

PANAMA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap Up (1 of 2)
Thursday, June 28, 2018 – 08:30 to 10:15 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ICANN 62 Panama City. ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap Up (1 of 2) in Salon 6.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we have a count of ALAC members, please? Alright, could we start the recording, please?

Welcome to Wrap Up Session 1. Don't those words sound good? It means the end is near. Most of this session is going to be devoted to discussions with the CEO and President of ICANN and the At-Large board members selected by At-Large.

The first part of the session is chairs announcements and I only have one announcement to make. The election was completed last night. There was not a tie. I'd like to introduce you to our new incoming chair, Maureen Hilyard. After I finish talking, we can stand up. The vote was quite close. I know people think it's easy to predict how many votes you can get out of 15. From personal experience, I can tell you no matter what people tell you, it's not a reliable way of gaging what the outcome is going to be. The count was nine to six. That's just two votes away from

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.

being eight to seven in the other direction. Well run. I'm very proud of how this all worked out. There were no abstentions and no one didn't vote. A success for the ALAC over all. I'm told now I have to stand up and have photos taken. Excuse me while we interrupt the meeting to do this. Maureen has asked for a word.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Well, I'm thankful for this opportunity to lead this team. I'm really very, very grateful. But, I do have to thank Tijani for making it tough for me because I never took this role for granted at any time. I really do appreciate that he made it a great competition as such and gave some credibility to the way in which we do things within At-Large. I really do thank you for that, Tijani.

I know that already it's a load off my mind to think that the election is over, but I feel the burden of the next year on my shoulders already. I do have to stop saying "um". I have been told about that.

I know that there's going to be a lot more hours, but I think that those hours are going to be shared amongst everyone here and I'm sure that if we can find the right mix of people with the roles and responsibilities that we have, it will be a piece of cake.

So, thank you very much for your contribution to the election and thank you for giving me this opportunity. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Thank you, all, for your trust. Yesterday over the dinner, I already congratulated Maureen before we see the result. This morning, I did also. I would like to make it on the record that this is a declaration that I am here to work. I will work with Maureen as much as she wants and I will give all the energy I can do because the aim and the objective is to serve the community. Thank you, all.

ALAN GREENBERG: I must note, however, that we have not met the standards of our external independent reviewer. We did not select the chair by pure random selection.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank heavens for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a little bit of levity, sorry. That would have been interesting, indeed. Sebastien, would you like to say whatever you're saying so everyone can hear you or not?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know why I need to do that if others are not doing the same when they talk.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything further anyone would like to say on this? Then we will go into our next section on the agenda, and that is preparation for the afternoon sessions.

There are two sections. One of them is on work track five and I will turn the floor over to Javier to give us a brief idea of what we can expect and what he expects of us.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Sure. This session is basically a follow-up to the first one. In the first one, we gave a status of where we're at. We also broke the room in groups to do brainstorming and get some more ideas and people that might not usually speak to chime in into basically the topic of non-capital cities, what policies, what the current policy is with the 2012 guidebook and the 2007 policy recommendations.

What the status of that policy is and what things we could do to enhance it, if anything. We're going to look at those comments today, those different views that came up in the brainstorm. We're also going to try to take a temperature of the room in that type of discussions.

In terms of At-Large, just be there. We're going to try to make it as participatory as possible, and as always, At-Large positions which, as Alan said yesterday in the GAC meeting, they're quite varied. But, this type of meeting, of course, everybody starts thinking about the same ideas. And we're going to have some slides, kind of like heat maps of what the positions are. We have some extreme positions on one extreme and extreme positions on the other extreme and we're going to also show in the heat map position that are closer to a center and then a possible [inaudible] somewhere in the middle where convergence and some level agreement could happen. We want to move towards that type of discussion, trying to see if it's possible to move forward with some agreements in things like non-capital cities and perhaps non-Applicant Guidebook geographic concepts, indicators, things, policies for that.

So, it's going to be interesting and I hope to see you there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: It's at 15:15. That's the last one.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll note they used a rather innovative method at the last meeting. As Javier said, they broke into groups. They placed the flipcharts right in front of each of the two doors and there was essentially no way to get out, which is a good way to guarantee participation. I'm not sure it satisfies fire regulations, but quite interesting.

The second session this afternoon is mine, I'm afraid. Sorry, we have a question. A hand. Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. As for the position of ALAC about this sensitive issue, I don't think that inside this room our 15 members plus the regional leaders we can have a position of the At-Large people. These kind of issues should be – our position on this kind of issues should be the position of the whole community. It means that each RALO has to make the consultation with their community and come up with their

position. The position of ALAC should be the sum of all this, the compilation of all this.

So, I hate to hear someone saying in ALAC we have almost this thing. No, we don't have anything. We didn't discuss it, in fact. Yes, we spoke about it I think last meeting, but it was only between us and this is not the position of At-Large. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I don't think we ever said there was an At-Large position. I know I have said the ALAC has discussed it. That's not necessarily the same as At-Large. I will point out we have around this table people from the leadership of each RALO and people appointed by the RALO and people appointed by the NomCom who work with the RALO. Every RALO should be taking this back and discussing it. It's an important issue. The only way that's going to happen is if the various people associated with each RALO choose to do that and I'd like to think they do.

It would be really nice if we have an informed decision with some consensus behind it instead of just the 15 people. Now, the people in the ALAC may choose to disagree with their region. It's not likely to happen, but it could well be, in which case, we have lots of mechanisms for expressing that. I don't think there's any debate over that. Tijani, please, if you have a follow-up, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. What I wanted to say is that it should be a process that we initiate. It means that we have to send to the RALOs a request that they consult with their community and come up with the consensus. If there is consensus, if there is no consensus, they can say there is no consensus in our community. But, give us the temperature of each region so that we can say after that that we can give a position of our community.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope we have just done that. I don't think we need to send an e-mail. People I hope are awake and I cannot assume that each RALO is going to ignore it, whether what kind of action they take. As we've discussed many times, RALOs have a fair amount of independence. We cannot dictate exactly what process each follows, but I hope on the subject such as this, where certainly I can predict in some RALOs there will be some very strong feelings that we hear. That's all we can do. Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. I think it's important to have a deeper explanation and opinion throughout the At-Large organization. On the one hand, I do find some of the working methods rather inefficient and unpredictable. I'm not a fan of ad hoc groups with

flipcharts. It can be entertaining, but I don't think it's policy. On the other hand, as you've noticed, I think I personally regard it more effective to actually write what one's point of view is on each major topic and I think we should have a paper which I will almost certainly write in the next week or two which could form the basis of a consultation of the RALOs.

Yesterday, at Tijani's invitation, I gave a short speech to the Francophone members of the GAC and that [text] is also a useful basis for further consultation. It is essential that people actually think in terms of their responsibilities to the user community at large, and not just the user community that we see today. The main thing that I notice about geographical names is that over the last 20 years, the interest of governments and individuals has shifted significantly and I think it will continue to shift because the [inaudible] cities and communities that 20 years ago ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Christopher, I'll ask you to keep it short. This is not the right forum that we want to have this substantial discussion.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. We need to think in terms of the interest of the Internet users and the future as well as those of the present. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Anyone have any further comments on geographic regions? There's absolutely no question that we need to both consultant and talk more amongst ourselves. We may or may not be able to come to a single At-Large position.

I'll point out that each RALO has appointed a person to act as a liaison into this group. That person's responsibility is to feed things back to the RALO. That's why we appointed that person. I have not seen a lot of that, to be honest. But, I think it's up to each RALO to use that person as input. And again, that person, their responsibility is not just to present their ideas to the RALO, but to present to the RALO what's going on in the group, what the various options are, so that the people in the RALO can try to process that and come up with what they believe is the important issues.

This is the first time we have ever appointed people from each RALO to the group, to a group, and I'll be honest, I'm a little bit disappointed that we're not seeing more of that interaction, the reason why we appointed the people. Hopefully, that may change.

I see we have several people in the queue. We have Goran Marby arriving soon, so we really have to move forward. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, chair. This is one of those issues that it is pre-ordained that you will not have a consensus on because there's two things. History tells us something. We have geographic names at the second level all over, registered. We also have geographic names that are titled in other areas of intellectual property. For example, Amazon is a registered trademark all over the world, everywhere.

It seems to me that we cannot fix what is happening in the past and it seems to me that any amount of restriction that we place on what's coming now will not help the situation.

Let me give you a question of Jamaica.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, please, very short.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I'll be short. Jamaica. There's a Jamaica.com that is not owned by the government of Jamaica or anybody in Jamaica. There is a dot-JM where we have rights on the ccTLD [inaudible]. But if we have dotjm.com, I don't know how we would make a big fuss of it, given Jamaica.com exists. I see that as the real

reasons why you will never have consensus on this issue. One of these things [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Carlton. I've asked for a one-minute timer but we do not have enough time for everyone to speak unless you have something that really has to be said. Christopher, you've already spoken. I really don't think we want to get into the substance. What we're saying is we need to discuss this within the ALAC and within our regions. Jonathan, what is it that you have to say that must be said now? Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, the pressure. I think this is a process question. So, as a question of process, would it be helpful if the policy team created a short one-pager that said here's the issues on both sides that we send out to the RALOs and allow them to socialize it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. However, as I pointed out, we have five liaisons. They must be involved in the process or somebody else if they're not doing their job.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But, just on that very point, strictly speaking, we don't know who they are. I happen to know who two or three of them are, but I certainly don't know who five are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Staff will send out a message reminding each RALO who they appointed. The action item is for staff to send out to each RALO or to each RALO leadership who the five liaisons are, lower-case liaison, to the group, to the work track five group. If staff can't find it, I will find it and send it out.

Now, if I may take back the microphone, I will try in a minute or so to talk about the second session that we were trying to talk about. The second one this afternoon is a presentation from the RDS WHOIS Review Team on what we have been doing for the last eight months or so and the way forward. We will be presenting the various areas that we're looking at. There are a total of 13 different subgroups.

Our intent is that we use about 45 minutes of the hour-and-a-half session to present what it is and hopefully open up to questions. That's going to be an interesting challenge of doing each of the some significant subjects in three minutes, but we're going to try. Well over half of the review team is here and will be presenting. I welcome you to come.

Again, since this is a topic which is right in the center of everything we're talking about in ICANN or much of what we're talking about in ICANN, I hope you'll find it interesting. I will give you a little highlight that ICANN staff's evaluation of the first RDS WHOIS review is that everything was completed. We do not agree. Come and find out why. Questions, comments?

We do not have a set agenda for the next couple of sessions. We have given Goran a number of questions. I must admit I was exceedingly pleased that we raised the question of, "Do you have any questions for the CEO?" and instead of a blank page which we normally have, we ended up with a huge number of questions. They were edited to try to remove duplicates and a few of them were not passed on because they were not really questions targeted at the CEO.

There are many decisions within ICANN the CEO simply acts as a servant of the board in implementing what the board says. So, we're not asking the CEO to take positions the board has to take, but I think we ended up with six questions or something like that and I don't know to what extent Goran will address those or other issues that he feels are important, but it should be an interesting session.

Leon we did not give any specific questions to. There is a number of obvious topics that he may well talk about and

hopefully we'll have enough time to open the floor for other people to ask questions or raise issues.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You have 15 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not according to my schedule. I've been informed that I had this timing wrong, so we can go back to work track five at this point. Sorry. I was [inaudible] this was an hour-and-a-half session. Olivier, you have something you want to raise.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. I was looking at the At-Large work space and usually all the questions to boards, CEO, Global Stakeholder Engagement and so on are on there. The GSE questions are on there, but I don't think we had any meeting with GSE. The board questions are on there, but the CEO questions don't appear to be on there. So, what are the questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we settled on them and posted them, but apparently not. Please, Heidi, do whatever necessary to actually say what we're doing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can you put those up, Yesim?

ALAN GREENBERG: This is a test. Can you read that? Heidi, why don't you read them out, please?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Instead of wasting time, can we just put them on the Wiki? That would be helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't we start with Leon and then we'll go back to him afterwards. Leon? While Leon is taking his seat, Sebastien has his hand up. I'm sorry, the chair is suffering from confusion today.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I have just one question. The title is Wrap Up. Okay, we will [inaudible] a lot of people during this wrap up, but when we will do a real wrap up and have the inputs from each of the participants of what is important, what's happened here, and how we can deal with some issues, particularly because some meetings happen in parallel with ours and it will be interesting

to have some feedback. At least it was my understanding of what is wrap up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sebastien. If you look at Wrap Up 2 session, I think you will see some opportunity to do that. It is typical that during the last day we do ask the CEO and our board member to talk to us. As it turned out, those ended up happening because of availability of people. Those ended up happening first before our business part of the meeting. Welcome, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. Thank you, everyone, for having me here again. I would like to begin by congratulating Maureen for the election and thank Tijani for his participation in the election. I think that the voters had a very tough choice with you two being there. Both have been outstanding, hardworking members of this community and someone has to be designated and that was Maureen. I look forward to continuing to work with you, Maureen. Of course, with Tijani and the rest of our community. You know I promise to be close and I think I have remained close. I will continue to be close, so feel free to reach out to me at any time UTC or wherever we are in the world.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

LEON SANCHEZ: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out that it was suggested that we immediately change our rules of procedure, cancel the election, and decide to have co-chairs. I thought we probably couldn't do that in one day. Just to show how innovative our community is.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was to say if you allow a closed session, you may have this idea pointing out, but as we didn't have, it was not possible to have any discussion on such matter. It must not have been a public discussion, but it could have been an internal discussion. And I am really sorry that the ALAC members decided not to have this internal discussion prior to the vote. I am very sad with

that because I wanted to [inaudible] proposal. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you. So, there has been much going on during this meeting. As you know, the board held a public meeting, plus four public sessions. I reached out through the Skype list and posted the details on that. Some on very short notice and I apologize for that, but the times were really short.

I saw that, actually, many of you, including Sebastien, were at those sessions. It's rewarding to see that we do have people participating in the public sessions and in the public meetings of the board because one of the priorities of this board has been to become the trusted partner of our community. I think, and many other board members think, that one way to achieve this is to become more open with our community and continue to work in a transparent way and communicate what we are doing.

We have not been very good at that before. We have had some things that can be done better and we are on our way to do it better. So, it's really important that when we have public sessions or public meetings, you show up with us, and while there is no open mic or there is no way to actually ask questions, you know where I am so you can ask a question to me directly and I will raise it in our public session. This happened in the IDN

variance session. Sebastien raised a question directly to me and I actually asked that question for him in our public session. So, there is a way to interact with the board in that way, too.

In our public meeting, which was a record-set short meeting because it lasted seven or eight minutes, which is I think a first for the board, I am very pleased to share with you something that you already know and we have already celebrated. The At-Large review was approved by the board. Now it's time for us to continue to work in implementation. It's our big chance and our big opportunity to show that we do care for improvement, that we do care to serve our users well. Let's try to do this in as little time as possible.

I want to thank everyone that worked on this. I know that there were countless hours, calls, meetings, ups and downs during the road, but ultimately I think we did a good job and I think that this will, of course, reflect in the wellbeing of the users that we care for in each of our regions.

We also held a meeting on the board priorities. We shared the status. We reviewed the status of the different deliverables. We spoke about where we are in replenishing the reserve funds. We strategized about the 2025 finances. We had an overview of how this looks.

During our workshop, we held a full day of strategic thinking. We have been doing this since I came to the board. I've been in this exercise two times and I think it's something that the board is carrying out to look ahead of time, of course, and feed this strategic thinking into the process of strategic planning and programs for the coming fiscal years.

Soon we will be circulating a draft on what we have been discussing and strategizing and it will be very important that you, as our community, provide feedback on those strategic lines of thinking.

There are several challenges coming ahead of this and I'm pretty sure that we will sort them out well, but we need to work all together and of course show the strength of our community in carrying out this task.

We also spoke about the long-term and short-term options for streamlining the reviews. There was a heated discussion and a very important discussion around how we can actually release some pressure and some time from our volunteers and from our community, because as you know, we have many of the specific and organizational reviews going on at the same time, and this of course requires a lot of time from a lot of people. We've seen this. We've been there. A lot of people are already exhausted and we need a break at some point.

So, what we're trying to do here is to find a solution or find a formula which will allow us to streamline all this organizational specific reviews throughout time in a way that the burden will not be or may not seem as heavy as it is right now.

So, we were presented with some options. One of them was to immediately start the ATRT 3. Another one was to start the ATRT 3 with a limited scope. Another one is a little bit more long-term. I think that right now this document is open for public comment and that public comments will be due by the end of July, I believe. So, as well, this is a very important issue for the community and the organization and I would definitely encourage you to provide your feedback and comments on this issue.

Alan, I would like to open the floor for questions and comments. I know that there are many topics and issues that you would like to ask questions about. I may not have all the answers, but I promise I will do my best to answer each question, and if I don't have the answer, I commit to do my homework and come back with an answer shortly.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Leon. My plan is when Goran and David Olive show up, we will switch them and then go back to you afterwards, so we'll have an interrupted session with Leon. If we

could have a one-minute timer, please, for questions. I won't put a timer on Leon's answers, but clearly, the longer the answer, the fewer the questions we have.

LEON SANCHEZ: 30-second timer for my answers, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know we have John Laprise and Olivier. I don't think we have anyone else in the queue right now.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you, Leon, for all your work. On the issue of reviews, I've been talking with some people in this meeting. If you can perhaps take back one suggestion, which is that new reviews should not start until at least three years after the previous implementation. This is not a workload thing. This is actually just an effective measuring thing because you cannot start a review on the effects of the previous implementation until you actually see some results.

So, if we set a clock so that post-successful implementation, there's a three-year period where we see how the work has gone, then we can do a review. So, that's just a pragmatic suggestion for good effects, good results. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, John. Not only I agree with you, but I think many other board members do as well. This is one of the things that we discussed during our meeting. What we have now is a constrain in our bylaws that states that the reviews must go on a five-year rolling basis. It says that the five years start counting from when the review actually starts, not when it ends and not when it ends implementation. So, this takes us into this loop of actually having to review things that haven't even been implemented. And I think that it's, in my opinion, useless to review something that hasn't actually been able to be implemented and we have no way of measuring the impact this review or this change has had. So, I think you are spot-on with your comment, and as I said, many of my board colleagues are on the same line of thinking.

This may require, I'm sure that it will require, a bylaw change, which in time, if it's decided to actually carry out this bylaw change, we will need your support from the empowered community. So, thanks for raising it, and yes, it's duly noted and I will convey this message to my board colleagues.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But, I note there's an open public comment on this specific subject. That is the method that we should be using to convey

our information, our opinions, whether they're individual or the group. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Volunteer overload has been in discussions at ICANN for forever, for as long as I can remember. Successive CEOs have spoken about it, have been concerned, and the board is quite rightly concerned about the current volunteer overload brought on by the different reviews. I'm absolutely delighted to see that it has taken that into account.

What is your view about the expedited PDP process, which is rumored to require perhaps as much of a commitment of 30 hours per week?

LEON SANCHEZ: This, of course, is a joke but it's going to end [inaudible] quickly. Speaking seriously, I think you are right. This EPDP will require a lot of work from our already exhausted community, but unfortunately, it's the only way we have to go forward. We will need to commit this time if we want to make this right.

We have to remember that these EPDPs are first in ICANN's history. We are literally navigating uncharted territory. We have a lot of doubt. We have as many doubts as you have in regard to the processing, in regard to many things.

The GNSO who owns the process will need to sort this out and we will need to facilitate this as a board and we will need to collaborate with them as a community.

My take on this is that, yes, you are right. It will require a lot of time. It will continue to exhaust our volunteers. It will continue to consume our resources. But, I see no alternative to this path, unfortunately, at this point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: First, thank you, Leon, for being with us today. My question is also related to the reviews. I actually don't know if the reviews are useful at all. So, we are talking if the reviews need to be every three years, five years, whatever. But, what we have seen so far, the reviews have not been that effective or that beneficial.

My question is shouldn't we be looking for other means of evaluation? Maybe we could find something else apart from the reviews. That's my question. Why don't we explore other means than the reviews to make those evaluations? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Hadia. The same concern that you have raised is a concern that we in the OEC, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, have raised. [inaudible] has proposed that we do actually not a review of the reviews, because that would be of course [inaudible] to this never-ending rabbit hole. But, we need to certainly make an impact assessment of whether these reviews are really achieving what they are meant to achieve.

In other words, we need to find out if what we're doing is being done well, but also we need to find out if this is what we need to do. And if it isn't, then we need to propose other ways to try to achieve the goal, which is to improve the structure and the effectiveness of our organization and our community.

So, yes, this is something that has been discussed. We don't have the answers at this point, but I'm pretty sure that the OEC will work in a plan to actually assess this impact that the reviews are having, and if they are not, if the result shows that reviews are not being meaningful and have really no impact, then we will need to come up with some other means of measuring, evaluating, and proposing improvements to our structures and to our effectiveness.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you, Alan. Leon, coinciding with what Hadia says, I think this may be a reason for review. There is one of the reviews – I can't really recall in which group – this survey. I'm not really sure when it was done, but it had more than 6,000 responses. The last review had less responses than the number of ALSes we are having.

So, I think those replies were due to the lack of participation from our people, but it may have been time as well. But, it is possible that we may be having a review with such a limited amount of replies. Maybe this is something that we need to review again.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Alberto. Yes. In effect, there are some reviews that have a very limited amount of comments. However, I would not compare the number of reviews with the quality of those reviews or the quality of those comments.

In the case of the At-Large review, many of those comments were sent through the RALOs, or in this case, through the ALAC. There were some individual comments. There were comments from other budgets within ICANN. For example, the IPC sent comments. Other bodies sent comments.

So, there are people working behind what looks like a single comment. The volume of comments is not indicative of the quality or the interest of the community in a certain review.

Another challenge is definitely participation, but this clashes with what we've said before together with Olivier, with respect to the exhaustion that the community is experiencing.

We are having a lot of things on our plate, a lot of things that we need to juggle with, and this sometimes does not allow us to cater to all the needs we are having and we are focusing only on what is a priority for each of our communities or each of our sectors.

I believe it is important to foster this participation for sure, but I also believe it is even more important to prioritize. The amount of issues that we are prioritizing, well, we need to focus on these and divide our work to have a better contribution.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm a passionate supporter of reviews within ICANN, both the organizational and the specific. But, I want to particularly raise a point now because it's geographic names what you're all talking about. And I hope it will be reflected if you want to think more on it on your comments when you contribute them to the long and short-term

timeline work which now I think is extended – correct me if I’m wrong, staff – to the 31st instead of the 6th. So, we’ve got a little bit longer to do our comments.

That is, when these reviews were set up – and here I’m talking organizational reviews only. They are the ones that suck the oxygen out of our volunteers. There’s a huge amount of AC and SO engagement. Specifically, two or three people. They can suffer. They stand up for that [inaudible]. Let them suffer.

But, the organizational reviews drag us all in. That was a design with one or two minor modifications that was so far back in ICANN history, and compared to where we are now with an empowered community and compared to where we will be with the work stream two accountability of AC and SO implementations, it’s the perfect time for us to stop and rethink. Rethink purpose, rethink frequency, rethink a whole lot.

So, I’m all for reviews, but we’re in a very different world now than we were when we first set up this design. So, I think it’s timely. Let’s make sure our comments are influential. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I’ll note the prime question the bylaws ask the review to consider is should this group still continue to exist?

I don't think we've ever had an answer in recent decades of other than yes, but it may need to change a bit. If nothing else, that part has to change I think. But, we'll see what the comments say and go forward. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Alan; and thank you, Cheryl. I agree with you, of course. This is a different ICANN than the ICANN which started [inaudible]. So, we need to be aware of our evolution, not only in terms of this procedural reviews but in terms of many other things. So, I agree that we are in the right time to question this, to raise proposals, and I would say socialize them with other SOs and ACs because this is something that, of course, should come from the community. And if the community agrees that we need to change the way we are doing things, and that the purpose has shifted or changed from its original position, then yes, absolutely, let's propose these changes and let's implement them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I see no other cards. Am I missing one? Olivier? Leon, if you have any other comments. Oh, we have Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If we have time. And I'm going to speak in French. This is the French [inaudible] for everybody, so that you can learn French. He promised me to learn French, but he hasn't done it, so now he has to listen to the interpretation. So, Leon, this is your French class. Thank you.

I think that the debate that we have on the revisions – and thank you, Cheryl, for [inaudible] the revision organizational reviews and functional reviews have to be taken into account differently because they don't have the same objective. They don't have the same structure. They are not on the same content. So, it's important to make the difference between those two type of reviews. Yes, it's over a minute.

So, we have to separate those two types of reviews, and [inaudible] has to be clear for everybody that since 2002, we had ICANN 2.0 and we had no global review of the entire ICANN organization. We're working in silos and we are working in steps. And I think we should have a review at one point, a global review, of ICANN so that ICANN becomes less complex. I'm going to stop here. Thank you, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Merci, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: I think you're spot-on, too. The reviews should have some logical ties one to another and we are not doing that, as you rightly point. So, I don't know if we need to do an overall helicopter review of the organization, but we certainly need to know how the different moving parts within our community and our organization interact. For that, I think that we actually need to link one review to others and how moving something in one of our community's [competence] may affect the other [competence] as well.

So, I will also take this idea and this message to my board colleagues, and hopefully we'll figure out how we can foster collaboration and break the silos, not only in policy development processes but also, as you rightly point, in reviews so that we can understand how we can better build these synergies that could improve our effectiveness overall.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Seeing no more cards, I'm going to ask David Olive if he will join us at the table and give David an opportunity to either say something or accept questions.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Alan. Either way, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perhaps you should.

DAVID OLIVE: No, I am not here to announce a new change in my position. I still remain head of the policy development support team. I'm sorry. I don't mean to create more sensations than is needed today.

Thank you for the invitation to come to the wrap-up session. I always like to do this. Of course, the policy forum is my favorite of the three ICANN meetings and I think you know why. Again, just to recap, I was here on Wednesday of last week. The executive team met in preparation for the meetings. We, of course, had preparations with the Board of Directors for their two days for this period.

It's been very active, obviously, with the GNSO looking at the subsequent procedures nearing their initial report. Obviously, the expedited policy development process relating to the RDS is a very important element and the rights protection mechanisms reviews, among others, that they are working on and we do hope and encourage the At-Large members to be part of that, to follow that, input into that as you always have been. It's an

important concept that you are part of, as well as the need to have your input and your views reflecting the At-Large community.

Obviously, the other important elements, the RSSAC is talking about their evolutionary approach to the root server operator system. Their advice just came out and they were talking to the community about that. That is another important change in the evolution of the supporting organizations and advisory committees and our structures at ICANN and is worth of course following as it goes forward in various steps.

The SSAC, of course, was talking about, among other things, the name collision project and some of their other activities relating to the Registration Directory System, and those are important elements from this policy forum.

The GAC, we are waiting. We are told it will be around noon or so for the GAC communique to come out and they have had, of course, intense sessions on all these issues and I think you have been part of some of them. You had your meeting with the GAC and that's also very important.

It's good to point out with the GAC that, in the past, they used to do all that communique drafting behind closed doors and that's now an open session that anyone can listen and watch as they prepare their communique.

Obviously, our numbers community people are not here formally, though the RIR presidents are here and other members of the Address Supporting Organization and they've been participating in some of their informal consultations and meetings with stakeholders, constituencies, and of course some of the board members. So, that is a wrap-up of many of the activities.

And I don't want to leave out the ccNSO. They're doing, obviously, the Tech Day is an important function for them to exchange information among themselves on their best practices and other issues of interest to them, including the emergency systems and disaster recovery concepts that they're looking at and we'll probably hear more from them on that as well. And their policy development process on the retirement of ccTLDs.

I'll stop there to take a breath, but it has been an amazing amount of activity in our four days here. Many people have said that this, of course, requires intense focus and you have done that. It helps with progressing the policy and advice development process forward with these face-to-face meetings. So, you've been an important part of this and I want to thank all of you for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm told Goran is on his way over. I'm not quite sure how far away he is at this point. Any questions, comments for David?

DAVID OLIVE: I'm happy to take questions, and the hard ones I'll leave for the President and CEO. The easy ones, I'll answer.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll do one, then.

DAVID OLIVE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: A good number of the items in the At-Large review have little notes in the comments saying we may need staff to do this. how do you see us going forward with this in what is clearly a constrained ICANN environment?

I will note the board approved the proposal with those words in it.

DAVID OLIVE: So, I thank the board for approving that and they then turn to me and say, "That's your issue." In terms of the ... Really, we

have to look at that. Some of that is data, if I recall correctly, and information that needs to be collected. I'm not sure. We'll obviously look at that. I'm not sure that is something that needs a full-time staff person for, but we will use the resources we have and if we need new resources, we'll look to them either in terms of professional services or the like to make sure that you have the support to fulfill those implementation of the reviews.

ALAN GREENBERG: Great answer. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: We have to use existing, and then if it doesn't work, we have to go on to others.

ALAN GREENBERG: As the board said, that's your problem.

DAVID OLIVE: That's right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

DAVID OLIVE: And that doesn't [inaudible] if there is something that we need more resources for that I would then proceed to ask the board.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly, the onus is going to be on us to justify why we need it and why what we're doing with the other people is already keeping them busy.

DAVID OLIVE: Exactly.

HOLLY RAICHE: You have identified a couple of issues. The RDS is clearly [inaudible] into the GDPR and is [inaudible] into the EPDP. What else do you see on the horizon? The other thing I see in the horizon, obviously new gTLDs and any of the work of the subsequent procedures in terms of whether we proceed, how we proceed.

I see that as the next big issue, but what other issues do you see on the horizon for ALAC? Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE: I think that that is the next big issue, and hopefully now that we have moved from GDPR as an interesting topic over here on the side, it has now been kind of integrated into our processes. I

think that's an important step and focused the attention of everyone here at ICANN 62.

But, I think that will be – then, looking at what were the requests to have best practices, information of lessons learned from the previous round of new gTLDs, so that we can be well-prepared for the subsequent round.

The initial report will have quite a few recommendations that will help guide that, as well as looking at some of the other questions that were raised. Also, rights protection mechanisms and others were kind of part of that process to pave the way.

I know that there was a discussion of what could be done in advance of this. Sometimes, there's technical research or technical systems that have to be put in place within ICANN and we're looking at that as well in preparation so that we don't say, "Oh, that's all finished now. How do we have a system to turn this on or accept application?" So, I think they're trying to do that in parallel in anticipation of completing the requirements of the reviews, best practices, and lessons learned.

And now, I can come out of this one.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I will turn the floor over to Goran Marby. I could give a five-minute biography of what he does here and why he's here, but I

think we all know that. And we did pose a number of questions to Goran. Some of them I see there are responses on the Wiki already. So, I don't know whether Goran is going to address them in person or simply rely on those and go on to the other questions. But, the floor is yours.

GORAN MARBY: You'll have to excuse me a little bit. Why don't we have a conversation, instead? Is that okay? I also first want to congratulate my dear friend here in Mexico for actually making it to the next round. He's like the perfect outcome from our perspective. We [inaudible] and we both went [inaudible]. Yeah.

LEON SANCHEZ: Nobody expected that, right?

GORAN MARBY: Who ever thinks that Sweden can win over anyone in football? I didn't. But, I think also the only person ever who made a victory dance within a GAC session.

First of all, I'm very happy to be here. To be here is my way of showing respect for the work you do. I also would like to take the opportunity, of course, to thank – we're going to thank Alan many, many times. Alan is one of those persons that

immediately ... My first interaction with Alan was [inaudible] where I invited myself to dinner with him. We had a fantastic discussion about old routers. Yeah, it was nerdy.

Alan has been an inspiration, but also one of those persons who has been keeping me back if I ever forget what the reasoning why ICANN exists and also telling me when I'm wrong, which I appreciate. So, thank you.

This is also your instruction book. ICANN Org and myself, personally, need people who constantly remind me of keeping myself on course. I don't know how many times I've said that and not everybody appreciates when I said it, but At-Large for me within ICANN is the answer to the riddle about public interest, of representing something different from other interests.

It's also volunteer work where an amazing amount of people are spending an amazing amount of time because of passion, interest, into the domain name system. As an Internet user myself, I'm very grateful for it. As the ICANN CEO, I'm actually impressed.

So, kickoff. Questions? You can't be tired. It's only Thursday.

ALAN GREENBERG: If the timer were moved, we could see the questions that we already have asked. Does anyone feel any of them are important and we want to ask them again? I'll note the first two questions were answered in writing. Somebody answered them. I'm not sure who. I'm not quite sure whose card that is, Judith or Sarah. Olivier is first I'm told. I have two people talking in the two ears. My hearing is not all that good, but when two points are different. I will arbitrarily say Olivier is first and Judith is second. Holly is third.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Just before you arrived, Goran – and I'm not going to ask any of the questions there because I understand several of them were responded by e-mail. But, just before you arrived, David Olive spoke to us about a next round of new gTLDs. Is it your belief there will be a next round? I thought the people hadn't chosen that yet.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. I have another question for you. How can you at this time in the morning look so dashing? Is there anything you can teach me? Sorry. That was not a comment. I'm actually quite interested that you can do that. He didn't go to bed? How do you know that? Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Same clothes he had on yesterday.

GORAN MARBY: There's a formal answer to it in the ... When the last round was closed, the board made a commitment about another round. So, that's the formal answer, and I'm of course bounded by the rules set by the decisions the board makes until they unmake them. It's something I have to follow.

So, of course it will be because the board have said so. But, you know as well I do it's not that simple because it's a community decision how to do things, when to do things, how it's going to look.

Does anyone remember the timing? Someone also told me it was a timing thing. Someone said we expect this process to start in a couple of years, and it's now how many years?

ALAN GREENBERG: It will be at least ten before the next time around.

GORAN MARBY: From where? From now or ...?

ALAN GREENBERG: From 2012.

GORAN MARBY: So, I refer back to GNSO and their processes there. Of course, I have no personal opinion. I've been taught this week that I cannot talk, have any personal opinions. I'm always the ICANN CEO.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I thought it was because you are Swedish.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. I guess my question is also – I'm waiting to hear what the answer to that one is, but also the question is in the review I guess at the fellowship program, since we did not get funding this year for our Global Indigenous Ambassador Program, is there a way within the fellowship so that we could have some slots from their limited one so that we could bring in and continue this program which has gotten some great results? That's what my question is. Is there a way to segment some slots there?

GORAN MARBY: I think I refer to David Olive for that question. I actually don't have the answer to the question. I'm sorry. Where is David? Is he here? He is holding my back.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Judith. The public comment process for that program is open and I think that's where you should really make the formal suggestion that there be some sort of consideration or position or slots reserved for those various activities.

I know, in the past, there have been – talked about how to best balance the fellowship program from various groups, interest groups, stakeholder groups, and the like. That is run by [Ergis], as you know. You should make those comments to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to add an answer to that. At least one person involved in that program has said, to me anyway, that they don't need slots. They're a mature community and they can compete with everyone else and don't need to have specific allocations. That may not be an opinion you share, but at least some people share that.

GORAN MARBY:

May I? San Juan I think when it comes to budget was an important meeting because we started talking about previous decisions made. I came up with the fairly stupid notion of the 85%, but 85% of the costs we have are related to decisions that we made before. Some of the cost increases, especially the personnel increases we've seen, are related to something else.

For instance, [inaudible] with all the checks and balances we put in place, we have to have more people supporting new functions and so on and so on.

That led to the input received and coming out with reviews. I hope that you are commenting on our proposal when it comes to reviews, which we picked up – we actually did [inaudible] we have 82 interactions on record where people talked about fatigue over reviews. That's a sort of good notion. It's not only about the specifics in the budget, but it was something totally insane how many times when you open the lid of a discussion that people started talking about it. That's why we came out with the consultation papers, which I [inaudible] hope that you will comment on, if you haven't done.

But, I'm more and more concerned about the processes itself when it comes to the budget, because we are sort of doing this – and as always, talking from my heart saying we treat it like we're a company. Most of the costs we have are, for instance,

[inaudible]. We don't start things in January and end them in December. Sometimes I wish we would, honestly, but we don't do that. We don't function on a yearly basis, but we do the budget that way.

The time we have after we submitted the first [inaudible] proposal is very, very small. The window, technically, it takes 15 months to make a 12-month budget because we also added on the IANA budget process, which first do the IANA budget process, then we do the ICANN and then we put it all into the ICANN because we only have one pile of money. So, we have put in a lot of procedures process in it. Personally, I think I would like to have more time for the community to have the balances.

So, one of the things we are talking with the board, because this was also raised I think from the GNSO Council, that why don't we look into having a two-year cycle instead, because most of the things we do takes two years. Sometimes even longer. Sometimes shorter. But, it takes to years.

Then, go back and see how do we align that with a five-year strategic plan that you've all been participating in for the trend discussions that the board will then look into and come up with a proposal.

So, how do we combine the five-year strategic plan with the operational plan that we [inaudible] budget that could have a

slightly longer perspective? It gives us time to have the discussions at ICANN meetings about some of those balancing points that I think everybody in the community would like to talk about.

I'm getting more and more into it, that may be able to come up with a proposal based on the discussions we had for the community to discuss to see if we can change the cadence to give you the ability, not only to talk to me about things like CROP program or fellowship program, but actually talk about it also within the community because I also think the more and more ...

Another thing I learned is that so many misunderstandings about what we do with our money. Not everybody understands. I think we can see that in the fellowship review as well, that there are people who have opinions sometimes, not because they know what's happening. It's just that they have a feeling they know what's happening. And by increasing the discussion about it, maybe we can reach a better budget process. That's a fear, isn't it? Any comments? [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, makes sense.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Makes sense, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] budget.

GORAN MARBY: You can have a rolling five year that you update every year.

ALAN GREENBERG: We could spend all of our time writing plans and never actually do any work.

GORAN MARBY: Or reviews.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We have Holly and myself in the queue. Goran, what's your time constraint?

GORAN MARBY: I came in late. I'm unfortunately to leave in five or ten minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, one-minute timer. One-minute timer for Goran's responses, please. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: It's a question I also asked David. Looking down the track, the issues that you see coming, clearly getting over the EPDP and the GDPR issues, but also next round if there is one, what else is coming down the track I suppose in a philosophical sense that you are going to want our input on?

GORAN MARBY: Can I say I'm sorry? My [inaudible] has texted me. Sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's alright. The question was what I asked David. Looking at what the sort of policy issues we're going to be talking about, clearly getting over the EPDP – whatever it is. Next round, if there is a next round. But, what else I suppose do you see in terms of I suppose a broader picture, what are the policy issues for the next, well, if we got a strategic plan, the two-year or the five-year or the rolling five or the possible six?

GORAN MARBY: If I look at the trends that you have, as a collective ... Is Theresa here? Theresa is not here. I feel lonely. I think that we've done 27 trends, strategic outlook sessions now or something. That's kind of heavy. So, we started to see some trends of the trends. And

one of them ... It's interesting because we haven't discussed it that much. That's the security of the root server system itself. The risk for DDoS attacks.

And I have to give a compliment to the root server operators who just came up with, first time coming up with a joint plan. The details of it could be discussed and should be discussed, but the actual fact that they did it was important. So, that's one of the trends. Economy financial, the development of the markets itself, are interesting notions and discussions.

But, it's also another trend that comes is how do we actually do policy under ... Now we have to learn to do it under legislation. GDPR is the first time we sort of hindered [inaudible]. Hindered by making policies because there is a law that has a direct effect on our quickly to make policies.

There is a learning process here. We have to learn how to do this because it's going to be more laws, not only in Europe even if they have two or three interesting proposals on the table right now. In the US, there are proposals. Everywhere there are proposals. So, how do we develop the multi-stakeholder process in full policy work when it comes to integration knowledge about laws without only – and I'm sorry to say this, Leon – having lawyers in the room. I'm not a lawyer.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry.

GORAN MARBY: I'm an educated chef. I failed ... I have one course left at university, so I actually didn't get my final degree, so the only final degree I have from anything is [inaudible] myself as a chef. You can't see that because I'm so thin, but I have a great interest in food. What are you laughing about?

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of you in the room may not understand, but others will understand and perhaps point you to the appropriate Wikipedia article. Goran has just identified himself as the Swedish chef.

GORAN MARBY: That joke is so old.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're the one who gave yourself the name.

GORAN MARBY: Yes. We have Muppet names for you as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'd be proud to know what it is. Goran, we are now at the time you said you had to leave. We have a number of people in the queue.

GORAN MARBY: I always want to have a question from Sebastien, my friend. Is that okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Goran. I would have been very brief, not now because you don't have time, but I wanted to know what is your feeling about current relationship between ICANN and the USG and between ICANN and the European Commission. But, let's leave that for another time we could discuss.

GORAN MARBY: I have no problem answering it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I know, but you have a time constraint I guess. I want to just make one comment and a question. The meetings are organized for the community to talk to the board and you say that we need

to have more time to talk between us within the community. How it could be achieved and how the meeting can help with that? Thank you.

GORAN MARBY:

To answer the first question, we have excellent relationship with [inaudible]. We have excellent relationships with many countries around the world and we have excellent relationship with the European Commission as well. We have sometimes [inaudible] discussions with [inaudible] countries within the GAC agrees with the multi-stakeholderism. After [inaudible] we have no formal relationship with USG. So, that's the answer to it. We are neutral in our dealings.

Right now, many of the things that we are doing – I'm doing – are related. Some, for instance, [inaudible] GDPR. So, that means that we deal a lot with the European Commission because they have acknowledged that we might sometimes [inaudible] because they actually wrote the law. I didn't come up with GDPR.

When it comes to the ... Yes. You're smart, as always, because you point to the question. I was specific about the budget. You should always have the ability and the board questions and scrutinize what I do. That's a part of my job. My latest joke, by the way, is that – and I have very good jokes – is that my dream

was always to be a villain in a James Bond movie. Apparently, I didn't achieve that, but coming in as the ICANN CEO is a good second, isn't it?

When it comes to the budget, today it's a discussion between you asked me questions. You asked me questions about the budget. But, some of those questions I can't answer because it's actually a community discussion that's going to happen.

So, you were in the meetings [inaudible] so you know that these are questions that [inaudible] in that light as well. I'm not saying that we should do anything about it, but the community might want to discuss certain things that it's already decided. That's what I'm talking about.

So, not to get myself out of the dialogue, but also point back where the community needs to make balances between some of the things we do, because going forward, we foresee with our knowledge, without taking – and we don't take anything into account that I cannot take into account, a sort of flattening funding for ICANN. With inflation, that means that costs actually increase. So, we will, in a couple of years, we probably have to [inaudible] things we already do. And if you want to add something that we want to do now, anything, that's one of the ...

In the work stream two, someone talked to me about that today. The next round of that after everybody agrees is that we actually have to put it in the budget as well. And I'm not saying that any other proposals are bad. I'm just saying that then we actually have to look at them and say, "Yes, but we have to take something away."

I think that discussion actually belongs into the community [inaudible] and make the ... I think that we're going to take something away there. So, that's what I'm after.

Anyway, my friends, thank you for waking me up. We have one more day to go. Make use of it. I really enjoyed coming to you guys. Bye, my friends.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Goran. I'm told you're obliged to stay and take a photo now.

GORAN MARBY: I am?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what my boss told me.

GORAN MARBY: Who is my boss here? I should have put makeup on.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's [inaudible] actually. Alright. We'll try to tick some things off of our next agenda and do it now. Goran mentioned one of the things that I was going to be talking about a little bit later. I don't know how many of you have looked at or seen the RSSAC review. That's RSSAC 037. Not review, report rather. Are you saying you've seen it or you would like to speak? You're saying you've seen it. Okay.

It is a ... I must admit, I have not read it thoroughly. It is an amazing document in some ways because it's something that many of us in the community would have predicted we will never, ever see.

It is a report of the RSSAC, the Root Server System Advisory Committee, authored by all of the root – well, endorsed by all of the root server operators, essentially looking at a renewal of the root server system, and in a group that historically some members of this group have not necessarily supported the concept of ICANN are looking at a way going forward with ICANN well integrated into it. At least that's what I've gathered from the very brief reading I've had.

It's a rather interesting document and it's also likely to be a rather expensive document. It's an interesting view into our future given that ICANN has a strong responsibility and need for a trusted, reliable DNS. Thinking about the root server system I think is a very, very important part of what we should be doing going forward.

Sebastien, did you want to say something?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Alan. It's one of the points I wanted to raise in the wrap up because I was at the meeting. They presented the document and I guess I was the only one from At-Large. But, it was a very interesting and very useful presentation and discussion.

What has come out is that for the moment this document, it's in front of the board, but in the same time, they are ready to share with the community. Therefore, I think we need to organize ALAC, At-Large, SSAC meeting during Barcelona to have a presentation [inaudible] what they are doing.

I really agree totally with you. From my knowledge of what is happening [inaudible] in the root server, it was unexpected and it's really very interesting because I tried to get from the ground. That means that, for example, I ask – you have the 12 organizations who run the servers and I ask why you didn't put

the letter of the server [inaudible] and they say, “We want to get rid of that because it’s just [inaudible] naming.” It’s just one small example, but I think it could be very useful to have a look.

I will, as soon as I go back to my computer, could give you the link of the presentation and the people who are interested could look at and I am ready to discuss with you what I learned yesterday. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Google will find it for you. RSSAC 037. It’s there. It’s quite interesting. One of the public comments that we just submitted or one of the comments we submitted to the public comment is on the RSSAC organizational review and one of the critiques that the RSSAC has made to that review is the review highlights the fact, not necessarily relevant on RSSAC review, but highlights the fact that many of the root server operators don’t trust ICANN and don’t want to have anything to do with ICANN.

Given that this proposal that has been made now has been worked on for the last several years, the RSSAC expresses some concern that, “Who told you that?” That may have been true historically, but it’s not clear that it’s true right now. Another interesting little insight into organizational reviews. Olivier? And

by the way, Sebastien, the intent to have a meeting with RSSAC is already on our list. Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I just wanted to mention two things. I haven't read the RSSAC 037 in detail. I've put a link to it in the chat, so if anybody is interested in this, then you can click on it and you've got direct access to it.

Quickly browsing through it, it's absolutely clear that they seek better integration with ICANN, with their communities, and the ALAC is specifically mentioned in there as well.

I just wanted to recognize, being aware of some of the work that came behind the scenes to reach this level, the warming up of relations between the root server operators and ICANN is the result of many, many years of tireless work from several people in ICANN, but I'd need to notice David Conrad in particular, having travelled the globe, and being a very esteemed member of the International Technical Community.

So, him and his crew of people and quite a few of them have really gone very far to be able to engage the root server operators, and I don't think that the level of distrust today is even one percent of what it used to be 10-15 years ago. That's thanks to their work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're blowing David Conrad's cover, you know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: He is the CTO, after all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else on that particular item? Nothing. I do recommend, even if the words baffle you, that everyone look at the proposal. It talks about ICANN in a way, as everyone has said, that was not expected by many and rather different from before and a very, very positive move. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Just if I wasn't quite clear. It actually talks about putting together a committee where someone from At-Large will be invited to be part of, so that's a significant step, too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. Although we haven't met with RSSAC in quite a long time, lots of discussions going on. It's one of the chair's responsibilities. And Olivier for the fourth time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: For the fourth time. Thank you, Alan. Could I just suggest, perhaps, an action item to meet with RSSAC in Barcelona?

ALAN GREENBERG: I already told Heidi. It's not an action item, as such, because it is already on the proposed Barcelona agenda, which doesn't have an action item as such. And we've managed to use up our extra time. So, we break for 15 minutes, return on the half hour, and we will continue the wrap-up session. I'll stand up if no one else will.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]