

---

ABU DHABI – At-Large APRALO Debrief Part 1  
Thursday, November 2, 2017 – 08:30 to 10:15 GST  
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

SATISH BABU: ...General Assembly. We hope you've had a fun time yesterday at the GA, and then later at the showcase. We will be asking you for your feedback, and that will be done –

Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There's an echo.

SATISH BABU: Oh, there's an echo. Can someone please look at it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

SATISH BABU: Okay. Okay now?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

---

*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.*

---

SATISH BABU:

All right. So we will be asking for your feedback in two different ways. This is a form that's in front of you. This is for a brief summary feedback, qualitative feedback that we will be scanning and including in the e-book. You'll [hand in] the feedback.

A more detailed feedback form is being prepared, and that will be circulated later. That will be used for processing further and preparing for feedback internally – both for the staff as well as the leadership team. That will be more detailed where you can give them feedback on individual sessions. So this one is a general feedback, which will be captured and preserved as your feedback for posterity.

Now we have a slight change in the schedule in the morning session. Cheryl, as you saw yesterday, is a very busy person. She's here with us to start off this session now. Olivier has very kindly agreed to move his session by about 10-15 minutes so that we can have Cheryl start off on the topic of the At-Large Review Implementation Plan, as well as any other topic she can help us with – general advice to the General Assembly.

It's over to you, Cheryl.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Satish. I appreciate your rejigging the agenda just to satisfy my needs to be in two places at once. So, I do deeply appreciate that.

My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. In fact, I say that and you can wonder where the comma is. Some of the interpreters' staff from language services actually come and say to me, "Hello, Cheryl Langdon-Orr-For-the-Transcript-Record. How are you today?" So it's probably a good idea that you also get that reputation. During today's proceedings, remember to identify yourself with who you are very time you speak.

It makes a huge difference when we look back at our history, for example. And having just made very small contributions to the work that your leadership team has done in putting the history document together recently, their job would have been a lot easier if we did our job of getting things properly annotated when we did them in the first place. It would have been nice.

I'd like to think that when they're doing a 20-year history, from this point on, all our records are a lot easier to research because of the way we introduce them and what we do with them.

That said – I just can't help myself doing housekeeping, I suppose – Maureen is going to share this section with me because Maureen is going to be the lead. As you know, I trust, Maureen is one of the two Vice-Chairs for this coming year's

---

Executive Committee – the leadership team of the ALAC. The 15-person ALAC select a chair and two vice-chairs, making three people, and two others.

That set of five people keeps the train on the track between meetings. It's not a decisional body. It's an administrative function, but it's important that we see the chairs and the co-chairs as part of our leadership model. That means there's some portfolio sharing and some jobs that you'll see that Bastien and Maureen particularly carrying the heavy load on.

I think there was a couple straws cracked into different lengths. There were long straws and short straws. Anyway, she ended up with a straw that I'm delighted that she got, which is going to head up the implementation – what the Board finally signs off on for us to work in the next 12 to 18 months on the outcomes of our review.

And it's to that end that I wanted to make sure you all start thinking now. You've got APAC leadership. You've got huge diversity. You've got people who are looking to engage and start to contribute to the work of At-Large and represent the region. And it seems to me that when you – assisting with the implementation plan, implementing the implementing plan in our region, but also putting people forward to assist Maureen

---

when she asks for particular subject matters to be dealt with – think about who we can put forward.

You’ve been given some great capacity building. You got all the 101 stuff. You should have the confidence. You know each other. At least here, you’ve got a friendly face. You’ve got Maureen, who will be doling out the roles and responsibilities.

Why is this important? Because this will set up what the regional and At-Large structures and the individual membership role effectively becomes for the next three to five years. The mere fact that we have Justine sitting at the table because she’s an individual member – absolutely traded equitably to every one of the ALS representatives here – is a function of recommendations out of the last review process.

So whatever you do, whatever you get implemented, will have real meaning in the future. Don’t just think it’s just housekeeping, like I started with. There are a number of issues that we believe the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, and then the Board, will say to ALAC, “We need to sort out.” It has a lot to do with outreach, a lot to doing that with engagement, and a lot to do with communication modalities and methods.

With that intro and without any preparation, I’m going to see if Maureen has anything she’d like to add to that.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Surprise!

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [You'll] get used to it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, I must admit I have been involved in the whole At-Large review from slightly early stages when we were first preparing readiness for the ITEMS script to come into play. Consequently, I had quite a lot to do with the writing up of the review from the contributions that were made from the ALAC itself and through Olivier and his connection with the RALOs. A big contribution came from them as well. So, we actually were looking at it from the ALAC leadership point of view plus the grassroots, including the sorts of comments that came from end users and ALSes, like yourself.

I know that Holly has had some feedback over the last week, or the Board has had some feedback over the last week, that she'd like to talk to you about. That does impact on how long it will take before we can start the implementation process. I foresee that there'll be quite a lot to be done, and it will involve the team of people who were initially involved plus people like yourselves.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, it's important to recognize that the Board will say, "These things are to be done." We've done the feasibility and we've given a rough thumbnail of how we think it should be done. They may modify that. They may agree with it. They may delete one. They may, even in this situation, add another.

But a group of people then need to make the magic happen. I would like to think, as Maureen just indicated, that at least a couple of people will continue on – but then again, Maureen is an example of one who will – from what is the Review Working Party and the implementation.

But there is a clear stop and new start. It is not a continuation of role. This is not the Review Working Party's job. This is now an implementation review team.

Why am I blathering on about this? Why am I even here, apart from the general decorative offering I make the room? When we did our first At-Large review, I happened to facilitate and assist in all parts of the last process. So I'm here now as a resource, as a point in history, and as, if you so desire, for some suggestions for how you may go forward when you become, perhaps, challenged.

---

When is it likely to start? We had hoped we would be beginning our implementation in terms of specific scoping no later than the end of the calendar year and be able to start to report on some of the short-term completions of things by March and April of next year.

That will now have slipped, as Holly will briefly outline. The way things have happened with our timeline out of our control with[out] the Organizational Effectiveness Committee means that we will not be seeing, from the Board, the instruction to begin implementation before much closer to the calendar year ending. So instead of us being on the road and getting on with it in November, we will probably be getting “It’s time to go” messages at the end of November or even the beginning of December.

That just frames what Holly is about to tell you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

This is Holly about to tell you. We were informed by – possibly there may have been informal connections beforehand, but really, the Theresa Swinehart memo – and she’s with, obviously, ICANN staff. She was the one to say, “Look, there is an issue here.” We have perhaps more challenges in mapping the issues identified by the ITEMS team with the responses that all of us contributed to in the ALAC response. So, they’re still undertaking



---

that mapping exercise that was originally forecast to you way back probably two weeks ago. That seems like a long time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just October.

HOLLY RAICHE: Because it is taking longer – it was in that memo that we found out that the date that they expected this mapping exercise, which is an attempt to map ITEMS issues with our responses, is not going to go to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee until the week of the 27th. That's when it will be considered. In fact, at that stage, there was a little scary phrase that said, “If this may require some more working party work...” and I took a deep breath and thought, “Oh, that’s good.”

We were a bit concerned (and this was expressed by Alan) that we haven’t seen the document – and won’t see the document – that MSSl is going to produce. We were reassured that, actually, there would be no surprises in it; that, in fact, we wouldn’t be informed by the OEC of what was in the document and it was really about managing documents that were already in front of us and in front of them.

The next piece of information we got was from Rinalia. It really explained the exercise, explained what they were going to do

---

with the mapping report, and explained it was going to go to the OEC and that's when it would be considered. That's when we may have more work.

The really final piece – and it doesn't add clarity to the schedule – would be the letter from ITEMS. Now, that has –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Irrelevant.

HOLLY RAICHE: And I was about to say it has generated a bit of heat, but it in no way affects the process. It in no way affects what the OEC is going to do. It in no way affects what we are going to do. It in no way affects what the Board is going to do. So, although it is interesting and we can speculate on why it happened, it certainly doesn't change the process one josh.

The thing that I would highlight is that little thing from Theresa Swinehart that suggested they may be some more work for the working party. I don't know. Satish was good enough to ask me, "What's the schedule now?" I just said, "Well, it's in the stars." For those of you who can read the stars, I would appreciate knowing. If you are as much in the dark as I am because the stars are very far away, that is as much as we know at this stage. I expect that, by the end of November, there will be much more

---

clarity as to what material has gone to the OEC, what they plan to do with, and whether they plan to come back to us with some further questions before it goes to the Board.

Although Cheryl thinks I'm going to spread a bit more light on it, what I've done I think is explain the darkness and explain that the stars are very far away. I'm trying to read them, but at this stage it's a little difficult. So I can't give you any more information than that. That's all I know.

We're just going to have wait, probably for a couple of weeks, before we know A) if we got more work to do before the matter goes to the Board. Really, until it goes to the Board and we know what they have accepted of the things that we have suggested, we really can't finalize any kind of implementation plan. So, I don't know whether that means we breathe easy or hard.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. I'm going to use my crystal ball. If you think I don't have one, I will send you all a photograph. It's just too heavy for me to carry because it volcanic glass. I do have a crystal ball at home, so I can see if I can connect to my crystal ball. I'm going to predict the following to help you with your timeline. Failing significant issues with the mailing document, we will have had a go for implementation on a number, if not all, of the aspects that we have reacted to in our feasibility work. It

---

would probably be by, ideally, the end of November, but I would think it's possible for us to have even sign-off before the end of the calendar year.

Assuming that there is a known intercessional date for the Board to give us final sign-off (and this is very much a foggy area in my crystal ball at the moment) I believe you should think about your Implementation Review Team being formed and having probably its initial kickoff – even if it's doing predictive work rather than actual work – sometime in the first or second week of December.

There are then going to be a number of traditional activities in various countries, ranging from the lunar new year in the beginning. We're just going to have to work around all sorts of times that people don't want to meet. We just won't all to be able to meet every time we want to.

So the real work: start thinking from probably the mid to end of January, 2018; and then solidly throughout that coming two, if not, three terms.

Why I am saying that? Because I believe, with the exception of some long-term implementables, we should be aiming to get “checked off, checked off, checked off, checked off” as much as we possibly can as soon is practical because I don't want to be in the situation of the GNSO.

---

The GNSO had its first review just as we did. The GNSO then had its second review. That second review happened before ours and finished well before ours. Their implementation team is hoping to sign off on their work and have their work at the completion stage for presentation to the GNSO Council around the 18th of December this year.

That is an awfully long time that they've been implementing things. I believe we can do better because, quite literally, their next review will be beginning almost less than twelve months after their final implementation is being signed off on.

So that's my crystal ball gazing. If it doesn't work out, no harm, no foul. I do need to take my leave from you in the next few minutes, so if there are any questions on this topic or any other relating to the General Assembly – not life, the universe, and everything – I would be happy to answer any questions.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Cheryl. I'd like to ask a question. Are there any steps in the remaining part of the At-Large implementation which requires input from ALSs or individual members?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is possibly a question that Maureen will be in a position to answer later when she has looked at what the Board does or

---

doesn't sign off on. My guess is, yes, there will be because there is specific outreach, engagement, and communication recommendations which are about At-Large Structures and individual members and how they can engage in our work. To try and put systems in place and plans in place about people without those people, I think, is just farcical and fraught with danger. If she doesn't design it that, I might be having a little chat to her.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Cheryl. Are there any questions? Yes, Fouad. Please.

FOUAD BAJWA: Cheryl, when this implementation plan comes, what is the language like? Is it the typical language that we receive from the Board, or will it be further made easy for us to volunteer and work? Because understanding that language has always been a challenge for the ALSes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, I'm going to suggest that you all – those of you are interested in this and contribute to this – you look the rough [thumblines] timeline, which is one of the beginning parts of the feasibility work that ALAC put back to the Organizational

---

Effectiveness Committee. In there, you've got a very generic "This starts here and ends here" set of ROs and sets of plans.

The very first job that the Implementation Review Team will need to do is flesh those very general, big headers into a proper project management timeline with expectations and milestones and all the sub-topics. And it's even deciding on what those sub-topics are and what has to go before what and what can run in parallel. That's the basic beginning work of your Implementation Review Team.

We can't say all of it will be done because the Board may indeed say, "We don't want this particular thing to be addressed now, but you need to address all the rest." So until we know what our marching orders are, all we can do is get our boots polished and our uniforms in order.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Cheryl. Are there any more questions for Cheryl?

Not seeing any hands, I'd like to thank Cheryl for being with us again today in the midst of her very busy schedule. Thank you very much, Cheryl. We look forward to your continued support from the side of all the ALSes and APRALO. Thank you very much.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Satish, thank you, because I find it an honor that you're still willing to dust me off and wheel me out and hopefully find some use for me from time to time. I remain, as ever, at all of your service.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Cheryl. Please give her a big hand.

Maureen has been elected to a very responsible position, so on behalf of us, I'd like to congratulate Maureen. Please give her a big hand. Thank you.

We now move on to Agenda Item #1, which is the ICANN policy hot topics. Here, "ICANN" means all the RALOs combined plus ALAC. Olivier is the right person to look at this and tell us about this because he's been working on these topics for quite some time. EURALO has done some backbreaking work in eliciting the hot topics in their region.

Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript. I'm the brother of "Cheryl Langdon-Orr-For-The-Transcript," as you all noticed the same family name.



---

As you've very kindly said indeed, yes, EURALO launched the concept of having hot topics for the region because each one of the regions is very different. The aim was to try and see which topics which were the ones that were star to our region that we could actually engage in quite actively, whether responding to public comments, whether making comments, or whether being involved in working groups.

We put together the list. The other RALOs followed suit, and we ended up with a number of lists from the different RALOs with some common issues between RALOs and some issues which were very different. Most of the time, actually, all of the issues were very similar. But it was just the weighing of those issues that differed. Europe, for example, is very strong on anything that deal with privacy, so that came totally at the top of their list. There were other issues that we might have been a little less strong about.

Satish has sent me the details of the work that you've all done earlier this week in putting together policy issues for APRALO. I've got a document about the EURALO hot issues, and I wondered which one of the two I should really go through because the concerted cross-RALO list is not ready yet since some of the RALOs haven't provided their full details.

Satish?

---

SATISH BABU: I think we can merge the important ones, the top ones from both. And if it's possible –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I'll have to see if I can do that on the fly.

SATISH BABU: [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Okay. I'll look at the one which is the APRALO one and see how it goes. The first one is ICANN Public Interest Commitments. In EURALO, we actually looked at a wider public interest, the search for the public interest. ICANN has got a number of bylaws and organizing documents that created ICANN – the incorporation of ICANN as a not-for-profit 401(c) corporation. You can check that out on the Internet. Is it a not-for-profit organization that is there for the public interest. So it's both in the bylaws and in the organizing documents.

We're looking, in the EURALO sense, at a wider thing of saying that it's not just Public Interest Commitments, which are a set of rules that are part of the contract between ICANN and a registry or a registrar operator.

---

Are you all set? Do you know the difference between registry and registrar?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah? Perfect. Those Public Interest Commitments basically say we're not going to sell domain names in a way that's unethical, etc. There's a whole lot of rules.

There's a part of it that's contractual in the Public Interest Commitments. There is the second part of it, which is voluntary in the contract. You can pull out any contract from I think the New gTLD website. NewgTLDs.ICANN.org has got a list to all of the contracts that ICANN holds with different registries.

That said, as I said, in EURALO we've looked at the overall public interest. There is a working group in At-Large that deals with the public interest. There's a session later on – I believe it's this week. Is it later on today, Satish? I think you're chairing the session.

SATISH BABU: This afternoon.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's this afternoon. So if you're interested in this – and it looks as though you are since this was highly rated in APRALO – I would suggest that you attend this working group session and take part and bring your input into this.

The second one that I'm looking at here is Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice. I'm just focusing on policy areas at the moment. Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice is something that maybe was also important in EURALO, but it took a slightly further-back seat because in EURALO, I think this sense of consumer is less developed than the sense of end users. So really, it's more like end user trust.

There is a slight difference between consumer trust and end user trust when it comes down the DNS. Consumer trust is someone that purchases a domain name. They buy one and they have to have a trusted supplier, a good registrar that they purchased a domain name from – perhaps an Internet service provider; whoever they purchased the name from – and the whole process of purchasing and of maintaining it, etc.

End user trust goes actually a bit further in that it really is anybody that uses the Internet because anybody that uses the Internet uses the DNS. So it really then touches onto whether, when you use a domain name and you type the domain name in

---

your browser or your e-mail, it actually gets to that specific organization.

If we were to send an e-mail to ICANN.org, we trust that this e-mail is going to go over to ICANN.org and is not going to go to some other organization that purports to be ICANN.org. So, that has a wider mandate, and it's something that's really strong in At-Large.

There used to be a number of contracts that ICANN had with the U.S. government that had specific parts on consumer trust. That has been somehow folded into the bylaws to some extent.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Affirmation of Commitments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, AoC. Affirmation of Commitments was the name of the document. That ended when the U.S. government decided it didn't want to shepherd ICANN anymore or oversee ICANN's operations. So, most of these parts about consumer trust were folded into the ICANN bylaws.

There has been a review of consumer trust that has happened in the past year. Kaili Kan has been on that committee, along with another gentleman called Carlton Samuels. It was called the CCT

---

– the Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice. Consumer Choice and Trust – is that it? CCT? And Competition. Here we go.

So all of these are put together. They've come up with monitoring how this round of new generic top-level domains has come out – whether it was good or not and what can be improved for any future rounds in future years and so on.

It's a very important part of our work as well. It's really something that's directly in our mission and in our mandate. I would suggest that we have a working group that supports the consumer trust issues. And that's the registrant issues, I believe.

It's quite funny because the Public Interest Commitments has got its own mailing list, but anything to do with WHOIS or anything to do with consumer trust – all of that ends up in the Registrant Issues Working Group.

Then I see here you've got privacy, WHOIS, and GDPR. These three are really linked together. The WHOIS saga is one which started before ICANN even existed. I think we're looking at 17 years of haggling and of not being happy, with some people saying there's too much in the WHOIS database; some people saying there's not enough; some people saying it's not accurate enough; and others saying it's too accurate.

---

So you can see that they're really starting at the four ends of the spectrum, if there are four ends – I thought there were two ends, but anyway – four ends of the spectrum that are really, really far away. Somehow, everyone has to meet in the middle.

There's been despair on the organizational side about things not moving forward, so a separate group was started for the Registration Directory Services, saying, "You know what? Let's just scrap WHOIS all together and replace it with a brand-new system." I think the main issue has really has been that intellectual property interests – and to some extent, people in our community have been really arguing about a very accurate WHOIs because, if you purchase something from a website, you need to know who you're dealing with.

But then, Civil Society and other –

SATISH BABU: May I ask you to expand on what is WHOIS? Because many people may not know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. WHOIS is a directory service where you type in the domain name and it gives you the registrant's details. It was originally set up for technical reasons so that when people were

---

registering a domain name, if something went wrong – you have to remember, the Internet was not as reliable as it is today.

If something went wrong and e-mail was bouncing about and stuff, there would be a name of a person who was responsible for this domain name. There was also a telephone number, an address, and an e-mail for an administrative or a technical contact. So that's how it started.

It was a good idea to start with because you could basically just pick up the phone and say, "Hey, listen. There's something wrong on your site." The problem, of course, is this was designed when most computers were just universities or companies. Then individual users, individual people, started registering domain names and having their details put on there.

That's where the problem starts because, for privacy reasons, if you start having just a domain name and you give the personal phone number and the personal address and the full details of where these people live, you could end up with harassment. You could end up with – in the case of a website that has a political incline to it – threats; with people being jailed in some countries. So, it has introduced issues.

There have been some ways to get around it by having some proxy providers that would effectively register your domain name and put details in the WHOIS that are cryptic records – just



---

a number, for example. So when somebody consults this, they would have to ask the proxy provider to say, “Who is the real owner behind this?”

Law enforcement has been basically saying, “We need to have accurate records, so we need to find out who is running the domain.” Governments have also said that. In our community, as I said, we’ve had two points of view: the one which says, “Yes, I’m buying something from this website. I need to know who I’m dealing with,” and others who are saying, “Well, if you have to put personal details of people, that just doesn’t work out,” because you have now children that have domain names. Their parents get a domain name for them and so on.

So it’s an incomplete system. You don’t know if the domain name is registered by a company or an individual person. They don’t ask that. You don’t know if that person’s country of citizenship is. There are a lot of details missing. So everyone is treated in the same boat.

The new Registration Directory Services is a tiered service with various levels of data that goes in there and various levels of consultation possible. So, law enforcement could have a higher level of consultation and be able to have full details of the address, etc., whilst the general user could have just the name of the website and the name of the company, perhaps. If it’s an

---

individual, it would say, “Well, this is run by an individual,” but not provide the full details of that individual. So, there’s some level of protection there for privacy reasons.

The problem is that having Registration Directory Services, a brand-new system, is expensive and has to rolled out across all of the top-level domains. Now we’re looking at over 1,500 of them. So, that’s a lot of ways.

The second question then comes to: where is the data located? Traditionally– as in .com, for example – all of the data is located in one location. It’s one big location and it’s called the Thick WHOIS.

In another model – there's a model called the Thin WHOIS – depending on who you've purchased your domain name from, they send you to someone else who sends you to someone else who sends you to someone else. When you perform the WHOIS request, it’s actually a registrar that has got that information. So the information is localized to where the person registers.

There are advantages and inconvenience for both. The advantage for the Thick WHOIS, where there’s a centralized database, is that it’s a centralized database. One size fits all. You go there – bang – you've got your answer.

---

The problem with the Thick WHOIS is that where that database is located is really important. If you hold data from citizens from all around the world in one location, in one database and that database gets hacked or there are no privacy rules regarding that database, you can bet that the company that holds that database is going to sell it all over the place and is going to make a lot of money.

And you're going to have all sorts of spam and be contacted, and people even call you and say, "Hey, do you want to buy some shoes based in Canada?" And you're like, "Well, actually I'm in China. I can get lots of shoes a lot cheaper than in Canada," and this sort of thing. And it's happened to me, by the way. I have had people call me based on the WHOIS records, which is really infuriating.

The Thin WHOIS scenario would seem to be the more logical thing. The problem is that it then requires the whole chain of command to be accurate and to actually do the job that they're supposed to do. The problem is that in the world, statistically there are always incompetent people and always some people that just are not going to follow the rules.

So you end up with WHOIS records that are sometimes patchy. Some registrars might run the WHOIS records really well, and others will just put the name of the person and it's actually going

---

to have typos and telephone numbers all zeros and, in fact, the name of the person is Santa Claus. And you think, “Hmm. I think I know someone called Santa Claus, but I’m not quite sure I want to buy anything directly from him. I thought he gave things away.”

Anyway, so that’s the sort of problem that you get. You’re laughing, but if you do a search on WHOIS for Santa Claus, you’ll get a lot of domains registered to Santa. I don’t know how he does it. How can you maintain a domain portfolio whilst doing all the rest of the work? Anyway.

And there’s also Donald Duck as #2. It’s really, really close.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And Mickey Mouse?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You’re laughing. Mickey Mouse, I think, has been a bit more quiet recently. Anyway, maybe I’m wrong. You’d have to check. I’ll leave it to you.

That’s the problem with Thin WHOIS. So, Registration Directory Services aims to be able to resolve many of things. It’s based on a Thin WHOIS model. That somehow helps out with reducing the problem with regards to data privacy.

---

Then, of course, they're still going around in circles, going, "Well, it's going to be costly," etc. And suddenly the European Commission decided in 2014 and said, "Right. We're going to put together a regulation, and we're going to call it General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). That's going to be the hot acronym."

So they came out with it, and that was actually 2014. Whilst the European Commission was putting this together and having consultations and so on, and the people in ICANN kept on playing around in their same circle and so on and completely disregarded what was going on out that.

I'm sorry to say, but the community totally failed to look at this and went, "Bah! You know what? It's just Europeans. They just want to be a pain in the butt. They're going to come up with some regulations. We're just going to ignore it."

But the Europeans found the special thing, which was: "Hey, let's not make it just geographical and put it as Europe. Let's make it as it relates to European citizens." So, any European that lives anywhere who lives around the world who is in our database makes it sure that the database itself is affected.

Holly?

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Or companies that actually have included in their records EU citizens. So, if you want to trade with an EU company, you're – good gosh – [inaudible]. It's lovely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Holly. Okay. So effectively, that really got everyone thinking. Well, actually, just the regulation and so on didn't get anyone thinking at all. They thought, "Well, it's going to be some set of regulations, but we're not going to follow this." But then the European Commission thought, "Ha-ha. We can impose fines." They thought, "We have to make them high enough, so let's do a fine which is up to" – is it 3% of your income?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 3%.

HOLLY RAICHE: 4%.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 4%. Oh, it's going up.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: It starts with a warning. And if they don't like what you're doing, then it goes to 2%. And if it's really serious, they can hit you for 4%.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And that's 4% of the income of the company – net before tax. Yes? Right. So for some companies, that's a lot of money.

Of course, you could say, "Well, let's disregard it all together." The thing is, it is a very big market and if your company does business with Europe, wherever you're located, you effectively have a choice. You either withdraw and don't pay the fine. That's going to be quite costly and they might get after you. They might run after you.

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: What's now being said is, this is no longer about 27 countries – or 26 minus England, whatever. It's probably about 120 countries because, by the time you figure out where the citizens are, where the companies are – I reckon maybe Kazakhstan is not affected.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sure they have European citizens working in Kazakhstan.

HOLLY RAICHE: There you are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know one who works in Kazakhstan.

HOLLY RAICHE: That makes 141, so basically –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Probably more. I don't think there's any country where there's no European citizen at all, except Bouver Island, perhaps because it's full of penguins. I can't imagine European penguins going all the way there – and Tuvalu. Oh, Tuvalu might have –

HOLLY RAICHE: When you think about who's working in the Arctic and the Antarctic and the scientists from all over the place, they're probably covered, too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It depends if the pet penguin has been given citizenship. Anyway, we're laughing, but it's no laughing matter for ICANN



---

and for registries and registrars in this community. It's a real big, hot issue. And you will have noticed there are several sessions about it. I think there's a big public session. Is it today? That's really big.

The whole idea is how they're going to get around this. Now, there are two ways. The first way is to just try to find some way around the law and come up with a quick fix. ICANN is good at trying to find quick, short-term fixes. But the problem with this one is that it's such a complex one and so overarching, so big, that it's really gotten everyone thinking.

Earlier this week, I'd been speaking to several registries in cocktails and things like that. That's what you do, and that's what networking is all about. The larger ones have basically told me, "You know, we're already doing work. We're already putting together using a new protocol that was created within ICANN" – the RDAP (Registry Data Access Protocol) that is based on an IETF protocol called the LDAP, which is – I can't remember what the "L" is.

What is it?

SATISH BABU:                      Lightweight.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Lightweight. That’s right. We don’t often use that “lightweight.” Lightweight Directory Access Protocol. Anyway, they are working hard to put together a new system, and it looks like that’s the way they might move forward sooner rather than later.

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: The other thing that’s starting to happen –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Who are you?

HOLLY RAICHE: You’re right. Cheryl Langdon-Orr-For-The-Transcript-Records. The other thing that’s starting to happen is they’re beginning to think, “We’re just closing WHOIS down. We’re actually not going to put any data out publicly.” And that’s starting to scare a lot of people because it’s so hard to figure out. If you’re a registry or registrar, instead of trying to figure out, “Well, is this information caught by the GFPR or not?” European registries and registrars and starting to say, “We’ll just shut it down.”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Holly. Ali AlMeshal and then Satish Babu.

---

**ALI ALESHAL:** Thank you, Olivier. Just to have a clear understanding about the whole concept of the GDPR. Now we are speaking only about ICANN because we are in ICANN, but that one goes on everything, doesn't it? So what is basically the compliance requirement? Is it data encryption? Data security? Or, no, there is – you don't have to sort it, regardless of the data security or whatever compliance is required for that.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thanks very much, Ali. There is a set of requirements. It's quite a large document, but it includes the way that the data is stored. It includes the data itself that can be stored, the sharing of that data – so under what conditions you can share what part of the data; therefore, the consultability of the data. Private details like name, surname, address, and telephone number can only be provided to a specific class of organization that would look at it. There are also restrictions on how to transfer it between different frontiers.

Most of the European countries have had local regulations dealing with this. I know, for one, that when I started running the English chapter of the Internet Society, we had the details of all of our members. I put these on my company's computers, and because of this, I had to go and register my company as a data

---

registration provider. I had to openly register for it and say where this data was transferred to.

So explicitly it says, “I can transfer this data to the United States, and that includes the following records that I could transfer to the United States.” That has been in place.

By the way, this record is then put on a website, on the Data Protection Registrar in the UK. And anybody who’s concerned can check Internet Society UK/England and find out: “Yes, they are registered, and this is what type of data they share with other parts of the world.”

The problem, of course, is that it’s a national register. The resources of each of the national registers are too tiny to go after companies that don’t comply. They can go after companies that [don’t comply] locally. In other words, they can sue or send a fine to the company based in the UK.

But today, the Internet is borderless and you have companies that span the whole globe. So it has become very hard to go after some companies that are spread anywhere; hence the GDPR, which is the commission that will go after the deep pockets and, of course, the much more powerful.

Ali?

---

ALI ALMESHAL: Sorry. Just to follow up. That reminded me I'm coming from the banking industry. We have been through this process a long, long time back, which was specifically for the card information, which is the credit card. There was a compliance requirement called BCIDSS. It's exactly the same. It's which data you should allow the other bank or the other body to see, and which data you have to encrypt.

That took a lot of investment from all the [bodies]. That was mandated across maybe three to four years until all of the banks had done that. Without doing this, the banks cannot operate [and the] card regulations and card compliance. So this is for the safety of this sensitive data. As of today, no bank can send to other banks or to a merchant or a client a full card number, for example, of a credit card.

So I guess, if I understand you right, this is the same requirement when it comes to the data. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Yes, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: The GDPR is perhaps the most stringent privacy regulation and has got huge fines. But it's basic privacy principles that have been around since – I mean, the OECD principles started in 1980.

---

So none of this is new. The thing that's new is the 4% of your revenue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Holly. Yes, indeed, it's expensive. Responding to Ali, it is indeed a very stringent set of principles and regulation for the . That's really important in light of the recent hacking incidents that we've seen with databases being hacked and with a single employee being able to download a full database – the Equifax thing, for example.

That's absolutely incredible. One employee being able to just take a USB stick and take millions and millions of records on there and then selling it online on the Internet afterwards. Today's world is so connected that you need to have tiered access for employees themselves so no single employee can have access to a whole database; so one database is not just one. It's actually five or ten databases that are interlinked together with different levels of security with different types of security so that if you manage to hack one part, you don't hack the whole thing.

Evin, I think you were moving your card around, so I'll turn over to you. Evin Erdoğan.

---

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. Actually, it's a question from a participant who's here. So, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Who's the participant?

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: Okay. Olivier, this is Siva Muthusamy–

SATISH BABU: There's a point of order here. If you're sitting in the room, I don't think you should you use the AC to – you can straightaway ask a question. There's no problem at all.

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: No, no. I'm sorry.

SATISH BABU: So please note, if there is person sitting in the room, please do not allow that person to use the AC to come in. Thank you.

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: I'm sorry. That is wrong. Your observation is wrong. It is placed on the AC for the record, and that is a practice of people

---

attending the meetings, logging into AC. So your observation is wrong.

I'll go ahead and ask my question. I'm Siva Muthusamy –

SATISH BABU: Please go ahead.

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: I'm Siva Muthusamy from ISOC India. It's an ALS. You made some observations about the WHOIS problem. My suggestion here is to ask if there is any way by which EURALO and APRALO and ALAC would work on a system whereby registries and new gTLDs are encouraged to offer distinct tracts for registration of business domain names and individual domain names. It's a little complicated. The suggestion is distinct from the work on Thick WHOIS and Thin WHOIS.

The idea is that many businesses are legitimate businesses – a good business. Or are spurious business like the ones that extract money from users – they won't register a domain name. They'll provide elaborate, authentic data – locational data and everything – while they're registering domain names. And the rules for access of those commercial data which take money from users or who are prone to exploit users, they could be more easily accessed.



---

Individual registrants who want to register individual domain names will have a lighter track to provide less data to register domain names. It's a complicated suggestion. It requires insights from law –

SATISH BABU: Please summarize. Your question's very long. We don't have time now.

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: Don't interrupt me, please.

SATISH BABU: We have exceeded the time now.

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: No.

SATISH BABU: Please be concise.

SIVA MUTHUSAMY: Let me complete my question. You're interrupting me [for deliberateness]. It requires inputs from various groups from law and order agencies, from privacy groups. Could you explore this

---

question, answer this question, and extend it as a mailing list discussion or something? Thank you.

SATISH BABU: We suggest you go by the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much. I don't know where the queue is, though. You need to put your cards up because I don't see things, but – okay.

Let me just answer this one quickly. Thank you for this, Siva. The work of the RDS Working Group and the work of the various WHOIS groups is actually putting together the rules for this. It's actually quite close to this sort of system. It's got tiered access and it's got different tracks for –

If you're an individual, you're going to provide a certain amount of data; if you're a company, a different amount of data. But of course, you need to find ways so that it doesn't get [gamed] because, otherwise, all malware companies and all bad people are going to go through the easier track. So, it's a very complex thing.

But there's a big group that is working on this, and you're very welcome to follow it. Judging from Holly who has been on that

---

group, she's spent many, many, many hours of her life on this. So perhaps we can have it that afterwards you can register for this as well and follow the discussions there.

Let's go through the queue now. I see a lot of things. First we'll have Lianna Galstyan. Lianna?

LIANNA GALSTYAN: I'm interested to know about the date. Is there a deadline for this thing? Because, really, the implication will be very hard. I think registrants/registrar's basically both need some transition time. Is there any deadline for this? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Lianna. Is it the 18th or 19th of May?

HOLLY RAICHE: There is a deadline: May 2018. But my understanding is that, if you have started working on how to deal with the obligations and started protecting personal information and you can actually look at the steps that you've taken or are taking, you probably are not going to be fined.

But they are going to be looking at the good faith with which you are taking this. If they see that you're actually not taking it very seriously and that you haven't done anything, I expect there will

---

be penalties. May – and I’ve forgotten what date it is, but May 2018 is the date that everybody is scared about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Holly. Next across, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] from [inaudible]. Thank you, Olivier, for your presentation. There seems to be lots and lots of information and I feel swimming in information. My question – it’s more a comment – is that the EU law that addresses all its citizens globally – my question is a jurisdictional issue. How are you going to be able to enforce that? Not you, but how do you see it being enforced by the EU with all their members living everywhere?

[HOLLY RAICHE]: Do you want to join?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I need someone – ah, here we go. Thanks for this. Well, it’s a big question indeed. How are you going to enforce this? The way countries enforce things these days is to actually slam a fine in their country itself. In this case, if your company does any business in any of the EU (European Union), then you will be

---

subjected to that fine and assets might be seized and all sorts of things.

Really, nobody wants to try at the moment, I think. I suspect there is likely to be a case, I'm sure – a company that will get fined and then something will happen. It might well be that it's totally enforceable. Who knows? It might be that it might that it is enforceable through other means.

The United States generally freezes assets of a company in the place itself. What they've done with the banking industry is to actually take their banking license away for any banks who didn't comply with the know-your-client directives, which is the directive against money laundering.

And that included, by the way – because they used this – to find about details of (and I'm looking here at Switzerland, specifically) numbered bank accounts. And they basically turned around to a bank and said, "If you want to keep your banking license, you'd better give us all the details of all the U.S. citizens that hold a private bank account in your bank."

The response was basically that, within a week, the Swiss bank got rid of all their U.S. customers. They basically sent them a letter and said, "You've got one of two choices. You stay and we give your name to the IRS. You leave and we'll say we don't know you." So there is, I think, these days no U.S. citizen that

---

has a bank account in Switzerland. That’s what happened. It just went like this – really very fast.

It’s difficult for U.S. nationals that live in Switzerland because they can’t get a bank account there just for their usual things because the banks don’t want them. And that’s because of the fine that they could be imposed with in the U.S.

So I think it’d probably the same system, where they’ll same, “If you want to do any business with the European Union, you need to comply. If you don’t comply, we’ll freeze your assets. We’ll fine you, etc.” That would be done in the European geographic jurisdiction at this point.

Is this okay? Fouad and then Lianna. Fouad Bajwa?

FOUAD BAJWA:

Thank you, Olivier. The GDPR was already there for many years, since the ‘90s. But the design was different then and now, because of the changes, the design is different. But at the end of the day, all some countries need is some ideas – some interesting, funny ideas.

In the case of GDPR, this is going to give known European countries some new ideas about this data management part.

---

Now, for the Europeans, there's an advantage. But for the other part of the rest of the world, we started becoming at a disadvantage. So the GDPR effect, [inaudible] [the network] effect – will it get to us? For example, ALSes would be concerned in our part of the world? Is it going to come to us? And what would be our interplay with a post-GDPR world?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Foad. I think that, as At-Large Structures, you are going to be affected by the GDPR if you have any European Union citizens inside your database. However, I also expect – and this is pure speculation on my part – but it might well be that other countries are thinking, “Wait a minute. This is a quick way to make .money.fast for the European Union. Maybe we have the same regulation locally so we can also fine other people.” So, that effectively puts the bar for privacy much higher.

I hope we're not going to spend the whole time on GDPR. There are a couple more issues that I wanted to touch on which I think are really important as well.

---

SATISH BABU: The problem is that some of us want to attend other meetings according to the schedule, so can you then summarize in the next five minutes or so?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can summarize the other ones, yeah. Satish, did you want to speak?

SATISH BABU: I did, but I think because of the time problem, I'll withdraw that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Just closing off on the GDPR, I think that the GAC and the Intellectual Property Interests are really going to push for the GDPR to be implemented. Some other parts of ICANN are going to be trying to find a way out of it. The WHOIS issue really started with European registrars having a problem because they had to send a copy of their database of clients over to the United States. So they asked for a waiver. They said, "Please, I don't want to send you a copy, so I have to apply for a waiver."

The ALAC a few years ago said, "Look, this system is absolutely stupid. There should be a blank waiver for all European registrars once and for all and it would be done." The thing is



---

that ICANN didn't listen, and it just went on. ICANN came up with a silly – sorry, that's my personal view – response, which was, “Well, if you're breaking the local data regulation laws, then you need to show that you're breaking them. So you need to be sued or you need to be prosecuted and show us the letter of prosecution.”

Of course, that's a little hard, because in the U.S. you might be prosecuted and then you get back in line and the charges are dropped. In most European countries, they're not. So you have to break the law to show that you're breaking the law, rather than saying, “I would break the law if I do that.”

Second is the idea of having no WHOIS records at all. Basically, no WHOIS, you empty the whole database, and say, “Hey, quick fix. That's done.” That would actually break the Registry Accreditation Agreement with ICANN because ICANN Compliance requires accurate WHOIS records. For a European registrar, they have a choice to either break the registry and registrar accreditation one side and they lose their license to operate, so ICANN basically chops them off and says, “You're not a registry (or registrar) anymore,” or the alternative, which is to break the local laws and end up with fines and possibly in jail. It's not a great prospect either way, and that's why this thing needs to be totally fixed and fixed fast.

---

Two quick things on the last two topics – Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

It's really just an aside, but there was a working group saying, "The structure that you outlined is ridiculous. We should modify it." So they did and said, "Actually, the advice of data protection commissioners would do," knowing full well that they won't advise on the subject. So we now have a process [inaudible], and it also has never been used.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Holly. Let me move down to the geographical names, which are another super-hot issue. You might have heard about Amazon.com, a big company that sells all sorts of things with hundreds of millions of customers. Brazil and Peru – Latin America, effectively – cover a very vast region called the Amazon. There's a case where Amazon wants to have .amazon, and there are objections from the region. Admittedly, they do come a little late, but that's the nature of things when things happen very quickly.

So we're in this kind of scenario where some member countries of the Government Advisory Committee, the GAC, are requesting that this delegation does not proceed forward and does not get

---

given to a private interest company. So you have actually a wider debate regarding the ownership of a name.

Traditionally, the ownership of a name or of a string is based in the World Intellectual Property Organization where you basically trademark, locally, your name. You trademark it with a geographical significance. So it's like I'm going to trademark the name UAE, for example. You also decide for what services that name is trademarked for. I'm going to do it for selling water, so I could have ICANN Water – selling water here – trademarked and it works.

But then somebody else could have another business which sells apples, and they'd say ICANN Apples, and they trademark ICANN for selling apples in the UAE. Or you can have ICANN Water being sold in the United States with a trademark over there on ICANN Water and it might be different than this.

There is a cooperation treaty that lets you extend your trademark in countries worldwide, so instead of having to register separately in each country, you just go, "I want that trademark in X number of countries." Sometimes there are clashes, but this is all done in the World Intellectual Property Organization.

Then problem now, of course, is that a string at the top-level domain on the DNS is actually not valid just for one class of

---

service or for one geographical delimitation. It's actually worldwide for everything. So you're effectively giving a word to a registrant or a registry.

Then you have the problem of geographical names. There is a list of geographical names that has been put together at the United Nations, but it's not a complete list of absolutely every single place that exists in the world. But you do have another list where countries can, if they want, establish sovereignty over a specific name as such. It's a bit of a gray area because the question has never really come up so much.

I'm not going to go through all the cases of different countries not being happy about a name. I'll just give you one: Macedonia. When the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was created, Greece objected because they said that Macedonia is Greek. Indeed, Greece has the right to the name "Macedonia," as in the antique Macedonia around Thessaloniki, northern Greece.

But further north, that territory is also called Macedonia. It just happens to be now another country. So, there you go. You have more than one country that says that that's their name. So that's the one side.

The other side is the trademark system: trademarks being effectively somehow extended to then be for all classes and for all regions around the world. We have, then, a fundamental

---

question at that point: who has the right to the word? Do you follow U.N. sovereignty law on one side – and its various different extensions at the different United Nation agencies?

If you've navigated the United Nations, you'll find out that sometimes one agency says yes. The other one says no. They're supposed to all come from the same umbrella, but there's no coordination whatsoever.

Or do you follow the trademark commercial law, which is actually national in scope and which varies from country to country, except in the World Intellectual Property Organization where things are evened out?

The debate was attempted at WIPO, the World Intellectual Property Organization, and it went around in circles. The debate is going on here, and there's a big question mark. The Board is being asked to decide on whether they want to give Amazon to Amazon, or Amazon to the respective governments that wish to have it. So it's one example. There are likely to be many other examples.

An extension to this is the country codes. The ISO31662, which denotes two-character country codes, makes a domain name a country-code top-level domain. We have .uk. We have .ae for the UAE. The codes themselves are defined by the International

---

Organization for Standardization (ISO). That's a U.N. process, etc.

There are now calls from some governments to also include the three-letter names at the top level. Of course, one would say, "Yeah, but at that point, .com is already taken." It's for Comoros, the Comoros Islands. That's one specific one that is already taken, but the other ones are not. So, [.ado] doesn't relate to any country code, etc. So there's a question as to whether these should be given country code status.

There's a third question, which is whether, at the second level, there should also be restrictions on country codes; for example, uk.com. Should that be allowed? That exists, actually, because there has not been a regulation on it.

So those are the extensions about all of these rights and the geographical names and geographical codes. It's a lot of work, and it's not likely to have a quick fix. So I'd suggest you follow this and have a look at this because it's quite fascinating, and it's history coming before us.

I think I've spoken enough now. Satish Babu, thank you very much.

---

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Olivier. It's been a very informative session. Unfortunately, we don't have time to continue discussions. I'm sure there will be more questions, so we can perhaps pick up these questions on e-mail or on a webinar if required.

The hot topics that we have collected so far have been compiled, and Holly will make a brief presentation during the second debrief session – together with Maureen's presentation on the group process that we did. So that'll be in the second half of the debrief session.

We are running late, but fortunately we anticipated this and we had a buffer of –

Yes, please, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Satish. Just one last thing. Looking further down the list, I do note some topics that are not purely in ICANN's remit, and I thought I would just mention it. ICANN's remit is the Internet's identifier system for IP addresses and domain names. I know Internet governance is fantastic, super-exciting, and so on. Yes, it is interesting as a peripheral topic. But as a core topic, it is not something to focus on. There are working groups to look at the outside environment of ICANN, but the names and numbers are really important.

---

That's all. Thanks.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Olivier. Yes, we note that. Those have come from the open-ended part of the survey where people have put in themselves without prompting. We have just recorded that.

Now we move on to the next part of the agenda, which is a presentation by my colleagues, Ali and Lianna, on leadership development, capacity building, and mentoring in APRALO. Over to Ali and Lianna.

ALI ALMESHAL:

Thank you, Satish. We said we'll give you an overall view about last year's program that we have started, which is the mentorship program. Most of you have participated in that, and a good number have joined us into this program. We started this in, I think, July 2016. We called for volunteers who would like to join this mentorship program, and we got a good number until we filtered that number and people replied to the survey and other points that we had asked for.

We ended up having 11 people – 11 mentees that we have assigned a number of mentors from the leadership teams. The objectives of that were to look into the potential leadership, potential active members within our ALSs, and see where are the



---

gaps that we can help and develop their skills in certain areas that we are looking for within ICANN.

That had continued for around nine-plus months, with follow-up calls almost every month. This is an official call that we were doing. We were getting feedback sessions from the mentee in each call. Also, there was a follow-up from the mentors with their mentees either on Skype, e-mails, or through a conference call or different channels of communication. That would have taken, as I said, around nine or ten months until we ended up with the first pilot mentorship program.

Out of that, we are very much happy. The development and the progress of the mentees who participated in that was excellent. You have seen great results now. We had two of these mentees join our leadership teams. We have Lianna and we have Nadira who have joined the leadership team, and that was a good outcome from the mentorship program.

This is not the only requirement that we are looking for as a mentorship program. We need more active participation, and we are seeing good participation from the team as well.

We said, as a leadership team, we'll be reviewing and assessing the result of that and whether we will go for a second round of that. But unfortunately, due to the General Assembly, we were totally overloaded with looking into the General Assembly

---

preparation. But this is still on our agenda “to do” list and, as the leadership team, we’re looking at if we will start the next mentorship program because we have seen it as very much successful.

I don’t want to take that much time. I’ll give the floor to Lianna because we are running of time. Lianna, please.

LIANNA GALSTYAN:

Thank you, Ali. I’d like to say about this mentorship program that it was an interesting journey to start. The first thing that is most important is to identify, yourself, that you want to go to this capacity building thing, to this mentorship thing.

When it was launched, as Ali mentioned, there were many people who applied for it. Those mentees who were identified were 11. The output was not only that we came to the leadership actually, but also the relationship that we have with our mentors. I see that it is a continuous process. Though the program is already finished, we do continue to interact with the mentors, people in the leadership. We have questions because the ICANN has an amount of questions which do not have real answers and that they are in discussions. So this is a continuous process.

---

We would like to maybe continue this program because it has a real outcome. It was very interesting in building and developing leadership skills. Probably when we have interests from all of you we will gather and prepare for the next step of this program.

About capacity building things and programs, we have now identified the hot topics. We run regular webinars together with the Outreach Committee. I encourage all of you to attend all these webinars for the questions which are of interest to everyone on all ALSes across the region.

Also, we have the APAC Hub webinars, which are also very interesting and very giving of much information, covering all the topics we are discussing here. So, really, I encourage you to participate from the regions.

I know the difficult thing of APRLO is the time zone, which is a serious thing. We can see if it is possible to have, in two parts, the same webinar to run for the different regions of APRALO countries and accordingly go in this way. So for the same webinar, we can have it in different time zones to give the opportunity for all of you to be a participant of those webinars.

Do you have anything more? Okay. Satish?

---

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Alia and Lianna. We had taken up the mentorship program with the very clear objective of grooming people to be in the leadership positions. Now, obviously, the leadership positions are limited. We have a large number of ALSs, and as we saw, this number is going to touch about 70 in the next three months. Out of the suggestions that have come up now – for example, Fouad suggested that we have some focus groups, which will involve people.

Now, the major issue here is not perhaps the leadership positions themselves but the contributions to the policy processes. For them, you don't have to be in a leadership position to make policy contributions.

We will now have to look at two things. One is the resumption of this mentoring program because last time what happened was that several people came to us after the program was launched and they said they would like to join, which was not possible at that time. We said we would consider them in the second round. So we will now discuss and see when we can launch the second round.

At the same time, we have to look at other processes as far as the policy contributions are concerned. Right now we have a lot of energy in the room with all the ALSs here. The challenge is in maintaining that energy and momentum and creating structures

---

or mechanisms that will allow people to participate, even when you do not know much about a particular policy topic. We can always get our experts to talk to us about whatever doubts or questions we might have.

So at this point in time, the leadership team is looking at multiple options that will enhance the engagement of ALSs and individual members, of which the mentoring program is indeed a very important part, but not the only part.

We have a few minutes for questions on this topic: leadership development, member engagement, and mentoring. If there any questions or clarifications, we would be happy to – Fouad? Anybody else?

Yes, please go ahead, Fouad.

FOUAD BAJWA:

Thank you, Satish Babu. To start with, the word is that we're interesting times. So many changes are happening for us. As for APRALO, what I've seen over the past two or three years is that the leadership has significantly improved its system and processes.

Now when an organization has a strong leadership system going, the membership should start looking at things or issues

---

which affect the long term instead of the short term because the leadership is not sustainable.

In that regard, if the mentoring program is polished words involving everyone through the online learning system and the webinar system, that helps everyone taking one case of learning. And then trying to maintain that over a year would be a very big challenge.

So having access to the repository on a regular basis, with all its analytics happening in the back, and leadership learning who's watching and not watching– and not being mandatory but very useful – I think this leadership program would actually build out to be exemplary. That's the number one thing.

The number two thing is, yes, the focus group idea. Last night I was thinking about it. It really compels me to say, “You know, there's a lot of skill around this table – some really wonderful skills – in subjects and topics which not even all of us would be aware about.” So I think it's going to be a lot of self-initiative. I want to take self-initiative in public policy.

During the day, I heard from another colleague from an ALS. She had expertise in public policy. So it could really turn out to be a very productive group.

---

Similarly, there's the technical side of issues. I mentioned Dr. [inaudible]. I mentioned Dr. [inaudible] – people who have in-depth knowledge of the network operations level.

So, yes, our leadership program is going to evolve, I guess. Lianna and Ali will have a lot of work to do. But then again, we have to help them do this work in order to evolve because how much are we going to put on your plate? So it's a lot of work that we should contribute as well. So, yes, this leadership program should be evolved.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Fouad, for those comments. Two people in the queue now: Amir and Glenn. I'd also like to point out here that there has been an interesting development from the staff side, which is that we have Mario now on something called ALS Relations, which is a kind of new portfolio.

Yesterday, Pablo mentioned some 24 events happening in 2018 in the Asia-Pacific. We do not know at this point what these events are, but staff is going to help us maintain a calendar. We hope to be able to engage with our ALSes much better through this mechanism also.

---

Taking both these points into consideration, I think we can gear up towards a better engagement, both through the mentorship program, as well as direct contacts with the ALSes.

FOUAD BAJWA: My assistance and support is available when you need me. I think I'll step up a bit as well. Thanks.

SATISH BABU: Thanks for that offer. Thanks. Amir?

AMIR QUAYYUM: Too small questions or comments. First is that we have successfully done this mentorship program. While reinitiating, we should gather the data of which things worked well and which we were some confusion and problems with. Then we can embark on this [rejourney] of this mentorship program with full trust and even better output.

The second thing is that I was thinking whether we can have, in APRALO, a mentorship program for our leadership team to go even further in ICANN and contribute more. Why stop here? Thank you.



---

SATISH BABU: That's very interesting – further inputs for the leadership team. There are actually a few things that the relationship team is eligible for. There is a centralized training program for leaders within ICANN which only the leadership team is eligible for. So those kinds of things are there. But I take your point. It's good advice for us. Thank you.

Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I think oftentimes people think of mentorships as a gateway or a pathway to leadership. In many ways, our organizations are very much like a pyramid. There are very, very, very few spots at the top to lead – whether Chair, Vice-Chair, or Secretariat. But there's many opportunities beyond that in terms of engagement.

What I would suggest for the mentorship program is that people realize that there's ad hoc committees, there's working groups, there's volunteering to be curators, volunteers to do policy comments, and volunteers to help with the showcase. My associate behind me, Aris, who has been a great volunteer with me – you probably wonder why I do so many pictures. It's because people like Aris have helped me doing photos. So, that's a volunteer and there's a mentoring that I've done with him.

---

So I would just say that when you make as association mentorship leadership – and that’s a natural pathway – it can happen. I’m not saying it can’t, but there’s limitations in terms of the spots. I would encourage everyone here to get involved with the policy comments and find out what topics you really are hot about and take a leadership role in doing a webinar, doing engagement, doing a paper – doing something. Going back home and doing nothing is not the right option. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Glenn. I completely agree. One of the issues that we are facing is that, while GAs are fine, they’re very infrequent. They happen once every three or four years. So people switch off if it’s only listening and joining calls and so on. A better model to engage the mentorship, as you say, is limited in terms of the actual slots in the leadership positions. But together with that, something like these focus groups, etc., we might want to look at.

The queue at this point is Ali, Maureen, and Amrita. Ali?

ALI ALMESHAL:

Thanks, Satish. I totally agree with Glenn. I will just start from Glenn going back as I compliment [his end]. We said that it’s not only for our leadership. The challenge that we are having is

---

people who are experts in certain policy development, or we need people to even volunteer for working groups and lead these working groups as well because being a chair for a working group or a committee is, again, a [inaudible] development or [inaudible] development for yourself.

Just to respond to Amir as well, we have done the [fair spot], as you mentioned. We have done an evaluation for the whole program, and we have received significant feedback from all the mentees, which we totally agree on on most of the points of how we can develop this program and how we can change some of these processes within that program.

My last point is about the development within ICANN itself having been changed from last year to this year. Yesterday, we had seen the webinar and ICANN Learn. The new website for that has significantly changed, and it's very much helpful where we can use it this time as well. You can customize a course. You customize a specific material or topic that you want to learn about. So these types of tools we'll be using at this time whenever we start the mentorship program. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Ali. Maureen, please.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: I have to agree with what has been said by others. The program actually reconfirmed for us exactly what it is that we feel is the potential that's within our RALO.

But one of the things, too, is that the mentorship program wasn't meant to be, as Glenn pointed out, a pathway for leadership. It was meant to actually help you identify where those opportunities were that Glenn mentioned because there are lots of things happening within ICANN, and we wanted to make sure that people took advantage of what was available out there and became involved. I felt that, for some people, they didn't take advantage of it because I think they wanted a bit of hand-holding.

So, really, if you want to be a leader within the ICANN ecosystem here, you've got to take it upon yourself. We can't lead you anywhere. You actually have to do it for yourself. The mentorship program was to have a team – we're all available – to just be there for you and to sort of say, "Come and have a little chat with us," and we could set you up with some sort of pathway, but not necessarily onto the Board straightaway.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Maureen, for those very important points. We will close the queue at this point. Amrita is the last with a question.

---

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you. I completely agree that a mentorship program is a wonderful thing, not only for the leadership but also to show the path because that's very important.

However, I feel mentorships should not be limited just for leadership. It should also be for retaining and engaging the ALSes, which seems to be a challenge in terms of keeping them onboard all the time. Since, Satish, you mentioned that the meetings of all ALSes are quite infrequent or once in two years, perhaps the 24 or 26 meetings which are going to happen in the APAC region over the year – not everyone, but many of them would be there. So in the sidelines there could be an informal chat to keep the groups going and connected. Thanks.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Amrita. I think that's a great idea, which is why we are now pushing for this calendar to be managed, so that we inform the entire community when the next meeting is taking place and we can find out who is going to be physically present. Whether it's formal or informal, we will try to organize gatherings of APRALO in all these places.

So thanks for all those comments on this organizational matter of mentorship and leadership development. Over the next ten

---

minutes, I have another item to be discussed. Now, we're not going to be closing this item. We're only going to start the discussions on this item. It has to do with individual members.

We have here with us Justine, who has been identified as a representative of the individual membership, of which we have nine people today in APRALO. The RoP, which was created about 2014 or so, did mention unaffiliated individual members.

Please go to 27.5.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

SATISH BABU: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 25?

SATISH BABU: No, no, no. Go up, go up, go up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. [inaudible]

---

SATISH BABU: Further, further. No, 27.5. The other way.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

SATISH BABU: 5. So we'll just – ah, here it is.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

SATISH BABU: We have 27.5. It says, “Unaffiliated Individual Members.” This section outlines what we mean by individual members. You can quickly run through this. It defines what an individual member is and that they should be a part of the Asia-Pacific discuss list. They should be a permanent resident of Asia-Pacific, and should not be a member of any certified ALS.

This is an issue because people sitting here – some of them – have a very large number of members in their ALS and none of them can be individual members here as of now.

Then there is an affidavit that they have to submit saying all these conditions are fulfilled. With that lightweight process, we can admit them as individual members. It also says that if any of

---

those conditions cease to exist, then they will automatically be decertified.

Now, 27.5.2.6 says that all unaffiliated individuals treated as a group will be responsible for selecting their representative when required from time to time and to contribute to the regional General Assembly.

Now, there is nothing mentioned about how the selection is going to happen. Who's going to do the selection? Is it the ALSes sitting here? Is it the individual members themselves? That's an open question because the RoP is silent on this matter.

Then there's another condition that says the representative must not be employed or contracted by a registry or registrar.

Next. Let's quickly run through them and then I'll highlight the issues. Let's go down. Yeah.

Selection or ratification of the representative of the unaffiliated individuals will occur whenever a new AP [inaudible] is called, like this one – an ALAC member is selected by membership or leadership selections are held. Basically, there is a little bit of a lack of clarity here, but what it means is that periodically there should be a renewal of this member. You're trying to [find a new member].



---

The last one says that the group of individual members will adopt a verifiable process to ensure that consensus is achieved if required. Okay. This is just a detail.

So the three issues that we have to open up for discussions and which will be endorsed later through our monthly calls are the following.

One is: what is the voting rights of this individual member representative, like Justine here today? In the General Assembly here, every ALS has a vote. Now, the general consensus is that the individual member representative also will have one vote representing all the individual members in this assembly. This is not there in the RoP. This is not something we will decide today, but we will open up this topic for discussion.

The second point is: how is the individual member representative? What is the process of identification for this representative? Again, the general consensus is that the individual members themselves should identify a representative, possibly based on his or her level of activity, especially policy contributions, within ICANN.

The third point is: what is the term of this individual member representative? Again, the consensus here is one year.

---

So these three points will need to be endorsed and incorporated into our Rules of Procedure sometimes down the line. This is the first time we are confronting this situation, which has been precipitated by the At-Large review. There is a new trust on individual members. It is likely that the numbers will go up from the current nine. It may go up significantly also, so we might end up with a situation where there are more individual members than ALSes. That's possible.

So whatever we think today or decide to put should be for a little longer-term. I will request Justin to tell us what you think in general about these points.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I'll address your points one by one if I may. First one is voting rights. You mentioned voting rights. I think it's fair to say that the group, whoever attends as representing the group, should have an equal position at the table – so therefore one voting right.

I also noticed that, in my past experience in ICANN, we don't actually vote that much anyway. So, I don't necessarily think it's a point of contention. But, of course, we have to have something in the Rules of Procedure to allow for it.

Just extrapolating forward – and this is not something I'm advocating per se, but it's just a thought. Satish, you said that

---

there is a possibility that the grouping of individual members could become larger than it is now. We're just 90 people at the moment. Therefore, the questions becomes: should the group have more than one representative when you come for a general assembly?

One possibility is to look at a tiered membership system. For example, say you had 100 members get one rep. If you had 300 members, you get three reps. Now, of course this is conceptual. It's obviously based on mechanics, logistics, and obviously finance/ budget. I'm just throwing it out for thought.

The second point is identifying the rep. I think it's fair to say that these procedures should be left to the group, so long as there's some mechanism by which the group can organize themselves.

As I mentioned to you privately, Satish and Leon, I was actually quite happy to converse with the group, except that I didn't know how to reach them. I appreciate that because this is the first time you have individual representative in the structure, per se. I can totally understand no provision for it being done earlier.

Looking forward, even something simple like having an e-mail list for the individual members so that they know how to identify themselves and converse among themselves would suffice. I think that's an easy enough step to take.

---

Again, it's also going to be a question of how you engage the people in the group. I'm pretty sure you're going to find different levels of participation in the group. It's something we just have to live with, unless we choose to focus on giving more attention to engagement of individuals.

At this point, I think, in terms of where the leadership is going, I believe strongly that you should focus on ALSes and let the individual members grow organically.

The third one is the term of office, was it? Yeah. Okay. I'm going to use the term "term of office." I'm not quite sure why it needs to be one year, unless for voting purposes it's mandated. But it should be in conjunction with the cycle of GAs.

SATISH BABU:

I'll respond to the last point before I take the other questions. The cycle of GAs is not very consistent. The GAs can happen arbitrarily, depending on ICANN budget constraints.

We also have an annual cycle for the leadership people coming in. This is the actual AGM. We will discuss this over the e-mails next.

We have now – the queue is Amir, Fouad, and Maureen. And I'd like a 30-second response from Yannis also and from the two other RALO Chairs that we have here, which are Olivier and

---

Glenn, on their model of individual membership very quickly.  
Please be concise in your questions. Amir?

AMIR QUAYYUM: Can I have my question after the response by the –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

AMIR QUAYYUM: Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just commenting on something that Justine said about having graded membership representation. We have ISOC chapters of over nearly 1,000 already. They only have one representative.

FOUAD BAJWA: I've been through those few years when this whole idea came up. I can tell you one thing: that's been a very long process getting here. In light of that, my own perception when I was Co-Chair of APRALO was that the individual membership should not overstep the ALS membership system. There's a reason behind it: the ALS system was evolved over years of deliberation and hard work.

---

The individual system itself, the individual membership, we can consider as one ALS. But nothing beyond that, and there's a reason for it. There's the membership process across the global RALO system within ALAC. That is why think this one ALS has to figure out for itself that we've given a good amount of thinking on this and, yes, they can evolve. But you know, we go to the ROP at a very crucial point. Otherwise, we don't make changes to it because there's a lot of things already done behind it. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much. Olivier, 30 seconds please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. I've lost 20 seconds already. Three things. First, the problem of representation and what's the weight of end users on this. In EURALO, we considered both options. We considered the option of the UN system, which is one vote per country no matter how big your country is or how small your country is.

We considered the other system, which is actually used by some organizations where you have a proportion of votes depending on the size of your community. That is actually used by some organizations in Europe. Unfortunately, what we've seen is that you end up with 200 members but five members – the five

---

members with the largest membership – controlling absolutely everything. So then it becomes undemocratic.

For this reason, we decided to put together the EURALO Individuals Association, which is a purpose-built At-Large Structure that is independently by some people that – well, basically semi-independently run. They have staff support. They can use facilities at ICANN meetings, etc. At least we’ve got another leadership that is able to manage themselves as if they were an At-Large Structure, being able to collect the votes of all of their members. They now have 36 members within a year. They grew very quickly.

I know the other regions have also self-organized, but for us, we thought maybe we could self-organize them and give them a bit of responsibility. So they choose who their voting representative is, etc.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you. So that’s the virtual ALS model. Glenn, please.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Since Olivier has taken 20 of my seconds – I have 10 seconds – if you look at our rules of procedures, we’ve updated them. We’ve probably had the longest history of having unaffiliated members. We have 15 members currently. It’s a simple process.

---

They select their representative, and their representative right now is – we all know him – Alan Greenberg. So they have a separate vote apart from the ALS. You cannot be a member of an ALS and a member unaffiliated.

SATIS BABU: Thank you, Glenn. The queue is closed now. Amir, Yannis, and Evan. Amir?

AMIR QUAYYUM: Thank you for the two [relaters] who gave good comments because I need reform my thoughts based on their comments and how they are working.

For the third point first, which is the term of the office for the representative, I can see in the procedures that is only for the AGM and for when there is a vote. So why do we need to fix a term? It can be on an event-to-event basis because the individual members can think about which one is best for which activity – for voting, for participation in the General Assembly, and based on their level of engagement with ICANN in different perspectives.

I still feel that the main aim of the APRALO is to engage different pockets of the community, so individual members, in my opinion, should not be the priority. There are any ALSes that are



---

really engaging a good number of members; for example 300-400 members in certain ISOC chapters. So having 10, 20, 50, even 100 individual members and then coming up with the representatives may not be a very good idea.

About the –

SATISH BABU: Please be concise. We are running out of time.

AMIR QUAYYUM: Okay. The last point is how to select the representative. I believe that individual members should be based on some wording or consensus.

SATISH BABU: Right. Thanks. I'll just respond to the first point raised. In 8.2, the individual member representative has been selected each time an ALAC member is selected or there are leadership elections held. That happens every year. That's why this one [inaudible]

YANNIS LI: Actually, I also have a question before my comment. I also wonder why there is a one-year term of office for the individual members because I don't recall that we have any restriction on the time for ALSes. I guess, if it is related to voting purposes,

---

then I don't think we already have any matrix for only active members being able to vote right now. Right? I'm not sure if that might be something that we want to consider as well if that's the case.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Yannis. We'll note that while we have the discussion as we go forward.

Evan, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Just to echo what Glenn was saying, NARALO, from the moment it was conceived, had the concept of individual members. In the time since then, ICANN staff has gotten very, very good at being able to oblige with us doing this. So what's happened with us is that once a year at the time when elections for an ALAC member from the region are done, we hold another election for the representative of the unaffiliated members. That person has the voting rights of a single ALS.

The process has worked very well for us. In fact, it is the source of the Chair of ALAC. Alan is an unaffiliated member, and that's how he comes into here. So the process works. Staff knows how to do it.

---

The idea within Big Pulse is that the day before you have a vote for ALAC rep, the unaffiliated people vote for their representative and that person has the status of an ALs for the purpose of a vote. It actually now runs pretty smooth. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Evan, for that input. I think it has been very useful to have the other RALO inputs also. The queue is closed. Can you make it 20 seconds?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

It's also good to have the individual members can have an annual check-in process just like NCUC and others bodies are already doing.

SATISH BABU:

The check-in process is when NCUC sends out an e-mail to all the individual members, saying, "Please confirm if you're still alive and interested." It's a [heartbeat-confirmed] thing, so they have to respond. Then you're put into the voters' list.

Okay. Thank you very much for all the comments. We will keep this discussion live for the next few months until we are ready for an endorsement. Thanks, again, for the comments. We close this

---

session here. We meet again at quarter past twelve in this room.

Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**