Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, well good afternoon, good morning and good evening everybody. This is the ALAC monthly conference call on Tuesday, the 28th of February, 2012. The time is 15:06 UTC. Welcome, everyone, and the first thing we have to do on our agenda which is quite long but which is actually quite exciting today is the adoption of the agenda and the call for any other business or other amendments.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:	This is Jean-Jacques. May I come in?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes, Jean-Jacques.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:	Thank you, Olivier. As explained earlier I have no internet connection at all so would you mind conceptually just going through these points of the agenda so that I'm aware of what the order is?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes sure, Jean-Jacques, it's Olivier here. We'll have the roll call, then we'll have the review of action items, the review of current ALS applications; and then after that we'll have the usual reports. The part which is different from usual is of course the new business – items for decision. We'll be looking at the policy advice development calendar which is the same as ever and

looking at all of the different proposals that we have for statements, etc.

Then we'll have the items for discussion and the items are the ratification of the ALAC/At-Large policy advice development process which is not something we'll ratify there but we'll be discussing it or at least I'll be providing you with an intro about this; the At-Large Costa Rica meeting schedule which staff will be taking us through, and that includes the…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hello?

Heidi Ullrich: Olivier, this is Heidi. We can't hear you now. If you can write… Let's see what's going on. Apologies for this.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Olivier has gone offline. We can't hear you.

Gisella Gruber: Apologies to all. Olivier can hear us, we can't hear him. He's going to dial in again and also Carlton Samuels has joined the call. And the interpreters are saying that it's very difficult to hear Jean-Jacques to be able to interpret into Spanish and French.

EN

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:	Gisella, should I hang up and call back or that's a risky thing? Because [without the Adobe] the operator really doesn't know what the connection looks like.
Gisella Gruber:	No, Jean-Jacques, I'm just checking with the interpreters and they can now hear you better.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:	Okay, thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	So I'm back, can you hear me?
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Oh good, yes.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	I do it quickly.
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Olivier, why don't you use the audio facility rather than the Adigo connection?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	I've found it to be, depending on the amount of traffic on the networks sometimes it's a little less reliable. If I drop off again I'll try with the audio facility online.
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Okay.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, so where were we… Sorry about this. So yes, the At-Large Improvements Taskforce will be described by Cheryl after that. Then we'll have the At-Large ICANN Academy Ad-Hoc Working Group where Sandra will be speaking and will [give us a perspective] on this. Then Sala will be speaking to us about the online capacity building within ICANN, and then finally we'll have the ALAC members' participation in working groups – just a little discussion on this. And any other business afterwards, Jean-Jacques, so that's the whole agenda for today.
	And I hope Jean-Jacques is still there because that was specifically for him… Okay, well, we'll move on then.
Gisella Gruber:	Olivier?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes, Gisella?

Gisella Gruber:	My apologies – Jean-Jacques just disconnected.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, right. Well with this I think we'll move on to the second item: roll call and apologies. Please, Gisella?

Gisella Gruber: Yes, good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's ALAC call on Tuesday the 28th of February. We have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ron Sherwood, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Yaovi Atohoun, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Pastor Peters, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Sandra Hoferichter, Alan Greenberg, Yrjö Länispuro, Ganesh Kumar, Edmon Chung, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Wolf Ludwig, Oksana Prykhodko, Sala, Eduardo Diaz, Carlton Samuels, Maureen Hilyard; Evan Leibovitch has just joined the call as well.

On the Spanish channel we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Natalia Encisco; nobody on the French channel at this stage. Apologies from Cintra Sooknanan and Jose Arcé. If I can also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, and from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco, Nathalie Peregrine and myself, Gisella Gruber. Please also note that the audio streaming is through the Adobe Connect room today as well. If you are on the audio bridge via Adigo please remember to mute your speakers on your computer. Thank you, over to you, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Gisella, and have we missed anyone in our roll call? It appears not so welcome everybody. This is really a very good turnout today. I'm very pleased to welcome you all on this call and we can move swiftly on to Item #3 on our agenda, the review of action items from the 24th of January 2012 ALAC meeting, last month's meeting, and thankfully there are not that many open action items still there.

I invite you all to open the Wiki page that contains those. We have the long-term action items which we're not going to go through. They are the standing action items which are still in progress, but underneath that we have the open action items – only one, saying "Beau to Chair and repopulate the At-Large Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Working Group." And this is an action item for Beau and it's been completed, I'm glad to hear this.

And newly assigned action items, I see none underneath there so it looks as though we haven't got any other action items to look through. The recently closed ones worth mentioning: staff to add the issue of online capacity building calls to the February ALAC agenda – that's been done. And of course the previous one, Sandra Hoferichter and Eberhard Lise are I believe in contact now. And prior to this, the Fiscal Year '13 master document was sent over to ICANN Finance.

Any comments or questions regarding action items? Seeing that no one is jumping around in joy or wishing to hold the microphone

we can move on to the next thing – the review of the current At-Large Structure applications. There are two recently-approved ALS applications… Should I get Matt to go through these, please?

Matt Ashtiani: Sure, let me just get back to the agenda page, one second please. So for the current list of ALS – I'm sorry, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. For the current-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think someone is speaking while you speak. Try again.

Matt Ashtiani: (inaudible) the two ALS applicants: #157 – Internet Society Cameroon Chapter, and #161 – Internet Society Armenia Chapter. Currently we have a few open ALS applications, the status of which have changed within the past 24 hours: #158 – The Association of Notary Public Professionals of Uruguay, we recently received the LACRALO regional advice and ALAC is to conduct a vote shortly. I'll be sending the poll out today.

#159 – National Association for Digital Inclusion, LACRALO also recently sent its advice and I'll be sending out the poll later today. #160 – The Ecuadorian Association for Free Software, as well we received this regional advice and I'll be sending out the vote today. #162 – Wikimedia Austria, we're awaiting the regional advice from EURALO. #163 – The Internet Society, Trinidad & Tobago Chapter, we're awaiting the due diligence which is due shortly so

we hopefully can move forward on that application within the next week or so. #164 – The Education Center NGO, we're awaiting the regional advice from APRALO; and lastly #165 – Internet Society Bahrain Chapter, we're awaiting the regional advice from AFRALO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Matt, and it's really heartwarming to see so many applications and so many organizations going through the accreditation process. Certainly a big welcome to the Internet Society Cameroon Chapter and a big welcome also to the Internet Society Armenia Chapter – two different regions of the world that are adding more ALSes and it's great to see that.

Of course that said, looking at some of the regional advice on the accreditation process, some of the applicants have not been given a positive reply I guess for the application process and that really highlights the amount of work that goes into the due diligence and I guess the requirements which are needed to join as an applicant.

Any question for…

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Jean-Jacques, please.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:	Thank you, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. After having voted for the Armenian (inaudible) I think that an email with the two remarks about my experience on the Board and the fact that there is a trend of some governments wanting to infiltrate [it] as well to control ALSes, and I just found it a warming note that I wanted to make sure that that is still relevant. Perhaps it's no longer relevant in which case I would like to be told so.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes, thank you Jean-Jacques, that is absolutely relevant indeed. And I think, well the due diligence certainly looks at the actual composure of the membership and composition, sorry, of the membership, and so the advice that you give here is absolutely correct. And in fact in some cases, some ALS applications have been rejected and thank you for reminding us of this. And I see people have put their hands up so we first have Tijani.
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Okay, thank you Olivier – Tijani speaking. Two things: first I agree with Jean-Jacques and I think that it is a point that we can add to the Metrics Working Group to think about. My second point: I think that this time we have the most number of applicants for ALSes so we need to highlight it and we need to make people know that we are growing so fast and that it is because our work is reaching people at the base. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Tijani. Question just on what you've said: you mentioned the Metrics Group for looking at the question that Jean-Jacques has mentioned. In what way would you say the Metrics Working Group would have to be involved?
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	I think that the Metrics Working Group can more or less define or at least orient the process of [secreting] ALSes and to define what are the things that we have to look for more than others; how we can have ALSes that will be real ALSes; how will we not repute this and not (inaudible) the puppet ALSes.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, so you're suggesting then, Tijani, that the Metrics Working Group will basically look at additional checks that would be performed by the due diligence process.
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Exactly, exactly. And also the way of approval from the RALOs and also from the ALAC.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, Tijani, that's noted. I think that Cheryl might have, just with the approval of Sergio and Carlton can I just get Cheryl to reply to this because I know she is jumping around. I can feel her energy.

EN

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [laughing]   Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record.   In fact, Tijani, let me reassure you and indeed Jean-Jacques that it is indeed something within the remit for the Metrics Review Work Group mainly because it's foreshadowed that in the next ALAC Review, which is not that far off – the next ALAC Review of course – that this is one of the matters we'll need to address. So part of what the ALAC Improvements Implementation Taskforce has done is not only analyzed what needs to be done in the near and short term but also what work we can give the various work groups and taskforces that are being formed to run the show as they come up, and this does certainly come into Metrics.

We need to remember first of all how we got the criteria for an ALS is something that would require… Any change in that would require ICANN agreement and considerable work with ICANN Legal. They are very hard-won criteria which is not to say those criteria can't be changed but I don't think it's a matter of needing to change the eligibility criteria but rather to ensure that not only the due diligence and staff up which we are seeing is done very effectively now; but perhaps at any point in continuation of eligibility and periodic reassurance of the system that no changes have been brought to eligibility is something that the Metrics Group can pick up on. Thank you, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this explanation, Cheryl. And next we have Sergio Salinas Porto. Thank you for your patience. Sergio?

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you, Chair. For the record I am Sergio Salinas Porto. Two topics that came to the fore and that I would like to comment on: it is not quite clear to me if there is a certain state or government that intends to work with an ALS. I do not see that as an issue. I think that a far more serious issue is that a company would be working with an ALS. Normally, the great drive within ICANN comes from the private sector, so if this is the issue, if this is what is perceived as a threat then we could see to what extent a government can interact with an ALS.

It comes to mind that in the case of my organization, we have worked actively with the government in my country and many ALSes, internet users' ALSes in Latin America and the Caribbean have been actively engaged with their governments. I don't know if this is what Jean-Jacques meant or if he meant something else.

Regarding the three ALSes that filed their applications to be approved and become members of [At-Large], we have seen only one organization – the Free Software Organization of Ecuador – as an organization that is directly involved with IT issues and domain names and numbers. This is not the case for the other two ALSes. In one case we see that the Board is made up of private company representatives and in the other case we see that the perspective ALS is the Notary Public Professionals Association that has nothing to do with the internet. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sergio, much appreciated. I gather that in fact having read your reports it's as though some of the applicants will not be allowed to become an ALS. Next on the list is Carlton Samuels. Carlton, you might be muted… Yes, now you're here.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair, this is Carlton Samuels for the record. I wanted to make two observations.   The first one is to qualify; I think Sergio was attempting to do that and I support what he says in part. In our area of the world, while we might not be directed by government we certainly have to work with government and I'll give you an example. Two months ago I was asked to write a statement for the [Caricom] heads of government on what was happening in the IT and internet governance space. The [Caricom] Secretariat got in touch with me and asked me to write a statement. I told them that they could probably get their best information online at ICANN.org.

And they came back to me and said "Well, yeah, we know it's there but we would prefer that you write a statement and highlight the major issues that are happening in the internet governance space." Now, I'm not being directed by government but certainly when it comes to those matters I am usually asked for a statement or to give some feedback on it. So it must be understood that while an ALS is not of the government you are sometimes asked to work with the government because of that, so in that context I am sharing Sergio's clarification.

I think I want to support Cheryl's notation that the qualification criteria is important and should remain, and I think that we could put enough emphasis on that to limit the kinds of confusion and the dissonance that could be had if you were to have an ALS that was government-approved or private sector-approved as part of this At-Large community. I am more concerned, quite frankly, while it's good to celebrate the number of ALSes we are putting up I am more concerned about the participation because quite frankly the [meat] and the approval they're putting is in the participation and policy discussions.

And for example in LACRALO you see how many we have but even with a relaxed quorum, even with a relaxed quorum we can't get a quorum for policy discussions and that speaks to me to the issue that yeah, we sign up a lot of people but what they're really interested in is different from what we're voting on. And I think it's going to need a longer and more involved process to move that participation question forward and to see how we might use it as part of the Metrics to determine.

And I'll tell you why it's important. For a lot of us, our instruments speak to quorum and quorum is about numbers, and when you can't get numbers it holds up all kinds of things. And so I would be looking very closely to see what the Metrics Working Group comes up with in terms of quorum and how that might impact the duties or the status of ALSes. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton, for these kind words.   And I certainly agree with much of what you've said. I gather that the Metrics Working Group is going to work out methods and ways to gauge how much participation there is in ALAC, and I think that the regions will also work on this. So it's something that the group will be working on in Costa Rica and beyond.

With regards to the actual criteria, this is clearly given on the page which says "Join" and it's got minimum criteria for At-Large Structures.   Certainly the fact that some members of an organization might be government-influenced is not per se a barrier to the organization joining; and it is quite clear that the primary aim of an ALS is that it needs to provide a voice to individual internet users.

Many At-Large Structures have sometimes weak links with the government − sometimes they interface with government or they influence government policy in their country, and in some parts of the world it is totally impossible to have a totally independent organization because of local laws that need local organizations to be given the green light to operate from government.

I have one more person in the queue and then I'll close the queue after that. It's Alan Greenberg.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: And then, Olivier, can I make two remarks after that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, please, Jean-Jacques, but first Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you, it's Alan Greenberg speaking. For the few of you on this call who were around when the current criteria were established, you may remember that there were some very, very difficult discussions because getting the words right for things like business involvement and government involvement was very difficult. Some people in some parts of the world wanted to say that we should not have any involvement and other people pointed out correctly that in that case we're disenfranchising whole regions because that isn't how the rest of the world works.

And we ended up with wording that is quite reasonable, and I think it's a sign of maturity of our group that we're now looking at how do we make sure that we're actually using the rules. Up until now very often it's been people outside of At-Large who have criticized us for not policing ourselves and not really trying to get real involvement from the regions, and I think it's a rather good sign that the hard-fought words that we have in the document should be reviewed obviously, but then to try to find out how do we actually make them work? So I find this discussion very interesting and pleasing, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan, for these words of wisdom, and now we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. Two points: the first is about government influence on roles. I would make a difference between approval and control. Approval, no problem; control…

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We may have lost Jean-Jacques. Oh dear, it looks like we've lost Jean-Jacques, in which case, Gisella, could you please confirm that we've lost Jean-Jacques? We have? He has disconnected, okay. Well, we'll move on then to the next part and when Jean-Jacques comes back online we'll do a little cut over to him for him to develop what he had to tell us.

Right, we'll move on to the next part which is the reports, the At-Large reports from the working groups, RALOs and liaisons, Wikis and ALAC monthly reports. We're not going to discuss through these but what I do invite you to do is… Am I still here? Can you still hear me?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, because usually it's Tijani that says a few words when I disappear. So I was just going to say we don't go through all of these. Thanks to all of the liaisons for the reports. I just have to advise the group of one thing – Julie Hammer has now been

selected by the SSAC to join the SSAC.   Julie Hammer will therefore be our liaison to the SSAC and so I welcome Julie.   And we'll arrange for her to be able to introduce herself to us when we are over in Costa Rica.

Cheryl, you've put your hand up so do you wish to say a few words? Cheryl? You might be muted.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, I had to mute because I was trying to flee background noise and I came back into background noise.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, there is something ringing at the moment, one line. But okay, that's fine. Cheryl, you're on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, okay, I can probably talk over that background noise anyway, Olivier. Two things, one of which is a piece of adminis-trivia: I've done my usual liaison report and I'm sure those of you who are interested in the ccNSO world so subscribe to any updates, but I did want to make sure that people were aware I've also edited the monthly reports page which is what links from your agenda, Olivier.

When I went in there as Chair of the At-Large Improvements Implementation Taskforce to make my monthly report because I had nothing to announce this month there was no space for me to

do that, so while I popped that in I've also put in appropriate space in my linkages to the yet to be done but certainly already sanctioned Rules of Procedure Work Group and the Metrics Work Group which we've just been discussing.

I wanted to raise a particular matter, though, for ALAC consideration. It may be something that they wish to discuss during Costa Rica if time does not permit now. Because I'm in control of all of those work groups and they are woven together, I think it would be appropriate for the ALAC to consider making the Metrics Work Group which you formally created along with the Rules of Procedure Work Group back in Dakar, it might be appropriate for the Metrics Work Group to be a subcommittee or a subgroup of the Rules of Procedure because the work of one really does need to seed into the other; and I also believe that we will have the same people, similar groups of people populating and I'm concerned about things getting mismatched and too much strain on volunteers.

So if you wouldn't mind I would very much like to propose that ALAC consider making the Metrics Work Group as it is currently writ a subcommittee or subgroup – I'll leave it to you which term you use – of the larger Rules of Procedure one.

The second item which is again a bit of adminis-trivia but one I would like ALAC's endorsement for is to do with the Rules of Procedure Work Group. The Rules of Procedure Work Group, Alan has obviously had his hand up for that before it was even a good idea so I popped his name onto the membership list even

though we haven't had a call for members; but the other person who expressed interest is Bret Fausett. And as Bret from NARALO, as an author of the version 1 which was called the "Interim ALAC Rules" – I very much value him as a Co-Chair or perhaps a deputy Chair if the ALAC would deem that appropriate. I think administratively and culturally that would be an excellent outcome. And that's it for me, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and let me just ask the question immediately if anyone would be against considering the Metrics Working Group as a subcommittee of the Rules of Procedure Working Group. If you're against this, if you think that this might not work you can use one of your little icons on the top – the same ones that you use to raise your hand. Underneath that one you've got a big red cross – I'll show you what a red cross looks like. That's the big red cross, like this, and if you disagree with that suggestion then you can use this.

And I see no one putting their cross in action so, Cheryl, it looks like this is a good idea and it's something that no one is against. I personally have nothing against it either, making the Metrics Work Group a subcommittee of the Rules of Procedure Work Group. With regards to the Co-Chair or deputy Chair position, is this not something that the Working Group itself has to work out by themselves?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	You can in fact do it either way. We can in fact have the ALAC be very specific on the leadership or you can appoint them as interims. I'm already there; I guess I can call myself interim Chair because you've appointed me as Chair. You could appoint them to an interim role and the Work Group could overturn it if it so desired. But I just think having the Version 1.0 information as well as the current information at the same level of input would be very, very valuable.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, Cheryl, and I have a question for you. Do you know if Bret Fausett will be in Costa Rica?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	I do not know that but I do know he is available to start work after the Costa Rica meeting on these activities. He has other engagements keeping him very occupied between now and the very, very end of March.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, thank you. I see that Carlton has noted in the chat that this is an At-Large Working Group and the Chair may make a proposal for leadership that can be ratified by the entire ALAC. So what I did want, because I have met Bret Fausett whilst in Dakar and I've read some of his illustrious work in ALAC; and of course the question is whether everyone knows Bret yet. And I would wish

perhaps that he could say a few words prior to taking this really important position.

But I see Tijani has put his hand up, so Tijani, you're next. We can't hear you; you're very, very far away. I don't think anyone else can hear you at the moment.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So now you will hear me I think?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And now we can hear you, yes. Before you sounded as if you were in another town.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, very good. I do think that the Working Group has to choose its leadership. We already agreed on Cheryl to be the Chair and inside the Working Group we can decide who is the Co-Chair, the deputy Chair, etc. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Tijani. But I think that Carlton was correct, though – because it's an At-Large Working Group the Chair can make a proposal and then the entire ALAC though still has to ratify. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:	Yeah, I just wanted to point out that Bret was my predecessor as GNSO liaison. I don't know if he was ever actually on the ALAC but he was very involved until 2006, 2007. Thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, thank you Alan. So what I hear then is that the Working Group will be selecting its own Co-Chair and what I also hear is that we can wait until Costa Rica for Bret Fausett to be selected. And hopefully if Bret Fausett is able to make it to Costa Rica perhaps he could address the ALAC prior and actually say a few words.
	Any other questions or…
Heidi Ullrich:	Olivier, this is Heidi.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes, Heidi please.
Heidi Ullrich:	Yes, just a note that Yaovi is asking if you can speak a little bit louder.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Ah, okay. I'm already speaking pretty loud here. Or "We would appreciate it if you can speak loudly like Olivier?" Okay.

EN

Heidi Ullrich: I apologize. [laughing]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm not sure; there's only so much I can shout. Okay, then we'll move on then if that's…   Is that okay with you, by the way, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'm perfectly happy. The subcommittee or subgroup model is one I'm very keen to explore so I'll now change the pages and get things set up accordingly, and I'll get the call out for interest in membership to get going before Costa Rica so we can settle it all during Costa Rica and twist a few arms if need be while we're there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Absolutely, and if you could also get in touch with Bret Fausett, having seen nobody against his appointment I think he's highly likely to be appointed; in which case it would be good to find out if he is going to be in Costa Rica. And also it would be good to find out a little bit more about him.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you'd like I'll pop his name up as a member because he's certainly agreed to be a member of the Work Group, and put the term "interim" with some sort of annotation there. But I would

suggest that because this is, like most of our work groups an open work group, although we would want regional balance or at least regional representation on it, it might be appropriate for Bret and I to work with Alan and a few others with particular interests on these matters of Rules of Procedure to formulate some pages and perhaps put a little presentation together that we could pop out to the monthly meetings that may follow Costa Rica.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl, and I see support from Sala. I see Alan still has his hand up?

Alan Greenberg: My hand up was for the next item once we finish this one. I thought we were finished but apparently not.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic, okay. Well, I was just going to ask you, Alan, before going to the next item whether you had any highlight regarding the GNSO as you are GNSO liaison.

Alan Greenberg: Well, my hand was up to apologize for not having the report there. I was waiting for something following the last meeting and it should be there in the next day or so. Nothing really to focus on other than the note I sent out a while ago on the Red Cross/Olympic Committee naming issue which is, as I noted, the

Design Team that was put together by the GNSO has made a recommendation, they will be making a recommendation to number one, see if it's acceptable or amenable to the GAC and to the GNSO with the intent of it is acceptable to actually try to get it approved by the GNSO in Costa Rica so that it can go to the Board – the logic being that if indeed there are going to be any changes to the Applicant Guidebook with regards to this it really needs to be done prior to the closing of the application period, and that essentially means it needs to be done in Costa Rica.

So on that particular aspect on top-level domains' issues, if there is any concern or any input it should be raised sooner rather than later. Last time I checked, a day or so ago no comments had been made on the Wiki.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan, and just to make sure the comment period is closing after Costa Rica, is that correct?

Alan Greenberg: There is no formal comment period at this point. This proposal was just developed in the last few weeks and the Work Group Chair is trying to see if the GNSO can approve it in Costa Rica. So there is not a formal comment period open by ICANN at this point but there is [input]. This was a Board decision to restrict the use of Olympic and Red Cross names. The words that actually went into the Guidebook were, to be kind, rather crude; and the Design Team has been looking at it and saying "If we are going to do this, and

apparently the Board has decided we are going to do this because it's in the Guidebook as we speak, are there any changes that should be made to make sure that the implementation is rationale and will not have a negative impact on other applicants?" and such.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Alan. And that's really worth noting because of course allowing one might allow a whole such number of other claims. Evan?

Alan Greenberg: Oh, let me speak to that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sure, go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Certainly the GAC's made clear that in their minds there are no other organizations that meet the same level of criteria as these two. And I would debate whether that's true or not… The people who work for the governments who signed the treaty seem to be convinced of that and I'm willing to accept that. There's certainly a question, and I suspect Evan might talk to it, on whether we should be giving these two groups anything at all. But that decision has been made by the Board and it's in the Applicant Guidebook right now, and the question on the table today is "Should we leave the rules as they were written in the Applicant

Guidebook or refine them to make a little bit more sense?" That's the only question I believe that is on the formal books. Of course ALAC is in a position to do whatever it wants in terms of stating what it believes the world should look like and as I said I suspect Evan will talk to that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks, Olivier – this is Evan for the record. Yeah, as Alan suggested I did have something to say. I wasn't sure if this was going to be under Any Other Business but I'm happy to talk about it now. There's two very specific issues to deal with this, one of which of course are the details of the two particular names or the two particular sets of names proposed for being reserved. There have been discussions that I've seen within the mailing list and there have been discussions about the various proprietary, or sorry, the suitability of reserving these names.

And so that's one issue, and yes, the GAC has said that they have no other names that they want to reserve this way until the next time. So my big problem though is the entire way this has been done, and the way that Alan has correctly described this – this is something that the Board has already imposed on the community and so all that is left is for the GNSO to make refinements and to make it look not as bad as it is.

As far as I'm concerned the entire way this has been done is a total subversion of the multi-stakeholder model. The community that is supposed to be involved in making decisions like this was not. In fact, we are being told after the fact "This is being done and how are you going to make it look least bad?" I think that ALAC has a responsibility to speak on this. I think we have a responsibility to speak not only on the substance of the proposed restrictions that are setting a very bad precedent but also on the otherwise bad precedent being set by the Board subverting the multi-stakeholder model by imposing decisions that the community is then given opportunities to polish and make look nice, but effectively has been shut out of the process. Thank you.

Sorry – and if desired I'm more than happy to work on a statement for ALAC to make on this subject either in Costa Rica or even before. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Next we have Salanieta. And Sala, you might be muted. We still cannot hear you so… Still muted, Sala. Is it *6 to unmute? Gisella is looking into this. I see that there is support in the chat… Oh, Sala has just dropped off the call, okay.

There is support on the chat for making a statement on the erosion of the multi-stakeholder principles by Board action and in some cases by GAC action, I gather, because really the response from the Board is in response to what the GAC wants. Okay, so what I suggest is that we touch on this in Costa Rica. It's just a little too

fast to discuss it here and to start working on statements and so on, but since we're only a week, week and a half away… Oh, Sala may be back on. Is Sala back on?

Gisella Gruber: It's Gisella here, sorry – no. I'm just trying to get hold of her on dial back, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Well, let's move on then to the next part of our agenda – that's… Yes, hello?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Yes, hello.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh Sala, you're back.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Yes, my apologies. I think Alan's (inaudible) what he mentioned, that there is a critical time we're expected to comment. And I suppose there could be better facilitation of that iteration to us having a position on the matter. I also hear what Evan is saying in relation to some of the (inaudible) in shunning – and I use the word "shunning" – At-Large interests to the corner and (inaudible). It could have been window dressing.

EN

Just a note, again I have not reviewed all this but there is also a danger from the Board (inaudible), specifically on the basis that it's accepted in At-Large in terms of the legitimacy of the treaty and document. I see that it is a danger because, totally unrelated to this matter, it also offers a potential [loophole] through which if any treaty were to, based on the bottom-up model, just to say that it (inaudible) a treaty is accepted if for any other matter…

Gisella Gruber: Sala, sorry to interrupt but if you stay on that line do you think you could get the volume up? The interpreters aren't able to hear you to interpret into the other channels.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: The volume is high, as high as it will go.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Sala, thank you. I guess they can hear you better than they can hear Gisella.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Yes, so it's just something to have in the back of our minds but that's all, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Sala. And whilst you were away and came back and whilst you were speaking I also noted in the chat that several

EN

members including Carlton and Eduardo are saying that it's important for the ALAC to reinforce the principle of the multi-stakeholder system, and therefore there is a suggestion that Evan puts together a draft statement that could be discussed in Costa Rica.

I'm happy to go along with that. I definitely think the multi-stakeholder system is very, very important. I see agreement from Sala, and so perhaps, Evan, if you can start on a draft statement then maybe we can address this in Costa Rica. And I gather that the discussion that we'll have with the NCSG is also going to touch on this matter.

Evan Leibovitch: Olivier, this is Evan. I'm having a hard time hearing you. (inaudible) draft something, and I know the NCSG has been working on this issue, it's essentially Konstantino's, so I will especially talk to him about this. The NCSG is having some challenges within the GNSO putting their point across which is very similar to the one we've been expressing here, and so there's a good opportunity here for coordination. They've already done a lot of legwork on this so I will commit as an action item to consulting with the NSCG and having a statement ready to put forward in Costa Rica. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan, and Matt, did you get this action item?

EN

Matt Ashtiani: Yes I did but I was going to ask for you to restate it as you'd like it recorded.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Evan to work on a draft statement, well how do we word this… I think, Evan, you said it very well actually. Can you say it again, please?

Evan Leibovitch: Just a draft statement about the substance and the process related to the reservation of top-level domains currently under consideration by the GNSO Drafting Team.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And you are to speak to the NCSG.

Evan Leibovitch: I will consult with my colleagues in the NCSG and then have a statement ready for ALAC consideration in Costa Rica.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic.

Heidi Ullrich: Olivier, this is Heidi.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Heidi, please.

Heidi Ullrich: Sorry, I dropped but I'm just wondering during which meeting would you like this to be discussed?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think that we can work this out… Can we work this out later because yes, we will be discussing this in the meeting with the NCSG but we also have space for a hot topic so this might be a hot topic. Let's just give us time until then and we'll liaise with Evan on how much time he needs.

Heidi Ullrich: Alright, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, Olivier, this is Evan. I will try and have the motion ready in advance of the meeting, circulated by email so that hopefully people will be able to give it some thought in advance and it won't be sprung on everyone at the meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Perfect, Evan, thanks very much. So next we'll move to the policy advice development calendar, and we will swiftly move through those. First we have two recently-approved ALAC statements.

The first one is the ALAC statement on the IDN Variant Issues Project Draft Integrated Issues Report, and I have to thank Edmon Chung for having drafted the statement on this. This was passed. The second one is the Initial Report on Universal Acceptance of IDN TLDs and I have to thank Salanieta for having written, having been the pen holder on this one.

And at the moment we currently have several statements being reviewed by the ALAC, although I'm not quite sure if we have ready statements for all of them. The first one is the Framework for the Fiscal Year '13 Budget. That was a statement that's already been drafted by Tijani – thanks very much, Tijani, for this – and some input was received. It's already been submitted to the public comment forum and I invite everyone to read through it if you have not yet read through it. The ALAC vote ends tomorrow so I gather that the majority of you must have by now read it and will have voted on it.

The next comment is the IDN Variant Issues Project Proposed Plan for Next Steps. This one I noted did not have a statement ready yet but I gather, is it Edmon that's dealing with this? Do we have Edmon Chung here? Yes, Edmon, we can hear you.

Edmon Chung: Sorry, I was on mute. Yeah, I think (inaudible) and I'll take a look at whether we did a response, whether this is the IDN… Also the IDN Variants Issues Project Final Report. Can you hear me okay?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, it's basically the plan for the next steps, what they're going to do next. And I gather part of it, I just wonder because I remember reading something related to this.

Edmon Chung: Yeah, this is [another one] from the Final Report, sort of a finalization of the Final Report because the Final Report Draft was put out for public comment and then finalized and included with the final report is a project plan. And certainly… I don't know whether one of the IDN liaisons went to the mailing list properly so I just sent them an update and yes, certainly, I'm looking at it and I think it will be useful for us to take a look at it and we should certainly prepare a response to that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Edmon. In fact, I note having read something about this.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, yes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And Tijani, I see your hand up so Tijani, please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yeah, okay, do you hear me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, we can hear you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, very good. So in fact we addressed this point in our statement on the Budget Framework because we saw that there is no details about the next steps but a big amount of money was put for it, as well as the implementation plan also. So if it is possible, first we need to make a statement about it – it's important in my view; and second, if we can have more detail about this plan it will be a good thing. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Tijani. So what I suggest, Edmon, is that perhaps can you do a cut and paste from the FY'13 comments that we have filed, take this… And I understand you have this week an IDN Working Group call that is going to take place and I wonder whether it would be worth discussing this to expand it, to draft a comment with the Working Group. Is this something that could be workable, Edmon? Edmon, you might either be muted or have been cut off.

Edmon Chung: Hello?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, we can hear you now.

Edmon Chung: Ah, good. So yes, I did see it in the FY'13 statement and yes, I think it should be included. And I think they have provided a little bit more information and we should expand on that, and respond on the project plan overall as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.   So is this something that you'll put then in the IDN Working Group agenda this week?

Edmon Chung: Yep.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, perfect, so let's have this then as an AI. So the IDN Variant Issues Project Proposed Project Plan for Next Steps – this will be discussed in the IDN Working Group call later this week.

So next we have the WHOIS Policy Review Team Draft Report, and of course Carlton has been working on this for quite a while. And I understand there is a call also that will take place soon, a WHOIS call. Carlton, do you have a few words on this please? And you might be muted, too.

Heidi Ullrich: Hi Carlton, this is Heidi. *7 to unmute.

Carlton Samuels:	Yes, and I was dropped. I'm back online now, yes? Yes, Chair, we have a Draft Statement out there with just one substantive comment on the Wiki. We are putting together a webinar to look at some of the issues surrounding WHOIS, hopefully one that is done where there might be comments and we intend, as you know we have a few minutes in the Policy Update in Costa Rica to discuss the statement. So let's see what happens. Thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, thank you very much, Carlton. And we'll move on then further down. The next thing is the Defensive Applications for New gTLDs. Now, this is a, let's try to look at this…. Yeah, this has a deadline of the 27th of February, that was actually yesterday; and Alan Greenberg has advised that this was not something we would wish to comment on. It's not an issue which the ALAC needed to submit a statement for.
	There is also the .cat WHOIS Proposed Changes. The deadline was the 10th of February and Carlton Samuels, in our Executive Committee call that took place mid-month mentioned that this issue would be covered in the statement of the WHOIS Review Team Draft Report. So no need to comment twice on this.
	And then we currently have a number of open policy forums… Alan, you have your hand up.

EN

Alan Greenberg: Yes, on the issue of the .cat, if the comment that is in the overall review says "Yes, we support what .cat is doing," there is no need. If the comment were to be "We don't think they should do it," or "There's something wrong with their proposed implementation," then you do need to comment during the comment period because otherwise it'll be approved, or potentially will be approved. So the two are linked. You can link the two fine if you're not looking to alter what .cat has asked.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Point taken, Alan. Carlton, do you have a response? And you're muted again… We can hear you now.

Carlton Samuels: I'm back on, thank you, Olivier – this is Carlton for the record. The issue as I'm understanding it around .cat is it is saying (inaudible) that as a generic TLD it is going to opt out of providing the WHOIS (inaudible) to the national laws of Spain. And the point we are making is that as a generic top-level domain, as long as you classify yourselves that way, I don't think you can do it.

I think the WHOIS requirement, at least everybody seems to be saying it consistently, is a question of consumer protection and therefore it remains relevant and we should continue to support it at the gTLD level.

Alan Greenberg:	That sounds like you're saying you don't think it should be done, in which case you really do need to comment in the specific comment period because otherwise the Board may… I don't know whether it will be ratified or not; the chances are it will be ratified. It is in line with what other gTLDs are doing, and they are not saying they're not going to make the information available; they'll only make information about persons, individuals available through a reasonable due process – essentially to law enforcement and other organizations that can show a reasonable need. And I believe that's not completely out of line with what has been done with [.kel]. Is it [.kel]? I'm not sure but I think so.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Alan. If I can respond to one thing – oh, go ahead Carlton.
Carlton Samuels:	If you had read the statement, Alan, you would have seen that the Draft Statement clearly makes a distinction between ccTLDs and national laws and what a gTLD [is]. We make the distinction because of the issue that comes up. If you are a resource that is common to the rest of the world then surely you have to make some determinations of what is good for the rest of the world. That's the point that we are-

Alan Greenberg:	On the other hand, .cat is saying they operate in a specific country and they must follow the laws of that country. So…
Carton Samuels:	We are very clear that we are talking about as long as you classify it as a generic top-level domain. We're very clear about that.
Alan Greenberg:	Okay, I don't want to have a debate about whether we should support it or not support it here. All I'm pointing out is if you are trying to influence what happens with the .cat [RSTEP] request then you really need to comment during that comment period.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Which actually brings me down to the calendar – it's Olivier here – the calendar being that the comments, the initial comments closed on the 10th of February and so at the moment we just are in the reply time. Of course we can submit any kind of comment prior to the end of the reply closing time, which is the 3rd of March. So I'll leave it in your hands, Alan and Carlton, to discuss this offline. I don't see anyone else particularly feeling so strongly about this, at least not on this call; I'm not seeing everyone put their hands up. But what I do note, though, is that if there is something we vehemently are against we do need to have our voice known, make our voice heard.
	Let's move on to the next thing on our agenda, and that's the current open policy forums and here we have deadlines which are

approaching. The first one is further bylaw changes following the adoption of Revised Generic Names Supporting Organization Policy Development Process. Alan, I already somehow know the answer but can you please say a few words about this and whether we need to go ahead or not with an answer?

Alan Greenberg: This I believe is a classic example of something we have absolutely no need to comment on. We and I specifically participated heavily in the process. The new PDP has already been approved by the Board. It's a [fate in complete]. These changes are changes in the bylaws, and I'll use the wording I used in a message I sent to the Executive Committee – have the onerous impact of changing things like 66% to two-thirds and 33% to one-third, and it takes a definition of a supermajority and takes it out of the middle of a sentence and puts it in its own point.

There is nothing substantive to comment on and the formatting and other things are being done well. I just don't see any reason that we need to comment on it. If anyone can come up with a reason I'll be glad to draft something, but I see no impact at all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan, and I see support from Cheryl on this. Does anyone have a comment on this? And I also see Tijani agrees with you and Carlton. So I think that this one we can definitely put as we will not be submitting a statement.

Alan Greenberg: I mean just to gild the lily, the only reason there's a comment period is the bylaws require it. Other than that it's fluff.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: There are times when the bylaws require things to be done and thankfully the bylaws are there because no one else wants it to be done, but since it's in the bylaws due process is followed.

So the next one is the Draft Roadmap to Implement SAC 051, and that would be helpful for us to have our SSAC liaison online for this. Of course, having a new SSAC liaison it's not a functional position yet. Does anyone have any information on this ahead of the Costa Rica meeting? I see Tijani has his hand up. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you Olivier. I think it's about WHOIS, too – is that it?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It certainly is about WHOIS and it's a roadmap for… SAC is kind of a notation for advice that is provided by the Security & Stability Committee and they write reports, and this report is specifically aimed at looking at the WHOIS data. It's a technical report. I don't know very much more than that… Perhaps Carlton who has put his hand up knows?

Carlton Samuels:	Yes, Chair, this is Carlton for the record. Essentially what the report says is that look, we've been having some trouble with the WHOIS protocol because it's now being used in all kinds of ways. We think we should have a defined protocol to do the same things that the WHOIS is intended to do in the ICANN work, and there are a couple of ones that are contending. And what the report says is let's have a formal way of approaching this objective, and they laid out a set of steps that they would wish to support in coming to a refinement or a re-imagination of what WHOIS was intended for.
	That's my understanding of it. I read it and it looks perfectly reasonable to me. I didn't find any red flags on it.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, thank you Carlton. So unless anyone else reads it and has anything else to say about it, for the time being let's just mark this as the ALAC does not need to submit any advice. But I invite everyone else to read through this report, and if you do think that we need to produce some advice then please raise the flag as quickly as possible. The deadline is the 18th of March.
	The next one is the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B Policy Development Process; Recommendation 8 concerning standardizing and clarifying WHOIS status messages. And so we're back with WHOIS. We have several people who might know about this online at the moment, so does anybody wish to speak about this? Carlton, your hand is still up.

EN

Carlton Samuels: Correct again. Essentially it's I think… I look at it and it seems to me all they're saying is when you make a request for WHOIS data there is some question as to what the status messages mean. And they're also concerned with the new internationalized WHOIS, the international WHOIS that is now required with IDNs. There must be some clarification in the status messages and so they're putting forward a set of criteria for that.

Yeah, it's a technical… It has, one good quality I'll say about it is it is attempting to harmonize how everybody sees the status and I think that's a good thing. I am not (inaudible) as to whether or not a comment is really required here but I will take advice from the rest of the group.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. And so once again I also invite members of the group to either email you or email the ALAC working list, or email the WHOIS working list if you do think that there should be a comment raised for this public comment period.

Next is the Interim Report on Support Significantly Interested Parties for ccTLD Delegation or Re-Delegation Requests, and I see that Cheryl Langdon-Orr has put her hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier, it's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I would suggest to you again that this is one where we have been instrumental in ensuring that the interests of internet end

users and registrants, and the (inaudible) community and ccTLDs have been certainly considered and (inaudible) to the extent that (inaudible) in this report. And so unless there is any regional advice to the ALAC, or unless some of the ALSes have any concern over this matter, we should remain silent on it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and so just like the previous advice we've had if anyone feels otherwise can they please get in touch either with you or post to the ALAC list what their concerns are regarding this.

And finally we have the Draft Advice Letter on Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition with a deadline of the 3rd of April, 2012. Of course there will be a number of sessions that will take place in Costa Rica about this and I'm not quite sure whether something needs to be written about it. I know that both Cheryl and I have been an inherent part of this Working Group. Cheryl, you've put your hand up?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, just on that I wondered if, Olivier, you'd have any opportunity in your Costa Rica meeting agenda for the ALAC to not so much make a statement but to in fact resolve its support or otherwise for this advice, remembering that this advice is in fact – once it goes through the public comment [fluff] as the various public comment periods are – will then become advice to

each of our ACs and SOs. And we have an opportunity to be a little bit preemptive and proactive, and if the ALAC has the opportunity to review this advice during Costa Rica they may be in a position to put this issue to bed if not obviously shortly afterwards (inaudible). If they do want it to happen during Costa Rica it might be wise for them to be able to either be in the room or to access the PowerPoint presentations that will be going on, particularly the presentation to GNSO which of course is in charge of the [organization] of the Work Group. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. The question, and I'm not quite sure when this will be shown to the GNSO. Is this sometime during the week or will this be in the Saturday session?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's a darn good question and I'd need to look at the material, so let me get back to you on that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you, Cheryl, because in the meantime we do have from 17:00 to 17:25, so that's 25 minutes, an update that will take place on the Sunday, 11th of March – so that's the first day that we all meet. Between 5:00 PM and 5:25 PM there'll be an update, and I gather we will be showing the slides, and maybe that will be the time where we can take a poll of members, well of everyone we have present, and show our support since as you very rightly said

this is not a cross-community working group – this is a GNSO working group which has invited us very kindly to participate in the process.

Okay, so we can now move on to the next part of our agenda. Thank you for all your input. We now have items for discussion and I understand it is half past…   Well, it's 16:30 UTC already. We are at the end of our normal time. If I may ask everyone to remain for another thirty minutes online then we can finish this agenda hopefully pretty fast.

So Item #7 is the Ratification of the ALAC/At-Large Policy Advice Development Process. I know that many of you have actually seen this already and we've now reached the stage of actually ratifying the new policy advice development process. I invite all of you to have a look at the actual diagrams and thank you very much, Dev, for having put these diagrams together. These of course were put together by Dev with the Work Teams, with the At-Large Improvement Work Team.

And they look- I'm sorry, Tijani, was that you?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, I said with the Taskforce.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The Taskforce but then it went into the Improvements Implementation Team, and so now we have to move forward with this. So what we will be doing is actually discuss this briefly, vote

on it whilst we are in Costa Rica; and in order for this to happen we need everyone here to, between now and Costa Rica, have a look at them and remember what they were about, and then we can just ratify it in Costa Rica. So that was just an announcement I guess.

Next we have the At-Large Costa Rica meeting schedule, and just a few things to point out. Shall I let Heidi take us through those?

Heidi Ullrich: Hi, Olivier, I'm happy to do so. Just firstly, we do note as you may have noted that the ICANN meeting schedule has not yet been posted. I've just been in touch with Meetings staff and they expect that to be posted either later today or tomorrow; and the reason for it not being posted is that there are still some last-minute changes going on.

But I'm just going to put in the At-Large meeting page starting on Sunday, and in terms of, given the time I just wanted to point out very briefly that there are 18 At-Large/ALAC meetings during Costa Rica in addition to a series of LACRALO events including the Showcase, capacity building sessions and the GAs, which Dev will be mentioning.

I think that most of the agendas are set except for the meeting with the NCSG, Evan. And again, that's fine. We will be translating the agendas into French and Spanish during the next week or so and I think everything else is self-explanatory. So Olivier, if you'd

EN

like me to go through it in more detail I'll do so but I'm just conscious of the time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Heidi, this is Olivier and I'm conscious of the time, too, so we can swiftly move on and I'm sure we'll all find out how painful 18 meetings are by the end of that week. [laughter] Anything else, Heidi, did you wish to…

Heidi Ullrich: No, not at this point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. And Tijani has put his hand up so, Tijani, you have the floor.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. We have to thank the staff, Heidi and the staff, for organizing those meetings because there is a big problem this time. The space is smaller and the meetings are more and more, so it was not easy to do it. So thank you, thank you, thank you Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you, Tijani, and again, thank you to my wonderful staff for helping with this, and of course Meetings staff.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Tijani, for pointing this out. Yes, it's becoming harder and harder with venues that are getting smaller, attendees that are getting more numerous but also our total craze for more meetings. And I don't know why we always go for more meetings but I guess there are a lot more things to discuss every time. So it's great to see it on paper. I wonder what we will feel like at the end of the week. I know that last time we all said "Never again," but here we go; we're back in the same boat as we were before. [laughter]

We also have the LACRALO events that are taking place, and I'm so glad to see that LACRALO will have the ability to have the Showcase and capacity building sessions, and also what I understand is about six hours of General Assembly time. So a serious amount of coffee will be required for everyone, but of course in Costa Rica coffee is a national dish I guess you can say – [you can always] get coffee. So it'll be great for everyone.

Do you wish to add a few things, Dev? I see that Jose is not online, is he?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev, are you hearing me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, we can hear you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, thank you Olivier. Jose's not on the call. I can just give a brief update. Well, we've been working very hard once we learned of the funding for the extraordinary events in Costa Rica had been approved. We are doing both a capacity building session and we are doing a LACRALO Showcase, and we are working hard to put some working sessions and General Assembly time. So it's a very crowded schedule and I have to thank At-Large staff and persons like yourselves who really helped us organize everything.

I'll just post the link to the new preparation workspace, and that will go to like some of the capacity sessions. We're trying to have the capacity sessions early in the morning and we're sharing them with the Fellowship Program. So they're [going to be] that we're working one hour with the Fellows and then one hour to do our capacity building sessions.

With regards to the Showcase, the Showcase has also been planned. We have two keynote speakers to start, and one is the Minster of Science and Technology in Costa Rica and we also have Raúl Echeberría who is the Chair of ISOC and the LACNIC CEO, and he's also been confirmed. And we are working very hard to finalize the Showcase details.

And with regards to again our work sessions, again, a lot of concerns have been expressed concerning our General Assembly time and the time allocated for our General Assembly, and as Olivier said at least six hours has now been allocated and we still have working sessions for us to really dialog and get to some better understanding, to feel like we can work better. I think that's about

EN

it. Again, I can answer any questions but the link to the website will have the full schedule of the capacity schedule, the Showcase schedule, and well, not so much the General Assembly schedule as yet. That's it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Dev, and certainly I see a lot of people on the chat clapping their hands, being happy and saying "Excellent," praising the work that's been done. And I must say I'm very, very impressed with the amount of work that LACRALO, that a lot of people in LACRALO have furnished because of the short amount of time between the announcement that the events could go ahead and the actual meeting itself. Of course there's still just over a week till the events take place and I'm sure there's a lot of work still to be done, but I'm really happy to see things move full steam ahead. Tijani, you have put your hand up.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you, Olivier – Tijani speaking. Dev, I am sure it will be a beautiful event and congratulations for all the work you are doing. I have a small question about the cooperation with the Fellowship Team. Do you already have the program of the Fellowship Team, and do you have the confirmation that they want to share with you their capacity building program?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: This is Dev; I can answer that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, please Dev, go ahead.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thanks, Tijani. Yes, we have been talking with, staff and ourselves have been talking to Janice who runs the Fellowship Program and she's agreed to really work with us to make this co-session work happen. The first [speaking] schedule has not been finalized as yet so we're trying to incorporate that into our speakers for our capacity session so that there's no duplication of speakers speaking on the same topic. So I hope that answers the question.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev, and since we are running out of time I think we have to move on with the next subject, but of course we all look forward to seeing those events in Costa Rica and no doubt it's going to be another fantastic Showcase. Always I keep on saying my most favorite thing of the week is to go to the Showcase and see what our ALSes are doing, and what real people are doing and not the usual robots that one meets in the corridors of ICANN. [laughter]

So next one – the development of the At-Large objection process. As I understand, Avri has managed to join us to say a few words about this. Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And Avri, I'm going to have to ask you to speak a little louder because we do have a few problems today. So sorry for that.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, that's okay – there's always problems with me speaking too softly for some reason.   I guess [people should be grateful that it's an occasional phone call]. Anyway, the At-Large New gTLD Working Group took very seriously the request we got from the ALAC Chair that the objection procedure, the objection process be ready for approval if at all possible by the end of the Costa Rica meeting.

To that end we've got it out in review by the RALOs and respectively by the ALSes I guess depending upon their process, and have started getting some questions and some comments in that were talked through at the last meeting; continue to keep following them. I guess the, I don't have the date in front of me but the comment period will probably end in around a week, maybe a week and a day, but in around a week and hopefully Heidi can correct me and give the correct date, which will give us

approximately a week before people get to Costa Rica to make updates.

Dev Anand, who has been carrying a very heavy [tank] on this one, meaning he's been doing a critical amount of work, has been keeping up on the edits and so every expectation is that this will be ready in time for people to review it, but it will only be a week. So then that's absolutely the best we were able to do. At that point it's really up to you all to decide whether you've had enough time with it, whether the issues have been ironed out well enough, etc., and whether to approve it or to tell us we have more work to do. Hopefully we give you something that you can approve.

The other pending issue in all of that is the issue I brought up last time I spoke on it, and I don't know if I was supposed to do anything beyond it like send an email confirming it; but there was the whole issue of the scope when it comes to community-based objections, which is one of the two types that ALAC can make. And we talked about it last time that the scope went from very narrow – meaning something that affected ALAC – to slightly wider, something that affected the RALOs and ALSes; to something wider, something that affected anything that ALSes could care about in terms of their local community, etc.

So now that's something that was sent as a scope question to you all. We've had in our last meeting one recommendation that sort of said there's really no reason to reply to that because ALAC will have to approve whether to make an objection on each individual case and that the decision will be made at that point. Now, I think

that might be a little late to not have a guideline from ALAC on what the scope is and certainly that's not—

[background conversation]

Avri Doria: Anyhow, I think I'm just about finished. So anyway, that's where we're at. You'll have something to review all things being equal, and I still have a pending question for you all; whether you—

[background conversation]

Avri Doria: Thank you.

[background conversation]

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: I think I'm actually done. I spoke for quite a while going into this late time of the meeting, so I guess if there's questions…

EN

Gisella Gruber: Over to you next, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, thank you very much, Avri, for this, and thanks for this update. And of course there is going to be a New gTLD Work Group meeting in Costa Rica on Monday, the 12th of March, that will be between 15:00 and 16:00. And I gather that you will take up the discussion during that meeting.

Avri Doria: Yes. One of the things we've put on it is a brief discussion of the objection process itself, and then especially a discussion of whatever has changed in it since it was sent for ALAC review.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. And just to close the question here, there is also a process taking place in parallel where I have been in touch with the representative from the GAC with regards to their automated web-based tool for objections. We are still in discussions to try to find out if we could make use somehow of some of the GAC's working tool for our own purposes, but this is all in progress at the moment.

And so I suggest that we move on to the next part of our meeting, and that is Item #10 on our agenda – the At-Large Improvements Taskforce where I will ask Cheryl for a quick update.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you, Olivier – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I'm very aware of the time but one of the reasons why I took the earlier preparation time to reorganize the meetings report from the group Chair's [base] was that I could then provide a link to the announcement which I've now put into the chat. The announcement here, which will act as a report from me on behalf of the At-Large Improvements Implementation Taskforce; Dev has also covered this in the timing of, as far as we know, the timing for our meeting in the Costa Rica.

Just to read very briefly for the record I'm delighted to report to the ALAC that the Taskforce after some (inaudible) has now finished its complete review of all 13 recommendations and implementation actions arriving from those, and we have completed or nearly completed… Staff is still (inaudible) and interim report to the Board Structural Improvements Committee – the SIC – before the Costa Rica meeting. On that [tranche], when that report is complete Heidi will be linking and attaching that report so you'll all have access to it in advance of your trip to Costa Rica.

We will be holding a half-day workshop on Tuesday, March 13th from 16:00 to 19:00 local time in Costa Rica and there will also be a short meeting with the SIC to review the report. That is I believe, Heidi, still to be confirmed. That's it from me but if I could also just let you know, the wider ALAC as well as the working group Taskforce know when the SIC meeting is confirmed. Thank you.

EN

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this highly efficient report. And because we are running out of time I think we should just move on to the next report for next steps, and that's the At-Large ICANN Academy Ad-Hoc Working Group.   Of course just a quick reminder, of course still on Item #10, there will be a session in Costa Rica about this so we don't need to do any discussion here.

And next, Item #11 – so the At-Large ICANN Academy Ad-Hoc Working Group.   Sandra, would you please provide us with an update and next steps?   Sandra, you still are muted.   So, not being able to have Sandra it actually reminded me to thank Cheryl very much for the huge amount of work that was done going into the next steps for the Improvements Taskforce.   And if we're not able to speak to Sandra then maybe we can then jump to #12.

Gisella Gruber: She's speaking.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: She's speaking but we can't hear her.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.

EN

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: *7 to unmute.   Maybe we can move to Item #12 and in the meantime, Sandra, if you can try and check out your technical setup so as to make sure it works.   Can we speak to Sala about the online capacity building within ICANN?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Yes, thank you, Olivier – Sala speaking for the record.   I'm just wondering if Dev is going to send everyone the link or something that I posted before into the capacity building?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, there is a link in the agenda and I have posted that into the chat.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Excellent.   Well, the truth of the matter is in terms of capacity building, you'll have noted that a survey was done some time ago, the caveat being that some of the dashboard [you would not understand some of the service knowledge].   But with the new ALS members, the dashboard would have changed and that kind of thing, and we'll see I suppose a slight difference in the statistics in relation to RALO penetration.

The reality is for At-Large, our penetration rates across the various regions are low.   There's no one (inaudible) over 50% and that sort of thing, it's not [good] penetration.   And that's one matter in relation to matters for outreach.   The second critical matter is in terms of meaningful participation.   I can't speak for other RALOs

but I do know within our own RALO we have a limited number of people working on critical issues, and there's a huge call from the ALSes who desire to be trained or who desire to be able to be informed; and not just informed, but to meaningfully participate in various calls for policies, various calls for processes and those kinds of things, and which is something that we should encourage.

And in terms of capacity building, to meet the needs of a diverse global community, especially in the fact that calls for comments and policies, calls for comments and statements have deadlines; and whether they are 14 days or 21 days – I can't remember precisely – but the issue here is being able to meaningfully participate. And it's one thing to be able to commit a statement on time; it's quite another matter for various ALSes in not-critical matters within the various ALSes or At-Large Structures to be able to push their views through so that we can truly fully embody the spirit of which At-Large was created in the first place, which is to truly represent the views of a global At-Large community.

And the recognition that one of the options that's available to capacity building as you know is (inaudible) building because ideally with the diverse community and the geographical constraints it would be challenging to have… It could be really challenging to have many face-to-face meetings. Having said that, I put a caveat to that – of course you see in the link that I posted I sort of mentioned that there are regional (inaudible) which you can sort of allude that in-country participants or in-region participants

EN

can certainly attend; and to identify a possible partnership with various organizations, things like (inaudible).

I also recognize that even with the IDNs, and I've been through the archives and I noticed that there was some [close work] done with some of the (inaudible) and the incorporated groups and that sort of thing. And quite aside from those platforms we also have web-bade platforms available to us in relation to addressing capacity building things, and it's not something that hasn't been tested. The numerous online capacity building mechanisms that have been tested, even some to do with the internet, that we could sort of lock on; but it's something that I would put to the ALAC that it's something the At-Large community could benefit from and it's something that we should consider and start working towards.

Okay, Olivier, I think I'll end there with the link.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sala, this is much appreciated. I realize we are running out of time but we do have a session on Sunday in Costa Rica that will be looking specifically at capacity building; and in fact there is one part that will speak about the ICANN Academy and about the development of a capacity building program. So there's plenty of discussion on capacity building on the Sunday and I suggest that we continue the discussion and certainly build on the excellent info you have drafted here. So thanks very much on that.

And now we have to move quickly, swiftly back to the ICANN Academy. Are we able to speak to Sandra? Sandra, I'm afraid you only have a few minutes left for this.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Olivier, can you hear me now?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We can, yes, that's great!

Sandra Hoferichter: Alright, that's fine – when I'm using the phone it's always hard but I'm using the Adobe Connect room this time. I'm sorry for this. Just a quick update. The curriculum is actually revised and it was published online, open for further comments but I haven't seen many comments because it was already discussed at length before. The next steps, which are undertaken by the Program Committee, are to invite the entire ICANN community, writing or sending them a letter explaining the project and asking them to join the upcoming ICANN Academy webinar which is most likely going to be held on Friday. And everybody from the At-Large community is also invited to join this webinar.

This presentation we will show during the webinar will also be shown during the Public Participation Committee meeting on Thursday during the ICANN meeting and I hope that as many of you are going to participate in this Public Participation Committee, because we are looking for your support for this project because

we will have the possibility to answer questions asked by the ICANN community. That's my brief comment on this due to the shortness of time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sandra. Thanks for all this hard work and I hope that we will be many people on the call that will take place soon with the webinar for all of us who don't know about it. Of course there will be discussions in Costa Rica that will follow up on this with public meetings on one side, but also with again, in our Sunday session, some time for everyone to be able to ask questions and to build into this program.

It leaves us with two more items on the agenda: the Item #13 which we have already spoken about earlier somehow because it points to the ALAC Metrics Working Group, but this one is actually just a quick mention from me on ALAC members' participation in working groups. As you will have noticed, several people have now taken the lead on specific items and I really thank them – Sala, Sandra, Cheryl, Avri, Dev. You've all taken a real leadership in specific working groups, of course in addition to people who were running working groups prior to that such as the WHOIS Working Group with Carlton, etc.

What I would like to see, and this is a personal wish and I hope that everyone agrees, is for all ALAC members to take leadership roles, not only as an ALAC member but also in specific parts of working groups. Perhaps it's taking a leadership role as the Chair

or Co-Chair of a working group or at the same time maybe being a very active participant in working groups.   So we will be discussing this in Costa Rica, and in the meantime I would advise everyone to take a look at the working groups you are interested in if there are any ALAC members who are not currently taking active parts in working groups.

And I understand there is an issue of time but there are times when you can just work for a… It's just a few hours to put together a document, etc. Anyway, that was Part #13 and now we move on to the last item of the agenda – Any Other Business.   And I understand that Evan just has one point that he'd like to ask, for a quick update on the Future Challenges Working Group. Evan, are you still here? And you are muted, no doubt.

Gisella Gruber: Olivier, he indicated in the chat that he had a hard stop and had to leave.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Ah, alas I didn't see that in the chat. Apologies for this, in which case are there any other businesses to be dealt with here? I see here… Yaovi can talk for two minutes?

Yaovi Atohoun: Yes, can you hear me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes we can, Yaovi, please go ahead.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yeah, first of all thank you, again, for this opportunity. I was active for many years and I am very grateful that this is working because my battery just went down and I have a good battery now, and I was able to continue following the meeting. So thank you very much for that.

My point is related to the (inaudible) meeting time. I know that many people, they are obliged to be up at 4:00 or 2:00 AM. I want to make this suggestion again, if it's possible that we can move the meeting up three hours, like 6:00 PM? It's just a suggestion, just to have it in mind and then we can talk about it later. It will make people not have to get up very early and then the people that are working, they can be available after working hours. I know it's difficult to find an appropriate time for everybody but moving it from 3:00 to 6:00 might help many people. Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Yaovi, for this suggestion. I have heard that in the past, the way that we usually find the most suitable time for everyone is by having a Doodle poll. And I totally understand that some people have to wake up really early, and I guess for some people it might make it a little bit late to have it later. I'm not quite sure what the best solution is but perhaps can I suggest another Doodle poll? I see there's a huge amount of following on

the call itself, so with so many people on the call I imagine we'd get a lot of response on a Doodle poll as well.

Can I ask Gisella to send out a Doodle with suggested times? So the current time of course but also times, is it three hours later? If we can do two, three, four hours later and find out how that works. I know that earlier is a little hard on people in the US and in the Americas, North and South America. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, just to point out that for the last two years or so or year and a half the GNSO has been rotating times, so there's I think three different meeting times that try to spread the pain around. So sometimes I have a 3:00 meeting in the morning and sometimes it's in the afternoon. Obviously at any given meeting somebody's going to be inconvenienced. It seems to be working well so you may want to look at something like that also.

The other hand side is what we do right now with always having it at the same time, and it's predictable and lets you map out meetings many months ahead of time. But it's an option we may want to look at.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Alan. So this is a point taken. I see in the chat many people saying "spread the pain," and in some people's minds the Doodle will not give the option of rotation. What we can do though is to find the most suitable hours for a possible rotation.

This has been discussed quite a few times. Maybe we can have a quick poll when we are in Costa Rica face-to-face and we all end up in the same time zone.

And with this it's six minutes past the hour. We have reached the end of this call. Thanks to everyone for having spent the past two hours on the call. I hope it was very informative for you and I look forward to seeing you all in Costa Rica, and for those who unfortunately will not be able to make it physically there I hope that you will be able to follow us remotely by using the wonderful facilities that hopefully will be working when we're there.

So thanks to everyone, thanks to staff for all of the work in putting together the agenda today, and also putting together the agenda in Costa Rica; and see you in a few weeks. This meeting is adjourned.

[End of Transcript]