
LONDON – ATLAS II Thematic Group 5: At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN - Session 1

Saturday, June 21, 2014 – 15:00 to 18:00

ICANN – London, England

UNIDENTIFIED: This is Saturday, June 21st. Two minutes before three. ATLAS II Thematic Group 5 in the Hilton 5.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I think we will probably start in one minute. I just want to get confirmation that everything is set to go in terms of recording.

Okay. Good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Good morning to possibly remote participants. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I'm the moderator for this thematic group #5, which is the At Large, the title of it is At Large Community Engagement in ICANN.

So, this At Large Community Engagement in ICANN was in fact one of the topics from the 2009's ATLAS I summit. And it's still a pressing issue as to how, well, how do we get persons to engage, meaning to participate and to be involved in ICANN policy development work.

And with us, we have several subject matter experts. Stéphane Van Gelder, who is a former GNSO chair, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond, who has just stepped out of the room for a minute or two. To asses me, we have also Alan Skuce, who is co-moderating, and for the reporter, who is doing the reporting, is Fouad Bajwa, who is sitting in the corner in the room there.

And Konstantine, how do you pronounce, sorry, how do you pronounce his last name, Konstantine? Kalaitzidis. Okay. I'm going to hope I got

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.

that right. Just a few housekeeping rules. Please state your name before you speak. This meeting is being recording and a transcript will be produced sometime afterwards and uploaded for other persons to read it.

And when they read the transcript, they don't want to see unknown name, unknown male, unknown female. So yeah, be cognizant of the fact that, you know, we are being recorded, and of course, you should try to speak, well, speak clearly so that, you know, the transcribers afterwards listening to the recording will be able to get an accurate transcript.

Okay, so we do have an agenda, and I've put the link there in the Adobe Connect room. So, let me just... So. I'm kind of wondering whether to do a roll call or not. I'm thinking hmm. Why not? Just a very brief roll call, since it's a relatively small group here. So starting from the end, I think that's Peter. Let's do just a quick roll call, just to say who is attending this meeting. So just introduce yourself. Thomas, I'm sorry.

THOMAS LOWENHAUPT: This is group five, a late arrival. I'm here from New York City. I'm a member of connecting dot NYC Inc. We're a public interest group that's looking for ways to make the dot NYC top level domain a public resource.

[LANA GOLDSTEIN]: [Lana Goldstein], ISOC Armenia ALS, and we are a certified ALS for already two years. This is my fourth ICANN meeting.

RAOUL BOWER: Hi, my name is Raul Bower. I represent a group of users from Argentina. I'm a member of LACRALO. I apologize for my English. This was not my first choice the group, but one of the reasons was the difficulties in the language. But you will apologize my English. I know we will apologize the decision of the people that [?] in this group. Thanks.

ANTHONY NIIGANI: Anthony Niigani, executive director with the Manitoba E Association. I'm also one of the mentees in the mentorship program, as well as a member of the NARALO.

TH SCHEE: Hello, I'm TH Schee, I'm from APRALO. I'm representing [?] from [?]. And I'm a relatively newcomer to the ICANN staff, but I've been involved in Internet and public years for like 20 years in the past. Thanks.

SUSIE JOHNSON: Susie Johnson, policy development support, ICANN staff.

ALAN SKUCE: Alan Skuce. Pacific Community Networks Association, ALS of NARALO.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Stéphane Van Gelder, EURALO and subject matter expert on this thematic group.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I'm moderator for this thematic group five. I'm on the ALAC from LACRALO.

BOGDAN MANOLEA: Hello. I'm Bogdan Manolea, from Armenia association called [Opt-in], and we are members of EURALO.

TAKAAKI HIGUCHI: I'm Takaaki Higuchi, APRALO, ISOC TAP, and this...

H.R. MOHAN: I'm Mohan from the Computer Association of India. One of the largest professional associations from India, having 120,000 members. And India has also become one of the largest use user base in terms of Internet users. And just I want to find out, you know, what is happening... This is my first meeting I'm attending. Thank you.

[VERNA ROOTSMAN]: Hello, I'm [Verna Rootsman], I am from the German Association for Data Protection and Privacy. And this is an ALS from RALO.

KONSTANTIN KALAITZIDIS: Konstantin Kalaitzidis, [?] ISOC.

FOUAD BAJWA: Fouad Bajwa from APRALO.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. So I posted the agenda. And one of the things on the agenda is, was supposed to be a review, during this afternoon what we are going to be doing is, we'll review the policy development processes at the, well, for At Large. Also do an overview of the GNSO policy development process.

And also look at how the ccNSO and the, which is the country code name supporting organization, and I will try to explain it any acronyms that come up. And please raise your hand and ask any questions if you have any questions about acronyms. So the ccNSO is the Country Code Name Supporting Organization, and the address supporting organizations, how they do policy development.

And Murray McKercher, who is also participating remotely, who is also one of the subject matter experts, would then be presenting on, well the end user perspective within ICANN. And why it's important. Also, then we'll just go into the question sessions, where we will ask the questions as to, can there be an improved process by which At Large develops its policies?

You know, how do we get persons more involved in ICANN At Large? What are the challenges? You know, perhaps you might have some ideas coming out as though how to overcome those challenges, or to mitigate those challenges. So...

[End of Audio 1]

[Begin Audio 2]

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: ...we want to also give, make the group aware of an ALAC paper, which was ordered last year, called the R3 paper. And which is making ICANN relevant, responsive, and respected. It raises four issues that the ALAC in 2012 first documented what needs to be done at ICANN. And obviously, there has been a lot that has been happening at ICANN in terms of accountability and transparency, and also trying to get more...

[End of Audio 2]

[Begin Audio 3]

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: So, all right. So we have started 22 minutes past the hour. One of the topics was going to be the At Large policy development process, but Olivier is still outside of the room. Excellent. Well Stéphane Van Gelder will actually be covering the At Large policy development process. So Stéphane, you have the floor.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks Dev. Stéphane Van Gelder. I ask for the slides to be put up. I'm not in the Adobe room, but that would not give me control anyway. So, once the slides are being put up, let me explain that these slides were very kindly lent to us from the ICANN policy staff, the GNSO policy staff.

Actually cover ICANN policy making overall. So I'm going, they're quite extensive slides. Can we expand that to full screen please? They're

quite extensive slides. Let's skip straight to the next one please. And yeah, the, yeah. And they are extensive in that they cover policy making in both SOs, Supporting Organizations, and the AC, Advisory Committees, at ICANN.

I'm going to stop on some slides more than others, but obviously this is not mean to be just a monologue. So please just raise your hands or just interrupt me. I'll probably, because you can't help it, use acronyms a lot. So once again, you know, this session is all about explaining these processes. Please do not be hesitant to ask even the simplest of questions. There are no stupid questions here.

Is it better if I control the slides myself? Susie?

SUSIE JOHNSON: Yes, I'm sorry.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Thanks. Right. So let's start with... What you have in front of you is a basic model of the ICANN multistakeholder environment. You can all read, so I'm not going to cover in detail. Suffice it to say that, as I explained initially, basically you have a variety of bodies reporting to the Board, or helping the Board, in its own decision making process.

Those bodies reporting to the Board, or directly responsible for making policy at ICANN, have the initials SO for Supporting Organizations. And those bodies advising the Board, obviously, are Advisory Committees. So the committee that all of us in this room are part of as members of

one RALO or another is ALAC, which is the At Large Advisory Committee, and that committee is the representative to the Board of the Internet user community.

So that's another breakdown of what I've just said. I'm not going to spend too much time on that. And that's something I've just explained as well. So as you can see, there are three supporting organizations. The GNSO, which I chaired, is responsible for making policy for generic, the generic domain name space. The ccNSO for the country code space, and the ASO for the IP address community, and advisory committees, ALAC, I just mentioned and you know your part in that.

The GAC is the Governmental Advisory Committee. SSAC and RSAC are technical communities, and we will cover those as well in this presentation. This is an interesting chart because it does show you the numbers involved, and those numbers can be taken with a slight pinch of salt. There are... But they do... I think it's interesting because it highlights one of the problems that you will find, and you will find all of us are up against, and that is community volunteer workload.

I'm not going to say burnout, although it's a popular term, but the workload is heavy. And as you can see, and as you will see throughout this presentation, the ICANN process is heavily dependent on these volunteers, you and I. So, that's a problem in anything that ICANN does, and it's obviously for the policy development process.

So let's go on to... I was supposed to present specifically on the Generic Name Supporting Organization's policy development process. And I can now that I've explained, I can shorten that to GNSO PDP. But I will cover all the other SOs and ACs in this presentation.

I'll skip over some of them. But I think it's interesting to set the scene. So, you know, and occasionally I'll just stop or raise my voice or something, just to make sure that everyone is still awake. I'll probably do that a lot. So the GNSO, as I said, responsible for making policy for generic domains.

The council itself is a complex structure. It's a structure that is bicameral, two houses. One of the houses groups the contracted parties, so the entities that have a direct contract with ICANN, registries and registrars. And the other, parties that are interested in ICANN policy making on the gTLD space, but I'm not directly contracted to ICANN.

I'm a member of the business constituency, which is in the non-contracted parties house on the right hand side. And I was, before, when I was GNSO chair, a member of the registrar stakeholder group. So it's a stretch, I know well from both sides, and it's a complex one. And to add to that complexity, you've got these little green men. Well, there are two green and one red.

And what are they? They are NCAs, NomCom appointees. They're appointed by the Nominating Committee to add diversity and a different point of view to the GNSO's council, deliberations, discussions, and policy making. As it happens, I'm also chair elect of the Nominating Committee, so I'm expected to be chair of the Nominating Committee next year.

So it's another body that I know well, and I'm happy to go into that, the way that the NomCom works. I think the NomCom is extremely important, both to policy development and also to ALAC, as you know,

or you might, as you might know, the NomCom fills a number of ALAC seats as well.

So that's the structure that I've just gone over. Basically all you need to know is that there is three levels. The council level, below that, you have stakeholder groups which are groups of common interests, if you will. And below that, you have constituencies. I'm happy to explain what those acronyms are, but perhaps, yeah.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev Anand. Please speak your name before speaking. Thanks.

TOMAS LOWENHAUPT: Tom Lowenhaupt. And I was listening to one of the teleconferences leading up to the event. And if you go back a slide or two, this one here. And they were talking about the picket fence and decisions that were made, within and without. Can you explain that a little bit? I didn't quite get.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Yeah. That's on a slide coming up, so if you'll indulge me, I'll explain that in a minute. But it's a good question. I'll try and explain it. I'm not sure I understand it. So that's the basic makeup. And the structure of the GNSO, the current structure dates from 2009.

Previous GNSO structure was a single house structure. So it didn't have any of this type of split. This structure was conceived at a time when the new gTLD program was becoming concrete. And it's designed to allow any group of interest to join the GNSO by not increasing the

stakeholder group, the number of stakeholder groups, but by increasing the number of constituencies.

So I'll give you an example. If you are a group of people that have a common interest in TLDs that only reference small meeting rooms, where there are no windows, I don't know why that example comes to mind. Then you can create a constituency, and you would have to slot into one of those stakeholder groups.

The policy development process timeline is this. I'm not going to go over it in detail. Suffice it to say that one of the things that you'll see is that there are regular slots for public comment. I think that's an important thing to notice. Nearly every step of the process, has one slot for public comments.

So the whole process is built to allow the community at any time to give their input and to say, "No. Hang on, you're doing this all wrong." Or, "This is right, but you should do this." Etc. Beyond that, this policy development process, like any other, reports to the Board, and then depending on what vote there is, I don't want to get into voting thresholds, etc. because they're complicated.

But if the council decides that it agrees with the policy development process, there are very few instances where the Board can refuse the council vote. There are some, but the Board is generally expected to follow the directive of the body that's charged with developing policy for a specific topic.

So the picket fence. There is a contractual obligation made on contracted parties, registries and registrars, to comply with consensus

policies. Consensus policies are policies that are developed by the community, as a whole, and are... Once they are developed and agreed and voted on, become enforceable on those contracted parties.

So if you look at examples of what's... So if you're in a room with anyone from the GNSO, you'll always hear them talk about what's in and out, inside and outside, the picket fence. What that means is topics inside the picket fence cannot be... Any contracted party has to abide by those, if there is a vote on them.

And it's limited to topics that are considered of public interest basically. I mean, if you look at the second item, security and stability on the Internet, the system is designed so that business interests of the contracted parties cannot bring the contracted parties to say, "No, sorry, we're not doing that." Because it's of, you know, interest to the Internet as a whole.

The other side is that, is that anything outside the picket fence, that's a contractual matter between ICANN, between the two entities who have signed the contract. So ICANN and registries or registrars. So consensus policies, something... IRTP which is something to do with transferring domain names from one person to another.

UDRP which is about protecting trademark interests or prior rights in domain names. WHOIS, I'm sure everyone knows what that's about. That is a very, very simple explanation of what the picket fence and why that exists. Is that okay?

What's inside is those three things. The second bullet. Limited to specific topics such as technical specs, security and stability, and WHOIS.

THOMAS LOWENHAUPT: And they're all controlled by contract?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: The contract says, any consensus policy you have to abide by. So Mr. Registrar, if there is a policy that the GNSO arrives at, that's inside the picket fence... If it's outside the picket fence, the contracted parties will say to the GNSO council, "You shouldn't be talking about this, because it's a direct thing to do with us and our contract with ICANN. If it's inside..."

THOMAS LOWENHAUPT: Does it broadly apply to everyone?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: No.

THOMAS LOWENHAUPT: Okay. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: And if it's inside the picket fence, then the GNSO community, which if you go back to this slide, includes as you can see, a full house of people that don't have contracts on the right, that don't have contracts with ICANN. The system is designed, once again, to protect users on matters

of extreme importance to the way the Internet works, but it's also designed to protect the people that the businesses that have contract with ICANN, from having every single item in their contract scrutinized by people that don't have that contractual relationship.

So it's a kind of weird mix of, I'm contracting with this entity, so it's a face to face, you know, one to one conversation on the one hand. But you've got this whole community outside, at some point is allowed in the room to decide what goes into my contract. Sorry.

It doesn't actually physically change the contract, because the contract has a clause in it that say, "Any consensus policy you have to abide by." So there is no need to change the contract. What happens is if the GNSO council votes on consensus policy, then the contracted parties have to abide by that.

The way... I'm listening to myself, and I'm thinking I'm making less and less sense as I'm going along. So we can stay on this for a bit if there is need.

BOGDAN MANOLEA:

So is there a lease to public... Bogdan Manolea from EURALO. So is there an exhausted public list of consensus policies that have been adopted?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

Good question. I know not, but I would expect so. It's probably... And with the ICANN website redesign, it's probably even harder to find now then it was before, which was probably hard already. But I'm sure such

a list exists. Certainly you can go back over the GNSO archives and you'll find all of the policy decisions there.

Okay? So we'll move on. So, this is actually quite an interesting slide in that really what we're concerned with here is getting At Large, the Internet user involved in policy making in ICANN. How can you do it through the GNSO? I mentioned the public comment thing earlier on, so I won't go over that again.

But every working group that works on policy, sorry let's go back a step. Here in this process you can see, on the third green box, forum working group. The policy development is actually done by working group, and then that reports to the GNSO council. So the working groups are open to anybody. So if you want to get involved, you can either join a working group mailing list, or follow, actually volunteer to join the working group itself.

Or if you fit in one, you can join a stakeholder group or a constituency. And if you are really, really keen and you've all, you know, you're suffering from sleep problems, you can actually attend GNSO council meetings. That's always a good way to, you know, get over the jet lag.

Some of these, to answer your question, some of the topics that they've been discussing on the GNSO recently, yeah. Any questions, I'm happy to answer them, but I don't think we need to spend much time over those. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What's important to Internet users in those? I mean, anything that really stands out? It's Olivier speaking.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: I actually didn't hear your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. What are the issues that are important to Internet users that stand out as being particularly important Internet users? Just 30 seconds.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Well I'd say all of the above to be honest. I mean, these are just examples. When I say Internet users need to look at, very carefully, and I want, I mean, I'll stress this time and time again. ALAC, we're here at ATLAS II, ATLAS I was in Mexico in 2009, was it Olivier? Yeah.

In the space of that five years, At Large has come on heaps and bounds. And the question today of how should Internet users and At Large get involved, and what topics are of relevance to that community, is actually, if you'll pardon my saying, less important today than it was five years ago, because At Large is involved in every step of the way.

And that was not the case certainly five years ago. But I think the issues that At Large should be looking at now, are issues that are putting pressure on the existing system. And those issues all come from the new gTLD program, basically when we're talking about GNSO policy development process. And what you're seeing, if we go back to this chart, what you're seeing now is strong, an intense pressure on this structure.

This structure was designed to factor in new gTLDs, but I don't think today it's working as well as it might. And you're seeing, if you look at all of the boxes, new gTLD registries or applicants, can fit in most of these. That is one of the issues that the user should be looking at. It's something that At Large can actually bring the council, the GNSO council, to look at in a different way because the GNSO council is designed to look at these issues very technically.

And if you look at the list of issues, you know, look at that. And if you understand any of it, then well done. You know, but actually what all of this is talking about, is the way you and I in our everyday lives work with our domain names and how we can manage them. Inter-registrar transfers, that's important to all of us. At some point, we might want to change our provider.

Proxy and privacy, who, at this table, has never felt some measure of discomfort at having to put your mobile phone number in the WHOIS to get a domain name? And I could carry on. So unfortunately, the wording used is very, you know, we all love to sound as though we know what we're talking about, but in actual fact, all of these issues are of relevance to ALAC, to At Large, sorry.

[LANA GOLDSTEIN]:

[Lana Goldstein]. I have some questions about the contracted parties, about registers. It's just interesting for me, for how many years a register will sign a contract with ICANN? Is there such a thing, for a period? And what will be the reason to cancel this contract? Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: There is no simple answer, but I'll try. The contract the registrar signs with ICANN is called the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the RAA for short. It is a fixed term contract that is subject to change. What that means is that there is, I think it's a five year contract, if my memory is correct, but it can be revised by ICANN and the community at times.

The community can force a revision of the contract. That has actually just happened, so there was a RAA that was redone in 2009, most registrars signed on. And at that time, they signed for five years. And the understanding is that they don't have to do another contract for the next five years.

If, in the meantime, there is another contract that comes along, they can choose to sign it, but they don't have to. Now between 2009 and 2013, which is the latest RAA, something happened which was that in the new gTLD program rules, ICANN said, "You can only sell new gTLDs if you sign the new contract."

That's the first time registrars have had to deal with that. So you cannot sell new gTLDs without being a signatory of the 2013 RAA. So basic answer to your question is five years, unless something new like what I've just described comes along.

I obviously don't know the contract off by heart. There is a compliance department at ICANN that constantly looks at whether contracted parties are following their contractual obligations. And if they don't, they get a letter. If they continue to do it, they get a second letter. And if they still continue, they start to get a mean letter.

And if they're still continuing then they get their contract revoked. Sorry, did I see someone else's hand up? No. Okay. So, the ccNSO, of which I know nothing about, but I will still try and muddle through. Is another SO but this one, you have to be a ccTLD operator to be part of that SO.

So, the ccNSO only looks at the ccTLD space. It works with the GNSO on common issues, but it's only tasked with looking at that specific space. There is a breakdown of membership. The ccNSO, the way it works, you know, because it is focused on representing that specific community, and it's a community that has no contract with ICANN, don't forget, which is...

I mean, I don't want to go into... We could spend a lot of time talking about whether cc's, you know, should be asked to contribute to ICANN in a different way, but perhaps this is not the time. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thank you very much Stéphane. I was just going to mention, regarding the ccNSO, there are two things which are important. With regard to country codes, because country codes are sovereign, there are completely independent of ICANN. And so the country codes, country code operators are registries that are part, that are part of the ccNSO, are only willingly part of the ccNSO.

They are not obliged to pay fees to join the ccNSO, although some decide to actually quite happily contribute quite heavily to ICANN by donating funds when they take part. Not all country codes are parts of

the ccNSO, in fact some are completely independent and have never stepped into an ICANN meeting.

Some ccTLD operators are governments. Some of them are private operators. Some of them are even individuals. Some of them are not-for-profit organizations, or end user organizations, which is interesting because in fact we have a couple of At Large structures that are connected to country codes as well since they are like this.

The policy development of the ccNSO does not take place in the ccNSO actually, because these are national policies. So each operator would run their own policies. Some of them might be bottom up, some of them might be multistakeholder, some of them might be just one person deciding one day they want to do this or that. And so be it.

And ICANN is not able to tell them what to do, far from it. In fact, if ICANN was to tell them what to do, they would probably say... Beep. I'm out of here. That's effectively what they would do. So that's it. That's the thing. There is much, just a coordination role here. There is some global policy work from time to time, I think, but there is not that much going on.

There is more of a coordination body between country codes, and of course, their involvement in ICANN.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

Thanks Olivier. This is Stéphane again. Just to add to that, a couple of things. First of all, if you look at what... If you ask yourselves, what's the major policy that the GNSO has done? The answer is simple, the

new gTLD program. That's the, sorry, the latest that, you know, the thing that comes to mind.

Actually the ccNSO has one as well, has a major program called the IDN ccTLD fast track, which predates the new gTLD program. And that was, as Olivier has just described, it was basically work done by the cc community, but there was a lot of governmental involvement, if not pressure, to develop that policy.

So it is a different world. And I would also add, that from an user perspective, you know, if we accept the fact that the multistakeholder model at ICANN is something that we want to see continuing to thrive, where now finding ourselves in a position, where the lines that were clear cut before aren't so clear cut now. The ccNSO is a perfect example of that because you look at many of the cc operators, they are also now new gTLD applicants.

So, there is, if not a conflict of, a common interest in the type of policy development that's done. And I think that's also cause for rethinking. I also think, once again, this is a scenario where At Large has a lot to, a lot of input to provide to the community in general. To try and steer this ship in a way that, you know, serves everybody well, because right now, what you have is some measure of discomfort from the G community, seeing they're obliged to pay ICANN, but the ccs aren't.

Yet, the ccs are now coming into their space, but they're, as you've just said Olivier, they'll, if anyone tries to tell them what to do, they'll turn around and say beep off. So it is becoming and even more complex problem.

TOMAS LOWENHAUPT: Tom Lowenhaupt. Is there... IDNs, I presume, the ccTLDs are going forward, but are there examples other than IDNs that they've applied for?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: As gTLDs?

TOMAS LOWENHAUPT: Yeah, gTLDs. If I understood, you said that the ccTLDs have been applying for...

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Oh, right, so I understand what you mean. No, so the IDN thing is actually completely separate. The IDN fast track was a program designed to give ccTLD operators their cc in IDN four. It's not a gTLD. What I'm saying is that some of them since then, I don't want to give specific examples, but many national... I mean, where are we now in England? Well, you know, close to home.

They've certainly become backend operators for new gTLDs. So, they've gone into this commercial space, you know, the ccTLD basic mandate is, "We represent the national interest. The ccTLD of our country, is a national resource, hands off." What they've done, these ccTLD registries is that they've built up both resource, financial and business resources out of managing that national resource.

And now they've gone into the G space. That's fine except it begins to put pressure on the traditional GNSO, NSO model.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Stéphane. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Actually, you've raised a very interesting point. The backend operator, effectively, you could apply for a new generic top level domain and not know anything about the actual running of this, the whole technical stuff. And subcontract this to an organization, a company, that would basically run the servers, make sure everything runs 24/7 etc. etc.

And I think what you're saying is some of the country code operators have that infrastructure and are now marketing this infrastructure for generic top level domains. Where does the line go at that point? Very difficult. And as we know, as far as At Large policy engagement in those organizations, how does that work then?

Does At Large have to engage through the GNSO? Or are they then allow to start engaging through the ccNSO? Certainly recent discussions which have taken place between the At Large advisory committee, and the ccNSO leadership, have shown a warming up of possible collaboration on some of the overall worldwide discussion, but definitely no warming up at all on At Large getting involved through ICANN, into national country code top level domain operators.

That's something which we can encourage our At Large structures to try and do locally, in their own country, but definitely not in this top down fashion.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you Olivier. Stéphane again. So, I'll skip over this part, mostly because I don't understand it myself. [Laughter] And go to, just very quickly, mention the other SO, which is the address supporting organization. If you're technically minded, you know that there are regional and Internet registries that coordinate through something the NRO, and that, do you want to speak to this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Stéphane. It's Olivier speaking. And so this morning, you've all seen Paul Wilson who came to see us before he arrived, and he was the, I think, one of the directors of the NRO, the number resolve organization. This is the pyramid. So the regional Internet registries and the NRO are the pyramid that distributes the IP address worldwide. The don't distribute them on a geographical basis or per country basis because as we know, the Internet spans many countries, and if you start dealing with Internet addresses into one country, and then other national Internet address in another country, well how do you get those two, sometimes four, sometimes 10 networks interconnected together?

So, this organization, this whole set of organizations is there to each distributed address in a managed way. Some might say it is a monopoly, but the reason for it being a monopoly is because if you provide the same IP address to two different computers, if you don't have a managed system, then you risk having routing problems, you risk having problems where an IP address will be present in two parts of the network, and therefore the thing will break basically.

It's even more important today with the IPv6, the new address space, which is so huge, it has to be managed pretty carefully. There have

been some concerns, in the past, by the United States having the majority of IP addresses, but that's of course a legacy thing. They were the first ones to use address spaces, and now that we're running out of IPv4 addresses, some countries are saying, "Well, this is stifling our innovation. We need address space to be reorganized on a per country basis, and every country should have the same number of addresses."

On IPv6 there are so many billions of them out there, that it will not be a problem. Or at least, in the near future, it's not going to be a problem. And I think the size of the allocations that are currently given out is large enough for any needs out there. The policy development of the regional Internet registries, of the ASO actually takes place in the different component organizations.

So AfriNIC for Africa, APNIC for Asia/Pacific, and Pacific Islands, ARIN for North America, LACNIC for Latin America, and RIPE for Europe and a part of the Middle East as well. It's a strange, strange mix. So all of these organizations have public mailing lists and possibilities for At Large members to actually take part in the policy.

But as Stéphane said very well earlier, it's very technical. And if you don't know what the slash 16, slash 32, and BGP routing, and all of that, then I wouldn't recommend going into that, it becomes quite technical. But for those people that are technically minded, please go ahead with it. Please take part.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks Olivier. Stéphane again. Especially as the ASO, it's the silent SO in a way. It's the one you never hear about. Yet it's actually probably

the most important one, technically, for the way the Internet and the domain names work. So, it's certainly worth getting interesting in and having a look at.

And, you know, Olivier just mentioned IPv6. One of their recent policies was on recovering IPv4 addresses. As I'm sure everyone is aware, in the transitions brought on by IPv4 address exhaustion, and the need to have more addresses, so they've, these IPv6, which are larger addresses, were created.

And one of the things that the ASO has looked at, and advised the ICANN Board on, is a way to look at how to recover slices of IPv4 addresses that we call blocks, and to be able to use those again, or assign them to people that, you know, might need them. So it's extremely important work, but it's work that is done, you know, it's in the engine room of the Internet.

So at times, it's not always seen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I could say, it's Olivier speaking. It's the Internet plumbing.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: So advisory committees. As I've mentioned earlier on, these are setup to advise the Board, and the ICANN community in general, on matters of interest to the work that is being done here at ICANN. So there are four of these, ALAC obviously you know, the GAC, the SSAC and the RSAC.

The last two are very technical. The governmental advisory committee is very political, and At Large is just perfect. So I'm not going to go over, I surely don't need to go over At Large. Do I?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are we all clued up on At Large? I think by now.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: There is a little diagram, just in case you're not. And you should all be able to fit in here somewhere. I'm blue, for example, in the RALO space. And just maybe to mention for those of you who are new to the ICANN process, the fact that the At Large community and through ALAC selects a seat on the Board, is both pretty new and very important.

So Rinalia, who has just been elected, is the second At Large elect to the Board. And that is something that this community has fought for, for a long time. Olivier, do you want to...?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You might wish to add something about the Nominating Committee perhaps?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: I mentioned the Nominating Committee earlier on, so yeah. I did mention earlier on, when you were being interviewed, that the NomCom appoints to ALAC, a large proportion of the ALAC membership, five people. These are based on regions. So, you know,

the intent is to cover all of the ICANN regions. And it's another way into...

I mean, I can take this opportunity just to describe, very quickly, that the NomCom process is another way into ICANN leadership positions. So the NomCom appoints to the Board, the GNSO council, the ccNSO council, and ALAC. And the importance of that is that it allows people, part of the ICANN community to come in and be a part of the work that's being done.

And why is that important? Well it's important to ICANN because it gives new different viewpoints or expertise into the process. And that's something that couldn't happen if you just depended on each of the groups that were in the initial structure, the first slide that I saw, I showed, if you just depended on each of those groups to appoint people to the Board, then you wouldn't get that mix, you wouldn't get that different spread of expertise, and you wouldn't get that, even that cultural and geo-diversity, which is much needed.

[LANA GOLDSTEIN]:

It's [Lana Goldstein] speaking. While we are speaking about the representative of At Large in the Board, Board members. I want to say that I'm very happy that Rinalia has been elected from APRALO region. But my question is, since the At Large covering the whole world through all RALOs, why the number of representatives is only one?

We have only one seat in the Board. It's really very strange. We can have either five RALOs, representative from each RALO, to bring the voice of our end users, or maybe a count of two or three on a rotating

basis. This is really very important for me, so that the voice of the end users to be heard on the Board, not one representative. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

So there is a politically correct and politically incorrect way to answer your question. I'll start with the second one, which is a simple answer, think to yourself lucky you've got one. And you know, if you're going to be politically correct, then you're going to have to go over a lot of history, difficult history, ICANN history, and the relationships ICANN has with the Internet user community in general.

But your question is about representation basically. And why is this representation limited to one seat? I'll just, just looking at the structure of the Board, ALAC and At Large are not being hard done by having one seat. The GNSO has two seats, because it has two houses. And each house elects one person.

The ccNSO has one seat. There are other, I mean, the NomCom appoints a fair chunk, no, no, many. I think it's eight, but because I'm going senile I can't remember the exact number, and it's very embarrassing. But the NomCom appoints a large slice of the Board, and then, you know, the community, as I've just explained, has one or most two seats.

So, just to say that, maybe Olivier will have a comment on this as well. But just to say that the At Large community is not being hard done by having one seat. And the expectation is that through the process you're seeing there of going from an ALS through a RALO to ALAC, that that

community will elect the best representative of all of the regions. Do you want to say something about that Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much Stéphane. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Of course, this is a very touchy subject in At Large. And we should, indeed, be happy to have one Board member, for many years we did not have a Board member or a person selected to be on the Board. We had a liaison.

This morning, Alejandro Pisanty went through the reasons why it became this way due to the direct suffrage, people voting for around the world, having somehow turned the election into a farce by creating thousands and thousands of new email addresses, and therefore creating new electors, when the vote took place initially. That's all part of history.

And the new system that is in place is obviously more stable. It's less prone to being captured. That said, this community might wish to be looking at the opportunity of asking for another Board member in the future. Maybe today, maybe five years from now, maybe it's long gone. I don't know.

I mean, this is one of the things that we might wish to discuss here for a while. This really is At Large engagement in ICANN. And if this working group decides that there might be an interest in this, then this is the place to discuss this.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you Olivier. Stéphane again. Yeah, please.

TOMAS LOWENHAUPT: Tom Lowenhaupt. I just like to comment that, the idea of having one for each region sounds reasonable to me. And the fact that the process is followed, was it year 2000, and it got botched up is no reason to try again, to think through the process again. It's, you know, one mistake is not the end of the world. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. So Stéphane again. So I'll continue, and skip through the At Large part of this. Just to mention the GAC. I'm sure you're aware what the GAC is. It's, sorry I thought there was more on the GAC. The GAC is a difficult topic because first of all, in most of the important ICANN development processes that there have been in recent years, the GAC has had special privileges, and that includes the new gTLD program where they have a specific right to get what they want that other bodies, that I've just described, don't.

But the relationship between ICANN and the government representatives, has been difficult or tenuous at times. And there are good reasons on both sides for wanting to have the GAC involved in the way it is today. However, just go back to the way the GAC works on a day to day basis, I'm sure you're aware that the GAC provides advice to the Board, every time that it meets, and that's three times a year when there is an ICANN meeting.

So the end of an ICANN meeting, you'll see a GAC communique, and that GAC communique will generally have advice in it for the Board. Anything else on the GAC? Skip through. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Stéphane. Olivier speaking. So there were... We spoke about NetMundial this morning. And there were calls by some organizations to make the GAC multistakeholder, which in effect, somehow showed the fact that maybe the ICANN structure was misunderstood. The government advisory committee is a room where we put all of the governments to talk about issues, and then bring their point of view to the overall multistakeholder table that we have in ICANN.

So, yeah, I just thought I would mention that so that we don't make this as a recommendation. Obviously, I'm sure we know a lot more than this. But it's interesting how outside of these walls, very few people understand the overall multistakeholder structure of ICANN, and the way things relate to each other. I guess it is confusing, but we need to be pretty clear in whatever recommendations we come up with, that not only will it be understood by the Board, but we also need to make sure that it's written in a way, and I'm looking at you Fouad, written in a way that people outside of ICANN will be able to understand as well.

Because the grave danger is, of course, that they'll say, "Ah, another internal report for insiders, by insiders." Yeah, you all will be insiders. Yup. You all are going to be pointed out and going, "Yeah, you guys, ICANN people. Ugh." So, you have got to make sure this is accessible to everyone.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Yeah, very important point. Thank you Olivier.

UNIDENTIFIED: This may be the category of dumb questions that was referred to endlessly earlier, but the... In terms of government advisory committees, are they necessarily, currently there is nation states that are those, there are any number of city governments that now have, or are affiliated with top level domains. And I'm wondering what it is, which don't have a representation in any sense in the ICANN process, and I was trying to figure out where that fits, you know?

Do you think the GAC is a place where they might pound down the wall or the door and get in?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Stéphane again. They do have representation through the registry stakeholder group. That's the place for city governments that have applied for a new gTLD using your example. No, the city governments do not have a place at the GAC, except their national representatives. So the GAC representatives of each country are there to represent everyone in that country, and work for the public interest of that state or that country.

And beyond that, countries in general. But the GAC is a body that only has national members, not regional members. And there are observers to the GAC. And these could be organizations that, for example, I believe the latest one to be approved as an observer to the GAC is the

OIC, the Organization of Islamic Councils. So you can have, you know, kind of almost governmental organizations that will be accepted as observers to the GAC, but they're not voting members.

Security and stability advisory committee, God knows what they do, probably something to do with security and stability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Stéphane. In fact, this morning, if you were listening, we had Patrik Fälström who came to speak to us briefly. And he explained to us what their purpose were. And we have to be thankful, it's thanks to them that the Internet still works, or the DNS, sorry, not the Internet. The DNS works, I guess, somehow.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: And I was, Stéphane again. I was obviously joking. Patrik does a great job...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the record, it's Olivier speaking. Stéphane was not joking at all Patrik. No, I'm kidding. I'm kidding. That's fine.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Patrik and I are great friends. And the SSAC is illustrious in that before Patrik, there representative was Steve Crocker. So it is an important body. It is really part of the backbone of ICANN, as Olivier rightly said. I mean, I thought we were allowed a bit of English humor, but if we're not, I won't do that anymore.

But as Olivier rightly said, you know, it's a crucial body, because it helps. If you look at what some of the... That's not detailed in these slides, but if you look at some of the work that SSAC has done recently, you know, it's simplifying technical matters for the rest of the community. And they do advise on critical technical matters.

I'm trying to remember the latest work that they've done, Olivier perhaps you can help me out in this because I know that you know this. But their latest reports, which I actually read, and I still can't remember what they were about, were you know...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Collision.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Name collision.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Name collision. Thank you very much. That the name collision report is extremely important. And it's a concrete example of the fact that the work they do impacts us all. How has this impacted us? Because the work that they did, led the Board to change the rules of the new gTLD program, and include lists of names that registries would not be allowed to use, because it was feared that there would be collisions with existing

systems that were configured or built or designed before new gTLDs existed.

So they use terms, strings, that the new gTLD program has, you know, applicants have applied for, as part of internal networks. That's where the collision happens. It's a collision between an internal network and the Internet. That was not a problem before the new gTLD program, it's a problem now.

So an example, humor set aside and joking aside, it's an example of the important work that SSAC does. And Patrik, we love you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Stéphane. You really seemed to be worried about Patrik. Patrik just unplug it. So, with regards to these, just to give you an example. Dot home and dot corp were two top level domains, new top level domains that would have collided with existing naming systems.

What's basically happen is, in general I think most Microsoft machines, when they're sent out have a MS home dot home as being a standard default setup. And if people don't change that default setup to their own things, which the majority of people don't change, then they already are using dot home, which is a local disk, local address of some sort.

If dot home was then released on the DNS by a new registry running dot home as a top level domain, that would have introduced the creating problem, but all sorts of associated things. Another problem was the problem of dot corp. In the Microsoft manual for setting up a corporate network, all of the examples used dot corp.

So, as many people think what name should I think of? Oh, dot corp, here we go, I'll just call it dot corp. And therefore, you'd end up with many, many thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands of companies out there that would have security breaches. Another one was to do with certificates. The certificates are usually assigned on a per top level domain basis.

This is all to do with DNSSEC and all of the encryption of data and identification of DNS queries, etc. There is a whole mix with that. What SSEC has found, again, some clever guy in there flagged this up and said, "Well, if we look at the list of new generic top level domains that are being created out there..." Let's say we have dot Stéphane for example, that someone has applied, God knows how would have applied for that. But someone has applied for dot Stéphane, and so we'll propose dot Stéphane worldwide.

Then what I can do is to actually apply for a private name certificate with an extension, dot Stéphane. And when dot Stéphane, the real dot Stéphane goes live, I can pretend to be the real dot Stéphane, although I'm not the dot Stéphane. That introduces huge security risks. And this is another advisory that the SSAC came up with and says, "Don't..."

Now that we know the list of new generic top level domains, do not provide private certificates with the extensions that are there. These are the sort of things that they work on, very technical. We have a liaison, as you know, with the SSAC and they've been very good. But it's also, often a lot of their work is not transparent because they deal with security risks, and of course, if you're going to put your finger on a security risk, between the time you actually identified it and the time

they've written the report, you don't want to have hackers and whatever, other people making use of that.

So a lot of their work is kept confidential until a cure is already presented for it, as in a lot of security work out there. That's it. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you Olivier. It's Stéphane again. I've nearly finished, so you are about to be able to wake up. Just the RSSAC, which is the Root Service System Advisory Committee, which is another technical committee, which obviously, looks at the root server system. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do you want to say a few words? I can say a couple of words.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Oh, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. So the history of the Internet is full of weird things. One of them being that initially, of course, the root server system was not created by putting out there a call for bids and, you know, for organizations, large organizations to start things. The Internet was so small originally that it was just a bunch of people who said, "Oh, I'm happy to run a root server."

And they would run it under their desk. And every Friday, when the cleaner passed by, they would unplug it and plug the Hoover instead.

And there was one root server less for the Friday afternoon. Oh, it's the usual Friday afternoon slow down thing. So this is something that used to happen. Of course, it's not like this anymore these days. But most of the operators remain the same.

And of course, the person that had it under his desk has had to get their organization, university, or whatever organization it was to put it into a data center, and actually work with other root server operators to be able to be sure that they've got policies that work across the root services.

One interesting thing is that, the root servers run on different types of software. And that's pretty much taking on the, or origins of the Internet, and origins of civilization actually. The very fact that we are still present as a species is because we're all a bit different. So if there is one virus that affects one type of person, then it will affect other people less.

And this is the same thing here. One type of malware will not affect all of the root servers because the software is completely different. And so the root server operators have to also make sure this remains like this, and has the system on one side, they have to enhance it elsewhere, but in a totally parallel space.

That's where RSSAC is, they don't do very much policy at all, I think. There are not very present at ICANN meetings. And in fact, it's only recently that we've actually seen a few of the RSSAC people turn up. Most of the time, they go to IETF meetings because they're more interested in bytes and bites than in people.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks Olivier. Stéphane again. I think this is finished now. Just a few links if you want to find out what happens in the policy world at ICANN. There is a policy newsletter that's published monthly. You have the link up there and it's available in several languages. And there is a policy update webinar that I think happens at every, you know, in the run up to every meeting.

This is actually very useful if you want to just have a very quick rundown of the latest issues before you get to an ICANN meeting. So just look on the ICANN website, that those are always announced. Those webinars. And that's it. I'll go over the policy stuff, and say thank you to them. And thank you to you for your attention. Back to you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. Thank you Stéphane for giving a comprehensive overview of how policy work, how it happens in ICANN. From how the supporting organizations develop policy, and how do these advisory committees give advice to how policies are developed.

So we spend some time looking at how policy is developed within ICANN through the various supporting organizations, and how the advisory committees give police advice. So the question really comes up, what's the At Large end user perspective? And Murray McKercher, who is our online remotely, and I think staff has done the magic and this... So Murray, are you able to... Can you say something.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I am speaking, and I'm curious to know if anyone can hear me.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. We can hear you good. So Murray, I think you sent your slides to the staff. Staff can you load up...? Okay, well staff is doing the magic now to upload your slides Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes I see those coming into Adobe Connect. So just while they're coming on, my late introduction. My name is Murray McKercher. I am part of the NARALO organization. And I still classify myself as a newbie to ICANN, having first been introduced at ICANN 45, which was held here in Toronto. And I've seen five meetings since then.

I'm still learning a lot of the acronyms. At any rate. I would suggest there were some great pieces headed up by Gisella and Heidi, with names of acronyms, and I always sat at meetings with that book open beside me so I could understand what was going on. So I hope that's helpful to everyone.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Murray, this is Dev Anand speaking. Susie, you want to just specify what has to happen?

SUSIE JOHNSON: Murray? I haven't received your file yet. Could you please upload it yourself?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Let me just turn on anything out there.

SUSIE JOHNSON: Click the down arrow. And share document.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Okay. [?] I can ask Olivier while I'm just doing this [?]... The end user perspective this morning, and I was going to read through that. So while I'm grabbing my [?]... take the floor, I would appreciate that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. I think what Murray was saying, and it probably dropped off a little bit because he was uploading his presentation, I think that he had shared the slides with you, so if you wanted to start it. If I understood Murray correctly. Apologies.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: That's okay. I emailed those slides a few minutes ago, so perhaps they have not arrived yet.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay.

[CROSSTALK]

SUSIE JOHNSON: Go to browse my computer, lower, no lower, at the bottom right, bottom left. Okay, the other right. [Laughter] Okay, now look for your document.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: While that's happening. I'm going to continue just by way of a personal interest in ICANN and how one manages to get involved. So I simply just showed up at an ICANN meeting in Toronto, and have engaged ever since. One of the personal interests for me was the WHOIS database. Because I thought it was unfair that someone could sit on a domain name, and I was unable to find out who actually was sitting on that domain name.

And thought that the whole WHOIS database should be examined. So I know that's happening, and that's an example of how one can be involved with ICANN and help make a change.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev Anand speaking. So, okay, have you selected your file to upload to the Adobe Connect? Your slides?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I have not. I'm not sure where I'm going to do it. I'll just speak to my slides, and we'll get them up in good time. So, from my perspective, the question is why was the end user's perspective important in ICANN? And the reason, for me, my definition regards the Internet really provides improved communications, and sharing of information between people. People are important.

People who use computers and people who use mobile phones. So ICANN as the steward of the global system that connects people, obviously needs to keep that system working. So end users are absolutely important. As Olivier stated this morning, and I had a slide for this morning's presentation, that why is ICANN important for Internet users?

And my sense is because operational policies, which are being decided within ICANN, will affect all Internet users. So it's important that Internet users have a voice. And also because we really need a true multistakeholder system, and that governance of the Internet obviously involves users. And thirdly because the strength of the Internet is that it really is a user centric technology, it's about users.

I won't say it's less about business, but when the Internet came, I have a lot of gray hair, when the Internet came, and there was a lot of discussions about who owns the Internet, because business had a difficulty saying, "Well, someone must own this." And telecom companies wondered who owned this technology. So a lot has happened since those early days.

That's really why users must be involved. So I think it's important that ICANN needs to listen to the users, and then in order to do that, to be a legitimate multistakeholder organization. And whereas ICANN needs the end user's feedback, I also believe that the end users need the open forum that ICANN provides to raise issues of a policy nature.

And we heard from Stéphane about how one could get involved in policy. This morning, I'm assuming a lot of people were there this morning, Nigel Hickson commented about Internet governance, and I

think we need to take Internet governance from the perspective and context of ICANN's responsibilities in the Internet ecosystem.

So, again, focusing on names, and numbers, and IANA, and DNS. Without creeping into a lot of other discussions, but nevertheless, ICANN provides an open forum for discussions like freedom of speech and other items. Finally, I would like to just talk a little bit about identity. It was raised this morning. ICANN is involved with names and numbers, but people are really about identity.

And as one has an identity on the Internet, names and numbers become important. And people obviously hold their identity in high regard. So I want go at length about identity, but I think we should have that as a discussion topic this week. And I will be in London tomorrow to meet with you all.

So I'll just summarize again, why are end users important to ICANN? I believe one, that a true multistakeholder model of governance includes the user feedback. It's very important that we focus on identity, and the important need for input from people is very important. And we need people's input for this rather precious global resource that we're managing. Thank you. I'll turn it over to you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Murray. This is Dev Anand speaking. So indeed, so as Murray has mentioned, you know, all the policy work of ICANN impacts the end users, and that's why it's crucially important that end user voices can be heard, especially through the multistakeholder system of

ICANN that allows for multiple voices from various actors, including end users.

So, well, now that we've come to... Let me look back on my agenda, sorry. So, now the next steps is we're going to a Q&A session, as to, well, we've now heard about the, how policy development is done at ICANN, and the key reasons why end users need to be involved and engaged in ICANN. So we can now go into the question session about, well, let's have a discussion as to engagement.

So, I suppose one way of throwing out the question is, do you think At Large is sufficiently engaged in ICANN? Are the individual Internet end users are engaged in ICANN? I throw that question out to the floor for anyone to answer. And if not, I'll start picking people, and I'll start picking people if I don't see hands.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev, it's Olivier. Whatever you do, don't hum please. Don't start singing.

THOMAS LOWENHAUPT: Tom Lowenhaupt. I had, on the way over here, it took me a little while, a couple of days, and I was noticing on the list that someone had asked a question of that nature. And I was wondering if anyone had follow that string in terms of thread, I guess, in this instance of well, why people, what actions people thought the At Large could perform for individual Internet users?

And I only got a glance at it once or twice, but it seemed like there were several people who had given an opinion on it. And as someone who runs, or is involved with an At Large structure, and one that's, whose role is going to change very soon when people start using dot NYC domain names.

We would like to present, since the government is somewhat abdicated in terms of responding to issues that might arise with city TLD. We're trying to figure out what role we play. You know, what do we do? We have, we're a non for profit corporation, we have a Board of Directors, a small Board of Directors that we have a number of people that contribute to this process that we've been in for a number of years, that dealt with the formation of this top level domain.

But as that happens, on August 4th, I think it is, the land rush will start, and the general public will be able to participate in using this top level domain. And we see ourselves as someone who might be able to assist, only by the fact that no one else is stepping forward. There are eight million people in the city, I don't know how many domain names there will be, and it seems like there should be an entity like an At Large structure that provides access to ICANN and other Internet governance bodies, as well as city entities that oversee the actions that happen as a result of a city TLD.

And, you know, that was a really good string that, I don't know if anybody has found it, but it was a good start. It flashed by me. I thought it was just a good, the question raised was good, and there were several responses. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay thanks Murray. Actually this is Dev Anand speaking. Sorry. I am mixing up my names, sorry. I'm just seeing that flashing. My apologies. It's late in the afternoon. I haven't had my coffee yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's not late in the evening, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It is. Somewhere in the world. Okay, being back seriously now. We spent about an hour and a half actually into this session, and we're supposed to go up to, I believe, 18:00 hours, and it's now 4:40. Is it okay, does anybody want to take a quick break? Yes. All right. So I'll have to say very quick, because I mean, I see Olivier's hand raised. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Dev. It's Olivier speaking. What I was going to suggest is on the agenda page, which hopefully might be up on the screen rather than having nothing on the screen, it would be helpful to put the three questions, which are just start up questions to stimulate discussion.

And so while we just do our business for the next five minute break or something, we can think of something while walking around, or even discuss it with some of our colleagues, and hopefully start getting some discussion here. This is your session. This is for you to bring your input. So, maybe that's a good thing.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks. So literally five minutes, but Susie can you put the agenda up on the screen? Because it has the three questions. So let's just get the three questions on the screen. It was posted on the link there, so if you see the agenda link? Okay. If you open that up...
[Laughter]

While it's going up there, I can probably read it out in the meantime, while Susie gets the questions out there. So the three questions that we put up in the agenda, so pay attention here. So the three questions were, is the At Large community made up of representatives from Civil Society? Private sector? Or the technical community?

Or all of these groups? If so, how do we engage with such a large community of stakeholders and break down the silos represented by these groups? The second question, is capacity building really about building knowledge? If so, how is that accomplished and how sustainable is it?

Then the third question, how can we save volunteers from burn out? Volunteers have lives outside of ICANN, they do, and often the, well, there is a typo there, they must work, and often the most work is accomplished by a dedicated few with a multitude of observers. How do we best engage the observers?

Fouad, I see your hand raised.

FOUAD BAJWA: Yeah, I was thinking. This is a suggestion. Maybe you'd also want to visit the Mexico At Large segment from 2009, and see within the engagement section, those topics that were there, the questions. And let's list those, maybe we should [?], or just haven't been answered until now. Right? They are even relevant to this discussion at the moment.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. So Fouad, if I understand you correctly. You want to like, well after the break, bring up the 2009 statement on engagement, and see whether, well, what has changed and what hasn't changed since 2009? Correct? Okay. Is that okay with everyone? I'm not seeing any objections. Okay. All right.

And finally, these questions are on there. Excellent. Go ahead, sorry Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Dev. It's Olivier speaking. I've noticed that the C, the last question here, is one which we'll actually be dealing with tomorrow. So if you haven't burnt out by the end of the day, you'll be able to provide some thoughts on the burn out thing tomorrow. But, let's have the break, maybe, and get people to think, and then when we come back, I hope you can all start telling us rather than us telling you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Five minute break. Let's keep it to five minutes people. Thank you.

Susie. Okay. Good. Okay. We're back. We just took a five minute break. And this is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. Now this is regarding for resuming the session on thematic group five, the At Large Community Engagement in ICANN. And we're now going to do more of a question and answer session, as to come up with just studied, looked at the policy, how policy advice is developed, the reasons why the end user's perspective is important.

And so now we have a question session. So are they, you know, there are two framing questions. It starts off with, could there be an improved process or processes, by which the ALAC could develop policy? And if so, what it would like at. And there were two other questions that, you know, just to start off the, you know, your thinking caps.

The part regarding how you can save the volunteers from burnout, that's going to be discussed tomorrow. So we don't, maybe we don't need to, well I would say, yeah. We may not need to cover that aspect today, but so let's see. I turn the floor open to the group, because I see Stéphane has raised his hand. Stéphane.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER:

Thanks Dev. Stéphane here. I actually think that the burnout question could be started now, but just wanted to be specific about the questions that we're trying to answer. When I read, could there be an improved process by which the ALAC develop policy, that in itself, to me has a problem because ALAC isn't supposed to develop policy.

ALAC is an advisory committee, and in the current ICANN structure... I'm not talking ethics here, I'm not saying, should ALAC develop policy or not. What I'm saying is in the current mechanism, there is no space for advisory committees to develop policy. There is space for advisory committees to advise on policy being developed by supporting organizations.

So I think we want to be specific about the way we ask the questions, and that will help us to come to answers that will be useful. What we're trying to do is be useful to the ICANN community. So, one of our answers could be, ACs should develop policy. That could be an answer. But, the way the question is phrased now, I don't think we can answer in that specific way.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Dev. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And thanks for pointing this out, Stéphane. Indeed that was an oversight on my part. I apologize. True, yeah, ALAC is not there to develop policy. But At Large members are involved, as we mentioned earlier, in some GNSO working groups. And as we know, the supporting organizations develop the policy, the advisory committees advise on the policy and might push it in one direction, [?] to it, or offer some counterpoints to some of the points which have been developed by the supporting organizations.

We had a little discussion earlier with Fouad and he's coming back in five minutes, and he had some thoughts about this actually. One of the questions is, how can we involve Internet users, our community more in the supporting organizations, in the advice that we provide? Are there any recommendations we can provide that would enhance our processes?

We know that there are several barriers to At Large being able to discuss policy matters. The first one is the steep learning curve that you need to incur when you come into this community. The subjects, the topics are very, very, very strong sometimes in a very technical, but not technical as in, you know, geeky technical, but technical sometimes regarding the laws, regarding local, regarding bylaws and all sorts of things which ICANN has to proceed by.

Give you an idea, privacy/proxy services. We have an unbelievable wealth of, reservoir of people in our community who are topic experts. And yet, we're not able to engage them. We seem to be spending more time on process and less time on actually getting these experts to speak, and being able to make use of the knowledge of the people that we have in our community.

Is there anything we can do to enhance that? So the questions which are here are just very basic questions. Regarding the volunteer burnout, I think, that has a chance of maybe killing everything else in our discussions. That's why I thought it would be better to maybe be kept to tomorrow. Today, just trying to think, how can we better involve users into the policy processes, and the advisory that At Large and that the ALAC provides?

And I see we have plenty of people around the table who have, to a more or a lesser extent, been involved. Maybe one of the ideas would be to see, what has stopped you in taking part into these policy discussions which we often have in At Large? Including the policy development page that we have, effectively is a development of advice, ALAC advice and statements.

What are the barriers? That would be maybe one thing to start looking at.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Excellent. I see a queue already. YJ and then Stéphane.

YJ PARK: Yeah, thank you. I wanted to address the number question, which I think is a very philosophical question. So before I answer to that question, I wanted to know, who are the, coming from Civil Society in this group? So if you are coming from Civil Society, could you raise your hands please?

Okay, that's very... Yeah, but the thing is then, let's go to the [EG] part. How many you of you are coming from private sector? Okay. One, two, three, four. Okay. So how many of you are coming from technical community? Still, one, two, three. Yeah, it is like overlapping. Yeah.

I mean, so I think as of today, we have actually the mixture of this kind of membership. And that when we go back to this ICANN structure, as we all know, ICANN is a very commercially oriented group, right? I mean, if you step on, introduce GNSO structure, and those non-

commercial kind of the stakeholders, they are a minority, and it will look at, you know, the other structures again, the...

It's very difficult to see the public sector's strong role in the ICANN. As we all know, we are also kind of the advisory committee together with government, who was supposed to provide this public service. So in general, I think ICANN has weaker voice of this public, you know, space. And so I wonder whether, at last, maybe we are the one who expected to provide some kind of the complimentary public sector voice, if that's possible.

And if we really wanted to approach to that direction, then that question can be very interesting one. So if we have like members from commercial interests, and maybe technical community is also, many times belong to the non-commercial or non for profit kind of category. And so, again, I think this question, is a heavily loaded kind of question, that has links with those, you know, what kind of law and [?] really wanted to play in the ICANN structure.

So I think maybe we, ourselves, have to clear among ourselves, what kind of direction we want to head toward. Are we really wanted to strongly kind of complement those governments role in some sense. Because I think, in some sense, a [?] has been increased to complement the role of government in ICANN.

And to do that, we really have to identify ourselves as more like this non-commercial oriented nature of the voices, and if so, then our membership of this commercial groups and other groups, which might have some conflicts, will be very interesting.

So, I mean, that's my take about the number one question.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks YJ. Stéphane you wanted to...?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Stéphane again. I really like the way you framed the question. To me, the end is, the last part of what you said is more difficult, but I like the way you framed the question, because it's, to me you're trying to make it goal oriented. And I think that's a great way to go about this.

What do we expect to achieve? If you can get people to understand what they can expect to get from being involved in the policy development process, then there is, they're more likely to get involved. If it's just abstract, you know, get involved, but you're not really sure whether what you're doing ever goes anywhere, ever does anything, or is it just absorbed by this horrible machine that just, you know, this ICANN engine that just churns on the same fuel all over again?

Then it becomes harder to keep people motivated to get involved. So I think that's a great way of going about it. One thing I wouldn't, myself want to do, but that's my background, is separate... When you're talking about Internet users and the At Large community, it is the community of Internet users. They can be commercial, non-commercial, Civil Society, anything.

I'm certainly from the commercial side of things, and I have no problems with that. I'm still an Internet user, and I'm still, even though

I'm a new member of a RALO, I'm very much, I feel very much part of the At Large community. So I wouldn't make that transition, but I like the way you framed the initial part. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Stéphane. I see Murray has his hand raised on the chat. So Murray, if you, can you, you can, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. We can hear you.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Okay. I just thought, I know that Olivier and I had chats in the past about there had been successes from At Large's perspective in affecting certain policy changes. And I thought it might be useful, I don't have them on the top of my head, but Olivier might be able to speak to our past successes and how that happened.

That maybe a good start with this discussion. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much Murray for suggesting this. It's Olivier speaking. So one of the big concerns I think we've had in At Large over the years was that we sometimes did an enormous amount of work to develop a comment, a statement, asking people in our community, putting together some very good advice, and then send it over to the Board, and in affect, it was pretty much like, I think Evan described it as, taking it back, tossing it over the wall and never hearing about it ever again.

Which is very discouraging for our volunteers because you spent your time, you've really worked hard, you're not getting paid for this, and yet you're not getting any kind of feedback on the work that you've done. In fact, you are being totally ignored. The concern, I think is slowly fading away in that we are getting more feedback now for the statements that we are sending, both in the public comment process, which is the overall process by which ICANN obtains feedback from the different parts of the community, but also from outside of ICANN on the policy development that takes place in the GNSO.

But also in statements that we send outside the public comment process, because you have to remember, At Large, the ALAC is able to comment on everything and anything, at any time. So we could be way outside a public comment process and comment on something. To fill one small little bit, in fact there was a discussion on the accountability and transparency review team, the ATRT 2, which you might have heard of, part of the overall set of reviews that ICANN goes through.

We had reviews for the different supporting organizations and advisory committees, and then we had this overall review, which is set in the

contract that ICANN has with the US government, and that's the affirmation of commitments. And in section 9.1, A to F, and I'm saying that because I was on the advisory, and on the ATRT 2, and I was in charge of that specific parts, so it's kind of etched on this part of my mind.

And I don't know what it replaced before, but obviously it's not going away. I will die with that in my head. This part basically says that ICANN needs to act in the public interest, it needs to make sure that the interests of users are taken into account, and then there are various levels and various angles by which it looks at that. And it also mentions that there needs to be a review. I think it's every five year review, of ICANN's performance in these matters.

And if the review doesn't come out well, of course recommendations have to come out, and are sent to the Board and the Board has to implement them, or doesn't have to implement them, but should look at them, and see how these could be implemented. That's the accountability and transparency review team process.

One of the recommendations which was discussed and was actually a bit tense when we discussed this. I remember it was in Washington, DC about six, eight months ago, was the fact that in the bylaws, in the ICANN bylaws, whatever advice the government advisory committee gives to ICANN, is advice that ICANN, and it says in the bylaws, the ICANN has to consider that advice, and has to then respond to the GAC for the advice that it has provided by the GAC.

Not only does it have to respond it, but if it doesn't agree with that advice, it has to enter into a negotiation with the GAC, and that's the big

difference between the government relationship with ICANN and the other advisory committee relationships with ICANN.

If the ICANN Board wants to ignore advice from the ALAC, it can totally ignore it. If it wants to ignore advice from the SSAC, it can totally ignore it. And in fact, one of the problems that we were faced with was the name collision that we just spoke about earlier. The advice from the SSAC about this was two years old, and the Board was busy doing something else at the time, and completely ignored this until it came to a head.

So often this sort of problem happens, and it's sometimes not wanted by the Board, it's just that they have so many things to do, that they just forget about it and they drop the ball. So the suggestion in there was that they would be a similar bylaw change in the ICANN bylaws so that the Board will also need to respond to advice by the advisory committees, all of the advisory committees, including the ALAC of course.

There was pushback from the government representatives on the ATRT 2, and I can say that pretty openly because our discussions were open, and they were transcribed out there, and you will hear government representative going, "No, you can't be serious. We are governments. ICANN cannot treat other advisory committees like they treat governments. There is a difference there."

I felt really bad when I heard that, and at the time itself, we redrafted something pretty quickly, which effectively now says, when provided advice by advisory committees, the Board has to consider that advice, consider it, it doesn't have to accept it. It has to consider it, and it has

to respond to it. And at least, if it just says, “Bugger off,” yes I used those words, “Bugger off,” which means, that’s English for go away, in a slightly different way.

You will have... I think, was it Notting Hill, Hugh Grant in Notting Hill, used this word, so that’s why I’m using it here. We are in London after all. If it says that, then at least this is on the record, and at least there is a record that the advice was considered and that it was not taken. And of course, I guess, the Board wouldn’t be as pompous as to just say that, go away, without providing a reason they wouldn’t want to adopt the advice as such.

That is part of the accountability and transparency review that is currently just about to start. And I would hope, and I think it was the hope of the whole group, since the whole ATRT 2 group had the government people at the table, had the chair of the Board that was there, Steve Crocker, that you saw this morning. They all said, “We think that would go. That would be okay with us.” It is hoped that the Board will actually go ahead with that.

So certainly the relationship will improve very much because of our advice, and the advice of the other advisory committees, will be listened to but also responded to. So I guess that is probably not something that this group needs to, or perhaps it could show support for this recommendation and say, “Well, specifically, this is something which we think is really important for, first the engagement of our communities.”

Because if our communities come here and think that they’re wasting their time, then they are not just going to remain in the community anymore, and we all know without At Large, without any of the advisory

committees in ICANN, ICANN can't exist. There is something broken at that point. So that's the thing.

Now, with regards to the advance of the process at the moment. Yes, the Board now responds to all of our advice statements. They sometimes asked for more questions. This is done informally. It's not in the bylaws at the moment. And that's just because we have a chair who is very receptive, a chair of ICANN, Steve Crocker, who is very receptive to our community.

And several Board members that are very receptive to our community. In the future, this might change. Dynamics, you know, we don't select all of the people on the Board, other communities do, and ICANN could go rouge a few years from now and not consider any of this. Hopefully this ATRT 2 recommendation is going to pass through. What else can we do to improve our relationship with the Board? And our relationship with the other public comment processes?

There is another last thing that I wanted to add, it's the public comment feedback. And we didn't go through the way that we draft public comments, and so on, with someone picking the pen and then going, you know, sort of first statement gets put on the wiki, after this first statement is put on the wiki, people have to comment, they've got a certain number of days to comment.

Then a second draft is being drafted, then a final draft, then it's getting voted on by the ALAC. It's a long process, but at the moment, until the beginning of this meeting, I think, we were only given 30 days to do all, no sorry. 21 days. 21 days from the time we read the topic, the question that's being asked by ICANN, to the time we needed to

produce a statement, which is very short, especially if we have to go all the way back to our communities back home.

It's being changed now. The ATRT 2 has been given a mandate to ICANN staff to change the timings and allow for more time. I think it's now moved up to 40 days, so that's just over a month. That's probably more playable for us. In fact, we've managed to produce most of our statements in about 40 days. And so that's an improvement as well.

But what else can we do to improve things? And one big concern, and that's another one of these things, we're all meeting face to face here for the first time in five years, and some of you for the first time. It's a lot easier to discuss things face to face then to discuss it at the end of a phone line, especially because we have two major problems that we can't go around.

The first one, is that the infrastructure, telecommunication infrastructure in some parts of the world, isn't that stable. And I have experienced myself, having traveled extensively. I have been on some calls where I had to be redialed 40 times in one hour, which I remember the operator's voice, I don't remember what was the discussion about.

Whenever I wanted to say something, I said three words and then, oh, we've lost Olivier again. And that happens and we recognize that. That's one problem. The second problem, and that problem, by the way, we can't go around. It happens, hopefully at some point, infrastructure will get better and we're trying to get Adobe Connect to work in some countries, and so on.

But it's still there. It's still a barrier. The other barrier, is the fact that the world is round, and that we can't do anything about. The globe is round. So at any time we have a conference call and we want to discuss an issue, for some person it's going to be the middle of the working day and they have to tell their boss, "I'm sorry. I'm an ALAC or At Large call, discussing an issue which has nothing to do with the company, and you're paying me for that."

Which of course means they would be fired pretty quickly. Or, they have to tell their wife, or even if they're not married, they have to wake up in the middle of the night at four in the morning, or three in the morning, and although some community members are able to do that, others are not able to spend the whole night on a conference call, and then actually function the next day.

And some people, yeah, that's true as well. Thanks for this Fouad, just a quick story. I was on Skype with Fouad and suddenly he had the camera, I thought, "Ah, this is great. They've got no problem in Pakistan. It's perfect." And suddenly the screen goes blank. I go, "Oh, something is wrong with your camera."

And he goes, "No, it's not a camera, it's the light, there is no current. The electricity has been switched off, and my laptop is running on this, and I'm using a wireless service so I'm still on there, but I've got about 30 minutes of battery time." Problem. And you have to pay, you know, when you turn the generator on, your calls cost by the price of oil, basically.

And if oil goes up, you might be able to go on less calls than the usual thing. How do we go around that? How do we improve this? Just a few avenues you might wish to explore.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Mike.

MICHAEL FORDE: What I would like to add is a barrier language.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks. Dev Anand speaking. Just a quick follow up on that regarding the ATRT 2, and the recommendation that the Board should respond to any advice from any of the ACs. Is that recommendation meant to be implemented so that it's implemented in the bylaws? ICANN bylaws? Or is it just a recommendation that...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. It's Olivier speaking. The recommendation is that ICANN changes its bylaws to have that in the bylaws. The Board has six months from the publication of the ATRT 2 report to respond. We are now the 21st of June, they have until the 30th of June, which means they're going to respond sometime this week, which makes it really exciting.

And we're all here to get that response from the Board. I have no clue at the moment whether they will proceed forward with this or not. They're not asked to act on this. Well, what they're asked to is to

basically provide a first response and say what they are going to do next about this. I have no idea whether they're going to say the B word, or whether they're going to say, "We'll look into this and we're going to see how we can implement it."

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I know there is a queue in operation, so I won't say anything further. I see Thomas, and then Bogdan, and then YJ. Thomas? And Fouad after.

THOMAS LOWENHAUPT: Yeah. I guess the, something was clarified by the previous discussion, but... This is Tom Lowenhaupt. The 21... There is a technical aspect to it in terms of the process. You know, I sit home and I'm always trying to do work that I do, and all of this stuff in the middle of it. And it's rather overwhelming that the emails that come in, that try to relate me and tie me into another decision.

And the priority given to them is never clear, is not clear enough for me. And also the tools that we're given to work with online, I mean, to find your way around that ICANN site, even the, I shouldn't say even, also the At Large site is not as clear as I would like it to be. You know, there is a wiki there, which, I'm a real wiki person. I'm a Wikipedian even.

And you know, the design of that and the ability to find things there versus finding something on the ICANN websites is just a total different world there. And another question, getting back to, or more to the point, getting back to what Stéphane said earlier, about the advisory

committee, that it's an advisory committee. I think we all come from At Large structures rather than advisory committees.

So I think there is a question as to whether the discussion, and I may be off base on this, but the question of whether we're thinking about the At Large structures and their role in the policy process. At Large structures, from my perspective, at least my, we can do whatever we want, you know, we may have, we may be part of the ICANN in certain way.

But the, you know, the advisory committee, the ALAC, is advisory. That's all it does, and it has a role, you know, perhaps that's changing, or should. But the At Large structures are a different animal because they are only partially At Large structures. They're also something else. They are involved with a different role that they set.

And I think that you have to incorporate, if we can incorporate those other roles that they're involved with, that they are not, maybe, that are not strictly technical in terms of what ICANN always claims, that we be a stronger and broader organization. That the At Large structures would bring into the process, other areas that we're all involved with in other parts of our lives. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Thomas. Bogdan?

BOGDAN MANOLEA: Thank you. I'm Bogdan Manolea, from [?] Armenia. We are involved in a number of policy issues, both of them national at European level. So

ICANN activity is not a layer of policy that we are interested in. So thinking about what Olivier was saying about barriers, I was just straight thinking that actually we have the same barriers in dealing with policy issues at the European level, for example, and then ICANN level.

And I think that the top three that pop into my mind, one of them is not that important. It's difficult to explain to a regular person why the working in ICANN is important, and why is that affecting the life tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow. And you see that much clearly on the registration being at the national or European level, because if something gets adopted, it will be affected on a daily basis.

The second issue relates to time. So, we don't, we are all volunteers in the organizations, and probably with other organizations. So in order to allocate time, we need to know exactly what you can do in that time, and how you can be the most cost effective. On ICANN, you need at least one hour to decide for what is in the message before you get further.

So that is too complicated. And the third point as it relates to the other two is understanding of the issues. And this goes into two directions. One direction with regards to the understanding of educational of what ICANN is, how ICANN works, what is ccNSO, GNSO, and other acronyms that we understand for one day and forget afterwards.

But the second issue, it relates with understandability of the information. So, a lot of users are probably not English speakers. So, all the acronyms and complicated phrases make them not be present in the process. And I have two suggestions for improvement. One is to make it simple and make it understandable.

And I will give you an example to prove that this could work. There has been a recent European copyright consultation at the European level, and they received 11,000 answers. This is the biggest answer to a public consultation at the European Union level. Why did that happen? Not because the European Commission was very clever, not because they wrote the text in a very intelligible manner, but because there were a lot of Civil Society groups, and civil interest groups, that transformed the public document that was available for consultation in simple Internet forms.

So you could go to one website, click one button, saying, "I'm a regular Internet user who downloads torrent." And then you would give them three questions that are important to that consultation. Or you would go and click on one button that would say, "I'm a copyright owner that want to regulate things." And then you would pop up five questions.

And then they say, after you ask the five questions, you can answer the whole 45, but you're not obliged to. So this was a very good way in order to involve people, and you can see the result in the number of public consultation that has been submitted. So, if you want to really engage people, you can do something like that.

I know it's time consuming. I know then you raise the question of how do you deal with so many consultations that have been provided. But, I think it's a potential way forward. The second suggestion is actually to map the interests. We're trying to do that in another organization where I'm involved in [?], and I think we started doing it in EURALO, at least one of my colleagues that was in the other meeting before this one.

So, we don't have all of the time in the world for all of the issues. We are intercede on specific topics. We have seen [?], other guys might be interested in IPv6, so it's if you note that, at the RALO, it's much easier to pinpoint whatever you need feedback on specific issues. Otherwise, all of the information, all the requests, are sent to all of the lists, and you can't see them.

There are too many, there are too many messages, there are too many lists. There is not, there is an overflow of information, that we need to cope with besides our daily job, besides [?] his wife or whatever. So you need to make it simple and easier for us. That's the basic point. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Bogdan. Very interesting points made there. I hope you are taking notes. Let's see, YJ.

YJ PARK: Yeah, thank you. YJ. I am still struggling with this, the number one question. So many of us sort of made kind of a rough consensus there. We are very open ended group, so it doesn't really matter what kind of stakeholder, you know, the interests you have. That actually includes government because when I deal with, you know, some of those government, they say at the end, they are users. You know?

And at some point they also retire. So again, from that line, it's very kind of confusing identity. And again, like Bogdan just kind of explained a lot of those public consultation processes, and as kind of the public interest, right? And so again, we really have to think very strategically,

how we identify ourselves, and we can be very effective in terms of like influencing this policy discussions in ICANN.

I think that still one of the main goals, we are very excited in this space. And that the thing is, how can we be seriously considered by other stakeholders. For example, you know, as [?] to mention the kind of, the frustration when we deal with government officers, and also when we deal with even the commercial stakeholders, because we are very special, or we can just to say, we are very different from other stakeholders because many of us, we brought to this space, open this ICANN funding.

And again, that can be very tricky kind of situation, and if we really wanted to have with an independent voice, it's better for us to kind of ask for setting up more independent funding system, rather than direct funding support from ICANN, because the current kind of support is not going to make our voice very reliable to many other stakeholders.

So for example, if ICANN and other funding sources can have some agreement to set up kind of trust, or whatever, you know, the funding scheme that can directly support our activities, then we can say, "Oh, we don't really fund by... We don't get funding by ICANN directly." That means we can have a more independent voice from ICANN.

But under this kind of systematic arrangement, we basically are funded by ICANN directly, and so whatever we say in public, some stakeholders can say, "Oh, we cannot really trust what you are saying because you are just like supporting what ICANN's, you know, the direction because you're being supported by ICANN."

So that's the kind of very tricky situation. So we really have to think through how we can have very sustainable model for us to be considered as very serious stakeholder in this whole structure.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks YJ. I see Olivier wants to respond to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Dev. It's Olivier speaking. So it's a very interesting issue, and certainly there have been... I've heard this issue being raised in the past. Of course, ICANN pays for our tickets, and for the tickets for the At Large Advisory committee, and of the regional leadership. There has been a lot of work to try and get that so as to be able to attend ICANN meetings.

One of the problems is external funds are just not willing to fund anyone. There is not enough money going around for us to be funded externally, for ICANN. That being said, I do not think that we've ever been told, by ICANN, not to say something, by being told, "Well, we are funding your stay here, you can't say this or you can't say that."

And I can say as an ALAC chair, you know, some of our statements have been very critical of ICANN. We've never been censored or, you know, funding has never been dependent on whether we agree with ICANN or don't agree with ICANN. Funding has been dependent on whether the people that were funded actually came to meetings and worked, rather than going out and visiting the town that they were in.

That's, of course, a major concern. It was a major concern in the past, I think less so now. You will notice there is a lot of people around the table, and in ALAC meetings, I don't think we don't have any members that are gone away without leave on this. But on the funding and the policy and the discussions that we have, we're totally free to discuss whatever we want.

And the advice that we provide to ICANN, even though we are part of ICANN as a component organization, is totally free. There has never been a censorship or an advice of saying, "No, you can't write that, you can't do that." That said, there have been two occasions, I'll be very frank on this, two occasions when our statements have gone via ICANN Legal before they were sent somewhere.

And these were the two occasions where we sent a statement, regarding NTIA. So it was a statement that we sent outside of ICANN. Because within ICANN, it's well understood that our advice comes from an independent part of the organization, made up with volunteers, etc. From outside, anything that has the name ICANN, might seem that it's actually ICANN drafting it.

That means, you know, the director, the chair, Fadi, Steve, the Board of Directors, etc. And so the check by legal was basically to see whether things were clear enough and not ambiguously drafted, so as not to give the impression that this was an official thing from ICANN itself, but to make it clear that it was an advisory committee, made up volunteers, that was part of ICANN that was making the recommendations or the statement.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks.

YJ PARK: Dev, and I just respond?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay.

YJ PARK: Yeah, yeah. I was not saying our position was influenced by ICANN, but I was just saying the perception of other stakeholders. So that's the kind of the burden we have, you know, down the road. And so we really have to solve this kind of challenge, otherwise, you know, our role in this whole system will not be very effective. That's what I'm saying.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very good point, thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. All right, Fouad and then Thomas. Before Fouad, I should [?] take the floor. I mean, I'm just looking at the time, so it's now 20 minutes again until 6:00, which is 18:00 hours. All right, now it's 19 minutes. [Laughter] But I know one of the things that we have to look at is the, probably look at all three people, but maybe you could just have to [?] give a little bit more to the questions, especially we have a queue. Okay, so Fouad.

But keep that in mind when you have 19 minutes, so shorter interventions.

FOUAD BAJWA:

Yeah, thank you Dev. Fouad Bajwa, APRALO. I will make this short and I have to write this as well. So, okay, one of the things which have been coming into my mind even before coming to the meeting is, that within the funding process, the travel support that ICANN gives to ALAC, and the RALOs.

The established system is as such that all the ALAC members come in, they're flown in, and there are certain members of the [?] RALOs, they're flown in. One thing to realize over here is that the ALAC really is managing the commenting process, and that's a very detailed process within itself. And the amount of decisions that ICANN has to take, and you can look at the policy development page, and there is like tons of things going on.

But when we look at the ALSs, you have people that contribute within the At Large process, they comment from their RALOs and the RALOs forward their positions. But these people tend to move out those leadership positions, and slowly you lose critical mass you've been developing over the years, and that ICANN has been funding completely into, you know, they disappear.

And this is a major loss for ALAC, and major loss for ICANN as well. So, one way to look at this is maybe explore the possibility of an additional level of financial support to, let's say, if these people, being experts in

certain subject areas. For example, I'll give my example, I am purely, professional education wise, I'm a public policy analyst.

I develop national policies for governments, for multilateral agencies. That is what I've been doing for the past 17 years. But, now when I'm going, I'm moving out of APRALO, which I am, right, this is possibly my last meeting, but I can still continue to add value to the At Large process.

Now structurally, within the At Large system, this will be a violation of the bylaws of RALOs and At Large, but maybe At Large can use me as a subject matter expert. Maybe I can help within At Large to quicken the [?] processes. I can sort of [?] and act for At Large. Like, let's say [?]... but having a good grip on subjects, or the language, and depending on the kind of policy document that we're commenting on, maybe my expertise would actually add value to that commenting process, quicken the process.

Help ALAC respond more quickly and cover more ground. So what if we could have this small group of subject matter experts? Pinpointed especially by a combined by ALAC. And additional travel support given to these people, right? This might be, maybe you might have people from the US, sorry, NARLAO, and then you might have one or two from this year, you might have one or two from Europe.

These people have no political standing, number one, in the management administration processes. These people are totally there for the subject. Number two thing, [?] what happens is that the leaders that come in on ICANN travel support, these people are also partially expected to go to other sessions as well, other than when ATLAS is

happening, go to the sessions and report back, and ensure staff is aware about who is doing this, who has gone to a session.

Now if you look at this, that person has already one thing, representing his RALO. Number two thing, also trying to keep track of ALAC. Number three thing, he is also, or she is also, expected to go to other meetings, and come back with some critical response which might help the ALAC process, but that doesn't really happen.

So this is when, again another important point, that these subject matter experts can go to those specific meetings, which are relevant to the commanding process that is happening, and come back and add value to the commanding process of ALAC. Fourth thing, if this kind of suggestion is made to ICANN, then you will require more staff support. But would the staff have anything thing to directly to do with the [?] support that [?] are given, the severe [metrics?] are given? No, they won't.

Why? Because final statement will actually be in collaboration in the presence of ALAC. So basically there will be no decision making within this group, this group is just [?] as complete [?] as helping out ALAC. The third part is [?] management wide, administration wide. This is to reduce [?] that increasing the gap that is being produced, because we expect too much from our leaders.

And there are so many volunteers in the community, which disappear, to bring them and keep them connected. It is not necessarily they'll be in every meeting. I wouldn't mind coming once a year. I would work, without participating, within the meetings particularly, but then maybe

once a year I might come in actually, just to get further up to speed on what the other groups are doing and so forth.

So this is like a suggestion that I had in mind. Maybe for your thought.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I see Olivier, your hand is raised. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah thanks very much Dev. And thanks for this thought, oh God I'm getting a blank now, Fouad. Interesting, because of course the travel support that is currently provided to At Large is mainly a process, a travel support, in that we need to have 15 ALAC members face to face to be able to vote on statements and take decisions there and there. And we need to have the regional leaders to be there to relate back to the ALAC as to what's going on in the region.

So that's an important thing, and I don't think we should relegate on having those people go to ICANN meetings. That said, the idea of having... Well, At Large has possibly the largest reservoir of knowledge in all of ICANN, because of the fact that we are so many people we have people back home who are topic experts in all sorts of things.

Many of which actually relate to ICANN processes. If it was possible, if I understand you correctly, if it was possible to find out what, in an At Large, what are our topic matter experts, and you mention five or 20 or something. I'm looking at 150 ALSs, each with I don't know how many topic matter experts. We have might have a directory of topic matter experts that could be looked at and thinking, "Ah, there is something

about privacy and proxy services going on in the GNSO, that's going to be the big order of the day, the big discussion there.

We've got three slots for topic matter experts for the next meeting. Who of these, you know... Who in our community would be able to come into the ICANN meeting as a topic matter expert? To go into the GNSO or to engage directly just specifically on this topic? That actually works with some of the discussions that have been happening across ICANN where we need to think less of supporting organizations and advisory committees, and look more at topics that need to be discussed.

And you will notice more and more that there are star topics that need to be discussed in each one of the meetings. The meeting here is going to talk about ICANN accountability and transparency, and about the transition of stewardship of the IANA contract. If we had the ability to know, well, we know a few people who are top notch knowledgeable about the IANA contract, we could ship them over and have them here for the week to be able to deal specifically with that, and to advise us, I guess, from within our community.

Is that what you basically meant?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: How do others feel about this actually? It is something that resonates with you?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [?], this is the first time that I'm speaking here. Although I'm aware of the ICANN process and the organization, of course, for like maybe 15 years. But as not really engaging the official process, that after, after a lot of things happening, AP region, this year. For example, for yesterday, the Hong Kong, they have like a [?] put on the Internet, but other people were unable to vote.

And a lot of people suddenly got aware some of the Internet governance related issues at this time. And this not just happen to Hong Kong, but it happen to, for example, where I come from, from Taipei, Taiwan. And I think there are certain large [?] or reservoir of people who, especially young people, who are now aware of the related issues.

But they are not engaged with the process, or even they have never heard about ICANN before. And now this is the right time, especially for providing [?] for them. I would say that's to provide a free, open, reason, or safe Internet. And [?] will get [?] of this.

And of course, because of the website it has been, some part of the website has been redone and redesigned before. So for us who have not been represented in the ICANN At Large committee we can just, because we are aware of the multistakeholder process, because it's like a native thing for us. We could just, you know, just read the wiki, try to find, locate, the right information.

So I think a lot of people, rather in the Asian Pacific region, and there are aware of the issues. They can read a document or try to join the email list, as [?] if you want to provide a good incentive for them, that is to provide a free and open Internet by engaging with the international communities and stakeholders.

So if they actively engage in the community right here, I think that will provide a lot of knowledge or vehicle for them to protect the Internet freedom, or things like that, back to their hometown, or even at some national level. That's my opinion and experience.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Although I do want to address, I'm just looking at the time and we have five, five minutes. And I guess I wanted to see if persons who haven't, you know, been observing this session and so on, I just wanted to get your feedback into this. So Fouad, just hold off on your, all right. Take the floor.

H.R. MOHAN: I'm Mohan from [?] India. I was mentioning at the beginning, India is one of the largest Internet users in the world after China, and maybe soon it will be replacing US. But there is still little there. As he was mentioning, ICANN is not quite popular in India. So unfortunately the ISOC societies are there, in pockets, like [?] like that.

I mean, it's two ISOCs, two more in [?]. They're not, not that [?]. So basically, I was just wondering whether there is any proposal from ICANN, some speaker who can come and then we can [?], you know, one of the largest [?], having 72 chapters in different locations of India.

You know, we can organize, we can [?] in terms of organizing and [?] the ICANN. And then make the people to get in more activity in the ICANN proceedings and things like that.

I was just wondering whether it was possible?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Mohan, thank you for this. Olivier speaking. So there is a Speaker's Bureau program, which is an ICANN program where you can, if you have an event that takes place, or many events that are taking place, you can ask for an ICANN speaker to be sent over to you.

H.R. MOHAN: Coming December, we have annual convention of the [?] society. Every year, we have the annual convention which is the largest event. And [?] celebrating its 50th [?] jubilee year. So these are times we want to sort of make sure that people are aware, you know, the governance of the Internet is beginning a major issue. So we would like to educate the people and really look for that opportunity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So if I could come back to this because it's a fair point. It's a Speaker's Bureau. It's Olivier speaking again for the transcript. So the Speaker's Bureau at the moment, it is set up a couple of years ago, initially it had the pool of people that were included as potential speakers, where, I think it's Board members, or specific Board members or ICANN staff.

When you are asking for someone from ICANN to come to your meetings, and you wish to have someone from ICANN come to your

meetings. Are you saying, as ICANN staff to come to your meetings? ICANN Board members to come to your meetings? Or would you be enlarging this to say, well, people from At Large, other people from At Large, that you could have as community members. Sorry, not only At Large but also GNSO and whatever.

Well known community members that would be able to talk about At Large as a community member.

H.R. MOHAN:

No, it could be basically, these conventions we will attract people from [?] and ASL, you know? So people from other technical associations, you know, they do attend. So something like this, you know. Maybe one Board member comes, and then some [?] who can talk about the other learned aspects of ICANN, that would be good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

But the current Speaker's Bureau allows for Board members and staff. Is it a view in this room that maybe it could extend? Because that's a discussion that's been happening, by the way, whether this should extend to well-known community members. I mean, there are some people who, since it's the community that builds the policy in the GNSO, would it be better to have parts of the community?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

I know we're running out of time. I see Fouad. Actually, I do see...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can push the R3 paper just like five minutes and let people read it overnight since nobody needs any sleep here.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I know, but we don't even have five minutes. [Laughter] So we're definitely going to have to push the R3 paper for discussion tomorrow. I do want to give preference now to Fouad, is it a very quick intervention? Yes? All right. Do it quickly. I want to give more preference to persons who haven't spoken yet.

FOUAD BAJWA: One of Mohan's [?]. Mohan's points, that At Large, sorry. ICANN has been taking systematically its local presence [?] in Singapore. I'm [?] the... It actually comes into the Asia Pacific then it comes to into the Middle East and adjoining countries. I was one of the resources from Pakistan that was picked up for the ICANN Middle East group, and sent to Kuwait to do public policy training during the [?] summer school Internet governance [?].

It's a five day school. So really, one thing would be to actually check that how many resources is ICANN already mobilizing and sending into the region? And maybe having that communication. Maybe this could be sort of... One thing which came to my mind, we could have a working group which looks at this new approach that ICANN is developing, and close to work with our At Large structures and the bureau offices, and see what kind of activities are happening over there and how we can even contribute to those, or [?] writing a report back on what's happening in those regions. That's one thing.

The second thing I wanted to react to was specifically more to your point as well. That, you know, this is where the subject matter experts could also help. The idea of subject matter experts not only help and contribute to the ALAC comments and process, but also contributing to these kind of issues which are country specific. Right? Because [?] so much stuff, ALAC is already doing so much stuff.

There should be people who also make this other pressing issues which are arising for ALSs in other parts of the world. If we are presenting the user voice, who is monitoring the user voice? Who is responding to that user voice? And what are the processes in place? Some things fall out of the mandate of ICANN. Yeah, some things fall out of the mandate of ICANN. But within ALAC, there could be a larger support group for these kind of issues.

So again, that also comes down to that discussion about subject matters.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Last minute, or two, two. Let's see, wonder if we should try to bring in any more questions or comments? I know you had your hand raised. Just very, very quickly.

RAOUL: I want to be very, very quick. Not only because of the agenda, but because now Argentina is playing [laughter]. I want to watch the game. In fact, I keep silent because I have more questions than answers. My concern, and I don't want to generalize, maybe not all the regions is the

same, but what I see in my region where I belong to, it [?], is that there are many ALS that there more, we say in Spanish, it's a rubber seal.

There are only a name. There are not interested in what's happening in ICANN. I don't want to generalize, but I see a lot of lawyers all over here, and we... We think we are trying to force ALS to participate, they don't want to force to participate. I want, it's not politically correct, but I will say what I think.

Many of the people, what I see, they want to travel. They want to attend to a meeting and to take the opportunity to travel, not to participate. And the discussions are more concerned than process, and formal issues than on the real issues. And I think that on the ALAC, we are all looking for, to try to have ALS from all of the countries, not looking at the kind of ALS.

So we have a lot of ALS, but not a lot of users. What percentage of users are all of these ALS representing? It's a micro percent, okay? Sorry. I don't have answers.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It's a fair comment. All right Olivier, you have the last...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry. It's Olivier speaking. Very good point Raoul. And in fact, there has been some discussion I think in LACRALO about well... Recently we've delisted some ALSs that were dead wood, that basically did not exist anymore, that had not even get a pulse for the past five years.

We emailed them, the email address doesn't work, etc. etc. There is now a discussion, and knowing LACRALO and some of the other RALOs as to whether there are many participation requirements for At Large structures. And some At Large structures are not, as you said, really not interested in the process, and might be interested in the travel and whatever.

Although it's very little travel involved. As you can see, it's beautiful and glamorous in here. But that is certainly something which I think a working group is working on. The ALAC metrics working group is working on to get ALAC members to perform because they've been selected by the region and they're being selected by the nominating committee to relay the work of Internet users.

And so they're not just given travel to go and travel around. They need to come up with results, they need results. Is it possible to ask for results for At Large structures? Big question. I'm not going to say yes or no, this is a big question which is out there. I would expect there would be many different points of view on that. This is where the working group is going to go in now and discuss this.

And we might have, in the future, an ALS sprinkling to make sure that whatever new ALSs we bring into the community are really interested in this. And we don't try and get an ALS that deals with people playing golf, and to say, "You can be an ALS as well. Yeah, sure." And people will, you know, the ALS will come and say, "Well, we just want to talk about golf. We're not really interested in..."

But there is a nice golf course just outside of London.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yeah, so I'm going to wrap this up. Obviously, we could have probably easily have continued to discuss for another hour. But keep thinking, because you want to be back here at 8:00 in the morning, I believe, yes. In this same room, I believe. We now have to go to the plenary session which should be starting now. So again, thanks everyone for your contributions.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]