet governance is a very dynamic space. We are aware of the different conferences that take place around the world. We actually have a timeline of these conferences that one has to monitor.

However, there is a multiplication of these. There is also a multiplication of, what you would call them, attacks, challenges, multiplication of proposals made by some countries with regards to Internet governance issues that relates to ICANN's mission – that directly relates to ICANN's mission. There is widening of the number of foray in which ICANN – and I'm here saying the word ICANN being used including the UN General Assembly, something completely unheard of. So whilst ICANN might have been flying under the radar for a while for many countries, right now the light is starting to shine on ICANN, perhaps for some good reasons in some way.

Certainly, one of the things that has helped with ICANN's image is the IANA Stewardship Transition but that has also raised some conveyance from some countries thinking, "Hey, that sounds like something we want to get involved with in a different way than how we get involved with it at the moment."

So the relevance to ICANN is particularly important. I have concerns that it's not shared by everyone in the community, but the threats are absolutely real and dismissing these threats without actually keeping a close eye on them and informing the ICANN communities of these through the experts that we have in the working group but also through the great work that is taking place on the Board with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance is really putting our heads in the sand with a danger

that one day, we wake up with the real challenge on our hands and being totally unprepared. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have nothing to say at this point on the subject.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. We have... yup, Holly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: [Relates] to Olivier –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Say your name.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche. Sorry. Aside from watching brief, what do you suggest? I mean, it's like do you actually watch the Titanic and record it full or do you make some other constructive suggestions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. So the ICANN staff, ICANN has dedicated staff that follow these issues very closely. I believe I've just heard that they have five people. They are going to actually looking at hiring two more people, one in Belgium in Brussels and one in Geneva. That's very hot news that's just come out, which does mean that there is a need for more people. ICANN staff so far has worked with the working group with a vehicle – let's call it the vehicle – and with the group on every statement that ICANN has sent out, drafted by ICANN staff. That has been passed by the working group and by the experts, the people that are members there and some input has been sent back and sometimes, significant parts have been amended according to the people that are on there.

The turnover that is required, unfortunately, for many of the consultations that take place in external matters is equally as short as the turnover time that one has for public consultations in ICANN – turnaround, sorry, the turnaround time is equally as short, in fact, sometimes even shorter. We have seen some consultations taking place in 14 days, which makes it extremely difficult for the working group itself to revert back to its communities and then come back.

So that's one of the constraints and a whole formal approval process for statements to be drafted by the working group, etc., is something that is completely unworkable except if we had any

kind of a fast track, which arguably in ICANN is a very difficult thing to have for these sort of sometimes very, very focused topics that you need a book to explain before you actually understand. There's a lot of political posturing around these issues and so on.

So it's been something that's been helpful for the Board, helpful for staff because it's brought some feeling, some gut feeling from the community. It's never been used as a formal way to draft statements as some people in the community might have wished in the past, and I don't think that there is on the table any proposal for this to become like this due to the very fact that it's very difficult for a small group to represent the whole community without involving the community itself. I hope I haven't confused everyone.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. You have. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm so glad.

KATRINA SATAKI: You did your best. So thank you very much. With that, I propose that we move to the next agenda item and it's on the discussion

on the use of country and territory names as top-level domains. As you know, we had Cross-Community Working Group and it came up with their recommendation that unfortunately cannot reach any progress under that particular umbrella and with that particular mandate. Currently, it looks like we have moved to Work Track 5 under Policy Development Process initiated by Generic Name Supporting Organization in order to find some policy recommendations for subsequent rounds on new top-level domains. I hope that everybody was happy.

Yes, we have sent a letter to the GNSO with our expectations on this process, just recently GAC also, Governmental Advisory Committee has come up with a list of requirements that they believe should be met. We also have some regional activities, country code top-level domains, regional organizations of country code top-level domains. They also issued a statement that they believe that if there's no progress and no better solution is found, then we should stay with the current status that is written in the Applicants Guidebook. That will be used for subsequent rounds on the new generic top-level domains.

Any comments from the ALAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. We also have said we support the group. We have named a co-Chair. We issued a statement saying that we reserve the right

to ratify it. We don't really have the clout that you do in terms of saying we insist that, not the clout but we're not in a position to say that the existing Applicant Guidebook must be honored if we do not come to closure but it doesn't really matter because one of us saying it is enough, especially someone who is a Supporting Organization and has their own vested interest in the names.

The GAC today issued – I think it was today – issued a much more exhaustive set of restrictions or conditions that depending on how you read them, either fit in with what the GNSO has said they will do or clash. They have said if you are trying to reach consensus, everyone must be treated equally. The GNSO response to that is we don't try to reach consensus on working groups like that and I may have the words slightly wrong. Clearly anyone can volunteer to be a member of this group. We are also going to be appointing people who are formally representing each of the regions to make sure that we are somewhat balanced and have people that have a formal obligation to participate. Clearly, people who just put their name in may or may not.

We also have a little bit of concern that to make sure, since we're not... People within At-Large have different positions on this and I have no doubt that there are some to use the classic example of Amazon, feel that under no condition should a

company be given it or under no conditions of a region be able to say, “Sorry, you can’t” when the trademark is trademark in those same countries.

So there are clearly different positions and we are optimistic that we will try to make sure that all of those positions are reflected there so that if the group can come to closure, we make sure that we don’t have people afterwards saying, “But you didn’t consider my idea,” which is really critical because there’s no point in the group coming to closure if the community doesn’t accept it afterwards.

At the same time, we are just a little bit dubious that we’ll be able to come to closure on this, and we in fact have a question we are posing to the Board of if this group does not come to closure and everyone is happy, then we revert to the current guidelines, which created the situation we’re in today, with the Board having to make decisions and how do they propose to do this given that they now say they don’t want to make decisions. So it’s a messy area. It could be interesting to watch. You may need a funny sense of humor doing it and if you have a vested interest in the outcome, it becomes really interesting.

Cheryl? Can’t imagine why Cheryl has any interest in this idea, this concept.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't know, for some peculiar reason, I felt the need to come and sit to the table. If any of you in the room are unaware, I've recently been appointed by the GNSO to be one of the two overall co-Chairs for the Subsequent Procedures for new gTLDs PDP Working Group and so that is one of my motivations for speaking. My other motivation is as some of you will also remember, had a little bit to do right back to study groups on this matter so I have a little tiny bit of history. I want to try and help you clear up a few concerns that I've heard at the table.

First of all, Katrina, you mentioned that in the letter, and we've seen as in the other letters... Let me stop this again. I'll do a Christy Spencer. Let me stop that sentence again. There will be a letter put out from Jeff and I via the Council to the ccNSO, to the GNSO and to the ALAC responding to all of your concerns. So that's happening, hasn't happened yet but it will happen. But I think I can help with a couple of things before you get the e-mail delivery.

The full back position – and I don't like using that word but the status quo was an even worse term for me to use. So whatever you wanted putting that where we stay if we don't do anything better terminology is the Applicant Guidebook as she is [inaudible], doesn't get changed. So that is a given, not just for Work Track 5 but for all the work tracks. That's across the board, so that's a given. But as Alan pointed out, one of the reasons we

are in this mess is because there was a problem with that, so let's try really hard and see if we can actually get some improvements.

The GNSO PDP guidelines are going to be the primary instrument. As I will point out, they have been with minor modifications with Cross-Community Working Groups that we have recently conducted so it should be something that is very familiar to most people who are going to be engaged in it. But what it does do is give us a set of specified levels of consensus that the whole PDP plenary has to agree upon. So the Work Track 5 will advise when it comes to an agreed set of recommendations and then that will go to plenary and of course that's an ideal opportunity for Annebeth to make sure that you've got people in the room because observers have the same right to raise issues as anyone else. So there's a couple of checks and balances along that way.

I'm going to cut to the chase here, it means that we don't ever need full consensus because we classify what consensus level is so the issues on voting and rankings and whether one has a right to veto unknown events because it won't make any difference that not have that process will go on. The councils and the Support Organizations and the Advisory Committees do not lose any of the current input mechanisms from the normal process.

So you can still put Government Advisory Committee or the ALAC at your normal points, be at the public comment or to the Board at the end, you don't trade off any rights by being involved in Work Track 5. A whole lot more will say in the letter but I don't think you need to be quite as concerned as some of you appear to be. And you said you don't have to be quite as negative as some as you appear to be. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much Cheryl. Any questions or any comments? I like the way Alan put it that not everybody agrees with everybody and that's probably the main problem why we need any working group. Yes, please, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm sorry. I obviously had far too long a day. On Wednesday morning at 8:30, we are going to start a three-hour session and Annebeth and – where's Christopher? I'm sure Christopher is in the room? Anyway, [inaudible] Christopher and Annebeth, we are having a meeting tomorrow, get the logistics, sort that out a little bit more, but that whole public interaction is going to be about everyone being helped to understand what the rules of engagement are, what the expectations are and it's going to be workshop so you'll get to start doing the framing and the

scoping. So if you're not already committed to meetings, I would encourage you to join us.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Greetings, everyone. Thank you. As you've just ascertained, I have been nominated by ALAC as the co-leader for At-Large in this new group. Our first meeting will be tomorrow so there's not very much to report or say about it.

I'm glad that Cheryl has explained the ground rules to us all. It is a delicate matter. The scope goes beyond the protection of 3166 names in all their forms and there will be some very tricky questions when we come to IDN, TLDs and of related variance. But my main point today would be to urge you, invite you to make sure that in addition to the five regional representatives to which Alan has already referred but who I think have not yet been designated, we do need a good cross section of expertise opinion and knowledge from around the world to deal with this question on a balanced and viable basis over the long term in the future.

I think this is not a one-off. This is an issue which will be with us for years to come. And as the internet expands in regions which,

I think sometimes are called underserved regions, I'm not quite sure that I appreciate that so that designation. But in any case, it's quite clear that geographic indications, geographic names which are not important today could very easily become important in 5 years or 10 years' time. So please look to the degree of representation and participation that you can ensure worldwide. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I would like to... Yeah, okay. Please Annebeth. I just must say that Annebeth has lost her voice and she must be really careful not to speak too much.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Hello, everybody. I have some problems with my voice but I'm the co-Chair for the ccNSO and we really look forward to work with all the stakeholder groups to reach some better results if possible and that's our goal. Since my voice is not very good at the moment, I leave the rest of the ccNSO to Nick Wenban-Smith who helps me out for a while in this if that's okay. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Please turn off the mic. Okay, yup.

ANNEBETH LANGE: [inaudible] so we know who he is.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Just to introduce myself, I'm Nick Wenban-Smith. I'm a UK lawyer. My shins are very sore from being kicked by Annebeth for saying the wrong thing but I'm the voice of Annebeth for the purposes of a lot of these meetings going forward. So again, you would have seen that pretty much unanimously from every single country code around the world, starting off with the Asia Pacific, TLDs produced statement essentially on geographic names, [sense] of the European Association for country codes. We had the General Assembly three weeks ago in Brussels, again unanimous amongst 60 or so TLDs. They all agree these certain position statements as we go into Work Track 5.

The Latin American and Caribbean are having a general meeting later on this month and we believe they will come to a similar thing. So there's a very, very strong interest in engagement from the ccTLDs on some of these questions. We believe there's quite a lot of potential unity of interest from some of the things in terms of underserved regions, identities, culture sensitivities so we look forward to working constructively.

I would be the first to say that the current – I wouldn't call it guidelines, it's the rules and terms and conditions, which you have to follow to get a new generic top-level domain. How

should I say this nicely? They are very difficult and they definitely could be improved. We've already had now I think five years since the 2012 round so one of the interesting questions is will it take another five years before we get there. That's pretty enough for now.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Nick. Any questions to Annebeth and Nick will respond because her voice at the moment. So if not, I must say that, wait a minute Cheryl, let me say that thank you very much for the invitation to join you on Wednesday; however, Tuesday and Wednesday, those are our ccNSO members days so we have to be there. So please do not interpret our absence as lack of interest. It's just different priorities perhaps. Okay, thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That does fit well into the next slide.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, exactly. That's why I decided to end with this clash of meetings because now we are smoothly moving to the last agenda item which is meeting strategy and how the meeting goes for you, how this new meeting strategy works for you. For us, we have established the team that would work on the review

of the new strategy and how it works for ccNSO, what is working, what is not working. So what's your impression?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we are going to get a number of different answers around the room. This meeting amazingly is going better than some of them but then again, it hasn't really started yet, has it? I have found that these meetings over the last several years and roughly coinciding with the new meeting strategy but maybe just coinciding with the world getting more complex had been harder and harder to schedule, harder and harder for people to participate in because of conflicts and the amount of juggling that we do very, very late in the game has grown.

Even though in theory, we are locking in blocks and things like that really early, as we start looking at the details that are fleshed out in the schedule, we find more and more conflicts and that we have to start juggling and playing games so we finalize the schedule, the ALAC is meeting about 11 sessions, essentially yesterday, today and some on Tuesday and I'm not even sure on Wednesday and we only finalized the schedule, almost finalized it about the day before we got on planes and then did a little bit of juggling when we got here just to try to make sure that we fit with all the conflicts because no matter how hard we try, I'm active in some GNSO PDPs. Other people are active in other ones

and so we have to juggle things to make sure that there's nothing... I can't share a meeting while I'm in another one, it's hard.

It seems to have gotten harder. We're also looking at starting to plan our At-Large summit which we have every five years and that takes a year of planning and yet we are going to be looking at the agenda for that knowing the block schedule for the March meeting that we're looking at for is only going to be settled a month or so before the meeting and how to do we do that? So it's difficult. The number of sessions that have been blocked out in cross-community work has grown.

On the other hand, certainly at this particular meeting, they are all good and we do want to participate in most of them. Is it working for us? Well, there's a lot of positive things about it. It's become a real pain to deal with but maybe worth it. Anyway, that's my personal view as one of people involved in the scheduling for our own sessions and I'm not the prime one but I stick my head and do it periodically.

Other people in the room on either ccNSO or ALAC side? Nobody? Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I would like to say two things. One, taking my previous role as a Chair of the Meeting Strategy Working Group, I need to really say that it was a pity that it was not possible to set up Implementation Working Group because everything was given [inaudible] few people in the staffs have tried to do their best but I'm not sure that it was first of all exactly what the working group and the organization and the community have decided but in general, it was quite complicated and it must have been a little bit different with an implementation working group.

So second is I would like to urge you and that's my personal point of view to be careful with single people with a lot of responsibilities. A meeting will always be complicated. Alan, I can tell you I spent my two days here. This meeting was going smooth. I decided not to go to any other meeting. I spent here my two days.

It depends what you want. If you want us to be here to talk about ALAC, then we are here. If you want to us to be outside, then we have to cancel the meeting here and be outside but it's not complicated. Once again, it's complicated for a few people and I understand why it is complicated because you have different responsibilities but that's not majority of the participants of the ICANN meetings and we have really to take that into account also. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I'm sure you also have seen and read the document prepared by ICANN Org on the future, some changes to the meeting and meeting strategy. One of the proposals was that, okay, A meeting is fine. B meeting might be one day too short and C meeting might be one day too long so what's your view on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: So in other words, we revert back to what we were doing before at least in terms of meeting length. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's really strange here also because you say you want one day less and we are already two days more. We are already weeks more than the supposed one week of what we say in the meeting strategy. We are already with CCWG meetings day prior, with Board meetings the day prior, with other meetings going on after. On Friday, it's [including] the meeting but we know already that's on Saturday meeting and people were struggling to have those meetings. What? It's too short? It's too long? It's too... by the end of the day, we want more, more, more, more times and let spend our all year in a meeting with ICANN and it will be great but it's a joke.

The fact that the second, the middle meeting was the B meeting, what we have called it outreach meeting was supposed to be even one day less of what it is today, because the first day was supposed to be one day of outreach because we were going in a region where we are not going often because it was – I will not say smaller country but is country with smaller facilities to welcome an ICANN meeting but in the same time now, we went not in those types of country, we went to South Africa then we could have done the A, B, C meeting, it doesn't matter. The old process is a little bit [inaudible] once again why I was very sad that we didn't have an Implementation Committee of the community working with the staff on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll make another comment. It falls on a little bit. Sébastien is right. That was called an outreach meeting. Now, it's a policy meeting. My recollection, which doesn't match everyone else's recollection, is that since we were meeting in Helsinki where we couldn't do a lot of outreach at certainly at that time of the year, the name was constructed as a policy meeting, became a formal name of the meeting, which has stuck. I don't know about the ccNSO.

At-Large, we go through different things and at one point, we may be spending a lot of time on policy, other time processes,

what we end up having to focus on because we're simply at that time in our life, we have been working heavily on the At-Large review. We're going to be doing implementation of the At-Large review, which will probably start in real earnest around the June meeting where we're probably going to be told we are not allowed to due process, we are only elected to policy and yet that's going to be the high priority on our list simply because we are going to make commitments and have to deliver. The Board finally is asking us when we are going to implement all these things that we say we are going to implement. That implies a priority.

So the world is complex. I don't think we are going to make it simpler. We seem to only be able to make things more complex and invent more processes as we go forward. We never seem to reduce them.

KATRINA SATAKI:

So on this optimistic remark, I think that we can make the world simpler and just close the meeting. Thank you very much for hosting us and see you around.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Three minutes early. A record for us, I think. Thank you. Thank you for joining us.

All right. Closing words for At-Large, this is the end of our Saturday, Sunday meetings. We will be meeting again later in the week. Tomorrow, the opening session I expect to see everyone there breaking early or watching it from your hotel room as you wish and we have lots of work to do.

Yes, sorry. I'd like to thank... We pushed it. if I may have your attention for just one moment more, we pushed the technology and our staff really hard in this room and I'd like to thank our At-Large staff for keeping us going, technical staff behind us. And to thank our diligent language interpretation people who put up with us talking too fast, not giving our names and some of us speaking unintelligibly. So thank you all for your marvelous work. Enjoy yourself this evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]