
BUENOS AIRES – RALO Chairs & ALT
Saturday, June 20, 2015 – 14:00 to 15:15
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm assuming staff are taking roll calls for these meetings. Not doing a roll call, but taking note of who's here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The first item on our agenda is auction funds. On Monday, there are two sessions. First one which will be – essentially on the stage will be the chairs of selects ACs and SOs. The second session will be chairs of stakeholder groups and RALOs or their delegates. I presume all the chairs had been invited. Does anyone not know anything about this? We have several chairs who are looking at me sort of stunned. Okay, I was told invitations went out. Well, you are now invited. Anyone chooses not to participate, you can either find a replacement or the seat will be vacant.

The discussion on both of the sessions, the first one and the second one, is on use of auction funds. As you're aware, in a fair number of new gTLD cases, there were multiple applicants for the same name. Some applicants have settled among themselves. Some applicants have held private auctions, where the proceeds of the auction were divided among the losers. And some have chosen to allow ICANN to

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.

run the auction, in which case the auction money has gone into our funds, segregated from general funds. I don't know what the current number is. Does anyone have roughly how much cash is there today? Many millions of dollars. I don't remember the exact number.

The question is what should ICANN do with this money? Now, the discussion has been going on off and on in my lifetime since early 2007. So we're now looking at eight years. The answer has always been, "Well, we'll worry about it later." Well, it's now later. The question is what does ALAC and At-Large believe should be done with the money?

I have some personal opinions, but I'd like to open the table for anyone else's before I give any thoughts to it. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. The question I had for you is whether this session, this high-interest topic session, was organized by the SO/AC leadership? How does that fall in the frame?

The reason why I ask is that there is also work in the GNSO regarding creating a cross-community working group that would be looking at this. It is widely accepted that it will be a cross-community working group. It will not be solely a GNSO working group. Based on the discussions that were this morning.

ALAN GREENBERG: The topic was suggested. I don't remember exactly by who. But the SO/AC chairs and David Olive, led by David Olive, came to the conclusion that this was the topic. He was informed that there was a GNSO effort going on. Jonathan Robinson will be leading off the discussion I believe and summarizing what's happening on their side. Then we're looking for input.

Presumably, the input will be listened to by staff. There's also a staff effort going on that is somehow parallel to the GNSO on. It's not quite clear who's doing what to whom at this point, but the discussion is being held in many different forums.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just for the record, it was asked for by the contracted party. Sorry, it was requested for by the contracted party, registries and registrars.

ALAN GREENBERG: As has been discussed in the GNSO today, there is certainly a strong push from the contracted parties, specifically the registries, that the money go back to them. It's their money. They should get it back. Whether that comes in the form of reduced fees next time, reduced ongoing operational fees or something.

That round runs counter to pretty much all the early discussions that have been had over the last eight years. As far as I'm concerned, if the registries really wanted the money to go back to them, they should've

held private auctions like some people did. If the money went to ICANN, ICANN should be using it for good things.

One other hand, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. I want to remind everyone that since the beginning of us, since the new gTLD program was initiated, there was a lot of discussion about that. I remember that we as At-Large, we have talked about it asking for using those funds to enhance the participation of the end users in the ICANN activities and to promote the work of the At-Large.

I remember also that Fadi, I think it was the last meeting or the meeting before, said that we want to spend this money to anchorage or enhance the participation of the ALSes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Garth, go ahead. Then I'll put myself in the queue and give you some of the thoughts that I've had over the last years.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Alan. Garth Bruen, NARALO. Just a clarification, who's holding the money currently?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's being held by ICANN.

GARTH BRUEN: You're saying, and I apologize for not knowing, that it was never designated ahead of time. Who or what would be done with this money? It's not documented anywhere.

ALAN GREENBERG: The question has been raised numerous times over nearly a decade. It has never been resolved. It is always something we'll worry about later, at least from the official point of view.

Let's not belabor the fact of whether that was a wise way to proceed or we should've decided earlier. We are where we are right now.

Okay, no one else. Gisella, you have a hand raised, but I don't know if you're trying to get our attention or not. You are.

GISELLA GRUBER: Please, if I may remind everyone, I did this morning and I will before each and every session, to please say your names. The interpreters need to concentrate on what is being said. Everything is important and they cannot look around the room and try and guess whose voice it is. And just when afterwards we refer back to the transcript in the recording, it's "man", "woman", "man", "woman". Thanks very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Gisella. Olivier, I'll give you the floor, and then I will take it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Man speaking. Sorry, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. So I wanted to obtain a bit more information from you, Alan, as to the format of the session. Is it going to be one with the panel in front of the audience and then people are going to stand at microphones and so on? I think it definitely would maybe change the way that we actually address this.

Are we basically building a set of response for you if you are on the panel to be able to express as the voice of the ALT, I guess, because this is the ALT here. Where do we stand on this, basically, as far as the format is concerned, without wanting to distract us from the actual topic itself.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we have an opportunity to discuss this tomorrow in the ALAC, we will. But the agenda is rather packed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, but the format of the Monday session.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that. I am there as the chair. If I have any wisdom I can pass on that I can say is the position of the ALAC, I will. Otherwise, I'm giving my own personal positions. If the chairs or anyone else during the second session is there, they are in exactly the same position. They should make it clear who they're speaking on behalf of, but at that

point, they are free agents. If they want to speak purely on behalf of themselves, they can. We're getting different perspectives from different people. Anyone who feels they can represent a group, so say. But just be honest about it.

The exact format typically in these meetings, people get a chance to speak, and then some people get a chance to ask questions. I presume we're doing that same thing tomorrow, but I don't know that for sure. I'm [inaudible] from that perspective.

Sorry, are you trying to intervene? You'll going to back in a minute. I don't think it's really all that important and we're very, very late at this point. We have other things to discuss. I'll toss out a couple of things that have passed by me.

Yes, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Now down to the substance itself. As you said earlier, the registries believe that this money should be paid back to them either in the second round, the next round of new gTLDs, or as a credit that they would be receiving back.

Tijani has clearly mentioned what Fadi has said in the past, and what has been mentioned in the past without having the full board approval of deciding in which direction we're going to go. As a result, we are at the point now where we need to put our own point of view across.

My person point of view on this is that if we try to sell this as saying these proceeds should go to the ALAC for outreach in At-Large, we're going to be faced with huge opposition from pretty much everyone else out there.

The way that I would suggest we market this, and market as in we express this need for having a balanced operational multi-stakeholder system in ICANN is that there is currently an imbalance between those people that are paid to be here and those people that have to give up their time.

Certainly we've seen, as far as working groups are concerned, etc., we are under great strain to be able to furnish the number of hours as a community for all of the work that has been needed of us.

We need more people, and therefore I think we should ask that the money be used to rebalance or balance out the balance of the multi-stakeholder process in ICANN. That, therefore, means funding for outreach activities, funding for having more people come to ICANN meetings. That includes not only with the ALAC, but also with the fellowship and also with the non-commercial part of the GNSO.

I would even go as far as saying maybe funding some of the GAC members that are from countries that are not able to come. And I know that there is some funding from ICANN from some GAC members. Geographical reach is very important. We're very, very imbalanced geographically. Maybe not in this room, but elsewhere in ICANN and it's terrible.

Finally, even the ccNSO. There might be country codes, small operators from, for example, Pacific Islands that are not funded to come here and there should be some funding made available for them to be able to come here as well. That would make for a larger ICANN meeting. I certainly understand that. But now that we have the meeting strategy with meeting A, meeting B, meeting C, there would be space in a meeting C I think, or A, for more people to come and for more people to be funded. That's my proposal. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. I'm not asking a timer to be put up, but I am asking for short, clear interventions. I will give a couple of things. Some of them have already been mentioned by Olivier. I won't repeat them. The concept of micro-grants for people who need some money, but perhaps that want to add some of their own to it. If I look at what the Internet society has done – and it's not an ICANN function, but it's a really important one – they've put money into Internet exchanges. It's an absolutely huge payback on it in terms of benefit to the countries.

We are still dealing with a world where many parts of the world are significantly disadvantaged because of lack of Internet service. Now, we're not going to build high-bandwidth networks around the world. We don't have that kind of money. But things we can do to augment things, to facilitate access for parts of the world I think are good uses of that money.

We're not likely to use all of the money for any one thing. I think we need to start putting out a range of ideas. I support everything you

said in terms of balancing stakeholders. We have to be careful. We're going to get intellectual property attorneys who are coming on their own dime not funded by their companies, and they may be eligible for it, too. I'm just setting the groundwork.

Quickly, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm trying to remember what I was going to say; I really am. Give me five minutes. Stakeholders.

ALAN GREENBERG: Garth, is that a new card?

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, it is.

HOLLY RAICHE: Go ahead, and I'll reply to you.

GARTH BRUEN: Following on what Olivier said, I think it's a better sell if it's not specific to ALAC, perhaps, if we have multi-stakeholder innovation and we do make it somewhat competitive, following along with the microgrants idea.

And to focus on ways that we can truly do global outreach and use the money for global outreach. I think that might make a lot of different people happy.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, I'm less interested in outreach than increased participation. They're very different. As we implement them, they're very different. Anyone else? Again, we're not trying to come to closure on this. Just trying to put some ideas, if only for the people who may end up on the stage. Olivier, last call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Do you think it would be wise to perhaps put forward the ICANN Academy?

ALAN GREENBERG: Personally, no. I think that's an ICANN responsibility that they should simply be funding. Just as I am not suggesting that we use the money to offset fees for disadvantaged people in future rounds. That's something that ICANN said they'd fund the first time. They'd better do it right the second time. I don't believe that's [inaudible] that money. That means someone else may – Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI: I'd like to add to what Olivier said. We should encourage the ALSes. I'm waiting for you to listen in on the interpretation. Can you hear me okay?

I wanted to add one idea, is to anchorage the ALSes to do some activities, some events, with a small amount that could be useful so that the activities of the ALSes are better known for training purposes in their countries, at the local level.

Second idea. Why not organize training for students in universities? When we have an ICANN meeting, we started to put together some training in our universities since ICANN is going to go to Marrakech and Morocco. We could do some trainings there in local universities. That could be very interesting for ICANN activities. It's very important so that ICANN be better-known.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You have to be a little bit careful in terms of suggestions to provide money for ALSes, because one of the bylaw requirements for an ALS is that it be self-funding. That's not to say we can't fund special projects, but be careful when you state that, that it's going to be very easy for someone to rebut. We need to be careful on that.

Tijani, last word before we go on to the next subject.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Replace ALS by RALO.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Noted. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Yes, I didn't talk about financing the ALSes. ISOC, for instance, they have programs about \$2000-\$3000 a year, all the way up to \$10,000 depending on the project that can be financed. The ALS is going to have a request for specific projects, just like you said, so that they get this funding and they'll be able to put together those projects. I talked about training, but it can be something totally different. It can be an event, for instance.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, I didn't say don't ask. I said careful how you word it. All right, next topic is we have been talking – Olivier, I seem to remember when you were chair and I was trying to get to the speaker, you would then say, "Sorry, Alan, we're out of time."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He never said that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, yes, he did many of times. But I won't say that to you, Olivier. I will give you 30 seconds.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's unfair because my name is longer than yours, so I lose three more seconds.

Just to add, I did mention the ICANN Academy and you pushed back on this. I now understand, yes, ICANN does have to fund these things.

Although I do have a bit of a concern about the rate at which ICANN is moving into these things. And I think that if one looks at our original proposal of the ICANN Academy where we had this whole pyramid with the leadership training program being just one of the bricks, use of some auction funds to perhaps boost forward some of the other bricks into being put in place and for things to happen there, might be a worthwhile use of those funds, at least for the launch of a pilot. And we're talking here about the expansion of – okay, out of time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll point out this is an introductory discussion It's going to be going on for a long time and probably a full PDP – not a PDP, but some major work group that will go on for a year-and-a-half to expose and defend all the ideas today. I was just trying to make sure that we had a bit of a discussion to help those who will be on a stage on Monday, so they don't do this completely cold.

Yes, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I guess in your presentation you need to take into account that there could be two source of money here and they are not the same and maybe they will not be used the same. There is the money of the auction and there is the money of the surplus of the program. That's two different types of money who will end up one day to be on this [inaudible] outside of the day-to-day budget of ICANN.

Today we have an event for the auction where we are today, \$58 million, but we don't know for the rest because it will depend at the end of the New gTLD Program. But [inaudible] will left there and it will be a subject also of discussion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I understand, but today we are talking about auctions only. That is the discussion right now. There may well be some other funds in a future world.

All right, we have been talking about ALS reform and ALS criteria, and due to the IANA transition and accountability focus, we have done very little on that in the last couple of months. We can't afford to keep not doing anything on it.

I sent out a paper a few week ago, or a week or so ago. I've given you copies here, so that those who haven't had a chance to look at it have a chance now. What I would like to do is spend just a few minutes looking at this and starting the discussion. This is not the end of the discussion. We do not have to finish it today. It's going to go on for a few months.

If I have my way, which I probably won't, I would like to come to closure on this by Dublin. It's certainly not just today's discussion, but I would like to start it off. There is an hour allocated tomorrow to talk about it. So this is not the substantive discussion. I'm just looking for some first opinions in terms of ALSes. Are there major things that come to mind that I do not have here? Is there anything that I have

here that you think is really wrong? As I said, we have an hour allocated tomorrow to talk about it, but I'd like some first opinion from the leaders here.

We have one person taking pictures. Is there anyone else with a hand up that wants to talk? Cheryl, you're not officially at this meeting, so it's okay. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I'm just quickly looking at this. Why [isn't] North American region specified in the first section?

ALAN GREENBERG: Because I cut – why is North American region specified in the first section? Because I cut and paste it from one of the examples I looked at and wasn't smart enough to notice.

GARTH BRUEN: I just wanted to make sure we weren't being pointed out as an example [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, of course. We're always picking on North America. I did go through all the five Memorandums of Understanding. That was the one I did the cut and paste from and I didn't actually notice that, so thank you for pointing that out.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to be sure, Alan, the three points are the ones from the MOU and the others are from somewhere else, or it's also in the MOU of North America RALO? Less responsibility, for example.

ALAN GREENBERG: The three points are from all MOUs, although the wording varies from MOU to MOU. We did not use any standardized wording for them. But the concept is in all five MOUs. That's number one. The rest of it is all mine. There's nothing there that . . .

The first part is there. There's an important issue here. The question came up very early that if we change the rules from what we expect from ALSes, can we apply it retroactively to the 200 we have now or will it only apply to new ones?

You'll notice that the ALSes are there to support the activities of the RALO, and those RALO activities defend what we're doing. So the answer is we will be able to retroactively apply it to all ALSes. How quickly we choose to do that – and the mechanics are a different issue altogether. We're not looking for a purge of 99% of the ALSes in the first week, but it does give us the rationale why it does apply to existing ones, even if we were not explicit at the time they become ALSes. That's why that section is quoted there. The bylaws explicitly refer to the mandate of the ALSes as specified in the MOU.

We do have Olivier who wants to speak. We also have Holly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I think Holly was before me, actually.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not really good at remembering which order things come up on. Holly, would you like to go first?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks. I actually like the paper. I think this is the beginning of a long road ahead. I think there's a lot of work to do in terms of looking at the individual RALOs and the rules and so forth, trying to [inaudible] coherent to do all of them and uniformity into all of them.

My comment to you when I first read this when you put it on the website was this is the sort of thing that I would think would certainly come out of the ALAC review, that I think a lot of this is lacking. I think this is important for us to bring this forward and to actually have the kinds of discussions so that this will wind up being outcomes, because I don't think we're there yet. I think we're a long way from there.

But if we start these discussions – and I think these discussions are definitely going to overlap with the ALAC review – I think it's a good start, but we've got a long way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier, I'll give you the floor in a minute, but I do want to answer that because I think it's important. You say we have a long way to go,

and there may be a long way and some time. I will hope that the list of mandatory things in ALS will do will not be four pages long. It should be a short, concise list and we're going to have to identify the things that we think are important. These may or may not be those things. But I think it's going to have to be a very short list of things well thought-out.

In terms of the implementation time, I'm afraid I disagree with you completely. As some of you may remember, I threw out the thought which was quickly vetoed by everybody, that maybe we should stop accepting ALSes while we're changing the rules. And there was a general feeling saying, "No, we shouldn't do that." But this is really urgent.

I don't think it's complex enough that we need to wait two years until the ALAC review is done to do it. The ALAC review, hopefully if we can do this, decide by Dublin, implement by the beginning of the year, the ALAC review will look at it and may well augment it, suggest something different, but I will not want to delay to have the ALAC review do the detailed analysis and rubberstamp us. I think we're an independent group. We can take action ourselves right now. The ALAC review may come and tell us we were crazy. That's fine.

Tijani? I'm sorry, Olivier, then Tijani, and then Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I totally agree with you. We don't have two years. We're currently going through the ICANN accountability process

which will yield a number of recommendations that will provide a lot more power to the community. It's called the ICANN Accountability Process. One looks at a more accountable ICANN, but then one really now has to look at more accountable supporting organizations and advisory committees. That includes the ALAC, that includes the RALOs, that includes our members. I would absolutely support what you're saying, Alan, and that we need to move forward on this as soon as possible.

As far as the draft discussion paper is concerned, I'm finding it to be entirely reasonable. I see this a little bit like the process that went through the Internet Society when it was worked through a paper for its chapters, because there were minimum participation requirements for chapters, growth of number of members, etc., etc. Of course it doesn't go to the – we're not going to tell the ALSes how many members they should have, but certainly there are participation requirements in the work that we do, and at least acknowledging that they're part of At-Large, etc., is something which I think is very important. We need to make sure we've got a vibrant community, not just on paper, but in reality as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll note that when we originally set the criteria, we did talk about saying it. Their website has to say they're a member of At-Large. We never actually wrote it. This time perhaps we will. Tijani, Heidi, and then Cheryl.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Holly, you said it is a long journey. Yes, it is. Alan, you said you have to move swiftly. Yes, we have. I think the only way to do so is to tackle things one by one.

In my point of view, the most urgent thing to do is to address the certification criteria of the ALSes. I do agree that we don't have to stop certifying ALSes. It is not our right to do so, but we can already work on the criteria and try to change them so that the new ALSes will apply according to those criteria. For me, this is the first step we have to take. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi next. I'll do point out it is our right if we choose to stop, but that's a decision we have to make.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If I could, just comment, Tijani, on your point and then just from an At-Large staff perspective, I'd like to offer a few questions and additions possibly to this document.

Tijani, I think your viewpoint of having the criteria changed, that's going to go for the future and that's the right way, perhaps. But what about the 191 At-Large Structures that we have now? How do we engage the 155 that we don't hear from regularly, approximately?

So we need to engage them and that comes down to the RALOs, the RALO leaders, the ALAC members, everyone. So this is a very welcome document.

I'd just like to add a few points that we just had a quick—

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, can I interrupt? We have an hour on this tomorrow. Let's deal with the substance and specific items tomorrow. I just want to go into that meeting having either where there's general agreement or understanding or people disagree at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. General agreement from staff.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I won't be at the meeting tomorrow, so I will apologize for that in advance. Now this is the NomCom thing happening. Apparently I've got to have coffee with someone; I don't know.

The point I wanted to make is one that I think may be worthwhile your group as a whole discussing tomorrow, so if you would indulge me, I'd like to put it – I never know whether I'm putting things on the table or off the table with American and Canadians, but anyway, this is what I'm suggesting. One of the things, and Maureen taking notes of course, we might need to be looking at is now we have almost universally the ability for RALOs to have ALSes and individual members that we could

look at a not different class of At-Large Structure, but requiring our At-Large Structures to identify certain demographics, such as in a band you have between one and one hundred members, or one and 100,000 members.

That will also give us very valuable information to build I think a more workable profile and to empower what our voice means with other parts of ICANN. I know that we have in Asia-Pacific at least one structure with 11,000 active members. We have another region which I believe quoted 7,000 active members. And that is classified in ALS terms exactly the same as the one who's got five. This is a good time to address that, and I think strengthen our positions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I think that is already covered in what I put down. You added a level of granularity in how we do it, but that's fine. This is not a done deal. It's not going to be a done deal out of Buenos Aires, but lots of time to guild it and to make it right. The real question at this point is what I'm hearing is the list of criteria of responsibilities does not sound unreasonable. The list of criteria is not unreasonable. And by the way, you'll notice the last criteria – I don't remember how I worded it, but it should be something to the effect of input, particularly from staff, to address issues that we have had in approving ALSes and the RALOs indeed in some cases will have input that they feel they should have had information which they weren't given or couldn't even ask in making the judgment on whether an ALS should be approved.

We're going to need a lot of input from the people who have been doing the job to make sure we understand these things. Again, not a done deal. Just trying to make sure that we're on the right track.

The second part of the discussion is individual members. Sorry, I missed a card. Siranush, please go forward and then we'll come back.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hearing ALS responsibilities, there are a couple of stuff pointed out very good. The first point I want to come back to that point that the report annually on its leadership and membership, major activities related to ICANN, etc.

No ALS is doing that. I mean, it's not written somewhere. It's not given to them as a responsibility to report to someone. If we are going to do this for the new ALSes, then we may put this in the application itself. So for people to know that this is the responsibility that they should come back with reporting to someone. But we are going to do with those 195 almost ALSes who we already have.

So it's some kind of – if we are going to use this for new ones, then how we can encourage the ones we already have to come back with the reporting, or is it the process that they should come up with reporting to make it streaming and easy, streamlined and easy. This is also the way how we should think on any other basis, if 40 ALSes will start writing reports, who is going to read them, how we are going to structure them. So these are the details maybe we need to come back with.

The last point related also with this individual members. I think that we need to have one strategy, cross-RALO strategy, for individual members. We have a good example in EURALO for establishing ALS for individual members. In APRALO, this may be a good start, but this may be not a good continuation because we may have number of people coming and joining this, but how we are going to – the issue of voting is there. We have discussed this today with Cheryl as well.

There is an issue for individual members to actively being involved. Just recently we have an issue with one individual member who was saying, “Okay, I am individual member from APRALO. I would like to comment on CWG and I saw [inaudible] public comment, the final document on that.” So where it was published, so I was not aware to comment on this. Am I eligible to comment on this? There are a lot of questions which will be coming, so we need to take into consideration. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Let me address one or two of the issues, but please let’s refrain from trying to get all the details. We have months to work on this and we will have a full hour tomorrow to start talking about it. There are many, many details to be determined.

To answer your last question, if that person had been participating in the ad hoc group we set up six months ago, he or she would’ve had an opportunity to comment. If they chose not to, we can’t do anything about it.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: It was a newcomer. She is interested to know, but she doesn't know where to go and where to find this information.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we have an information problem and that I think was addressed by one of my first items.

In terms of applying to all ALSes, what we are talking about will apply to all ALSes, period. These are requirements we're putting in to allow the RALO to do its job properly, and if the RALO doesn't know if the group is still alive or not, it cannot represent them properly. That's what the three bullets at the top demonstrate, that it is an ALS responsibility regardless of when they were applied for.

But let's not worry about the details today. This is a very, very initial discussion, before we have tomorrow another initial discussion.

Wolf, did you want a minute? I really want to go on. We're now over. We'll be over time and we still have several major items to talk about. I'll give you, Wolf, just a minute, please.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks. I'd like to be frank. This is a wish list, what describes a nice, some kind of wishful reality that does not fit to the given circumstances. If I were to apply this now to EURALO, I think we could more or less decertify 90% of our members because they will never,

ever respond on something like this reporting [inaudible] a copy of the annual report of their activities.

I think it's the wrong approach. I think it makes not much sense and it will not encourage new members who are somehow put into a very narrow responsibility structure, and they will of course ask themselves why should we do this?

I think the best way to deal with members in a RALO is that the RALO leadership has regular contact with the members. It's on us to know about their activities and to know to what level they are engaged in net policy activities. In the [German] country, we have the ISOC chapters, etc. I can tell you more or less by heart if you ask me a particular question about one of our members, how they are active, involved, etc., in what kind of activities, etc., how big is the ALS. It's also a capacity problem.

Most of the ALSes in Europe to name a second contact person. So they have a primary contact person who is more or less following up, and if they are following up, I'm happy with it, but getting a second person already in is somehow over-demanding as their capacities and I simply think – I am brief now, and I finish – it's over-demanding. I do not know whether this is a constructive approach. I have my doubts.

ALAN GREENBERG:

A couple of comments. I've now heard from one person that we need a universal approach across all RALOs, and from someone else each RALO should tailor its own rules.

The each RALO tailoring its own rules has not worked really well in terms of really encouraging participation at this point. So my inclination is to follow – I don't set the rules. We're going to have to decide communally is to do something across the board.

When I say an annual report, I didn't plan to have them write a 12-page printed document and mail it to us I'm talking about a web form, which they might have to annually or maybe every two years. And if that is too much and getting a second e-mail address for contact is too much, then I think we need to rethink the concept of an ALS. Honestly, if that's taxing the world more than we can, then how can we stand up in front of the rest of ICANN and say we have ALSes which have multiple people doing it if we can't even get a second e-mail address?

I think we have to decide what business we're in, and it has to be – I agree with you 100%, Wolf. It has to be something that can be implemented and will map to reality, not just someone's figment of what reality should be.

But on the other hand, we can't pretend we're something that we're not to everyone else, when we can't even demonstrate it at all. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN:

I just want to counter what you said, Alan. I think sometimes it's really a lot to ask of these organizations, especially when ICANN's interface is problematic. You're asking people to fill out a web form, but we have a lot of different spaces where we do work in and they don't all

talk to each other. We even acknowledge that there are a lot of problems with, say, confluence, etc.

I know staff does a lot to try and reach out to different groups and the chairs do a lot of work to reach out to different groups, but it's a problem. It's a problem.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think you have to look at this as a package. Right now, we know there's very little contact from whoever is the main contact of the ALS to the rest of that organization.

But on the other hand, we don't facilitate that. We don't send them information in palatable ways that they can redistribute. That's something we have to do. All of these things come together. We can't expect them to suddenly become functional if we're not doing our part of it. There's a whole package.

Maybe the answer is the whole RALO-ALS Structure can't work and can't be useful, in which case maybe we have to admit it. I suspect the external examiner will notice that. But I think we have to give it a try and try to give the ALSes the tools they need so they can be viable. Some of them will not be. Some may succeed.

I don't want to give up and say it's futile. On the other hand, we know it's not working in many cases right now and I think we have to try something.

Tijani? Sorry, I haven't been keeping track of who. We have Tijani, Aziz, and Olivier. I don't know which order you were in. Self-select, please.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you. I listened to my friends from different RALOs and I see that there is a difference for each region. You all have different problems and issues. I just wanted to repeat what I proposed earlier. We shouldn't decide ourselves, the RALO presidents and the people in charge of ALAC. We have to talk to those ALSes. We have to first start at the basis, and [cannot] ask them for reports, for instance. It doesn't work with the different chapters. They have to be engaged. They have to be stronger.

We have a working group with Tijani and we send them e-mails. We let them know about the changes, the different rules that are going to change, the accreditation, certification, and so on and so forth. We got many, many answers. We had a good working group with 12 ALSes and it shows that they did a good job. We had to stop it at one point because now we are talking about the IANA transition. For now, we stopped it and Tijani can tell you more about it. We started that process, this working group. We have to ask at the level of the ALSes what they think about the new rules, about the certification process and each and every RALO knows who's ALS is very active, which ALS is not that active and who's nearly absent to the activities.

About this working group, we already took care of the individual membership. Most of the people were against it. We did accept individual members, but they have to bring a lot. They have to

contribute a lot. They won't be able to vote. They cannot vote and they cannot get to a higher level.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I would like to say that the solution wouldn't be to decertify inactive ALSes now or next month. The solution would be to try to make them more active, to make everything. But this time we have to take real action in this way. We have to discuss together what are the means we can use to make them more active. We can discuss with them to see what we can do.

If at the end, they are still inactive, I am sorry, but they are ICANN ALSes. If they are not active in ICANN, they are not ICANN ALSes. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have another hard meeting in a minute and a half. Olivier and then Siranush.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Since Tijani is speaking English, I am going to speak French. Regarding those ALSes, one important point. I talked about the Internet Society process and I did compare both processes. They did put together an ISOC chapter document. We are starting a

new process and I think it is important not to [inaudible] ALS. We talk about this and that at this point. What do you think about it?

I think we should have first document. It would be this document that we have. This is a good start, this first document, which should be circulated to our ALSes. Some of them are going to say, “This is tough. This is difficult. You’re tough on us.” But we have to start a debate. We have to have a good conversation with our ALSes and we should start with a good, strong document and see what feedback we get from them. [inaudible] important to have a good discussion with them, to have more legitimacy. We’ll be able to know better where we’re going later on.

If we get no answers from the ALSes regarding this document, I think this is a green light for us to start going further and see, we can go further.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: I agree with Tijani that RALOs should put efforts to make them active. Just recently, I’ll just briefly give the example of what APRALO did recently. We were holding NomCom selection and this was for the last two years period. It was not consensus call. It was election, actually.

We really get hard time to pass the majority of the votes, so to get ALSes to actually spend one minute to vote and do their responsibility. After the numerous efforts done by staff and leadership team, we got finally 26 out of 38 – out of 40, actually – already.

So we had 14 who didn't say anything. We decided with our leadership team to send private e-mails to ask them, okay, what do they need from us to help them to get into this? And it's already two weeks those letters went to all those individual people and we heard only from three of them.

We will keep continuing doing this and we ask them, requested them, that if we don't hear from them during July, August, and okay, until September or October, until Dublin. So we may come back with them saying, okay, ten ALSes, you are not doing anything. We just don't want to have the numbers there only. So we need to come up with this solution what to do – disqualify or decertify those ten? I don't know, but we need to come up with a decision how to deal with it. Because if those people are not coming back for the years and just having them listed, it doesn't make sense. It's a headache for a RALO or leadership as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Siranush. I've taken over the chair from Alan for the remainder of this meeting. We are running over time. How much time could we over run by? Could we or could we not? There's negotiation going on. It was five, five. Who gives me more than five? Ten, okay. We have ten, thank you very much to the interpreters for this.

Siranush, just in response to your question and your suggestion, obviously other RALOs are faced with the same problem as well. I do know that LACRALO has had a system whereas if some ALSes do not

vote beyond a certain number of times, they are disqualified from voting. I paraphrase and I might be totally wrong, but I see Dev Anand Teelucksingh could maybe let us know about this.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, individual At-Large member from LACRALO. Just to clarify, that is a proposal that has been as part of LACRALO metrics. Then there's been some debate on that issue.

While some feel that is a good measure, in our case, for LACRALO's case, and I'll precede this with my personal opinion. We don't have an issue with people LACRALO voting when it comes to elections and so forth. It's getting engaging on the actual issues.

When there's a debate on a particular topic, very few people. But when there's an election, pow! We have like 80 and 90% representation in that regard. I'm very quickly to – you don't even have to chase people around to cast their vote. It's under discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Dev. Is this the case in other RALOs as well where there are elections, lots of e-mails, lots of comments, but when it's an issue where we ask for input on a policy issue or something, there is less response. Siranush?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: In APRALO, I think that those who are active always are active also during the voting. So there is not that much – yeah, we have balance in that sense.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Siranush. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Sometimes we have difficulty. Active members have difficulty voting. They have technical issues. I've documented a number of them. They don't always get all of the notifications. They have difficulty logging in to cast a vote. I've gotten a number of different types of complaints about the voting. A show of voting may not be the best way of measuring participation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Garth. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: In AFRALO, we have the same type of issues, just [inaudible] said earlier. Some people don't know the rules. They don't know the rules. The elections, nominations, still don't know the rules. In our last elections, we renewed the president, vice president, of the representative of AFRALO in ALAC and for NomCom as well, and we had about a two-thirds of ALSes that did participate in that vote.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do you have more answers during the elections or when you just have a debate about something about political issues or is it about the same?

AZIZ HILALI: They're always the same participating doing their job. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Usually, having any voting or consultation, honestly speaking, it's a pain in the ass because you have to run three days at minimum behind because any posting on the mailing list, there is 80% no reaction. So they would miss any deadline. It was always sending SMSs, sending personal mails on a daily basis, calling them, pushing them.

If I was lucky after two, three, four days latest, I could reach up to 80% of the members. But it's always a huge effort. Sometimes you have to really explain them again what it's all about, what has been on the mailing list five times. They simply didn't notice it.

Let's be frank. These people have daily jobs. They are volunteers, and this is always some kind of effect. It's a nice list. It's a nice idea. I partly agree to the idea of Alan, but it's beyond the realities. We are dealing with volunteers.

If I can get these volunteers over some years somehow involved and participating, that's the only thing I could reach. I tend almost to be grateful for the minimum level we reached, and I would not go for any reinforcement mechanisms and imposing new duties on ALSes. Maybe

they will apply anyhow, but afterwards, I risk any bet they will never deliver what we would try to ask from them.

So I think we have to be a little bit more creative. We have to use more social media. I am not very good in social media. I hope, Olivier, you will be much better in this respect. I'm very hesitant imposing anything new on them. Let's reflect and find more creative ways, how to get them involved and how to get them better participating.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Wolf. I think we've gone around the whole topic. Heidi Ullrich, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Just a very small comment. What we do in staff and now with the chairs as well, the chair of ALAC, is when we have an urgent message for a particular person, we will send in all caps in the subject line "URGENT" or "PLEASE RESPOND" or "ACTION." We've done that sometimes when we have a call for nominations or last call, etc.

So maybe everyone could agree on what some of these terms could be used if you absolutely need a response.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. We're running really behind schedule. I just noticed we still had one more thing: regional issues, next steps. Any problems that you wish to raise and that is a regional issue specifically? I guess we've gone around the block for the whole problem of involvement of

ALSes, but any other regional issues that you might have that you wish to say here and that could be then taken up by the ALAC? Anything that the RALOs need that would need to be taken up by the ALAC? This is question mark.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. One of the issues that I've been trying to tackle [inaudible] problem is the mailing list translation issues. As chair of the Technology Taskforce, I've been working with IT staff.

[inaudible] detailed presentations for the At-Large Technology Taskforce meeting on Monday at 2:00 PM. But a big challenge is that really what it's boiling down to is that there's only one person on ICANN working on this issue and part-time, in his spare time, I should say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is that you?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It seems to be me. But yes. I've introduced new concepts and stuff like that. It just has not been implemented.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Dev. Maybe we can take note of this and inquire why are there so few people dealing with this when it's such an

important issue. Any other issues that you have in your region that need ALAC action or that need to be asked of staff or whoever?

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE:

It's just a thought on involving people with policy issues. Picking up from an earlier point, not everybody's involved. Have we followed through with a concept of having – say, if we're asking people to vote, having a webinar on the issue before, so people have a chance to understand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Holly. We've done that on some issues. Certainly on IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability. I'm a little concerned, and this is my personal comment, as to the number of people that have attended webinars. I think we have had a good turnout initially, but recently I don't know what the latest figures are whether we've had a lot of people. But it might be also the amount of calls that we've had.

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Could I suggest that some of them not be held at 2:00 in the morning?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That will be noted. Thank you, Holly. Any other issues? So webinars on these issues. I think that's a good point. When we do have consultations that are important, we could have a webinar before that.

Okay, I don't see anyone else put their card up, so thank you very much to all of you. If you have any further comments or things that need to be done, we can follow-up after this meeting with e-mails.

I'd like to thank our interpreters for the additional 15 minutes now that we've managed to take. This meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]