

---

TORONTO – ALAC & Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Meeting II  
Friday, October 19, 2012 – 08:00 to 10:00  
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're still awaiting a few more people, so the one minute mark was a little premature I gather. Perhaps about five minutes. And for Julie and Siranush, if you can hear me, we're still waiting for a couple of people to turn up.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And the good news is that we can hear you very well, so that's great.

JULIE HAMMER: Excellent.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so it's a quarter past – start the recording please.

MATT ASHTIANI: It's Friday, October 19<sup>th</sup>, the time is 8:14 a.m. and we are now recording and live.

---

*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.*

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Good morning everybody. This is the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap-up meeting Part Two. This is a new feature actually because we usually had just one wrap-up, but because we were always so pressed for time, and because maybe we had a few more things to discuss we decided to cut into two parts. So now we've got part two.

Our agenda today is extensive again, and we're going to speak primarily with our liaisons. The first person who will be speaking to us will be Alan Greenberg, then we'll have Edmon Chung, then Sebastien Bachollet will come from next door; he has a meeting just close by. He'll come down here and speak to us about what he's been doing over the week. And then we'll continue with our liaisons with Cheryl Langdon-Orr and finally with Julie Hammer who is currently, you can see her on the Adobe, she is listening to us remotely. Good morning Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Good morning Olivier and everyone, hope it's been a good meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic thanks. Well we'll speak to you in about an hour and a half or so, but first I guess we can start with Alan Greenberg. And really the purpose of this meeting is to provide a little more insight into what the work of a liaison is. I know that we see them running in and out of the room but we never really know – they give us this five minute update usually in the wrap-up.

I thought this time it would be better to give them a little bit more time, and not only that, but also in explaining what a liaison does and not just



---

running between rooms and between meetings but also the sort of relationship etc that you have to forge across the community.

ALAN GREENBERG: Keep talking while I find my paper.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So now I have to fill in because our first liaison is missing his paperwork, but I see Evan having put his hand up, so Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: If – this is Evan – if you wish I can fill the gap by giving a very brief report on the NCSG liaison.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes go ahead Evan, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: This is a somewhat more minor role than the others because Alan speaks to the whole GNSO Council whereas my liaison role is with the NCSG, which is only a part of the GNSO; it's the non-commercial constituencies which comprise the non-commercial user constituency, NCUC, and the non-profit organization constituency, the NPOC.

There were two activities that we had each week with them both of which I think were extremely productive, together with the NCUC, actually with the entire NCSG. We drafted a joint statement on the URS issue that Olivier and NCSG Chair Robin Gross presented yesterday at



---

the public forum. That kind of collaboration I think is extremely useful, helps to really put forward the point that when we're coming out with a statement that we have multi-constituency support I think it gives us just that much more leverage as we try and make our points in front of the ICANN Board and the rest of the community.

So that was a very nice piece of work. There was a number of collaborators on this both the people behind the scenes and everyone working on the text and Olivier and Robin for delivering it. Previously earlier in the week Rinalia, Jean-Jacques and myself made a presentation about the R3 paper at a session that was organized by the NPOC. And that was about a larger, the exact kind of larger conversation about the multi stakeholder model, both within and outside the ICANN context.

I think it was very well received. I'd invite Jean-Jacques and Rinalia to comment if you like. I was very happy with the way it went. It was a good diversity of opinions. And just as we wanted it's starting to bring the conversation outside ICANN on how to really enhance the model, compare it against what's being done outside of ICANN, and to try and improve things. Alan, are you ready? So that's just enough time for my report. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Evan. And in fact Jean-Jacques, while you were speaking, Jean-Jacques also reminded me of a meeting which he was sent to attend in my place. And I thought it would be good for him give us just a few words about this and then we'll go directly over to Alan. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.



---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good morning. Jean-Jacque – oh there’s no transcription so I don’t need to go through the ceremonial is there?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is a transcript Jean-Jacques. There’s no interpretation, that’s all.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Well in that case I will have to abandon my French accent. So the meeting Olivier sent me to was a meeting of the Structural Improvements Committee at the behest of Bertrand de la Chappelle who wanted to get together all of the AC and SO Chairs in order to think about the possible impact of the wave on new gTLDs on the structures of ICANN.

He started out by saying that there were two purposes, one was how to continue to conduct this discussion in the coming months, between now and Beijing roughly. And the second point was how do you articulate this with the whole set of reviews with which ICANN is plagued. He didn’t say plagued, I’m adding that. So just a few points which I found really interesting.

First it’s that the number of people who talked all spoke of the requirement of balance. And this was an indirect way of underlining the lack of balance which exists today between the various ACs and SOs; the definition of roles but also the methods in which we try to impact the overall ICANN picture.



On behalf of Olivier I made the remark that our contribution was older than the initiative by Bertrand; in other words the R3 paper was not in response to his request which was about a month ago which was much older; ours was much older and much broader.

It was not addressed specifically at the consequences of the gTLD program. Jeff Neuman from the GNSO insisted very much, and he was followed by several others on the importance of trying to translate all this into operational impact and not only structural. Because as he said, and I think most people agree that a structure will only take care of things for a certain time. And with many more people wanting to come in to fit into various constituencies, there will be a time when this is no longer possible.

So that's where the announcement by Fadi Chehade was referred to again. Because his proposal to create alliances as it were on specific subjects as they come along was very much appreciated. Another word which was mentioned several times is the necessary resiliency. And the answer from the Board members was that this will not be conducted by the Board as a matter of urgency. It has to be a deliberate, progressive way forward. And it fits into the strategic planning.

So finally with his usual talent Bertram tried to sum up the session by using just key words or catch words. I'll give them to you straight off like that – balance, evolution, taxonomy, resiliency, we have time, consensus, structure and process and mind set, systemic – just a word here because most people agreed at the end it was a systemic problem. We're not in here to put a patch on a broken tire or something, it's a system problem.



---

IDNs and compliance. So this is pretty patchy, but I think it gives you an idea of how far ranging the discussion was. Also what I found encouraging was that people were not stuck with their short term views, they were willing to look way beyond and to address the systemic dysfunctions. Thanks.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much for this report Jean-Jacques, very encouraging indeed that people looked at the broader view rather than just what happens tomorrow. Okay so I think that now we can – Alan are you ready? Fantastic, so now we'll have Alan Greenberg who is our GNSO liaison and he's going to be speaking to us about what happened in his life this week, or his world. Well his life – no he probably did not have a life this week, so just his word. Alan, it's over to you.

**ALAN GREENBERG:** I most certainly did not have a life this week. I'll talk for a minute or two first on my view, and this may not be universally held, but my view of what a liaison must do. And I think the very first thing is, and exactly how that is done will depend on the person, the situation, the group they're going to, is to, as much as possible, be considered a member of the group they're going to.

Now the rules change. For instance a liaison to SSAC is formally an SSAC member. Liaison to the GNSO is not. The Bylaws are very explicit. I am not a Council Member, but I sit in the council room. And with the exception of, they used to use the code word that they do not vote, but the prescription of what you can do is a little bit larger than that. I also



---

can't make a motion, and that's a very significant difference. Because making a motion essentially forces council to discuss something and I don't have that ability.

So you really want to be considered as much as possible in peoples' minds a Council Member. You have no vote. You have no ability to direct the discussion; all you can have is your ideas. And the target is to be reasonably respected. And in general, that has not been a hard thing in the GNSO. We've gone through a succession of Chairs who have generally understood that as a new Chair comes in, it's sometimes a bit problematic for a while.

But overall I think my experience has been, with a few suggestions that stick out like sore thumbs or sore some things, I think it's effective. Now clearly there are some people who have taken the position over the years that a liaison must only give positions that are formally adopted by the ALAC. That is you are not empowered to speak on your own. I would suggest that if that's all the ALAC liaison would do on the GNSO, an email program would work.

We make very few statements that are known ahead of time, and I view my function as far wider than that. I view my functions as being a contributor to the discussion. To the extent possible, if an ALAC position is known, it will certainly be relayed and labeled as such. I don't know how many times I've done that over the years I've represented eh ALAC there. It's a small number, and usually on some very controversial issue.

Most of the time I'm speaking ad lib, most of the time what I intervene would probably be agreed to be the majority of the ALAC if the question





---

ever came to the ALAC, but it won't. Because there's a lot of brainstorming, there's a lot of countering arguments that someone else makes often without the same world view as I have. And that's the largest function of course. The second half of the function is carrying things back, alerting ALAC and At-Large when there are issues that must be discussed, simply keeping people up to date on things which you don't have any real power to change but you need to know about, and of course there's also different flavors of those.

The other part that I view as part of my job, and I guess this might vary, is even when I was on the ALAC and on the ExCom as a vice-Chair, I view part of my responsibility is to get involved in GNSO activities. I'm not going to sit on every working group because there's many, many, so you pick and choose ones that may have a user aspect to it or simply are interesting.

The workload ends up getting real heavy, but I think that's the way you become part of that group and it's important to do that. And I know people who have been around this table for a while have very often seen me take a position which might not be my personal position, but trying to explain the position of registries or registrars or the intellectual property community or something like that. Because it's important to understand where they're coming from and that's the only way you can help move forward with policy that may be acceptable from a user perspective and also tend to meet the targets.

I think you've heard me and other people speak about the STI effort which came up with the URS and the Clearinghouse. And I personally have never seen in an activity in ICANN quite like that, because people



came in with very, very different positions and left with something which was generally acceptable to all, and developed a bunch of friendships along the way. Part of it was, and I hate to say it but I know it's a significant part, was the Board gave a very short time and a threat.

Threats are helpful because you don't dare not do anything and simply stand by your original positions. Because if you can't come up with something you all agree with the Board may do something and do we trust them, do we trust them to understand the issues enough to do something that would be as wise as we could if we were going to do it ourselves. I suppose it doesn't always work.

Now I will say that the reorganization of council was done with a similar timeframe and a similar threat and what came out of it was a disaster. If any of you were present at the open forum yesterday you heard Wendy's comment, which said "blow it up, start all over again." Now Wendy likes to take dramatic positions like that, but there is some truth in it. The current organization has caused less cooperation, more rifts, a far more complex process, a process that occasionally ends up with completely unreasonable answers.

For instance, if there right now seven people on the contracted house, six from registrars-registries and one liaison, and 13 on the non-contracted, six, six plus one. If one whole stakeholder group and their NomCom appointee were to vote against something, everyone else in the room votes for. So one whole stakeholder group says unanimous, the other one says everyone accept the whole other stakeholder group but not their companion on.



If what you're looking for is a simple majority you haven't got it. You have close to 73% of the people in the room voting for something, it's not a majority because a majority is defined as a majority of both houses. It's changeable if anyone had the will. But we've ended up with situations where the vast majority of people wanted something and it doesn't happen.

So the new structure, what came allowed the group to reach compromise in the timeframe, but it was far from an optimal answer. And the reason was that people who had to come to a unanimous, essentially a unanimous agreement, because that's what was decided was needed, were not going to give up power that they had to the extent that they had any control.

The business related groups gave up power because the Board had now made it clear that whatever came out of it, commercial and non-commercial had to be equal weight. That was a significant change from the previous council. But the net result was not a good idea; I'll put it bluntly. Similarly working groups right now are not a good idea. They solve the problem of task forces in that task forces had forced representation of the groups that were involved, but that's it. Including the liaison if the liaison chose to participate.

Working groups are open to all, but that allows a party with a lot of skin in the game to put a lot of people on that group. The people who don't have skin in the game may not, and then it becomes a shouting match of who has more speaking rights, who can try to veto decisions. And you end up inevitably with lowest common denominator output, not a lot of change.



---

So there are problems with the GNSO. How to solve it is not clear. Putting the same people in a room again I don't think is the right answer. And that's akin to Wendy's blow it up. It's got to be rethought in a different way. And from our point of view, very particularly, at the last go around I pushed very, very hard and I think the ALAC did, in its formal statements but I'd have to go back and check, that the non-contracted house talk about users not registrants.

And the message that came back from the Boards' governance committee at the time, now the SIC, was "sorry registrants, this is the GNSO. We're only talking about registrants." And that – I think the organization, and certainly the thing Fadi is saying, understands now that there are the billion and a half users, or whatever the number is this week, are impacted by the decisions and really need a real voice at the table, not just someone meekly from the corners calling for "hey think of the users."

Now that doesn't mean that person wins the arguments. This is still a large organization and people have different views, but it's got to be presented with an equal power I believe. So we'll see where that goes. This week, unbelievably busy week. The weekends have been evolving. They went to, over the last couple of meetings, almost all reporting from ICANN staff and people got really frustrated.

These are things that largely we can read the reports, you can get your updates different ways. So it was moved this time to largely discussion; very much a discussion of the issues which would be coming up in council, which was absolutely crucial. There was a very productive discussion on the consumer metrics position. And as – sorry?



---

FEMALE: I was saying it's very productive it's just that in the end the vote was so bad on metrics.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. No, this was the advice of the computer metrics group.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: By the way Holly introduce yourself for the transcript when you're talking. We're still be transcribed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that was Holly speaking. No, Jeff Neuman from Neustar had raised the issue that some of the metrics were segregated for essentially commercial TLDs and separated private, but some of them were not. And to put a rationale about why we are using and why you should use dot Neustar when dot Neustar is only going to be used as an internal one. What it does is it since there's going to be hundreds of these such TLDs, it lowers the average metrics.

So you're guaranteeing that the results will not look very good. I mean I'm shortening a long conversation. And that was on consideration the council agreed that's a problem. The working group, at least the people in the room agreed that's a problem. It's not a fault of the group in that no one knew what the split was going to be at the time they had to come up with her report.



---

And I'm giving you this as an example, I'm going into it some depth because it shows the level of collaboration. What they were planning to do, the GNSO has a rule that you can defer a motion, and the motion was on the table for this meeting. And you can defer a motion essentially because you're not prepared for one reason or another. You don't have to justify; it's not voted on, it just happens.

But you can only defer a motion once, or Council can only defer a motion once. They were planning to defer the motion and bring it up in the next GNSO meeting. That would set up an impossible situation where there's a good chance it could get voted down. Because the group would have to rework, get it published in time for the next Council. Almost surely it would come in way too late for the stakeholder groups to consider it.

So it was on my suggestion that they withdrew the motion, we'll bring it back at a future meeting, probably the next one but maybe not, revised and it will likely pass 100%; very, very strong support for the outcome which is interesting given the fact that it took so long to get started. But the reason it took so long to get started is no one understood what the Board motion meant. And the Board motion basically said come back by the next meeting with metrics – a totally unreasonable target even we had understood what it meant.

And it wasn't until after the next meeting, or maybe at the next meeting, that it was actually explained by a Board member what they meant by the motion and then people could start working. So, it shows the complexity of some of these kinds of things. In terms of what happened this meeting, I've lost track. I think they approved two new



---

PDPs and one or two issue reports. That's a volume almost unheard of and is indicating that there's going to be an awful lot of work to day over the next year, year and a half, two years driven by these in addition to the ones that are already going.

That's a staff resource. It's quite heavy. And a need for people to man the workgroups, to staff the workgroups, sorry. And you'll be hearing a lot more from me on those kind of things. The report will go up online in a week or two with more detail on specific issues. There's nothing at this point that requires highlighting today, other than the Thick WHOIS. PDP now has a charter and that workgroup will be kicking off real soon. It may go through like an oiled something, or it may get bogged down in a number of people would like to see it get delayed, a negative outcome of it, or its scope widened.

I think the scope issue is okay now, but we're going to need people on that group if we care about the outcome. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** I'm so sorry Alan. Thank you very much for this full report. For those who did not hear this it was a horn; we now have a buzzer in the public forum and we don't actually have a buzzer here yet so we felt a horn was appropriate, or a gong.

**ALAN GREENBERG:** Alan for the transcript record. What you don't realize is I'm somewhat hard of hearing and I hardly heard that.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well thank you very much for this report Alan, very comprehensive. And you certainly gave a good insight of what happens in the GNSO and how things happen. There is one comment which I have heard in some circles, which is that the GNSO seems to be really the center of what goes on at ICANN. And with all the new gTLD process taking place there is somehow, the whole process of some other ACs or the ccNSO are somehow left to the side.

And it's unfortunate because the ccNSO certainly regroups a heck of a lot more people than the GNSO country codes or worldwide and there are a lot more people – we're not necessarily registered or have registered names in those countries but are directly impacted by the ccNSO's work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg. That's not an accident. The ccNSO work is dictated to a large extent by what scope we have to control and what problems there are and what's missing. We have very, very little control over the ccTLDs. We do have a level of control that is should we decide to pass a policy than all ccNSO members are obliged to follow it. But we haven't seen fit to do that very often and probably for good reasons.

So when it comes down to it the ASO does very important things but there's only a limited range of things that they can do within the mandate. The ASO can't say let's renumber everything – that's stupid. So there's just limited mandate and the GNSO is virtually unlimited. And on top of that we've built a process which will generate thousands of new problems almost guaranteeing it because it's brand new and it's an area we have some level of control so that's where the work goes.





---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. I have two questions because I've been following things but wasn't able to participate in the meetings this week. First of all, on the issue of the consumer metrics, I remember that when the discussion was on that there was a thought that council might give parts of this a rough ride because there were demands on parts of the industry that some people might not like and that there were components to the metrics that might get some pushback. Did you get any of that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the summary is absolutely none. Council is not in general taking positions that "it's not good for me therefore it's not good for the internet"; that doesn't happen very often. It does happen on occasion. And the Council in general is taking to heart the principle of the new reorganization that they're not setting policy, they're establishing working groups. If the workgroups follow reasonable practices Council tends to approve them. There are occasional differences because of real philosophical differences where the group didn't feel the PDP should start to begin with, if it's a PDP, but many things pass unanimously or almost unanimously, which you wouldn't have expected to, based on the inclinations of the people in their own right.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

My second question has to do with a request that had been made apparently be a group of cyber cafes to create a new constituency. And at least from some of the discussion I've been seeing it seems like it was a bit of a football that was being punted back and forth between the business and constituency and the non-commercial constituency, neither of which wanted them in their own so they were looking to make their own. And I was just wondering if that was ever in brought up this week?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It was brought only in that Milton Mueller, who was representing somebody who isn't here, I don't remember who, made the impassioned plea. The same impassioned plea that he made at the open forum, no more constituencies, we don't need, what's the expression from the movie – we don't need no stinking constituencies. But that was the position that NCSG has taken from the very beginning and it's theirs.

As far as I know the application that was submitted recently is for the non-commercial stakeholders group. I have not done an audit of the people applying to see whether they're commercial or not.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

By the way, I don't think Milton reflects the entire stakeholder group because the NPOC I don't think would share that. I think it's more an NCUC thing. They've constantly resisted other constituencies.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably but I have no comment. I don't have any personal information, but I tend to agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, this is Jean-Jacques. The question to the Chair, I'd like to bring up a general question about liaisons. Would this be the moment or should we have all the liaison reports first perhaps?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. I think we'll wait for the more general questions about the function of liaison totally at the end of the session. First we'll have the reports and their description. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the record. Alan, a couple of things happened when I was watching the – and it was the discussion on the metrics. What I saw was an awful lot of support for the metrics and one particular group saying “no we don't like it at all,” so the whole thing just screamed to a halt. And I thought “well that's unfortunate.” What I was hearing from some of the, I think it was the registrars. There was a lot of “but a lot of work has gone into this and they're pretty good.”

And so I guess when I heard Wendy sort of say the whole thing is broken I got the feeling that really things were broken and the frustration that I saw in that room about how they couldn't even agree to put a motion



---

to say everything is broken. It was just done in a forum. And so I guess I'm calling on Evan too, did you have that same sense that was behind Wendy's sort of standing up and saying the whole thing is broken."

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I think I would have to agree with Alan's characterization of that. Wendy has her views, she's expressed them within the GNSO, she's expressed them when she was the ALAC liaison to the Board and it's been fairly consistent. I don't know if I have anything more to add beyond Alan's take which I generally agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay thank you. We are in violent agreement I think on this, and I think we now have to move on because Sebastien has to leave in 10 minutes, so I'm really sorry to cut this short but I have to thank you very much Alan for your very thorough description of what goes on in the GNSO and what the issues were. Thank you. And now I introduce Sebastien Bachollet whom you all know, and he is the person who is occupying seat number 15 on the Board, selected by the ALAC, well by At-Large by definition. So yeah, the At-Large selected Board Directors, is that's how it's called?

The At-Large selected Board Director. Sebastien you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. First of all I know that I am not a liaison to the Board, but I am happy to be with you this morning. I didn't prepare nothing. I think I am with friends and we can exchange if you have questions. I just



---

want to raise a few things. The first is that as you see yesterday there were tentative feedback on what the Board heard during the week. In fact I discovered that it's not possible to gather all the information.

And just to take one example, there was some interesting input during the NARALO event, but it's not a place to have somebody take notes on what it says there. And I guess that there are a lot of meetings that nobody from the Board were participating, then the taking stock is not done completely. And it's under your responsibility to be sure that all the points you want to bring to the community or specifically to the Board is done after this meeting.

I want to underline that, and I really think that you are, I guess, the only group who have tools to work, process to work and who deliver in smooth ways a lot of materials. At the Board level we don't have Wiki. We use very, very small number of meetings the Adobe Connect, and so on and so forth. And when I joined the Board I was quite struggling on how we can work. And we can't work very well.

Fortunately just 21 persons, it's not 15 plus RALOs and hundreds of ALSes, but nevertheless. And you have a wrap-up session. I have to struggle with the Board to have a wrap-up session. What we learned from this meeting, not just at the policy level but also how this meeting is organized, what were the good points, the bad points, what we could announce.

Of course we have new staff leaders and I hope that they will help to deliver better outputs in the future, better meetings, better tools, better organization. But it's still we have to be careful and I am very aware of the concern with that is that we don't leave the staff and



---

reinvent the wheel or something we already get through. For example yesterday you may have heard Fadi say Sally Costerton will work on new format for our meeting. And I tell her please go to At-Large, discuss with them how they work, they have a good knowledge on how to involve a lot of people within this world before to decide that you will change everything or you will do something different.

Because they are the ones with the better knowledge on how to work together. You had also some discussions about review of the GNSO because it's supposed to start next year; review of the NomCom that we need to start that now, better than to wait two years. I am struggling with that idea of reviews because the ICANN tomorrow will not be the ICANN of yesterday and even of today. We will have 1,000 more registries. We will have a lot of the 1,000 registrars currently becoming also a registry and vice versa.

And we can always discuss about how the GNSO is working or how the ccNSO is working but don't we need to have a fresh view on how we want to deal with that. For example the question of the ccTLDs acting as gTLD, is it a question we can put on the table or not? And if we put this we put it on the ccNSO, on the GNSO or somewhere else, just to take one small example.

Then I am starting to ask that we do, eventually we can do a review, but we also start some work at the broader level to see how we want to be organized. And once again, At-Large is really fitting this organization because you are a cross topic organization. You don't deal with g or cc or address or whatever, you deal with all. And there are not other actors who want to do the same, who could be organized the same or



differently but such questions that I think we need to put on the table. And my two last points for now, it's as you heard me saying during the NARALO event is that I am very keen that we push to organize a second summit in 2014.

And that means that you need, and I will help as much as I can, put this request into the next budget process because it's the budget for 2014. And the last point, we talk about a new review but one part of the review from the At-Large is not yet done. It's the second Board member. And I think it's a good time to struggle for that. We have a new leadership team and I guess we have a Board more open to discuss that.

How we can bring that to the table I don't know. I would like very much that we do it, especially because I think the time it will take to be done could be land that we are able to do that at the same time of the renewal, or the election, whatever you want to call that when my term ends. And if at that time we can decide to have a second Board member from At-Large, it would be great.

That's some ideas that I wanted to bring to you, and I would like really to thank you for your hard work you all do. It's very appreciated. I know that for me it's a good help. I would like even to have more help from you, but you already do a lot. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sebastien. How many more minutes do you have to answer a few questions?



---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Take your time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. One question which has already been discussed here is the consolidated meeting strategy. Consolidating meetings for the next three years, rotation between Africa, Latin America, Caribbean and North America. And the other two regions having a guaranteed meeting every year, so Europe and Asia-Pacific having a guaranteed meeting. Could you comment on that, or the pros and the cons which you see with this as a long time participant and also a Board member?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. First of all I am very involved in that because it's the document came to the PPC and as you know I am Chairing the PPC and I will Chair it one more year as was decided yesterday. I will try to go outside a little bit. The broader question is how we are able to give to the community a plan for the next three years. As you know we don't know yet where we will go at the last meeting of next year. And that's troublesome.

We were supposed to deliver, our staff was supposed to deliver two years in advance a plan. Then staff came with this proposal for various reasons. One are on the table what was presented by [Nick]. I don't think it's all about the fact that two out of three year plans, it's his year to do like that. I can tell you that the discussion in the meeting in Africa and Latin America was quite tough to organize. And today, and I am not visiting the place and it used to be done by Board members and it's not anymore.





---

Then I can't tell you why this place is better than the other and why to go there or not there. But I have the impression that in those at least two places it's quite troublesome to find a place who fits with the needs and will fit with the future needs of this organization. Because if we have to bring 1,000 more registries, registrars, how we will put them. And at the same time, we want to be able to allow At-Large to have more participation, to GAC to have more participants and it's quite tricky.

It's why I think what I would like you to do is to take this document I put on the table and to look to those three last questions at the end of the document, and to answer those questions. To try to be as positive as possible. And if you don't think that this policy is a good one, yes tell us that you disagree. But tell us whether the solution to do it, how we can under, for a short term – that means for the next three years.

As you know a working group will be set up to work on what we need for the future because we need time to discuss that with the different parts of the community. And I can understand the frustration of regions, but just to take the example of Latin America and Caribbean. Where the proposals from Caribbean, from Trinidad & Tobago, which is not working. And it's not working for good, I think good reason. I will not enter into detail but there it's not working.

And the other countries we get trouble and we may end up to go again in Argentina, why not. But they are a country in this place that we will wish to go. And that was a tricky situation and that's where the staff ended up as a proposal. Thank you.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sebastien. And I will only allow one more question on travel policy because ICANN is not all about travel. I know Tijani you were...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Sebastien. You said if you disagree to tell it please. Yes I disagree and I will tell you why. I totally agree that there is problems in finding the right cities where to organize the meetings. but if you adopt the principle of holding meetings in the same city, the problem would not be there anymore because in any continent you can find a city where you can organize our meetings.

Second point – the proposal didn't explain well the reasons of this review. You said now or something but it is not in the report. So we cannot say it is right or it is not right. Third point – if you want to make the review of the strategy we have to do it according to key points. And since the aim of those meetings is to be the most inclusive, I think that the Visa issue is the first criteria that we have to take in account.

Because otherwise you'll always have people from Africa who will not come because of the Visa problem. So the first criteria must be the Visa. Second criteria will be the quality of service – I agree. And the third will be the cost and I agree on also. But if you don't take those criteria as the main criteria, any review will not be the right one. So deciding on having an early meeting in Europe, it's a big problem. Because people from Africa cannot have the Visa [exchange] very easy. Thank you.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani, and we have one more comment from Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Unless we have the kind of transparency that we say that we want in ICANN on this kind of issue we are never going to satisfy people who are absolutely convinced their region can sustain more meetings. Whether Africa consents to stay more or not I don't know, but we need some level of the parameters that people are using to make that judgment.

If we don't know how many people you're targeting, how many rooms they need, how many big rooms, how many small rooms whatever the other criteria are that are being used to reject cities that people around this table and many tables feel are perfectly adequate, you're not going to get buy in from the people who feel that they're being disadvantaged. Give us more information and you may be surprised people will be reasonable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. And I think that if you go to the meetings.ICANN.org website you click through the maze of information in there you will find an exact document which gives full specifications of how many meeting rooms, what size of meeting rooms, etc. So it's pretty clear and that is already in existence.

I think we have to thank Sebastien for joining us. I know he has to go to other places. And we also have our next liaison in the room. So Sebastien thank you.



---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much and good work and I am happy to have Cheryl taking after me. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As long as I'm taking after you with a big stick Sebastien it's a safe thing. I'm Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And I've got very little time with you today, and unfortunately I have less personal time available for you than I have time allocated in the agenda. I can start off therefore with a most humble apology. There was no indication, I'm sure the voice will be getting through but we can do that if you like.

Don't bother with it. Normally if I get too close to the mic it blows everything away. And I'm assuming my audio is fine or they'd be waving frantically at me. Yeah. Usually the boys go "stop it Cheryl, talk down quietly." Because I'm locked down, I think that's the right way to describe it at the moment, in NomCom today, I really can't give you the full 20 minute allocation. So I've just had a quick chat to Cintra and I'm going to ask her to fill in the what happened when part of the reporting from the ccNSO liaison perspective.

What I do want to do however is – Matt, you can throw up the – you can't throw up. Perhaps you can but you can't put up, the internet has left us. The internet's left the building? Right, never mind. I would like to have just bought all of your attention to the ccNSO liaison Wiki page. Perhaps you could at least put the URL into the chat, that would be helpful. And you can all remotely or in the room please click on that link when Matt makes that magic happen.



---

The ccNSO liaison page is like my fellow liaisons, quite an extensive and useful resource. It's essential that you go there regularly, especially if you are a regional leader. But I would also propose certainly if you are an ALAC member. Thank you! Your blood is worth bottling, well done. That goes on longer than I've lived. Just scroll down, scroll down, scroll down, scroll down – anything you ever wanted to know about anything I've done is there. My attendance or lack thereof will be there, everything. It's an archive.

So back up to the top thanks Matt, because we'll all get bored. And I would suggest that what you do do is watch this page. There's a very simple system in the Wiki which allows you to watch this page. If you're really brave you can watch the space. But if you watch the page, you will get an email that says "the ccNSO liaison has changed something." Matt, if you go to the top; you're logged in I see. Just click under tools I believe it is and there – you see. You've got that watch option, are you all looking at the screen. Thank you Matt.

If you click that right, and you're logged in it will link to that page. Rest assured I don't send out notices unless it's a substantial change. Your email box is not going to get full of updates because I've changed the color or a – I'm now echoing. I can put up with two or three of me but I'm not sure everybody else can. The point is I only tick, I untick the box routinely and only tick the box that sends out those messages when there is an update.

So if you subscribe to that page today, by tomorrow you will get an email because we will be putting up updates. Because all of the reporting will be coming back from the ccNSO activities over the next



---

day or two, and as they come to us I put them there. When I sent to the list recently I said I would like to have a couple or some people to shadow me and take over some roles and responsibilities, and perhaps become the heir apparent for things that do, and that would include ccNSO liaison certainly for next year.

Because next year, as Chair of the NomCom I simply would not have the time. So I have to have an exit strategy. My plan was to be shadowed and both Maureen Hilyard and Cintra Sooknanan have been brave enough, willing enough, and able enough to do that. The plan for shadowing didn't happen, they've basically been tossed in the deep end and hopefully have learned how to swim because there were so many competing things that I was not aware of when we put this plan together. And that's why I'm going to ask Cintra to specifically report on activities over this week.

The ccNSO is unique because it is a unusual mix for any SO. It is actually a trust network. In that room you have a Council which has administrative jobs and is elected. You have the ccNSO members who are ccTLD operators who choose to join. And you have everyone else who may not join. So you've got three layers, you usually can't tell the difference between them. There are extreme political and geopolitical pressures, there's financial and economic pressures and there is resistance to change.

And of all the SOs it is the one that we need to make sure we have someone who is able to do a good liaison role, not only to Council but to all of the relevant workgroups. So between now and next year I trust we will have a couple of really good people for taking over and being



me, part of me currently is ccNSO liaison and I'm very pleased with the welcome and the acceptance in the work and the input that both the ladies who've been actually in front of me rather than shadowing me have done.

At that point I certainly want to report that the framework of interpretation workgroup, which is very important to many of, is getting closer to sending out yet another chapter. And I would like to recommend to the ALAC, if I may, that we watch very closely and respond to that. It's about delegation and redelegation and it's about revocation. It's all the hot stuff. It's the really, really tricky and difficult things.

I would recommend that Maureen and Cintra are the lead pen holders on your reply to that because they've been immersed in that room and they're getting at least some feel for it. They have been offered the privilege, and I would take it as a great honor to the ALAC and to the quality of the girls we've put in the room that the Chair of the framework of Interpretation workgroup has asked for them to be added to our list already, and for them to attend the future meetings. So I think that's very important.

You actually have three people in the room now which is great. The country codes and territories names use, I need to report a hiatus. Unfortunately the UNESCO survey has not come back in in numbers where we are ready to go to the next step yet, but that is a "watch this space" one. The aim there would be to have something substantial for you to look at, it's probably not going to cause great need to comment, by Beijing.



---

The possible exception to that need to comment, because we're looking at internationalized naming as well in that, the IDN group may indeed want to watch that space. And if there is any response I would suggest that your IDN work group is the role there. At that, with your permission Mr. Chairman I'm going to run like a bunny back to the room next door and around the corner, and ask if Cintra would be so kind as to give you a very brief [prose] of the thrill-packed and wonderful world of ccNSO at ICANN 45. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. And I gather that if there are any questions for Cheryl I'm sure you'll be able to catch her later on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They know where I'll be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Cintra, you have the floor.

CINTRÀ SOOKNANAN: Thank you Olivier. Thank you, Cheryl. Just for your records I've put two links. One is the presentations from this week's ccNSO meeting as well as the audio transcripts. So if at any point in time you find the parts of why said or Cheryl has said is of further interest, you can always refer to those. I'm going to go through the Council meeting in particular and highlight from that. the Council meeting took place yesterday, sorry, on the 17<sup>th</sup>.





---

Some of the main things coming out of that was approval of Greece, a review of the [LAC Strategy] which is something that was sort of importance to us with specific focus on how they could create synergies with the Board, find process and procedure to engage with the community.

As well they will have Council elections of Asia-Pacific (inaudible) regions, on the 29<sup>th</sup> of October to the 12<sup>th</sup> of November 2012. There are several ccNSO statements, in particular the GNSO Metric Working Group on consumer trust, choice and metrics. It was recognized that this is still in draft form. And when it's finalized a ccNSO statement will be released.

You need to tell me if I'm going okay with this because it's my first report as well, so I don't know if you want this level of detail or otherwise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well you've got about five minutes or so, so pace yourself on this.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: It was recognized that there was no impact of the ICANN Bylaw changes regarding the Board appointments. As well as they went through all the working groups basically. The ccNSO would plan updates, They're utilizing a Mind Map as well as a [gun] chart, which I found was quite interesting. And those results are provided on their website. I was also on the Framework of Interpretations Working Group which Cheryl spoke towards. And they did specifically discuss revocation, but also the scope of revocation they're using the concept of reasonable excuse for



---

misconduct in public life to kind of add a duty of care to ccNSOs role. So I found that was quite interesting.

Again it was quite detailed, so that wording is still in draft form. But I do think that this is a space that I would be keen on looking at. What else should I speak about? There was also discussion about the ICANN Academy. It was agreed that they would be part of the community consultation before launching any training programs, as well as it was recognized that a survey study of questions would be circulated to all ACs and SOs to obtain recommendations for that training.

ccNSO improvements – at least two recommendations from the survey in 2012 outstanding. It was agreed that a new survey would be done for the test translations documentation costs, methods, the finance cost, quality of languages required. So a lot of the issues are kind of ours well, but at a different level. I would say I think in some respects, such as language, we are more advanced. I think that's it, thank you. I have more details though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Cintra. Are there any questions from anyone around the table? I have a question. Not having spent much time in the ccNSO room, I always wonder how other parts of ICANN function. Did you find the level of engagement from the different cc's and from the different participants to be on a par with the level of engagement in our community, where although one might say 90% of the time is the same people speaking. In fact, having looked carefully at the transcripts and so on you do find that there's a good broad engagement from everyone.



CINTRA SOOKNANAN:

Thanks Olivier. This is Cintra again. What I noticed is because you have so many participants in the room they've found ways to streamline engagement. So they would have cards with three colors – red, yellow and green. So when they ask a question red is “I disagree,” yellow is obviously neutral and green is “Let’s go for it.” So it’s a quick way to gauge around a room if you have unanimous support or otherwise. So I found that was kind of key, as well as I do think that there’s a broad range of perspectives in the ccNSO because they are different in terms of organizational structures and that sort of thing.

But at the end of the day they have one mission, and they focus on that. What I found was actually interesting is there was a panel discussion on registry principles, which I would actually like to get all of the slides for. And dot br, who’s I think also managed very closely by ISOC members, right? They have quite a detailed listing of requirements and public interest including DNSSEC and that kind of thing, implementations in order to provide and raise that duty of care.

Whereas I know many ccNSO TLD holders would not care. But the point, the fact that this is even raised here means that perhaps it can be looked at in terms of GNSO. So it could be a model that could be used otherwise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay thank you. I see no one else putting their hand up so I think we can move on. Thank you very much. And since we’ve shuffled our agenda a little bit the next person to step up should be Edmon Chung



---

for the IDN liaison report. Unfortunately Edmon could not make it today, but he has sent a report and I have asked Rinalia Abdul Rahim to read through the report please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. For the record, this report is submitted in bullet form, some of which contains incomplete sentences and requires some interpretation. To the extent that I can, I will provide some interpretation, and where I cannot I will leave it as it is. I hope that is acceptable. Okay, the first item in our IDN policy liaison report is an IDN Working Group meeting update. The working group met on Wednesday October 17<sup>th</sup> and the first item that we discussed in a response on the IDN Variant TLD issue, specifically related to the label generation rules for the root zone.

There was a document that has been posted for public comment about the procedures that would be required to generate these rules, and these were the points that are highlighted by our liaison. The first, commend them for the good progress that has been achieved and the overall two panel framework. And what we mean by two panel is there is a proposal in developing the rules for label generation but there is a primary channel that would constitute the demand side which is script community of various languages, and a secondary panel that would comprise experts that would review the proposals and determine whether or not they would be safe for allocation or delegation into the root.

The second point is a comment on the secondary panel composition. There is a concern about whether or not all of the experts on the panel



should be paid and thus abide by rationale be accountable to ICANN. And there was a discussion on whether or not this has merit and I think that the point was made that we don't care whether the experts are paid or not, but they need to have contractual obligations that would make them accountable given that what was at risk is the security and safety and stability of the root.

The next point is about the need for periodic review of the process. Because at the moment the proposal states that there is no review of the processes that the secondary panel takes, given that the ultimate concern is on security. The next point is on lack of consideration for At-Large audience in discussions. And I confess that I'm not quite sure what Edmon means by this.

MALE: Could you repeat that?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: A lack of consideration for At-Large audience in discussions. And I think, if I think back to the working group discussion itself, I think Edmon raised a concern about having a balance on technical expertise and policy expertise in the panels themselves. And I think what he means by that is that there needs to be some kind of process or overview on whether what is being decided is fair and not just from the technical consideration. And there is, at the moment, no solution on that and it's an open question and we will be highlighting this.

The next point is a response will be drafted and the target is to submit it before the close of the reply period. And then on the issue of the IDN cc



---

policy development process, as I said before in our ALAC Wrap-Up session, we had a drafted statement; it was sent out to our community. There were no objections but in the working group meeting itself there was a request to include one additional point, and this issue was about visible confusability. And Hong Xue has submitted some proposed text for the working groups consideration and Jean-Jacques has also supplemented that.

And we will be looking at that and incorporating that into the revised statement. So we will also be submitting this statement before the close of the reply period. Moving onto the next item in the report, the IDN Variant TLD project, which is what I referred to before which is this project 2.1 root variant label generation rule set. This involves two day meetings prior to the official ICANN meetings on October 12<sup>th</sup> and October 13<sup>th</sup>. And there was also a public session on Thursday October 18<sup>th</sup>. And the liaison highlighted that there seems to be significant changes that are expected to the current draft after discussions, and there are concerns for how this relates to the prioritization of IDN gTLDs and whether the synchronicity of the two will create issues.

And to elaborate on the topic is that the new gTLD program has a timeline for reviewing the application and it has certain review process. And at the side of it there is the variant project, which has its own timeline which is currently not clear, in terms of how long it will take to generate the rules for generating labels. And the two teams haven't really been in touch with each other to synchronize because there are variant issues in some of the IDN applications and I think the team has taken that feedback and they will come back with a response.



On project 6 in the Variant TLD Program this is on user expectations and this is where the liaisons report does not result in a complete sentence. It says “comprehensive set of –blank – and then key findings show – blank” -. But having been at that update meeting I would have to say that there is a study currently being undertaken on user expectations. It is ongoing and it is expected to be, the results will be presented in Beijing.

And I think that they’re fairly detailed about the issues that they are looking at and we’ll get good findings at the end of that process. The next item is on JIG, which is the Joint Implementation Group involving the ccNSO and the GNSO. They had a meeting on Monday October 15<sup>th</sup> and the issues that were discussed were on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, where they discussed proposed recommendations on the possibility of creating the policy to request IDN gTLDs and IDNccTLDs to support universal acceptance. Specifically for IDN TLDs, registries and registrar system to be ready for IDN TLDs, for example, in name server records, email for contact information, etc.

Because the current situation is that this is not the case. And it is also expected that there will be a public session on universal acceptance on IDN TLDs in Beijing. That is the end of the report Mr. Chairman.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. And would you be okay with accepting questions?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I will try my best. Thank you.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Are there any questions? Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. It's not a question it's a brief remark I want to make. I think that the contribution of ALAC has been remarkable. I say this because when I was on the Board I was one of the founding members of that IDN thing and at the Variant thing and I'd like to give you a sociological remark on this. It is felt to be very much top management, meaning VP level, and one small group within the Board members and nowhere else.

So the very fact that part of the community has been able through its expertise to have a role in all this and to produce documents like this is, I think, quite remarkable. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques; much appreciated. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: In following the process on the label generation rule set and in looking at the document itself there has been issues that I particularly am concerned about and it has to do with fairness in treating applications that may come about in terms of TLDs with IDN Variants. And the thing is that in dealing with variants and the root zone there is the issue of first mover advantage. This is a fact and we have to deal with it.



---

But how we deal with it in terms of how do we ensure fairness when there is a first mover advantage, this is not clear and this is also part of the concern in the framework that has been developed, which is primary panel and secondary panel, how do they determine this and what happens when there is unfairness and when it becomes politicized given that families of languages that share the same script may be competing with each other.

And this has not been sufficiently addressed and I think that I would like to raise it later on within the group and in other fora. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Any other questions or comments? None, well I just wanted to add one thing to your report or Edmon's report and yours as well I guess since you have been working with him now for well the whole length of time between the last meeting and the one now and even before. I know that you both are a part of the IDN VIP which is the variants implementation program, very long, very complex, long winded and it's not an easy environment at all. Not because of its politics but I think the variants of languages and scripts start becoming extremely complex when you don't just deal with one, which could be just Chinese and that's already complex enough.

But you also have to look at all of the others and you end up an expert I guess in the world's languages and scripts and that really is a totally different world in addition to being technical, and also to being political. So u just wanted to thank you and to commend you on the work that you and Edmon have been doing. And I ask for a quick round of applause.



Bearing in mind that both Rinalia and Edmon were here a few days before the meetings started and I think they were in this very room. So how the circle, the loop has closed, you're back to where you started more than eight days later. Anyway, so I think we'll move on and we'll have our next liaison which – well that's Julie Hammer isn't it; that's the SSAC liaison. And Julie has been very diligently waiting and listening remotely.

Unfortunately she was not able to make it to Toronto but instead is being punished by spending the night – what time is it on your end Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: It's 25 minutes to midnight.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh that's not too bad. The night is young. You still have plenty of time after this call. So Julie, as our SSAC liaison, that's her first year past now and I gather you are going to be able to give us your report please.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Olivier. I guess to begin I'll just say a few words about the role of the SSAC liaison that you happened to mention a little bit earlier with Alan. The SSAC liaison is one of the positions that is accepted as a full member of that committee. So my role as I see it is to actually provide a conduit or a channel whereby the ALAC can provide the SSAC with some input to and some feedback on SSAC reports and suggest and



[influence in fact] the selection of topics that they SSAC might wish to study.

The SSAC is willing to take both suggestions from any part of the community. As well as what I try to do is ensure that SSAC reports are written in a way that is understandable and leaning full to an ALAC audience and to the broader community. Like all other liaisons this job means that I not only need to keep up to date with all of the SSAC topics that are being worked on, and that's whether I'm a member of the working group or not, but I also need to keep a watching eye on the topics that are being discussed in ALAC.

So trying to keep across the activities of two groups as all the liaisons need to do. And I guess in my first year I found it's quite a challenging task because the volume of the email traffic is very high, and not all of the issues are necessarily relevant to my role. And it's also the case that much of the work that the SSAC is doing can't be discussed in open forum. And so my reporting can't usually be as detailed as some of the other liaisons.

So I guess that's just a summary of how I see my role and how I try and that with both communities. During this meeting in Toronto one of the earliest meetings of the week, in fact the first meeting that I dialed into was the SSAC meeting with the ALAC. So unlike the last ICANN meeting this time there was a specific meeting and Patrik gave the ALAC an update on what was happening within SSAC, and in particular gave a briefing on three of the recent SSAC reports that have been released this year.



---

There have been more than that released but three specifically based on dotless domains, on the SSAC comment on the WHOIS Review Team final report and the most recent advisory on the impact of DNS blocking which was produced as a result of a request from the GAC. And he also just mentioned that there are currently a number of active working parties within the SSAC – The Registration Data Validation Working Party; The Identifier Abuse Metrics Working Party and the Root Team Rollover Working Party.

And what I'd like to do just to finish off is to talk a little bit about the Identifier Abuse Metrics Work Party. I want to specifically on this one because I feel its focus will be of particular interest to ALAC. It's been in the formation process for quite some time because it's been grappling with the difficulty of clearly defining the focus. It knew there was a problem there that needed to be looked at, but it wasn't quite sure how to express that.

It was originally called the Domain Name Holding Team. But that title was thought to be a bit inappropriate for the work as the scope of the task evolved and crystalized. So it's recently settled on its scope, which initially is to gather data and metrics to analyze and to better understand the extent of [risk-based aggressive] domains and related issues. And the aim is to eventually define and explain the different types of use spaced abuse so that through defining terminology we can have more unambiguous discussions about them, and to describe in quantitative terms how frequently this sort of abuse has been counted.

And then finally, to offer best practice advice for dealing with that sort of abuse. I really expect that this work party will take quite some time



---

and that it will need to progress through a number of stages to tackle what is really quite a massive problem. And the form of its deliverables aren't yet quite clear, and the work party realizes that that will crystalize over time. But because I believe that there is likely to be very keen interest from ALAC on these issues, I've volunteered to be on this work party and I'll keep you informed within the security aspects of the SSAC work, I'll keep ALAC informed of its progress. And that completes my report. Thanks Olivier.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Julie, much appreciated. And I now open the floor for questions if there are any. Apart from Heidi coughing quite profusely, possibly because it's a mix of tiredness, a cold, plus a tea that has just gone the wrong way. I see Rinalia has put her hand up.

**RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:** Thank you Mr. Chairman; Rinalia for the transcripts. Julie, I'm curious, in the SSAC when they discuss issues that pertain to security and safety and resiliency of the internet, is it a requirement that the committee come to unanimous agreement in terms of whatever advice oppositions that they put out? Thank you.

**JULIE HAMMER:** No actually, it's not Rinalia. And I do see on the occasional SSAC report down the bottom there is a standard practice of recording who may have not agreed with various aspects of the report. Now that hasn't happened in recent times because it seems like there has been universal agreement from the working party. It's only disagreements of those on



the work party itself that is recorded. But the process does allow for those disagreements to be recorded and I think in some of the reports, I couldn't give you an example, I'd have to go through them and look for it, but I think there have been such disagreements recorded.

I don't think there is scope to record a disagreement of someone who was not on the work party itself, but having said that, when a draft report is produced and is deemed by the work party to be ready, it's then circulated to the whole of the SSAC for further comment and feedback. And that's often updated as the results are back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia again. The reason that I asked Julie is that in this IDN Variants Label Generation Rules for the root zone the rule for the secondary panel, which is basically the experts of technical, is that if there is no unanimity there will be no approval. So any proposal would be rejected and so I wanted to see if the SSAC has a way of dealing with this and if you have any other ideas on that just please send me an email because I'd really appreciate that. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: I'll have a look through some of the older reports and see if I can find one that actually does record disagreement with some of the findings and I'll send an example to you Rinalia.



---

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Julie. Any other questions or comments? Seeing no one put their hand up, I have to thank you for all the work you do Julie and generally also please extend our thanks to the SSAC. I know we had Jim Galvin and Patrik Fältström come in to see us earlier this week and we already commended them on the work of the SSAC. But whilst there is a marked increase in the number of SAC reports, which they produce, and whilst Patrik Fältström has shared with me that some people in ICANN do wonder if this is not too many reports, at the same time I think we do appreciate in our community that there are many issues that the SSAC should analyze and they're doing an excellent job.

So as part of that committee, and also as part of the work that you perform in telling us what is going on in that community and being really our bridge to this committee, I thank you and I would like to ask for a round of applause.

**JULIE HAMMER:** Thank you Olivier.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** And hopefully we will be able to see you in Beijing in six months time.

**JULIE HAMMER:** I'm certainly planning on trying to get to Beijing. It's here in my diary.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And now we have about 10, 15 minutes left to continue just a general discussion if there are any questions or comments, and I see Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I'd like to take this opportunity to suggest a different approach perhaps and a more general view on the whole system of liaisons, which I think is very good. It's even essential in our type of community. But first let me say that what I'm about to say is not a repair job which I'm suggesting. It's not a crisis management exercise. On the contrary it's a sort of policy planning exercise I would suggest.

What drives me to take this opportunity is that I have the feeling that ICANN is actually about to enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and that's a momentous piece of news isn't it? Some have called it a new season. The CEO has used that term several times. And I think we shouldn't stop at face value, we should go beyond that. And I think it really means something, it's not just something to be poetic or nice.

I think this implicates many, many things. So first of all, I think that the growing number of elements, call them elements, which will be joining ICANN through the new gTLD system, there will be of course a temptation to either create new constituencies or to overpopulate existing constituencies without sufficient justification. What are the implications of that? Well they will be overload. There will be overload on staff. There will be overload on volunteer work. But also there will be a huge load on connections, meaning how does one constituency or group of interest relate or intertwine with others.





That in itself is a systemic challenge of huge proportions. So what does this mean for the ALAC? I think that we have to bear in mind that if we to continue in the current system we will be swamped. There's no way we can possibly follow all the coming constituencies and all those complexities of insufficient links. So I think that it's time for us as ALAC to rethink our priorities. What is it that is really central to the ALAC, to its existence, to its duty?

I think we all agree already that it should be centered on the user, the global public interest. Having said that, how do you translate that into actual policy choices? That's open to discussion but I'd suggest that user rights could be one of those central elements. For instance privacy, data protection, open access, all these things we know quite well in ALAC. I'd like to insist on the fact that now is the time to become more issue driven and less, what's the word, structure driven.

The methods, we already have fairly good methods. But I think that we should look at the possibility for instance of sending liaisons not to structures, or not only to structures, but rather to issues so that we should have liaisons on certain issues and not only a liaison to the GNSO or to the ccNSO etc.

Another remark I wanted to make is that in this new setup which is emerging partly thanks to Fadi Chehade, there will come a time maybe in a few months, maybe in a few years where one of the bases of our structures in ICANN is going to be jeopardized or put into question. That is our notion of geographic regions. Our current system of regions does not reflect the reality of the world. There is no way that ICANN envisioned Yemen in Asia-Pacific. There's no way that ICANN imagined



the Caribbean for instance being necessarily a part of South America where as it may have really specific preoccupations.

So I think that this is one of the fundamental things which we are avoiding to discuss. There was I think a year or two ago in the ICANN community a new attempt to redefine geographic regions, and we know the result of that working group; it was no. The safest thing of course is not change anything, just go ahead. Otherwise people may be hurt and all of that.

So I think it's time to have a real new look at this. And by the way, if we choose to give input on this now in the coming months, it may be received with if not sympathy at least with interest by the ICANN leadership, meaning the Board and the CEO, because they are having a new approach. We may not succeed but it would really be a pity not to try. So my last remark about this is that perhaps, because we are representing the general user community, we could actually take the initiative to set out a few things.

One, it is time for transform the regional approach to make it more in conformity with reality with the 21<sup>st</sup> century. And two, to rethink the system of liaisons; not to abolish it, simply to improve it in light of the great changes we are about to face.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques, and several people have put their hands up to be in the queue. So we have Tijani, Alan, Wolf and Rinalia; so starting with Tijani.



TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Jean-Jacques, two points I want to raise with you. The first one you said that we have to go to the issue more than to the structure – it's a wonderful idea. That means for the GNSO we'll have as much liaisons as there is issues on the GNSO. It is good but we have to have the means, the funds to do that. people who will follow the GNSO have to attend the GNSO meetings.

Second point, you spoke about the geographic regions. You're right, there is a lot of things that are not well done now. But I want to remind you that there is a working group on the geographic region and they proposed a way to change it and to make it stick to the real division on which we opposed as ALAC very strongly. And I'm sure there is a way, we proposed a way to make the geographic regions more representative, but not in the way they presented it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Tijani, next is Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Jean-Jacques, with regards to regions first, I agree with your completely. The current set of regions makes no sense to most sentient people. On the other hand if an idea regarding regions is to come from ALAC it would also have to include how we would change in response to what kind of regions we're recommending. Clearly almost any reasonable break up, not break up of regions, division of regions is likely to include more than five.

We're not going to scale the ALAC with three members per region times 12 regions. It isn't going to happen. And therefore we are going to



have to give way and not have as much representation, and perhaps not have equal representation from each region because those regions may well be radically different sizes and radically different populations and radically different physical areas.

So, even if we pretend, even if we take some completely arbitrary set of 12 regions, and I'm sure any of us could dream up a set of 12 regions, not necessarily defensible, but let's pretend that's what ICANN adopted. How would we recommend the ALAC be transformed to match it I think is one of our real challenges we may not have full control of the regional lines, but hopefully we would have an opinion of how we would be morphed. And as I said, just multiplying three times the number of regions, or two times the number of regions is not going to do it. That's point number one.

With regard to liaison, I both agree with you and disagree with you 100%. But I think the issue is a matter of terminology. I don't think you want many liaisons to things. We need liaisons to groups number one, and it's reflected in their drafting of rules. We have liaisons to groups that want liaisons and we only call someone a liaison if that's a mutually agreed terminology. We have appointees to many things and we have volunteers for many more things.

So should we have a volunteer who is interested in intellectual property rights within the GNSO world? Well I would be delighted if I'm not the one to draft every paper on a GNSO subject, so yes. That requires someone to be or get knowledgeable in the subject, and then attend meetings and do all the things. And not a liaison, but it's a function that I would certainly welcome and I think we need. So I think the word



---

liaison is wrong. Participants, active participants either acting on explicit, appointed by the ALAC or simply volunteering from At-Large and acting equivalent to a liaison, a conduit for information both directions, is what we desperately are missing right now.

So I agree completely in function but I don't think we want to confuse the issue with the term liaison because it will create problems and not generate any real help. If people need a title I'm sure we could come up with one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Next is Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thank you Mr. Chair, it's Wolf Ludwig speaking. I just would like to pick up or reinforce what Jean-Jacques said before. Seen from a regional angle they've often discussed about enabling and disabling factors for our activities. And the regional model of the existing regional at ICANN, from a European point of view has often showed its limits or disabling factors. Let's take the usual example of Armenia. Armenia is officially considered by the ICANN regional model as being part of Asia and we always, with whatever Armenians we have met over the last couple of years, they always turn to us by saying "we have nothing to do with Asia. We consider ourselves being part of Europe. We are part of the Council or Europe.

We have so many close relations with Europe culturally, historically, etc." So we made an initiative during this working group on the regional model by at least adding a footnote that there might be very good



reasons to rethink, reflect, etc and modify this blocked structure. And we didn't get any feedback at the time and therefore my suggestion was, and my idea is let's be pragmatic. Tell our friends from Armenia "you are welcome"; they are officially part of APRALO, but if they want to contribute at EURALO they are welcome.

And we have Siranush who is doing this for years now. And I think this is the practical best practices we have to encourage. And there are moments when you simply need to ignore stupid structures and you have to make on a practical level and try to make the best out of it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Wolf. I just wonder, the Geographic Regions Working Group which is an ICANN wide working group has produced a number of papers, including I believe a final report, which then made it to the Board. I think that all of what you've mentioned is in that report. We've made a lot of recommendations. I'm not sure as to the status of where this has gone so far. I have a feeling that since 95% of the Boards' cycles are used with new gTLDs this has somehow been put to the side.

I don't want to spend more time on this issue. I think we're wasting time we've already discussed this many times in the past. But thanks for mentioning it because I know it's something we feel very strongly about. Rinalia and Carlton and the queue is closed. We have to close the meeting after this, so Rinalia please.



---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Mr. Chairman; Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcripts. I agree with Jean-Jacques intervention in terms of the need to rethink how we organize ourselves and our work, particularly along thematic lines, which is essentially the issues method that the mentioned, as well as regional lines. And I recognize that the regional rethink could be more challenging for practical reasons.

I remember raising it in my first meeting with Board members in Dakar at the lunch, and I had a chat with Steve Crocker about it. And when I mentioned that the regions need to be restructured he gave me this look and this reaction that tells me that the cost is not just about the participation but there are in the way ICANN is organized, the RIRs and etc. It goes very deep and that's why it's complicated.

But I think in the way that the At-Large works we can perhaps take practical means and like the way that Wolf mentioned. Now going back to the thematic restructuring, I believe I had a discussion with Olivier in the beginning of the week and it is particularly on this topic. I highlighted to him that I think it's about time that we identify some overarching themes that the ALAC and the At-Large work on.

It's because we need to identify what is it that our issues are around. And I think that Jean-Jacques had highlighted that already and I think that we are ready to do it. And what would result from that is actually a matrix organization, just as Fadi Chehade is reorganizing the ICANN operations and management the At-Large and ALAC I think is ready to work in a matrix way as well. And this can address the problem that the ALAC Chair has raised about how do we encourage cross working



group relations and work, and I think that we can do that through themes.

I want to raise another issue which is related to liaisons but pertain more to capacity. I think that the work of liaisons is tremendous, requires an inordinate amount of time and one person, it's almost impossible to do it but our liaisons do it well. But going into the future where the issues will get bigger with additional constituencies being added to ICANN itself. We need to think in terms of teams. They don't all need to be designated as liaisons, but they are teams working together, you can have official representation.

But it supports the process of feeding responses on issues that matter, especially when not everyone can do everything from A to Z. And I think that should be our working method as well, because we are focused on collaboration and working together. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Rinalia. Just as a comment on a number of things you said, the work of liaisons as we heard, for several of them, is Bylaw mandated. The building of teams, would you want to make this formal or is this an informal thing, for teams to basically group around liaisons and work with the liaisons.

**RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:** I think we should be open. Because as you say in terms of our work it's depending on interest and volunteer energy, time, etc. And I think that





---

there is sufficient interest among the community it's just a question of how do you create a process that they can get engaged.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you. Just for the record we've never been closed, so we are open. All I'm wishing is for things to actually happen, I'm really happy to hear all these suggestions, but just make it so. And not specifically to you, to everyone around here. With regards to the process involvements and looking at the bigger picture and getting things done, I think we have a working group called The Future Challenges Working Group, so it falls directly in line with what it needs to do. I'm looking forward to seeing results on that.

Next is Carlton, the queue is closed because we have run out of time and David Olive is waiting for us. So Carlton Samuels.

**CARLTON SAMUELS:** Thank you Chair, this is Carlton Samuels for the record. You actually took away the thunder. The first thing I suppose Jean-Jacques, yeah, because it is clear that we have themes, you may have heard it in the week where the RAA and Registrants Rights and WHOIS and all of those could be easily combined thematically. And so there is a question that we can work in themes, no doubt about it that we are hamstrung by the Bylaws.

With respect to the liaisons, the Bylaws is a hump we have to get over. And it's easy to say we can disregard it, but I would caution that you have to be very mindful that in the other parts of the ICANN ecosystem and the fact that we are Bylaw mandated has a lot to do with the kinds



---

of attention you get. And so in our zeal to make it better by working thematically we have to remember that even as we create themes and work on themes we have to remember we are straightjacketed by the Bylaws. And we wouldn't want to go too far away from them without changing them in other words, because you would be in trouble with the rest of the team.

With regards to the geographic regions, again I support Jean-Jacques totally. I was a member of the Geographic Working Group and we've had a full report, you're quite right Chair, because of the tension paid to the new gTLD issues then those recommendations in the report just kind of back burner-ed. So I think as Jean-Jacques says maybe one of the things that we can do to revive is in the new construct where they're talking about looking at the new world and trying to figure out how you go forward.

Maybe we can attack that as one of the things that has to be addressed in making that possible. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Carlton, and just to make it clear, they ALAC cannot unilaterally change its regions. This is a Bylaw thing so it would have to be the Geo Regions Working Group that is ICANN wide that would have to get the Board to choose the new model. Back to you Jean-Jacques for closing words.

**JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:** Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. So in reply to all these very interesting remarks I want to end by making four points, first about regions. Let's



---

not forget why these regions happen to be as they are. This is a consequence of the Cold War mentality. To be very precise it's (Inaudible) plus United Kingdom driven originally. It was to avoid a certain number of areas of the world to enter this stuff and bring ideology which was not in conformity with the views of the United States, great Britain and some others. I want to be very clear about this. That's why I say even more strongly it is time to change.

This is not about only Bylaws. If the Bylaws have to be changed it's up to us to suggest. I know we cannot change the Bylaws; there's a Board for that. But the Board on its own may not think about changing them. We have to suggest and demand a change provided it is well argued. What I'm suggesting is not an ALAC or At-Large review of regions. It is a thought piece in order to get the rest of the ICANN community, and especially its Board, to review the way regions are currently distributed.

My second point is about liaisons. I take Alan's point, very well made, about vocabulary. I really don't care whether you call them liaisons or something else. Being French I find that liaisons says exactly what it says. It may not be a structural function. It is a function you perform according to the needs you have that day. That's also a liaison, but never mind, I won't argue about the vocabulary. Let's keep that open.

In answer to Carlton's point, yes the Bylaws there again, but we should not feel blocked by Bylaws. We are constrained, sure, blocked, no. it's up to us to propose where necessary and when it's justified changes to the Bylaws. I tell you this as a former Board member. Third point, metrics. This is the key of all my expose. I haven't used the word and



---

Rinalia thank you for reminding me of this. Yes this is very much about metrics.

And I believe very strongly, very sincerely that what Fadi Chehade told us at the outset of this week it's truthful. It is sincere. He will be working along those lines. This is a challenge we in the community have to take up also and not have a mind block by thinking only in terms of structure. Final word is, before you mentioned it Olivier I just popped up to Evan and said "Don't you think we should suggest that if the Executive Committee and the full ALAC so desire we are at the disposal as co-Chairs of the Future Challenges Working Group to take up the subject and to present a sort of bullet points one-pager to all of you simply to see if you agree with the general content and then we can start working on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Jean-Jacques, and since we have run out of time I thank all of you for having come here this morning early. And I just wish that you have a safe flight home for those who have to fly today, or a nice stay for a few more days if you are staying and being a tourist. So thanks very much and I'll see you all in Beijing, but in between now and Beijing we have a huge amount of work and no doubt we will be speaking on a daily basis.

Thanks and good-bye. We will have an ExCom meeting in about three to five minutes. David Olive has been very kindly waiting, but a quick break and we'll reconvene. And we will start in exactly five minutes. So it's 18 minutes past 10, add five – 22 past.



[End of Transcript]

