
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the NARALO Monthly Teleconference on Monday, 8th December 2014 at 20:00 UTC. On the call today we have Evan Leibovitch, Allan Skuce, Eduardo Diaz, Glenn McKnight, Louis Houle, Alan Greenberg, Garth Bruen, Judith Hellerstein, Le-Marie Thompson and Tom Lowenhaupt. We have apologies from Silvia Vivanco. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much. This is Garth Bruen. Welcome to the NARALO Monthly Call for December 2014. Before we begin with the call I have a brief announcement to make. After discussing this with the NARALO Leadership I've decided to request a leave of absence from the Chair of NARALO, due to a number of pressing family obligations. My plan, as documented – and I'll release this to the list – is to return as Chair in April for the April call.

Before proceeding I'd like to get the region's consensus on permitting me this leave, by affirming with the green check button. I'll wait for those folks on the call to agree with that. I see Alan has his hand up. Go ahead Alan.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Garth. Technically we need a quorum to make a decision like this, which is 50 per cent, but I cannot imagine that if we send out something on the list we will not get that, so I think based on the overwhelming support on this meeting we can present it will get done within the next day or so.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. We will endeavor to make it official. To follow up with that, in terms of the specific request, in order to provide for leadership we're going to be recommending that Evan be an acting regional Chair, and that in making it consistent with our previous plans to do a trial run with a Vice Chairship with Judith Hellerstein as Vice Chair, I'm going to recommend that Judith be the acting Secretariat, at least for the Singapore Meeting, and then for the remaining calls between now and April 2015. We can definitely discuss this more, and we'll release it to the list for discussion as well. With that being said, can the Secretary please read the Action Items, 2.0? Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: For the AIs, there's an update on the open ones. 2.1, about the First Nations Mentoring Program, Heidi, is there an update on that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: On that, the idea is to have a global mentoring program for first nations people, and that will likely be submitted as a FY 16 AC/SO request, and that process should be starting this month.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: As a matter of information, “first nations” is a term I typically only hear within Canada. Elsewhere I hear the term “aboriginal” or “native” or other, so it might be worth researching what the appropriate term is that’s used worldwide, so there’s not a confusion of what’s intended. I remember when we were doing the native presentations at the LA Meeting, when we used the term “first nations” we got a lot of funny looks to the Canadians.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Really quickly, I see that we have Loris on the call. Perhaps Loris might be able to clarify that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, I believe when we first discussed this the decision was made to call it “disadvantaged communities”. There was a general consensus that certainly includes indigenous peoples but it might be a somewhat wider and more generic term to use, so I think we did decide to use “disadvantaged community” or something very close to that.

GARTH BRUEN: I want to throw that out to Glenn and some others. Is that actually the case? I’m not sure personally about the “disadvantaged communities” tag, because I’m not sure that actually applies to every single aboriginal or native community.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I know this was a big discussion in the Accessibility Committee, because we also had that issue about accessibility and the digital divide. I'm uncomfortable with the term "disadvantaged". It's the same as the term "disability". It's a loaded term. The whole onus of this, when we started talking about this, is looking at first nations, the Indian population in North America, which were communities that have been ignored in the Fellowship Program. We can start talking about other groups as well, but this is the main focus.

GARTH BRUEN: I feel like "disadvantaged" is such a broad bracket that could involve so many different groups. We made a point in recognizing aboriginal, first nation, native groups, as being a specific area where we needed more representation and focus. I think if we can't come to an immediate consensus on what the terminology is we should continue to discuss this. I for one – and I think Louis is backing me up on this, and Glenn – think "disadvantaged communities" may not be the most appropriate tag. Louie?

LOUIS HOULE: Thank you. I don't like the term because in some of our communities I've been in touch with would probably not appreciate being put in a disadvantaged group, so using that term would be, I think, even offending to some of them. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Yes. I see Loris has put into the chat “vulnerable”, “unserved” or “underserved”. I think that those terms are even completely distinct from “disadvantaged”. We’re getting deep into nomenclature here. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I simply want to make the point that this isn’t a discussion we should be having just within the RALO. If Heidi’s point is that this is being taken global then we’re not really the only initiators of this. There are other people, like [unclear 00:08:30] from the Maori community in New Zealand who might have something to say about this. There are other communities. If this is going to be global, this is not a NARALO discussion or decision only, and I’m not quite sure what form this needs to take, but we’re not in the place to resolve this.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Evan. We can table this and move onto the Action Items.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: If I can make the suggestion, as a follow up to the AI, Heidi, could you possibly try and assemble a group of people who have an interest in these communities? Let’s have a list.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I’ll do that with pleasure – the global group that will help prepare that proposal. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry Garth, I didn't just punt it without having something coming out of this that had some indication of going forward.

GARTH BRUEN: Appreciated. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Moving forward, AI 2.2 – staff to please advise the status of the request to grant access to the VIBUG [unclear 00:09:39] development and testing of the new ICANN website. I'm assuming that means as the website is suitable for the visually impaired. Is there an update on this?

GARTH BRUEN: I do have a couple of emails from Laura Bengford. Heidi, is this the person that would be coordinating this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. Yes, Laura Bengford and I have been in touch on this issue. She did also confirm that she's been in touch with you, Garth, and I wrote her just earlier today for an update on that and waiting for a reply.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you. We'll keep coordinating on this. Go ahead Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: 2.3 has to do with potential ALS decertifications pending – one for Peoplewho.org and the other for Web 405. It mentions at the end of that “on hold”. Are there any updates on those processes?

GARTH BRUEN: The on-hold refers to only Web 405. When I sent out a last, most recent notice to these two groups, the representative for Web 405 did respond to myself and Evan. So we actually requested that they send their notice out to the list so everybody could be aware of it. I haven’t heard more from them but we do want to not go through with decertifying them until we know all the details, if they do want to remain, and what they’re going to do about it. As far as Peoplewho goes, there’s no response.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, so at that point, given no response, do we discuss your next step to take on that regarding Peoplewho?

GARTH BRUEN: I think that given the history it may be advisable to move forward with the decertification of Peoplewho. I definitely would like to put that to a regional consensus before doing anything else. I did not hear any more discussion on the NARALO email threads about it, after we mentioned it. I want to give anybody who has a need to speak about it to speak about it here. Was anybody part of NARALO when Peoplewho first came on? I know Eduardo’s been around for some time, and some others.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I remember them but it was a few years ago. Who is the contact person?

GARTH BRUEN: A Sylvia Caras.

EDUARDO DIAZ: No, I don't remember her.

GARTH BRUEN: Does anybody have any interaction with her – any recollection of dealing with the group?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: There hasn't been any contact that I'm aware of, for years. In the early days of NARALO they were involved but dropped off, and essentially [unclear 00:13:22].

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. I suppose we'll start the procedure then. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, is that an AI?

GARTH BRUEN: We're going to discuss this in more detail on the Agenda, further down under Item 5.2. We can wait until we get to that point in the call.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Moving forward with the AIs, 2.4 is the update of the MOU between NARALO and ARIN. Garth, very briefly, before you joined the call it was discussed – and just to make sure that we knew the version that was being considered – there is a [rav 2 00:14:14] of the MOU. At one point I was considering us possibly suggesting some amendments, but upon reflection, after seeing so many other people approving it as is, I decided not to. So what we have in front of us is the [rav 2] version of the MOU. So far we're looking at the comments on the mailing list. I've seen significant approval of it and absolutely no dissent.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. With that being the case then, we'll take a quick consensus here on the call to approve with moving forward with this MOU. I just put my checkbox in. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I have my check.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Although this is related to something [earlier on 00:15:21], in fact it was my hope that if I receive the funding for CROPP, it's my hope that at the ARIN Meeting we can have some kind of a small signing ceremony where we're able to move this forward.

GARTH BRUEN: Fantastic. It looks like there are no objections. All right, next item.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, the next Item is 2.5 – update on the ALS application for the Consumer Association of Canada.

GARTH BRUEN: That’s a question for staff. Do we have an update on that application?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I’ll need to check on the status of that. I’ll try and get back before the end of the call.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: If that’s the case, the last one on the Action Items to do is 2.6 – staff is to update on when we can submit requests for new brochures.

GARTH BRUEN: I think that means do we actually have an updated brochure that is suitable for sending out.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Silvia and I have been working with the Communications Department over the last few weeks and what we’d like to start this month, with the Outreach Working Group and the Secretariat is discussing a new

approach to the way the RALOs do outreach in terms of the document – a much more interactive and more multimedia than just [unclear 00:17:12] that have been around now for about five years or so. If you would perhaps bear with us, as we get that process started and then become involved in the discussions and how this new approach would look, again that should be starting this month some time.

GARTH BRUEN: Any comments on that from anyone?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: We're now onto Item 3.

GARTH BRUEN: Updates from various Working Groups. The first on the list is the Technology Taskforce latest meeting. There was a meeting. Who's prepared to discuss this? Anybody part of that effort? Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: We had another meeting today. We've been looking at different processing tools and we reviewed two additional ones today. We're looking to the wider community, and as now the Co Chair on the Committee, we're looking for people who are interested in participating – number one – and also suggesting ideas; whether it's conferencing tools or other tools that we can assess in our call. We'd like to invite as many people as possible to participate. We'll be doing a short summary, which is a cross-assessment on each of the conference tools that we

tested; so not only different platforms – Windows, Mac and Linux – but we also looked at the tools from an accessibility point of view.

GARTH BRUEN: Wonderful. If somebody wanted to join that Working Group, who's the Chair of that group?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: The current Chair is Dev, but you can get hold of me, Judith or Dev any time, and we have a schedule. We have another call next week as well.

GARTH BRUEN: Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I just wanted to say that Glenn and I are the Vice Chairs of that Committee and Dev is the Chair. Dev is not going to be travelling because he's no longer on ALAC, so either Glenn and I will be holding the on-site meetings at the ICANN Meeting. Also, we do want people to test out these tools from an accessibility point of view. We've tried it on many different platforms and some work and some don't, but we really do need people who are either hearing or visually impaired for that – that we can make sure that anything we approve would work with all platforms.

GARTH BRUEN: I think that's an excellent suggestion Judith, thank you. The Accessibility Committee – we have an update from that group.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I could give an update. Glenn and I are working with Laura on trying to figure out how we can get approval to do captioning for AC. Glenn has also been demonstrating captioning on videos, so any ICANN produced videos are out. We should have those close captioned as well. The YouTube close captioning that's offered for free is really not used. It's actually horrible and most of the people in the deaf community turn it off because it's so bad. If we're going to be producing stuff on ICANN and putting it out on the web, we do need to have those captioned, so we're working with Laura to explore the best way of going about that. Glenn, do you want to add anything?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I've done a short slideshow on the tool. It's [unclear 00:21:50] out of Australia. He's created a tool called Craptions.to.Craption, and as long as you own the video you can edit... You turn on the tool on the YouTube captions and then you edit – very quick, nice tool. If anyone has ever seen the YouTube closed captions it's awful. It's also [legacious 00:12:15], because some of the stuff can be quite bad. If you're interested and you own a video, this is a great tool. It's a beta format but if you're interested, I'll be doing a presentation in one of our Technology Taskforce sessions.

GARTH BRUEN: Did you say [legacious]?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, I did, because if you take a look at any video, sometimes they muss up the names of people in their titles, and because they get it so wrong there's been cases that have been [legacious], yes.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. This is very important information and things we need to be aware of. Next, the CCWG on the IANA Transition. Anybody to speak about that?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I will try to fill in what we've been doing and what's going on. I will try and fill in the gaps. Basically there's a proposal. I'm talking here about the proposal for the names issue, not the technical part or the other areas that [unclear 00:13:45] that came out of the names. I'm participating in the group that's putting the proposal together, and this proposal is already out for public comment and basically what has been proposed is to create an independent company, which is supposedly a shell company that will not have any staff or funding or anything.

There's a few details about that company that will be independent of ICANN. The purpose of that company will be to administer the contract for IANA – basically who is doing what NTIA is doing, from the contracting side. Then there is this group called the Multistakeholder Review Team, that will give this company instructions on what to do with the contract – specifically if there's going to be another stage we

move the contract away, if there are issues with the IANA operation and being able to direct that corporation, we don't know. This will be a new multistakeholder team.

There's discussion about if it's inside ICANN or if it's going to be outside ICANN, and either way, what about the accountability of that group? That's another issue. There's another group that's being proposed that's like the [customer committee 00:25:40] – something like that. It's to oversee the day-to-day operation of IANA; to make sure things are moving along and there's nothing happening there. That will be like a Standing Committee. What's being proposed there is that this Committee is mainly registries and registrars there, where people [unclear 00:26:08] multistakeholder.

Then there's this fourth group that's been proposed. It's an Independent Review Panels, where if you want to complain about the IANA, independently, then you'll go to this independent group to do whatever you have to do there. Basically that's the proposal. If Alan is here I'd ask him to give you a perspective of what we believe in ALAC. We're seeing this from a different perspective. Alan, if you can give this perspective then I'd really appreciate it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Eduardo has described it, and certainly those within ALAC – and we're not unique but we're in a minority right now – have very significant problems with the proposal; specifically the concept of the contract – the company that will exist solely for the purpose of awarding the contract. By the way, Eduardo, it's no longer no people and it's no

longer free. There's been acknowledgements that that's not likely to happen. Essentially what we've suggested is that the NTIA transfer the contract to ICANN and that ICANN's accountability be enhanced so that there's recourse if something starts going wrong.

The concept of having this company that exists solely for the purpose of awarding a contract, and taking all of this advice from other multistakeholder entities, just seems to be overly complex and overly expensive, and potentially fraught with long-term problems without an awful lot of benefit. There's a general agreement that ICANN is doing a fine job right now. No one sees that changing, but there's this worry that what happens in the future. My preference certainly would be to make sure that ICANN is fixed so that it is accountable to multistakeholders because it has wider import than just IANA, and not try to build very complex processes over and above it – but we'll see how that comes out.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. No further hands up about this subject. Getting more deeply into the accountability issue, the next group we have is the CCWG on Accountability. Any updates from that group?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The group is just formed.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. What's the progress of the group?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, you're on it. You might as well offer an explanation.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are two streams. One is to recommend to put in place any changes that are needed to ICANN to enhance accountability, to allow whatever the transition is to happen, and the second is a longer term effort to fix ICANN's accountability in the more general sense. The way I put it is we're in the situation right now where various entities and people around the world do not trust ICANN, and we need to put in place processes, procedures, rules, structures, whatever, such that ICANN can be trusted, and ICANN has the face of the world in doing what it's supposed to be doing. That's where we sit right now. It will have its first meeting tomorrow.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you very much. The meeting is where and when?

ALAN GREENBERG: Teleconference, 20:00 UTC. If you're a Member or participant you'll be invited.

GARTH BRUEN: Next – a capacity building series of webinars scheduled for the year. This seems like a general statement.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: What I meant to say is that there's a whole series of webinars scheduled for FY 2015. Some have happened already, like the one on IANA functions standard naming and numbering, but there are others coming on. There's one on Wednesday on IANA names function stewardship transition that Olivier is going to be speaking on, and then the sessions on ICANN 52; understanding and [unclear 00:31:18] cyber activities, IANA function stewardship transition, enhancing ICANN accountability, universal acceptance of TLDs, and security and stability. So these are what have been selected for FY 15.

We always like [unclear 00:31:40] do not have any input into this, other than the RALO-suggested input, as well as the Committee, as well as some other people. So I've posted a link in the chat, and I think Heidi did also. You can download some of the presentations that have happened already, but it's basically trying to encourage others to join, things to publish in the webinars, and why these were picked is these are of general interest to most of them, and to try and enhance knowledge and training of ALS Members, to give them some ideas of what the main issues are. Maybe Olivier has more information on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The one that's coming up this week, on Wednesday I believe, and we hope to be ready by then, is we have a draft statement on what the ALAC is going to be sending for this IANA stewardship transition process, which arguably is, I would say, the most significant thing that's going on at the moment out there, because it has the potential to pretty much affect the way that the root is run, and the root is pretty much the center of the domain name space, and if your domain names don't work

then the Internet doesn't work. So it's a very significant discussion that's taking place.

You heard earlier from Eduardo about some of the positions that the ALAC has been defending. They are controversial because we are in a minority. One of the things we want to do is get a statement out as soon as we can, and find out if there is support for this out there. Obviously we'd need to find out if there is support in the At-Large community and explain the issues that we have to people in the At-Large community. So it's a good time for people to be involved and to attend that webinar.

It's not only just Olivier that's doing this – it's the whole set of participants in the CCWG that will be presenting. We'll be looking forward to hearing feedback on this, there and then, so I look forward to seeing you all on the call. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Okay, thank you very much. Evan does not have a comment on future challenges. He has a comment on new gTLDs. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. I'll keep my comments brief. As some of you know, at the end of the LA Meeting I read out a motion that was passed by ALAC, that was essentially commenting on particular strings of high public trust; in the banking, financial and gambling areas, where we had a concern that public interest commitments were not satisfactorily addressed. This was the result of a lengthy public comment process and a unanimous ALAC

vote during the ICANN Meeting. So we had issued an official advice to the ICANN Board, calling for a freeze on a certain sub-set of the new gTLD domains being considered.

It's my understanding that the Board is taking the advice under consideration. Early indications suggest that they're not going to freeze the domains. What's yet to be seen is whether or not the Board is going to come back to us with any suggestions on how to improve the situation going forward. We tried our best with this. There is a number of communities that have been supporting us. The only communities really that have been opposing us have been essentially the [unclear 00:36:08] domain registries.

Unfortunately they've been [having a sway] and so as a result, it looks like the request for the freeze is not going to happen. It's possible that there might be some attempted remedial way to deal with public interest commitments, but at this point I'm not even sure if that's going to happen.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just as a follow on, the statement the New gTLD Committee made was they were not going to follow the advice, but would get back to us on what else they are doing regarding the situation. There's a New gTLD Process Committee Meeting this Thursday, and my understanding is that the only Item on the Agenda is further discussion of this issue. So

presumably they're taking it seriously. What will happen remains to be seen.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Alan, this is the first time I'm hearing this. In the interest of being bottom-up, or inclusive of the community, is there any interest in actually having anybody from the [unclear 00:37:27] of the concerned people actually involved in those discussions? Or are they once again going to create a solution in the absence of people they care about? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will not deign to speak on behalf of a Board Sub Committee. I wasn't invited to participate is all I can say. I believe they very rarely have people from outside participating in these meetings, but that's not my domain.

GARTH BRUEN:

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I was just going to mention that you might have seen in your mailbox, on the similar subject, a call for applicants to be on this PIC DRP. So it's the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Provider. It seems one of the things is it's going to have some people that are not just chosen by an unknown set of people. It asks for community members to be part of this. I don't know – because I haven't had a chance to discuss this

with Alan or any of the ALAC yet – but I don't know to what extent the ALAC wants to recommend people for this, or whether we just want to have people in the community that should go and apply for this.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. In the interest of time, Evan's indicated he may have to step off the call, so I want to give him the opportunity to conduct his presentation at this point in time, and then we'll take up the rest of the Agenda Items afterwards.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Garth, Glenn is fully capable of doing the presentation in my absence. In fact, the slide deck is of his creation. Don't change the order on account of me.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. In that case, do we have any updates from the FBSC? Alan?

ALLAN SKUCE: A couple of things. The Five-Year Operating Plan is open for comment until January 5th. I'll post that into the chat. Also, we're looking to get an active group that are going to meet face-to-face in Singapore to deal with the comment, and also to start getting ready for the opening of the FY 15 budget approval.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you Allan. Do we have any update from our NomCom. Louis?

LOUIS HOULE: Yes, very briefly, I forgot to mention one thing during our last NARALO Meeting. During the NomCom Meeting we've been [unclear 00:41:13] on Sub Committees, and I forgot to mention that there were four Sub Committees that had been approved at the time: one on conflict of interest, chaired by Cheryl Langdon-Orr; the second one our outreach and [improvement 00:41:33], NomCom has the same problem as we have with the [unclear] for outreaching; the third one is transparency, and I'm part of that Sub Committee, and I'd like to say a couple of words on that.

Actually, the goal is transparency but what we want to do is improve the communications of the NomCom [unclear 00:42:05] the ICANN community, and we think by the experience that as far as I am concerned, I have in 2014, there is still a lot of room for improvement – for instance having a report card that's not bureaucratic but more journalistic, I could say. The fourth committee is a Wiki SOI revision, which is being done by Ron Andruff. This is one thing I forgot to mention. The other thing is that we've been [going to 00:42:40] [unclear] review of each and every Member of the 2014 NomCom, and we decided during the last meeting that we would publish the results of the evaluation, the assessment, for each of the NomCom Members.

So mine is available, so if you're interested in seeing what NomCom Members think of your delegate to the NomCom in 2014, then I'd be glad to post it on the list. That's it. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Louis. Do we have any other Working Group, Committee updates from anybody else? The next AI deals with CROPP. Glenn is approved for [ENTED 00:43:39], Judith is approved for SXSW. Evan submitted for Consumer Electronics. ARIN, Evan submitted for the April, and I-Tripoli, Marie Thompson in May submitted. Do we have any update on those three submissions? Alan?

ALLAN SKUCE: Those first four are moving along. We're still waiting for any comment on Marie's submission, so if anybody has anything to say about what it contains, that may not fit with what we're trying to do, then we need to hear about it right away because it will be going to the Review Team and then the regional VP.

GARTH BRUEN: Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'm part of the Organizing Committee for the I-Tripoli IHDC. It's going to be in Ottawa this year. They're very impressed with Marie's résumé. We're going to be looking at having her further on the Panel. We'll probably be able to [unclear 00:45:04] because I'm part of the

Organizing Committee that gets the NARALO brochures in everyone's bag as well, which is always nice, but since Marie's on the call, I wonder if she has the chance to speak for a few minutes?

LE-MARIE THOMPSON: I think it's going to be a really good opportunity to interact and exchange with the I-Tripoli group. They've got quite a good segment of the tech population that's focused on specific humanitarian tech issues, and I think maybe the [unclear 00:45:48] of some of the issues that are being discussed within ICANN. I'm excited about it and I hope that if anyone has any questions for me, or my background, I'm happy to answer and can provide any details that are needed.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Evan, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I've already mentioned the things in the chat, that I would note that the CES is starting to get down to the wire. I put my stuff in well in advance of the deadline, and I just note that the CES conference actually happens next month and registration fees rise significantly December 31st, so that procrastination has the potential of actually costing money. I'd just note that to anyone who's listening that has any say on this.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. I think Allan said they were moving along. I suppose him saying “moving along” means that they’re doing the best that they can. I don’t know. Unless Allan has some sort of insight?

ALLAN SKUCE: As soon as we hear from Chris it will go to Travel and then you should hear back, I would expect, within the next two weeks.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I appreciate everyone’s dedication to this project. It’s very important. Glenn, you still have your hand up. Do you have further comments?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, I was just going to say if Louis is still on the line, he attended that same IHPC last June, and he can comment about being a participant at the event. Are you there, Louis? I guess not.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. It sounds like things are moving along. In terms of Singapore travel it says “Glenn confirmed”. On the list are Evan, Judith stepping in for me, and then of course Alan and Eduardo. Is anyone having any difficulties or delays in organizing their travel? I’m going to assume there isn’t. If there is, please let us know. Communication outreach strategy – we’re going to be continuing to discuss of course the disabled communities and other issues, in terms of recruitment and making sure ALSes get the support they need. These are all important efforts.

Turning to our community, if Glenn is ready we can begin his presentation.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

I sent the link, so the slideshow should be coming up. This is available on Slideshare also. Our mission, as all the ISOC Chapters, is we're able to promote an open development and evolution of use of the Internet, for the benefit of all, and because of time I'm going to give a quick overview. ISOC has been incorporated for over two years. We're a Canadian-wide chapter. Anyone is able to join and there's also a second chapter in Canada – ISOC Quebec, which Louis Houle is Chair of. We're looking at organizing a conference, coming up, possibly late winter or early spring, focused on keeping the [unclear 00:50:22] in Canada. We've been moving forward on a number of things.

One is we've created a video series, where we've gone and spoken to [thought leaders 00:30:34] in Canada on Internet issues. As indicated, we have over 200 members currently, out of the 55,000 slots, individual members that exist at ISOC formally. We have 11 Board Members that are currently active. We have a number of Sub Committees that we're working on, and I'm just looking for a current picture, but I do not see a current picture of our Board. Again, we have over 11 Board Members. Most of the work we've done in the past year, like any organization, we've focused on systems.

We've created [unclear 00:51:22] system for our database. We've also created a PayPal system for payment of membership. We do have a fee membership with ISOC. This is not always the case with ISOC. Germany

has a membership base. Many other chapters do not. Again, we're looking at issues that are pertinent to Canadians. The one issue we definitely want to champion is [unclear 00:51:57] in Canada – a conference that we're doing hopefully with the Munk Global Affairs Organization based over at UT. Because of time, I'm going to stop right now and ask if anybody has any questions. Okay. it's fairly short, but the slideshow link is in the chat. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you very much. Moving onto the next Agenda Item – decertification. Just so everyone's aware, for our rules, if an ALS does not vote in three consecutive elections and does not contribute to a comment on ICANN policy through our discussion lists for a year, they automatically lose their voting rights and active status within NARALO. We attempt to notify the ALS of the status change and encourage them to return to active participation.

We understand these are volunteer efforts and things are difficult, but that is reflected in the long period of time that we wait to hear back from somebody – so it's three consecutive votes and a year of non-participation. We attempt to contact them, they're given ample time to respond back. In the particular case of the ALSes on the decertification track we have Peoplewho, who we discussed at the beginning of the call. We've not had any participation from this group in several years. They were not present at the Mexico City Summit in 2009 and as far as I know, and as far as the records show, they've not participated since 2009.

In terms of going forward with the decertification I haven't seen any objections. We've given them a lot of time on this. The next group, Web 405, the same conditions apply to this group as they do to Peoplewho, except the representative of Web 405 did respond to me last week, when I reached out to him. I'm going to try and illicit some kind of formal statement from their representative before moving forward with any decertification, but in terms of Peoplewho, I suppose we're prepared as a region to move forward with their decertification, unless there are any objections? None. Okay, moving on, Agenda Item 6 – the At-Large Advisory Committee. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: With regards to that organization you got in touch with, you said they responded to you. Was their response meaningful or was it just a case of, "What are you trying to do? Are you bothering us?" Or something?

GARTH BRUEN: No. The response was, "I guess I need to pay attention to this. I need to look into this in more detail," and I want to give them a chance to respond more fully.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great then. Thank you. I think that's a model of the kind of due diligence to do when you take a step forward into delisting an ALS. It's important and I'm glad you're doing so and you're making sure this is done in a proper and meaningful way. When we delist an ALS we are

absolutely convinced and we know that the ALS is a complete “dead duck” and that’s important.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. ALAC issues. Looking for comments from Alan, Glenn and Eduardo, starting with Alan. Any updates?

ALAN GREENBERG: There are all sorts of things going on. We’re looking at rules, changing the process for certifying ALSes; in that we’re not currently following the detailed rules that we have, and planning on reformatting them. We have an effort that’s jus starting on looking at ALS criteria and expectations to try to put a framework in place for RALOs, to set any additional rules so that we have a good basis for ALSes that are actively participating. I don’t just mean commenting, I mean they’re feeding information back and forth.

I suspect there are all sorts of other things, but you caught me unawares and I’m not sure what else we’re doing. There’s a good dozen initiatives that are starting at this point. We’re reformatting the FBSC and that’s an ongoing process now, to gear up for the new budget year. The performance of our budget requests in the past year was not spectacular and we’d like to make some significant changes in that. Heidi, what have I missed?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think you’ve covered it, Alan.

GARTH BRUEN: When was the last ALAC teleconference?

ALAN GREENBERG: It was November 25th and the next one will be on December 22nd.

GARTH BRUEN: All right. Glenn, what's your take on ALAC business?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: We had our first meeting. I'm new to the process so I'm getting used to reviewing. The recent comment I've done is on the budget. Leon Sanchez is the penholder on that. We're working on doing an ALAC response to the Strategic Plan, and the other call by Alan was to comment on NomCom. Again, I'm mainly a newbie and I'd say Eduardo has more comment.

GARTH BRUEN: Being a newbie, Glenn, what's your experience so far with ALAC? How are things going? What's missing? What's working well?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Again, it was only one call I've been on so far. There's a lot of chat I've seen. Again, the learning curve is still there for me, but it's still a new experience.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Eduardo, ALAC business?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No. I think Alan covered most of the items. The monthly calls are well attended, so everyone participates. That's something I've seen happening. But no, I have nothing else to add.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a quick further comment. At this point we're looking at an awful lot of administrative things. I know there's a certain amount of frustration in doing administrative things instead of the work that we're here to do, but a lot of things have dragged for a number of years and it's time to revise them. For instance the ALS criteria has not been changed since 2007 and we have a lot of experience under our belt since then, and it's time to look at those kinds of things. But in parallel, there's an awful lot of real work going on at the same time, certainly IANA and the accountability will be kicking in, and the kinds of things Evan talked about on PIC is rather interesting.

This is the first time we've really gotten the focus of the Board to the extent we have this time. I think we're set for an interesting year. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I just wanted to add that in the spirit of openness all the ALAC calls are open for everyone to attend, so if anyone's interested in hearing things, how things go on in that Committee, then they're very welcome to be on the call. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Underneath the ALAC Agenda Item we do have a number of links there – the policy advice development page, the ICANN public comment page, the PICs that were discussed. These are voluntary statements by the contracted parties that they're going to observe certain rules, certain self-discipline, and the questions around us have been how do you enforce things that people are saying are voluntary compliance? The CCWG Charter, adopted in 2014 for the FY, statements of endorsements being developed, the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan, which has been mentioned earlier, the CCWG naming related functions draft transition proposal...

These are things that are still open and being developed. There's the label generation rule set and tool project, and the tool set specifications. Then open for public comments, .madrid, the introduction of two approved launch programs, and new gTLD action rules for indirect contention. What is "indirect contention"? Can anybody answer that? Does anyone know?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can try. It's a lot easier with the diagram and I don't have one to show you this very second. On the ALAC call we did have a diagram as an aid. Indirect contention is the following. I'm going to indent something; that

there are four applications for .buystuff and one application for .buymorestuff. The five applications for .buystuff are in contention with each other because they've all applied for the same string and only one of them can win. They are not necessarily in contention for .buymorestuff.

If one of the .buystuff applicants filed an objection saying .buymorestuff is confusingly similar with .buystuff and won, then that .buystuff is in contention with .buymorestuff. The other .buystuffs are not in contention with it directly, because they didn't file objections, but they are indirectly. So you could for instance have the last .buystuff and .buymorestuff delegated, because they're not in contention with each other, but you could not have the one that filed the objection and .buymorestuff delegated, because they are essentially identical. Everyone clear?

GARTH BRUEN: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's essentially names that are not in contention because of being identical, but because they're in contention because at least one of them filed an objection and were found to be in contention, and therefore the other ones that are identically spelled are indirectly in contention.

GARTH BRUEN: But are they subject to the objection?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, they're not. That's the point. if .buystuff one objected, and it was found to be in contention with .buymorestuff, that is number one and the .buymorestuff are in contention with each other, they could not both be delegated. Because they're deemed to be identical, only one can go live. If the second .buystuff were to win among those five, it could be delegated along with .buymorestuff. Coming out of that you could either have one TLD or two, depending on who wins. It's confusing and messy. We don't really care, which is why we decided not to file for comment on it.

GARTH BRUEN:

Very good. Moving on, is there Any Other Business? Tom, please go ahead. Tom has posted a document and he's typing. He wants to mention an event and all are invited. I suppose if you click on the document, you'll see it's an ISOC New York party at Holiday Panel and Panel, December 18th, 6:00 pm to 10:00 pm, 55 Washington Street, Room 321, Brooklyn, New York. That document is in the comments submitted by Tom. All right. Well, I thank you all very much for your attendance and I'll speak to you all later. Take care. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]