CR - LACRALO Capacity Building Session 5
Thursday, March 15, 2012 – 08:00 to 09:45
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Maguy Serad: How many of you have seen compliance presentation this week? Anybody? Okay, good, thank you, and you of course; so next slide please Matt.

Can we make it bigger? This room is challenging. I'm buying a binocular next meeting, so I know, oh mucho gracious, thank you. It's not good to squeeze your eyes. So next slide please.

Contractual compliance is a function that is part of ICANN staff. And as you see on the slide we are part of the big ICANN community. So we are servicing and working with all the different stakeholders and ICANN community members. Everybody cares about how we do our job, and how we are doing our service with the contracted parties. Next slide, Matt, please.

So our basis for our work is the contract. That's very important to know because sometimes people think we can go and ask someone to shut down the website because the content is not good. In the contract, we do not speak of content. So the contract has very specific rules and agreements that everybody between ICANN and the contracted parties have to work to. Next slide, Matt.

The contracts we have, as you know are with registrars and registries, so that's the scope of our work. However, if you are familiar with the ICANN community, you know that the contracted parties also have contracts amongst themselves and with other community members, like registrant, or with resellers. So the contract itself has some elements that flow to the next level, but if we have a problem, we work only with the contracted party. Next slide, please.

And that is very, very important to keep in mind, because you will know it's a very complex model. So for us when we built our vision to do our job very well, we need to be able to work with everyone and earn the trust of the community. Because every stakeholder, as you know has a different interest in contractual compliance to serve their interest or their community.

For contractual compliance our only interest is really the full picture of ICANN to ensure that we are delivering that service. And the way we are going to earn the trust, it doesn't happen immediately is we are going to work with the community members, we listen to the expectations, and we are going to deliver reports and data and enforce our contract with the contracted parties. Next slide, please.

So on our organization today, the staff is 12 team members. With me in the room today, I have Pam Little, she's the Senior Director on my team, but she also supports Asia Pacific. Also in the room I have Jack [Huwasha], if you raise your hand please and Jonathan Dennison. Jack is also a new team member; he's only been with us two weeks. He will focus on risk and audit management.

As you know it's very important to identify the risk, because it will drive our strategy in our audits. We want to make sure we are focusing or have a mitigation plan. Jonathan works on a team that supports the WHOIS and UDRP function. But the team is mostly focused on what we call the registrar, registry compliance. The team will acquire the knowledge and work together based on the demands, on the volumes, on what we have working.

So the idea is that everybody can step in and help, depends on what's going on. Sometimes you have more volume of work in the registrars, so we want to have the team to be able to shift. Now with new gTLD, we don't know what's going to happen, so we're still training the core team, and we'll do that.

Another function that's very important for contractual compliance is the reporting. It's the performance measurement and reporting. This is very key for us to earn the trust of the community, but mostly to be transparent, you know the ICANN structure and community expects transparency. This is one way to do

it. And we have improved our reporting. We used to tell the community how many complaints we have. That was not enough story. What the community, we heard from them, they want to learn more about where are the problems, what is causing the problems. So now we are using the data better to give a better story to the community. But most importantly for our team to be able to manage those areas of problems and address the root cause of the problem and work with the contracted parties to get it resolved. So next slide, Matt. One more.

What I'm going to talk to is two more slides, and then I would like for you please to take the rest of the material and come back to us, because we started late, and I apologize again, I do have to leave at 8:30, my team and I we have another commitment. But the most important thing to learn is you've heard it, if you have attended some forums or meetings this week, you are starting to hear people say "culture of compliance". Why? Because it's important that the community realizes everybody is a critical member of bringing compliance, not just the compliance department.

So we start from the bottom up with our contracted parties. We are today doing what we call self-assessment which is similar, it's like a questionnaire, and we are doing a test of it.

What does that mean? Once a year what we want to do before we decide or we launch an audit, we want to send a questionnaire out to the contracted party for them to provide us information based on the rules and the contractual provisions. We receive this information, we review it, and we sample size who we're going to do a further audit with.

But the most important thing in a self-assessment, it's like a checklist, the contracted party knows that it's a checklist of the contractual obligations. So they use it to make sure they are operating properly, but they use it also to train their staff to make sure that they are following up. It's like a reminder.

So it's going to serve two purposes, ongoing and also once a year. We have finished the pilot, the test. And we ask the contracted parties who volunteered to

tell us their feedback. You know the ICANN community is multi-lingual, very diverse. The self-assessment is in English, but we are asking we had volunteers from different contracted parties, we're asking is the question in English clear. We don't want people to interpret the question. Is the message clear? It should be very simple, very clear. How long does it take you to answer the question? Is it easy to use the tool?

So we want to understand from them how are they looking at it. The other way we want to look at it is also from our department. Are we receiving good information? Can we use this information or did we need to make it better and work with them differently. So it's a two-way check point to see does it work for the contracted parties around the world, and does it work for compliance to be able to do our job with good facts and good information.

The second slide I would like you to look at is a slide that we have been doing and showing to everybody. This slide is very important. People say okay, why is it important to have a consistent process? Because it will allow us to work very efficiently, effectively; it's a standard approach to all the contracts. We receive a complaint on the left side, you see intake, and we have pictures behind the intake. It's just different systems, different ways to receive information. Don't worry about "W" and "C" and UDRP, those are just systems we have today that we wanted to put as an example. Some people know what it is.

But the most important is whatever we receive in our system, we take it into what we call the informal resolution or the prevention phase and we have step one, step two, and step three that has very specific dates. We ask for very specific information to help us make good decisions and if we do have collaboration with the contracted party and they do not fix the problem or work with us to provide the information, then we reach what we call the formal phase, which is enforcement.

When we reach enforcement, this is very important. It tells the community what's going on, because at the beginning, we want to make sure that it's not a misunderstanding. Sometimes we have to talk to people like whether it's in

French, we don't talk Turkish on the team, but we have to get translation, because English is not enough sometimes.

People think we're asking something even though we all say oh, we are communicating. No, we are not sometimes. I've had to talk French to some registrar before, my team mate, Pam, has had to use Mandarin to address some other issues; so, it gives us time with very specific timeline, though, it's not forever and ever, but we take that informal phase to collaborate. We don't want to terminate. Not everybody is bad.

But if there are bad people, guess what's going to happen, they are going to be filtered to enforcement. We're going to reach formal. When you reach formal, we publish on their website, and we are very strict, and very time driven, very fact based all along the way, but so much more focused in enforcement because it is very important and very visible to everybody.

So what I want to do, like I said earlier because of the time crunch we have, I'm going to open the floor maybe for a couple of questions, but the rest of the material, please take a look at it, because we have information by region on the different data.

Another thing Jose, somebody had asked a little bit about law enforcement, so I added a couple of slides in there too, so to give the community an idea. But please again, take a look at it, and if we don't hear from you, maybe we will see you at the next ICANN meeting. Questions?

Male: Thank you very much for being here with us. Can you hear me? Okay.

Thank you very much for being here with us. My question is based on, and I'm going to be very brief and punctual. ICANN creates contracts; we have to take care of contractual through this department, contractual compliance to this department, but what is the menu or the tips or points that you have to take into account in ICANN to take care of the users? Do you understand my question?

Maguy Serad:	So if I may repeat, your question is saying that the contract is with the contracted party. What about the community or the users like the registrant.
Male:	No, the users.
Pam Little:	Who's the users? Define the users.
Male:	What I am asking you is what are the points that we have in the – when celebrating a contract foreseen or taken into account the surveys, taking care of the surveys that the company is going to give to the users? I understand that we have to take care of the whole community, the ICANN, but there is another part what I think that we have – that ICANN should look or take care of the user who is the one purchasing the domain names or who interacts with the domains.
Pam Little:	I'll try to answer the question in English. Maguy shared with us earlier what contractual compliance is about. We have the contract with registries, and registrars. In those contracts these are the rules, registries and registrar to comply with. These rules are really designed to protect registrants.
	So they have to comply with a set of rules to be sure a level playing field among all those registries and registrars, but ultimately we have a lot of provisions, they are about registrants' rights and obligations. All registrars now need to actually provide on their website, a link to a document called Registrants' Rights and Obligations or Responsibilities. And that document is on ICANN website. If you look at a lot of ICANN contract provision with the registrars or policies, ICANN consensus policies, a lot of them are designed to protect registrants.

For example inter-registrar transfer policy is designed to allow mobility; you know you can have choice as the registrant. If you don't like Go Daddy, you can go to Network Solutions, for example. So they are – those protection mechanisms are reflected in the contracts of ICANN policies. Does that answer your question?

Maguy Serad: I would like to add, please go on the ICANN website to the newcomer track, in that we provided more information about the questions that will address your question. A list of the different consensus policies and how they protect the user, okay? Thank you.

Male: Mucho gracias. Thank you very much.

Maguy Serad: Another point very important, you can see on the screen one of the ticketing system, called C Ticket. Really that is a window you can file complaints if you have an issue with your registrars, and we review those complaints and follow up on behalf of the registrants and try to resolve the issues. Thank you.

Jose Arcé: I'm sorry we have time just for one question because Maguy must leave, I saw Fatima. Fatima would you like to make a question or Sala, I saw your hand raised, can you ask the question later? Can you send the question by email? Fatima you have the floor.

Fatima Cambranero: Thank you Jose. Thank you for your presentation. I have a question. I came here late, so I apologize if you have already talked about it.

I would like to know if as a volunteer we can collaborate with your department somehow and if this is the case, should we participate as community, constituency, or can we collaborate individually? Thank you very much.

Maguy Serad: I'm not sure as a volunteer what is the scope that you want to collaborate in. But we do encourage that you collaborate through the community or the constituents' group that you are coming through. I know for example through the ALAC community, we collaborate, they send us the questions, and at every ICANN meeting, we come, we give them a small brief update about the activity. But we only talk about their questions, their discussions that they brought to our attention. So I don't have a clear yes to you, because if you can imagine if everybody wants to volunteer, we cannot do our job.

We'll be volunteering with everybody. It's better to bring structure and bring it through a constituent group. So if I did not address your question, please send me an email with a specific question what is it about, the volunteer, and I'll try my best to respond. Is good?

Jose Arcé: Thank you very much Maguy for being here with us. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Maguy Serad: Maybe next meeting we do it after siesta, it's better. In the morning there are too many meetings. Have a nice day.

Jose Arcé:	While we wait for our next speaker and record this on the records. The desertion or absence rate of the training course of today is really [worrying]. I just wanted to mention this publically.
	Just a reminder; remember that at half past ten, we will still start with our General Assembly, it will be held in the Orquideas Room, so please note this in your agendas.
	The second part of the LACRALO GA will be carried out half past ten in Orquideas Room. That was just a reminder for you.
	Okay, now let's move onto our next speaker, we thank him, he is Alan Greenberg. He is a member of ALAC and he is the liaison to the GNSO. So Alan, thank you very much being here. Just a clarification he is the liaison with the GNSO.

[Applause]

Alan Greenberg:	Thank you, could we get it large enough so we can see it?
Female:	Everyone is the AC room, so they should be able to see it on their screens.
Alan Greenberg:	Okay, next slide. One moment. All right, thank you very much for inviting me. I'm delighted to be here and this is a subject which is both, I think exceedingly important for you to understand and very, very difficult. I apologize for that. But much in ICANN is very difficult to comprehend.
	The Generic Names Supporting Organization, the GNSO, is the organization in ICANN that is solely responsible for originating policy related to gTLDs. The organization has the abilities to do other things also, but they are the only place

where policy for gTLDs can originate, and of course it has to go from the GNSO to the Board.

A subset of these policies are called Consensus Policy, and notice in the slide it has upper case "P", upper case "C". The word consensus in ICANN is used in many ways. If you think it's difficult because you're speaking Spanish, that's not the problem, the problem in English is we use the exact same words, spelled the same say to have very different meanings. And you're supposed to know which one is correct at the time.

The term consensus – there is many terms like that in ICANN, but consensus is one of the worst. When you see Consensus Policy, capital "C", capital "P", it is referring to something which is also often called within the picket fence. Now a picket fence I don't know how well that translates, it's a pretty fence with little white sticks. The picket fence is in reference to parts of the ICANN contracts with registrars and registries which can be changed by the GNSO.

In other words, the registrar or registry agrees to abide by the contract, but that contract can change automatically in a minute if the GNSO adopts a new Consensus Policy. And what is eligible for the Consensus Policy is identified in the contract. So it's important to keep that in mind, and we'll talk about that as we go on in a little bit later. Next slide.

What you have there is a picture of the current GNSO. The GNSO or its predecessor the DNSO, the Domain Name Supporting Organization, that was before the ccNSO split off into a separate one was a complex organization to address a number of problems several years ago, it was re-organized and became much more complex.

As you can see the overall council; and the council by the way is equivalent to the ALAC. That is the whole GNSO consists of all the constituencies, all the members of the registrar, registry, business, non-commercial stakeholder group, large numbers of people just like At-Large is, the GNSO is equivalent to the ALAC, the body of people who are given the responsibility of making decisions.

The GNSO has two houses, two sides; one for contracted parties, the left side on the diagram, one for non-contracted parties and that breaks down into contracted as registries and registrars. Non-contracted is commercial and non-commercial. There are three NomCom appointees, one of them sits in each of the houses and gets to vote. One of them sits on the GNSO council but is not in a house, and as you'll see in a few minutes, the voting schemes are all based on houses, and therefore that person doesn't get a vote at all. Next slide, please.

The voting scheme by which the GNSO approves things is complex, as you can see. Different thresholds are used for different types of things. For instance, yesterday the GNSO approved a policy development process on thick WHOIS that is whether dot com, dot net, and dot jobs should use a thick WHOIS model, or a thin WHOIS model. If you look on this chart to initiate a PDP, it takes only a one-third majority of both houses. So it's a very low threshold. To initiate an issue report, that is the step prior to that, requires only a 25% threshold.

On the other hand, to approve a PDP, the result to take the recommendations and tell the Board implement them requires what is called a super majority, and that can be achieved one of two ways, either two-thirds majority on both houses, or three-quarters of one, and a half of the other. Now you say why are we being so complex? And the reason – it is an important reason. The concept of super majority in ICANN is two-thirds. It's used in a lot of places. It's used by the Board.

On the other hand, once you've divided things into two houses, what happens if you're trying to approve recommendations for registries, and the registries don't want them? Well, if everyone else wants them and the registries don't want them that may be natural. We're asking them to do things they don't want to do. The structure says we can approve it, as long as the other house, we get a large number of people and at least 50% of their house with the NomCom you can get 50% with no registries approving it. So what that says is a single stakeholder group cannot veto, and that's a very important concept, because very often policy is aimed at a single stakeholder group.

So they're complex, we don't expect anyone to memorize them, a few of us have unfortunately, but it just gives you a flavor that a lot of thought has gone into the process of how does the GNSO enact policy. It's very, very easy to get to the point of discussing a policy. It's much more difficult to get to the point of approving it, and once the GNSO approves the policy with a super majority that is effectively two-thirds, the Board must approve it, unless two-thirds of the Board vote it down. So unless two-thirds of the Board takes positive action to say this will harm ICANN, the Board has no choice but to approve the policy. So it's a very, very strong system, it's complex, but there is a lot of safeguards built into it. Thank you, next slide.

Now policy issues can cover a wide range of subjects. WHOIS is one we are talking about a lot these days. New gTLDs, the whole policy that allowed us to come with new gTLDs was the result of about a three-year policy development process in the GNSO.

Inter-registrar transfer which Maguy mentioned a few minutes ago, to allow you to change from one registrar to another was a policy from the DNSO. We are in the midst of five or six year process of fixing it, because there's been a lot of problems that were seen, and it's long process. The universal policy dispute resolution that is if someone takes your trademark name and uses it in an improper way to register a name, this is a process by which you can get them to stop, again a GNSO policy.

Some GNSO policies are highly technical, some are highly legal, some are not. It ranges the whole gamut. Any policy is relevant to a bunch of people; otherwise it wouldn't have gotten to the point of being discussed. Many are relevant to users. Next slide.

Now how is work done? As I said the formal policy, and that's when we use a capital "P" is the result of a process called the Policy Development Process, the PDP. The rules for a PDP are in ICANN's bylaws, these are not arbitrary rules that change from day to day, they are formally defined with very careful processes. The PDP rules have just been refined; it took us two years of

discussion to come up with them. And I think they're a new set, and then with regard to the At-Large, there are a number of improvements in it, which for instance the new PDP says if At-Large requests an issue to be discussed and the GNSO decides not to pursue it, they have to come back and explain why. They can't just say no, go away. So there is a lot in it, and again I don't expect you to read it, it's a complex document. But and I'll come to the "but" in a minute. The work for policy development is typically done in working groups. Now we in ALAC and At-Large use the term working group rather loosely. In the GNSO, again, because of years of experience and trying to refine the processes, it is a very carefully defined term with very carefully defined rules about how it works.

The ALAC often borrows some of those rules but not necessarily all of them. We also have drafting teams which is a less formal process. And occasionally the GNSO invents a new term just because the others don't seem to fit. There is a lot discussion these days about cross-constituency working groups, that is working groups charted by the GNSO and another organization, maybe the SSAC, it may be the ccNSO, maybe the ALAC, maybe combinations of them. So there is a lot of flexibility and in ICANN there is more and more interest in working together between the groups. That's not easy. Some of our groups have very different working methods, but there is an interest and I think as you watch ICANN over the next few years, you'll see more and more of that kind of thing, exactly how it will take, how it will be embodied, I don't know.

Okay, users; how do users interact. From the GNSO perspective, users are registrants. So no one in the GNSO has a formal responsibility for looking at what we would call users. That may change, the GNSO is going to be re-organized again probably in a few years, and maybe that will change. But right now registrants equal users from the GNSO perspective. And therefore, users as such don't have a vote, unless some part of the GNSO feels it is in their interest to defend the rights of real users, and that does happen on occasion.

I sit on the GNSO, and I have a voice, but I don't have a vote. Next slide.

One of the changes that came with the current working group model, and it extends to design teams and other things, is although it is a GNSO activity, anyone can participate, and that is literally anyone, and certainly anyone from At-Large. There are some requirements that aren't written. The requirements are if you're going to go participate in a working group, be prepared, do your homework, you're expected to be thoughtful, and no just mad. And under those conditions in the current world we're living in, people are respected and are listened to. I say generally on the slide, respected, because sometimes no one is respected. You can be from within the GNSO and not, but in general people are welcome, the input is appreciated because there is really an interest in making sure that policy ends up being good policy for everyone.

Now is this always the case? No. Sometimes people will say we don't care about users, but that happens in all environments. That last bullet I have is, but it's not always received. And that's a very large problem. There are very, very, very few people in At-Large who actively participate in GNSO activities, and GNSO working groups. Next slide.

The ALAC has the ability to request that the GNSO look at a subject. So we can request an issues report; that means staff has to go off and write a paper to describe the problem. The GNSO then has a choice of whether to go ahead with it, but as I pointed out before, the threshold, the number of votes you need to go ahead with a PDP is very low. The ALAC has done this in two cases. One is domain tasting, if you're not familiar with it, I won't spend time right now, but it's an interesting example, and it was a policy that ended up changing with a very, very significant impact on ICANN and registrants and users, and registries and registrars.

We are just finishing one that was looking at the rights of a registrant to renew a domain after it expires, if it expired accidentally. That's an interesting example. It was initiated by the ALAC, the number of ALAC participants in the actual working group was very, very small, to a large extent there was me, and I happen to be chairing the working team, which shows that the GNSO is open to other people doing things and when I started off as an ALAC member and then

as a liaison, chairing the GNSO policy working group, and Cheryl participated, but to a large extent, that's all. And this is the policy looking at forcing new rules upon registrars. I'll ask you a question. Do you think registrars participated in that? You bet! Lots of them. And it's really difficult having a conversation when six of the eight people on a phone call all say yes, I agree with him, I agree with him, I agree with him. And two people say no, we don't. It's just difficult. You know it's not an issue of voting, it's just more people to talk. And At-Large has to start participating in these issues that are important to At-Large. It's not enough to make a comment afterwards saying you got it wrong. People have to participate. That's it. I'm open to any questions you have and if not here, then at some later time.

Sergio Salinas Porto: This is Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Dear Alan, it's a real pleasure to have you here and I have a question for you. I visited the GNSO website to see the PDP document, and I find that it is only available in English, and as you know in our region, very few colleagues are English speakers. Therefore, I will ask you to kindly suggest at the GNSO that the documents should be translated, at least the PDP, that the document should be translated into the six UN languages, so that all the At-Large members can participate here. I believe it is paramount to have different ALSs working with ALAC. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, in general outputs, reports and things like that are translated. There is sometimes a little bit of a time lag, but most report-type documents and I think that includes issues reports, but I won't swear to it are in multiple languages. The working groups all work in English, I'm afraid, and intermediate documents are all in English. English is the language of ICANN. So we have no choice. That may change some time in the future, probably long after I'm alive, so it is hard for people who are not in a position to have – to be fluent in English. Just think of the people who speak languages that aren't in the list of what ICANN

translates, and there's many of those. So they don't even have translations of the important end product documents.

The challenge in your area is to find people who are interested and who can participate in English. I can regret that that's the case, but that's the reality we live with. The cost of trying to translate all intermediate documents and have teleconferences in multiple languages, the cost in both money and time and effort is just too long. The one single criticism that everyone has of GNSO processes is they take too long. To elongate that even more, there is just not going to be a will for it in the near future, until we get a lot better at it. So it's difficult. I appreciate it. I don't think we can do anything about it. Your challenge is find the few people or the many people who can work in English and are interested and are willing to learn the work. It makes the challenge harder for you. I don't have an answer other than that.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Sergio speaking again. I think that we need to have a further debate about languages, even within ALAC. However, I was specifically referring to the PDP document that is available only in English. So as a starting point, it would be go to understand that document, to understand what is going on at the GNSO. So could you please ask to have at least this one important document, to have it translated into the UN languages, please?

Alan Greenberg: To qualify, do you the PDP on a particular subject, or the document describing PDPs?

Sergio Salinas Porto: Sergio speaking again. The PDP document, it is called PDP, I'll let you know in a minute. It's the first document I find as I visited the website.

Alan Greenberg:	The GNSO website is horrible, it needs to be redone. It's impossible for me to find anything on it. So you have to put that part into it also, the document you're looking for may well be there and impossible to find.
Sergio Salinas Porto:	Sergio speaking. There is a document reference within the GNSO. One of them is called Policy Development Process, the other is a document referring to organization, and then there is another document reference, let me just check. Oh, no, with these two documents translated into the UN languages, then it would be enough for At-Large to understand what is going on at the GNSO. Surely there will people that can study English, that can participate in the teleconferences, but we need to at least understand what is going on, so that they decide to participate thank you.
Alan Greenberg:	Give me the URLs. I will either tell you where the Spanish version is if it exists, or suggest, if it's a common document that is a basic introduction, you're correct. I suspect many of them are translated; I will pass that on as a recommendation.
Jose Arcé:	Umberto, you have the floor.
Umberto Carascas:	This is Umberto Carascas from Chile for the record. It has been a real pleasure to listen to your presentation. But I'm concerned about the expression, consensus; because it denotes somewhat frustration in that some minorities take advantage of the term consensus and want to impose their positions when vast majorities have reached agreements, so what has been…

[interpreters speaking]

Umberto Carascas:	So which is the concrete mechanism that you have designed in order to work out these issues?
Alan Greenberg:	As I said, the word consensus in ICANN is used in many a different way. In terms of how agreed people are on a subject and the way I use Consensus Policy is a policy that was agreed to in a specific way, not necessarily unanimous, but agreed to in specific way.

With regard to working group rules, as I said, the working groups have some very specific rules. If you go to the Working Group Manual, which may or may not be in Spanish, I think it actually is, but I'm not sure, we define many different types of consensus. We define full consensus, partial consensus, consensus with particular dissenting views. And there are percentages and there is numbers. Full consensus is not unanimous, but close. So we have attempted in the GNSO anyway, because these are not ICANN wide, but they're starting to be used in common ways. We have attempted to define what consensus is and what different levels of consensus mean.

There is always going to be somebody who disagrees with something, and you cannot stop an organization from going forward because one person or two people disagree. On the other hand, you have to listen to them. One of the changes that we have in ICANN recently is we have had comment periods for a long time. For a very long time, many of us believed that comment periods were something to make it look like we were consulting, and then we never read the answers.

Any of the work groups I've participated in, and I know it's not unique in the last year or so, we spend a huge amount of time going over each of the comments and saying is this something we already discussed? If it is, you know very often people bring up things that were discussed, and we decided for one reason or another, there was no consensus to do it. On the other hand, changes do get made because of comments and so one person should not be able to alter, to break consensus, but they can influence the outcome. So all I can say is if

you find cases where it appears that one person is getting in the way of closure, then we have figure out how to address that. Sometimes it's because they have an important point we're not listening to. Sometimes it's because they just disagree, and we will find disagreement.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Alan, I must apologize, I found the versions in the six UN languages, and I am very, very pleased, so thank you.

[Applause]

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Sergio. As I said that website is – of all the bad websites ICANN has, that's got to be one of the worst. I think the only worst one is ALAC's. Forgive me, at the beginning of the meeting I asked Heidi where do I find – what the correct schedule is a for a given day, and the answer she said is the published schedule is the right one, the one we have on our Wiki. I spent a half an hour trying to find it. And I know I had found it before. I finally found a printed copy and typed in the name at the top of the page and that got me to it again. So a lot of websites in ICANN have a problem and what can I say.

But in the more general case, if you find documents that you believe your region need to be able to validly participate and it's not outrageous, it's not 4,000 documents, tell us about them. ICANN is very good these days about providing reasonable translations for documents that are needed. And in some people there is a belief that they do a lot of translation, and no one ever reads the documents at all. So it's important that we focus on the important ones, but we do have to get those done if they're not. So thank you. By the way, I'm available to stay here. I think the room is available. So I don't mind keeping on going, but I don't know what other commitments. The interpreters stop, okay. So are we already stopped?

Female: No, no, they're still going. We can't just –

Male: One more question?

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Jose Arcé: Thank you Alan. And will the speaker identify himself?

Male: This is a point of clarification regarding what you said at the end of your presentation. You said that one person cannot alter consensus but may influence on the outcome. I took note of that, and I am under the impression that a person, if a person can affect the result or the outcome, at the end of the day that person is altering consensus.

Alan Greenberg: Yes and no. if you come to a group and give them an idea they hadn't thought about, and they say that's a good point, you are altering consensus, but you're doing it by convincing people that there is something important that has to change, and that's the way reasonable people affect outcomes of anything, any discussion. So they're not using some authority to do it, they're using the power of their arguments and their reasoning, and that's reasonable, I think. Maybe I'm missing what your meaning is, but all I'm saying is any one person, just like one At-Large person on a GNSO group, may well change the outcome, not because they have authority to do it, but because they have ideas that other people might not have thought about. Does that address the question?

Male: Yes, thank you. It is clearer now, but I will think about it in the coming days.

Jose Arcé: Jose Arcé speaking, Alan thank you very much. And here goes another round of applause to Alan.

[Applause]

Alan Greenberg: I thank you for being here and for the good questions.

[End of Transcript]