

LOS ANGELES – ALAC Leadership Team (ALT) Meeting
Friday, October 17, 2014 – 08:00 to 11:00
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

ALAN GREENBERG: As Chair I demand that the elevators come quickly. Would staff please arrange that? We have Steve here. I will let him speak.

STEVE CROCKER: This is familiar and quite enjoyable actually, despite the form of this of being skillet session. I share with Rinalia some prep pages that I was handed as I was coming in. I looked quickly at them and now I'm going to thank you all for this and congratulate Alan. I handed it to Rinalia for amusement of the kind of support stuff we have. We're on too familiar a basis to waste time on the formalities. It's genuinely a pleasure to be here, a pleasure to be working with Alan. You guys are well organized and I'm happy to just get right into it.

I do want to say that I appreciate very much, I had to reschedule things and more stuff was piling up for this morning than usual, so I think we shifted the time on this and I thank you all for that. This is my second appointment of the morning. It's not the first. My day almost uniformly has been starting with 7:00 am appointments. I used to have appointments that go well into the night – appointments scheduled for 10:00 pm, and I've pushed them back. I'm getting old. I put a dampener on that stuff. It's made it harder because now I have to squeeze everything in.

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.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I was getting to a larger question. Do you miss having a full Friday?

STEVE CROCKER: Absolutely not. When I list my accomplishments over my several year term, it's going to be right at the top that killing off Friday was a good thing. You may have differing opinions but I don't have any hesitations saying that. If it's necessary to restore it, we will, but it truly was a waste, when you look at the whole picture and how we actually used that time and so forth. Feel free to push back and re-use the time and if we do add the day back in, I definitely don't want to use it the way we were using it. There I think we have common ground.

The whole business of how you use the time and how the days are scheduled, we're still fiddling with it. We have a Constituency Day on Tuesday that repeatedly feels awkward, the wrong thing, and I don't know exactly how that's going to play out. It remains a live subject and logistically complicated. Definitely having an early morning Board Meeting and reports from the SOs and ACs, and having the Committee Reports and so forth with six people, all of whom we know by name sitting there, wasn't meaningful, wasn't useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I'll do the official pushback. You have 100 per cent agreement that we were not using that Friday particularly effectively. From the point of view of ICANN's support of a small number of travelers and the individuals who had to pay for themselves, clearly that was a huge cost with very little benefit. I can't speak to how the Board's workload has changed in the last number of years. Ours has increased very

significantly. If those Fridays were still there, we probably would have expanded into the full Friday.

Even if you had taken the Board Meeting away and the Public Forum associated with it, that option is not really there. It's there for the other groups who for a large extent have control over their own travel, but for us it's not. Accordingly, we're really pushed. We do meet as a group, not individuals with one-on-one meetings. We tend to meet every day at 7:00 am, or most days. The only exception is the day the Chair has a commitment somewhere else, and therefore we can't re-use that time as a group meeting.

I think in the future, I think my inclination is that if the Chair has to be away, a Vice Chair runs the meeting and we keep going anyway. That's heavy, and we're not accomplishing our work. I understand we may be going to a new meeting schedule, and the whole issue will change somewhat, but it really has hurt us significantly. Note it anyway. Any other comments? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Good morning. All this is behind us because we proposed to you a new strategy for the meetings and we'll see all those problems will be solved. Believe me. Everything was done to avoid those problems.

ALAN GREENBERG:

By the way, regarding Constituency Day, in terms of how we use the day, other than the Board Meeting, that day is packed, and I suspect that's the case for many of the other groups. Whether the Board Meetings that we hold, and therefore basically your whole day, is an effective way

of using that part of the time, that's a different question all together. I think you'd get a fair number of people here who feel that we're not doing that as well as we could. That's not the kind of interaction we generally want.

STEVE CROCKER:

The thought that's floating around about the alternative Constituency Day is to organize it by a topic rather than a group, and just processing what you were saying about how you're using your time during that day, I can imagine that if we did that it might be more efficient for the discussion of the topics and bringing in people, but it might have really bad repercussions for the way each group, including ALAC, organizes its own time. I don't see a quick way through that thicket, but it would be interesting to talk about.

ALAN GREENBERG:

In that particular case I can see the advantages for some, and for the Board. ALAC has a wide range of interests across this organization and we may be staring at you all day, which effectively would take a day away from us. Some win, some lose.

STEVE CROCKER:

Also, the impolitic thing that if I were going to think about who I do and don't want to see during the day you would not be at the bottom of the list.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question. I think we all agree that the Meeting with the Board Constituency Day is not terribly productive. This is a much more productive session I think, because it's much more informal and we can actually raise issues. Part of me would like to say, "Can we do away with that, can we do more of this?" which is a much more genuine contact, a much more thoughtful contact. We actually have the possibility of raising issues. Is that a more efficient and perhaps a more effective way of us liaising with the Board?

STEVE CROCKER: I wouldn't have any problem with it. My picture is that you've invited me here as an individual but not as the full Board. I never thought about it. I'd be happy to spend more time, if you want. It's just a question of the scheduling of that. If we wanted to open it up and have the whole Board, or a sub-set of the Board that was organized for the purpose of doing this, all of that would be perfectly fine just to think about and do. When we do meet with you during this Constituency Day, it's more than just you. The issues I think are more on your side than ours frankly. So however you want to organize it and however you want to do it, we'd be happy to engage.

HOLLY RAICHE: I was just thinking of how do we make our communication with the Board effective? I think everybody in the room has a kind of, "Is Constituency Day as effective as it might be?"

STEVE CROCKER: We've been trying to be crisper about our organization of those sessions – take notes, respond, and so forth – so we try to make it as effective as we can. There's room for different perceptions here, but my take on it is that the mere fact that there's a very large number of people has a watering-down effect of just how time gets used and so forth. Yet I wouldn't want to say, "We only want to talk to the representatives," so you sort of have to figure out where in that balance you want to be.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. What we're talking about here is also going back to the previous version, where a sub-set of Board Members would come to see us and there were some merits in that, if the right Board Members happen to show up. If the wrong ones happened to show up it was close to a total loss. Cheryl and then Evan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I actually wanted to make two points. One is with the inevitable pushback that will happen from the traditionalists. Not everyone likes change, Constituency Day is of course something that a lot of the groups have as their day, and I guess we'll see how the new system works and we'll have to review there. Why I put my card up was actually to note with the effectiveness – and there is great effectiveness of bringing people around a table – some of the Working Groups, particularly out of the gNSO, so I'm wearing my gNSO Liaison hat right now – they've piloted now about twice to bring a Working Group together at an appropriate time.

This is [unclear 00:15:59] day. We're now at a day minus whatever, so there's day zero and now we're like minus three. There might be some benefit to look at bringing or allowing a space and a plan so that people can be brought together for meaningful policy development discussion, particularly with more and more of our CCWGs coming on. I think from a future planning point of view, because I'm seeing stuff ending up in the week before the ICANN Meeting. The week before the ICANN Meeting is practically a training week. It's about to become an APRICOT Meeting where you've got a week of tech "insert work group" activities and in-service training, and then the other meeting.

I just want to be sure that what goes on in the Working Groups, particularly the CCWGs, if we've been brought together, that that should still be in the public view. I think it would be wise to have those as public meetings where everyone else can see how successful or otherwise that aspect of our policy development is.

STEVE CROCKER: What would it take to make those more visible publicly?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not happen pre-ICANN Meeting, because people who come to an ICANN Meeting find out there was these Working Group meetings planned the week before. It has to be the right meeting at the right time, and particularly with CCWGs I think there's opportunity. It's good PR. It says grass roots.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. It dawned to me when you were talking, you weren't talking about it but it twigged something. If you are going to change Constituency Day in the way you're discussing, to topic-based or something like that, you really need to lock that in before we're supposed to be setting our schedules. This Meeting has been horrible in terms of decisions made. Not all of them are under our control, I understand, but we're told we absolutely cannot change meetings, and then the things are changed around us. If perhaps we may want more than a 1.5-hour session with the Board, because it's topic-based, we really want to have those topics locked in so we know which times are really available for us. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Steve, I wanted to ask about the nature of the Board ALAC Meeting itself. Were you happy with it? We spent an awful lot of time talking about the difference between a capital A and a small letter a on the word "advice". Number one, is that really a problem? Number two, can we put that back into a constructive way so that we're not spending our really valuable time during the Board talking about that kind of minutiae?

STEVE CROCKER:

We have some people on the Board who take the distinctions like that more seriously than I do, frankly. The Board is composed of a range of people who are tuned in various ways, all well-intentioned, all well-meaning. That aspect didn't give me a bit thrill. I'd prefer to err on the side of taking virtually everything that you say in the same speech to anybody else, any other group, and treating it as something to be taken

seriously and then to work through. If it fails one of the obvious tests, like can't understand it or can't be implemented, we'd say so, then send it back, and then it stops being an issue.

I guess I wasn't super happy but I didn't come away thinking, "That was terrible, I don't want to do that." Frankly one of the problems for Constituency Day for me is that it all goes by in a blur, so there's a bit of burn-out. One of the issues I recall though, now that you mention it, is the positioning of ALAC in the rotation. What did we do this time? Were we first? I'm trying to remember whether you said you didn't like that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

In at least one past meeting, some substantive issue of relevance to all of ICANN arose at the second or third meeting, and therefore was a subject of discuss in all of the rest of them. We were omitted from that path. I don't think that happens often enough that we really need to worry about it.

STEVE CROCKER:

It's interesting, the various defects in terms of positioning. It's like do you want to be first or last child in a family or something like that. If you think it's a problem going first, you ought to see what happens when it's after lunch.

ALAN GREENBERG:

As I said, it was an issue once. I don't think it's a major issue. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just I agree with you Alan. It was a onesie. The idea of being first... I think you've traditionally had the GAC last, which has got to be the great ending of your day. Having us first I don't think is a problem, except for the one or two Board Members that may walk in a little [unclear 00:21:39] from bad sleep, I think it's worked pretty well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have Olivier and then I put myself in the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I'd like to come back to this capital A versus small a thing. Is this interference or is this a genuine concern on the Board? How would you treat capital A "Advice" differently to small a "advice"?

STEVE CROCKER: I don't know how to answer the first part about interference. I don't view any of it as interference. We had the discussions some time ago about what happens when you suggest something and it was getting lost. It was just, "Send it over with a number and we'll track it and so forth." We're still some distance away from where we want to be with that process, but we're getting there. If you send us something that's couched as, "This is formal advice from the At-Large Advisory Committee," it will get unquestionable treatment as formal advice.

Without splitting a bunch of hairs that I don't really want to go back and revisit this week, we'll treat it on a par with stuff coming from the GAC, from the gNSO, from the ccNSO and so forth. Then other stuff that isn't

labeled so formally we'll still treat with respect, and try not to lose it and try to respond to it and so forth. We may not have to be quite as careful about worrying about whether we're in complete consensus or whatever, but it should be a sensible conversation. If we're spending too much time trying to decide which side of the line it is – whether it's big A or small a, we're wasting time that could be better spent on substantive matters.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I have two thoughts on the issue of big A, small a. First of all, it was an issue that may or may not be of substance, but it was brought up along the way in the conversation, and it diverted the whole discussion from where we were going. Therefore, regardless of whether it was relevant, it shouldn't have been allowed to take on a life of its own. My personal opinion on the capital A, small a, is I think there are two classes of advice, and I suspect we should not use a capital letter as the flag to say which it is, but come up with a new word.

I would view the capital A "Advice" to be treated roughly equivalent to how you treat the GAC advice. That is it's something we're telling you that, "This is really important." The lower case "advice" – and we have sent a number of things to the Board like that – is really, "This is what we believe, this is important from a perspective of users, but we have not tried to wave across with all the other competing issues on the subject, and when you deliberate on this we'd like you to simply take it into account seriously." I think we need a name for that because I don't like the lowercase issue.

STEVE CROCKER: Surprisingly, having another name would be very helpful. My mind was going the same place. We've had a comparable discussion in other settings. I use a collection of terms: "comment", "suggestion" and "enquiry" or "question" as a basket for all of those. Some of the things are, "Why is this the case?" or, "What's the status of something?" and that deserves an answer every bit as much as, "We think you ought to do the following." I don't have a single term to cover all of those, and if you come up you'll have made a contribution to us all.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we're talking about something stronger than a suggestion, but it's equivalent. Now we've determined that what the GAC says in its communication is only advice when it says "Advice" they say other things to you also, which presumably you consider seriously, but it's not one of the "go to the wall and you have to follow the bylaw procedure" if you choose not to follow it.

STEVE CROCKER: The GAC is a bit of a special case. I got a note from Bertrand complementing me on the particular way I phrased the GAC. He said instead of using the normal phrase about "not used to working together" that I had phrased it as "used to not working together".

ALAN GREENBERG: The last comment I have on this overall subject, would you be offended if we put timers on speeches in that meeting, assuming that it continues as it is? There are a small number of Board Members who tend to wax poetic at it for long periods of time, not necessarily on subject.

STEVE CROCKER: We've tried to do that in other places. We should certainly do it with ourselves and so forth.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would do it for ourselves also, other than perhaps introducing the subject.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry to intervene – it has to be the right time for the particular piece. If someone is being given the job of reporting on X, then that might be a five-minute clock, but response might be a two-minute clock. Not everything fits into a two or three-minute.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree. I said presenting the topic might be different. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Typically those lengthy dissertations tend to be lectured to us on how the process works. That's happened a couple of times, where somebody's said to us, "This is how it's supposed to happen." Everyone in the room pretty well knows that, and when something's been said it's been said deliberately. I think the whole double-a, single-a, uppercase, I think it's all overblown. When there's public comment stuff we put into public comments. When it comes time for us to say something to the Board, at that point I think it's deliberative and frankly I don't think it should matter.

If we say, “We think something,” I don’t think it should matter what particular verb we use. By the time it gets to the Board, it’s been thought out, it’s something important to us. If it’s less important then we’ll put out a comment to a public comment process or something like that, which we’ve done many times in the past. If there’s something where we just want to recommend to the community, there are ways we can do that. If there’s something we’ve asked staff to send to you, I don’t think it matters whether it’s advice, recommendations or whatever. By the time it gets to that point we’ve been concerned enough that I don’t think that kind of splitting hairs really helps.

STEVE CROCKER: Noted.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’d like to go off of the subject of advice. It’s going to require some discussion on our part on how we want to proceed forward with when we send things to the Board. Holly next.

HOLLY RAICHE: This is a bit of a follow on and a bit of a thought piece from what Evan said, which was essentially is there any opportunity to just stand back and somehow think about the structure of ICANN? I realize it’s all set in stone and nobody will change it, but if you think you have a so-called policy body here, and yet the people who should be contributing are simply called advisors, it’s always struck me as interesting. I think one of the ways we’re dealing with that, without formally dealing with it, has

been a lot of the cross-constituency stuff and involving people in decisions.

Even in the context of IANA saying, “At our core we ought to be about stability, resilience, public interest,” everything that the ACs do. If you see what I mean? The structure is an interesting one. We have to deal with it, but I’d appreciate your thoughts.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me offer up two or three thoughts. First of all you’re raising a very relevant and important point. Something I’d begun to mention in various settings is this distinction we have between SOs and ACs is kind of a garment that isn’t exactly crafted properly and it’s ill-fitting in some respects. One could argue that SOs have a degree of similarity. The ACs, that’s a label that was put onto a series of organizations that are more dissimilar than they are alike I think, and I particular I would cite SSAC and RSAC as being fairly small, specialized, self-selected in a way, and ALAC and the GAC have broad constituency. They’re representative across a big swath. In that sense, they’re in a way more similar to the SOs.

I’ll just let that hang there. Reorganizing by issue in a lot of things we do is certainly an idea that’s come up many times in the CCWG idea. It’s getting more frequent use. The idea of looking at how ICANN is organized came up in the Public Forum. That was you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

That was me. It was the first comment in the catchall session. I said, “The idea of maybe applying the 360° ...”

STEVE CROCKER: Let me speak. First of all, just a small detail about the way my mind works. I've discovered over the years that I have a peculiar defect in that I remember what was said without remembering who told me, and I very often am in the position of earnestly telling somebody and discovering I'm telling the same person who was telling me. So I apologize for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a note – David will be here in seven minutes.

STEVE CROCKER: I need to be elsewhere as well, but this is a very important point I want to touch on in a couple of ways. I made a decision when you spoke to do more than just say, "Thank you," and try to respond a bit. I think this is the right setting to take it to the next step. This seems to me an area where a thoughtful Whitepaper might seem a little heavy-handed. A memo or a think-piece of some thought – take that thought, gather a handful of people who are interested in it, put it together as some sort of idea, and let it wander wherever it's going to wander and get that thought process started. I think that would potentially be an enormous contribution to the intellectual process here. You're smiling as if you've already done this, or you're in the process of doing it?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, we already have produced a Whitepaper and that was sent to the Board. In that contains the kernels of some of the stuff we've been talking about.

STEVE CROCKER: This is the I3C...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No. We called it R3. It was the first Whitepaper ALAC ever produced.

STEVE CROCKER: That doesn't resonate with me. It doesn't seem to me exactly the kind of thing we're talking about. Maybe I should go back and re-read it. That's fair enough. I suspect there are reasons why I didn't immediately say, "Yes, we've seen these ideas before," because it seemed to me there was a bit of rhetoric in there that had a direction to it. I apologize. I may be filling in some blanks that weren't really there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: There was a kernel of this in there, but it focused elsewhere.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the salient thing that Steve said is, "There are a bunch of people," not necessarily just ALAC. I think this would have to be done across the Board. If I remember correctly, there was a strong comment made at the Friday evening, or the Friday afternoon session on just that – that maybe it's time to start thinking about the overall form of the organization.

STEVE CROCKER: I wasn't saying that this had to go outside ALAC. That's up to you. I was thinking completely independent of the organization, a handful of people, and if they happened to be the ones sitting in this room, that's okay – but focused on the effectiveness and how do we take a fresh look at how we're organized. I think that would be helpful.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: What's your comment on actually applying the 360° to a higher level?

STEVE CROCKER: The quick answer is I really don't know. I'd have to understand it a bit better. It's a nice label to put on something but I'd want to understand the next set of things. I just don't have a quick reaction to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else? Different subject?

STEVE CROCKER: I have one. The Leadership Training that you guys have spearheaded and brought into existence is getting rave reviews. Was it worth doing?

SPEAKER: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was on it this time. I'll wax poetic for a while if you like. Whether the actual training is effective or not, it brings people together who would not have met each other, and for the rest of their careers in ICANN will

know each other and go to each other as appropriate. We need a lot more of that.

STEVE CROCKER:

I don't know, but I imagine if not everybody, many people in this room have had experiences in their lives when they've been involved in a process that brought, together with contemporaries, that that's formed relationships, professional and sometimes personal, that have paid off over the years. I can certainly tell you about some of mine. In all ways, this has been a very good thing. I think in a very natural way it's embedded itself into the thought process of when we focus just on how we train Board Members. We sent Rinalia and Asher this time – two incoming Board Members. I suspect we'll be happy to take advantage of that and use that as a piece of our training. I just want to pass along very specific and very strong appreciation for what you've done.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani? Probably the last question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. As for the Leadership Training, I think it's more than networking, as Alan said, and more than people getting to know each other, etcetera. It was I think a very good experience, especially with the facilitation track, which was helpful for everyone, because we all need it. Everyone needs it. I think this program has to be expanded and it should be systematic for all new leadership, new leaders of ICANN. Any new gNSO Council Member, any new ALAC Member, any new Board Member should do it.

It will be really an added value to the organization. If you want to review the program, I don't mind, but keep in mind that it's really useful and it's really something that the leaders, when they come here, they have this real need.

STEVE CROCKER: Are you suggesting that it's a requirement, to enforce it?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I suggest that all the new leaders will be subjected to this program, and I suggest also that we review more or less the content, because it is already good, but we can...

STEVE CROCKER: In my mind I have a slight but important distinction. I like the idea. It's a good thing for everybody to do. Making it a formal requirement raises the nasty set of questions of what happens if somebody doesn't do it? Does that mean they can't take their seat and so forth? But I think making it visible and understood that this is a good thing to do, and the river runs in that direction, I think that's an absolutely first class idea. That also means there has to be places for those people, so there's an allocation or priority given to people coming in.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: There's an associate from my ALS that came to this, and it was the first time he'd ever been at an ICANN Meeting. He's the legal secretary of the group, and deep legal background from Ottawa. His first comment was that in some of the meetings he couldn't believe how badly they

were run. His thought was you could save 25 per cent of the time that's spent on some of this if everyone who was a Chair, a Working Group, constituency or whatever, had even some basic training on how to do that.

STEVE CROCKER: When do you have a slot for me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for saying that, Steve, because I was going to add, "As important as it is for new people, there are people who've been around for a long time." I would predict that Asher is going to know more about this organization, partly because of what she may have learnt in those two to three days, and partly because of the contacts she has made, than pretty much any other Board Member who either came in from outside without any real contact, or came up through the organization at a time when we were really silos and had very little contact.

I suspect you will see a difference in that alone, and Rinalia also, but Rinalia had part of that from before. I can't speak too much in its favor. I've never belonged to a voluntary organization with this kind of continuity of volunteers, where there wasn't something like this. I'm delighted we're doing it now. Tijani, you have 30 seconds.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Since we are talking about the Leadership Program, as you know it's run by the ICANN Academy. I think that the ICANN Academy has to really be enforced. We had a lot of discussion this week with a lot of

senior managers here at ICANN. I hope that we'll manage to have a real... We think that this Academy is the framework of any learning effort in ICANN, using all the tools developed by staff, developed by anyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll just add that talking to Sandra, apparently there are more things going forward.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you all. [Applause]

GISELLA GRUBER: Just before we welcome David Olive to the table, if you wish, there's a breakfast outside. Apologies for the delay, but it's there for you.

ALAN GREENBERG: David only has a few minutes for us, so quickly back here with whatever you want to eat. A fair amount of leadership out of a mini Leadership Training Program, run by the same people. So it'll be fun. David, what time do you have to leave?

DAVID OLIVE: Around 9:10 am is fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest we start. The floor is yours to start with.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you very much. I see I don't know this group very much, because during the ICANN Meeting I don't know if I've talked to any of you. It's nice to be here for the third time, or at least a good period of time. I always like to wrap up with this meeting of the ALAC Ex-Com, or ALT, as it's now called. I thank you for this time. Some of my concerns that I'd like to raise with you really deal with the challenges we have and opportunities of course in our PDPs. To that extent I always want to encourage all the groups that I talk with about the need to have that input.

I know you have active participants on some of the Working Groups within the gNSO. You have Liaisons to the ccNSO and other groups that you remain contact with. That type of interaction is very important both for reporting purposes of what's going on, as well as to be able to input into processes that they have – either directly, as Members of a Working Group, or through the PCP. That's the important message. As I was mentioning to you earlier, the other issues that we're dealing with on the Chairs of these SOs and ACs are to deal with the workload, how to prioritize.

That's really a concept that relates to how we can better and more effectively engage our volunteer workers and stakeholders in the process. If it's too complicated, or too confusing, or if it's too short of a time to comment, that is not an advantage to anyone. So part of this exploration of how best to prioritize, or better package if you will, in a digestible format, so that your community members can, 1) understand; 2) decide if it's something they want to comment on or are interested in;

and 3) have an ability to do that is an important part of what we need to do at ICANN as we move forward.

The second element of course is how to re-energize our existing networks of people. To that extent the ATLAS Summit was a good example of how you were activating your ALSes. To that extent we always have to look to making sure there is plenty of room for new participants, new entrants, and how to make those paths as easy as possible – first to be welcomed into your group and secondly, from my particular point of view, as possible participants in Working Groups and the PDP.

We're at a stage of possible change, because of the expansion of the new gTLD programs. I think we're just now going to be seeing more requests for policies that affect these new gTLDs, as the experience and as they begin to be rolled out. I think in the last year or two we'd been at a bit of a plateau on policy development issues. Part of that was as the application processes were going forward, the policy development bodies were dealing with existing and ongoing issues.

I think there's going to be an increase in those, and therefore we're trying to be prepared for that and have new mechanisms so that we can quickly summarize or digest these issues and make sure the various bodies and inputs into those policy development bodies are scalable enough for that. Those are the challenges I see ahead. After this meeting I'm going to a meeting internally, looking at basically the next few years, of what IT support and IT tools we need. To that extent that's hopefully going to be a helpful addition to the work that we do – less manual, more automated, as I was explaining a little bit about some of

the concepts we'd like to introduce for the PCPs – a little more email notices, interactions, calendar invites.

Leon and others were talking about this in a very useful fashion. To that extent, those are important elements to engage IT with, so that we can have some of those tools, including improved parts of our websites and the like. To that extent, those are the issues on my mind. Of course the fourth issue is resources to do all this. To that extent we have to make sure that we have the right staffing levels and the like. I think I'll stop there and hear whatever other questions or comments that you have.

You were very helpful in the various consultations we had with the RALO Leaders and the ALAC Executives in the two or three meetings I think I had with you. I think this is a very important feedback session. I appreciate it. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

A couple of things that would really help and are maybe not too resource intensive: things like when an issue is raised, think about having a webinar – actually, two webinars; one for Asia Pacific and one for the rest of the world – to explain what the issue is. Oftentimes there isn't a background, and if people want to be involved it's, "Where do you start?" The next thing is, on the website, actually finding the background. The ALAC website is being revamped and it's going to have a much easier to find way into policy. You have to know what you're looking for.

You have to know a lot of stuff, to find that background. If there is webinar and links to why this is important to us, and then ways for if

people are interested, some sort of, “Where do I go to ask further questions?” I don’t think that’s resource intensive, but I think it would actually help a lot of people to understand why something is important, what they can do, what the issue is.

DAVID OLIVE:

Holly, I heard you were a morning person, so I thought maybe we should have webinars at 3:00 am? Since I’m in Istanbul I sympathize. I thank you for that. Actually, two things on that point. On many occasions I sometimes get the same question from Evan Leibovitch, so I can return it back to you. I’ve offered to have policy webinars for At-Large on various issues, and was never taken up on that offer. So we can surely do that. It’s the good point that you make – that if there is a new issue coming up, how best to publicize it and have an educational element to that.

I’d like to hear your views on this: I was thinking of webinars – you’re right, it’s not a big issue in terms of time, but it’s timing and scheduling – that maybe we’ve done this a little bit in the gNSO, where the Chair of the Working Group explains what a process is. Maybe a video would be a way to start that, or in addition to an announcement that the gNSO is starting whatever, this video of someone – it could be from somebody from policy staff or it could be the Chair of the Working Group – saying why it’s important, why it’s what we need... A quick shot, and then where to go for the information.

That might be a combination of the two. I’m trying to look into that, and thinking that the videos might be a quick reference. I’ve heard comments from many of you here, Dev in particular, about short video clips and things like this. We’re going to try to do that. It’s not difficult

now with some of the technology. The second part of that is where to find it. Within the SO and AC Chairs we're looking at this knowledge platform, knowledge base. That's a broad term meaning how to have quick reference to what you're trying to do. So if one wants more background they can click onto, "More background," but keep it as a quick reference, plain English, "Here is what it is."

We tried to do that in the policy update – why it's important and things like this. We just had to use more of that, or cut and paste if you will, in our work. We do sometimes get pushback when we try to translate it – I call this English to English translation – we try to translate it from ICANN-ese to English. "Oh, you're simplifying it," or, "Oh, you're missing the major points," but the point is you have to start some place. If they want more detail, a quick précis or summary is not a verbatim transcript, we understand that, but it's important to get the highlights so that people understand, "Is that something I'm interested in or is it not?"

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a follow up. If you are expecting input from ALAC and from the ALSes, who do not speak ICANN-ese, you have to start there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'm glad you picked up on that Dave, because that's pretty much what I was going to say. Don't lean too much on the tools. Knowledge management is an important part of this, but what people find when they get there is more important. While webinars are useful to those people that can give two hours of their time continuously towards learning something, having somebody on staff that is a professional

write, somebody who's done dummies books, or people who have the talent of taking the babble and turning it into plain language and multiple languages, that's the kind of thing that's a really good accountability step.

It helps in our outreach and it helps generally in the world understanding what you do. Even webinars are going to be too much for some people, especially just the ones totally on the periphery that we're trying to say, "A page – this is what dotless domains are, this is what the controversy is," without making judgment on it. The idea of coming back to the communities, identifying what are the "hot topics" or whatever, and then just doing a briefing page – even a one-pager. If somebody comes back to you with, "You're simplifying it too much," or, "You're leaving out too much," then you give them the tidal wave of raw stuff that this place tends to produce.

The précis, the abstract, the plain English, the plain French, the plain Chinese form of this, is really necessary. The knowledge management part is important, but what they find when they get to the end of that search, if all they find is babble, then we really haven't accomplished some of the basic things you're trying to do. I'll leave it at that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anybody else? Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Alan. David, I just wanted to raise an issue with regards to the Pacific. You know I'm always raising the resources that go into the Pacific. I have to say that we really appreciated the ICANN initiatives

that actually really helped us in our most recent event – PACINET – not only the stakeholder engagement contribution that was made to it, and Save’s presence, but also the CROPP initiative. I think that was fantastic, especially from the perspective of a developing country Member of ICANN.

I think that one of the important parts of this wasn’t just the financial support that we got, but it was the amount of work that was done within the APRALO for example, as we looked at who would be the best people to take advantage of that particular initiative. We really appreciated it. We had Ali and Holly. It was a double-whammy for us, because not only was it a PIC ISOC event, it was great to be able to have people who were ISOC as well as high-level ICANN Members, and to be able to bring out the outreach objectives of both organizations at the same time, that was very much appreciated.

Also, the fact that they were from two completely different cultural backgrounds, I just wanted to say that we really did appreciate that support, and continuing to get support from within the system. I just wanted to mention that.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you. That’s indeed helpful and good to know, because we’ve been trying to integrate and make sure this collaboration with the other parts, including the GSE Teams, are a little more closer to your areas, your regions. The Policy Team is busy on its activities and we can’t always send people, but Save and others are very good to be a part of that region. The CROPP, we guess it was part of the comments from various groups to do that, and I think it’s working. Please take

advantage of it, because if we have to prove that it was worthwhile, it's helpful to do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have an online comment. Evan has asked to speak, but I'd like to hear from other people first who haven't spoken – that's Siranush and then Evan, if we have enough time. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: We have an online comment from Carlton Samuels: "Plus one to Evan. Issue management is key and that requires staff support. Current At-Large staff configuration is not fit for this purpose."

DAVID OLIVE: Carlton, could you explain why you say that?

ALAN GREENBERG: He probably can't easily. We'll come back to Carlton in a moment. Siranush?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Hi there. My question relates to the CROPP challenges for the region. We have talked with Dev and our team who's in the CROPP Working Group. They presented the challenges recently. We used our first opportunity within the CROPP to send two representatives from APRALO to PACINET in the Pacific Islands. It was a really very important outreach activity there, conducted by our Members. The issue is that the limitation of three days and two nights is very difficult, because traveling

for two days, reaching the destination, and having only two nights covered, it's nonsense. It's happening all the time.

Our Members are just paying out of their pocket to stay there longer, because there is a need to stay longer. The same is for upcoming meetings, which we are thinking to go to. APRICOT is for almost ten days. We want to have our APRALO Members there, because there will be APTLD and APNIC meetings simultaneously in that meeting. Covering only two nights, it's not enough for our Members. It's just a concern for everyone, from us, to take into consideration. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you very much.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I was going to ask something along a very different tack, so if you'll indulge me for a moment? There's a very big opportunity coming up for you as how you handle policy here. Right now, some of our biggest problem has been the short timelines that are involved in public comments. "Something's coming up, comment on it." "Something's coming up, give advice on it," or whatever. We now have the fact that the Board has said, "We're going to be very deliberative about the second round of TLDs." There's a very good opportunity to really demonstrate the strength of bottom-up.

We've been talking about the fact that we rarely have enough time to go bottom-up – to go to the ALSes, to go to the RALOs, to go right to the bottom of the grass roots to get policy. I've heard from other constituencies that are deep that they have the same issues when the

timeline is too compressed. Is there a way of identifying something and saying, “This is a big picture issue. This is a major issue. Let’s take a timeline – it could be six months – that follows a process of we’re going to identify it, we’re going to prepare materials, we’re going to give our constituencies a chance to go to the grass roots, inform them, get reaction back, and then come back up.

That takes a long time. In our case it takes translation or whatever. There’s an opportunity here with the second round of TLDs to be able to do that kind of engagement that’s not really come up before. Very often it’s, “Here’s a public comment, here’s three months, do something on it.” Having the opportunity to get to the ALAC, to the 15 people, to get good comment to come back up, sometimes is a challenge with that kind of timeline – let alone go down to the RALO and the ALS level.

I honestly think there’s an opportunity here, with a major issue, with a big picture issue, to be able to take that kind of step back, long-term thinking, and say, “Okay, how can we most fully engage the grass roots and not just in At-Large?” I’ve heard in Business Constituency, they have a problem. NCUC. They’ve all got grass roots they have to go back to. Half the time you’re only hearing the usual suspects, because sometimes they’re the only ones that are engaged enough to be able to respond quickly to what’s going on. I think there’s a really good opportunity here to do that – really deep engagement that’s really often been lacking.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I’ll point out there’s nothing stopping us from doing it without a formal blessing. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Comment from Carlton Samuels in response to David: “Our current staff is considered as event managers and are already overworked.” There are already competent and certainly, IMO, capable staff to do the real policy work Evan is speaking about, and I am supporting, but now they are configured to be ‘gofers’.”

ALAN GREENBERG: David is three minutes late now for another meeting. Olivier has had a card up, which I didn’t realize. Sorry. 30 seconds, and I’m going to count this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Just on the matter of the accountability process in ICANN, is policy in charge of this or is it another department?

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you for that clarification. Accountability is a strategic initiative that’s under Theresa Swineheart.

ALAN GREENBERG: Policy has contributed their best person to make sure the process works well. Thank you David.

DAVID OLIVE: Indeed. Just to wrap up quickly, in terms of staffing and what-not, Carlton, not to cut you short, but the policy development staff has 23

people in it. To say that there's no interaction between the policy staff supporting the ALAC and the policy staff supporting the gNSO, the ccNSO, and those SOs that do policy development, is a misunderstanding. To that extent, we always have interactions, regular meetings, so that the people supporting the ALAC know who to go to, who are the SMEs for the policy to get those webinars or the information that you need.

In terms of your role as advisors or commentators on that, we try to help as much as we can, but in terms of who's in charge of policy, we have a policy team that's supporting all the SOs and ACs. We just happen to have specialists for ALAC and others, so I'd like to make that as a comment. Finally, Evan, to your point, the policy development team doesn't create the policies. If the gNSO comes up with some ideas of next steps for the new gTLD, you should work with them and talk to them about that. In terms of timelines, the GDE did issue a paper that looked at the potential timelines for the next round of the new gTLD program.

It doesn't relate to what policies may come out because of that. As you know, the PDP is somewhat different from those timetables, but that's something you should really talk to the gNSO about and make sure that you have constant communications to make sure you know what they're doing, what they're thinking of, and remind them that you're also there to help out. I'd like to thank you on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much David. [Applause]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, I have a process question for you, now that we've heard from David, that's related to this. You know better than anyone in this room what it's like to initiate a PDP, whether or not the gNSO wants to do one. Is it within our remit, and is it something we should consider, that if the gNSO doesn't want to revisit something in the Applicant Guidebook between the first and second round, that we have the ability to initiate a PDP to do so? I think specifically on applicant support, the community criteria, and some of the other things that have really been bothering people here? Is it within our remit and is it realistic to consider if the gNSO doesn't want to revisit some of these issues, to try and create that agenda?

ALAN GREENBERG: It is within our remit. There are other processes that are going on in parallel, and we've not participated particularly well in them. There's a gNSO activity that's looking for issues that people believe are important – some of which are policy, some of which are implementation. The intent of that group is to do a PDP as a follow on, once we've scoped out the issues enough to start the process. It's not clear what the issues are that are on the table. The only participation I believe from At-Large is I have gone to some meetings and not contributed anything, as I had a lack of time. Tijani is a more active participant and has raised at least some of the issues that you're concerned with.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Is this the group that put out that mind-map just before the meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, then I joined within the last month.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. At this point it's not clear that everyone wants a PDP, but there are certainly many who do. There are large aspects of the process, for the last round, that were developed during the implementation round. We now understand that some of the aspects of the implementation round were in fact policy. Fine. We're going forward on that issue. It's quite clear that there are at least some issues that have to be changed, which do require policy. It's pretty certain. I think it's inevitable there will be an opportunity for that, but we really need to make sure we're part of all of the processes.

There's likely to be a Board initiative process that goes on in parallel to this, because coming in late and saying, "But but but..." when we didn't participate in the active collection of the information is not going to have any effect. It may have an effect, but it's certainly the wrong way to do it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So this is just a flag going forward that to any of these processes that are coming down, we do need to be involved in it going forward. There are some specific issues – the applicant support, community criteria, and of course the public interest commitment. All of these three things need to

be looked at, maybe more, and if the gNSO doesn't want to move forward in addressing this, this may be something where we need to press the issue.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think it's premature to say the gNSO doesn't want to look at this. There's lots of initiative even in the gNSO on the particular issues that we're pushing. I don't think this is the time to discuss the substance of that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

No, this is just a request to make sure that whoever within staff or whatever, as long as we can be kept in the loop, there's going to be a Review Team that's going to be involved in looking at the first round. I'll just say ahead of time I'm going to apply to be on that Review Team because I was involved in the metrics and so on. We do need to be involved in this, and this is just a heads-up, we can't be caught flat-footed at the end of this process. We need to be involved from the beginning.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think it's intuitively obvious that we don't want to be the GAC coming in after everything is signed, sealed and delivered and saying, "But we object, you have to stop everything." We should have more savoir-faire. Olivier, and then we really have another very important issue we have to go onto.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Just a moment ago I asked David about the responsibility for the IANA and the accountability process. The answer was, “This is reviews,” etcetera, and I’m a little concerned at the moment because on the IANA stewardship for example we have asked that the CCWG, which has been created jointly by the gNSO and the ccNSO, would need interpretation. There has been no response whatsoever from the Co Chairs of that Working Group. I’m not sure where the resources would come from – whether it would come from GSE, Policy, Accountability...

There seems to be a lack of clarity as to who is in charge of what. I understand it seems to be that Theresa Swineheart is above all of this, so that would point to therefore strategic initiatives. Yet the CCWG has been created under the general ICANN rules of creation of CCWGs, which may make it point over to policy.

ALAN GREENBERG: I really don’t care who’s funding it. If we want to make a statement that we need certain levels of translation, we will do that, period. Clearly that’s something that’s higher on our priority list right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Alan, so may I please just ask that we make such a statement?

ALAN GREENBERG: I suggest I assign it to an ALT Member, one of the Vice Chairs, to make sure that we don’t forget it. Consider it an informal Action Item, which we will remember. Gisella? Tijani, we will come back to you.

GISELLA GRUBER: One, two, three... [Sings Happy Birthday to Siranush] Thank you for joining us on your birthday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we resume our previous scheduled program. I would like to start going into a whole number of issues, but let's continue this thread for a minute or two. Tijani, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. It's only to say that there are one or two reviews, Evan, going on. There's also the discussion group. A lot of things are going on. If you have a particular interest in a particular thing, you have to go there. As for the discussion group, it's absolutely open. I'm a regular member of this group and you can...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm sorry. I did join. My concern is specifically in occasional previous experiences within the gNSO, the fact that there is some interest in something does not guarantee that it will actually percolate out the top of the gNSO. If it turns out there's interest amongst some communities, but by vote or whatever they decide not to move forward, we still have the ability to take the initiative, together with those members of gNSO that wanted it as well. I'm simply saying they have a voting process, they have a very formal process.

Simply because there's some interest from some members in the gNSO in a topic, doesn't guarantee they will move forward. If they do, great,

we'll be part of it. if they don't, we have to be ready to move forward in a parallel process, like we did with the metrics issue. They didn't do metrics we liked. We did something on top of that. We might be in a position of needing to do that as well here. That's all I'm saying.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll point out that the group in subject is not a Working Group. It's a discussion group. That's a new set of terminology. They're not making value judgments, they're collecting at this point. How that group evolves remains to be seen, but at this point they're collecting information, trying to find common issues and trying to flush things out. Are there any other unscheduled interventions before we go to what I think we should be talking about – not that that matters. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'm waiting for you!

ALAN GREENBERG:

At this point we have, according to our Agenda, five minutes before Rinalia has her half an hour. What is your schedule? Are you here for the whole morning? You're on now. You have in theory 30 minutes. If you choose not to use it we won't complain a lot.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

If you need the time to discuss the ALAC strategy going forward, certainly I shall see most of that time, because I think that's quite important.

ALAN GREENBERG: Use what you want, up to 30 minutes.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. I have officially started my term. The work began six months ago. What I've been focusing on in the last six months, apart from the learning, understanding and observing the Board, and also engaging and contributing to the discussion, is actually to enhance their understanding of the ALAC and the At-Large, in terms of your issues and your concern, and also your image. I think there were some issues in terms of the perception of the At-Large, but I believe that has been corrected now.

You don't have any baggage going forward, because I think out of this ICANN Meeting the At-Large community came out very high in the impression of the Board, particularly after the meeting where you presented the At-Large Summit Declaration. In the way that it was done, it was clear, there were visuals that helped them focus. Yes, there were some issues about capital A, small a, but that came from an individual. The other Members of the Board appreciated that and they have a better understanding across the board of what you're trying to achieve. That was excellent.

I also wanted to say that the Global Leaders Meeting with the Leaders of ALAC and RALOs left a deep impression on them. The majority of the global leaders don't really interact with you. you don't see them – John Jeffreys, the people behind the scenes, but who are highly influential. They were very impressed with the work that the At-Large does. They begin to understand more about how important it is to the organization

and now I would expect that the level of operation between community and staff would go up to a much higher level.

This is very good, because the impact of that is that I would expect from now on that the issues that you bring to the Board are oriented towards policy, strategic governance types of issues. If you have operational issues you go to the global leaders. If you believe that you are not heard by the global leaders, you bring it back to the Board. During the meeting between the At-Large and the Board, the Board communicates amongst itself through its own communication channels. You don't see it. Some of them crack up. Sometimes I end up laughing for no reason. It's because this communication is happening.

The comment was made, "These are operational issues." I emphasized the point to them that it is important for the Board to witness the At-Large communicating these points, because they need these points made and it was clear that they didn't have the confidence that these points were heard before. It's important for the Board to see it, so that they note that this happened. That's my second point.

There was a request for Board time, in terms of Board participation in At-Large teleconferences. I can tell you in general this will not work, because of workload, also because of the process that you go through in your teleconference. I would suggest that you target very specific calls or members. If you have a hot topic then that is when you can initiate a request to have a call with the Board. If it's not a hot topic I would say it's not a good use of the Board's time. I would like to encourage you in going forward, the next time you meet with the Board, continue with slide presentations.

Not all Members of the Board are English-language oriented, and when they see words and they hear you, they can make better connection and better understanding. I believe the new gTLD review will feature very prominently moving ahead. If you can have slides that highlight, “Here are the areas that the At-Large is concerned with, perpetually since the past,” and in a nutshell explain why you have that concern, that would help the cause a lot in moving forward.

Finally in terms of moving forward, in terms of how I would like to work with you, in the ALAC Meeting right before the ICANN Meeting happens. I will try my best to participate in your call, because I think it’s important to know what’s going to rise up in the Agenda. If we can spare the time, I’d also like to have a preparatory meeting before the Board Meeting with the At-Large – like we had this time on the Task Force for At-Large II Implementation. I think it’s helpful for you to have a preparation for what might come up, the kinds of questions that might come up, and that would help us have a smoother meeting.

I won’t be able to anticipate everything, but I think that could be useful. That is my suggestion. Lastly I would have to say the NARALO Showcase was deeply moving, and I just want to say thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I’ll point out the NARALO Showcase was deeply moving to some. There were a number of Board Members there who were clearly bored out of their minds during the keynote speech, and showed it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

[say that on the record? 01:30:46].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Evan, you have a comment?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. First about the showcase, there's nobody in this room really that can take credit for it. You're looking at me, but that was basically the work of Glenn, Eduardo, and the team behind them. I agree with you – it was fantastic. If it's not everyone's cup of tea then so be it, but it was moving to a lot of the people there. I think it may have given Fadi a bit of a better appreciation for first nations' issues. He may have to change some of his own personal lingo a little bit, but that's a detail.

A question based on what you said. As I mentioned in the RALO Meeting with the staff leaders, we often find ourselves in this squishy area between policy and non-policy. PICs, which has been a nagging thing with us, seems to have been in that. There was no policy made to have PICs. There was a policy made to serve the public interest. PICs was staff's way of saying, "This is what we think you wanted," without asking anybody. We've had a constant cycle. We go to the Board, they say, "It's been settled." We go to the Board and say, "No, it's not settled," and they come back and say, "Yes, it is." We're now in our third iteration of this.

As far as we're concerned, they've started to sign contracts for .pharmacy. This is deeply troubling to a lot in the community. Number one, do you have any strategic opinions? Number two, when you say, "Go to the Board with something if it's policy and go to staff if it's not policy," what do we do in a situation like this where it's an amalgam of

everything squished together? The gNSO may have its hands tied because some of it is outside of policy. We don't have those bounds. What's the best way for us to handle them?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I view the PIC as a policy issue, and in terms of views on PIC I think that in the Board there is a diversity of opinion about that, and to my mind it's not quite settled. Because there are these continuous questions that come up, I think the issue has not been resolved sufficiently. I think if you feel that it hasn't been resolved sufficiently, you need to continue raising it – even if people give you body language or verbal language that is against it. But I think you should raise it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have Maureen next and then we have Olivier, who doesn't have a big enough card, so it's not visible. Before Rinalia leaves I want to jump into one of the issues I was going to talk about, because I think it's something you need to know.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Alan. I just wanted to agree with Rinalia about the NARALO event, which I also found very moving. I think in relation to the comments that you made, I think it does raise that whole issue of cultural sensitivity. I think it's really important that these are showcases about the region, and I think it's a little bit... it takes me a little bit aback that it was mentioned that some people may have not appreciated it. Also, taking up with Rinalia said about her continued involvement with us and ensuring that our voice is heard appropriately at the Board level, I

think that we all really do appreciate that what's important to us will actually be taken forward to the Board. Thank you Rinalia.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any comment? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I wanted to pick up on the discussion regarding the .pharmacy. Just to comment on this. The PIC statement that the ALAC has sent is I think absolutely correct in its concerns, and I've even graver concerns in that it doesn't appear to be heated in any way. It's not the first PIC statement that the ALAC sends. It's being absolutely ignored. We're not even getting an answer on the statements. When Steve was here earlier he said he would be answering all of the ALAC statements.

We're not getting answers on it. There is a *Wall Street Journal* investigation into ICANN practices with regards to pharmaceuticals, drugs, and so on. This thing is a time bomb, and if we don't do something about it, we'll be put in the same basket as ICANN in not doing anything about it. So I have real concerns. This seems to be a train that's gone out of control. We're being ignored. Many others in the community are being ignored. Throughout the week I had several people that came to me that actually spoke to me about .pharmacy, about these issues.

I said, "The most we can do is a statement." But at the moment it seems to be a case of ICANN is putting forward its own process by saying, "Well, we're already too far into it." I even have concerns that the GAC

is saying, “Well, some contracts have already been signed, so it’s a delicate issue, we can’t really roll back the clock.” Hell no, you can roll back the clock. It is possible to do so, because if you don’t then you’ll be sued, and that’s not a good way forward. That’s the first point.

The second point is to do with the ALAC having one call in between meetings with the ICANN Board, and I think Rinalia, if you could clarify, you mentioned that this was not going to be possible?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: What I’m saying is if your general request is to ask Board Members to participate in At-Large calls, that’s not going to work. But if it’s a specific topic that is a hot topic, you are likely to succeed in getting that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so if I can follow up on this, I think that yet again the Board has misread the issue. If you read the actual recommendation it says, “The ALAC should have a call with the Board at least once between ICANN Meetings.” At the moment the ALAC meets with the Board – and this is how great the communication is in this organization – three times a year, for one hour. Three hours a year between the Internet users and the Board.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I actually think it’s a good idea, but what I heard from the meeting was that there was openness to it, but there should be a specific agenda and it shouldn’t be just any call, basically.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. There's no 'but'. The 'but' is always a case of, "We'll do that, but..." and at the end of the day their answer should have been yes.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: It was a yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point there has been no "no". We had some pushback from Steve when we met with him on Friday. I think the onus is on us to put together an agenda and request a meeting a month, month and a half ahead. They want to refuse then we play that out, but I think that we need to go into it with a specific agenda, I agree. It's not clear that we'll always have an agenda between even each ICANN Meeting, but let's at least try it once. We have to go into it with some seriousness. I have Evan, Leon and Tijani. We're on a timeline now, so we're getting rather tight. Make it short please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just to follow onto Olivier's follow on to what I said, let's take it a step further beyond .pharmacy to .health. That was an absolute disaster. We put in objections. After all that crap about [rexix 01:39:30], about all the things, about objectionable strings, about all that stuff that took thousands of hours to churn through, ICANN, the Board, gave At-Large the ability to launch objections. We launched objections. They were tossed for lack of standing. What kind of stupidity is that? We're given the right to object and then the objection is denied because we didn't have the right to object.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan, raise it with the new gTLD process. That's one of the key things we need to raise.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I understand, but part of the problem is, as Olivier said, the train has left the station, it's going full-tilt, the throttle stick has broken off, and we're told there's nothing we can do about it. It really has that feeling. You see the bridge out ahead. I don't want to be... We've taken out stand. We did the motion yesterday, but there's the frustrating feeling of I don't want to be the ones that said, "We told you so," rather than the ones that helped change something. There's a feeling of helplessness here.

ALAN GREENBERG: I trust our Board Member, in discussions where this comes up, will point out that the Board took a lot of flack, including in the new gTLD agreement – a process by which they could unilaterally change the agreement after the fact, if necessary. We have Leon next.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Alan. Just to reinforce what Olivier said, three hours a year with the Board and the Internet users I think is pretty... To but it in some way. Having two more hours, which would be the calls in-between meetings, I don't think that's much to ask. I agree there needs to be a clear agenda and we're not just calling the Board to say, "Hello, how are you? How's the weather?" but it concerns me, or strikes me as a

concern, that the initial answer from the Board is, “Oh no, we’re not willing to have that call unless...” Exactly.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I don’t think they said that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, that’s what I understood. We’re missing something in translation here.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: No, they did not say that. They were open to it, but they want a clearer understanding of what the meeting would be on. Otherwise, how would you...? It has to be prepared. That was the understanding.

LEON SANCHEZ: Absolutely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are they saying the ALAC functions without agenda then? This very question is what I’m concerned about.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Try not to put words into people’s mouths. Try not to second-guess what people are saying. What I heard from that meeting very clearly was that there was openness to it, let’s work on an agenda and let’s trial it first before going around in this non-productive circle.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I participated in the redactions of this recommendation, so I support it 100 per cent. In my mind it's not a regular ALAC meeting. How can you bring Board Members to a meeting that [unclear 01:42:51] more than two hours, discussing things that they don't have any interest in? It is about specific meetings with specific agendas, which have to be well prepared. I don't think it will be very much for us. It's necessary for us. I don't believe there was ever a request to have all the Board Members attend a regular ALAC meeting. If someone said that, I didn't hear it, and it would not have been a bright thing to have suggested, if someone did suggest it. I don't think that was on the table at all. I hope it wasn't perceived as being that. Rinalia, anything else pressing before I go onto another issue? Okay.

One of the issues that is going to be on our regular agenda today, if we ever get to it, is the problem of engagement of ALSes and engagement of people at the bottom, effectively, of our food chain. Olivier and I had a rather candid discussion with Fadi. It started 15 minutes late and ended 30 minutes late, so instead of getting a half-hour we got three-quarters of an hour. We started off listing some of the issues, strengths and weaknesses that we have in our organization. I don't think we pulled any punches.

There are some very mixed messages that we've been sending, saying, "We have this vibrant ALS structure with 170 ALSes and each ALS has 50 people on average," or whatever the number is that's been bandied around. At the same time we saying, "We desperately need education material because they don't know what they're talking about." Those

are two very mixed messages and that's problematic. We talked about it. In general terms, at the end of the meeting Fadi said, "Before you leave there's something that's really been bugging me." Yes, I see your hand, Olivier. How do we really get engagement from all of these individuals?

I'll try to be as verbatim as possible. Sure, you're going to get a couple of policy wonks who are interested in policy. You'll get a couple of people who are interested in IGF and governance issues. What are we going to do with the rest of them? What we need to do is have processes by which we can find people who have technical interests in the Internet. We need more IPv6 evangelists – people who are interested in outreach within their communities, people who are interested in the political issues related to the multistakeholder model, and find ways to capture them, to get GSE involved in activities with them, so we can really use the diverse group of people.

Those statements are about 180 degrees from what we've always been told – that we could not venture outside of ICANN's very limited scope, or we're completely out of bounds. He says we'll find ways of doing it. Well, it remains to be seen how we can implement this. It remains to be seen how we flesh it out, whether we get support anywhere else, but that's a radical position that changes, and it's really a game-changing move if we can affect it. It's something you need to be aware of, because I don't think he's going to have 100 per cent support on the board for it. He was really adamant.

We will be pushing forward on this slowly to make sure we flesh it out and there are no misunderstandings. I wish we had recorded that

session, which we sadly didn't. We will be working on it, but as I said it's a direction which is very different. If we can end up pulling it off it's a way of getting involvement from people who have no interest in commenting on ICANN policy statements, or accountability issues. It perhaps bodes well. I just wanted to get that on the table before Rinalia left.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you for everything. See you in Marrakech.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Just a question, within the Board, the ASO Directors, in particular, are very interested in having ALSes engaged in numbers policy development, which covers the IPv6 area. That's one comment I just want to throw out there. So perhaps there is synergy in all of this. The other part of it, which I think you mentioned, was the multistakeholder and Internet governance. I believe that within our At-Large eco-system there are these people who are working and interested. I don't see that it's actually outside of our realm.

ALAN GREENBERG: Those two are not outside of our realm. He mentioned a number of others, not all of which I captured, which are things that if the community supported them, helps doing other things – infrastructure essentially. But he believes that we need to push on all of these things to get people involved in the overall process, even if it's not a direct one-on-one with something we do. As I said, I wish I'd captured the words. I

didn't. We have two short interventions from Holly and then Evan, before Rinalia has to leave. Olivier also.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Very short – just to say one thing APRALO's done, we do have our MOU with APNIC, and for the last APRALO meeting we actually had Pablo come and talk to us. The thing that's relevant to us is they have actually developed policy papers in terms of the transition, and they want our feedback on that. There are ways that we can, and already are, dealing with the numbers community, at least in the Asia Pacific.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'm just waiting for the Chair to recognize me. I was just going to follow up on what Holly is saying. I think what's happening is a lot of the RALOs are taking the tack of having direct conversations with their local RIRs as their way of getting into numbers policy. That's happening. It's happening one-by-one with the RALOs. I think eventually all of them are going to have that kind of relationship going. If there's a different path to take, I don't think we know what it is, but having the direct conversations with the RIRs, that is already ongoing I think, or at some stage, with every region right now.

The only other thing I wanted to mention before you need – and ISOC was mentioned once or twice – there's a couple of us here that are both involved in ISOC Chapters that are ALSes, and some that are not. I think there's a really big potential for collaborative engagement. We had a little bit of a start here that had some ISOC outreach happening at the At-Large booth that was here. I'm hoping to see that expand a bit.

Personally I'm very disappointed to see the One Net initiative go nowhere, because that was a really good opportunity to have that kind of, "It's not just ICANN trying to move all this multistakeholder stuff forward, but a really good collaborative body."

That may be too late to salvage, but if you can just fly the flag for just working together with these other bodies and trying to make sure... ICANN isn't alone in trying to fly the multistakeholder flag. There are other groups and there are other collaborations that are possible. There's other help that's out there to try and support this. I really don't think that that opportunity has been exploited even a fraction of what's possible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Comment, no?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: As the Head of ISOC Malaysia, or you're deeply involved with it?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I'm on the Executive Council. The term is ending in this quarter of the year. My personal opinion is there are certainly lots of opportunities for collaboration. The challenge is actually making it happen. What you mentioned about the RIRs, I am sort of monitoring that. I'm more concrete on the Asia Pacific side, because that's the region I come from, and I try to make sure that concrete things come out of it. But there are different paces of engagement and different levels. I'd really like them

to move up to a level where the engagement becomes broad and concrete.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I wanted to comment on two things. First on the engagement, the Board Member who keeps on asking for this engagement in RIR policy development, I have already told him what we do. He seems to have forgotten. I'm not going to repeat what I told him, but LACRALO and LACNIC are working very closely together. APRALO and APNIC are. AFRALO and AFRINIC are extremely doing so much together, and of course with the IANA stewardship transition process we also have people embedded in all of the different RIR discussions in there. I don't know why we're back on this question.

That same Board Member also told us yesterday that IPv6 is a very recent, very new technology, and that many countries in Africa cannot have registries that run with IPv6 because they don't have IPv6 in the country. I think that's absolutely insane because in Tunisia for example there is IPv6, it is a tunneled-IPv6, but it works extremely well country-wide and as a result Tunisia has got very good results with regards to having IPv6 penetration – so a non-issue that's being beat and turning around and around

The second point I wanted to touch on was with regards to self-flagellation of At-Large ALSes and ALS counts. I totally object to this sort of thing. We had 150 ALSes that came to London. The great majority of

them were very active and did very good work indeed. Whether they have ten people or are offset by an ALS or some ALSes that have 20,000 people, like the Computer Society of India for example, we really have to be careful about saying, “They’re all very small, and we have a small subset of a small number of ALSes.” That will just be taken against us. Really in fact, it’s very difficult to find out how many people we have out there. I would certainly err on saying let’s have more rather than less.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have our next speaker here. Rinalia, do you have any closing remarks?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Just to respond to one point that Olivier mentioned. The discussions are happening but it doesn’t result in policy engagement. That’s where the effect is, and that’s where we need to end up. I think we need to do a little bit more capacity building to get them there. Is this my last comment? Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Allen, would you join us up front? If you’re very short we’re really going to end up this ALT Meeting with this ALT Meeting for the first time never discussing what we’re going to do. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to say that for Africa the cooperation and the interaction are very well established. As for the policy – and I will speak only about that – next November AFRINIC will conceive and implement a special capacity

building for the AFRALO Leadership about policy. The aim of this capacity building is to make those leadership able and well prepared to participate in the policy, in the AFRINIC policy discussions. Then the leadership of AFRALO will replicate this knowledge to all the ALSes, through webinars that we'll organize.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Excellent indeed.

ALAN GREENBERG: 20 seconds.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Just as a quick response, how do you quantify policy development in the RIRs? Because there are mailing lists for each one, for policy development, and yet there's very little traffic. There are about five or six people that always engage, and those five or six are usually holders of large blocks of IP addresses. I've taken part in some of the discussions. It's pretty much a cartel.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Good to know. I won't quantify it. They each have their separate processes, but we do just want to make sure that there is ALS engagement, if there is a policy to be developed. The main interest of the person who keeps raising it is that there is interest in having policy initiated or suggested by the end users, because they feel that it's important to them in their community. So there needs to be an understanding of the process to be able to do that, otherwise you won't

be able to. That's why I was very pleased at the PDP webinar happened in Asia Pacific, and now it's going to be on the ground in the African region, which is really excellent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Rinalia. We have Allen Grogan here, Chief Contract Compliance Officer. I'd like to give you a few minutes to introduce yourself and tell us roughly where you think your new super unit is going, and then a small opportunity for questions. We are running very late unfortunately. I'm not sure... Heidi, could we extend this little session to 11:30 am if we need to? Not sure if we're going to have the Internet? Then we don't have Internet and we'll speak louder.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'll have to check.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead Allen.

ALLEN GROGAN: I'll try and make this quick so we can keep you on schedule. Fadi created this position I think because there are dramatic changes underway in this space. On the horizon we're seeing the end of the US Government of the IANA functions. We're seeing the expansion in the gTLDs, from 27 a year ago to 500 or so now, and soon to be over 1,000. One of ICANN's core values is to be accountable to the community, and one of the principle ways in which we are accountable in through enforcement of our contracts with registries and registrars.

Particularly as we looked at this new gTLD space, there are new safeguards in the form of PICs that we need to figure out how to interpret, what the remedies are going to be to enforce those. A lot of those remedies are really directed at safeguarding the public, not just our community, our registrants and registries and registrars – but they’re directed on prohibitions on malware, botnets, phishing and copyright infringement and unlawful activity. We decided we needed to apply a deeper level of legal analysis to how we’re going to interpret and enforce those provisions.

Until I got appointed at this position for the last 18 months, I’ve been Chief Contracting Councilor, so I’m the one who was principally responsible for getting all the new gTLD agreements negotiated and executed. I’m about as familiar with their terms as anybody is, so it seemed like a logical place for me to move towards enforcing those. I think Maguy and her team over the last couple of years have done a great job of operationalizing compliance and making it scalable, which is important, because if it wasn’t scalable we’d be running into serious problems as we move into 1,000, 1,100 or 1,200 new gTLDs.

Now I think we need to overlay on top of that operational excellence – a more nuanced analysis of how we’re going to interpret and enforce those things. The other thing I want to do, and that’s part of the reason for creating a Consumer Safeguards Director Position, is think not only about how to intelligently enforce contracts, but there are some things we’d like to accomplish to serve the public interest, to serve the great good, that may or may not technically breach a contract. I want to think about things we can do, consistent with our limited remit and our mission and our values.

That's going to be a delicate balance, but things that we could do to encourage better behavior out there amongst registrants and registrars, even if it may technically not be a matter of contract enforcement. That might include things like promoting best practices, trying to marginalize the few bad players in the industry that give everybody else a bad name. I think most registrars are trying to do the right thing. There's a small number of bad apples that tarnish the reputation of the industry. We need to figure out some ways to address that problem.

That's very high-level, what I conceive of as my role, and I'm happy to engage in a dialogue with you and everybody else in the community in terms of how we can move forward.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Allen. I'll point out that what we're really looking for, and I think what you're looking for, is intelligent enforcement of contracts. That includes proactive work. Also, if you talk to registrars and registries, they are worried that there may be enforcement of things, which may technically be a problem due to the contracts but in fact are not real problems. As I said in another meeting earlier this week, it's somewhat arrogant to believe we've added so many words to so many contracts and didn't get anything wrong.

This is a complex situation. I'm optimistic we'll have some intelligent thought, not automatons simply enforcing contracts, because on both sides, that misses some of the really important issues. We have Holly next.

HOLLY RAICHE:

You've drawn some a lot bigger than that. If you look at the 2009 Charter of Rights that we developed, that is sitting on my computer and never happened, or the Code of Practice that's actually written into the RAA, that's never been written, or the ITRD we thought, "There's got to be a way for registrants to actually take some action if the registrar won't." We actually ditched the idea that was up in c, but the remedy now is information on the ICANN website that will help people understand. The website is so bad you don't even know if you're a registrant, let alone what you're going to do.

We have an Ombudsman that receives complains, 70 to 80 per cent of which he cannot deal with. You have a lot of people who have complaints that cannot be dealt with and you have a website that does not provide information. I don't see your job as contracts. I see your job as actually not just even consumer protections. I see it as global user protections in information that's available, in complaint mechanisms that are available, in terms of rights and obligations that are clearly spelled out, that are not hidden, and they are.

Clearly we're not going to go into the human rights, privacy stuff, because that's too big right now, but your job's a lot bigger than contract. I hope when we talked about liaison that there is an active communication between this community and you. You are conceptualizing the job far too small.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will point out I did mention the concept of a liaison or some kind of communication path between At-Large and Allen's department. He was quite agreeable to it.

ALLEN GROGAN: Yes. I saw that in the resolution and I welcome that. Happy to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon and then Evan.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. With regards to the reach that these new areas are going to have, will we be looking at some kind of authority in which domains may be suspended or taken down as a consequence of a breach of contract? Let me put some examples into this. For example, regulated areas like pharmacy, like .lawyer, like .doctor, etcetera. Will you be taking some domains down if they breach contracts, and – this is a very wide question – with regards to copyright infringement, where would you draw the line between copyright infringement and fair use. Also, now that human rights is a topic, for example, where will we draw the line between freedom of expression and these fair uses that some copyrighted material may have? Will ICANN be looking into it? Is it on the path? Or how to avoid it, if there's not the scope of what you'll be doing?

ALLEN GROGAN: Thank you. There are a lot of big questions there, and some of those questions relate to ICANN's Mandate and what's within the scope of what we're supposed to be doing and what isn't. Generally our scope does not include law enforcement or regulatory activity. We need to be careful in not overstepping those bounds. I think we need to do as much

as we can, within the scope of our remit, to address some of those issues. In terms of the ability to shut down domains, that's also challenging because ICANN doesn't have any direct contract relationship with registrants.

Our relationships are all with intermediaries, with registries and registrars. If a domain name owner is violating an agreement, it's an agreement between the domain name owner and the registrar. It's not an agreement with ICANN. Our ability to terminate a registrant is very limited and our technical ability to turn off a website is non-existent. The only one who could do that would be the registrar, the registry, the ISP or somebody other than ICANN. There's no magic switch in our IANA Department that allows us to turn off a website selectively, right?

I'm going to be grappling with those issues. I don't have clear answers to them, but I understand people are looking for answers in those areas.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Allen. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. I think the key to this is the words you said at the very beginning, which is limited remit. I guess part of the challenge is finding out what those limits are, because even though as you said you wanted to be proactive beyond them, you're still bound by the limits of what's in the contract. I think what you're hearing from us is that there are all sorts of end user and consumer issues, in which case just even finding out where to complain is at the top of it. When we had our meeting with the ccNSO and I said, "Is there any location where an end user can

find out?” There’s a whole bunch of TLDs that ICANN has absolutely no say over. An end user doesn’t know.

Go Daddy is selling .com and .co as equivalents to the end user. They don’t know the difference until they have a complaint, come to ICANN and say, “Not ours.” Yet, we went to the ccNSO. Does there exist even a webpage that says, “Here is where you can go”? Nothing like that exists. There are so many big consumer issues that exist out there, and everyone is going, “Not me, not me.” So you’ve got a specific small area that you’re enforcing, but from our point of view in At-Large – and I don’t know who I’m speaking of beyond me – but certainly beyond me, when I talk to my family or people that are not into this as their hobby or profession or whatever, there’s absolute confusion.

There’s a myriad of places where they go and say, “Not me, not me.” I don’t know if this is just venting at you, but asking if there is anything that we can do from our point of view, even as a matter of information. Even when there is something outside your remit, that there’s a clear indication whose remit it is, or where somebody should go, or something like that. There’s absolutely nothing out there. You basically have a whole bunch of silos that are saying, “I can deal with my remit, don’t ask me about anything else,” and there’s a real confusion.

There’s an education role or at least an information role that ICANN can play beyond the peer enforcement thing that says, “Even if we can’t help you, we’ll at least try and find out where you can go.” Even that alone would be a massive improvement over what exists now. The other thing is, as you may be aware, At-Large has had some issues with the PIC regime – just little ones. I think we’ve mentioned it once or twice over

the years. I've seen very poor experiences any time an issue goes to an outsourced resolution panel. We've seen it with the community evaluations, where a lot of the results have been, shall we say, unsatisfying.

The concept of complainant [pays 02:12:03], which seems to be behind some of this, is a barrier to entry for complainants. Do you have any comments on how to deal with this, in terms of trying to facilitate the path of someone that believes they've been wronged, without having all these obstacles, and then when they get to the end of the path, having a process that in some ways seems to be – this is personally – bias in favor of the existing parties here?

ALLEN GROGAN:

Several things were wrapped up in your comments there. Let me take a couple of them one-by-one. In terms of education and better information to consumers about who they should talk to and where they can go for different kinds of issues, I had a very similar conversation with the Ombudsman some time in the last couple of days, because he's frustrated by the same thing. He gets numerous complaints that are not in the scope of his remit, and he's made the same comment that when you look on the website it's not clear who you're supposed to go to. If it's not the Ombudsman, if you're supposed to go back to ICANN or you're supposed to go to regulatory authorities or law enforcement...

So I think there are things we can do in that area. In terms of the PIC DRP process, obviously we haven't actually had anybody invoke the PIC DRP process yet, so the jury's still out on how well that will work. I think the intention and the way it's drafted is with the hope that there would

be a relatively expedited resolution. When the complaining party makes the complaint, the first thing that happens, which shouldn't be terribly expensive or time consuming, is the complaining party and the offending contracted party with ICANN are put in contact with each other to try and negotiate a resolution.

If the contracted party is clearly in breach of the PIC, our hope would be that that would result in some accommodation reached through negotiation. If that doesn't work, the next step is for ICANN enforcement to get involved. Again, we'd hope we'd be able to resolve that. I think the outside edges where everybody is concerned is where there's really not a meeting of the minds – the contracted party believes in its heart of hearts that it's not violating the PICs, isn't willing to change its behavior and wants to see the matter go to a panel or mediation or arbitration.

Those are the kind of nightmare scenarios where yes, it could drag out. We hope it doesn't come to that. We hope there's a speedy resolution without the expenditure of a lot of time and money.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

What do you say in the case of some of the optional PICs where the list of PICs have a clause at the end that say, "We reserve the right to amend or delete any of them without notice on the fly," so you could literally have a situation where after a complaint about a PIC is launched, but before it comes to any resolution, it's actually been deleted?

ALLEN GROGAN:

As you know, just to set expectations, there are some PICs that were mandatory – mostly as a result of GAC advice. There are some that apply to all of the new gTLDs and some that apply to specific regulated sectors or sensitive strings, as defined by the GAC. In addition to that, we told the applicants that if they wanted to commit to more than that, to go beyond what’s mandatory, they could submit voluntary PICs, whether for their own marketing purposes or because they thought it would forestall opposition to the delegation of the TLD, or whatever the motivation was, they were welcome to do that. Those were not dictated by ICANN.

Those were voluntary in the sense that the applicants drafted them, submitted them, agreed to abide by them. It’s in those voluntary PICs that some of them said, “Yes, I’m willing to agree to abide by these, but I want to revisit that after two years.” I think that’s the time period for the one applicant that submitted most of the PICs that have a potential sunset clause on them. Those were put out for public comment. There was no hiding the ball on the fact that they were making a commitment, but it was a commitment with a potentially limited duration.

I think that’s simply the nature of those PICs – that they went to the community, they said, “I’m willing to commit to do this for two years but maybe not for longer than that.” So on the mandatory PICs those will remain in effect forever, or until we modify the agreement. On the voluntary PICs they’ll be enforceable in accordance with their terms, and if they have a sunset clause on them, they have a sunset clause on them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Allen. I have myself in the speaker list. Is there anyone else? We're reaching the end of the time. No? Just a couple of quick comments. One of the focuses that we've had on the PICs is the fact that one must demonstrate harm, and therefore it makes it probably impossible for governments or consumer agencies or things like that to launch a complaint. Even if they have the money to do it, it's not clear they have standing, because they cannot demonstrate harm. In an earlier meeting today we referenced the fact that in the Applicant Guidebook, At-Large [heads 02:17:41] was allowed to submit certain classes of objections.

When we did, they looked at At-Large to say, "What's the connection between At-Large and this reason? You don't have standing," and they were rejected on that bound. That's another catch 22 one. It's not the same one, but it's one of these frustrating things that the people who care most about the issue do not have the ability to do anything about it. That's something. Think about it. It requires a real change, and it's one that's been fought tooth and nail by the Board every time we raised it. It's been raised since from the beginning.

In terms of the website, the current Compliance Group has believed it's within their mandate to try and make consumer information available. They've done a lot better than the previous incarnation did. When we had a similar discussion on TLDs the other day, as we were talking, I went to the ICANN website from the start and said, "Can I find what is a TLD? Which TLDs point where?" You can go very easily from the ICANN website through the chain of links to find a list of all registries, or all TLDs rather. It's an ASCII list.

If you added to that a URL pointing to where to go if there's a question, it would suddenly become useful instead of simply being an ASCII list of now 1,000 character strings. There's plenty of places to go. Thank you. Any closing comments?

ALLEN GROGAN: Just that I look forward to working with you, and yes, if you want to establish a liaison, let's set up regular meetings, establish a dialogue and try to move forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Allen. I'd like to call a five-minute but not more break, to either refresh your coffee or visit the washroom or whatever. Then we'll reconvene and get back to the original agenda. [Short break] Can we please reconvene? Maureen, you have a minute or so. You'd like to mention ccNSO-related issues?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. First of all, just mentioning the Joint Meeting we had, I got some good feedback from the ccNSO Members about that meeting. They felt it was very productive. Some constructive comments came from that for them. With regards to ccTLDs within my region, as an ALAC Member who came into ICANN through the Fellowship Program, I try to make contact with the Fellows as much as I can.

I found it very difficult this week, but I did meet up with the two Pacific Fellows last night, to find that they were both ccTLD Managers, and one of the things that we're thinking of doing is creating a Pacific ccTLD

thing, in conjunction with Don Hollander, to try and encourage more ccTLD participants on the PIC ISOC list, who may not be Members of APTLD or ccNSO, but to get some collaboration and try and interest them into joining the ccNSO. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Comments? No? Implied. Julie, you have a minute or so on SSAC.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you very much Alan. There were just a couple of points that Patrick did mention, that I'd like to reinforce. Patrick raised this very specifically with me after our meeting, and that was that the SSAC is very interested in getting any feedback that anyone in ALAC would specifically like to give on SSAC 67 and 68 – the two that have just been issued about the IANA functions. My answer to him was on SSAC 68 was, "I don't think anyone's had a chance to read it yet, but as soon as I get some feedback I'll pass it on." So Holly, if you've got some, please...

HOLLY RAICHE: 68 was the one... The contracts... I didn't go through the whole thing, but I skimmed through a lot of it. It makes it really clear that we're actually talking about three different things. We're talking about ICANN's relationship. First of all what he says is there's no such thing as IANA. There are IANA functions and these functions are under this contract, these functions are under this agreement. It's so useful in terms of the way you understand it. I just think it's, for me, absolutely added a lot of clarity to the debate as to what we are talking about.

I haven't read the history, but everything I've heard about in 67 is it's also incredibly useful. Just from my point of view, 110 per cent for doing the hard yards on that one, to really, really add a lot of knowledge and [concepts 02:32:52] to the debate. By the way, in a lot of different fora throughout this week, people have said, "If you read 068 or 067..." – sprinkled throughout this ICANN 51, other people have read this stuff and it's been mentioned, from what I've heard, in a lot of different contexts. Obviously what they've done is really valuable thinking.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Great. I'll pass that on. I really appreciate that feedback. If anyone else has got any feedback they'd like to send me by email, I'll pass that on as well. The things I really did want to reinforce again – Patrick mentioned this in his brief – was the ten-year work parties that are setting up. I believe both of them are of interest to the ALAC – in fact significant interest – and for that reason I'll probably get really in trouble at home for this, but I've volunteered to be on both work parties.

The first one is having a look at what's happened with the new gTLDs from a security perspective and seeing whether our advice has been implemented or not – that is SSAC advice – whether the advice, if implemented, whether it's been effective, and what have been the problems that have arisen, and how might that inform the next round of gTLDs. So the scope of that is still meshing at the moment. I think that the outcome of it, whatever it is, will be of great interest.

The other one that I think may well be of even more interest is a very focused work party that Marike is leading on registrant protection and credential management. I think that's going to come out with some

really interesting advice that will be not just for registrants but for other service providers, but also for users. I just bring those to your attention again. Sorry for taking more than one minute. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'd like to go into the substance of what I was hoping to discuss, and I'm told we have until 11:30 am now, so we have an hour. I want to essentially identify some of the issues that I think we need to focus on, and I certainly plan to focus on. The ALT Members have seen an early version of this. The others have not, although I've talked about an awful lot of them as we've gone forward. These are not in any particular order. I wrote them as I thought of them, and I've never bothered to try and re-order. I won't right now.

The first issue is ALAC involvement. We have, in my mind, the best ALAC we've ever had, certainly in this last year. With the exception of some problems in AFRALO, which Tijani and I will be talking about, pretty well everyone else is involved in something. Whether it's the most important thing on our agenda or not is not always the case, but we have active people. We've never had such an active ALAC before, and we're active in places where we've explicitly never been active before, and that very much so is for Latin America. The Caribbean part of that RALO has always been quite active, but Latin America has not.

It makes a big difference. I'm happy where we are. We need to make some small tweaks and perhaps redirect or semi-direct people who need to focus more on issues that are more important to the ALAC, but overall we're in really good shape. I'm hoping the incoming ALAC, which is not that changed from the outgoing ALAC, will be equally vibrant. That

remains to be seen, but certainly I'm optimistic. Any brief comments before we go ahead?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Just to tell you that things in AFRALO are evolving a little bit. You have sure noticed that Sean and the new young Kenyan ALS, they are deeply involved in the transition. They are deeply involved in the discussion about the transition. I hope that in the future we'll have a better situation, but unfortunately, as you said, there is a big problem in our region. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I was specifically talking about the ALAC. The region itself is doing much better than it has in various other times. You have a Chair who has again one of these people who has more energy than I think they should, and you have a number of active people, and that's certainly a credit. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thanks Alan. With regards to LACRALO, I think there has been improvement but I think we've been punting the problems down the road. It's going to come to a head soon with regards to our process issues. The political factions within LACRALO are competing for positions so there are some things that still need to be really worked on. One of the key problems still is the lack of progress on the mailing list translation. I submitted the problem list to IT staff when I was LACRALO Secretariat.

I've been trying to follow up with every meeting to say, "What's the situation?" "What's the situation?" and it's like it's a very small side project for IT staff admin. It really needs to be solved because the LACRALO list, if you've been on it, it really is just terrible, so that really needs to be fixed properly. There's been quite a few people from the Caribbean, from the Fellowship and so on, and I'm going to try and see if we can get individuals onto the various ALAC At-Large Working Groups, just to tell them, "Hey, just come on because we can get involved."

ALAN GREENBERG:

Leon, I'm sorry you were gone at that point. Dev was identifying among other things the difficulties we're still having with translation in LACRALO lists. Staff will have an AI to try to push that forward with IT, but I ask you to take personal responsibility and sit on them, figuratively, and try to go forward and get a [unclear 02:41:00]. The political problems in LACRALO we are not likely to address. We have one year at this point with stable leadership, and let's see what we can try to accomplish in that one year. Yes, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. With regards to the automatic tool for the mailing list, I'm absolutely baffled how the tool seems to perform less well than Google Translate. I actually receive both lists. I happen to just try and learn a bit of Spanish this way, I guess. When I do a cut and paste into a Google Translate page I get text that actually means something, that is meaningful. When I actually read the automatic translation on the English mailing list it's nothing. It's incredible. It seems that it's actually some software that doesn't work.

Now, we've flagged this a number of times. Nothing has been done, it appears. I've not seen the tool change in four years. I think something has to be done, because what we're doing here is to really let down our communities. I must say, when I read just the English list in the LACRALO, it's totally useless. I would not say take the tool away, because at least it's something. If we take it away then basically what we're doing is, "It's not our problem," and that's not acceptable. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, I would ask you that you try to arrange a teleconference with Leon, Olivier, me and obviously staff, and someone in IT who would like to speak to the issue. Heidi wanted to speak and then Tijani.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Very briefly, I do acknowledge that this has been going on for several years, but I do take point that nothing has been done. IT staff have been working with LACRALO on that. It's not explicitly an IT-only issue, there's also the way that in the Spanish language the way the written language is produced, so long sentences, etcetera, versus shorter in English. They are working on that. I did bring this up to the new team under Ashwin, and there's a Liaison that we can work with. We can perhaps bring him on the call and work on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think an explicit call on this, instead of people working in quiet, is worthwhile. Olivier, you wanted to follow up directly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. The long sentences I understand might be a challenge, but why is the Google tool able to deal with that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Questions already asked. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. There is now a group on language. I don't know exactly the name. I'm on this group and it's about exactly these kinds of things – what doesn't work or what is working for the languages. I don't know why there's not someone from LACRALO, for example, who can... I wasn't aware of the automatic tool that Olivier speaks about. That's why I never raised the point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've got an answer to Tijani. A call was made, and I think that some people from LACRALO have moved forward for this. Certainly I was told that they volunteered for it, so it should have been followed.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Dev and then Ariel with a comment online, and then we'll close this one.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. There's been several emails on the Technology Taskforce list about it, where I've been trying to ask for status updates and so on. It might be helpful if you want to have a Technology Taskforce call with the IT persons, and hear the exact issues and maybe what resources or lack of are being put towards resolving the issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, modify that AI to invite any Technology Taskforce people who want to participate. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: We have a comment from Carlton Samuels: "OCL, you have hit the nail on the head. More than two years ago we suggested they adopt the Google Translation engine by talking to Google. This is key to the solution. Part of the problem is this [disparate 02:45:55] encoding schemes for Spanish language."

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The next Item I want to talk about is one we've already talked about a little bit. Please, let's not repeat the same things over again. It's ALS and ALAC participation. We've had a large focus over the last years in growing the number of ALSes. I think we want to quickly review what criteria we want, because right now we have very little, in terms of how do we qualify an ALS for joining. Right now, other than satisfying some administrative processes and being controlled by individual users. The only real criteria is they want to join, for whatever motivation.

I'm not predicting what the outcome. Maybe we end up with no changes, but I think we want to look at whether we want to impose any criteria for new ALSes, and then a separate issue is how do we integrate those back into the previous ones. That includes not only criteria for joining, but expectations that we have once they are joined. The RALOs have put a number of criteria in that are under their control to identify dormant ALSes. But I think we want to give them some more tools, and I believe that has to come from the ALAC, because that is essentially a bylaw-mandated requirement. So that will be proceeding in the near future. That may well be we drop a few ALSes. Hopefully not huge numbers of them.

The issue of how many active Members, Olivier, I understand that it's a wide range. It's the one where the number may be zero, which is particularly crucial to us. The ones where the number is one, and there are likely a significant number of those, maybe we have to gently redirect those into unaffiliated users, when and if we get that in all ALSes, we have it currently in three of the five ALSes, or maybe four. I think LACRALO may be the only one left. Is AFRALO talking about unaffiliated Members?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, we are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. You're not there yet but you're talking about it? We're down to one at this point. That should make life a little bit easier going forward, that we have a path for someone who's interested, who doesn't happen

to have 50 friends that are similarly interested. Nothing's a fait accompli, but that, combined with the initiative that Fadi was talking about, which may give more avenues for people to be active within ALSes, outside of the traditional ones that we've focused on, I think will put us in a good position. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. I think this is about two things – about criteria for certification and about metrics of involvement. In AFRALO we are working on both, and when it will be finished we will provide it to you, but I think this is something urgent that ALAC has to address.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just for the record I'll interject that I have talked to Cheryl. She understands the issue. She will not feel upset if we take some of these parts that are currently within the Metrics Task Force and pull them back into the ALAC. If that happens, it happens. I was supposed to have talked to Maureen about that before we had this meeting, but I didn't, and my apologies. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

As everyone knows here, I've probably been one of the people pushing back hardest on strict metrics, and yet I'm part of the region that was one of the first to decertify an ALS, so the two do not necessarily go hand-in-hand. My personal preference is simply a matter of philosophy; it's being very liberal in who to accept and very conservative in who to kick out. I'd prefer to err on that.

If an ALS wants to come in either because they want to be super sharp focused on only a single issue and remain silent on everything else, or even if they want to come in and simply have a better conduit to information coming out of ICANN, with the potential of possibly coming in, should they see fit, at the right moment, and otherwise they stay silent? I don't see that as a problem, and frankly I don't know why anyone does. Yes, we want to encourage active participation, yes, we do outreach, yes, we make it as easy as possible to participate invited, but if an ALS comes in and they stay on the periphery and they stay even minimally engaged, I would be very hesitant to try to think of ways to kick them out. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Evan, I really don't disagree with anything you just said here. Notice other than in mention to the name of a Working Group, which is cast in concrete at this point, I did not mention the word metrics. I mentioned the word criteria. How we enforce that criteria at some later date is an interesting discussion, but not the one I want to start with. First we want to ask ourselves what do we want from an ALS? If we have an ALS that takes information that we give them in palatable forms, and disseminates it to their mailing lists, I can't see anything other than saying, "That's what we're looking for."

If they don't happen to feed things back, that's a different issue, but it doesn't disqualify them. So we're not disagreeing about it. It really is a matter of first deciding what we want from ALSes, which we've never had this discussion, and then we can decide on enforcement, which is not a word I particularly like. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am not afraid of the word “metrics”. Metrics doesn’t mean punishment, doesn’t mean anything. It means that each region can define what the meaning of involvement is. They put it clearly. We need references. If we don’t have references, that means that we don’t have anything. That’s all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, and I don’t think any of us are afraid of them. We need to approach it with appropriate caution, and some of it may well be RALOs, some may be set by the ALAC. Again, we have to stand behind the ALSes that we have and be able to talk about them without people whispering. It’s a combined problem. Any other comments on this subject before we go on? Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just an update regarding LACRALO, there is keen interest of metrics, but we do look to get rid of those ALSes that aren’t participating or are only participating by voting for positions. With regards to individuals, there’s been very negative pushback on the concept of having unaffiliated or individual users within a RALO. It’s within Latin America at least, not so much from Caribbean ALSes. Still lots of things to work on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Dev. Any other comments before we go on?

SPEAKER: We should be looking at forming or constituting the Active ALS User Association as an ALS.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev did mention something that we've talked about before, and it's come up in a number of RALOs. That's the concept of a RALO often ostensibly a one-person RALO in that they're an organization with multiple people, but only one person every shows his or her head, and their only participation is voting and putting their name up for positions, but no actual involvement other than that. That's common I think among many of the RALOs, if not all. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Putting the hand up when it comes to things like travel and other little perks is perhaps when it's most obnoxious.

ALAN GREENBERG: NARALO for instance has, as a major criteria, voting. I would like to campaign that that one be taken out, because just voting on the very few votes we have, which usually involve picking people and therefore your friends, is probably not the most productive way to identify an active ALS. Okay, next subject is one that I'm sure we'll have just a little bit of discussion on, and that's meeting effectiveness. I'm talking about both face-to-face meetings and teleconferences. Let me make a couple of comments there. I don't think there are many people who do not have some level of frustration.

Not to pick on Olivier, but it's not just about how the meetings are run, it's the frustration that the meeting runners have on a whole bunch of things. You've already given me a lesson of that in the first two hours, so I'm starting to learn some of the issues. I think we need to make sure that in all cases we make effective use of people's time. To ask people to take time out of their job or their private life, we have to make sure that at least on that aspect of their life that we're using it effectively. I have some ideas on how to do this. Spending eight years on the gNSO and about 120-something Council Meetings, has taught me a fair amount.

I've had five Chairs that I've worked with, each of which has had different styles but each of which has managed to effect some good meetings, some better than others. But nevertheless, I've learnt a little bit in that environment. On Working Groups on the other hand, I've watched essentially horrible Chairs, so I've learnt lessons in both directions. Hopefully I'll be able to apply some of them reasonably. I ask you to give me feedback when I'm not. I have no monopoly on the right ideas, and I'm sure I'll make my share of mistakes. I prefer this privately, instead of having open discussions about it, which take time in meetings, which is probably not effective use of time. But I'm open to opinions and I'd like to go forward.

There has been some talk about the ALAC teleconferences. I have no intention of changing the scheduled time at this point, but if we get to the point where we're not using that time on a regular basis then it will be changed. As I look, by the way, over the gNSO Meetings, you'll notice I said 120 meetings. That's over eight years. A little bit under eight years actually, which averages 15 meetings per year. There was a period

of time where they met every two weeks, a period of time when they met every three weeks. The workload was heavy and people did it. The meetings were scheduled well in advance.

One of the things I'd like to try, and Olivier has already warned me that it won't work, but I don't believe we've tried it in a very long time, is to try rotating times. If we can find times – again, I don't mean to use the gNSO as a bible but lots of experience there of trying to set a window so nobody is meeting between midnight and 5:00 am or something – I tell you, they don't always do it. Although we haven't had many people from Australia, the ones who typically have been worst off are those from the US. I attend meetings at 6:00 am, which I don't like, but I can do it.

It's 3:00 am for the people here, including some of the staff members, and gNSO has a fair number of people from the West Coast. So they certainly didn't do it perfectly, but at least try and spread the pain around. I'll be working with staff to try and see if we can find something like that. I think it's best to do it on the same day and rotate around. We'll do a bunch of Doodles and try to find something that will work. It may well be it doesn't, but it's been a lot of years since we tried, so I think it's time to try again.

In terms of managing the meetings themselves – and if I didn't already have this one on my list then it would have been after this meeting – we need to become somewhat more disciplined in handling speaker orders and things like that. I'm not going to go into details right now. I think I will try to follow best practice of speaker orders, but with the exception that when we're on a particular topic we may want to violate that

speaker order to get rebuttals in and things like that, so we don't lose the thread. But that's a pushdown list that could end up never getting back to the original subject, if we're not careful.

I will be encouraging people to say what they need to say, but not say it four times and not have side conversations during meetings. If you need to finish it, then finish it. It's frustrating to people when they think they have asked to speak and 14 other people speak behind them. I'll try to keep the group alert to what the speaker list is. Obviously if we're using AC it's relatively obvious, although going around the list when we want to keep on the same topic gets a little bit complex. I'm practicing writing notes to myself as we go ahead. Not repeating what you said five times for emphasis, and not just speaking to say, "I agree with John."

I think we can get better than we are. To be honest, we're much better than some Working Groups I'm on, so we're not starting off at a really low position, but I think we need to get somewhat better at it. Just for the record, I intend to – I see Olivier and Holly – when I plan to speak, other than a very quick one sentence or something, I'll put myself in the speaker list as opposed to simply taking the Chair's prerogative and speaking. We have Olivier, Holly and Tijani.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I must say I absolutely agree with your points, so thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I'm going to repeat my suggestions made many times. I think if we can do a consent agenda, not necessarily changing the agenda but...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to interrupt you. Done. Just as a side, the gNSO has implemented a consent agenda. There's rarely anything on it, but to the extent that there will be, yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You spoke about two calls a month or sometimes even one call a week. Yes, you remember very well that in the JUS Working Group we did that, and it worked very well. We stick to the one-hour call when we decide it's one hour. We stick to 90 minutes when it's 90 minutes. This is what we have to do I think. I think if in the future we manage to do that, we'll be very efficient and very effective, but for me, efficient means effective and with other things. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: My commitment, poorly demonstrated in this meeting, is to try to keep to agendas, and more important than keeping to agendas, keeping to the overall envelope time. Some issues will run over. That's inevitable. You don't want to stifle an active, productive discussion just because you're over. You have to compensate by either shortening other items or deferring them to a future meeting or something like that. Noted. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think there's an AI on all of us to also control what we say and the length of what we say, because many times the reason a meeting goes on is because we go on far longer than we need to. If you as Chair say, "Excuse me, you've said that," I think we all have to take that in exactly the spirit it's meant, which is all of us want to keep the meeting only as long as it needs be. You may have an unpopular job, but I personally will welcome it if you say, "Look, thank you, let's move on," and we all listen carefully and go, "By the way, that's a very polite way of saying, "Would you just please stop saying that four times?"

ALAN GREENBERG:

To the extent that I can control myself, of which your discussion on consent agenda was not the best example, I will do my best to not interrupt people but talk to them after the fact and try to point out that it would be better if they didn't do that on a regular basis. Sometimes you have to interrupt and I'll try to do it in a genteel way. On the facilitation discussion that was during the leadership training, there was an explicit session on how you do this – how you interrupt people, how you curtail things.

The standard method, which works better on a one-on-one conversation than in a teleconference is to interrupt people and play back to them what they said in a concise matter and say, "is this what you're saying?" but that doesn't work as well in this kind of environment. It can be used on occasion. The next issue is staff. We are continually saying in various ways, and I believe Carlton had a submission that we didn't have time to hear, but I asked him to send it in email, on use of staff and what skills staff should have. There have been a number of private discussions at

this meeting on the lack of staff and staff resources in a number of areas.

The remarks were made at a senior level, and they don't get any more senior than Steve and Fadi. They were put in a somewhat embarrassing position in one of the meetings, where various stakeholders said, "Staffing is a problem," and he asked, "Why didn't you ask?" and the answer was, "We did." I'm talking quite candidly here. The answer goes up the chain, and essentially for all intents and purposes, GSE has been the focus of this operation, and growing the international offices and policy staff has not grown substantially in the last little while. The messages that were sent this last week, if nothing else, may have some effect.

Again, I'm not a dreamer, and it remains to be seen. Part of the way that if we are going to get more staff, it's going to be because we document exactly what it is that we want done, in a coherent way that makes some sense and is sailable. Simply throwing a temper tantrum and saying, "We need more people," and even saying, "Our people are overloaded and they work n hours a week and n hours a day," is probably not going to do it. I think we have to be more specific. I'd like to finish the overall staff discussion and then I'll take questions or comments.

The second component of it is using staff effectively. I'll tell you the example that triggered my adding this to the list. One morning I got up and I found about 50 messages in my inbox that one of the staff people had been deleting files from Wiki pages. Over the next hour and a half I got another 60 or 70 messages. That person spent a cumulative almost

2.5 hours deleting files. I asked her why, and the answer that basically came back was, “When we copied agenda pages from one meeting to the next, any attachments get copied over.

“No one told us we had to delete them, so by the time you get to the 12th meeting it has all the attachments that all the previous meetings had in it.” IT was starting to complain about the amount of space that was used, so they had to go through and do it. Of course, because there’s no way to turn off a flag saying, “Notify every user,” everyone gets notified that they’re deleting these files one-by-one over a two-hour period. Hopefully that’s a one-time effort. Once we clean up all the pages we’re now smart enough to clean them up one-by-one as they’re created, but it sent a message.

One of the things is IT staff told our support staff, “You have to delete all of these files.” IT staff, I’m sure, I have absolutely no doubt, could have written a short little procedure, command as it were, app, to delete all of the old files on any page, or any set of page, and that could have been done in a one to two-minute interaction. It probably could have suppressed the notifications too. I’m not sure. But instead it became a manual operation that will be done again and again in one form or another. Clearly at this point to create a new agenda we need to copy and delete all the files, but that’s a manual operation. So I think we want to look at effectiveness.

That’s going to need feedback from staff. When you feel you're doing something that is boring, repetitive, that kind of thing, tell us. Whether we can fix it or not, whether IT can fix it or not, I don’t know, but if you don’t mention it then you’re going to continue wasting time that

shouldn't be wasted. Now, I'm not saying all of time is like that, but there's a fair amount of it. We do a huge amount of Wiki space maintenance and creation of pages and things like that. Again, you see all the notices. If we can figure out ways to automate that, to make it smoother, then I'm sure we can save a modest amount of time.

It's not going to save Heidi's time, but it's going to save a lot of people's time, and these are real resources we can deploy other ways. I think we all need to do this more intelligently. I want to make sure all of the people we have working for us and staff, who are all unbelievably dedicated, don't feel disenfranchised and disempowered to help control things, to make their things easier. In past lives, and in hundreds of management books, it points out that if you want to make processes better, talk to the people who actually do them instead of six manager levels up trying to fix them.

I've had my speech, my piece. I see Leon? Okay. Holly? We have Holly and Evan, in that order. Anyone else?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think we should ask staff how we can better use their time, instead of, "Are you doing stuff that is not productive?" is there something that we should be doing? If we have x amount of staff, and from what I've heard from Fadi on down, resources are stretched. What is it that we ask them to do that is something we could do just as easily and probably should do, and what's duplicating effort? All those kinds of things. I think it's worthwhile sitting down and saying, "What are the most important things you do for us?" "What are the most important thing we need?" and maybe it's a small team that can do that, but I don't think we're

going to get a lot more resources. Can we be effective in what we've got?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just to make it clear when I say "we", that's including the volunteers also, because we do have things that volunteers could better do that we ask staff to do, and I suspect vice versa. This is a joint effort. It's got to be done without pointing fingers. It's really a matter of how we can work more effectively as a group overall. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I have three points. Number one, on the issue of deleting files, as a somewhat frequent user of Confluence I would not put anything up as "of course this can be automated". It's totally possible that in Confluence it has to be manual. It's possible, I hope it can be scripted, but it wouldn't surprise me if it couldn't be. On staff resources, two parting shots. Number one, Ariel, what you're doing with the social media stuff, keep on doing it. It was a phenomenal initiative. It's really important. Keep on doing it. Heidi, you make sure she's got the resources and the time to be able to do it. It's really important. It's going to be increasingly important, and it's been a fantastic initiative, probably unlike anything else in ICANN.

If there is any extra available resources, personally my preference would be to see them put into research. The ability to take some of the stuff we do and to be able to put in some hard research, do some investigation and say, "A study was done that..." That helps back up something that we advance to the Board, or the gNSO or elsewhere.

That allows us to take stuff and not just say, “We’re At-Large, we’ve gone to our grass roots and this is what we think is the case.”

If there’s anything we can do and if there’s staff resources that can help us go through the various libraries that are out there or whatever, it’s slogging work, it’s academic work, but I think it can really go a long way to help give what we do a bit more “oomph!” than, “This is 15 ALAC Members and x number of ALSes,” or whatever. If we actually have some research that can back up what we say... I have this gut feeling that it exists out there, but we just don’t, as volunteers, have the cycle to do it. If I had any recommendation and there were extra staff, I would ask – and it need not be a part-time job, it could be an assignment – but I think one of the biggest needs staff could do is helping us slog through the research at a purely policy level.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Evan. I’d really like to focus on the concept, not the individual tasks right now. We’re very limited in time, but yes. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Will you be re-opening the conference comments to the public without needing to log in? That was put there when we were under spam attack. The idea – and I forgot to do that before finishing with my term – was to re-open it at some point.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will let you reassume your position of Chair for just that activity, if you’d like. Yes, I think we should re-open and judge again whether we

have a problem or not. I have one comment and then we have Heidi and Dev. One of the things that has been mentioned is using staff to do more writing. Many years ago that was stopped because there was a strong feeling in the then ALAC that if staff were to write things, staff would decide the content and the direction that volunteers were taking. I have observed enough writing without that problem, in the gNSO and in other Working Groups, and I have a great amount of confidence in our staff.

Several of our staff members have CVs that say they can do it in their sleep, and I'd like to go in that direction. Again, I don't want to have that discussion now, but if any of you feel that's a dangerous direction to take, I'd like to hear about it. We have Heidi and then Tijani.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Alan. I do very much welcome this discussion. I've been waiting some time for it, so I'm happy that it's now a bi-directional. I do welcome the idea also of having this be a group effort between staff, the community, and the ALT. Just one response to Evan's comments – we do all thank Ariel for the social media, but I do need to point out that it's not the staff that are leading that. That is a fantastic Social Media Working Group that's doing that work, with Ariel.

Again, the focus here is that it's the Working Groups, it's the community, that need to lead some of the activities, and it's staff with the talent and the skills for that can obviously support them, but we all have core duties as well. Just a comment on that. On Evan's other comment about research, we have 16 or 17 Working Groups with people there. Another policy person that would be able to do that, that would be

really useful as well. Bring it back to the community as well. Get those people engaged who have that expertise within the At-Large community, who are in those Working Groups.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, you remember for the JUS Working Group, the first phase we were drafting ourselves the Report. For the second phase we asked for staff to help, and they helped very well. I don't feel that if staff helped in the drafting they would bias our point of view. If they do, that means that we don't know what we want. I have two very good experiences – the JUS Working Group and the Working Group on Meeting Strategy. The staff helped in the drafting and they didn't influence our point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, I prefer not to talk about substance, unless anyone here has an objection to investigating this? Okay, anything else on staff...?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you clarify investigating this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Talking about it a little bit more. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Just to respond regarding the Wiki organization and the tedium or maintaining it, this is something that's of concern to me as well. [unclear 03:21:39] Technology Taskforce, to try to get it standardized on the way it competes for the various things that we have on the side, so you minimize copying and pasting and try to eliminate that minutia of trying to sort it all out every now and then.

ALAN GREENBERG: The expression I used was "death by Wiki" and we're coming close. Anything else on staff? I've now changed the term to staff and volunteers. Okay, done. ALAC statements. This I guess is vis-à-vis Evan's question to David yesterday, I think it was yesterday, on, "Do you want more statements or do you want better statements?" David was very politically astute and as a senior staff person he certainly cannot tell us what to do. He walked that line very carefully. As the Chair of ALAC I can tell you what I think we should be doing.

I think we should be going for whenever possible not submitting any statement, unless it's top-rate. That likely means on the things that we have very little to say and very little to contribute, we don't bother contributing. It's hard enough finding people to write the important statements, and I think we need to go a little bit in that direction. That's a judgment call and it's going to always be a judgment call. There are times for instance when we have absolutely nothing to say, but we're afraid other people are going to be saying the opposite – that we agree with a recommendation, but we think people are going to shoot it down.

That's a good time we need to support it, even though we don't have anything substantive to add. That doesn't happen all that often. That's

the direction I'd like to go in. I don't have a lot more words. As we make decisions going forward, we need to remember it and try to use our judgment to do that. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. How do you gauge what the response is elsewhere? Do you wait until the first public comments appear in the forum? How do you know whether there may be serious opposition or no opposition?

ALAN GREENBERG: Partly it's that in some cases it's really intuitively obvious. I'll give a recent example. There was no way that the Commercial Stakeholders Group was not going to object to being lowered from four delegates to the NomCom to one. There is no world where they'd say, "Yes, that makes sense, disenfranchise us." Yet we said we support it. That's an example. There are cases with regard to registrar issues in the past. Maybe we're getting into a different world where everyone works together, but certainly in the past there have been issues like that. You don't know them all, and we might be taken by surprise on occasion, but it's really not all that surprising sometimes.

Anyone else? We're going to make mistakes. Occasionally we'll comment when we didn't have to, and every once in a while we'll decide not to comment and after the fact say, "Oh dear." That's life. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. With regards to policy making and whether we need to be doing better statements or more statements, I think that goes in line

with one comment that Evan just put on the Wiki regarding the draft statement that we did on geographic names. It reads – and correct me if I’m wrong – whether we’re doing a statement or a comment or what we’re doing in that text. Maybe that’s like our departure point to find out whether we should be doing comments, advice, policy, or what we should be doing. My aim is that, since this is a call for comments, there should be only a comment and not a statement, but then that’s on the table to discuss, for all of us.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes Evan, very quickly. We’re down to four minutes and I have two more Items.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I know, because I can hear Godzilla coming. What Leon’s talking about basically this is a comment to a GAC statement that includes advice. That’s why I’m saying depending on the target audience, it could be construed... We send it to the GAC, “Well, you can’t advice us, we’re the GAC.” They’re not subject to it. But if this is advice to the Board, resulting to comments from something from the GAC, there’s a subtle change in the wording of it. My answer was I agree totally with the substance, but depending on the target audience it has to be worded slightly differently.

This was a comment that embedded in it including advice to the Board. Well, is this two separate statements? Is this a reply and an advice letter? I’m just saying that was the confusion on the document.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. I will add one very brief comment to that, and that's that as we make comments the process that we've gone through in a number of times in the last few weeks or last few months, where we've had substantive discussion – not only substantive discussion but discussion that yielded changes of opinions, which is what this is all about, coming to a common view if we can – has been very productive. On the other hand, we had a very substantive and very long discussion on how we should do voting for ALSes.

That amounted to – and I count – 85 emails talking about a very, very edge case. We need to focus on where we need the involvement. That one probably should have been deferred to a face-to-face meeting, if we'd have been wise. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Was there consensus on this discussion?

ALAN GREENBERG: There was almost consensus. I'm not 100 per cent sure, but we do have a question to ask and a vote. I think I know which way the vote will go so I think there was consensus, but there was still a strong but probably relatively strong vocal minority. I'm not sure. I haven't bothered asking people here. I know at least one or two other people changed their minds. The next one is one we'll not discuss in a lot of detail, but there will be a lot of one-on-one discussions. That's the involvement of ALT, and perhaps others in the ALAC, or the non-ALAC, Evan, to take responsibilities for particular things and not only Chairing Working Groups.

I have no intention of attending every possible meeting, as Olivier generally did, unless he was traveling – and even then he often did it. On the other hand, I have no intention of being disconnected from what’s going on. I’m going to rely on people to monitor certain aspects of what’s going on and then feed back to the ALT or to me. We’ll decide on the details. The same thing with some responsibilities – I plan to delegate to a much larger extent, essentially in-line with what we have in our Rules of Procedure, that came in halfway through Olivier’s term.

In all fairness to him it was not something that was easy to turn on a dime, but to the extent possible we’re going to try to give our responsibilities so things don’t rest completely on the Chair, and more important, other people are in a position to know what’s going on. I’m not going to be in this Chair position forever, and it would be nice if we had one or two alternatives when the time comes for me to leave. More discussion on that, not right now.

The second thing is on what I titled “Culture”. By the way, I’ll be sending out this note to everyone with some changes in it based on today’s discussion. The ALT Members already saw it. Others did not, but the last one I titled “Culture”. We have moved from a group that was supposed to be working by consensus whenever possible to a group that is voting a huge number of times. I’d like to try to move back in the other direction. There are some bylaw-related issues and some other things, but I’m going to try.

There’s also a tendency that we’ve seen, both in ALAC and in some RALOs, that every position must be contended. We must have formal elections, and our elections, as we know, are not necessarily the most

effective way of finding the best person. That doesn't say a lot for democracy but I've got to be candid. I'm not talking about any elections I've participated in. This is not sour grapes. We have a problem. LACRALO is certainly evidence to part of that, but it's not unique to LACRALO, or NARALO, which is another area where this has happened.

We have to try to move back. The opposite side of that is if we decide on everything collegially, we're accused of only appointing insiders to every position, and we need to start developing the culture that if you want to take office, if you want to hold positions, you have to start contributing in non-officer roles first, and volunteer more. That message needs to get out. The first time we see your name should not be when you're volunteering to sit on an AC representing the ALAC, when you've never been in an ALAC Meeting and never talked to ALAC Members.

That's a culture issue. I'm not quit sure how to proceed, but it's a direction that we're going to go in, and it's going to take a fair amount of discussion. The ALT Meetings we hold... A lot of these things I've said need discussion. I hope to be able to focus on many of these on ALT Meetings, without having a two-hour meeting every week, although we may be close to that to begin with. I have no doubt you will catch me at trying to make every decision myself on some of these directions. It really has to be something the group is behind.

I feel very strongly that we have a five-member Leadership Team, and the Liaisons, that need to each pull their weight. For the record, as some of you may have already noticed, several years ago –and we've determined purely by accident – the Liaisons were omitted, were taken off the ALT Skype chat. None of us had enough nerve to ask why, so

we've remained off. Some of the Liaisons are new that didn't know there was a history. Just like the Liaisons are part of ALT Meetings, including confidential parts, they are part of the Skype chat now that goes on continually. At least it used to, when I last was on it. That I believe is now fixed.

I'm done. We are five minutes over the half-hour extension. Is there anything else that anyone feels compelled to say? Carlton has a comment? Can you read Carlton's comment?

ARIEL LIANG:

Carlton Samuels said, "I want it noted for the record I strongly support Alan's comments, beginning at 1:33 pm local, 11:33 am PDT."

ALAN GREENBERG:

That was the culture. I think we were on culture at that point. Carlton, if we weren't on culture and I got it wrong, let us know, but I think that's where we were at that moment. We're done! Although I'm told there are some other things we have to do before we leave the room. Those of you who are leaving soon, or not leaving soon anyway, safe travels. We will be in touch, far more than you probably wanted to when you volunteered for the position. For those of you leaving, we're not going to let you leave completely. We're going to try to not let you leave completely.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]