

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone, and welcome to the ALAC monthly conference call on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of May, 2012. The time is 14:07 UTC. I welcome everybody on the English channel and of course our colleagues on the Spanish and the French channels as well. And the first thing that we're going to do is the adoption of the agenda and ask to call for any other business or other amendments.

Now, I note there was a request from Alan for a piece to be added to any other business. Alan, was that GNSO-related?

Alan Greenberg: It was related to the JAS recommendation and I think Avri will be on in the second hour to also talk about that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so we'll keep that in any other business.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, hearing no one else let us... Oh, I see Evan. Evan, you've put your hand up.

---

*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.*

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, Olivier. I'm just wondering if there's... I'm looking in the agenda to whether or not there's mention of the Future Challenges... Oh sorry, it's Item #11, never mind.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes there is, Evan. Yes.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, sorry. Never mind.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan, and thank you, Jean-Jacques. Yes it is there, and you will notice that our agenda is 17 parts' long so we better fly through this and immediately move on to Item #2 which is the roll call and apologies.

Gisella Gruber: Welcome to everyone on today's ALAC call on Tuesday the 22<sup>nd</sup> of May. On today's call we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Ron Sherwood, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Alan Greenberg, Eduardo Diaz who will be joining us shortly; Ganesh Kumar, Salanieta Tamanikawaiamaro. On the Spanish channel we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Fatima Cambroner. Apologies noted today from

Tijani Ben Jemaa, Oksana Prykhodko, Yrjö Länispuro, Julie Hammer and Jose Arcé.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Gisella Gruber. Interpreters on the Spanish channel are Veronica and Sabrina, and on the French channel Clare and Camilla. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. If so, please state your names now. Also I want to just remind everyone to please state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes but also to allow the interpreters to identify the speakers on the other line. Thank you, over to you, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Gisella, and we can now go directly to the review of the action items from our last meeting that took place on the 17<sup>th</sup> of April, our last conference call. I invite you all to go over to the Wiki page which has the long-term goals and the open action items. We will not go through all of the page; I invite you to just look at the current action items at the bottom of the page, and those are as follows. The first one: the Rules of Procedure Working Group members to create a glossary of commonly-used nomenclature. I notice nothing next to it – would anyone have a follow-up on this one, please? Perhaps Cheryl?

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thanks, Olivier – Cheryl for the transcript record. It took a moment to unmute. That is actually part of the job of the Rules of Procedure Group. It's one of their action items, to include a glossary as one of the appendixes to the Rules of Procedure. But we should also note that the acronym, (inaudible), whatever you want to call it is now a standing item at the bottom of the ICANN webpages. I think we should probably make greater use of that as well, being a live document or a document I should say in a live space where when one group or another comes up with yet another piece of alphabet soup, a mixture of levels which is incomprehensible even to some of us in ICANN, let alone the newbies or from outside of ICANN, it automatically goes into that acronym analysis and glossary tool.

So no, it hasn't been done in terms of a completed item; it's still an ongoing action, and it will be an ongoing action until the new Rules of Procedure are drafted, written but also adopted by the ALAC. But it is part of that role, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and since this is a Rules of Procedure Working Group action item now may I just say that this is passed on to the Rules of Procedure Working Group and the ALAC itself can close it?

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl for the record. I would have thought it should have already been in that state, but let me make it more [personal and formal] – an absolute yes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. So it now is. Second: At-Large staff to move forward with the SOI and COI page, otherwise known as the Statement of Interest and the Conflict of Interest page. Let's just stay away from finding what the difference is between the two. What we do have to know is that this is in progress and a template is currently under development. Any update on this, Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: Hi Olivier, thank you – this is Heidi for the record. My understanding is that Alan, well I know that Alan and Carlton have spoken with the consultant who is preparing that and the consultant did updating (inaudible). Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Any questions or can we move to the next? Okay, next is Gisella to prepare a document showing ALAC members' current membership in working groups... Maybe we should take away "by the next ALAC meeting" because this is the next ALAC meeting and it was several ALAC meetings ago. Gisella, is it still in progress?

Gisella Gruber: Sorry, Gisella here. Yes, in progress.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. I would say just take away the “by the next ALAC meeting” because this is a running joke now that goes from month to month. But please, Gisella, if you can try and move this forward that would be of great help.

Next is after each ALAC meeting Silvia to send APRALO leadership a list of the PCs the ALAC will and will not be responding to. So that’s the public comments. Has this been done now or is this starting from this ALAC meeting?

Silvia Vivanco: I’ve already (inaudible).

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Silvia, and I did have a lot of echo from you but what I understood was you’re already doing it and you will keep on doing it also from this call as well.

Okay, next: the recently closed action items, and I thought we’d just quickly read through those so we know these ones have been closed. The first one was “After the New Year staff to work with Cheryl Langdon-Orr in preparation of the Rules of Procedure

Working Group and Metrics Working Group,” and there was to be a call for membership. That’s of course done and I’m extremely happy to hear that now the Rules of Procedure Working Group and the Metrics Working Group are working quite hard and moving swiftly forward.

Next, Silvia Vivanco and Gisella Gruber to ensure that the transcript of the 24<sup>th</sup> of January ALAC meeting is to be saved for the Rules of Procedure Working Group so they can review it once they begin their work. Cheryl, has this been passed on as well as a Rules of Procedure Working Group action item, so it’s duly noted?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

It has not, I’m afraid, no. That was Cheryl for the record.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Cheryl. Perhaps could this be transferred over to the Rules of Procedure Working Group for it to know that it exists and is not forgotten, and of course for it to be taken into account in the Rules of Procedure Working Group work? And I hear that Carlton has also just joined us, so welcome Carlton and we are quorate.

Okay, so any comments on the action items? And if we don’t then we can move on. I see no one putting their hand up so let’s move on to the next part of our agenda, and that’s the review of the ALS applications, the At-Large Structure applications. We had quite a

---

few At-Large Structure applications – shall I let Matt go through this? Oh no, Matt is away this week.

Matt Ashtiani: No, I'm here right now, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, Matt is here. Oh, hallelujah, fantastic. Well Matt, you have the floor.

Matt Ashtiani: Hello everyone, this is Matt for the record and I'm just getting out my paperwork right now. So for the list of current ALSes that we have, we have four open at the moment, or actually three, excuse me. The first one is AFRALO, the [ATTD] IT application from Chad. The current stage is we are awaiting regional advice. There was some regional advice but I believe they've been asked to clarify it. The other two open applications are the LACRALO ALSes where they've been asked to clarify the regional advice for not accepting the applicant, and those are the National Association for Digital Inclusion and the Association of Notary Public Professionals or Uruguay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much for these, and of course we have recently approved the ALS applications and a warm welcome goes



over to Wikimedia Austria and also to the Media [Education] Center NGO which is based in Armenia. So I think that's the second or the third Armenian At-Large Structure we now have, so a warm welcome and we look forward to having more input from more At-Large Structures. Any question or updates on the current applications undergoing the [equitization] process? I see Sergio has put his hand up – Sergio, you have the floor.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Thank you, Olivier. This is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. Good afternoon, good morning and good evening, everyone. I just wanted to raise a point of clarification regarding the Notary Public Association of Uruguay. If I recall correctly we had also an Association from Brazil who ALAC members had requested the LACRALO Secretariat to call for a consultation among LACRALO membership to see their opinion on these organizations. I know that this is going to be shortly implemented so we will await our region's bottom-up input in order to face our abuse on this topic. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Sergio Salinas Porto. It's very helpful to have the latest news on these, and I ask if there is anyone else who wishes to comment? I see no one else putting their hand up so we can move on to the next part of our call and that's the report – the RALO and the Liaison reports and of course the ALAC

monthly reports as well. I have to just mention that on the RALO and Liaison reports I have received a note from Wolf to apologize for the delay in the EURALO report for this month and for last month. It's been written but it's not been put up on the site. But I have to thank everyone who has put their reports up; it's always extremely helpful.

As far as the Liaison reports are concerned we usually go through them, although I have actually seen first Wolf has put his hand up. So Wolf, do you wish to comment on what I've just said perhaps?

Wolf Ludwig:

Yes, Wolf Ludwig for the record. Olivier, I was a bit late; it was just a short information on the approvals of the new ALS applicants and regarding the Media Education Center from Armenia, what you've just mentioned. For our next Secretariats' meeting in Prague on the 27<sup>th</sup> to my memory there will be an agenda item where we will discuss a cross-RALO cooperation of certified ALSes, and I think the Media Education Center may become such an example where they may be involved in both regions – in APRALO and in EURALO. But we will discuss concepts and details of this in our Secretariats' meeting in Prague, just for your info. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Wolf, bearing in mind though that an ALS can only register in one region at a time as part of the ALAC bylaws. But yeah, I'm sure the discussion will take place in Prague. So we're now moving back to the reports, and so the Liaison reports, we usually don't go through them. I invite you all to read through them, however I do usually let Cheryl Langdon-Orr, our ccNSO Liaison, and also Alan Greenberg, our GNSO Liaison, to say a few words about what's been happening in "their part of the world." Cheryl Langdon-Orr, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I like the fact that my "part of the world," and of course my part of the world is the world with ccNSO. Just a short addition to the most recent updates that I've done on the Wiki page, which I'm sure you all are avid readers of since you all subscribe to every change I make. And just as an aside there, Olivier, might I point out what I think is a very good tool addition now to the updated Wiki features, where you used to have to tick to say that what you're updating was only a minor thing and that "the email [list] has been changed" note did not need to go out is now of course a situation of an opt-out. So when I made a minor change in the last few days to the Wiki space as the ccNSO Liaison I noticed I had to check to say I did want it to be emailed out. And I think that's a good change; it'll stop the people's email boxes getting

---

full of Confluence updates as I'd encourage all of us who update Wiki pages to tick that carefully.

My short intervention, having done that aside which is actually longer than my intervention, is to let you know that the ccNSO has recently received another membership application for .km – that's the ccTLD of the Comores. They are an [org city] for IANA so it is assumed that .km's membership will go through and that will become a member of the ccNSO shortly – if not at the end of the month then at the very beginning of the following month. And that will mean 132 members of the ccTLD community will have joined the ccNSO, and I think that's something that we need to be very aware of because of course there's going to be opportunities for growth there, cooperation and crossover between a number of our At-Large Structures [whoever they may be] and those ccTLD operators. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And I'll now turn to Alan Greenberg and ask him for his short summary of what's happening in the GNSO Council.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'll comment first on the ccNSO, which I think is interesting and I don't think it's been emphasized. One of the issues related to ccNSO membership is that should the ccNSO pass

policy on any given issue it is binding on ccNSO members. So even though ICANN doesn't hold sway over them in general, a ccNSO member is bound by any formal policy the ccNSO does take and therefore the fact that we now have a majority of country codes in the ccNSO and growing does have great import should it ever be necessary to pass important policy regarding whatever – just a little insight.

In terms of the GNSO, my report is much longer than normal, at least I think it is. I suggest people read it. There's a lot going on, not a lot definitive at this point. As we'll talk about later there's some concern in the [GNSO] about the JAS effort and the Applicant Support process right now. The Red Cross Drafting Team, the IOC/Red Cross Drafting Team we think is still going ahead to address the specific concerns that the GAC raised and forwarded by the Board although that's not 100% clear at this point, but it looks like the GNSO has accepted the fact that it does have to address the issues that were put on its table for the first round, that is.

There is a bunch of things going on in [Abusive Support]. There was a significant discussion on the cancellation of Friday Board meetings; I think people are a lot more comfortable now than before but not completely. There is still some concern on the ICANN Academy specifically related to has it been formally approved, who's going to formally approve it, who's going to fund it; but the GNSO will be participating actively in the process. And

---

the rework of the [URF] which came out of the blue in the budget again, it's not clear what the current outcome is but there's a little bit of summary in my report.

The last thing is there was a presentation that was originally supposed to be given in Costa Rica that was deferred for several meetings on an overview of the new PDP process. It uses some graphics that were just inspired, they're quite marvelous, and so I suggest if people are looking for what that process is they take a look at the presentation and perhaps listen to the description as it points to in the MP3. And that's about all. I do note the name of the graphics designer and should we ever want some good graphics designed we may want to ask ICANN's IT people to specifically put him on – it was quite inspired. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan. Just one question for you with regards to cross-community working groups, I understand there were some calls for some new ones, or some of them expanding or being reorganized?

Alan Greenberg: You're going to have to remind me of one because I don't remember something like that, but maybe I would remember it under a different title.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I might have to look for it. It's just I vaguely saw a call for membership. I'm not sure whether there are any new working groups being created at the moment but it would be good to keep track of that because of the fact that as you've said in the past, they are open to our members and it is interesting. And it's important, often important for the ALAC to get involved early on whether than just us commenting [inevitably] at the end.

Alan Greenberg: There are drafting teams, there are rather working groups being formed but I don't think there were any cross-community ones or multiple-chartered ones. Maybe I'm forgetting something but I'm not aware of one.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, not multiple-chartered. I think we're just talking about new ones being formed that would benefit from input from elsewhere. I see Cheryl has put her hand up; perhaps she has the answer to that. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier, this is Cheryl for the transcript record. Your last sentence made it a little bit clearer. I was just going to say that the last joint work group that I was aware of having a recent call for renewed membership was of course the JIG which is the joint ccNSO and GNSO activity. If you're talking more general

---

---

work groups then yeah, they're open to all, so that's slightly different to a cross-community thing.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, Olivier, there are a number of things that are about to be kicked off. I don't think there are any calls that are outstanding today other than old ones which people are still welcome to join. There have been some comments about the Red Cross/IOC one about why wasn't it open and it always has been open. If anyone cares to participate there's still a lot of work to be done and the work is just starting on the second level work. So if people have an interest in seeing an outcome in a certain way or in seeing no outcome then participation is the only way to impact that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Alan. Any comments from anyone else on the floor or questions to Alan or to Cheryl, or indeed to any of our other Liaisons who might be on the call? And unfortunately I think they're not.

Seeing no questions we can then move to the next part of our call which is the new business items for decision, and I'd like you all to



go to the policy development calendar which I did ask yesterday for it to be replaced by the actual wonderful table that Matt has done instead of pointing to the spreadsheet which hasn't been updated in the past few months.

Anyway, the recently approved ALAC statements: there were quite a few of them last month and in fact I think it was a record number of statements that were drafted. I have to thank absolutely everyone who was involved in that work, both the people holding the pen but also the people who helped formatting it together and brought in their comments, and who channeled in the comments from their community. It really is important to have a voice and last month was really fantastic on this.

We currently have a number of statements being reviewed. The first one is the draft fiscal year '13 Operating Plan and Budget. Tijani Ben Jemaa is drafting the statement. He has actually emailed me a preliminary copy. It closes on the 24<sup>th</sup> of May which is in two days' time. I think we might take a few more days to open about five days' of comments from members; and Tijani has basically been working quite hard on relaying all of the discussions that we had already in the past as far as the Budget was concerned and he went through the plan quite efficiently and quite carefully. If there are any questions or suggestions on that please put it on the Wiki. I think that there is a link from the page

there so you'll be able to put it in there, and I expect the statement to go on there in the next 24 hours.

There are a number of open policy forums, recently opened ones. The first one is the proposed revised process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership restrictions on operators of existing gTLDs. So far we haven't made any choice as to whether a statement should be drafted or not. Would anyone like to speak to this, please? And perhaps Alan, since you are our GNSO Council and I believe that that looks like GNSO Council business.

Alan Greenberg:

To some extent. I guess the answer is we're not sure at this point. If one remembers or if you were involved then the ALAC and At-Large were split regarding whether vertical integration was good or not. That question is off the table right now; the Board said vertical integration is in. The question at this point is what should the methodology be for phasing it in for the existing registry operators? I have some concerns but I really need to read the documents first.

My real concern is one of the options is for registry operators to simply adopt the new policy, the new contract. I don't know what the financial implications on Verisign are for doing that so I don't know whether there's a chance they're going to opt for that or not. I suspect that that would cost them an awful lot of money

---

and they will not opt for it. On the other hand, the new registry contract does not have price caps. Now there is an issue of market power there, which clearly .com has...

[busy signal on line]

Alan Greenberg: Hello, am I still here?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You still are.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Anyway, at this point we're still looking at it. I'm not sure whether we should submit a comment. I'm going to try to have something done by the end of this week of my opinion on it, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Alan. Let's move then to the next one which is the WHOIS Policy Review Team final report, and I know that for this one there has been a fair amount of discussion going on. Perhaps should I let Carlton speak about this, please?

Carlton Samuels: Can you hear me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We can hear you but you've got an echo.

Carlton Samuels: As you say, Olivier, there has been interesting discussions on the list (inaudible) the report on the list. I really haven't seen one new idea (inaudible)-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Carlton, we can't hear you very well at all. I'm not sure what the problem is or maybe it's only on my side, but I can hear a lot of blowing on the microphone and not much else, it's sort of cutting.

Carlton Samuels: I'm using a [cordless mic], I'm not sure.

Gisella Gruber: Carlton, we're not able to interpret at this stage. It may be because you're coming through your computer. If you send me a number I'm happy to dial out to you.

Carlton Samuels: Can I ask (inaudible).

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm sorry, Carlton, this is Olivier here. I can't even hear what you would like to ask us.

Gisella Gruber: This is Gisella here. We are dialing out to Carlton now. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Gisella. We'll move on to the next one which is the draft statement from ICANN (inaudible) and Remit in Security, Stability and Resiliency of the Internet Identifier System. That's a wider, more of an internet governance-type statement or public comments. I open the floor for discussion or suggestions regarding this. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl for the transcript record. I know it's a statement on a statement but I think it's a statement that the ALAC should consider making, albeit I assumed a fairly brief and warm and fuzzy one. The type of document we're looking at here is one of those structural and foundation-type pieces which is easy enough to have a few people draft [via] a Board or Board and staff team. But what is important to its actual power and credibility is to have the component parts of ICANN either buy into it or not. So whilst I'm not big on making just [mother good]-type statements I think this is in fact one of those that we do or dare I say perhaps you

---

don't – I would like to think you do however – endorse that this is one of those times that we encourage the ALAC to do that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and in fact we did have a previous statement which was related to the SSR Review Team – Stability and Security Review Team. I wonder if we should perhaps ask our Liaison to the SSAC to have a glance over this and see if we should add to that, or perhaps ask those who were involved in the last SSR RT statement, well the statement we made about that, to see if there's anything else we should say about the one we have here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, Cheryl if I may for the record again. I know Julie's not on the call. I know she was instrumental in polishing if not drafting the last statement or bludgeoning it into something that could be regarded as intelligible. So yeah, I think that's a good idea but I would suggest that this is one of those things that probably should go to the ALAC as a Committee as a whole with sufficient time for them to have good comments and a [process] on the Wiki before you take it to endorsement vote, because it is one of those principled types of documentation [on the other end of it].

So perhaps if I could encourage an action item for a (inaudible) that that could be reworked out of existing documentation to respond to this specific statement. I certainly would be happy to assist on wording here because it does come into the core value work that I've done over the years as the previous Chair of (inaudible) and the DSSA, and I was just thinking, Olivier, that if it's not something that maybe your Committee as a whole then certainly your Executive Committee should pay a close eye on it and [be] involved in it. You might want to have such a draft come to your ExCom, your next ExCom meeting. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and with the amount of time that we have on our hands, which is very little, I would suggest that we perhaps do the two in parallel. The ExCom will be meeting later on this week but at the same time the request could be sent to Julie Hammer, our Liaison for anything related to the SSAC and security. And because she has drafted the last, she has held the pen in the last statement we made she would be knowledgeable about this. So action item: contact Julie Hammer about this statement and also put it on the ALAC ExCom agenda for discussion. Is the action item recorded?

Matt Ashtiani:

Yes, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Matt. If we can now go back to the previous one, which is the WHOIS Policy Review Team final report, I understand that Carlton Samuels is back online. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Olivier. This is Carlton Samuels for the record. Are you hearing me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Carlton, we are hearing two of you. You're going to have to shut down the microphone of your-

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Olivier, this is Carlton Samuels for the record.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, better.

Carlton Samuels: I was saying that you're quite right. There was quite a flurry of activity on the WHOIS list after I posted the notice of the final report from the WHOIS Review Team. I would recommend to the ALAC that they make a fulsome vote to endorse this report and I'll tell you why. The report itself is an improvement; it's a [signaled] improvement on the draft in my opinion because it literally

---



outlines not just the recommendations but implementation steps. I would note also that the final report actually endorses some of the extended ALAC positions and on that basis I thought it was a homerun.

Subsequent to that there was an interesting idea, a concept that was introduced to the list, and that was the idea of a third party – giving third parties standing to sue in terms of WHOIS infractions. The idea is that it's a contract, it's a contract. The WHOIS is [vested] in the RAA and all of the parties of the contract then have a standing to bring action. However, the feeling is that because in some instances ICANN itself might be lax in enforcing its own contract. Then what might be appropriate is for the contract to specifically give standing to third parties who sue – it's an interesting idea.

I'm not sure I've seen much pushback on that idea from the list, but that is the only thing that was kind of introduced a little bit. Most of the entrenched positions are the same. Some people still believe that you should break it down by natural law. The biggest problem of course is there are people who think that ordinary internet users have no right to be able to access WHOIS data, and that's the biggest one that has been trolled around; and the idea is that if you make it so that they can only access it via national or under national constraints then it would be better.

I don't support that view. That's the [vulcanization] of a global resource and that is much too nationalistic in my view, and it seems to me that most of us agree on that. So I came to push for the ALAC to endorse the report fully. I intend to hold the pen on writing a brief ALAC statement which I will put out by tomorrow on the Wiki and then we can take it from there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, thank you very much, Carlton, and I see a few people have put their hands up so we will go in turn. First we have Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. Sala, you have the floor. At the moment we can't hear you. Okay, Sala, we can't hear you at the moment. I see here, oh – that is, "I agree with Carlton that ordinary internet users should be able to access WHOIS information." This is in the chat from you.

Perhaps I should let Alan Greenberg speak first and then, Sala, if you're able to get through with the microphone you can have the floor afterwards. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you, a couple of things. First of all, in summary I support Carlton's position that we should support the recommendations. I thought that the overall report was masterful in that it sidestepped all of the controversial issues, which would just get mired in quicksand again if we went into them, and identified

things that can be done and should be done; and squarely put responsibility on ICANN to say “We may not have a perfect WHOIS but we can solve a whole bunch of the problems if ICANN decides it’s serious and chooses to act.” And I’d like to see something like that in the summary, because I think it’s important that a lot of what the report says we and other people have been saying for ages; and it has been totally ignored and this one hopefully they can’t ignore. That’s point number one.

Point number two is there was a lot of discussion on the list not on the report but what wasn’t in the report. Part of it was led by one of the ALAC representatives on the report and essentially focused on the issues of privacy and whether individuals should be subject to having their WHOIS information revealed or not. And after a long discussion I made an intervention that pointed out that if indeed ALAC feels or At-Large feels that registries should implement privacy on WHOIS to protect the registrants who don’t want their information revealed, this is a policy issue, it is an issue which several registries have requested and ICANN has approved. And it is a policy issue in which the ALAC could initiate a PDP on, or request the initiation of a PDP on. But instead of talking about it unendingly, if indeed we feel strongly that this is an issue – and that’s up to the community to decide or not – then the ALAC should take some action on it and lead the way instead of just complaining that no one’s doing the right thing.

Interestingly that silenced the conversation completely. There was absolutely no follow-on after it. [laughter] And my third point is on the issue of thick versus thin WHOIS, which again came up in the subject of certain people pushing the fact that thick WHOIS is bad and thin WHOIS is good: it's quite interesting that the hiding of personal information and releasing it only to those who are particularly privileged and have the correct rights, thin WHOIS allows you to implement local rules easier. That's true, but it would be almost impossible to localize widespread rules because you have registrars in virtually every country in the world who are controlling their own data and not necessarily following the overall policy that is going to be requested of them.

So it's just interesting that our discussion immediately leapt from the review report into the subjects that are continually coming up without resolution, and I think we need to take a leadership position; and if indeed these are subjects which are important to At-Large and ALAC – and I'm not saying they are, but if they are because they generate so much traffic on our list then we should do something about it instead of just complaining. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: That's not quite a subject that was on here but I think it's one that comes up, and I think we should be doing something.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Alan, very helpful. And you touched on the thick WHOIS versus thin WHOIS religious debate. One thing which I have noticed is people do often make a mistake thinking that thick WHOIS means a WHOIS with a lot of information and thin WHOIS is a WHOIS with only a name or just a one-liner about the registrant. Can you enlighten us, please?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, certainly. The difference is not the information collected or how that information is revealed. The difference is where does the bulk of the information reside. In thick WHOIS most of it is collected by the registrar but it resides in and the registry has custody of it in a centralized location. In thin WHOIS the registrar keeps and releases that at their own will and according to their own rules, whatever the details are other than... The only thing that's kept by a registry in a thin WHOIS is when the domain expires and who the registrar is – effectively that is all. The rest relies on the registrar to maintain and to produce. Thank you.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan. And of course for registrars that don't implement a WHOIS, the only information one has then is the name of the domain and what registrar is being used.

Alan Greenberg: Well, every registrar is required to implement WHOIS if they have any domain names.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, but they might have a very restricted WHOIS.

Alan Greenberg: Then they're in violation of the contract.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That is something which Compliance I think has been following recently as well, and I've heard several discussions taking place. Anyway, we are moving on in a tangent at the moment. Thank you and we'll just wait for 24 hours when Carlton is going to draft a statement, and no doubt there will be more points, more discussion taking place. If I can ask Matt to create a Wiki page specifically for this if it's not already been created and let Carlton know where to put this.

I'm eager to move on and we can move to the next thing, which is the draft ICANN Language Services policy and procedures. That is

---

one, a public comment period that closes on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of July so we have a fair amount of time for this one, though it is particularly important since we rely on our five regions and we rely on our interpreters very much in order to bring the voice from all of our five regions. So I open the floor for discussion and I see Cheryl has already put her hand up. So Cheryl, you have the floor.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Olivier – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. This is one of those times where there should be little debate and no doubt that the ALAC does need to respond with a statement to this public comment. I've been quite pleased with what I read in reviewing the might I say long-awaited but now here and much welcomed document that's come out as our Language Services draft. I personally would recommend a very affirmative and welcoming response from the ALAC to it. I think we should probably point out that not only have we been particular beneficiaries of what is now going to be a Language Services policy but we have been an initiator, a test bed and indeed a testing space for it; and that we've seen the net benefit in terms of productivity when it works well.

And we trust that with the new Language Services policy if and when it is adopted, and the procedures including a review process – which I think is delightful to see in such an initial documentation; when that does come to pass, and I trust that it

will, we can only build a much stronger and more robust system that will benefit the whole of the ICANN community and indeed our target markets, if I can use the At-Large [aplomb] for a moment for the general [registrant] and internet end user. I was delighted to see the inclusion of I think pretty much all of the things I've heard come out of the At-Large and ALAC wish list on the matter since about 2007, and I was in some of the history in the documents being perhaps less credited to the requirements, the needs, and the badgering in some cases of the ALAC to get some of this up and running previous to Heidi, the Director of At-Large who was utterly instrumental in the first round of the documentation language for what was then called "Interpretation Policies."

I'm not sure that the history that is written in the Language Services Policies and Procedures document is as generous to the detail as I'd like it to be but I'm certainly not going to dime and [pinch] over the accuracy. It's not all accurate; it's not just perhaps as wholly inclusive as it should be, but we have to say something and we have to say something that I think would be affirmative, and I'd be more than happy to be on a small work group to pen that. And perhaps we could meet with a small amount of time devoted over coffee and a little bit, [two eggs] during the Prague meeting to polish that up.



Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and I see agreement from Jean-Jacques Subrenat and from Carlton Samuels as well on the Adobe Connect at the moment. I think that this is a statement actually which affects some of our regions so much I would really like to see involvement from those regions, specifically in LACRALO and the AFRALO regions. And so with this having a closing date after the Prague meeting I totally support your suggestion, Cheryl, of having a discussion about this over coffee with our friends from AFRALO and LACRALO; perhaps even having our colleagues hold the pen from that region.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Great.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Hello, this is Jean-Jacques, can I jump in?

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

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, thanks Olivier. Apparently my sign to raise my hand doesn't work so I'm sorry for that. So two or three remarks: one is that finally ICANN has accepted to have a linguistic policy with the proper vocabulary, a "language policy" or "linguistic policy." It

used to be called “Translation Policy” for a long time so that’s an improvement.

The second point is that I agree with Cheryl’s suggestion that we should react to this and commend what has been done, and the way forward which was proposed. My third point is that we should also do some drum beating and bring all of this to the attention of our wider community through our network because I think it’s an important point for outreach, for public participation and therefore for the general user. And of course that dimension can also be integrated into whatever reaction we draft in order to acknowledge this progress made in ICANN. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. And next is Sergio Salinas Porto. Sergio, you have the floor.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you, Chair. For the record this is Sergio Salinas Porto. I just raised my hand to volunteer as a member for the Drafting Team. I would like to know if I would have any LACRALO colleague or maybe a colleague from another region, probably AFRALO who’d like to draft this document with me? Thank you.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sergio. Well, how I understand things will happen is probably from now until Prague the people who wish to take part can start thinking about what they would like to have in the statement, obviously read the policy from end to end and have a discussion then around coffee in Prague so as to then have a statement drafted hopefully by the end of our Prague meeting and perhaps having a statement that we can ratify whilst we are meeting in Prague. That also depends of course on the amount of work that we will have at the time and whether at the last moment we will not have something else to do as a priority. Hopefully that's the way forward.

So I'll ask staff to make sure that Sergio is noted as wishing to be a part of the Drafting Team, and perhaps to collect the names of any others in advance in case anything needs to be prepared in advance so as to find the correct time for a coffee break. We have a little bit more time in Prague than we had in Costa Rica due to having less events to run simultaneously so hopefully that will be possible.

And I think we have to move on now to the next part of our items for discussion, and that's the draft ALAC statement on the Verisign request to implement the reduction grace period, the RGP, for .name discussion and vote. Alan, you have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: I thought that was listed as something we've already decided on.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:           Yep.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:       Was that from the last...

Alan Greenberg:               On the agenda it says it's already decided.

Heidi Ullrich:                 Yes, please refresh your agendas and again, the agenda in the upper right-hand pod is correct as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:       Okay, right, now that's clear. You change the agenda as I read it. [laughter] Alright, so we can then move on. I did think this was a little strange because we'd already made that [mistake on the call]. Anyway, let's move on then to Item #7, the ALAC/At-Large vision statement, and a working group had been meeting in Costa Rica to discuss and prepare a vision statement and so then a follow-up was done with a lot of comments being received. I think I'll let Cheryl Langdon-Orr expand on this, but expand briefly please. Cheryl, you have the floor.

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Olivier. Well, what can a girl say? A huge amount of work done and we would like to thank in particular the work group where we met early in my today and in your yesterday. I was really delighted with the amount of commentary and interaction that went into the Wiki space that gave us a huge amount of product to go over and to use to create the particular text which we are recommending to the ALAC that it endorse.

We have taken a “less is more” attitude to vision statements. The work group was particularly keen to see something that was as concise and as meaningful as possible. To that end we did recognize the discussion on the terminology and uses, the word “catalyze” or “catalyst” spent its time in the discussions. We felt, and I think it was a clear consensus between that “catalyst” was still the preferred term but that we did in square brackets an alternate term, and in this case it was – here I’ve had a mental blank now... “Initiate,” there, I knew it would come back to me.

And if there’s anyone who’s taken the time to look at a thesaurus, the term “initiate” really does speak very much to staff and we believe the word “catalyze” tends to indicate more of an ongoing and change aspect. So we would obviously like to see “catalyst” stay and the very short vision statement that we put forth to the ALAC for consideration to be agreed upon, but we do recognize that perhaps there is a [contiguous] feeling about an alternate word. I’d suggest it be something like “initiate” but we would like to see that any alternate word is chosen by the ALAC to

---

particularly see that it's not just a matter of a beginning of an action or activity; that the role of ALAC working through its At-Large community is a great deal more than that. And with that I'd like to recommend text for the committee to review. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and it is worth noting that yesterday night, or my yesterday night – a few hours ago, let us say – the working group came together and had a follow-on discussion on this, and one thing which wasn't quoted was that many of those words – “catalyze,” “initiate,” “facilitate” – many of those words had been handled already in Costa Rica with the known list of words being used. And so some of the suggestions which were made in the comments on the Wiki were words that had already been considered by the group, and for one reason or another had been put aside due to whatever reason it was or consensus not being found on those.

It is difficult of course to have the perfect wording, but this is really as best as one could have found considering how short and how to the point the statement needed to be. I see that Alan has put his hand up, so Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I'll make an overall caveat that I support the statement that I think Carlton made on the list, that I'm not a fan

of vision statements. That being said I think this one is pretty good. I think it's short and concise. I did raise a flag on "catalyze" as I was worried to what extent it will translate well and be understood well. That being said, "initiate" does not replace it at all. "Catalyze" can mean initiate; it also means to facilitate, and specifically it means "speed up" a process. And if we were to replace "catalyze" because it is not going to render itself well in other languages I think it's going to have to be replaced by several words, not by one; and I think that that will make that sentence significantly more complex.

So I think we have an issue of complexity due to a complex term, or complexity due to the sentence structure getting even more unwieldy than it already is and it's pretty unwieldy as it is right now. [laughter] One wonders if perhaps it should have been broken up into two sentences, and that's a recommendation I would say should be considered if we had the time and interest. But other than that I think it reflects relatively well what ALAC and At-Large should be doing, and I do not support the use of "initiate" instead of "catalyzes" although it would be part of a multi-word replacement if one chose to do it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan. Anyone else have anything to say or ask or comment about this proposed mission statement or vision

---

statement? In fact yes, there was a mention there: why vision statement and not mission statement?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We already have our mission statement that's been done. What the Work Team [D] recommended – sorry, this is Cheryl for the transcript record – is that beyond our mission which is the home of the individual voice in ICANN and (inaudible), whatever it is that's on the top of every At-Large webpage at the moment, we needed a specific [vision statement] and that was an implantable out of the Work Team [D]'s activities for the ALAC Review process.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Well, whilst we have no more questions now I think we can move on to a vote on this. And so I will ask for the vision statement to be read to the record as it is if no one has any changes they wish to make. I understand that “catalyze” is preferred over “initiate.” So Heidi, can I please ask you to read the statement? Thank you.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, this is Heidi for the record. The vision statement as posed by the At-Large Improvements Taskforce is “The ALAC, building upon the experience and [views] of the At-Large (inaudible) catalyzes and facilitates inclusive, meaningful participation of general



---

internet users worldwide; advocates their input and brings their voice to bear in all ICANN matters.” Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Heidi, and of course as usual the statement that will be that of reference will be the English version and the versions that will be translated to Spanish and to French will have to be worked on and have to follow this one as closely as possible. Of course they will still need to have a meaning, and unfortunately we have not had a chance to make sure that they will have meaning if they are drafted using the exact same words. But that’s outside the scope of the vote today. The scope of the vote today for us is to say “Yes,” “No,” or “Abstain” from what’s on the English statement.

So if I could first ask if anybody would like to propose this? Well, I’m ready to propose this – any seconders that this becomes the ALAC’s vision statement?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Sala has indicated...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yep, Sala is proposing it. Seconders? Okay, Jean-Jacques has ticked – is that to second? I don’t see the hand, I just see a green mark so seconded by Jean-Jacques Subrenat. And seconded by

---

Sergio Salinas Porto, as well, and so now I ask if we can all vote. All those people who wish to say “Yes” let’s go ahead. Please put a green tick on the Adobe Connect, and if you do not have the Adobe Connect can you please indicate on the phone that would be [the tick. And of course only ALAC members], but unfortunately since Eduardo is away I was hoping we would have enough people... (inaudible)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. You do have quorum because Carlton’s abstention will (inaudible).

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, excellent. So at the moment one, two, four are okay with this vision statement and now that’s interesting, that seems to me like it’s a majority at the moment. Okay, anybody against please put a red cross. And I hope that staff will be recording these names. So no one is against, and anyone who is abstaining can you please now put in a red cross? I see Rinalia is writing that she’s abstaining. Anyone else? I see a turtle from Evan. I’m not quite sure what that’s supposed to mean, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Abstention.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Abstention, okay. Thank you, Evan, and Carlton has also said that he's abstaining. So we have three abstentions at the moment. Staff, can you please find out if we have everyone who's voted yet?

Heidi Ullrich: We have seven so far, so Eduardo needs to vote. Currently we have four in favor, none saying "No," and three abstaining.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's not going very far is it for a vision statement, goodness. We appear to have developed some form of myopia. Okay, we do need to have a majority on this. I'm not sure we need to have enough people to do this.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, we've lost Ganesh as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We've lost Ganesh, we've lost Eduardo so we don't even have quorum on this. So that's going to have to go online I guess. Yes, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just trying to do the math. I mean who have you not got on the call that indicated... Sorry, who have you still got to get a vote

---

from? You've got Eduardo to get a vote from and Ganesh to get a vote from, correct?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Correct, and Sandra Hoferichter as well.

Heidi Ullrich: Correct, three. And Yaovi, Tijani...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, Yaovi and Tijani, okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Edmon?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan, you're abstaining, we've already counted you. I was just trying to work out, even if those who are not present for this call all voted "Yes" whether or not we would ever get consensus results. With the addition of Yaovi and Tijani there is a theoretical possibility, therefore you would get [clearance] for an online poll. I would just advise the ALAC that whilst abstentions do not count as "No" votes they do count for quorum. But they are still an abstention. Unless there is an 8 or greater vote on the "Yes" then the vision statement will not be adopted. If the vision statement is not adopted or if a vision statement is not adopted then that

means that the ALAC Improvements Implementation [tasks] will remain incomplete. So over to you, as long as you're aware that that's the consequence.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and I believe that we've all heard that, and it is a good point indeed to remember that this is all part of the Improvements – that we had to develop a vision statement. And that whilst I understand that many think that a vision statement is not required or is not something that is important it is something which was put in the Improvements part. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, I was wondering whether it would change the position of some colleagues if we adopted the suggestion or the remark by Rinalia saying that we don't need a vision statement, we need a mission statement. So we could have a mission statement instead of a vision statement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. We have a mission statement. That's the statement that the ALAC, well the mission that the ALAC has given in the bylaws. So we already have a mission statement; it's a vision statement which we're looking for. And I know it is... I'm

not willing to waste any more time on this one although I know it's particularly important to have this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Well apparently not as important as the work group thought, so just let it go to online and it will be what it will be. It's all on the ALAC, and its next review will be short enough in the future that it can be sorted out then.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

What I suggest therefore is to take the vote online. I've [heard enough] people who have voted here may change their minds but we will see when the people who are not here vote and we will be able to count all the votes and so on. So action item to have the vote online starting today, please. Evan, I see your hand.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi Olivier, this point has been made. There's eight people in the quorum, why can't we get this over with now? I'm prepared to change my vote in favor. I personally don't think it's needed but if the Improvements Working Group has decided that it is I have no objection to the wording. So if there's quorum here let's do it now.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. I ask staff to let me know how many people are in quorate on the call now because I've lost track. People come in and are dropped then come back on, so it would be very helpful to know.

Matt Ashtiani: Olivier, if Sala actually votes we'll be quorate.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, is Sala able to vote? Is she with us?

Heidi Ullrich: Sala, are you voting? Okay, "I vote yes," okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. And so Evan, I've heard that you're ready to change your vote to "Yes" as well?

Evan Leibovitch: Like I said, Olivier, my feelings on this are stated. Having said that I don't want to get in the way of this if there's people here who feel this is important.

Heidi Ullrich: So with that, Olivier, we have six in favor, zero against and two abstentions.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. And so this is still not a pass because we need eight in favor. So we need to have the votes of those people who are not here; this is exactly the point I was making, hence the reason we'd have saved a few more minutes by saying "Let's just do it online and launch the vote today," because the vote is always out of 15 members. So the members who are not present would probably count as abstentions I gather; and if it does it's as though they were voting "No." So we'll do this one online; I'm not ready to waste more time on this and we will give it a three-day vote because it's not such a large thing. I guess we've all already discussed this and there'll be a three-day vote ending on Friday night. Cheryl, do you wish to say something?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was saying that Sala put the motion [with Jean-Jacques] indicating that those motions, Carlton just suggested they withdraw the motions. The motion [as stated] is to become an online vote as opposed to a poll.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Correct, yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So we can withdraw the motions [so we can vote]. Sorry, it's just me being a [peasant].



Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So that's exactly what I meant. The vote has been deferred and is being brought online. Okay, well let's move on to the next thing on our agenda – I'm hoping we still have quorum here – and that's the At-Large Improvements final report. That's the final At-Large and ALAC Improvements Implementation Project final report, which has well all of the follow-up. Perhaps I should let Cheryl say a few words about this as well, please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, [laughing], it's prepared. It's hopefully distributed on the agenda and I'm looking in the Adobe Connect room, not in the agenda. For those of you who read and do remember well the report that was put to the SIC and the ICANN Board at the Costa Rica meeting there's been a number but not a large number of updates made to the course that we proposed that you endorse for us to send to the SIC and Board for the Prague meeting, which in a perfect world would have all of the ALAC Review implementation tasks completed; and in asterisks that I would come back to in one moment if you would indulge me, Olivier.

With the changes I perhaps could and should defer to Heidi who went through the work with the Work Group today, but the brief (inaudible) time we took on the last issue I think I'll just do it very briefly. What has changed between this final report and the report for the Costa Rica meeting is that it has been enforced in

---

activities that were not mentioned in terms of the particular Work Group activities and matters that were discussed and dealt with at the Costa Rica meeting, such as the session that was put together to discuss and create (inaudible). Sorry, it's deafening almost.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think we're receiving noise from Carlton's line, or Carlton's Adigo.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was going to say the amount of noise going through is like torture. Let me collect my thoughts again, now... The other particularly main change will be on Page 3 where you will all be remembering the pretty-colored lines that go across looking at 25%, 50%, 75% and 100% complete – those lines, with the exception of the line associated with Recommendation 8 which is the public comment recommendation, in the report that we put to the ALAC for consideration all be marked at 100% complete. That will now need to be [part] modified depending on the outcome of the vote for our vision statement of course, because that might indeed to bring us back to less than 100% on the associated recommendation. It's one of the context of several implementables in the recommendations, so it wouldn't go back to 75% but it would certainly take us to well under 100% if there is no vision statement endorsed by the ALAC and adopted. But that can be seen in the next few days.

---

There is square brackets in the text which you will see are placeholders for if and when the ALAC does or does not endorse a vision statement, and there is also square brackets in the text for a date to be inserted if and when the ALAC does or does not endorse this report. I think I've covered the hard points but I'd like to defer to Heidi to see if I've totally missed something very important.

Heidi Ullrich:

Cheryl, thank you Cheryl, this is Heidi. Did you cover the issue of the status report of the Recommendation 8?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

No, I [blocked] those deliberately. [laughter] Okay, if you want me to go into it I will. Recommendation 8, when you look at the table that has all the pretty-colored bars, anything that has been allocated to an ongoing watching brief or responsibility – for example, some things whilst the implementation has been complete need ongoing maintenance, such as what the Technology Taskforce is going to be doing in terms of our online tools and that sort of thing. So annotation has been made to this table on Page 3 to show where those responsibilities lie.

For Recommendation 8 which concerns the public comment period, which is a recommendation from the ALAC Review which gave the 45-day capability as required, if and when required the

ALAC wants to say “We need 45 days.” And that was going to evolve so of course we put it at only 50% in our report so far because of the matters of how ICANN was going to be implementing or otherwise the ATRT Review Team’s recommendation for public comments with the comment and reply/comment system. We needed to recognize of course that with the comment, reply/comment system for ICANN public comment calls that there was to be a 21-day minimum with the accent and underline on “minimum” for the original comments; and an equal amount of time devoted to the reply/comment period which in a perfect world should have actually given everyone, not just ALAC, a roughly 45-day time for the completion of their interactions and interventions on public comments.

It also was designed to be a system that would run with a clear, effective, well-maintained and proper forecasting so that the ICANN community would know the majority of the public comments and topics; and when approximately within the next 12 to 18 months they would be coming into their agendas. And that’s the part that hasn’t been addressed as yet, and we’ve also sent (inaudible) to perhaps go for 21 days as a norm as opposed to 21 days as a minimum for the first comment section.

Each of the ACs and SOs that I have been associated with and who I think is in processing on the AC/SO list has had problems with this new system and more work will be done; and whilst ICANN is doing the work on how their public comments will be enacted, it

---

---

means that we can't complete our [outline] of 45 days so therefore we've taken the color out totally and we have put in a link to a Wiki page where all of the relevant correspondence between Olivier and various other meetings and interactions and interventions between the ALAC and Filiz and to the Participation staff on this topic can be found. In other words, we're tossing the ball back over the wall to ICANAN and saying "It's not our fault we can't finish this task. You guys need to get your act together first."

And that is probably why, Heidi, I wanted to gloss over it because that took more than the initial report time did. [laughing]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and I was just going to add one thing with regards to the 21-day period: a discussion, an interaction already between Filiz Yilmaz and myself has taken place. We've sent each other emails to discuss what the problem is and where we could go from here. There will be a call scheduled shortly between Filiz, Sebastien Bachollet who is the Chair of the Public Participation Committee, and myself so as to explain what our position is so far. And hopefully we will be able to report to you all by Prague.

I understand we are running somehow out of time. I was going to suggest that if we were going to vote on this report to be ratified there were a couple of amendments that needed to be made,

primarily in the contents of the text itself because a couple of things are wrong. On the first page for example, or Page #2 third paragraph: “At the SIC meeting on the XX March 2012...”

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually we’ve fixed the date; you obviously have the wrong copy. It is attached to the agenda; that has already been fixed.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Ah, well because that was the one. So I’m reading from the copy that is linked to the agenda.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I recognize that; sorry, this is Cheryl Langdon-Orr intervening with Olivier. I recognize that the same thing happened during our work group call earlier. That is not the final copy; that “XX” has been changed and it is the appropriate date there now. And all I can do is apologize if the updated version was not uploaded as was staff’s intention before today’s meeting with the ALAC – there [was to be a cross link].

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so we don’t have access to the final version.

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well “XX” has been changed to the proper date, and of course you can say that you have other links in square brackets which are placeholders for the if and when the vision statement is finalized; and obviously the ALAC would need to go to vote on the document if it still has square brackets on it even though it is endorsed because-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...after the vote. Might I point out that from a logistics point of view you do have some time to allow for the ALAC to review this document and deal with it as a Big Pulse online endorsement because Heidi, correct me if I’m wrong but we need to have this report in the hands of the SIC before the 14<sup>th</sup>; but we could maybe get some time in the couple of days before that from the ALAC and then get it through in a timely manner.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, the 14<sup>th</sup> is the deadline, the absolute deadline for that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Right, well thank you, Cheryl, and thank you, Heidi, for this. That provides me with the answer for the next course of action on this one. Rather than having the decision taking place now I

suggest that we have a Big Pulse vote after a few days, possibly after the – not at the same time as the Big Pulse vote for the vision statement, so at least then we also have an answer for the vision statement prior to passing this one. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, a question and a suggestion. The question is when do you think ideally, Olivier, we should achieve this work we're talking about, the Improvements?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Jean-Jacques, it's Olivier here. The Improvements should be finished as soon as possible. Our final report should be given to the SIC in Prague.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Okay, thanks. So I think that my suggestion is a sort of political suggestion to make the most of the work which has been done in the At-Large circles and in the ALAC. I speak as a former member of the Board and also a member of the Working Group which had built into the structures of ALAC, etc., the ALAC Review Working Group. So I think that we are now at the end of a historic stage of ALAC, so we should not just send it over in a routine way. I think we should make a stronger statement; perhaps in the form of a letter from the Chair of the ALAC to the Chair of the Board



signaling that this work has been done and it is completed; and perhaps just underlining two or three of the major points.

That's a suggestion I make because I think that when the Board appointed its ALAC Review Working Group, some members of the Board were under the impression that the question really was "Should we allow ALAC to continue?" It was a very fundamental question. So I think that in hindsight now we should say "Yes, we have brought the proof through these improvements that it has accomplished its task and it is moving forward." Thanks.

Hello? Have I put everyone to sleep?

Heidi Ullrich: Olivier, you may be muted.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I was muted, thank you. [laughter] I have to repeat my lauding of Jean-Jacques' way forward. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Yes, I tend to point in your direction, absolutely. It's an opportunity for us to drive this point across, and definitely it's news to me that the question was at the time – which might have predated me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But at the time of the initial Review – did the ALAC serve a purpose or did it not? That was a while ago. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. The first question in all of the reviews is does the organizational asset that we're looking at in the review continue to serve a purpose. And in the case of the ALAC Review there was some pressure for us to prove that that was indeed the case.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Well mindful of the time I wish to move to the next point, which is the membership of the At-Large New gTLD Review Group. This one is again a long process and it's all to do with the objections process for the new gTLDs. There's been a call for a Review Group to be formed with two members from each RALO being selected or being not selected but recommended by the RALO; and one member from each region being selected by the ALAC – all of the members of course needing to be ratified by the ALAC.

All of the RALOs have supplied two people so far. Is this correct?  
Heidi, could you give us an update on this?

---

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, hi – this is Heidi for the record. Yes, that is correct: all RALOs have now recommended two members apiece and I have put the workspace in the chat. Olivier, should I read those members?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes please, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, thank you – this is Heidi. For AFRALO we have Aziz Hilali and Fatimata Seye Sylla. From APRALO we have Fouad Bajwa and Kenny Huang. From EURALO we have Adela Danciu and Rudi Vansnick. From LACRALO, the two recommended RALO members are Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Marcelo Telez. From NARALO the recent polls have put Garth Bruen and Eduardo Diaz as the two recommended members. Those are the RALO members. Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Heidi. So all of these results are confirmed; what we need to do right now today is to basically ratify the appointment of the people that are listed on this dashboard, on this workspace, sorry, as listed and as just mentioned by Heidi. Any comments or questions? Any discussion that anyone wishes to have?

Now, I see a question from Sala: “Do any of them have commercial interests?” Yes, thank you very much for reminding me of this. There is a very important part of this Review Group is that they should be absolutely non-conflicted. So all of those people have had to basically fill out a statement of interest to describe whether they were conflicted or not; and I believe – and I’ll have to ask Heidi again for this – I believe that they’ve all said they are un-conflicted, absolutely un-conflicted and that the RALOs have also provided confirmation that those people were un-conflicted. Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich:

This is Heidi for the record. I have not actually heard from all of the RALO officers confirming that, primarily NARALO because the vote has just been announced and we’ve just sent a note to the RALO Chair and Secretariat. But again, if you would like to review all of the SOIs on that workspace just by clicking on their name...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Olivier, Cheryl here.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes, Cheryl, please go ahead.

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yes, putting on my Queen of Process gown yet again, I think it's important that for the record it's clear that with the ALAC advice on any, and dare I say any RALO advice on the statements of interest and indeed any ALAC endorsements based on the statement of interest have the rider "to the best of your knowledge." You have not done due diligence, the RALOs have not done due diligence. You're working on best effort and to the best of your knowledge, and I think it would be wise of you to have that. It's not a detriment but I think if it's written into one of the motions or indeed endorsed [if] notes are in the public record it means that it's gone through an open public system where anyone who is aware of any conflict unreported in a statement of interest has had the opportunity to raise it; but you've not gone through a full DD process nor should you in my opinion as it would be too costly and too time-consuming to do that.

So just cover yourselves I think is what I'm suggesting, and that should go to the RALOs as well as the ALAC. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Alright, thank you very much, Cheryl, and I note there is a sheet, another Wiki page which has all of the statements from the various candidates. And yes, I confirm that none of them have been vetted in any way, any scientific or unscientific way by the ALAC. We have taken their word for it so it's as far as we know.

---

So are we ready then to vote on these, or are there any questions or anything prior to us holding a ratification vote on those suggestions from the RALOs? Hearing no one with their hand up, oh, Evan, your hand is up.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry about that, Olivier, this is Evan. Do we have a separate process then for choosing a third person or are we simply now ratifying the ten people offered by the RALOs and there's a separate process for the third person from each region?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's correct, Evan, yes. The third person is someone that the ALAC would find from the regions, not from the RALOs. The candidate can be part of an ALS, so they might be falling under the RALO structure, but they might also be people who are totally independent that might just be people living in the region without being a member; which would allow for consultants if it were required. This is of course to keep this process as open as possible and it would need to be the ALAC that chooses those people, hence the reason why it's actually drafted in the Rules as being "a member from the region."

The work that needs to be done, I think: there is a few more days required to be able to find those people; and in fact, in some RALOs where there have been more than two people wishing to

---

go for the position they're very open to propose themselves forward to the ALAC as being the additional person from that region. Does this answer your question, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: It certainly does, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. I see that Sala proposes we defer the vote due to due diligence being required. I'm not sure we have a process for due diligence here and we should have thought about that before...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I make a suggestion? It's Cheryl.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes please, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sala, I'd have to disagree. There is not the time nor the funding to do anything that would be an appropriate high-level due diligence. This is one of those situations where you have to take these on face value and assume this is a transparent system and anyone who has information to contribute will bring it forward, either publicly or privately to the attention of the Chair of the ALAC. And that's why I suggested it should be under the guise of

“to your best knowledge” or “to the best of your knowledge,” and that way you’ve all covered yourselves. I know that’s not all that much comfort to those people who would prefer a higher degree of DD but it is expensive, and as we’ve seen even the (inaudible) CEO of (inaudible) without having I would have thought a clear amount of DD done in some of the (inaudible). Time’s short and money’s not [available] to do it, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and I note here that Sala has replied on the chat that her comments are on record and it’s certainly something we can improve in terms of rules and procedures in future times, and of course to have a budget specifically for these things and that would help as well. So I suppose that if we don’t have any other discussions on this we could move forward to a vote to ratify those members today, and then take the next few days to find a third member. I just wondered prior to that whether Avri who is on the call has anything to add to the... Because she was supposed to be associated, well, she Chairs our New gTLD Working Group and of course she knows the process inside out and was closely involved with the design of the way this was all put together. So Avri, do you have a few words?

Avri Doria:

Not many, I wasn’t planning to speak on it. I do understand all the discussion about the vetting. I think as long as each of you have

---



---

all read the SOI statements and have done a little bit of due diligence on your own you're probably covered. I think the process is actually moving along quite well and I'm pleased, so I have nothing [more to say on it].

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thank you very much, Avri. And so what I ask now is for someone to propose the motion, the motion being that the people listed – and I'm going to have to ask Heidi to read them to the record – the people listed as people recommended by the RALOs for taking position in the At-Large New gTLD Review Group become members of that New gTLD Review Group. And so could we have it read to the record, the names of the people please?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, this is Heidi. The names of the people being recommended by the RALOs are from AFRALO Aziz Hilali and Fatimata Seye Sylla; from APRALO Fouad Bajwa and Kenny Huang; from EURALO Adela Danciu and Rudi Vansnick; from LACRALO Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Marcelo Telez; from NARALO Garth Bruen and Eduardo Diaz. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Heidi, and the motion is moved by Jean-Jacques Subrenat and seconded by Rinalia Abdul Rahim. And so all those in favor, would you please use your Adobe Connect to

put a green tick? And if you cannot use Adobe Connect for that then would you please say it to the record? And if I could ask staff to read and record who was for?

Heidi Ullrich:

Okay, so this is Heidi for the record, and those in favor are Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Carlton Samuels, Evan Leibovitch, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Natalia Enciso, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Sala T – I'm not going to be that brave – and Sergio Salinas Porto.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Heidi, and now could I ask if anyone is against could they put a big red mark? I see no one against the motion, and anybody abstaining can you now please put a red mark or a turtle if you wish, a turtle in the Adobe Connect? And I see no one putting a turtle up so we have eight in favor, no one against and no abstentions. And I believe that this is passed.

Thank you, everyone. Is this recorded, Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich:

Matt, is this recorded?

Matt Ashtiani:

Yes, it's on the right-hand side.

---

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, I see that, yes. The vote is recorded and the motion has passed, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thanks everyone. Since we have very little time we are probably going to have to move to the items for discussion. Just as I mentioned earlier on the ALAC-selected members, the next steps are for a few days' time according to the calendar which was published but which I don't have in front of me. We need to find one more person from each region, and that's the ALAC has to find one more person from each region, so I ask all of those present here today to go back to their region and look for someone; and if they wish to speak to RALO leadership that's entirely their choice. It would be great to involve more people.

It really is just a case of trying to involve more people in our processes and particularly it's a good way to start. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you've put your hand up, Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you, this is Jean-Jacques on the line. I'm sorry to back step to Item #8 but I just wanted to make sure that staff would take it as an action point, my suggestion which you approved I think of having a letter prepared from you to the Chair of the Board to accompany and to highlight the work done in that Improvements final report. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I understand that was an action item and maybe I have not had said it explicitly. I hope that Matt has recorded it.

Matt Ashtiani: Yes I have.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Oh, Matt and one side and Heidi on the other, so we had two people recording – perfect. So now items for discussion. Item #10, Future Challenges Working Group white paper was presented and shall I let Jean-Jacques... Now I'm afraid we've put 15 minutes here; I know a number of people have a hard stop. We've now been on the call for two hours. If you can just give us a quick rundown on what this entices, either yourself or Evan?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: It seems that Evan has had to leave; he had a hard stop at the top of the hour – this is Jean-Jacques speaking. So just very briefly, first I would like to correct perhaps an impression which may have

been given over the past few weeks or months that the exercise was shut off for some people – it was not. We consulted at the very beginning to know who was included in this. You may remember that at the very beginning we even put the question of whether this was to be an ALAC working group or an At-Large working group, so I think that was already a first indication of its open nature. In addition to that we made sure over the months, Evan and I, that we would consult people to find out if they were interested in participating in this work, whether or not they were members of the ALAC.

So that being said it's taken quite a long time and quite a few iterations. So to make a long story short I would like to point out that now there is a consolidated draft which is on the Wiki and it takes into account the remarks, the suggestions, the criticism of quite a number of people who declared that they were interested in this exercise; and some substantial drafting or redrafting work was done also by several people. I wish to thank them all on behalf of Evan and myself.

So now where do we stand? We could have gone through a process of submitting this to the Future Challenges Working Group, but I think that all the members of that Working Group are members of ALAC or have been associated with it and are probably on this call. So Evan and I thought that we would submit this to you as a proposal for a comment period. Now, we think that as the text is now open and available we should open it to a

---

comment period as an ALAC comment period; and after that take in whatever suggestions or remarks are made, consolidate the text once more; and at that moment if the Chair of ALAC and the ALAC agree, then go to a vote of the full ALAC with our hope that it will be presented as an ALAC statement.

The timeline we are aiming at is Prague. We would very, very much like this to be presented as an ALAC position in Prague. Now, there is one uncertainty in my mind: if this requires a separate telephone conference of the ALAC, or if – and perhaps Heidi and others could confirm this to us – if it's possible to consult the other members of the ALAC by email for them to give their agreement or their opposition online. So that is the first part of my presentation, that's where we stand today. And then after your remarks I would suggest perhaps a way forward, especially in terms of a communication policy to enhance or to develop this work that has been done. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques, and so that your question to Heidi was basically whether one could comment online on this.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Comment and perhaps vote online once the comment period is over.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, well that can always be done, Jean-Jacques – it's Olivier here for the transcript. For our statements we always have the comments that go on the Wiki page and then the voting after a second draft that takes place using a Big Pulse vote. So that's entirely possible. And at the moment the whole Future Challenges Working Group work is on a Wiki page, so I can see that indeed there are some comments. I gather that these are comments to previous versions of the text, is it?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Well, let me reassure everyone on this call on this point. We have integrated, actually, the actual physical work of integrating the comments or suggestions was done by Evan who had the key to the Wiki; and we have integrated most of the comments or suggestions. And those which have not made it into the final text, we've explained to the author or the person who suggested it why we are not taking it onboard. So I think we can now consider that the paper which is before you is a consolidated draft – that's why I used the word "consolidated" because it does integrate all those remarks or suggestions.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi Olivier, this is Evan. Sorry, I have my coat on and I'm ready to go out the door but I just wanted to add one more thing to that?

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Go ahead, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi. I just wanted to, one of the things I was hoping to do in order to get the widest possible At-Large engagement was take a snapshot of the current version that you and Jean-Jacques have been talking about just now that has incorporated all this; that we take a snapshot of the revision that is right now listed on the Wiki page as version 0.10. We take a snapshot of that, make a PDF format of that; make translations in the five UN languages and make those available for circulations to all the ALSes and create that kind of engagement that we're looking for.

So what I'm personally hoping is that this isn't just "Go to the Wiki and comment" – this is "Here is a draft white paper in a PDF form, translated into the five UN languages that is out there for circulation that would get feedback from the ALSes through the RALOs and back to us as we move towards ratification."

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. As this involves translation and interpretation and costs I cannot give you an answer right here there and then, but I can ask staff to find out what that would entice in time for the ExCom call later this week.



Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Okay, fine. Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Jean-Jacques, go ahead.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Have you elicited now remarks, not on the content of course because that would be another step, but on the proposed method and timetable? Or should I first go ahead with the way we, that means Evan and I especially, see the timing now... Sorry, not the timing – the communication effort which would follow.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, I'm not quite sure we have enough time to go through the whole motions of the full communication efforts plus the timings and so on. I'd like to gain an idea of what your timings are, yes. Ideally what I'd like to see and find out today from our meeting today is if the ALAC itself has any objections to the process moving forward one step further, and I don't think that we'd need a vote – it's just a case of does anyone object to this being taken in the course that you're suggesting? So I'd like to hear your idea right now, between now and Prague knowing that in Prague there'll be a wider community involved – what your timings are. It's only four weeks away.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, thank you, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. The timing we envisage is as follows: as soon as possible to first get a sense of the ALAC's position on this, whether we as the ALAC are prepared to support the suggestion made by the Co-Chairs of the Future Challenges Working Group to submit this to a comment period – by the way, I don't know what that comment period would have to be, how long it would have to last. And when that is done and we have integrated the comments and suggestions, then to submit it to the ALAC for a vote.

So I can't give you a date on that because I don't remember how many days that entails, and after that hopefully we could make it public – never mind about the details of the communication policy, but the idea is to make it known not only in our At-Large and ALAC circles but beyond that to the Board and more widely to the community – so that in Prague, in the course of the international meeting of ICANN in Prague it could be discussed and it could be even discussed in the corridors, in the margins of the ICANN meeting itself. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you, Jean-Jacques. And when you mentioned "submit this to a comment period" I gather you wished to say "submit it to At-Large comments," our own internal comments – not a public comment period, an ICANN public comment period.

---

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Well, I don't know because I haven't done this very often in ALAC, so I'd like to have your suggestion or your position on that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Well I think it would have to be supported by the ALAC before it gets submitted over to a wider comment period, so the way that I see it at the moment it would be get a sense of the ALAC position on this by having it on the Wiki, having comments from At-Large and ALAC members. I understand that you wish this to be in the UN languages or at least translated in Spanish and in French and that might also take a little bit of time; and then to submit it to a vote after that.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, well Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. On this I would like to take up Evan's point about translations and perhaps state that my personal position is less absolute than his. I think that the timing is perhaps a bit more important at this juncture than the full translation into the UN official languages because I think we have not a deadline but at least a very unique opportunity which is the Prague meeting. So I think it would be more important to have it commented in Prague and improved, etc., rather than waiting for all the translations to be ready and then send it out, you see?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so let's work it this way then: would you be able to have this as submitted to a comment period that basically starts now, an At-Large comment period, and then just before Prague have an online vote on it so as to be able to then take it to the wider community in Prague? Or do you suggest it should be discussed in Prague before having an ALAC vote on this?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: No, my preference – and I think I speak for Evan on this as well: our preference would be to have an indication and if possible a support of the ALAC before we go to Prague so that we can present it for a public comment period as an ALAC paper or an ALAC suggestion. My question to you and to Heidi was if it's an ALAC comment period is there a minimum or is it up to you to decide whether it's three days or two weeks or what?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's up to me, yes – it's Olivier here for the transcript. So it can be three days minimum when we really are pressed for time, but usually it is in excess of five to ten days.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Right, well do you think that one week, seven days would be reasonable in this case?

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I would believe so. I'd like to hear from our regions, especially non-English speaking if one week would be enough for them to be able to submit to their members and to discuss in their RALO. Alan, Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, we have three weeks before Prague. We're not going to make the deadline for formally publishing something for formal discussion at the meeting in any case, so I would suggest you want to allow more than one week for the regions especially given the current lack of French and Spanish translations. When you say it's going to be presented and discussed formally in Prague, is there a meeting scheduled for this?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Well, I had developed this argument or this position before, Alan, of why Prague? Why is Prague a fairly important element on our calendars? It's because in Prague we will have a new CEO, at least the name will be announced; and there will be of course certain interest on the part of all the community to know how the corporation will be led for the next whatever it is, two or three years. And I think that we have to get our message across on an important subject such as a way forward, which is basically what our paper is about; that we should use the opportunity of Prague to make it known and to solicit comments at that period. That's

why we were pushing for this before Prague so that it can be discussed in Prague.

I'd like to just come back to a remark by Carlton on the Adobe Connect page. He says "Solicit a consensus view here and now," so that's exactly what I would like to suggest, Olivier. Could you perhaps propose that we all take a position on this saying "No, it should take another five months," or "Yes we go for it," or whatever?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well, Jean-Jacques, it's Olivier here. I'd like to get a consensus on the timetable. I don't think we can get a consensus on the contents but we should effectively have a timetable that will allow us all to find a consensus on the contents. You mentioned seven days; I have thought about this. We do have until Prague. If we need to have a ratification by the ALAC prior to Prague, as I understand this is your suggestion, we can ratify it the week before Prague. And so all we need today is just to say "If we're okay with leaving a comment period open from now until a week and a half before Prague," and let you have another week to make any amends based on the input, at that point we can come up with a plan and a timetable going backwards – saying opening of comment period, closing of comment period; opening of vote, closing of vote. And by the time we're in Prague we've got something that is like an ALAC statement effectively.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, yes, I agree. So if you'd say one and a half weeks or two weeks before Prague, fine. Your rationale, Olivier, is that seven days would be too short?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Correct, yeah.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: How far away are we from Prague? We're about seven weeks away, right?

Heidi Ullrich: Not that long.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Oh sorry, yes – five weeks, four or five weeks away. So would it be perhaps more reasonable and give a bit more time to take into account all the suggestions and remarks of the comment period if we said two weeks before Prague, before the beginning of Prague?

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me, Olivier, it's Alan. My hand was still up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh sorry, Alan. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: What is the deadline for officially publishing things for consideration at a meeting? Is it two weeks?

Heidi Ullrich: It's the 14<sup>th</sup> of June, fifteen days I believe.

Alan Greenberg: Then we need to publish it by then and therefore the revised version should be there by then. Whether the ALAC has voted on it or not, it would be nice if it had but it's not as important. Judging on past history, a paper that has gone through this kind of process is not likely to be rejected by the ALAC at that point. So I think it's important to publish as close to a final one as possible in terms of the formal deadline, because as Heidi says there is a formal meeting scheduled.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So here's the question then, and I ask from all of you: does anyone object to it being open for comments in time for it to be able, if it passes the vote, for it to be subjected to the 14<sup>th</sup> of June deadline and therefore be included in the material in the Prague meeting? Alan, your hand is still up.



Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry, I was trying to read the chat at the time you were asking.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No, I was just saying your hand is up, so...

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, my hand will be down but I'm sorry, I thought you were asking me something regarding what you just said, which I didn't catch.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, let me just ask it again then. Does anyone here on this call object to opening a comment period now, an At-Large comment period on this paper that will be... And we're not going to calculate it exactly on the fly like that; we will calculate it by the ExCom meeting later this week. But the calculations will take into account the amount of time that is taken to conduct a vote, the fact that the 14<sup>th</sup> of June is the deadline for having this material included in the material for Prague, and will be long enough of course – will be in excess of ten days so it will be long enough for it to be consulted by the regions and to be translated also.

---

Alan Greenberg: Are you saying a vote by the 14<sup>th</sup> or the final document by the 14<sup>th</sup>?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The final document by the 14<sup>th</sup>. If the vote goes against it we can always take the document out. I understand it's putting the document in that needs to be by the 14<sup>th</sup>.

Alan Greenberg: I would certainly support that, not that I have the vote.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well I'm not asking for a vote, I'm just asking for objections because I don't think we've got quorum now. But out of all the people here, which I think is a fair amount... I think we're just under quorum, aren't we? Anyway, I don't see any objections here. I see only ticks from Carlton, from Cheryl, from Jean-Jacques and you can record from myself, and I gather from Evan as well, and Rinalia. So let's proceed this way and open it for comments as soon as possible. And if I can ask staff as an action item to find out with regards to translating it to other languages how long that would take and whether that is feasible vis a vis our budget, because I think it is particularly important for the regions to know what we are talking about. It is quite a milestone document from my point of view at least, because it addresses

---

some fundamental parts of not only how At-Large and ALAC works but also how ICANN works.

Okay, so I think we've gotten through this one. We still have many, many other things and we're running very late – we're 24 minutes past the hour now. The next thing is the update from the selected At-Large Working Groups with the Working Group Chairs. I suggest that we move this until next time. I understand that some of you need to leave in a few minutes and also we might lose interpretation pretty soon.

So that one I don't see anyone going against, so we will not be dealing with the update from selected At-Large Working Groups. We trust that the work is going on well. And #12, At-Large Prague meeting development – Heidi, was there anything that you needed five minutes for this?

Heidi Ullrich:

I need just thirty seconds, and that is that please do fill in your questions under Section C. We have questions for the Board, the GAC and the ICANN (inaudible) and Compliance, questions for Global Partnerships and for the Participation and Engagement with Filiz. The deadline for that is the 24<sup>th</sup> at 23:59 UTC. We will use those questions, we will forward them to those staff members and the GAC and the Board for their information and their preparation. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Heidi, and not having very much time for questions I suggest we move also to [part for information], #13: the ALAC policy issues to be part of the Policy Webinar. Well, that's something new. Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, very briefly that is going to be held during two calls on the 14<sup>th</sup>, one at 12:00 UTC and the other at 19:00 UTC. I will be working closely with Olivier and the Executive Committee on the items for that, but the internal deadline for that is the 1<sup>st</sup> of June for the slides. So Olivier, perhaps that can be on the ExCom call as a major item [this Wednesday]. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much. I understand we're invited to listen to that, are we?

Heidi Ullrich: Absolutely. You have to register though, and there was an announcement sent out and the information on how to register for that was in that announcement. It's also an announcement on the ICANN announcement page, so perhaps we'll make an action item to send that out again for the list.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Will you be speaking about it?

Heidi Ullrich: I will.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Then we'll be able to listen to you, fantastic. Okay, so then #14: updating the ALAC Top Ten policy issues. As you will have noticed our ALAC top ten issues date from 2008 and I would like to hope that they have evolved somehow. If they haven't we still haven't done very much, [laughter] and bless you to whoever has just sneezed.

So the ALS Survey in December 2008 yielded a number of issues. We are now thinking of coming up with a new survey and staff, would you help me out on this one since I was not there on the first one? I'm not quite sure what the process is.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, this is Heidi, and I would suggest... Go ahead, Cheryl, I defer to you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I said I was there for the one before that. [laughing] We did do an earlier top ten back in '05, '06, '07 that was in the interim ALAC world. This particular one, just so everyone understands, was

born out of I think a wider consultation practice because it engaged all of the ALSes, because those who responded to this survey were then able to be included in the early 2009 At-Large Summit. So an ALS who wanted to be supported and funded to send a representative to the Summit had to fill out this survey, so I think this particular 2008 set is a particularly valuable set of interests. The one that appears earlier in some archives was really a construct of you know, 15 of us and in fact only five of the 15 of us bothered to interact. Over to you, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich:

Thank you, Cheryl. So if I may I would suggest that if the ALAC does decide to update this that maybe a survey be prepared and sent out, but I would ask that that be done if agreed after Prague.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And I don't see anyone objecting or jumping up and down, saying "Oh no, we want it now, now, now!" so I think we can say yes to that. And perhaps it's something that we can speak about again during our Prague meeting, and have an action item then for the Prague meeting to design a timetable for that work when we're in Prague. So again, just getting a timetable so that we know we can start right after Prague. Cheryl, you've put your hand up?

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, Olivier, could I counsel and encourage you to certainly discuss this during Prague, and I would think particularly the Secretariats' Meeting in Prague could start chewing on this particular topic; but I wouldn't want you to try and put it to bed in Prague. I think it's something that probably needs to start immediately after Prague. It's amazing how much time and energy can go into setting up an apparently simple survey that's going to [harm] the best set of results. And the other advantage of doing it between the Prague and Toronto meeting is that that is an appropriate time for where we can induce them, that if you didn't fill out the survey in 2008 you weren't going to be able to be supported to go to the At-Large Summit in 2009.

Between your Prague meeting and your Toronto meeting you would have the opportunity to I guess see whether the ALSes are alive and well and whether the contacts you have for them – in other words, there's the example that someone who responds to the survey could be almost a third ping on will your ALS be on the short list to be audited and reviewed.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, thank you Cheryl. I think I never said we would need to put that one to bed in Prague; I said we could design a timetable when we were in Prague. So take the Prague meeting for both the regional leadership but also the ALAC to design the actual framework of what we want – when do we want that survey to

start? When do we want it to end? Certainly rushing it is not the way forward on this one, especially since the last one seems to be dating from a couple of years ago. Just a handful of months more will not be killing us. Well maybe not a handful, but one or two will not be killing us on this one. We just need to establish a timetable.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, great thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Any other comments? And if not we can move onto Item #15 which is very far down this page. I see oh Cheryl, your hand is still up?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I just haven't gotten to put it down. I've got my arms tucked in my blankets that I'm wrapped in because it's freezing cold here in Sydney at 2:00 AM!

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So your real arm is down but your virtual arm is up. So Item #15: updating of At-Large website, just a quick one here to keep you informed. We are already starting the work now to update the At-Large website. The current one is an absolute nightmare. There's been a call to ask for a few volunteers who know about,

---



not only who know about websites but who know about At-Large, about the ALAC, about what type of information we would like to be able to access, how we would like to access it; what is useful, what is not useful; what doesn't work; what should work – you know, how do we want our future website to be there?

And so far the consensus was that the people designing the website would be able to interview about 12 to 15 people, so it's about two or three people per region. We'd like this to be balanced worldwide geographically and also gender balanced, and I'm therefore asking you all to make sure that you have a handful or a couple of volunteers so that they could be subjected to, is it just a one-hour interview, Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich:

This is Heidi, yes, I believe it's one hour. We have currently 11 volunteers. We still do need to pull from AFRALO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, so this one is specifically for AFRALO then. Eleven volunteers is a lot more than the last time I heard, so a number of people have now volunteered – that's really good. Cheryl, you've put your hand up again?

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yeah, I just wanted to clarify because you were talking about the diversity need there and I just wanted to clarify the position that came out of APRALO's meeting today. I apologize to Rinalia if I'm jumping into something that she was going to bring forward to the ALAC but I've got the floor now. The two names that we've put forward from APRALO are [Danella Osbrink] who I had raised earlier in other conversations on this matter, and Holly Raiche. Holly Raiche is acting in her capacity as one of the Executives of the region. The fact that she happens to come from say an At-Large Structure and an English-speaking background of Australia is not to be confused with the fact that APRALO is putting Holly forward because of her ability to speak on behalf of the region; and we are putting [Danella] forward because of her international status for accessibility and the disability issues because we think it's terribly important that a rejigged At-Large website is accessible to all.

Now whilst both those women are also members of the ISOC AU ALS within APRALO I just didn't want the geographic diversity there to be confused for anything but they are the best ones for the job. Thanks very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and thanks for reminding me of this actually. Just a quick question: do you know whether the current new ICANN website is accessible for people with disabilities?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It does not comply with the highest W3C requirements. It doesn't fail but it doesn't pass with flying colors.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so well hopefully we will be able again to lead the way in doing something.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can definitely do that I suspect.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic, okay, well that's the website. Can I just ask Heidi, do you have timetable of how long it will take? What's the plan, how many months until we start seeing the results of the first draft, if you want, of our new website?

Heidi Ullrich: This is Heidi. We will be first conducting the interviews and depending on what the results of those interviews are in terms of the amount of changes that need to be done, then there will be a meeting with At-Large staff and the Web Administration staff to begin determining the initial timeline. And then we'll also be working with the Technology Taskforce on that as well, so we don't have an answer for you yet.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. And I'm glad to hear the Technology Taskforce is also involved in this. Great to see everyone working on common plans. Right, and now we finally reach any other business, and there is the CMR issue which Alan is going to be able to speak to us about. Yes, first question – CMR? What is CMR?

Alan Greenberg: That was the first part. I will give a very brief summary; Avri can fill in more if we feel we need it. The CMR is the Community Member Representatives that will take part in a variety of parts of the review of applications for gTLD support. So this is out of JAS. The staff plan felt that it was important to have people who were involved in the original JAS development take part in, not be voting members and not be active participants but monitor the process at the very least; and also have some input as to the qualifications that are needed by the actual people who will actually be doing the evaluation.

Staff came to the JAS, the JAS Group was reconvened as per the current extended charter to discuss this. The JAS Group agreed with staff that former JAS –members would be good candidates. A variety were selected; I will disclose I am one of them, somewhat reluctantly but nevertheless. And that was the recommendation being carried forward by staff.

---

The GNSO as perhaps one would expect felt that although the JAS Group's mandate had been extended [talked] to staff. It was not extended to make decisions on behalf of its chartering bodies, and any recommendation at the very best should have gone back to the GNSO and the ALAC for action before staff would even think about trying to implement it. And certainly the selection of people was not something that the JAS Group could do unilaterally. And that's where it stands right now.

The GNSO has discussed it briefly. It will likely be back in the next meeting, and the question is does the ALAC want to take any action to endorse what the JAS Group did prior to that or after that, or sometime before Prague in line with the belief I believe that there are a significant number of ALAC and At-Large people participating in the JAS Group. And I don't think it's any surprise to the people in this group what the recommendation was, and if the ALAC wants to support it that might help solidify the case for moving forward with the current plan.

That's where it stands. Avri, if you want to add something to it or if people have any questions, that's about as short as I can make it given the length of time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Avri?

---

Avri Doria: Yeah, I only wanted to add one quick thing and I'm willing to answer anything. I think the reason it's important is because with the bru-ha-ha the GNSO Council is putting up at the moment the staff is somewhat in existential paralysis about how to move on. And so if the ALAC does think that the right thing is happening it is helpful for them to say so, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good point, Avri.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, and that was Cheryl that just said "Good point, Avri."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I'm typing it in so that it's there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, I think we've had a very long call on this. What I suggest on that... It's very good for bringing this up, definitely. What I suggest is... I understand, I mean is this documented?

Avri Doria: Yes, the CMR, there was a draft document sent out. It was sent out within the At-Large New gTLD Working Group. It isn't their final document but it is a fairly complete draft.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so what I would suggest then is that this gets then passed not only to the New gTLD Working Group but for the ALAC to have a look at. And from there the ExCom can discuss this later on this week whether the, well based on the feedback that we get from ALAC members in the next 48 hours – I believe the ExCom meeting is on Thursday, is it, if I could be reminded?

Heidi Ullrich: I believe it's Wednesday.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay Wednesday, so that's tomorrow. So I could ask our ExCom members to have a look at it, but basically the idea being that we look at this further and whether the ALAC should take unilateral action on this. I'm a little concerned about moving in as a sort of kickback thing today, but because of the whole history that the JAS has gone through – the fact that it has two charters, etc., etc. But at the same time it is important that the process moves forward, and if it means that the ALAC has to act for the process not to be blocked in a stopped position; and if the ALAC believes that it needs to move forward then let's move forward with it.

I see that Avri has sent it to the ALAC list so that's our first step forward. Alan, you put your hand up?

---

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah, without saying what action we should take it should be noted that if the GNSO formally objects, which it is likely to, and the ALAC has not supported it I don't see a way that staff and the Board can go ahead and implement it. So I'm not trying to guide which way we go forward but that situation is not likely to end up with an implementation that is implementable. Now, the TAS failure – I'm sorry, glitch [laughter] – has given us a significant amount of time that we weren't planning for. The original schedule probably had some slack in it although we didn't want to admit to it so we have a bit of time, but the longer that this goes on, and especially if it goes into Prague with no action taken, we're almost killing the process in my mind.

Now that may be the right thing to do if indeed the JAS Group acted inappropriately or something but I think we have to understand what the implications of no action are. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay. Well, thank you very much for bringing this up to the call, and it's on record now and I am looking forward to the discussion following up on the ALAC mailing list. Any other business in addition to this any other business? And I don't see any hands up anymore. I'm afraid we have lost, I believe we've lost the interpreters in French already and we might have already lost the interpreters in Spanish, but I thank all of you who are still here and of course I thank the interpreters and the people on the



language channels as well for having lasted that long. It is 46 minutes past the hour so effectively we're 46 minutes late – 16:46, and this meeting is now adjourned. Thank you very much, all of you. A very, very productive call, thank you.

[End of Transcript]