
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Today is the ALAC monthly conference call on Tuesday, 27 May 2014. The time 14:02 UTC. We will start this call with a roll call. Gisella, please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Olivier. Well, on today's call on the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Beran Gillen, Sandra Hoferichter, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Siranush Vardanyan, Allan Skuce, Anthony Niiganii. On the French channel, we have Hadja Outtara.

New to the ALAC call is Russian interpretation. We're very proud to announce that we have a Russian channel moving forward. On our Russian channel today, we have Oksana Prykhodko. We also have Julie Hammer and Murray McKercher on the call.

Apologies today noted from Judith Hellerstein, Fatima Cambroner, Pierre Dovonou, and Roberto Gaetano. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Kathy Schnitt, and myself, Gisella Gruber. Our interpreters today on the French channel are Claire and Camila; on the Spanish channel, Veronica and David; and on the Russian channel, Galina. Leon Sanchez has also just joined the call.

If I could please remind you all to state your names when speaking not only for transcript purposes but to allow the interpreters on the three different language channels to identify you and also to speak at a

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.

reasonable speed as we have live interpretation in French, Spanish, and Russian. Thank you. Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Of course, I wanted to also add there is interpretation in English, as well, for those people who are in the other channels. We always forget that, but it is one of the interpreted languages.

Right. Let's have a adoption of the agenda or asking for any other business or amendments to the agenda. I don't see anyone putting their hand up. It looks like the agenda is therefore adopted.

We can go immediately to Agenda Item #3, which is the review of the ALAC action items of our last call, which was on 29 April 2014. I invite you all to click on the agenda page and have a good look at the action items page, which thankfully has a lot of – I would call them green ticks, but they're not actually green – but a lot of tick marks next to the action items that we have listed on there.

First, the open actions items. We are only going to go, for the sake of saving time, through the action items which are yet to be completed. The first of the open action items is asking for Ariel Liang to work with Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Olivier Crépin-Leblond on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of At-Large action items. That is still ongoing.

The next unticked box is Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Evan Leibovitch to liaise with Rudi Vansnick in regards to the implementation of consumer

metrics and follow up further details. Has there been progress in this? I'm not sure who would wish to speak to this. Maybe Cheryl? Would you be able to bring us a quick update on this, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As far as I know, there has been no furthering of this. Although it may be that I, for some reason, have been out of the loop, but I am unaware of any action on this item at all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. Let's see, are Evan or Rudi on the call? Perhaps there was action, after all. I don't see Rudi on the call and neither do I see Evan, at the moment. We will have to leave this one unticked. Could I just ask, Cheryl, if you could please just send a note to the other two people listed on this action item and find out the status? Hopefully, there will be some action for the next time we have a call or the time we meet face-to-face.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I will. Thanks. Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next, staff to monitor the use of additional languages over the course of the few months as ALAC, APRALO, and LACRALO calls will be offered additional language interpretation by the language services. I turn over to staff to provide us with details of what they have found. Perhaps I should ask for Heidi, specifically, then. If no staff is ready to

start speaking, maybe we'll ask for Heidi, specifically. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, thank you. I'm about to defer back to Gisella, but it's my understanding that these new languages have just started. In fact, I believe Russian's the first new language. So once we have about a month behind us, we're going to start. We'll let you know what the results are in terms of how many people are on these new language channels. Gisella, if you wanted to add anything to that, feel free.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. If I may, we will be adding Chinese hopefully after the London meeting, all going well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, fantastic. Okay, thank you very much. Let's move to the next – well, let's leave this one unticked, then, and see until the next time.

Now, the next unchecked box is for the ALAC to create an ad hoc taskforce or working group at the upcoming ALAC call to organize the selection of two ALAC reps to the transition of NTIA stewardship of the IANA functions. There are a whole number of sub-items underneath that. Could I ask staff to provide us with an update on where we are with this, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Olivier. Hi. There were calls for the subcommittee to select the two people was sent last week and none of them for the committee itself. Actually, sorry. A Stewardship Issues Working Group was also sent last week. The deadlines are effectively tomorrow, the 28th, and Friday, the 30th. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Heidi. Could you please send a reminder to the lists except, of course, if we've got too many people volunteering forward. I have seen some volunteers, and their e-mails have reached. I hope that someone is collecting those and building the working groups as we go along. Could you confirm this, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe Ariel was asked to do that. I'm sure she is. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. Ariel, you have the floor.

ARIEL LIANG: Hello, everyone. Yes, I have been keeping record of the people who volunteered towards this steering subcommittee, and I also updated their information on the Wiki page and subscribed them to the mailing list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Ariel. Just to remind you, there are two separate tasks, I understand. One is the working group and one is the subcommittee for selecting people that will go onto the steering committee. Is that correct?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, that's correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Well, if you could please send a reminder to the list. That will ensure that we've got plenty of people who will be involved in this essential work that will take place in the forthcoming months.

Now, I could open the floor for anyone who has any comments on those open action items. Seeing no one put their hand up at the moment, let's scroll further down this very, very long page.

You will note there are quite a few recently-closed action items. Thanks very much for all the people, including staff have had an enormous number of things to do. In there, you'll notice it's all done. We still have some newly-assigned action items from our last call. Some are still not complete yet.

First, the new gTLD Working Group is to analyze the input on the PABs and suggest the next steps by contacting At-Large staff. Now, that's something we will be dealing with a little bit later during the current call. There is an agenda item on this. Let's put this to the side.

The next unchecked box is for RALO leaders to follow-up on the At-Large Structures to be decertified, listed on the Wiki page. That's also an item in our agenda later on in the call. We can put this to the side, too.

Finally, Nathalie Peregrine to post the new online ALS application info on a Wiki space viewable to the public and publicize the Wiki space. I understand that this is also later on in our call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Heidi, please. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Actually, that item was removed from the end of the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah. Thanks for telling me.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Over the last – over the weekend. Nathalie's on the call, but I'm happy to update you since Nathalie is not able to – hello? [inaudible]

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Nathalie.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Yes, we're very, very close to having the ALS application form ready to be posted on the Wiki space. However, we first needed to clear things with Legal regarding the rewording of certain items of the application form. There were several phone calls last week, and we're getting the final validation today. I'm expecting it any time today, given that yesterday was U.S. bank holiday.

Once this is validated, we're working with tech support and they claim that it will be very, very quick to get the actual application form posted on the Wiki. The minute that's done, I will send an e-mail out and [update further on].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Nathalie. That is our last action item on our action item page. I open the floor again for any comment. Seeing no hands up, that means we can move on and finish with the action items and go swiftly to something that links in directly with the At-Large Structure application form. That's the review of the current ALS application. Back to Nathalie Peregrine to take us through this, please.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Olivier. We will come to the application number (198) ISOC Venezuela. Just yesterday as a LACRALO ALS they were welcomed.

We have a NARALO ALS application vote starting today at 23:59, Manitoba E-Association. This vote will close next Tuesday on 3 June at 23:59 UTC, again.

Due diligence was finished for application (203), which was an AFRALO application, Open Source Foundation for Nigeria. This due diligence has been sent to AFRALO secretariats. We're awaiting regional advice, whenever it's possible.

We also received, finally, the translation of the application form for ISOC Tchad, which is our most recent application. It's the AFRALO one, (204). As we received the application form translation, we will be starting due diligence today.

I understand that Silvia, my colleague, is still awaiting news regarding due diligence for application (202), which is the LACRALO application from Panameño. That's where we stand right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nathalie. A very, very warm welcome to our recently-certified At-Large Structures. There appears to be a real push at the moment for more applications to arrive. It's great to see that. There is a growth.

If you recall, we had started at the beginning of the year with just about 160 At-Large Structures. We are now on 177 and more and more countries are being served, which is really, really great to see.

I really look forward to seeing much involvement from the new ALS participants and look forward to seeing the results of the due diligence on all of the applications that are currently pending. How great it is to see that these are applications from all over the world. It really, truly is a very diverse set of stakeholders.

I open the floor to questions and comments. I note Tijani Ben Jemaa has put his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Nathalie, you didn't speak about (170). Why? University Community Partnership for Social Action Research.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's actually (170). That one was sort of in a comatose state. That one actually was submitted some time ago. I think it was late last year. Then, it was indicated that the person who submitted it for that organization had not authorized the submission. We need to go ahead and continue following up with that organization to see if they do wish to actually apply.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. Thanks for raising this point, Tijani. I hadn't seen this, indeed. Very strange to see we're in the 200 marks already

whilst we have that application for (170). That's fine. Any other questions or comments? Tijani, you have your hand still up. You wish to comment further?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, it is a problem of Adobe Connect. My connection is very bad, so I cannot lower my hand. This is the problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, you have successfully performed the lowering of the hand just now. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just one more word. Certainly, it's great to see more ALS applications coming in. I think that there is still sometimes some confusion as to whether an ALS or whether an organization should be certified or not or should be accepted by the ALAC.

I note a discussion that took place a few hours ago on the LACRALO call about this. As you know, LACRALO leadership was unable to provide a consensus position for one of the applications that are listed here.

It's one of these things where you have to go with your gut feeling, I guess, but at some point, I think – and perhaps even during the ATLAS II – there should be a discussion about this and about the exact way to

find out if an ALS is going to be accepted or not. It's not exact science, but it certainly is an important thing. As you can see, there is a lot of growth in our community.

Now, one more thing that has been noted in the Adobe Connect chat and that's that CROPP is very fruitful. Indeed, I must say a lot of the – well, this really is a lot of the results from the CROPP Program. To me, it looks like another really successful program that has been started.

As you know, it was a pilot program. I'm not sure whether the second year will also be pilot or whether it's going to be losing one of the two Ps that it currently has. But I'd like to see that second P go, because it certainly seems to have worked very well for us.

Let's move on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am sorry. My connection now, Adobe Connect won't work on my screen. That's why I didn't raise my hand.

I'd like to say that for this question of certification of the ALSes. Since there were a lot of problems this year and last year and the year before, I want and I suggest that we engage a deep discussion about that inside

the At-Large community. Better to do it in the ALAC, inside the ALAC members before and then perhaps to enlarge it to the wider At-Large community.

I don't feel very happy with what happened right now, because we had conflict between the regions and ALAC. This is not something that have to happen. It's right that it is the right of the ALAC to certify, not the region. But I think that we need to have the same values, the same criterias so the same result, the same decision. We have to clarify that, perhaps, by a deep discussion inside the At-Large community and to come up with some, perhaps, new rules to make it happen in the future, I hope.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, Olivier. Sorry, my Adobe Connect connection went off for about 15 minutes, but I'm back now. On the point that Tijani has just raised, I wish to support his suggestion but also indicate that this is one of the themes which comes up every now and then on the Board discussions among Board members about the importance or not of having a set of criteria for these certification things. Maybe it would be worthwhile asking our staff to check with the Board staff if there has been any recent movement on this point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Next, we have – oh, goodness – a lot of people on the list. Okay, let's go through everyone, and then we'll address some of the points that were made. Alberto Soto is next. Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Good morning to you all. As a member of LACRALO, I would like to tell you that this item has already been included in our agenda for the General Assembly in London. We are even working on a kind of procedure for LACRALO. It will be issued before the meeting, because our agenda needs to be ready seven days before the meeting.

The thing is that unfortunately, we had a very, very heated discussion, especially for some of the ALSes. Unfortunately, this was due to the fact that there was an intersection of political issues – really political, not policy issues. It was too heated for our liking.

We have allowed this discussion. We do not really have a restriction for this. We are trying to reduce this level but also to have something that a bit more defined to have an opinion on the acceptance or not of an ALS. We know that ALAC is the one to decide, although we would like to contribute to that decision. The last ALS had ten. We didn't really reach a general consensus, so we actually had ten opinions in favor and ten against. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alberto. Next we have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I guess I support the concept of reviewing our both processes and the qualifications, because it hasn't been done for a long time. I think that needs to be done a semi-regular basis.

But I'll point out that the wording we have right now was established after very, very significant discussion and was deliberately written to allow flexibility because, across the regions, both the culture and the realities of life in many of our countries is such that an ALS will take a different structure in one place than it will within another.

Those who wanted to make sure we didn't let anyone in that didn't meet their qualifications wanted a much tighter set of rules which wouldn't work in other regions. Therefore, they worded somewhat flexibly and allowed discretion to decide whether an ALS is truly a good ALS or not. That inevitably leads to differences of opinion, because it's not completely cut-and-dried and deliberately so.

I'll otherwise support reviewing these things. I think it needs to be done in the context of we are not going to have a tight set of rules which everyone will interpret the same. At least, I don't expect that to come out of it. Therefore, there's always, I think, going to be some discussions about whether does a particular group meet what we want an ALS to be. There's going to be judgment calls involved.

Although I support the review, I'm not convinced that the outcome – the outcome will be different words – but I'm not sure it will be that much more certain and controlled. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Hearing the very interesting discussions I've just heard now, it looks as though there might be some real worth in each one of the RALOs to discuss this matter on a RALO level first, during their face-to-face General Assembly. It sounds like a really good topic to discuss to see if the accepting criterion for the region are working out for the region or whether there is a problem with this acceptance criterion.

I'm very well aware of the difference in the way each region works and also the cultural difference and the difference in perception that people have. I think that perhaps for the RALOs to discuss this first and then for the RALOs to share this information with each other, either through the secretariats meeting or perhaps through one of the short sessions that we could have in London. Although I'm not quite sure when we would be able to have this short session in London; perhaps a follow-up conference call after London.

It looks as though there is some interest for a review. Whilst, at the same time, I understand that historically, there has been already considerable amount of discussion on this in the past. That's often the case for things like this.

Of course, as you know, later on in this call, we will be discussing the delisting of At-Large Structures. That's another concern I personally have, including some ALSes which I recall having voted to ratify and to get them to join At-Large.

Suddenly, it looks as though we have problems with being able to bring those people from that ALS to London just a couple of years down the

line. What has happened? Have circumstances changed, perhaps? Have personal circumstances changed for the ALS representative, as well?

There needs to be something done so as for us to be able to have more active ALSes and also not be turned away, I guess, by some ALSes that appear to be moving interests and may be not totally suited to this kind of environment.

Anyway, the discussion needs to be taken further. Alberto Soto, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I have asked for the floor, too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALBERTO SOTO: I agree with what you have just said. Within LACRALO, we are modifying other procedures. We have had many problems with non-active ALSes, and so we have tried to define what active ALSes are. The public comment period is open to talk about the modifications to the procedure.

We have established some procedures within our region to say what is that we consider an active ALS. If these requirements are not complied with, then the ALSes will not be able to send a representative to a face-

to-face meeting. This active classification can also be recovered following the same procedures within the following year.

We have also defined what we consider active participation of an ALS member. This will allow them to run for an elected position within the region or within ICANN. We have a lot of consensus in this sense, and we hope to be able to approve this before the London assembly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alberto. I really look forward to seeing the results of this work. It certainly is something which I think many of the other RALOs will be looking at with very much interest, as well.

Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa. Then we'll close this topic and we'll move on because, otherwise, we will have taken too much time on this. The clock is ticking. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Alan, I didn't say that we need to change the rules. I said that we need to engage in a deep discussion. I like to learn from the problems we just faced these last two years.

It is more or less brainstorm about all the issues, all problems, why we had those problems, what is the difference between the perception of the RALO and the perception of ALAC? Where is the problem? Perhaps this can lead to additional rules. This can lead to modifying the rules. This cannot lead to any change in the rules, but just have better understanding for both sides. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Last in the queue, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, Tijani, I'm agreeing with 100%. I was just giving a bit of historical background for those who weren't around seven years ago when we last had this discussion. Thank you. Bye-bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. That closes the review of the current ALS applications. Now, we will move over to the reports. I invite you all to have a look at the At-Large reports from the working groups and from the RALOs and the liaisons. Speaking of liaisons, we will start with our ccNSO liaison, Maureen Hilyard, and ask for your quick, summarized report. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I have my report. Firstly, there is still some confirmation to be had on our joint meeting that we normally have. Things are pretty tight in London, of course, as we all know. I think the last time I heard, we were considering a breakfast meeting with the Council. That's still to be confirmed, and I'll get back to everyone on that.

There was a promotion for a DNS forum that was sent to me just before the meeting. I've put some information on that in case anybody was interested in attending.

The meetings that I've attended for ccNSO over the last few weeks include the Council meeting. I note with great pleasure that Marshall Island has joined from the Northern Pacific.

Just a few comments about the working groups that I've included in the report, more information on that meeting will come later.

The other meeting was the Framework of Interpretation Working Group, which is in the last stages of that working group as they prepare a set of recommendations to accompany their revocation report, which will go to the GAC in London. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. Are there any question for our ccNSO liaison? Seeing no hands up, I just note some new members of the ccNSO. I think that's really great. To see, on the one hand, we have new At-Large Structures and the ccNSO also has new members, that certainly shows a big growth all across of ICANN. It's absolutely great to see. Thank you for your reports, Maureen.

Next, we turn to our GNSO liaison. His name is Alan Greenberg. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. The report from the last GNSO meeting has been up on the web since the meeting. There's not been a lot of other activity since then that needs to be reported.

I do want to focus a little bit, though, on one of the decisions during that last meeting because I think it shows a very large change from what has happened in the past. Although it is not a precedent, it is an interesting happening.

You will recall that there was a Board request for comments on Specification 13, which gives .brand owners the ability to be more selective with registrars. The Board passed the approval of Specification 13 with the exception of the statement on registrars and went to the GNSO and gave them something like 45 days to either say whether they agree or disagree with the implementation of that statement regarding restrictions on registrars or if they needed more time.

In the past, asking the GNSO to come up with a decision in 45 days would have been almost impossible, partly because of the time limit, and partly because, in general, the GNSO has not taken decisions unilaterally but always chartered working groups and such to go off and do something.

In this case, the ultimate decision – and there was a very large amount of debate – the ultimate decision narrowly was to tell the Board New gTLD Committee that the change that they were suggesting was a departure from policy. That is, the specific issue was discussed at the time. It was decided against, therefore it could not be considered something which simply hadn't been discussed but was a departure from policy. That notwithstanding, the GNSO Council supports the adoption of this policy. Essentially saying they are changing, agreeing to allow the policy to be changed.

The motion was not supported by the registrars, was not supported by NCSG, but did get the majority needed to approve it. I think this has significant repercussions on the discussions that will be held in the Policy and Implementation Working Group because, although this is not a precedent, it is an example. It's going to, I think, change the tone of some of the discussions. I'm not sure which way. It's a rather momentous decision both on the substance of the decision and the fact that the GNSO could come to closure in the timeframe that was given to actually do it.

It indicates, I think, good things about the GNSO that they're acknowledging and able to work in the world that we're living in. Also, I think it portends or foretells some rather interesting discussions and very substantive discussions on how GNSO policy can be set in a world where things change and we don't always understand things completely at the time when we're making decisions initially. It's, I think, a very interesting occurrence. That's about all I have right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Just one quick question: How does this translate to the Internet end-user? How might this affect the Internet end-user?

ALAN GREENBERG: Virtually not at all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. It's more of a procedural thing, then, effectively?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's purely a business relationship between registrars and registries. The registrars claimed that, although more convoluted, the .brand registries could get almost what they wanted through existing rules. But, clearly, the registries did not agree that it was equivalent.

It has virtually nothing to do with end-users. It will not change one iota the end result. It's just a procedural issue of how are registrars and are all registrars treated completely equally in terms of addressing registration of .brand names.

It's not a user issue from the perspective of the details of this decision. It is potentially a user issue, however, from the perspective that the GNSO is looking at ways to respond to policy questions which are different from the traditional ones. The next one that comes up, which could come to the GNSO for a decision like this, might well be a user issue.

I think that's a positive thing that the GNSO is being flexible in these kinds of cases. Whether you agree or disagree with the contents of the specific issue, I think in the changing world, some level of flexibility is necessary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Alan. I open the floor for questions or comments regarding Alan's report. Seeing no one putting their hand, let's then move on to our other report.

That's a report from our dotMobi liaison. As you know, we appointed a dotMobi liaison a few months ago. It's good to keep up-to-date with what's going on in the dotMobi world.

Murray McKercher, you are on the call. You have the floor. I note that Murray is getting linked to audio at the moment. I was hoping you would already be linked. Okay, we'll come back to you later, then, if we don't have audio with you.

Right, let's move on, then, to the next part of our call. This is going to be – oh, just before we close on the reports, just I wanted a round of applause and thanks for all of the RALO reports that we've received. I think nearly all of them are up-to-date. But it's great.

I understand there is so much going on on the RALO level at the moment with the preparation for the At-Large Summit. There are just so many reports and so many things to report on, it's hard. But it's good to see just a few words on the RALO activities.

Let's move on – oh, I see Julie Hammer has got her hand up. Yes, I was going to say, let's move on to our next liaison report. That's the SSAC liaison. Julie, you now have the floor.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Olivier. I thought for a moment there you might have skipped me. In fact, there is not a great deal to report, but that doesn't mean that there has not been a great deal of activity.

I've been participating in three different SSAC work parties. One, the Identifier Abuse Metrics Work Party is working on its report, which I think is probably still some way off.

The JAS Report Comment Work Party has been very active with [inaudible] another three meetings in the last month, two of which have been with ICANN staff and the JAS team. There's been a lot of discussion in working through issues that are probably best looked at behind the scenes rather than in public.

Finally, I've been on the work party planning the SSAC activities for the London meeting. I've just mentioned here that SSAC has offered to meet at any time between 14:30 and 16:15 on the Monday afternoon. We're just still waiting to hear back from Heidi and staff on what time you would like them to meet.

I think the only other activity was my participation in the Security and Stability webinar, which I thoroughly enjoyed, and I appreciate everyone who linked into that. That's my report. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julie. May I ask, fast, since you have mentioned the Monday afternoon meeting with the SSAC, or at least with the SSAC Chair, as I understand. Do we have any update on this, Heidi, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, everyone. I was unmuting. No, not yet. That's something I need to follow up with Julie Hedlund, the SSAC staff support, on that. I will do so today.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. I think we have isolated a time or we did say a time for it. Let's try and get this done within the next week, please, so we make sure that things will move.

Just one note, with regards to the scheduling on this Monday afternoon. There's been some discussion with regards to the high-interest topics that the RALOs usually bring up on the Monday afternoon. That appears to now must be taking place because most of the SO and AC Chairs and SG Chairs, as well – so the stakeholder group Chairs – have also said that the Monday is going to be very, very busy indeed.

That might bring a little bit more space to our agenda, as well, if we need to find some more time for this specific meeting.

Now, I note that Murray is on. Let's see if we can have his very short, I guess, very short report with regards to the dotMobi liaison.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you, Olivier. It is a very short report. There was a dotMobi Policy Advisory Board meeting on 13 March. I did publish a note to note that, basically, a review of the charter. Another meeting was not set.

There was an agreement that we would be doing teleconference as opposed to face-to-face meetings at ICANN gatherings, only because

most of the members are busy with a number of ICANN meetings at the same time. We have not scheduled the second.

The only item coming out of the first meeting was regards to ICANN's RSEP vote transfers as it related to dotMobi. There was some waiting on ICANN Legal in that regard. I'll publish a more detailed report, but that's it in summary. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Murray. I open the floor for any questions on both the dotMobi liaison report and the SSAC liaison report, as well. I haven't seen anyone put their hand up, so that closes our section on the liaison reports.

I really thank all of our liaisons who do an enormous amount of work in the community that they are liaising with. It's hard to do so much in At-Large because there's just so much going on. But at the same time, being in the other community and then relaying information back and forth is very important and is very welcome.

Let's have a look back on our agenda and move to the next item and that being New Business, Items for Decision. Here, we have a list of recently-adopted ALAC statements and a list of statements currently being developed and reviewed and voted on and so on by the ALAC.

I don't think there is much worth in going through a detailed list of the recently-adopted ALAC statements. It's very interesting to see that there are six of them in the past month. We've seen a real growth in the number of statements that have been sent out.

In fact, it's more than six in the past month, since we also had the four parts of the ICANN Strategy Panel. That makes an all-time record, probably, for At-Large and for the ALAC. As you can see, there's been much support for all of the statements that are drafted there.

I'd like to really thank the people holding the pen on these. It's good to see that we are able to share the load. There are more people involved in holding the pen.

I just want to remind you all that you do not need to be an ALAC member to hold the pen and draft a first draft. You can be an At-Large member. You can be in the working group.

Everyone is very welcome as long, of course, as you are able to sustain taking the statement from the beginning all the way to the time when it gets voted on by the ALAC – first draft, obtaining the feedback, etc. Of course, staff is at-hand to help you out with the Wiki space, etc.

Let's go to the statements or endorsements currently being developed. Then afterwards, I'll open the floor for discussion or questions on any of those statements, including if anybody wishes to add a few words to the recently-adopted ALAC statements.

Now, the ALAC is currently working on the ICANN Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan (FY16 – FY20). There is a first draft that is on the page. That's up for comment. There has been extension with regards to the closing date for the comments on this. As you will note, the comment closing date is now 27 June. There is much more time on this.

There has been some discussion taking place on the mailing list. It's understood that the statement needs to be lengthened a little bit, so a little bit more will be added to it shortly. I invite you all to comment on the statement that is already there on the Wiki page.

Next, the FY15 Operating Plan & Budget. The ALAC is still considering drafting a statement on this.

It is worth noting that the Finance and Budget Subcommittee works usually on any finance and budgeting issues. There have been several calls that were organized by ICANN Finance to build – kind of community calls – to be able to obtain feedback and explain parts of the plan itself. The calls have been very well-attended by members of the At-Large Finance and Budget Subcommittee.

I'm not really sure whether the FBSC would like to produce a draft of feedback or whether this was seen to be enough and no further feedback would be sent back to ICANN Finance on this. I look forward to hearing a little bit about this in a few moments.

The Notice of Preliminary Determination to Grant Registrar Data Retention Waiver Requests is another public comment request that has landed on our table. The ALAC is currently considering drafting a statement. By this, I guess because it has to do with registrar data retention waiver requests, that is probably something to do with the Registrant Working Group or with our GNSO liaison, who could enlighten us on this.

I see Alan Greenberg. Oh, I've missed Tijani earlier, and I see Holly Raiche. I see there's much interest in this. Let's start with Tijani. Maybe

he's going to speak to us about the previous topic. Then we'll move back to Alan Greenberg and Holly Raiche. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, exactly, Olivier. Thank you. I'd like to speak about the budget and the operating plan. I think that the ALAC should submit a statement or a comment for this public comment, even if it is we are to decide it is good, it is a good evolution, it is better than last year, we can say that, if we will say that. But we have to comment on it.

Since the deadline will be 1 July, I think that I can make the draft perhaps before London or just the last day of London to submit something to your consideration.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Tijani. Let's put you down, then, as the penholder for this. Now, I turn to Alan Greenberg, next, who will probably be commenting on the Notice of Preliminary Determination to Grant Registrar Data Retention Waiver Requests. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Olivier. We have made statements on that before, saying that we believe ICANN should allow registrars to obey their national laws. But I don't really think there's any necessity for it, in this case.

I cannot imagine it not going through, so I don't think it needs our support. We make enough statements. I don't think one is warranted in this case. But if we made a short one saying we support it, it would be in line with previous statements. But I really don't think it's necessary. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Thank you, Olivier, and thank you, Alan. [inaudible] I'd be happy to take Alan's advice. We were thinking about doing a statement, particularly since there is another comment sought on three applications under the policy.

It wasn't clear in my mind why the statement was required since, in fact, it seems to be an ongoing policy. But certainly, Carlton and I were quite prepared to have a look and see if there's anything that needs to be said, particularly since there's been a couple of really important EU decisions since then and having a look on whether this sort of can tie in with some of the privacy/proxy stuff.

But, look, I'm happy to work with Alan offline just to see if actually it's worth it or not. Alan, I'll [tic-tac] with you later, if it's okay. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. Yeah, if you could please just, immediately after this call, just check this with Alan and come back to us soon with a decision on this, that would be great.

Next, the WHOIS Requirements and National Law Conflicts. Now, that's an interesting topic. That obviously has direct implication with end-users. With the new WHOIS requirement of having exact data and this data being made available to everyone, that certainly has privacy issues. Some national law does not allow for these issues, so interesting topic. I wonder whether there should be a statement on this. Perhaps I could ask Holly Raiche about that.

HOLLY RAICHE: I certainly was thinking that it probably is worth a look. There just seems to be a lot of, I suppose, privacy issues that are interrelated. There's certainly the privacy/proxy stuff. There's the EWG. Happy to have a look at this and see if there's something in there that we should say in addition to anything that we might say on the requirements on national law conflict. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. I would suggest maybe some of our European [inaudible] might wish to look at this. I know that privacy issues are very, very strong. The point at the moment being developed by the European Parliament and pan-European laws. It would be good if they could come back to you or come back to staff as well or, indeed,

comment on the Wiki page itself if they believe that something should be drafted about this.

Finally, the Enhancing ICANN Accountability. Again, the ALAC is considering drafting a statement on this. I see that Tijani Ben Jemaa has put his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. The deadline is 30 May. I do think that we need to ask for extension if we want to comment on it. I think it is something that we need to comment on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Tijani. The Enhancing ICANN Accountability comment period for the initial comment period closes on 30 May, you're quite correct. But the reply closing date is 21 June. That gives us a little bit more time.

If the ALAC believes that there needs to be a statement from the ALAC on this topic, then we could ask Ariel to just provide or send an e-mail to the staff member in charge to say that the ALAC will be submitting its statement in the reply period.

I have lost track of whether we've already asked this or not. I might have to ask Ariel Liang if we've already notified Theresa Swineheart about the possibility of sending something during the reply period on this topic. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Hello, everyone. Yes. I already sent an e-mail to notify Theresa about sending a statement during a reply period.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Aha. Thank you very much, Ariel. That's good. We have already notified. We do have time until the period closes. I note that Jean-Jacques Subrenat has put his hand up. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Olivier, just to point out that I got the e-mail notification or request from Ariel Liang and have replied today by e-mail. There are a few [recommendations] on content which was suggested. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Will you be coming back to us soon?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, I'm waiting now for Ariel to tell me what she has decided and what form it will be integrated into. I think you were envisaging a special call on 28 or 29 May, is that so? If so, I will be at your disposal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Indeed, I was going to mention this a bit later but, yes, that's correct.

There are two streams that will take place regarding enhancing ICANN accountability. The first one is the one where we are going to be meeting as part of ATLAS II in London. There will be a big discussion about this. But also, in the last call that we had there was so much interest in this topic that we are going to have a special purpose call on this specifically. That will probably be the time when we can build a statement.

My gut feeling is the ALAC will be submitting a statement on this topic. We have had a presentation that was done already (I forget if it was last week or the week before last week) by Sebastien Bachollet and by Theresa Swineheart. We have that as a starting material, but now we need to be discussing this. We need to basically put pen to paper and come up with a statement on this. That's ongoing, as well.

Now, looking at our agenda page, we have gone through the statements currently being developed. There are two additional currently open public comments. There was one on the Proposed Implementation of GNSO PDP Recommendations on Locking of a Domain Name Subject to UDRP Proceedings. This is the revised UDRP rules. In interim discussion between the GNSO liaison Alan Greenberg and myself, Alan has told us there is no need for a statement.

Then, the Board Member Compensation is another public comment where this was announced and there was very little discussion initially on this. This was marked as no statement. But recently, there has been much discussion about this in the ALAC internal list, which is because it might deal with issues of Board member – well, as it says – Board member compensation and so on.

I frankly don't understand why it's only internal list, but maybe there's a reason for that. The question of what's come up in the discussion is whether the ALAC should be drafting a statement on this or whether individual members of At-Large should all draft a recommendation and send those over to the public comment.

I open the floor for questions and comments on these. I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, my hand is up – maybe not on your screen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can't see it on my screen, I'm afraid. Yes, go ahead, Alan, please.
[inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sorry. Regarding why I – I'm the one who sent the note to the internal list. I sent it to the internal list because I was looking for personal opinions from ALAC members and RALO officials. I didn't want to do something that was publicly archived until I decided whether I was going to do something and what I was going to do. That's why I put it on the private list.

In light of the – basically what I'm saying, for those who haven't seen it, is that although I agree completely that Board members and liaisons deserves the compensation that some of them receive and we're talking about for others, I think that it is quite inappropriate that we continue

to increase the perks and benefits for Board members without any acknowledgment of the work that others do – in some cases as much work as Board members or many Board members put in, in other cases, even more.

Although Chairs are given the one benefit of business-class travel to ICANN meetings, the gulf between the benefits that Board members get and the benefits that others in the community who put equal amounts of time into it get I think is quite inappropriate. I have revised the statement, and I will be sending it out. I'll put it on the public ALAC list. I'll be putting it onto the public comment forum.

I do want to get this out quickly because I want the opportunity for other people in the community to see it and maybe comment on it. I did ask if anyone on the ALAC internal list wanted to cosign it. I had a few people who said yes.

Since I've changed it relatively substantially in light of the comments, to make sure there were no misunderstandings because some people misunderstood what I was asking for in thinking I was asking for every volunteer to be paid. That clearly is not likely to happen in the near future. I'm not that much of a dreamer. I am making a change in it. I will submit it purely on my own, but I do encourage anyone in the community who likes what I'm saying to submit a comment saying they support it, with reservations or completely.

Now, whether the ALAC should submit a statement, I don't know. I think that's a decision the ALAC will have to make, whether the formal body supports that or not. I personally think the ALAC should comment on

something like this because I think it affects the ALAC's ability and in fact ICANN's ability to get committed volunteers. I strongly believe that volunteers have to be acknowledged and thanked. Money is not the only way to do that, of course. But it's got to be more than what we're doing right now.

I would support the ALAC doing something, but I don't really want to try to influence what the ALAC says based on what I'm saying. I will submit it and individuals can support it, or the ALAC indeed could support it if the ALAC chooses. But I don't really want to try to influence that decision. I would abstain if the issue comes to a formal vote of the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I responded to Alan's e-mail after having read several other comments, especially Sandra Hoferichter's comment, which I approved. Therefore, I wanted to go even a bit beyond what Sandra was suggesting.

In a word, I said that we cannot really decide about compensation if we don't look at the future shape of ICANN. What is it that we're looking at? ICANN and the Internet are currently in flux. There are many, many changes occurring or which may occur in the upcoming months. We have to take that into account and try to anticipate what ICANN is heading for.

If we continue in what I called pioneer mode, with volunteers doing a lot of the very basics of which perhaps could be done otherwise, fine. Then we need a very clear compensation scheme.

If, however, we think that we should all use the current flux in order to give other priorities to ICANN and perhaps change the working method as far as volunteers are concerned – more upstream, more an aid to decision making by the Board, perhaps less in-detail – in that case, I would go along with Evan’s proposal or remark that actually a lot can be done by improving the conditions which are offered the volunteers in their volunteer work, such as better travel arrangements, etc., without going to what is called compensation – in other words, payment.

I sent an e-mail in response to Alan today. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. Next in the queue is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I didn’t understand that the Alan asked for compensation for himself or ALAC member or really for any other volunteer. He was only highlighting that the gap in consideration between the Board members and the other volunteers who are sometimes doing more work than some of the ICANN Board members. I think this is something very, really true. I do support it and I supported this.

There is a misunderstanding, and I think that the new version will clarify that. For me, I think that ALAC has to have a comment on this. If it is not a statement from ALAC, ALAC can support a statement written by Alan or by any other one who is well-balanced. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Tijani. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. For clarity, yes, Tijani is right on. Although certainly compensation for all volunteers or all heavily-working volunteers – if you could identify them – would be a delightful thing – certainly, my bank account would appreciate it – that’s not likely to happen in the near future and that’s not what I was suggesting. What I’m saying is continuing to add things on the Board level without any acknowledgement or any consideration for the rest of the volunteers is what I was identifying as problematic.

As an example, and I will give it because Olivier won’t, the fact that a Board member can choose to come a day early because after flying halfway around the world, they want to be well-rested before they actually start their work is something which is completely accepted.

But for the rest of the volunteers – including Chairs – that’s not a decision that we’re allowed to make because we can’t be trusted to make it. That’s an example of the kind of issue that I think needs to be highlighted. The statement that I’ve reworked will make that clearer. I’ll be sending that out to the ALAC list shortly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I note that the queue is moving and it is growing, again. I'll close the queue now. I noted that Evan wanted to put his hand up. It's still there. I've still got Sandra and Evan in the queue. Then we'll have a consensus call on this since these are items for decision. Sandra, you have the floor.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, very badly at the moment. We can hardly hear you. Your voice sounds very muffled, indeed. Please get off of the underwater call that you are in.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Is this better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's good enough. Let's hear what you want to say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Sandra, yes.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I do apologize. I got the e-mail [inaudible] but for [inaudible] compensation is about money. I absolutely agree that the issue, of course, see that the value a volunteer is giving to a community should be appreciated by the rest of the community.

Travel support is one issue, but there are others as well such as the way we are. Sometimes we have to [inaudible] or [inaudible] people are talking to us or about that.

I think this is the same. We really have to work out, and anybody who is putting in voluntary work to any [inaudible] community should get appreciation for that.

Unfortunately, the world does not appreciate [these things] enough, I think. However, I think working under several guidelines that ICANN should be able to ask for [inaudible]. Hello?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sandra? Sorry to interrupt. Olivier, apologies for interrupting the call, but I can't give this [inaudible] interpretation because we're not able to hear Sandra on the language channels.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thought that might be the case. I thought it would be a bit hard for the interpreters to hear you, Sandra. I understand you're going through the points that you were making on the list. I also had trouble understanding part of what you said.

I wonder whether you could maybe share this with us either on the chat or if dial-out could go over to you. Yeah, Adobe Connect audio doesn't seem to working too well sometimes – definitely not during the ALAC call. If you can share this in an e-mail, that would be great. Gisella, please, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Sorry. It was just to ask Sandra if she would like a dial-out. And in which case, just send us the number. Sorry, I see that she'll share it in an e-mail. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much. I think that we've reached the point where Evan has put his hand down. Evan, I believe you don't want the floor anymore, or is my AC room playing up again?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Well, Olivier, most of what I wanted to say has been said. I have noticed that there's – I just wanted to make one quick mention of the fact that At-Large is in a fairly awkward position here because the ICANN concept of volunteerism is a little bit skewed. A lot of the people that participate in ICANN are here because of their careers. Either their business interests or their career interests require or is benefited by them being here.

At-Large, almost by definition, is almost unique within ICANN in not having that situation, so we come at this from a fairly interesting perspective.

But I want to emphasize the point that has been made by Jean-Jacques and Alan and elsewhere that, in some ways, simply treating us a little bit more humanely in our volunteer activities when it comes to things like either travel consideration or other considerations goes a long way without having to get into the realm of direct compensation. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this, Evan. I realize we're now starting to move into the travel issues and further away from the actual topic itself, the Board member compensation part. But I also note that there is much interest in this discussion. Maybe people are sharing the views with you as well, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I don't mean to interject but it is relevant because, on one hand, travel is travel and it's a very specific item. But it does go directly to the way that the volunteers community is treated by ICANN. Compensation, like I say, takes many forms. Treatment of volunteers takes many forms. I think this whole concept that Alan has absolutely accurately raised about the concept of designating elite volunteers and non-elite volunteers is [inaudible] degrading. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. I note more people are putting their hands up. We'll close the queue with Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and we'll go to a consensus call. Let's get a move on on this. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. This is a matter that's going to take a lot longer than this call or, indeed, any number of others. It's a topic that could be raised in the appropriate forum in London that perhaps needs to be raised both in an online forum and in a future face-to-face forum at another ICANN meeting.

Perhaps, Olivier, you and the Leadership Team could propose that this a good conversation for an ICANN-wide community discussion because it is very much, as Evan was just saying, it's a matter of recognition and treatment, not remuneration.

We can move this away from cost-recovery and cost concerns where we will have, for example, parts of the organization that feel they are overcommitting their funds to some processes that aren't directly benefiting them.

This is a bigger issue. But as someone who's managed volunteers for about 35 years of my life – in the adult world, at least, along with [a knack] in youth – if you treat people with respect and recognition, you are getting far more value out of them.

In a recent Board exercise where we had not changed a very small stipend one tiny dollar in the last eight to ten years – this is a tiny stipend for meetings – as we have improved the treatment and recognition of our hard-working Board members, in this case, we could say any volunteer, we have got far greater participation and engagement.

It's a big issue. It's one that has to be worked on, but it's not going to be fixed now. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Let's have an action item for Olivier to take up the issue of volunteer recognition – I think is the sort of wider name for this – with the other...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, if I may. That does not mean yet another huge [inaudible] certificate in the blue folder. That's not the recognition the volunteers require.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yeah. What do you call it, then, to stay away from this name, then? Then I'll come over to you, Alan, afterwards. Volunteer recognition? Volunteer what? What would you suggest as a name? A volunteer...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Consideration, consideration.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Consideration? Okay, consideration. Let's make it the issue of...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Recognition is another word we use, recognition and consideration.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Recognition/consideration: Olivier to take up the issue of volunteer recognition/consideration with other SO and AC Chairs as an ICANN-wide issue. Alan Greenberg, and then we'll have a quick consensus call on this. We need to get moving. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just asking is there a way to put up multiple tick marks and applause to Cheryl's comment on another piece of paper in a blue folder. But I put that comment in the chat. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. I see applause, as well, from some people here. I'm not quite sure. There's applause, tick marks, and etc. The community is very joyful today.

Quick consensus call, then. Does anyone object to the ALAC releasing an actual statement with regards to the Board member compensation? If you object, could you please – all those ALAC members who are present, and I understand there is quorum here – if you could then please a big red cross next to your name if you object.

This is not a vote, so we're not counting the votes. It's just to see if there is any objection. If there is no objection – oh, I can see an objection at the moment with the ALAC drafting a statement on the Board member compensation from Sandra Hoferichter. Sandra, I know it's hard for you to discuss this, we can barely hear you. But would you be able to drop in the chat your reasons for objecting to this?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Olivier, can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, very well now, yes. Welcome. Now, we can hear Sandra. Before, you were underwater.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I had to choose the right micro. I didn't know that there is a button to choose the other one or the other. I'm sorry for that.

The reason why I don't would like to put down a statement because I think it will be misunderstood. I feel sometimes the ALAC is always seen as those who are yelling and crying about being treated so badly. I think we should earn our – not compensation – but we should earn our valuation by the community otherwise.

Being self-confident, standing up for our issues, talking about the content and not about how do we feel we should be treated like in a better way. I don't like that thing of – this is some – it feels like I'm begging for something and I'm a proud volunteer. I'm not willing to beg. This is my very personal opinion. I know that others might object, and I accept that. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Sandra. It's good to have heard your description. Now we can hear you clearly, finally. There's objection from Sandra. Does anyone else object to this?

Well, I'll tell you what. Let's have someone pick up the pen. Let's see what Alan – put something on the Wiki page and take it from there. If there is consensus on the Wiki page, then we'll be able to – we will have a statement moving forward on this.

You have to remember, consensus doesn't mean unanimity. At the same time, we'll have to see if there is agreement. If there isn't, then we will have just picked up the pen and everyone will be asked to send their own comments if they wish to directly to the public comment period. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you. I don't think we need unanimity or we need a full consensus. If there is a very big majority willing to write a statement, I think that we have to go and write it. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tijani. That's what I said, I think. But that's fine, yeah. Let's move forward, then. I will ask Ariel to please move this Board member compensation Wiki page back to the current statements or endorsements currently being developed, reviewed, or voted on by the ALAC.

If I could ask Alan to pick up the pen on this, to put your short, initial statement that you wanted to put on there. We'll see, since of course, none of the discussions that have taken place on the internal list are publicly consultable, we'll see if there's a little debate that will take

place, then, on the Wiki page and also on the ALAC public list. That would be great. Thank you.

Let's move on and apologies for the time that's been taken on this. We still have several items to look at. Next is a Consensus Call on the Creation of the At-Large Curation Working Group. This is a working group that we had alluded to during the last ALAC call but we ran out of time. Well, it is still very early days.

I would ask – who can I ask for this? Maybe I can ask Dev Anand Teelucksingh to provide us with a quick summary of what this proposed Curation Working Group is about. Let me explain. Dev is currently holding the position of interim Chair on this. Dev, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier. The At-Large Curation Working Group aims to raise awareness of the ICANN At-Large community and enhance end-users' engagement with the community by developing a strong and sustainable presence on social media.

The interim Curation Working Group has been set up. There was a call for volunteers. I have to say that there's been a very strong response, about 18 persons. We still need some more persons, I think, from EURALO and LACRALO.

What we've begun to do is to work on the tasks for the Curation Working Group. The key task for the Curation Working Group is to plan and draft some static content that will be posted on social media in the

next month and also to create templates for fluid content, which is like the messages that come from the ALAC Announce mailing list.

I'll post a link in the chat, which is what myself and really a huge thanks to Ariel Liang, we put up a sort of curation workflow where we've broken up the tasks into several phases as to what type of content we want to post in the coming month, including the ATLAS Summit in London. We've already assigned persons to help come up with the static content there.

Well, we are going to have our next call on this Thursday. If anybody wishes to attend that call and is willing to help, please do. I think I've summarized it succinctly, I hope.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. That's a very good introduction. Just one question: What is up with this name, "Curation"?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: The reason why the word "curation" came about is because we needed to curate content for social media. The idea was just to really have content suitable for the target audience for social media, which is the not-so-experienced persons involved in ICANN, At-Large, and so forth. Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Dev. I understand the working group has already had a first call. It was very well-attended. I listened in as an

observer and felt it quite fascinating to see what the group was doing as a whole strategy for publishing tweets, etc., and all that. It's very interesting.

What I was going to ask of the ALAC present here is for a consensus call for the official creation of the At-Large Curation Working Group. Are there any objections to this Curation Working Group being created? If there are any objections, put a red cross next to your name.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't see a red cross next to anyone's name, but I've heard Evan's voice. Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Two points. Number one, watch out, you're using the term "red cross." It might be protected somewhere.

Secondly, I totally agree with the use of the working group, but I do think that the term "curation" is almost counter-intuitive. Although their things may go through a single account or something like that, the concept of curation I think in some ways is almost counter-intuitive to social media.

If we're trying to explain to people what this thing is about, then let's just say this is a social media working group as opposed to "curation."

To a casual observer just looking at what this is would have no idea what it's actually working upon based on the title. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Dev, any thoughts on this?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, I think the curation is an accurate term because it is what the group is doing. It's creating the content from the community so that it can be shared on the At-Large social media account. Right now, the [inaudible] so far is that the staff will have the control of the account. But the idea is that we're going to funnel all of our content to the staff, who will then be posting the content and monitoring it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Dev. Next is Murray McKercher.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Just my two cents as I have joined the curation group. I'm not particularly worried about the name. Obviously, we're using social media. A lot of social media, in my experience, is already curated by corporations. Nevertheless, those platforms allow for an open discussion amongst anyone on the planet. I think it's a good thing. My two cents. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Murray. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I do share the concern of Evan. Perhaps social media is not the best word for the name. We can use, for example, I don't know, Content Working Group or Social Media Content Working Group. I don't know. We can find other thing but something which is explicit and which make people immediately understand what it is about. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this comment, Tijani. Back to you, Dev. Then we'll close. We'll move on. We're not going to spend another hour just on the name of a working group, but maybe it's something for your working group to take on and discuss internally if you wish to do so. Dev, you have the closing remarks on this.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I mean, I guess I am reading the comments in the chat. I guess I can see the potential for misunderstanding. I think we could probably have that discussion on our Thursday call to rename it. Maybe Social Media Working Group, then, might be a better term. We'll definitely consider it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Dev, for this. I note someone having put a link to a Wikipedia article which also says that it's cultural heritage management and healing. Hopefully you can find both of these during your next call.

Let's move on. Just noting that on this topic, we have held the consensus call on the official creation of the working group. Therefore, having had the consensus call having had no objections, the working group is created and the action item there is for the working group to be discussing its own name during its next call.

Dev, we will be asking upon you during the next ALAC call to come back to us with whatever decision has been reached by the working group. I hope it won't take a whole, full hour on this.

Next, we have items for discussion. We have plenty of items for discussion. I realize we are running slowly out of time. But the first item for discussion is the Next Steps on Public Comment on the Proposal for the Use of Mandatory Policy Advisory Boards – the same as PABs – for Regulated Industry Sector and Consumer-Trust-Sensitive New gTLD Strings.

This is the public comment period that the ALAC has created and has been running for the past few months. There was an extension to – I believe it was today or, no, sorry, to be during just a few days ago or so. Anyway, this is now closing. I guess there needs to be next steps agreed on, and next steps agreed on by the ALAC since it is an ALAC public comment period.

Does the ALAC wish to pass this back to the new gTLD Working Group? Does the ALAC wish to act directly? Where do we go from here, effectively? I'm going to ask Evan Leibovitch to expand on this topic. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you, Olivier. As you said, Olivier, there's been a long process on this. At the request of some of the organizations there were submitting responses, we extended the deadline on this issue.

Hopefully, to save some time because as you say, we're running late, I absolutely agree with your recommendation to take this back to the New gTLD Working Group, which will then review the submissions that we'll then discuss and then propose next steps back to ALAC. I think right now, that's the best that can be suggested right now and especially since you're short on time, I think that's a reasonable way to proceed. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Evan. A quick question to you: What is your time scale for this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Frankly, I'm not sure. I'll have to consult with the other members of the working group. What I would like to do is have the working group perhaps present something that will be ready in time for the summit. That's my personal goal. If there's a desire for it to go faster or slower, I'm happy to work with that. But that was my personal thought. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Evan. I was going to ask, now, staff, on the topic of the summary of responses. I'm not quite sure how that is performed, whether this is a staff item or whether it is a working group

item to be making a summary of the responses. Having been in other working groups, I've seen that these things suddenly appear magically in our mailboxes. I'm not quite sure whether the magic will take place here. Heidi Ullrich, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, Olivier. It is normally staff that does just the initial analysis. I will go ahead and try to get to that this week. Then, the working group can decide what to go ahead and do with that for the next steps.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much, Heidi. Let's have it as an action item, then, please, so that we can keep track of this. Staff will perform the initial, what do you call it, analysis? Yeah, the initial analysis of the PAB public comment or the PAB public – I guess that these really are public comment forums contributions. That's one.

There's a follow-up or in the same action item, the New gTLD Working Group will take up the follow-up work on this. Okay, and maybe there needs to be an e-mail sent to the New gTLD Working Group on this ASAP, please. Evan, could I task you for this, please?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thank you. Now that takes us to agenda item #9, the At-Large Structure Decertification. Here, we have the next steps, again, as we discussed it earlier. We have a few dead ducks among our ranks – At-Large Structures that are either inactive or that don't exist anymore, where the organization has effectively been dissolved or in some cases structures that have asked to be decertified.

At the moment, we have a total of four, six, eight listed on the Wiki page, which I invite you all to have a look at. You notice that you're able to look at the detailed information about the At-Large Structures themselves and the reason for them being on this list.

You have to be logged in. That's primarily to avoid having the information picked up by automatic search engines and then displaying it over on the search engine, in case the information doesn't make those organizations look too great in some cases.

Now, we've got these eight that are here. Last month, I have asked for RALO leaders to provide the inputs on each one of these organizations and for the ALAC to be able to make its choice on whether it needs to agree to its delisting or not.

I know that the first four requests have been sent out. What I'm going to ask is each one of the RALO leaders – actually, they are all on the call – to be able to take us very quickly through each one of the organizations there and explain the reason why they are on this list.

Let's start with the EURALO At-Large Structures. Wolf Ludwig, if you're able to speak, now is the time to please take us through these four organizations listed. Wolf, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, Wolf is indicating he can only participate on Adobe Connect.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wolf is only in Adobe Connect, ah. That doesn't help. You're not able to speak through Adobe Connect, I gather. Then, maybe I have to guide you through these.

There's four of them that are here. Associazione Italiana per le Sicurezza Informatica (CLUSIT). Then there's KEPKA, consumer.org from Greece. Then there's Terre des Femmes from Germany and Yinternet.org from Switzerland.

I know that there's been some requests by Wolf Ludwig to ask those ALSes to confirm whether they want anything done, whether they wish to remain an ALS or not. I note that with regards to Terre des Femmes, the message could not be delivered. There was a bounce regarding that message. With regard to Yinternet.org, there was also a bounce. That means the Internet address does not work anymore.

With regards to KEPKA.org, I'm not sure what the response was on this. I will ask Wolf to please type in the chat, or whether he is able to speak on the AC, to let us know if there was any response from this one.

Finally, with the Associazione Italiana, the CLUSIT, I don't see any feedback on that, either. I just see an e-mail that was sent out and no feedback on it. Wolf, if you could just let us know.

Wolf is saying he is waiting until 31 May for a response. There were no responses so far, and likely there will not be responses.

I open the floor for comments and questions from anyone on the call regarding the EURALO delegations that are up for being decertified. In particular, knowing that there was a big discussion regarding the three organizations that were already decertified last year, are there any concerns with going through the process in this way at the moment? In other words, if you don't receive an answer, if you're unable to get ahold of someone in that organization, is this enough for the organization to be decertified?

Dev mentioned that KEPKA.org looks active. But are they active in EURALO? That's the big question. Is the person that we are trying to get hold of actually active? That's a real hard one. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I'm just looking at the information provided on the decertified workspace. Is it that, regarding [KEPKA], is it that they have respond if asked directly? We contacted the persons at KEPKA directly via the website and gotten zero responses over there? I guess – I see Wolf is responding, so I will stop there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The answer from Wolf, yes – is rather robust, should we say? Using the number “seven” before the word “years” – it's been seven years of trying, which probably is long enough.

Okay, I see no one else wanting to comment on these. Now that we have the next two, which are from LACRALO: the Asociacion Costarricense de Derecho Informatico and the National Consumers' League.

Both of these are put forward by LACRALO, but I have noticed that there was a note with regards to the Costa Rican ALS that they had responded and were actually interested in remaining an At-Large Structure. I wonder if we have Alberto. Yes, we have Alberto Soto on the call. I wonder if I could ask Alberto Soto to take us through these two organizations, please.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you, Olivier. The Asociacion Costarricense de Derecho Informatico had one member which was very inactive. When we asked for a clarification on this, we received that that inactive member just contacted us with another member in the organization.

The organization is still on, it still continues. It just does not participate because of that non-participation of one member. The new contact has committed to continue working being an ALS. Therefore, in this sense, we request that with the inclusive character that we always work on, we do not decertify this association.

Now, with respect to the National Consumer, we have not had any contact. It has been a long time since we contacted them. We do agree within LACRALO. We have reached consensus that they do be decertified. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alberto, for these explanations. Effectively, as far as I understand, the Costa Rican ALS might be taken off the list for the time being, then. Is that correct?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes, that is correct, within the metrics that we are approving – we hope to approve them before London – this association will have one year to define whether they will continue belonging or not, in case they do comply with the metrics and they would be considering what an active ALS is. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alberto, very helpful indeed. Let's put these off the list for the time being. Finally, we have the two NARALO ALSes, the Consumer Web Watch and the Alberta Community Network Association. Do we have anyone from NARALO who wishes to take just a couple of – not even – minutes to explain to us the status on these, please? Who is going to step forward in the absence of Garth?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, I don't have much to say on them except that NARALO has gone through quite a bit of discussion and its own due diligence to confirm that this is appropriate. I don't have much more. I didn't plan for anything to say here, but I can tell you that there's been significant discussion. This situation has been fairly well-vetted. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this, Evan, and I see agreement from Alan on the Adobe Connect.

Okay, so these are the ALSes now. You've got the full list in front of you with only one that has been removed from the list with the Costa Rican one removed from the list.

The next steps for this is for a motion for each one of these to be put forward. I think the last time, it was a motion that was put forward by Alan Greenberg and then it needs to be seconded. Then, the vote needs to take place electronically. All of that will take place electronically. I think that gives us a green light to proceed forward with sending the motion out. Alan, are you okay with, again, being the person sending the initial motions out?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would be delighted. I have no problem with that. I can paste and copy from e-mails.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. I'm going to ask for a seconder here so we can have the motion sent out by you and already seconded by someone. Someone else who would like to second these motions?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm happy to second it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see Evan and Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Eduardo Diaz.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Dev is also seconding it and Leon in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Dev as well, and Alberto Soto. Goodness, everyone is seconding, they really want to get rid of ALSes. Interesting; interesting dynamic. Seconded by Alberto Soto, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Leon Sanchez, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and by Evan Leibovitch, as well. Great. Staff, you have the whole list?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ariel? I think we do.

ARIEL LIANG: Hello.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, you have the floor. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, I can't hear you. You must be muted at the moment.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, it was a mistake. I didn't ask to speak. I did not ask to speak. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay. Your hand is up, though. Okay, thank you. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I just want – if someone could send – the list is not in the agenda, so if someone could send to the list the formal list of the ALSes to decertify so I have something in writing that I will submit the motion. I assume it's the list in the Wiki, but we should have an e-mail on file.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much, Alan, the list in the Wiki without the Costa Rican organization.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understand, but...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's have Ariel follow up with this, or who deals with decertification? Is it Nathalie or Ariel? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's actually both, because Ariel will set up the vote and then Nathalie will handle the process of it. I think that that could be an action item for Nathalie, please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Just cut and paste from the Wiki and put it in an e-mail to the ALAC list so I have [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Minus the Costa Rican – yes, minus the Costa Rican ALS.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. Thank you, Alan. Let's move on. Now, we have the ATLAS II update. That is tasked for 30 minutes. I don't think that we will take 30 minutes. Well, I hope we won't spend 30 minutes.

I know that we have interpreters until the top of the hour. I'm not sure whether we can get an extension with the interpreters for another 15 minutes or so. But in the meantime, until I get a reply to this, let's proceed forward with the update. I hand the floor over to Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Chair. Just a quick update, just to tell you that the newsletters are going out. There's a newsletter number two going out this week. I believe it is being translated.

There is a web page that is already online, and it's located here. You can go and see this, go and visit the page and provide comments to the

Communications Group. There's some things that need to be done in the web page, and the idea is to make it better for everyone.

In regards to the event and event agenda and the Thematic Group agendas, Wolf and Tijani can give you more details on that and staff also.

I understand the Fayre of Opportunity is being moved to Tuesday, mostly because Tuesday we were able to use a larger room that will fit the purpose of the Fayre.

Also, we all learned last week that about 38 ALSes still have not connected to ICANN Constituency Travel. The information was sent to all the RALO leaders to follow up individually with each one of these ALSes – 38 is a big number, so I'm not sure about the results of that. That's my report, thank you. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Eduardo. Next is Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, sorry, just a quick update on those numbers. Actually, they were slightly inflated. There were actually about 20. Since then, the RALO leaders have reached out to them. I think we're making really good

progress on reducing the number from 20 down to the 0 that we want it to be. That's making good progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I would like to ask about the African participants delegates because we reached out to them and I think that they all are in touch with the Constituency Travel. But this concern, if there is still people from Africa who didn't do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Tijani. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Tijani, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, thank you. I can go ahead and do that. I did see this morning that I believe one person from AFRALO, the visa was rejected. I'm going to just look into that and see if we can get that person to try again with some more information.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Please inform us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Heidi. One last thing with regards to the travel, of course, is to make sure that those of you needing to have visas for London, I hope you've already sent out your passport to get and obtain a visa.

It takes 15 working days, which is about 3 weeks. We are just about 4 weeks away now so this is the very, very last week that you're able to send your passport out if you want to be able to get it before you fly out to London – if you ever fly out to London. If you don't have your passport, then you won't.

A couple of more things, also, on this: the Thematic Groups, very important thing. The five of them, the Future of Multistakeholderism; the Globalization of ICANN; the Global Internet: The User Perspective; ICANN Transparency and Accountability; and At-Large Community Engagement in ICANN – very interesting topics indeed.

We've got Subject Matter Experts and moderators and reporters all lined up. There will be a call for these people shortly, maybe this week, maybe next week. There's just an enormous amount of – a lot of things going on simultaneously. Heidi, back to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you, Olivier, just some other updates. There's going to be a Board cocktail with the ATLAS on Sunday evening. Also, as I've noted in the chat, please could everyone add their agendas on the Wiki or send them to staff by Thursday or this Friday at the very latest, including the General Assemblies. We only have a few, and we need to get those sent to be translated to have them up in time.

Also, it was just decided this past week that Olivier will be asked to present the Summit Declaration at the beginning of the public Board meeting on Thursday for a few minutes. There was some lack of clarity whether that was going to happen in the public forum or if that was a Board meeting and it was private, that it would be the Board meeting. Thanks Over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Heidi. I'm glad that I'm learning this today. Great. I'm glad I attended this call.

Next in the update, as you can see, there is a link to the draft agenda. This is the whole length of the week that we have. I just wanted to ask staff: Has this been updated?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, the big Excel one has not yet. The reason being is that there were some, just late last week, some changes, significant changes in terms of this schedule, including the Fayre, the cocktail, etc. We'll get to that updating. I know that's an action item from, I think it was [before] the [OC] call. We'll go ahead and do that this week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Heidi. The draft agenda shows that most of the Saturday will be plenary sessions with the afternoon having workshops. Then, most of the Sunday will be workshops. This is where we work on those thematic discussions.

Just as a reminder, those thematic discussions will then come up with a statement from each one of those working groups. That statement will then become collated and compounded into the other into a report. That report will be given to the Board. We're dealing with some very serious matters in London.

Simultaneously, there will also be other events taking place in London. On the Monday, there is a GAC high-level meeting in which I think some of our At-Large Structures might be interested in going to see, as well. It's just a very, very packed week throughout the whole London week that we will have.

The ALAC's work is moved somehow. Some of it takes place on Monday, some of it will take place on Tuesday, some of it on Wednesday. It's all shifted around.

Of course, on the Thursday, there's a large shifting of things because there will be a number of public discussions taking place starting at 10:00 in the morning. First, the ATLAS II will have to meet early on on the Thursday morning to be able to finalize the statement and its report. Then, the ALAC will meet over lunchtime to actually ratify the report.

It's an even busier week than past weeks. Hopefully, we will be able to take it easy in Los Angeles at the end of the year – at least, as compared to the London venue.

One more thing: it's not all work. There is also a little bit of play in this and some happiness in this whole hell of a schedule. That's on the Saturday night. There is a dinner which has been sponsored by Afilias that will be taking place outside the venue in a pub. That's going to be great fun, I think, for all of the At-Large Structures. It's an ATLAS II thing so everyone is invited.

Then, there is a lunch that will take place on the Sunday, right in the middle of the day, which will give a welcome break for all of our participants. That lunch is sponsored by PIR. That also takes place off-site, just down the road. At least we'll get a bit of sun if it's a sunny day, or we'll get a bit of a rain if it's a rainy day on that date. But that's one way to get out of the meeting room a little bit.

Then, we of course have our Fayre, which will take place on – and that's going to be changed. This was originally going to take place on the Monday afternoon. But because we didn't have enough space in there, this is going to be moved later on in the week.

I see that Evan and Tijani have got their hands up. Let's take the queue and then come back to the list. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Olivier. As if things weren't busy enough, I note that because many of the flights getting into London – especially from the western hemisphere – are overnights, there'll be people that may be coming in earlier on the Friday. I'd just like to let you know that there are two events actually going in on the Friday. They're not part of the official schedule for either ATLAS or the ICANN meeting.

There is an all-day workshop being presented by the Internet Society for any of its chapters or chapter members or any like that on engagement with governments and other bodies. Also, the NCUC is holding a workshop on civil society on Friday in the late afternoon. Anybody that is able to get there and has some time to kill or is just trying to settle in, if they want to get involved early, there will be activities going on even on the Friday. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Evan. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I would like to ask if it is confirmed that the Fayre of Opportunity is moved to Tuesday. Have we already checked the availability of people who will speak in this event?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I turn to Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, no. Not yet. There was a holiday. I will go ahead and do that right now. But I suspect that they will be available. Just to let you know that on the Monday time and date, the speakers were only available just for a few minutes, as well. It wasn't great. We'll get back to you on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. On a much more mundane level, the best way to get from the airport in Heathrow to downtown – well, actually to our hotel – is the Heathrow Express. It's quite expensive, but it offers significant discounts if you buy more than one ticket at a time. We may want to look into people who are arriving at the same time and things acquiring tickets ahead of time and saving a fair amount of money. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Alan, for this tip. Certainly, the Heathrow Express only takes ten minutes to go from Heathrow to central London. Then, it's about a five-minute walk down the street to the hotel. But it is also the most expensive rail line in Europe, allegedly, should we say? There's always a price for speed.

Right. Just a couple more minutes on this topic still to ask Eduardo to just explain to us quickly the Fayre of Opportunity.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Basically, Fayre of Opportunity will be mostly a networking event. But we're going to have the, I mean, we can look at the agenda, which I don't know the link but if staff can put it in online, that would be great. It's an agenda that has been already approved by consensus.

Basically, we're going to have Olivier open the event. Then, we will have some speeches. I think there is a break, and then we come back and we do a quiz at the end by [inaudible], I believe.

Most of you participated in APRALO in Singapore event, we see they had a quiz-type thing. People were answering some of the quiz answers. They were getting gifts and things like that. We're planning to do something like that for about 20 minutes during the Fayre.

If you look at the schedule, it's a very intense two hours that we're going to have Monday with background music from all over the RALOs world. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. Evan and Alan, your hands are still up. Are you wishing to speak or is that an old hand?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's an old hand, okay. Thank you. Let's move swiftly further down. We have the Mentoring Program which is – in fact, we have two things. We have the Mentoring Program which takes place with the ATLAS II Mentoring Program.

I'm desperately looking for Fatima Cambronero and cannot find her on the list at the moment. I don't know if anybody is able to share a few words on this to let us know where this is at the moment.

But in the meantime, I'll ask Gisella Gruber to take us through the Mentorship Program, I believe, or Mentor Program? I've lost track. I think it's highly confusing to have two programs with a very, very similar name. Over to you, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Olivier. The Mentor Program we are referring to now is – we're just bringing the page up – is the Pilot ICANN Mentor Program, which is different to the ATLAS II Mentor Program. You will have met our three mentees in Singapore. We have Gunela, Mercy, and Anthony.

The first day was Singapore, and they have now submitted their reports. If you wish to read the report, it's on the page that you see here. I'll put the link in the – sorry, Heidi's already put the link in the Adobe Connect chat.

Between Singapore and London, they've been working with their mentors, attending the pre-ATLAS II capacity building seminars, where we have our eighth and last one this coming Thursday. We've got a call set up for tomorrow where they'll be discussing their involvement in the ATLAS II and how they will be playing an active role throughout the week of the summit.

This page will be updated as soon as we have their London schedule. It will then become more of a workspace for them to add any information that they wish to add. We'll make sure that everyone on the ALAC Announce list is aware of what has been put on the page. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Gisella. Next, we have the sponsorship update and very quick feedback. As I've told you earlier, we have sponsorship from Afiliás, from PIR, but also sponsorship from Google. We're still working through a couple more possible leads. Hopefully, we will have a budget that will balance out, thanks to those great sponsors.

Communications Update - Website and Newsletter. Dev, is there anything you would like to add to what you shared with us earlier?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to say that the third newsletter, we mean to get that newsletter out within the next two days. The ATLAS II website, the Communications Group has posted, as Eduardo said, the Communication Group has posted it for comment for within the group. I don't think there's nothing much more to add. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Dev. If I could ask the interpreters to remain another two minutes, we will be finished. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor. Please be less than two minutes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Just to say that I am worried about the survey results. Do we have all the ALSes decided on the groups they choose? If they didn't, we have to proceed and form the groups and let people who didn't choose their groups that they are assigned to this or this other group. It is something that we need to do now, because we need to make some calls before London to prepare the work of the groups. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Tijani. Indeed, a concern. If we could have a link to that survey, please, in the Adobe Connect chat. If any of you as ALS representatives have not filled that survey, please do so now so we have this. If you don't fill the survey or have not filled that survey, then I'm afraid you're due to be allocated a group that you might not be interested in. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. This might be any other business. Are you to that point yet?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. You're putting your hand up early. Finally, promotional items: we got a great number of little goodies and things. They are all connected to the agenda. You'll be able to see the list of promotional items that we have there.

I understand there will also be, in addition to those promotional items, there will be a number of – well, I can see the gifts there, so there you go. They're here already. The list is there.

Okay. That finishes the ATLAS II updates. Now we are moving over to any other business, the last part of our agenda. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. I have been in contact with – well, actually, any other business is going back to action items, but I [inaudible] now.

I've been in contact with Evan and Rudi via e-mail during this call. Whilst Rudi hasn't gotten back to me, Evan has. Neither he nor I know what on earth the action item against our names is.

Can we have an action item on staff to get back to us to explain to us what that action means and what we are required to do? Because

during this call, I've gone through the transcript of the ALAC meetings all the way back to Singapore, and I can't work it out and neither can Evan.

Also, on the transcripts from Singapore, the links from the Singapore meeting which should take you to the ALAC meeting takes you to the NCUC ALAC meeting. That needs fixing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Cheryl. I hope that staff has made a note on this: Action Item for staff to explain the Action Item that is currently open, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Evan Leibovitch to liaise with Rudi Vansnick in regard to the implementation of consumer metrics and follow up further details.

I think we are reaching the end of this. I thank you all for being on this call. Yes, Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, only to say that we need an Action Item for the group formation. I think it is time now to proceed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For group formation, yes, please. A follow-up on that, please. Yes. An Action Item, second Action Item, staff – and this is the last one – for the formation of those thematic groups to proceed forward. Is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, exactly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Okay. With this, we're reaching the end of this call. I absolutely have to thank the interpreters for having stayed an additional 20 minutes like this. It's really incredible. There is one more announcement from Gisella Gruber, I know. Gisella, please, make that introduction.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Olivier. I'll just be five seconds. I would just like to introduce you to Kathy Schnitt, who you may have seen on the attendees list. Kathy is joining us as part of At-Large staff temporarily to help us over the next few months. Welcome to Kathy. If you do see her name on an e-mail, you will hopefully now know who she is. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella.

In thanking the interpreters – back to the interpreters – I would like to thank in particular the Russian interpreter because it's the first time we have a Russian interpreter on this call. Apparently, there is only one person assuming this position, which means they have not stopped talking for two hours and twenty-one minutes. Well done! Really.

Thanks to everyone and to our staff for having been through this very long call. I note we still have a lot of people on the call. It's been a great call. I really look forward to seeing all of you in London in less than, what, is it 30 days? How many days do we have left? Heidi tells me every day how many days we have. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Twenty-four.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah!

HEIDI ULLRICH: I know. That's my reaction.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Twenty-four! Scary number. Thanks to all of you. Good-bye. This call is now adjourned.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, everyone. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
