

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody. This is the ALAC Executive Committee Conference call on the 23rd of May 2012. The time is 19:04 UTC. We have an agenda that's quite long, as per usual, and we'll start immediately with the roll call please.

Gisella Gruber: Welcome to everyone on today's call. We have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Carlton Samuels, Evan Leibovitch; from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani, and myself, Gisella Gruber. Apologies noted today from Tijani Ben Jemaa and Rinalia Abdul Rahim. If I could also please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Gisella and I'm not sure, do we have anyone else on the call perhaps. It looks as though there is no one shouting, no unknown voice shouting, so let's move on directly to part two of our agenda which is the review of the Action Items. And we'll start with the Executive Meeting of the 7th of May, which is the one we had earlier this month and we'll just go directly over to the bottom of that page which speaks about the open Action Items, and there are two of them.

One is the At-Large staff to move forward with the SOI and COI page that we'd mentioned, this is a progress, there has been a meeting with people at ICANN IT Services who will put together – well put something

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.

together basically for us that will be pretty much sort of thing as what the GNSO has. I think we're all aware of that, so I'm just saying this for the record.

And the second one, the staff is to send the ASO, the Address Supporting Organization a list of countries with the ALSes. And I believe that this is actually not in progress, this has been done. Could I have an update on this please?

Matt Ashtiani:

Hi, this is Matt for the record. That AI has been completed.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, thank you very much Matt. And for the record, we have had a reply from John Curran of ARIN who has thanked us for this list and he has passed it on over to the people in charge of relations of the – RIR relations. At the same time, I have replied to John's message as well and advised him that we'd like further collaboration in the same way as finding out what ALSes can do for RIRs – sorry what RALOs can do for RIRs, what can RIRs do for RALOs. I understand that there are some cases where RIRs have funds for helping, travel funds for example, sponsorship etc, and this is the direction in which I'm hoping we will be able to go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yes, that's actually going to be a very useful thing I think. Not only can they – it's Cheryl for the record. Not only can they give support to remote participation which can be inclusive of the local At-Large

structure membership, not just the members but leadership, but they'll often be in a position to have (inaudible) positions or [cursory] based activity which can be a real outreach builder. Sorry, I just got excited; I'll shush up now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It is exciting Cheryl. Thank you. And I believe we do have another meeting with the ASO in Prague; is this correct Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: Correct, this is Heidi, correct. We have it on Tuesday during one of the ALAC policy sessions.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay thank you. It is a shortened thing, it's not a full hour we have with them.

Heidi Ullrich: Correct.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But what I suggest is that we touch on this when we actually see them and basically start putting things down so as to be able to obtain funds and at the same time also to be able to help them out in their defense of the multi stakeholder model. We are all aware of the WCIT taking place later this year with the ITU and of course both the ICANN model, us included, and the RIR model will be under serious attack.

For the record, the RIR model proposed as being replaced by a national system where governments would be dealing with numbering.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That'll be a whole lot of fun.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: There you go. Anyway...yes please go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Is there any plans in ICANN for them to have a contingent that is in place at the ITU plenary to as if be the ambassadors for the ICANN model. Is there any plan in place for that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's a very good question Carlton, and I do not know and perhaps we should have this as an Action Item for staff to find out.

Carlton Samuels: I think yes, thank you for putting that as an Action Item sir. Because I think they have to take this seriously and they have to go directly into the fight, and it seems to me they want more than the usual suspects here. They want people from the At-Large especially from all over to go in. I hope they have a good sense to have you there at least in this engagement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Yes, go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry. Can I just clarify? I thought that Carlton was asking about what the ASOs planning was; ASO, NRO and RIRs planning was. But then he indicated that they should at least have you as the ALAC Chair this; that's sort of ICANN as opposed to the more independent RIR type.

Carlton Samuels: I was thinking both Cheryl, thank you for clarification. I started out by thinking ASO, but then I thought let's make it bigger and get ICANN in from the top.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Might I just point out that the first time around we used this of course our Australian Government sent the president of our At-Large structure.

Carlton Samuels: Oh, that's even better.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I mean there are models we can follow that are protected from that point of view, but prior planning is probably almost too late to get many of those mechanisms up but we shall see.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so this is noted as an Action Item and we'll follow up with that. There are a couple of recently closed Action Items that were there: the staff to ask the ICANN Academy Working Group to discuss the capacity

building at the next meeting and to ask Sala that she be present on the call – well that’s very old. That’s not really even recently closed, but that’s past. And a call for a meeting of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee to review the information that Tijani Ben Jemaa received it, it’s to be held; that was done.

And the newly assigned Action Items: staff to send Alan the main points of the ICANN Academy. I could ask staff...

Heidi Ullrich: I’m sorry Olivier, could you repeat that please?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The staff to send Alan the main points of the ICANN Academy.

Heidi Ullrich: I’m in progress.

Alan Greenberg: This is Alan. I don’t know if it was done or not, but that meeting is over so it’s rather moot. I didn’t actually see them but maybe they arrived.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, Alan what I could do is just send you the links to the Wiki pages. I don’t know whether you have any specific questions.

Alan Greenberg: It was impressed to a GNSO meeting which has already happened. I did by the way try to find the Wiki pages and I couldn't.

Heidi Ullrich: They're all under the working group. They're all under working groups, which is at the bottom of the gray box.

Alan Greenberg: In any case it's moot at this point; that meeting happened already.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. So that's the first thing, the first set of Action Items. Then we also have another set of Action Items which is our recent ALAC call. Just for the record, this Action Item I gather is to be closed – staff to send Alan the main points of the ICANN Academy; that's done? So passed anyway. The second set of Action Items, that's the ones from the call we had yesterday and the two open Action Items are the ones on the SOI and COI page and that one is in progress as we just mentioned.

And the other one is Gisella to prepare a document showing ALAC's members current membership in current working groups by the next ALAC meeting, and that's in progress as well. So the newly assigned Action Items are Matt Ashtiani to contact Julie Hammer regarding the draft statement of ICANN's role and remit in security, stability and resiliency of the internet's unique identifier system statement. And this statement is to be put on the ALAC Ex-Com agenda if of course a statement is required, which I believe is in progress, is it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I indicated I would be happy to help with that as well. When staff contacts her they could let her know.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: They can carbon copy you and I, yes. Any note from staff on this.

Heidi Ullrich: No. At least Matt says that.

Matt Ashtiani: I'm sorry what was the AI Olivier?

Heidi Ullrich: Matt to contact Julie Hammer regarding the draft statement regarding ICANN's role and remit in security, stability and resiliency.

Matt Ashtiani: No I did not have time yesterday. I'll contact her today.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay sorry.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Matt, with a carbon copy to myself and to Cheryl as well, since she was willing to take the lead on this.

Matt Ashtiani:

Sure thing.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay next one. Matt Ashtiani to begin a vote on the Vision Statement within the next 24 hours, and that is done. And thirdly a letter from the Chair of the ALAC to the Chair of the Board is to be sent with the improvements report. Well I might just send it to the Chair of the Board, not the Chair of the Chair. But if that's the case then I'm happy with that and that will be in progress once the improvements report will be sent out. What I'll probably do is to liaise with Jean-Jacques Subrenat who had a set of expressions that he thought would be helpful to include in there and that would be certainly showing how much of a big step it is for us to have reached this point. Any comments on the Action Items that we have here? No comments?

Okay, then we can move straight to the Policy Advice Development calendar and here I'd like to have an Action Item first for staff. When they prepare the agenda, for them to link the words "policy advice development calendar" to the new page that – the At-Large Policy Development page effectively that Matt has put together, rather than having a link to the Google spreadsheet, which I believe is not in use anymore. So, we can test that out next time around.

We'll pass over the recent approved ALAC statements. Does anyone have any comments to make over our recent statements? No one? Okay and then the statements currently reviewed by the ALAC: the first one, the Draft Fiscal Year 13 Operating Plan & Budget. I've had some emails back and forth with Tijani today. He was waiting for a question of his to be answered by Xavier Calvez. Xavier has been very

overworked and has not replied so far, although he did tell me yesterday he would reply within 24 hours. So hopefully we'll get an answer soon.

Tijani has given me the green light to put the statement that he's written so far, apart from the two last paragraphs, which relate to the question that he has asked. So I'll be doing this right after this call and cut and pasting and staff will be sending out a request for ALAC and At-Large community comments. There up a handout from Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich:

Yes Olivier. This is Heidi. Tijani sent us a note earlier today. I thought that he said that Xavier had basically said that one of the questions of Tijani's was now in David's hands. So I was going to follow-up with David on that today as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well I was not aware of that. If that's okay with you then please go ahead. The problem I have with multiple people asking multiple questions is everybody starts becoming unsynchronized. And I was hoping that David would reply to Xavier fast enough for Xavier to reply to Tijani.

Heidi Ullrich:

Yes, that's what I'm going to suggest that he do if he has – he's in transit the next day or so, so that might be problematic. But I'll make it an urgent issue.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well I'm on conference calls in transit so...I'm sure he can read emails in transit. In the meantime I will still put up the start of that statement.

Alan Greenberg: Since we have a lull in the conversation...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Since we have a lull in the conversation is anyone else having trouble getting things from the Wiki?

Heidi Ullrich: Alan this is Heidi. Just really about 30 minutes ago it actually was down and the IT staff says that yes the confluence people were aware of it and they were able to get it back up, but it does seem to be very slow at the moment.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah it's not taking anything I send.

Alan Greenberg: For the record, Olivier, every time you ask does anyone have any issue with the rest of the things, whether it's the Action Items or the statements, I don't know what they were because I can't get a list of them. I'm assuming I had no comments.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well the .com registry agreement renewal; the ALAC statement on security, stability and resiliency of the DNS Review Team, SSRRT; the ALAC statement on the VeriSign request to implement reduction grace period, RGP for a dot name; the ALAC statement on the fake renewal notices report; the At-Large draft advice letter on consumer trust, consumer choice and competition; and the IDN Variants Issues Projects Proposed Project Plans for Next Steps.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If you have any comments...

Alan Greenberg: I have no comment that's appropriate.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. So, we've done the ICANN FY 13 Operating Plan & Budget, the timetable for this is probably likely going to make us late in delivering it. we do need to give at least five days to our community to be able to comment on it, so we'll be a few days late. Comment closes on the 24th of May, Xavier Calvez is aware of the fact that we will be late. I'm not sure, would staff perhaps drop a note over to officialize this, because this was on a call that we said this to Xavier Calvez. Perhaps it's better to do it also by email and say we'll have five to ten days delay on this.

Heidi Ullrich: Olivier this is Heidi.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We could ask for an extension, the problem that we're faced with is that we're going head against the actual deadlines that are required for the Board to be able to look at the budget.

Alan Greenberg: Well Xavier said it was no problem, let's assume he's right.

Heidi Ullrich: Olivier this is Heidi. I believe Xavier also said that we could send text over as it was developed or even the draft one just to let him know what the possible statement might look like.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for reminding me, yes excellent point. So that's probably what we will do then. We can send an interim text and then we can send a final text and we can then send another note five days later to advise him of how many votes this final text got. Perhaps that's the best way forward.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here Olivier. Sorry, is that Carlton? Was that Carlton wanting to speak?

Carlton Samuels:

No, no, no I was telling Olivier you had your hand up dear.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Oh gosh, well thank you. I just wanted to put in here for the record that as you all know, the ccNSO has raised a number of concerns about the comment/reply/comment and general issues in terms of the timing and logistics from their council and in their membership, but definitely their council point of view with the current state of affairs on current comment. It's this particular thing, this particular one, the ability to respond to the draft plan and budget that has got them particularly annoyed. The ccNSO has put in extensive, complete and we would suggest highly effective and informative commentary on all of the prior incarnations of the public comment on the matter of budget and strategic planning.

And they are, to say the least, a little annoyed that with an almost unblemished interactive history due to the very narrow window and being buttoned right up against the necessity for the Board decision that the prior planning on this particular performance is going to make them look as if they were either incapable or uninterested, neither of which is the case. In other words they're really annoyed about this one. I think this particular example is going to be a good one for pushing further for change.

I think the Ex Com needs to know of all of the public commentaries option, topics, and annoyances that have happened, this one certainly has got the other SOs at least, I don't know if the GNSO I won't comment on that, but certainly has the other primary SOs, the ccNSO

annoyed and that's an understatement. They're actually serious. Okay, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Cheryl and I'm just trying to scan our agenda whether we're going to back onto this, and I believe we might not be – looking at the agenda, review group – we're not going to touch on that in the rest of this call, so perhaps it's good to talk about it now.

Carlton Samuels: Can I say something?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes sure, go ahead Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Chair. Carlton Samuels for the record. In light of what is disclosed to us by Cheryl, I think it makes sense for us to coach our request for extension within that context. The context being that the budget and operating plan are [signal] important and therefore given all of the determinants that we are up against, it really does not give us enough time to give it the proper shake it needs.

So instead of begging for time, simply state that we are time constrained because of the circumstances that present itself. Much in the way the ccNSO Council has been making the case that they've always been attentive to budget and making comments in due course, I think the ALAC could make the same case. So I'm suggesting that we

take some advice from that statement and leverage what we say to them.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Carlton. What's actually happened is in the past few days there has been a exchange of emails between Filiz, Yilmaz and I with regards to those timings, the public comment timings. As you know, one of our recommendations in the At-Large and ALAC improvements is for the ALAC to provide for enough time for communities to be able to file their comments. And the schedule that we have developed in-house goes directly against the schedule which ICANN has adopted.

ICANN adopting the minimum 21 days and us adopting – Cheryl please tell me the number, is it 30 days or 40 days?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it used to be, sorry the recommendation for us is quite clear. It's to be at any time that we want – sorry any time that ALAC wants up to 45 days.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Up to 45 days, that's right. So, the request that was made was to – and on previous occasions – was to basically do a follow-up on what we had said in Costa Rica to Filiz. And I only received a reply – was it today or yesterday, very recently,. And her reply was that the preference for ICANN would be basically asking for an extension, and extension are

granted. And so it would provide an extension of 15 days if that's what we would require, we as the ALAC would require.

Now that said, it's not what we're actually asking for because it doesn't bring us in line with, if you say 21 days plus 15 days does not equal to the 45. So effectively we have replied and Heidi would you be able to provide us a quick rundown on what you have sent over?

Heidi Ullrich:

Yes. Basically I updated – this is Heidi for the record. Basically I updated Filiz on what the issues were in terms of the recommendation eight and in terms of that the recommendation eight was actually made by the ALAC Review Group not the ALAC, and that's the At-Large Improvements Work Team and Task Force have come with Action Items to implement that. Particularly for example 8.1B and 8.2 – I don't know exactly what ones they are now.

But the proposed text that we're hoping will be come out from this discussion is – I'm just going to read – “for purposes of recommendation eight, ALAC consulted with ICANN staff responsible for the implementation of the public comment enhancements. ALAC confirmed it's understanding that the guidelines for public comments recognized flexibility in extending the public comment period beyond the minimum requirements. And ALAC may, on a case by case basis, request extensions of 5, 10, 21 or 30 days in exceptional circumstances.

“Such requests will be made directly to the staff person responsible for the specific public comment period, thereby notifying them that the ALAC intends to submit comment. ALAC further requests that a staff

response to such request for an extension to a public comment period be granted or denied within an expeditious manner.” So again Cheryl, you’ll recognize that text. That comes directly from I think it’s 8.1A and 8.2B.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that’s good.

Heidi Ullrich: So again, that’s what’s being proposed that they come back with. I don’t know whether they will agree to that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you Heidi. Now, in addition to this, knowing that time is of the essence and we really wish to push as much as we can right now, ultimately the people who are working on the Board on this, or the Public Participation Committee, and we happen to have Sebastien Bachollet as the Chair of the Public Participation Committee. Now Sebastien is today in Ukraine. I have managed to actually speak to him that was very recently, it was just last hour. I spoke to him. He will only be back on Friday; well he will only be available again on Friday because he’s staying in a hotel with no internet and obviously roaming costs for mobile phones are very expensive as well.

So tomorrow he’s travelling. Friday morning he will be in Paris. I will speak to him and we will try and find out if we are able to come to an answer on this as soon as possible. I believe that staff and I are speaking to Filiz tomorrow, is that correct Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: I think that we have a little bit more time where we could possibly speak with both early next week. We were pushing for a first of June deadline to post the first document, but now I've just heard this morning that the deadline is the 4th of June. So we still could speak to them on Monday and start a vote and post the final report in time for the 4th of June deadline.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, because Filiz is not available on Friday, is that correct?

Heidi Ullrich: I believe that is correct. Gisella are you on the phone?

Gisella Gruber: Yes, Filiz is not available on Friday and as Olivier has just said Sebastien is travelling tomorrow afternoon. So if it's okay I was just waiting on the decision on this to send the Doodle to just to check availability on Monday or Tuesday.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well make it as early as possible please Gisella, because we need to really push on this. The thing, we have already sent an official email and an official statement on the fact that this timing is not working well for us. The current answer that we got is just one of saying "well you can request for extensions". So we need to make sure that we get the amount of extension that we want and take it from there basically.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Olivier. Thank you. My sense of the feeling, at least in the ccNSO is on this particular topic, i.e. the budget planning etc, is they have raised their hands up in absolute horror, gone “oh for heaven’s sake this is ridiculous”, but they realize that there are vital mandated hard stops on all of it. And it’s all very nice on the part of ICANN to grant extensions until the cows come home by themselves, but the Board still has to make a decision by a particular date. And input either will or will not be able to be taken into account.

And so they’ve got a “thank you very much for making us look bad” attitude, “let’s hope you have the core competency ICANN to fix this next time”. Particular because there is no excuse for, let’s face it, the most important public comment set of milestone dates to be pushed up against deadlines like this, literally no excuse. This could hardly be a surprise. We should be able to be planning in the date of public comment on FY 2015 now.

They’re I think going to, and you might want to just check Olivier with the Chair of the ccNSO, put in a “you will note the absence of a normally extensive and detailed comment from us, not because we didn’t want to, because there has not been time. Thank you very much, no thanks. To you we look now [pad].” I’d almost take that hard line in the sand where in the public record for the public comment responses on this part of the process. You have key stakeholders within ICANN going “well sorry, we normally say something but not enough time, tough. Next.” And that’s my thoughts, but that’s really – ALAC is slight

different I guess because it's got the Advisory Committee status. It can take a more generous approach with an extension or just direct advice.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well this is it Cheryl, in our last statement or our last correspondence we have clearly made it known that we would like to have extensions, we would like to have the proper time to reply, but if it's not granted we'll just take the right to do so. Admittedly, I've also mentioned that to Xavier Calvez this week and he said "well it just makes it more complicated for them" because they ideally would like to see other replies on what our submission is and what our statement is basically. So it will just allow less others to reply on what we have said. It's just an absolute dogs breakfast basically. Sorry, I had to say that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I agree with you Olivier and I know I get extremely upset about this but I keep putting on my ATRT hat. It basically ensures that all of the good reasoning and rationale behind what is supposed to be a better system and that whole concept of comment with our comment, which was supposed to be better not worse. It's like getting a group an instruction and an opportunity to make a silk purse and they haven't even delivered a sows ear (inaudible), I think it is.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alan you put your hand up.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah. I'd like to stop the hand wringing over how badly they've screwed up in the general case and address the specific one of the budget comments. And as Cheryl implied just saying "we have demanded 400 days before, we're demanding it this time doesn't have any merit because there is a deadline by which the budget has to be accepted and ICANN finance has to have some time to get it to the Board.

Now, going back to the start of this discussion, you said that when we talked to Xavier he said it is okay if we are "n" days late, but he would like to see the thing as it's evolving so they've got a heads up and know where we're going. How many days was "n"?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I think we were speaking about five to eight days.

Alan Greenberg:

Okay then, let's put in a comment saying "as we have discussed with Xavier, because of our processes we will not have a final comment until a certain day. It will be submitted at that point". And since we now have a comment in, we can respond to it and put the actual content in. We've done that in at least one case before. So let's put a comment in saying "this is what we're doing, we're not asking for 49 more days, we're not asking for 45 instead of 21, we're asking for another five or six" or whatever it is we really need to do it properly. And if the vote comes after that, the vote comes after that. So be it. Not many of our votes fail.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan. And this is where the plot thickens because in the email that I sent to Filiz I mentioned three different scenarios. The second scenario, the one that we made use of last time and which we wanted to make use of, or which we could make use of as you've just mentioned now for the budget. This one was apparently not the one favored by Filiz. She favors the one where we ask for an extension.

Alan Greenberg: Then in parallel with that put in an extension, ask for an extension for five days; not an extension to go up to the 45 days which was our ideal, what we need in this case. If they refuse the extension we still have a comment in that we can reply to. If they accept the extension fine, everyone is happy, even the ccNSO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay so staff please send an email to ask for an extension on this for an additional eight days. We'll make it eight because we do need to have...

Alan Greenberg: Is eight reasonable given that they have to set the budget in time for the meeting?

Matt Ashtiani: Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, who is this?

Matt Ashtiani: This is Matt for the record. Just to be clear I have copied down Alan's comment. Would you like to send the comment that Alan just made? It's on the right hand side of the screen in the "notes" pod, or would you like to send a request for an extension of eight to ten days?

Alan Greenberg: I think we should do both.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Both, yes. Yes Heidi, please go ahead.

Heidi Ullrich: Just to confirm, you would like staff to send in that statement that Matt has noted to the comment period for the Fiscal year Budget Operating Plan and Budget and at the same time that staff also send a note to Xavier saying that ALAC is requesting a five day extension.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Correct, yes.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay two things. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I understand that this might send mixed signals but this is the mixed signals we're now getting from ICANN so we might as well send the same things back.

Carlton Samuels: That's exactly right. It's mixed signals and we'll respond with mixed signals.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And just to enlighten you a little bit on the reason why the budget is so delayed, and this is following up on a call of the Finance & Budget Subcommittee where we had Xavier speak to us, well actually speak to all the AC and SO Chairs and we had several people from our Finance & Budget Subcommittee on the call. Xavier mentioned that the delay with the closing of the TAS system and the delay with the finding out of how many applicants there were and how many applications there were at the end made it very difficult for him and his team to come up with exact figures for the budget.

So they've had to tweak the figures and they're going to have to tweak them again, which means they basically were – well it appears quite overworked and could not start earlier in order to finish in time. This means that the Board might not have enough time to go through the whole budget since they will have to wait till the end of the public comment period, those comments will have to be integrated into the report. And then the Board will have to look at those and ratify those and that is very likely to last until after the Prague meeting.

And since we all know that the Prague meeting ends on the 30th, is it the 30th, the next day if the first of July. What the Board might have to do is to ratify some early projects that would take place in July and August on a case by case basis and then give a green light to the rest of the budget once that budget is finalized sometime in July. Pretty strange to have...

Alan Greenberg:

Olivier, it's Alan. Let's not agonize over what the Board will do. The Board can pass an interim budget and adjust it three weeks later. They have all sorts of mechanisms at their disposal which meet corporate requirements. That's not our problem. Let's just go ahead and do this. We've spent enough time talking about this one. And by the way, the statement that Matt transcribed, I used "internal processes" as a shorthand, we should say internal processes. We should say "due to our requirement to discuss throughout At-Large or something like that.

Carlton Samuels:

Good enough for me.

Alan Greenberg:

We're not going to fix ICANN's problems in this meeting and some of us have other things to do today too, so let's go on and do what we have to.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay noted Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I'm cranky.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No that's fine, I just thought you'd need to know about why the budget was late and why we're basically not given the 400 days, was it 400 days, or the amount of time we basically wanted to follow. Ultimately it's on the record that we are not the ones who are being late; it's elsewhere with things such as being gone back to front. Anyway so let's move on to the next one, the WHOIS Policy Review Team Final Report. Carlton has said that he'll prepare a draft statement so I guess that's coming up pretty soon?

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton for the record. I actually have prepared a statement. I sent it to Alan because I wanted him to have a look at it. I was particularly was...

Alan Greenberg: When did you do that?

Carlton Samuels: This morning, early this morning.

Alan Greenberg: Ah okay. I've been doing many other things today, email is not one of them. Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Okay I'm copied on that. I just want you to have a look at it Alan because I wanted to use some of the words that you...

Alan Greenberg: I'll get it out shortly.

Carlton Samuels: Okay. And once we agree on that then I'll send it to Matt and Matt can put it on the Wiki and we will announce it to the rest of the world to say that it's open for comment and then we will take it from there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay thank you. The next one is the draft statement on ICANN's role and remit in security and stability etc. Let's have a look, what is it saying here. CLO suggested a short statement that should be prepared and Julie Hammer will be looking at this. Has staff followed up on that?

Matt Ashtiani: Hi Olivier that AI was given to me and I didn't have time to email Julie yesterday; I'll do it today.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay and then the draft ICANN language services policy and procedures, that's one where Cheryl has also decided to look at. I'm hoping that we get...

Carlton Samuels: Can I remind you of something? In the ALAC meeting do you recall that Sergio Salinas Porto wants to hold the pen on this and he's actually asked for support from LACRALO, all the people of LACRALO and AFRALO in particular? So you might wish to make note of that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay thank you Carlton. I was just about to mention I was hoping that LACRALO and AFRALO would be involved with this. But of course this is something where other regions, including the APRALO region, possibly the one with the most languages, needs to be involved in. But it would really be great if someone from LACRALO or AFRALO were holding the pen on that.

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton again for the record. I want to just go on record as saying that your note, because in the chat Cheryl Langdon-Orr did make the point that 64% of the world's language diversity is represented in APRALO. So it is quite important for the APRALO people not to be left out of this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may then, Olivier this is Cheryl in response to Carlton. I might also point out that APRALO manages where LACRALO apparently can't, it only has two if not three primarily languages to deal with and we have 68. But we manage to just get on and get the work done. So if APRALO isn't a major player in the drafting of it we will just continue on in English and in our own local languages without drama.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Cheryl. Just one point Carlton, you mentioned that...

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl for the record.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Carlton you mentioned, just one point that Sergio wanted to draft this. I remember that he wanted to be part of the drafting team; I didn't know that he wanted to hold the pen.

Carlton Samuels: Well yes. Actually if my memory serves I was particularly taken by back. He did ask to hold the pen, that's what my recollection. But I stand corrected on the record.

Matt Ashtiani: This is Matt. I confirm that what Carlton said is actually true. Sergio requested to hold the pen and requested support from AFRALO in writing this statement.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Leave it to them, let's see what they can do God love their little cotton socks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay well if we can follow-up and put pressure on them from now please, so that this can be done and not left till two days before or two days after.

Alan Greenberg: Olivier it's Alan, my hand is up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Please go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'll try to say this politically correctly. The position of LACRALO on translation and interpretation is often more stringent and has more requirements than otherwise we might ask for. We better get this draft and look at with enough care to make sure that this is a statement that ALAC wants to make, not just LACRALO wants to make.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh Alan, Cheryl here. I was just going to make sure that we advised our APRALO to vote intelligently when they have to vote.

Alan Greenberg: Well that too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Because you know, this is going to be like watching a train wreck if this goes wrong.

Alan Greenberg: Well indeed, but our statement, if it gets approved, and let's face it our statements usually get approved...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well then people get what they vote for.

Alan Greenberg: Well indeed, but there's our credibility at stake also so I'm just saying that we should be careful. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan and thank you Cheryl. Of course there is our own – well we'll see. We'll see how this comes out. For the time being I'd like to give them a chance and it's certainly an important thing for them to draft a statement on it. The earlier we get this statement the better it is. And by this, perhaps should we start setting – well the first thing I'll be doing is to set up a timetable of when the first draft should be ready and etc. And that will of course be done by everyone.

Carlton Samuels: Can I say something Chair?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes go ahead. I think first Cheryl and then you Carlton.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just wanted to point out that I think what's important is that this is a response, this is not an opportunity to write our own language service policy. As long as it is focused, as long as the group that is doing the initial drafting focuses on what the job is, i.e. responding to the draft language services policy as she is writ, then it should be fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm totally in agreement with that Cheryl, but this is something we'll obviously have to find out once the statement is drafted, the first draft is done. And if it's not the case, if this is not understood by the people drafting it, then at that point of course comments to that extent will be important. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Chair. Carlton Samuels for the record. The first piece of what I want to say that was said so ably by Cheryl, but the second piece is in the context of what you said earlier on, that you have to put out a timeline. It's right that you have to do this, but I would respectfully request that as Chair in this case you send out a timeline along with a reminder of what is expected, before we get too far. Because we need to guard against going down to the wire and have maybe been carried afield in this case. That's what I wanted to say.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay Carlton. I'll make a note of that. So I'll include this in the call. Right, any other comments on this; maybe we can move on. I realize we are rather late now. It's 55 minutes past the hour. Next is the proposed revised process for handling the request for removal of cross-ownership restrictions on operators of existing gTLDs. Alan you were going to read through this and let us know if this was something we needed to comment on or not.

Alan Greenberg: When I said that I didn't know I was reporting to you for today. Sorry, I'm working on something else with a hard deadline and I haven't had much time. I'll try to get it done later on today. It may not be till tomorrow.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Alan. And we'll move onto then items for discussion number four – pre-Prague policy webinar. And I guess I'll hand over the floor to staff if you have any more to tell us since the ALAC meeting yesterday.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, this is Heidi. Thank you Olivier, a couple of things. First on the issue of interpretation. There were a few requests from LACRALO for Spanish interpretation. We had some discussions on this internally. The call is actually being held on Verizon which did not offer interpretation. So we will continue to hold this call in English only for this time, and make a point of for future calls we will look into offering interpretation on this. Sergio and Silvia on the LACRALO list seem to be okay with that.

In terms of the ALAC portion of this, it looks like I will have approximately three or four minutes to discuss the key ALAC issues. It was suggested that only two or three key statements be discussed, as well as the possibility of discussing the At-Large Improvements project teams finalized in Prague. I need to submit two or three slides for those issues and then also at the end of that discussion offer resources for more information.

So what I'd like to discuss with you is what topics, what are the two or three key statements that you'd like me to highlight. But of course at the beginning what I was thinking is that I would note the number of statements that the ALAC has submitted since Costa Rica. I think that's quite an extraordinary amount. And I'll hand the floor back to you Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Heidi. And we have such a long list of statements that we could pick from. Do any of these stand out in any of your minds – I can hear myself now – hello?

Carlton Samuels: I'm here. I'm here.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh you're still here. For some reason I just heard myself for a while.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes and the echo seems okay now, thank you. Matt would you please put the first one page up that links to that one?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think confluence – is it working now? It wasn't working earlier.

Heidi Ullrich: Yes it's on the webpage so I think we should be okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh yeah, the community website is definitely not working. Hmm, we might be suffering a denial of service attack on the Wiki, who knows.

Carlton Samuels: You can never tell.

Heidi Ullrich: IT is telling me all this technical information about crawlers and the need to turn from this text into html – so if that means anything to you that's what it is.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: About what?

Heidi Ullrich: Something about crawlers and the need – some problems they've had from upgrading from version 3 to 4. The pages need to be reconverted for the crawlers, that's what that is. I don't know what that means.

Alan Greenberg: Something in the html is causing the search engines to ignore the pages or reject them it sounds like.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you Alan for speaking to me in English. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So the corresponding page yeah.

Heidi Ullrich: So we have that, so let's go from – if we could start from the 23rd of March, that's still Costa Rica but I think that that would still be okay. So starting with that one perhaps are there any that stand out that you would like me to mention?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I guess they all stand out somehow. They were all particularly important. I was going to mention the SSRRT was an interesting one. Of course the Olympic and Red Cross names were important, if not the most controversial out of the whole lot. But it appears that the Board has heard us on those. The Board Conflict of Interest was the second one I believe, wasn't it? We have two of these so you could actually batch the two of them and say we've submitted two on those. And there hasn't been any apparent reply or...

Heidi Ullrich: If I may suggest, again this is a pre-Prague webinar, so is there anything of these that you expect to discuss in Prague? So I would say that the IOC Red Cross one is probably going to be discussed.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: This one will probably be discussed, but the conflicts of interest are definitely going to be discussed in Prague since we're going to touch on those with the GAC.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. And the SSRT one?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The SSRRT I gather, I don't think anything will be discussed in Prague about that one. That's true.

Alan Greenberg: I doubt if there's going to be any Red Cross IOC substantive discussion in Prague.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Are they not coming back onto the discussion at the moment Alan?

Alan Greenberg: No. At this point, we think but we're not 100% sure that the group is going to continue working on second level protections. But our first meeting after this debacle is only next week, so we're not likely to have

any real substance to report back. I may be wrong, but I'm not expecting any major discussion.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so if that's the case forget about the Red Cross and Olympic. I would say touch on the conflicts of interest – that's going to hurt, but there you go. The SSRRT, I don't think there will be a follow-up because I don't believe that the SSRRT is meeting in Prague.

Carlton Samuels: New gTLD agenda. And the TAS, what has come out of the TAS. That should be something that's topical.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Correct but these are not things that we are talking about. We're just speaking at the moment about topics that Heidi will speaking about during the policy webinar.

Carlton Samuels: Oh the webinar. Oh, alright.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So, the statement on the consumer trust, consumer choice and competition is quite a short one. I don't think it's worthy of being mentioned in the wider scale of what's currently going on in the CCI Working Group. Although the final advice letter will be provided by the CCI, I think it's better that the CCI itself tell what they're going to be doing rather than the ALAC mentioning anything on this. Yes, Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: Sorry, I'm just looking at what will be developed here – what about the WHOIS Policy Review Team final report?

Carlton Samuels: Yeah, I was about to tell you that, but I also wanted to say back on the agenda the application for (inaudible) because there has been something going on especially with the Review Team, and the selection for the Review Committee – that's going on, Olivier. So you might want to bring that up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Again, though, what we're dealing with here is just a briefing that Heidi would be giving on the webinar.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The objection process would be worth going into because that's something that other parts of ICANN would probably benefit from understanding.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, that's a very good point.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I think so. I absolutely think so.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Excellent point on that, yes. And then of course you're going to be speaking about the last line of our Improvements Review or is this not considered policy?

Heidi Ullrich: Well, I mentioned that to some Policy staff who are organizing this and they said "Well absolutely that's fine." In the past when the GNSO Improvements had some major milestones they mentioned this on the webinars as well. So this is something that's really quite important. I think I might even be able to mention that the ALAC will be commemorating its ten year anniversary. I don't know if that's really policy but that might be something that I can mention.

Alan Greenberg: There's plenty of things listed on the webinar agenda that are not formal policy, so I wouldn't agonize over it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Heidi, is that enough?

Heidi Ullrich: So let me just confirm. So we have the statement of the COI. If you agree with the WHOIS, Carlton, your next final draft – would that be something? I know that Liz will be talking about that so I think that would be good if we could organize something about that. The GNSO is talking about it and the ALAC is immediately responding to it, I think that would be useful.

Carlton Samuels: Yes.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, so we'll do WHOIS. So those are the two policies, and we're not going to do SSRT – is that correct?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Correct.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, and then we'll also mention Improvements and a very quick mention of ALAC-

Carlton Samuels: And the objection process.

Heidi Ullrich: You wanted the objection process.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes we do. I think it is important for others to find out what we're doing, and it's definitely important because that's something that will be public-facing, so... Okay, so the first time you may have to mention, or you should mention actually that it's the first time we are actually committed to an operational matter rather than just an advisory matter and its operations.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. Okay, we'll mention the review groups also, okay. So we've got policy one issue, next one is operations, mention the Review Group – that they're going to be in operation by then. Thirdly is a quick mention of the Improvements and finally in closing, everyone is welcome to help ALAC celebrate their ten year anniversary – mention that. And then finally I comment on where to find more information, and I'll put a link to the correspondence page. Does that sound about right? Okay.

So the deadline, my internal deadline for slides, etc. is the third of June. I'm going to send that to you obviously prior to that, probably early next week just for you to confirm that. Olivier, I'll be working with you closely on getting all of this right. We have a practice run on the 11th and then we have the two webinars on the 14th.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, perfect.

Alan Greenberg: Olivier, it's Alan.

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

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. Do we want to put a very brief stake in the ground statement thing of "ALAC and At-Large members are continuing to work with staff on the implementation of the Applicant Support process?"

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's an interesting question you're asking me here, Alan. It's quite controversial.

Alan Greenberg: I said it's as a stake in the ground. That doesn't go by me. I don't think we should say "ALAC is working" but "ALAC and At-Large members are continuing to work on the processes to implement the Applicant Support mechanisms."

Carlton Samuels: I can say something to it, whether it's in this context or outside.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well I'm not against just mentioning it in the way you just-

Alan Greenberg: Yes, that is all I would do in passing, and make sure it's not a formal action of the Committee, but just "People are continuing to work on it."

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, I'm happy for this to be mentioned because that will be on record.

Alan Greenberg: I understand it is a political statement and that was intentional.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Anybody thinks that we shouldn't?

Heidi Ullrich: Thanks, Alan. Are you going to answer the questions for that?

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure I'm going to be on them.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you even more then. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Heidi, you can answer the questions.

Alan Greenberg: I certainly will if I'm there or you can take them and say you'll get back. Okay, anyway, maybe I'm just being [obstructionist]. I told you I'm in a nasty mood today. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well look, does anyone object on this, think that we [should not be pitching on] this? Does anyone not support it? Well, I think that... Yeah, I can see support from Carlton and support from Evan, and there's definitely support from me and I'm sure there would be support from Tijani since he's been so closely related to the JAS. So just that sentence would be fine. It's not a case of expanding on this, and I think, Heidi, if you do get questions on this then you can just refer to the substantive writing.

Alan Greenberg: I would say in fact that Heidi should not answer questions on this. This is not a Policy staff activity; this is individual members are working in a group with the Board and staff to advance the process. I would not go into any more than that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But it's individual members from the New gTLD Working Group, so...

Alan Greenberg: Not necessarily. They were a subset, superset of JAS who were volunteered, picked, whatever several months ago.

Carlton Samuels: Yep, that's what happened.

Alan Greenberg: There was a reconvening of the JAS Group which I wouldn't mention.

Carlton Samuels: It was a subset of the JAS Group reconvened. They thought that the JAS Group should have the Chairs, the Co-Chairs. I deferred my position to Cintra but essentially it was [veterans] of the JAS Group that went into the implementation planning.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So then, you see, that makes it not an ALAC thing, and what we are doing here is to provide details on what the ALAC is doing as far as-

Alan Greenberg: Then I withdraw and let's go on.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Evan has his hand up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, I haven't said much in this call because I haven't found too much to talk about yet until I got to this. [laughter] I do not want to take off the table what Alan said. I think it's important to be there. I support it, and if it means a matter of nuance to say that this is not an ALAC activity but this is activities within At-Large Working Groups, within At-Large members. This is things that the At-Large community is bringing to the table. No other constituency is going to bring this forward to ICANN. This is for us to talk about ; this is for us to describe and I think we have an obligation to talk about not necessarily just the 15 people of ALAC but the community behind us. So I agree with what Alan said and frankly I'm a little disappointed by the quick move to try and take it off the plate. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. The question, you know, my hesitancy is not drawn by that. My hesitancy is drawn by the question on whether this is suitable for discussion as an ALAC activity or not. Now if the presentation which Heidi is to give is providing both details of what the ALAC is doing but also what our community members are doing then I'm all for this to be included. But Heidi, you know much better.

Carlton Samuels: Can I give you cover? I'm an ALAC member and I'm a community member and I'm involved, so you have cover.

Evan Leibovitch: Olivier, if there's a real need to nuance this, this is a derivative of an ALAC effort. This is a derivative of an ALAC Working Group that has essentially gotten involved into a working group that's still involved in the issue and in fact has contributed a number of community members to a staff initiative to try and implement this thing. I don't think that's something to shy away from. That's something to me to be proud of and to basically own up to our part of this, and if it's not...

Alan Greenberg: Olivier, for the record these are not community members acting on their own behalf, acting.... I'm not quite sure what the right word is. They're not representing the ALAC but they are doing this with the support of the ALAC. So it's not as if we're talking about what they're doing back home in their spare time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Then I would have... Okay, well I'll explain to you my thinking on this one. I understand the JAS is currently at odds with the GNSO Council by having worked directly with staff on things that it was, according to the GNSO-

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry no, Olivier – I guess Alan was going to jump in there and so will I. That is not the case. Staff has asked individual people from the community that they have seen from their participation in the JAS and others to help with the implementation. This isn't the JAS helping staff. This is the staff saying "We're trying to implement it, we want some community help so we're going to go look at the people that helped draft some of the policies that we have to implement." So no, this is not the JAS inserting itself in a staff activity; this is staff asking for advice and naturally coming to find the people involved who are naturally both inclined, energetic and have a background on the issue.

Alan Greenberg: The GNSO is upset with the JAS Group being reconvened and making a decision which staff was then going to act on. It's that latter part that they didn't follow the chain of recommendation from the reconvened JAS Group going back to the parent groups. I was not referring to that aspect of it at all; I was referring to the interactions that a number of people have had helping to implement the policy. They're connected but they're not the same.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I just want to make sure that this is not confused by those who will be on the webinar. So Heidi, if you can word this then, in a way which will not make it sound like the JAS is doing this or a child of JAS is doing this, but these are individual At-Large members – and I mention At-Large not only ALAC – then I’m fine with it. It’s just because it is a politically sensitive thing and it will be in an official webinar delivered by a member of our staff. I don’t wish to end up having the ALAC being criticized for having touched on something which they shouldn’t have touched on.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Olivier, one last thing and then I’ll shut up. Number one: look at our bylaws. Everything that you’re talking about is within our realm to touch and to comment on. Nothing is out of our realm to talk about. If GNSO wants to get their noise out of joint because they think that this is exclusively theirs they’re welcome to tie themselves up in knots but that doesn’t mean that they’re correct in saying that we have no authority to even talk about.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, the words perhaps should be “Some ALAC/At-Large members, in addition to those from other parts of the community, are continuing to work with the staff and Board members to implement the process.” All we’re saying is it’s not dead, it’s still going on and we still care – that’s all we’re saying.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That works with me.

Evan Leibovitch: And if that message gets people's noses out of joint I'm sorry, I don't care.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm fine.

Alan Greenberg: Heidi, I'd be glad to vet the specific words you want to use or write them for you, whichever you prefer if there's any level of discomfort.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I'll go back into lurk mode. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Well, I'm glad we've got this one fixed. Anything else that you wish to touch on, Heidi, under Item #4 pre-Prague Policy Webinar?

Heidi Ullrich: No, thank you. That's been most helpful, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. So now we'll move on to the development of the Prague ALAC meeting agendas, and I guess it's back to you again, Heidi, for taking us through those if you have any questions or comments or so on.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, thank you, Olivier – this is Heidi for the record. Just a couple of points that we need to discuss today: staff are trying to finalize the At-Large meeting agenda at the latest by the end of this week so we can send them to get translated. Again, the 4th of June is the deadline to get this posted. We will meet that at least on the English version of them. A couple of things: the ALAC meeting with the SSAC, there was a question of would you like to have a spot for that session. One possible time is Tuesday, the 26th of June between 15:00 to 15:30 – that's in the ALAC Policy Discussion Part II. If you did decide to have that session that would then eliminate, or we would need to find time somewhere else for the hot topics session that has sort of been traditionally placed within that meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, the first thing, Heidi, and this is Olivier. The first thing is to have a look at what we would like to discuss with the SSAC, and I would imagine the inspiration would come from their latest publications. And I must admit I have not read their latest publications; well, I don't know if there are any additional ones that have been added since Costa Rica. But what I can do is to check through those, and I invite everyone actually to check through those by the end of the week.

Heidi Ullrich: And we'll then confirm? This is Heidi.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, then we can confirm whether we wish to have a meeting with the SSAC or not, because at the moment we have not confirmed a meeting with the SSAC so far.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You haven't had one for quite some time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We have to have one, definitely. It's good to entertain good relations with them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, you haven't had one with the SSAC for quite some time, so if there is a worthy agenda then I'd be encouraging you [to meet].

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Heidi Ullrich:

Okay, this is Heidi. The next point is the ALAC meeting with the GAC, a quick time update and that is it's now going to be 10:00 to 11:00 on Tuesday the 26th rather than 9:45 to 10:45. That was a request from the GAC and it fit into your schedule, so I went ahead and changed that. Now in terms of the topics, well not only that but in terms of moving down to Section B under Meeting Agendas," we put up your request, the question Wiki pages for several of the meetings; and they're listed on the agenda – questions for the Board, questions for the GAC, Communications, Compliance, Global Partnerships and for Participation and Engagement. The deadline for that is tomorrow and we have very few comments. I think, Evan, you're the only one who has put some questions on there.

So again, that's pretty urgent. We need them for the GAC – we've had several requests from the Secretariat and staff support from the GAC for what the final topics will be. So if we can get through those, and in addition Matt is putting together the agenda, the draft agenda for the NCSG meeting with ALAC and so we need topics for that as well. So Olivier, back to you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Do we need to have a reminder sent to the list? I know we're asking an enormous number of things at the moment; there seems to be a constant flow for requests for comments for this and comments for that. But it's just a concern that we're not getting any feedback at the moment.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, perhaps if we can do that – this is Heidi for the record. Perhaps we can do that this afternoon our time and maybe just extend the deadline by one day to the 25th if that would be okay with you, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, that's fine. What's our deadline for transmitting those to the people who've asked for it? That's really where the question lies.

Heidi Ullrich: Well, I haven't been given firm deadlines but again, final agendas are due to be posted on the 4th and I'm sure that we're going to be hearing requests now for the Board report, staff... As I mentioned, the GAC staff has been asking for a couple of weeks. We do need to give Maguy and her team enough time for Compliance questions; Global Partnerships, I'm still waiting to hear back from Mandy. I did forward her your request about the event that was held in Toronto several years ago, and also the issue – just today, the issue that Tijani raised about the upcoming IGF events in [Kafu] and the need for GP work and coordination with the RALOs and with the GNSO on that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So Heidi, it's Olivier here. You know, you're suggesting extending till the 25th – I wonder whether we could extend to the 28th or even the 30th if we have until the 4th. That would give another week; we could send a reminder and give another week for people to bring their input on this.

Heidi Ullrich: That's possible but again, the 28th – the Monday you're saying?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Correct, yeah.

Heidi Ullrich: That's fine, that's fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I've got my hand up about a couple of things. Number one, you said you were mentioning to Mandy about my comments going back to the private registry/registrars meetings that went back to Toronto a couple of years ago.

Heidi Ullrich: No, the question on you had on NARALO and I think you posted it on the Wiki on the questions for Global Partnerships, that there have not been outreach events.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, sorry, sorry – like the one that brought Darlene and me into ICANN in the first place.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, that's what I raised.

Evan Leibovitch: And in fact I was kind of hoping that maybe this time in Toronto there might be something to coincide with the ICANN meeting that would take the exact same format. The problem is there seems to be no institutional memory so that the people that actually did that event, neither they nor their bosses, nor anyone I think who has recollection of the event might still be at ICANN.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, this is Heidi. I believe Mandy may have that institutional memory. I think she's just [clogged] and she hasn't been able to get back to me yet on that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, alright. I just wanted to add something about the two comments about the GAC meeting and the NCSG one. About the GAC meeting, I mean I don't know if we have to have too many different items of focus. Based on our experience with these meetings, getting action items off of two meaty, genuine topics might be all that we can ask for. We've already got on the plate conflict of interest as well as issues of consumer issues. Those, together with trying to move forward on a way of working together, I don't know how much more either can or should be attempted to be added at this point to the GAC agenda.

I mean I want to know what everyone else thinks about this but my intention or my inclination would be to try to keep it simple and make our way very well through a small number of items rather than trying to pack a whole bunch in. And after that I've got some things to say about the NCSG.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, Olivier, this is Heidi. I've put into the Skype and the Adobe Connect chat the two topics that are currently on the Wiki for discussion topics with the GAC. Can you please confirm that you would like definitely those two and then the two that Evan just mentioned?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, I mean.... I'm happy with that.

Evan Leibovitch: Was conflict of interest not one of the original ones?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I thought they were, exactly. The first one is the conflict; the second one is the GAC and ALAC to work on the impact on internet users on the gTLD Program launch. I'm happy with those two being there, and these have been here for a while.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, and that second one in fact relates to the second one I just said, to go back to the whole ICANN definition of what's a consumer as opposed to what's an end user. And that ambiguity arguably is a problem with the way ICANN responds to these issues, and I think that's also legitimate to bring up to the GAC if only as a starting point. What I really want to try and do is figure out a better way to work with them, and that means having some action that happens in between meetings; and if that means designating small groups of people that work on stuff,

not with any official blessing or approval at that point until they bring something back to the respective groups – just something that allows us to do something substantive between meetings, which just hasn't happened yet.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Yes, go ahead, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Just to confirm the four topics for the meeting with the GAC. The first one is conflict of interest, second one is impact from the New gTLD Program as stated currently; then a follow-up on “end user” and “consumer” definitions within ICANN?

Evan Leibovitch: Those last two actually are two sides of the same coin to me, Heidi. I don't think they need to even be raised as separate issues.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, so then the third one would be finding a better way to work with the GAC and the ALAC between meetings.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, I'm a little dubious about the third one because I totally understand where we're coming from but we've already been told on numerous occasions by Heather that the GAC does not work with anyone between meetings. It's individual members who don't even represent the GAC, etc., etc., etc. We're already in with the GAC to

work in between meetings. There was a joint statement in the last interval between meetings and there's one that is probably going to be in the works. I don't think that we'll have enough time to be able to have a joint statement released before Prague but then I don't know yet.

I do know that we've had the European Commission step forward to say that they would be interested in working with the ALAC on a joint statement. I'm not sure whether the European Commission would be doing this on behalf of the GAC or not – probably not on behalf of the GAC but just as an individual GAC member, but I haven't had any feedback from any other GAC members to step forward although we might wish to get in touch separately with those GAC members whom we had heard in the past were interested in such a thing. They might have just missed the message that came on their GAC list.

Evan Leibovitch:

Yeah, Olivier, what I had in mind by that third issue was just making it clear to the GAC and making sure that they didn't have an objection to us working individually with subject matter experts within the GAC who then may or may not choose to bring things forward to the GAC after they've been working with us.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yeah, if it's just a question like that then that's fine. It's a good opportunity to ask this question, but I hear and I think we might have to formulate the question in a way that they don't take it wrong and think that the ALAC wishes to work with the GAC jointly on many different

projects because so far we've only seen negative answers on that. And it might just be them repeating themselves.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl speaking. Evan, I hear what you're saying. I think we're getting slow but nevertheless gradual progression each meeting and in between each meeting. We're getting more and more opportunity with individual members where we've had the Australian rep, for example, recently interact with Olivier on a couple of things in (inaudible); and [dare I say, Evan], he will take it back to the GAC. All of those [tendrils] starting to take hold, it's just from a political point of view you do need to be careful what you ask for. If it's well phrased, fine, but you may very well force the hand in a GAC meeting for them to say "No," which is where we were back in Los Angeles days. The Los Angeles meetings in 2007-08 the only interaction between the ALAC and the GAC was not only informal, it was unsanctioned and frowned upon. And there are still people sitting at that GAC table who would be perfectly happy to take it back to that. So you know, you might actually force the hand in the opposite way of what you want. As long as you're willing to take that risk, that's ALAC's choice.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Cheryl. So Heidi, back to you – any more on this?

Heidi Ullrich:

Okay, so I have the first two topics; I just need a decision on the third.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, we'll have the third one on there and I gather that what usually happens is the GAC also has to bring two topics forward and usually cross out one of our topics, so we'll see.

Heidi Ullrich: Correct, thank you for that. And then the next one is questions for the Board, the meeting with the Board.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: By the way, just to mention that they either cross it out or they merge it with one of the other topics we have in there, so they might even merge it or already answer it and say "Yes, we can do that, we're already doing this." Anyway...

Heidi Ullrich: I'm sorry, before we go to the Board meeting, Evan, I believe you wanted to talk about the NCSG draft agenda?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, I wanted to get a sense of what the interest here is in having a meeting with them. I have been the Liaison to NCSG and that's so far taken the form of monitoring the mailing lists and occasionally engaging when possible. We're at a juncture where at least based on the bulk of the comments that are happening on the list, there's an extremely small intersection of things that we have in common right now in terms of interests or points of view. The NCSG list was, we had common reason but in totally different senses of tactics on the Red Cross issue; and a good chunk of the NCSG has been fighting us tooth and nail on the

WHOIS issues. So I'd like to try and get a sense from this call if possible of how to engage them in things that we should be doing in the meeting, because as of right now I really fear that we're going to get into a shopping list of things to agree to disagree on, and this seems to be not to be an extremely good use of our time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, good point, Evan. Any other comments on this? I don't see anyone jumping forward.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I actually think occasional meetings with the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group, just like occasional meetings with the stakeholder groups that would be either Commercial or Contracted Parties would be well-worthy. Every time we gather together in the name of ICANN? I think that needs a serious look at, because what Evan is describing happens all too often. It gets to be a "Why won't you support us on our views?" and boo-hoo exercise. Maybe you should look at rotations throughout all the parts and constituencies of GNSO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, let me then turn the table around and ask is there any specific goal that we need to achieve at the Prague meeting where we would need the support of the NCSG and we would need to coordinate with the NCSG to reach that?

Evan Leibovitch: Personally I would like to engage their support at very least on the conflict of interest issues. I mean of the things of which there's common ground right now I think that's the best one with the shot of commonality. Of other things that are of interest to us right now I'm really not sure; even on the consumer versus end user versus registrant issue we don't totally see eye to eye. So that's the one thing where I think engagement might be useful on, and certainly I'm hoping to get their interest at least in the Future Challenges work. But that I don't know if it needs its own meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So the conflict of interest and the Future Challenges. Carlton, any thoughts on this?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Olivier – Carlton Samuels for the record. I support Evan in that I think those are worthwhile points of engagement. We have to reach out to them. My position is very clear: I would prefer to talk to any group that would help me move the ball up the field rather than stay silent. So like Cheryl, I think whenever you get a chance to talk to a group of persons about the intersecting interests that we are committed to we should take the chance. You might not get them now but certainly after a while there will be something that comes up that their insistence on helping you might be the thing that puts you over the top. So I am for talking.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Carlton. I think that on this occasion we do need another meeting with the NCSG. The very reason is it was actually asked also by Bill Drake. There appears to be some demand on their side. The problem I have with having meetings with the NCSG is, it's two things: first, it seems to be extraordinarily hard to get a defined agenda with them until five days before the meeting is supposed to take place. The other thing is a timing issue: it's hard to find the right time to meet.

It appears we've found the correct time to meet on. Certainly engaging support on the conflict of interest issue is important. I'd like to find out what their point of view is on the conflict of interest, especially since it appears that some might have conflicts within the NCSG, how to resolve those, etc. These are things which I think might be important to discuss. The Future Challenges, I'm a little concerned because we're just about reaching the time when it's being opened up, and throwing it directly over to the NCSG for commenting might be for a first, well, for a second meeting I guess in Prague – because there will be one public meeting of the Future Challenges Group. Opening it up in an NCSG discussion might just be a lot more than you can handle, Evan, in one go because it could go either way.

Evan Leibovitch: I hear you.

Carlton Samuels: I think it's not opening it up for discussion, but it might be useful to say a few lines for it and say "Here's what we're thinking about; we'll come

back to you in a more full discussion frame depending upon what the framework is and depending on the timelines that we're trying to get something done in." You know, it's meta data that we share.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, that can be data we share but I wouldn't put it as an agenda item because that would effectively open it as an item for discussion. So if you want to mention it in any other business that would be great, that would be fine, but not as an agenda item.

Carlton Samuels: That's fine; I'm not suggesting that it becomes an agenda item. I'm suggesting that it's one in which we at least lay down the [four marks] with them so that at some point they know that the thing is coming around the bend and it's not a sock in the gut where and when it comes to them.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alright, we're happy with this. So Heidi-

Evan Leibovitch: It's not a what?

Carlton Samuels: Sock in the gut.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: Or a kick in the seat. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Heidi, you're okay with that?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes. So the issue, the one item that we have is conflict of interest and the point of view of both groups.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I will take it away as an action item to engage the NCSG on its mailing list and find out what the interest is from their side, if there's things they would like to identify.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, thank you. So again, if we can move on to topics for the Board, the meeting with the Board on Tuesday.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Now that's an interesting one because we don't appear to have anything listed so far. Certainly one thing we would like to discuss I think is the definition of the consumer.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah, but I thought we had a few topics that we'd called out already, Chair.

Evan Leibovitch: With the NCSG, Olivier, I would actually put that into some of the agreed to disagree realm. Based on conversations I've already had, that's one where I would ask "Are you sure you want to do that?"

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No, the Board, the Board. We're dealing with the Board.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh, sorry. Okay, sorry, we're off the NCSG. Never mind.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The Board questions. Now Carlton just mentioned we already have some subjects? I'm not exactly sure.

Heidi Ullrich: I don't have any listed on the agenda and I don't recall...

Carlton Samuels: Have we not solicited already on the list, unless we haven't received anything, topics that we might wish to talk to with the Board? Have we not done that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We have solicited this, Carlton, and the Wiki page has been created and so you can see it's on the Wiki, but there are actually no topics that have been suggested so far by the community. But the topic I was going

to suggest is the definition of consumer being one thing, at least finding out what their point of view was on that. I don't think that's the primary discussion that we should have with them though; I believe this is just an annex to it.

Carlton Samuels: I would like to place a big topic that WHOIS Review Team has actually brought into play – a strategic kind of framework for Board WHOIS, including the Board having more direct accountability for what happens with the WHOIS moving forward beyond the chitter chatter stage to an implementation stage.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So WHOIS.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, I would actually like to hear if they read the report and what their initial reaction is to that request.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's a pretty good point, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: That suggestion is actually to me, it's actually a game changer.

Heidi Ullrich: Olivier, this is Heidi.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Heidi

Heidi Ullrich: Carlton, could you just state that as you would like it to be listed on the agenda, please?

Carlton Samuels: Well, I would like to hear the Board's early response or some early thoughts on the WHOIS Review Team's suggestion that the Board must begin to act more strategic with respect to WHOIS enforcement, especially in light of its recommendation that as ICANN Compliance staff report directly into the WHOIS Board.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, thank you. I have enough of that I think to put into a short agenda item.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl, can I hear you? Yes, go ahead, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl, for the record. Sorry, when I'm on the tablet for some reason I can only ever manage once to join via the ordinary browser – I seem to have to do it via the mobile which doesn't give you the hand up opportunity. Anyway, maybe I'll download things again and see what

happens; if I try it the other way it tells me I've already got a ticket open for the Adobe Connect room, whatever that means.

Just to point out two things you might want to consider: I think it would be fascinating to find out what if anything is able to be said about the IANA contract at that time.

Carlton Samuels: Yes, yes, yes, yes. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And call me fussy but I just happen to (inaudible).

Carlton Samuels: Me too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And the other thing, I assume by then we'll know, or if not they will soon be about to tell us who the new CEO is. I'd like to know what the Board's priorities are for that CEO.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah, that's more [gristle for the mill] right now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Carlton Samuels: I actually like that first one from Cheryl very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, as you all know I emailed Kuo-Wei Wu, Chair of the IANA Subcommittee on the Board and the reply that I received was that the details were currently being worked out between the Board and the ICANN staff, and the information was too confidential to share it; but that he would be keeping us informed. Now, seeing that the deadline for the submission of this contract is I believe the 25th of this month or so, I asked-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It will have passed whether they've talked to us or not.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It will have passed, yes. But I also understand that the contract, well the submissions and so on will be made public if I understand correctly. Now I might be wrong on that one but I just find it, and I was going to write actually to Kuo-Wei a follow-up email within the next 24 hours to ask if there is any information that they can now share with us, because I find it quite disconcerting that a Chair of an AC which is at the core of ICANN would not have a clue about what's going on on the Board. That I believe goes way against anything to do with transparency in ICANN, and at the moment the community is not even being told what's going on. We don't even know whether they are working on it, whether the subject has been totally forgotten about or whether there's a huge team working on that.

Carlton Samuels: Well, can I make just one quick observation here? When I read his response to you it seems to me that the one thing he doesn't know is the thing (inaudible).

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, that's right.

Carlton Samuels: So probably that's why we should [jaw it out] and say "Well, you know, we have standing to know."

Alan Greenberg: [We're not going to win on that one] so why bother?

Carlton Samuels: It's no matter. You still at least [take the mark].

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Since a major part of the complaint that the Department of Commerce had in advocating the contract with anyone was that none of the organizations were befitting the mark...

Carlton Samuels: That's right.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And since most of the correspondence from the Department of Commerce seems to be pushing on the side of – well, there are many, many different points in there but certainly the transparency is one of them, and the accountability to the internet, the consumer-

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, but Olivier, let's be practical about this. This is a competitive bid. They're not going to announce to their competitors what it is they're doing to try to win.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, if it was a competitive bid with regards to costs and things like that I would understand this, but if it's a competitive bid with regards to transparency I certainly think that this is not information that you cannot share with the community. Anyway, our views may vary on this one but I think it's being totally mishandled in the same way that the first round has been totally mishandled, which is the reason why we are in where we are now.

Evan Leibovitch: We can probably all agree on that part.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. So there we go. So Alan, you've got your hand up as well. I'm not sure if you wanted to say anything?

Alan Greenberg: I do. I have a suggestion which is serious but I don't expect us to do it. I'd like the Board to comment on the letter that they just received from the NTIA two days before the meeting since there always is one. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, so just the letter from NTIA. So we can just say "What do you think about the letter from NTIA?" That's a good point.

Alan Greenberg: It's either a letter to ICANN or an issue about ICANN. There always is one a day before the meeting. [laughing] I don't think we can put that on the agenda but we can add it on the fly of course.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I note three 😊 from Cheryl on the chat. Okay. Right, so the Board direction for the new CEO, that's a very good point actually and so we could have that as one of the questions. I'm okay with this.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And the previous one that Evan has mentioned, the IANA contract one, is definitely something I'd like to have on there.

Carlton Samuels: That was Cheryl, by the way.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh was it Cheryl? Sorry, so that Cheryl mentioned.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, this is Heidi. So just to confirm we have several, we have four it looks like – or sorry, we have three: the [fore] thoughts on the issue of the Board being more strategically involved in the WHOIS – that’s coming out of the WHOIS Review Team final draft; the IANA contract; and what are the Board’s priorities for the new CEO. Is it in that order or would you like the order to be adjusted?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We’ll have them in that order, and no doubt the Board will zap one of those three and we’ll reorder it as well, because that’s what they’ve done in the past.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, thank you. So again, the other questions then would be for Communications: that’s going to be Jim Trengrove who will be speaking to the ALAC on Sunday. Questions for Compliance: that will be Maguy and her team speaking to you on Sunday afternoon. Questions for Global Partnerships: now again, we’re going to be inviting the Vice Presidents from North America, Latin America, Europe and Asia-Pacific to those so if you have questions for those Vice Presidents please send those in.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So for communications, and knowing full well that this call is recorded and transcribed, I'd like to ask why is Scott not here?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And how are we going to work with [Sue] in the future?

Heidi Ullrich: I didn't hear that, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The question of how we're going to work with Sue in the future. In the absence of an existing relationship continuing, which it is clearly not, what's their plan? Or are we just hung out to dry now?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Because that really is the biggest thing. Having the new kid on the block coming in to take on a seat that's probably the first question.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They don't even know how to fill ALAC yet. [laughter] They can barely fill ICANN.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, I think I'll ask those questions and I believe at that point we will also be able to have the updated At-Large brochure that Lynn Lipinski from Communications has been working very closely with me and with the ExCom on, as well as a good outreach document for consumers that again, Lynn is going to be working on. And the next *Beginner's Guide*,

which was requested to be more of a “How to participate in ICANN,” for various reasons I think that is going to be a very light draft in Prague and then the aim is for having that ready by Toronto.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Well, I think that’s enough discussion on the Communications.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I move to Global Partnerships just very briefly? If I may, Olivier – Cheryl for the transcript record: with the lineup of the number of people they’re bringing, I’m wondering whether your agenda should be fairly light on questions and heavier on getting to know each other and what sort of plans or possible plans might be served and established during a more free-flowing meeting. I mean we’ve worked with Mandy over the years but this is an opportunity for regions to look at who is on the other side of the table who perhaps can help get each other to the table locally. I think a sort of fairly open format might be a good idea, that’s my advice to you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes Cheryl, thank you. Well, Evan has suggested in a comment a question on the lack of close integration between Global Partnerships and At-Large. That’s also something which I find as being quite interesting and quite important. It really appears to be that the current hasn’t flowed too well between Global Partnerships and ourselves. I think that a mix of the two might be very helpful: first a presentation of who those new people are in there, but definitely also trying to see how

we can actually get the two to work together, rather than Global Partnerships totally ignoring us. Oh, did I say that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [And that's staffing that's] been causing that. They [haven't got] the staff.

Evan Leibovitch: But actually, Cheryl, I think it goes beyond that. I think it's been a matter that we've had a cycle for the last whole bunch of meetings where Global Partnerships comes in, they tell us what they're doing, we tell them what we're doing and they leave and that's it until the next meeting where we repeat the same cycle.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I understand that, Evan. I am just very aware that the reasons behind that have now altered and that you are being presented, the ALAC is being presented that all the people they can muster now have the job and role and perhaps resources to make any changes happen locally in the room. So if ALAC wants to go in and go "Why the fuck hasn't anything been done to date?" and boo-hoo as opposed to "Hello, nice to meet you, how are we going to move forward?" that's your choice.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I propose Cheryl's question go in verbatim.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Carlton Samuels: I would support that. I would support Cheryl's position and how Evan says that the question should go in verbatim. Let's use that approach. I quite agree with Cheryl that the deck has changed, and if the deck has changed maybe what we should do is at least change the approach ourselves.

Evan Leibovitch: By the way I didn't remember, Olivier, when we went off the Board stuff and on to Global Partnerships because I still had something to say on that. My hand had been up for quite a bit and so had Carlton's.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, apologies for this, Evan. Let's see, since I see Carlton is first let's have Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: I wanted to endorse what Cheryl had said earlier about the IANA, and her second statement took care of what I wanted to say so I'm done.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. And Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: About the Board thing, did we want to raise the issue of the concept of a consumer at a high level and just get them thinking about it? This has

crept up into a number of discussions that we've been having with other constituencies and-

Carlton Samuels: That was the first thing that Olivier raised.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, I thought that was already in there.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, sorry. That was first on the list? Never mind.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah, that was on the top of the list that Olivier put.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Pay attention, Evan, pay attention. I'm kidding you. [laughter] Okay, right, so we're back over to Global Partnerships, so let's go ahead with Cheryl's approach on the reintroduction of... I gather it's a new department so we need to find out who does what and perhaps we'll leave the "F" word out of it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [laughing] Oh, alright. Am I allowed to bring it to the table though?

Evan Leibovitch: With pleasure.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: In Prague, abso-fucking-lutely but not prior to that, please. [laughter]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (inaudible) why Language Services can't take care of the need for Australian language use.

Carlton Samuels: (inaudible) then maybe they would.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Come on, everyone, I think we need to plow on. We're really, really late. We're now two hours into this call. I know we absolutely enjoy each other's company so much but there are other calls that are supposed to take place afterwards, as I'm sure staff would like to be able at some point to eat some lunch.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, just remember that the Draft Applicant Guidebook – DAG – is an official ICANN word.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And it's good because it pretty well does equal the Australian definition of what a dag is. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And of course that acronym was coined in the times of [Paul Twomey].

Alan Greenberg: I understand, but I'm pointing out that if you want to use swear words there's an official ICANN one. [laughter]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's not a swear word; it's a descriptive. It's the pieces of shit that hang around the tails and fleece of our sheep.

Alan Greenberg: I understand what it means. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's great, thank you. Okay, let's move on please. [laughter] Heidi stepped away briefly and since she's supposed to take us through these I'm really now in the dog part of the world. At-Large Communications Department questions for Prague – we've already just done. The Compliance questions I believe, shall we just punt this again over to Garth Bruen to send a list of questions and take it from there?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl for the transcript record. I think that's almost part of it, a natural part of it at this stage so I do think we need to have the follow-on. There were a number of plans and proposals of "This is how we are going to have our, for example complaints interface redesigned. These

are the next steps we the Compliance Department are taking on how we manage.” I’d like an update on what they told us last time because it was all planned. In the half hour they’ve got what perhaps-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well what’s interesting of course is that you and I know that Maguy Serad came on the CCI call and appeared to let us know that things were still in the planning stage. So we need to find out when the plans will be coming to fruition.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I’m happy with that. So questions from Garth which will be sent in advance and then of course an update on what’s going on with that darn interface that’s in the Inter NIC and that doesn’t seem to have changed since the last time we’ve seen it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I just say we shouldn’t just have questions from Garth. Clearly Garth has the resources and the motivation to put in a list of expansive questions. We still need to I think poll the community for questions, knowing that we will get them from Garth but also that it allows any other component part of the At-Large to bring it forward. So you might want to put that in as an action item out through the list.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, we have polled the community but at the moment the Wiki page “At-Large Compliance questions for Prague” workspace is dreadfully empty.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Since you might need to remind people for other things that need to come in, I think you might need to remind them for this.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well that was an action item anyway that we were going to remind, and the deadline for that would be the 28th of May rather than the 24th of May – that gives us a little bit more time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is one of those times when I’d really like to know are all the ALSes even still subscribed to the announce list, and whether or not the addresses that the ALSes are putting forward are still even live and updated. I know it’s not something that we can fix now but it’s something that’s bothered me a lot over the years. You put things out on the bulletin board but you’re not really sure who’s driving past the bulletin board, and [I don’t know how we’ll fix that.] It’s a future issue but particularly I think there needs to be a little bit of an [awareness] of that as the regions might need to think long and hard on that as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Cheryl. Heidi, did you get that last?

Heidi Ullrich: No, I'm sorry everyone, I had to step away. I'm just following now what's going on in the notes, so was that the latest issue?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, the latest issue was... So we've done the Communications Department, we've done the GAC questions; we've done the Global Partnerships questions and we're now dealing with Compliance.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, I don't believe we have any questions in Compliance.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And in Compliance we've just said that we would have some of Garth's questions which are the usual, but in any case for all of them we need to reissue a call for questions to be closing on the 28th of May. And we've also asked on the Compliance questions to be given an update on the redesign of the frontend which is located in Network Solutions – the frontend page for complaints, this one-stop-shop for complaints because we haven't seen any movement on that. So we need to have an update.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Olivier, I've got my hand up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Evan, please.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually I don't think this time around that the questions are all going to be identical because Maguy has been very, very forthright and forthcoming in her conversations with Garth. There's been a very good, active and open channel of communications going on, and that actually leads to some different questions of the kind that have traditionally been. We no longer have to ask "Why aren't you talking to us?" anymore, and in fact can switch the questions to some issues of substance that have come up in the conversations that have taken place.

For instance, one of the things that has been uncovered is that there have been a number of times where there have actually been infractions by contracted parties that have gone either unpunished or not even brought to the community until they were brought forward. So the idea of having an investigation reveal that in fact the RAA has been contravened and yet the issue is closed without consequence, on one hand it indicates an unusual, unprecedented and very welcome amount of candor and openness from the Compliance Department but it also begs the question of "Why was this path taken?" So we're now getting less into the issue of bad communications and more into substantive issues of what we're finding out now that the channels are open. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Excellent. So if you could please put that on the Wiki that would be great.

Carlton Samuels: I think it's already on there, isn't it, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Well, it wouldn't have come from me; it would have come from Garth because I know that he's been...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, he pretty much made that exact same... To my mind, and I'm reading Garth, too – it's a very faithful response that Garth himself gives of more open communications. And he's even learning more, well it's not so much learning more but he's getting confirmation of the misses or the gaps in Compliance.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's great. But it's not on the Wiki as I see it here.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I'm going to track down where Garth has made these comments and-

Carlton Samuels: It may have been on the list or on the Skype chat, Evan. Maybe it's on the Skype chat.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The Skype chat is a difficult medium to archive. If you do, if I can actually ask everyone here, because I do try and read everything but that sometimes is pretty hard as well – if you do find anything that’s of importance that should be cut and pasted over to those pages then please do so. And you can do it under your own name and put “On behalf of Garth” or “On behalf of…” whoever it is that left the note, because that really is our only record of us being able to work on this. If we have to scan thousands of lines of Skype chat it’ll be very difficult for us.

Carlton Samuels: I fully endorse that, Olivier. I fully endorse that. This is my fight with the LACRALO people. They think that I’m a reprobate because I told them it was better to have comments placed on an official channel, because then you’re actually commenting on something rather than an unofficial Skype chat.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, it’s much more difficult. Heidi, anything else? I do see this is taking a long time now.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, I think if we give the announcement of the 28th that might stir interest in that, and thank you again – we’ve made great progress on these issues.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thank you very much on that and I wish I could say it was the end of this call, but we actually have a number of other things to discuss. Let's move on over to... So we've done all the Prague meeting agendas and you're happy with all of that? Because I see also ALAC Anniversary event also being mentioned in there.

Heidi Ullrich: That was just for information.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Now okay, I think we're all aware of the Anniversary events. One question I have had from Sebastien when I spoke to him today was the exact date of the ALAC being created. It appears that it was, according to him created in December, 2002, which is closer to 2003 when the first RALOs met. I'm a little confused. But I was not around at the time, or at least not around inside but somewhere...

Carlton Samuels: Yes, it was December of 2002, but the first RALO came into being at the San Juan meeting in 2007.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, the ALAC was created by an act of the Board when they changed the organization of the Board and created At-Large at the same time. I've documented it before when we were having some previous battle and I could try to dig it up – I probably have the date of the Board meeting. I'm not sure there's a specific date for the ALAC itself.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so what was called into question by Sebastien was whether this was really ten years of ALAC.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, Olivier, there's two ways to look at this, one of which is when the Board was reconstituted, got rid of direct elections and created an ALAC that was mainly appointed. So there's one starting date where you can say "Well, when was the all- appointed ALAC first created?" Then there was another milestone where the ALSes and the RALOs all came into place. I would suggest that if you were going to use that as a benchmark then we're not talking ten years; we're talking only about five years because the final RALO signatures if I recall – which were LACRALO and NARALO – were both done at the end of the San Juan meeting which was in June, 2007. So before that the other RALOs-

Alan Greenberg: No, LACRALO was San Paolo. It was the first one.

Evan Leibovitch: Well if I recall the actual documentation was approved and signed by Vint in San Juan because they hadn't agreed on Rules of Procedure until then.

Carlton Samuels: Right, you're correct.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if you really want the last one it wasn't until the APRALO signed in Delhi, you know (inaudible). We were still operating and APRALO was still operating under letters of intent well before that time. So is the point should we be running it in Toronto or should we be running it in Prague? What's the point of the question?

Evan Leibovitch: Especially if they're not spending any money on the celebration.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well that's really the question – should we have it in Prague or should we have it in Toronto? And now that the EURALO has already started organizing things for the ten years I just thought I'd kick it out over to you and what your point of view is on this. I personally don't think it's a matter of having to do it on a per-monthly basis. Ultimately I think that all of these anniversaries, whether it is the Anniversary of the Birth of the Internet, the Birth of an Internet Society, the Birth of At-Large, the Birth of ALAC doesn't need to be a specific set date. But we are looking roughly at about ten years of actual activity plus or minus six months.

Evan Leibovitch: If you want to consider the fact that the first ALAC was all appointed and really didn't represent the grassroots.

Alan Greenberg: Well, five of them were NomCom as they are today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, and that's fine. It was still a landmark change to have this particular model.

Evan Leibovitch: And depending on who you talk to that's a step back from direct elections.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...of that. I mean I could also raise the issue of why we're even bothering to celebrate at all. Maybe we should celebrate when we get some of it right.

Evan Leibovitch: Cheryl, I'm with you on that.

Alan Greenberg: I'll be dead by then so that's easy. [laughter]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah, me too.

Evan Leibovitch: All of us.

Alan Greenberg: The Board meeting that created the ALAC was December 15, 2002.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so here's one thought, then. We could have some celebration there; nothing stops us from continuing having another facet of the celebration when we meet in Toronto as well. We could say we're starting off the run up to the buildup of the ALAC 10th Anniversary.

Alan Greenberg: Or the first meeting of 2013 which will be the actual 10th Anniversary of us really coming into being.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl for the record. Or maybe in Prague what we can do with a historical approach is kickoff a year of celebrations, and it can cover a couple of meetings.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Now there's a good Australian way to do things – a year of celebration with [lots of beer]. [laughter] Okay, sounds good to me. I'm happy with that, being a Frenchman – I'm happy with celebrating for a year. Heidi, you've taken notes?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, I've taken notes. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alright, that was the only question I needed to ask on this, so I guess everything else is fixed. You mentioned the ALAC meeting with the SSAC which is the 26th of June between 15:00 and 15:30 [available] –

that was already mentioned. And the GAC meeting has also moved to 10:00 to 11:00 rather than 9:45 to 10:45 – you mentioned that.

Meeting agendas we've done, so now we can move over to the New gTLD Review Group where I have to provide you with a little detail on what's going on in that. As you all know, the RALOs have provided us with the names of their group members. Those names have been selected by the ALAC or ratified by the ALAC in full knowledge that we don't have a guarantee that the details which were given by those candidates are actually indeed correct. They are correct to the best of our knowledge and to the best of the knowledge of the RALOs.

Now the ALAC has to select five more people, one from each region, and has issued... I believe, Heidi, if you can remind me, has the ALAC issued a call for volunteers?

Heidi Ullrich: Well, they've issued definitely one but I believe even two reminders – at least one reminder and perhaps even two reminders. We currently have two nominees, if I may continue, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, go ahead.

Heidi Ullrich: So we have nominees Carlton Samuels and Seth Reich.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so that's for Latin American and Caribbean and North America, and now we need one from Africa, from Asia-Pacific and Pacific Islands, and Europe. I have asked because I did think that there was going to be interest from Dev Kissoondoyal from the African region, I thought that he would be a good addition on this but I have not heard from him yet with a confirmation on this. For the other two regions, well, in Europe I haven't had any other feedback. I can follow up with Wolf. In Asia-Pacific, Cheryl, any feedback on that? What's happening there?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. I can tell you what we discussed at the APRALO meeting, which is we had put two names in from a regional perspective and it was up to the ALAC to decide who the ALAC wanted, [not from the RALO perspective]. So it's up to the ALAC to decide who the ALAC wanted from a regional perspective. So we suggested our two names, we were happy with those two names; you accepted those two names provisionally obviously with the SOI COI aspects and now you know, I'm sorry the ball's in your court.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, well one is in Taiwan and one is in Pakistan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well those are the two we've suggested.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's one of two things: we can either look at having a regional, sorry a geographic diversity; or we can look also at having a gender diversity

because the two are male at the moment as far as I understand. Or we can also look at having something to, well find out someone with a specific skill that we don't believe is on the committee yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

And the regional view was that's your business, not ours.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well I'm therefore asking the ExCom, the ALAC ExCom. Just because your representative is not here but you are in the region I thought I would ask you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Sure. The representatives who were on the APRALO call did not indicate to APRALO that any of them had a particular interest in the role. And I guess there's two options as well: we were feeling that you were restricted to only an appointment of an ALAC member to the role but you could certainly appoint a non-ALAC member to the role if you so desire. But we didn't realize or feel that you were limited to that; that you could certainly go and get whatever leads [whose] geographic, skillset, and/or gender diversity if you even want diversity who you wanted to have in the mix.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

So for the record, I hope that the ALAC members from the regions – because at the end of the day it is the regions that appoint two members. I do hope that those will take their hands out of their pockets and actively search for someone from that region because I

don't think it's actually fair for the Chair of the ALAC or for members of the other regions to look for filling in gaps in the region where nothing has been done. And at the moment that seems to be the case.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

May I suggest that what you need to do is have staff or yourself, Olivier – and this should have been a discussion that happened at ALAC; ALAC should have decided this at the ALAC meeting in my perfect [eye] view but I was too busy wondering why we didn't have a vision when we do. Oh, did I say that out loud? The issue possibly will be if the APRALO and AFRALO areas, geographic regions that have not currently got people in, that the ALAC members of those regions are approached and are asked are they going to take up the mantle or are they finding someone to do so? And give them the deadline to get back to you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, good point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

But since you've got [no other one] on your ExCom call I can't act in that capacity.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yeah, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, I put in my nomination on a couple bases. First of all, Heidi, in the email I got from you I think you suggested in fact that the deadline was today for this. Did I have that wrong?

Heidi Ullrich: No, this is Heidi. The schedule that Olivier put out for the revised call for the ALAC-selected members of the Review Group, the BP vote was supposed to start today. But at the same time, those nominees needed to have submitted their SOIs, and I don't... Well, actually I think we have it, those two so far have it.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, I can just say in the case of NARALO, as you know we had a vote out of six people and so two people were voted first and second and those were the two ones put forth by the RALO. I was strongly asked by the leadership of the RALO to consider the person that came in in third place for the position and that is indeed the person I put forward. Because he had to have an SOI in place before the election his SOI is available now to ALAC. I just found myself in the very awkward situation of performing an almost NomCom type of role to try and find somebody not only within the RALO but anywhere within the region for filling this role, and yet having about 24 hours to do it. So forgive me for the lack of imagination in my nomination but considering that we did have an election and he came in third that seemed a reasonable way to go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And yours was the only region I think that did need to have an election, wasn't it?

Evan Leibovitch: Correct.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Next is Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I don't have a particular suggestion on how to go forward at this point, but there is a lesson to be learned. Clearly when this whole thing started what the ALAC should have done is not just ask the regions to supply two people, but to ask the regions to supply two people and make suggestions to the ALAC for candidates inside of or outside of their region who they thought would make eminently good people on this group. And if we had done that maybe we would have gotten some suggestions that the ALAC could then mull over and make decisions on.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. The reason why this was done in a two-tier format or two halves format is that the regions themselves, the RALOs might have specific ideas about who they wished to select and how they wished to select them. So in any case they would just make recommendations to the ALAC. The reason why they would make two recommendations to the ALAC is so that they cannot then argue with the ALAC that their

three recommendations would need to be taken into account with the ALAC finding itself- Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Olivier, I didn't say that we should have asked each RALO for a half a dozen names. I said we should have asked them for their two recommendations plus any other ones, and the other ones did not need to come from their region. I can identify someone in Europe who I thought was just an inspired person to do this and I should have been able to do that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, that's a good point.

Alan Greenberg: So the process that we went through, whether it was a one-step process or a two-step process within the region... I mean obviously if a region selects some person then that person isn't eligible for also being picked by the ALAC independently, but the process should have given us a reasonable pool for the ALAC – a reasonable pool of candidates to choose among. And of course ALAC members, without the RALOs could add to that pool. I think the lesson is we need to think through these whole processes, not just do the next step and not worry about the ones after that. Thank you.

And I participated in these discussions also. I'm not putting guilt on someone else's shoulders. Clearly that is what we should have done if we had had the good sense to do it at that point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. I gather this was also quite rushed and I have to take a fair bit of responsibility as well for having had to rush this one through, but the calendar that we always have to be dealing with... So by now we have an action item on this one for staff to send a note to the ALAC reps for each region who do not currently have a nominee to supply one ASAP. The vote, it can be a shorter vote than just a five-day vote and we are bound by the closing time for this. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Olivier, you are going to suggest that of course they can be the reps themselves, yes?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: At last resort.

Alan Greenberg: No, not as last resort.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm putting it at last resort because I believe at the end of the day there should be one of these things where you can actually have positions of responsibility that also brings outreach. One of the problems I find are too many of the same people assuming too many responsibilities. This specific RG might be a fair bit of work on a weekly basis, and the last thing I want is to have the same people being so busy in so many

different working groups that they will not be able to attend those working groups.

Alan Greenberg: Forgive me, Olivier – the last thing I want is for this group to be staffed wholly by people who don't really understand what the issue is or what all of the impact of what they're talking about is, and take action whimsically.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well ultimately any action that this group would take would have to be green lighted by the ALAC.

Alan Greenberg: I understand, but we're...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, what I understand from you, Alan, is then it's good to have some people in the group that are versed in the ALAC, that are seasoned ALAC members. Is that correct?

Alan Greenberg: Not necessarily ALAC members but people who will look at the overall... I mean we're talking about an objection process to try to kill someone's application for a gTLD.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's absolutely huge, yes.

Alan Greenberg: Exactly. And I'm not expecting many subjections. I don't think this is going to be a huge workload because I don't think we're going to get a lot in. So I may be wrong and so be it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd like to put on the record for you, Olivier, that of course APRALO did give you fresh blood. These are people that are newish in terms of their commitments who've gotten nods from us and who we believe are appropriate, but they're not the usual suspects. But we have no problem if the ALAC chooses the usual suspects as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: I name Cheryl to the group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [No.] [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl might be conflicted.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I'm not but I do decline.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, right. Let's move on then on this one and let's go to our Item #7, which is the Future Challenges Working Group white paper. And we should really now discuss what's next on this one: the timeline and the translation – these are the two things. We discussed this on the ALAC call. The white paper is up there; it needs to be publicized over to the ALAC. We need to obtain feedback and we need to take it to the next level. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. As I have already talked to Olivier and probably a number of you about it already, it's actually my goal to take this even a step further than that. At-Large or ALAC has never actually put something out through the ICANN public comment process. We've always been chasing after it; we've always been responding to it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: [There is.]

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so there is a process?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, just don't say that we haven't because we did. And that's okay; that can [also be replaced by this] which I think is (inaudible) and very worthwhile.

Evan Leibovitch: Well actually, it helps, Cheryl, because I don't even know if there's an awareness of a precedence of it. So knowing that it's been done before makes my life a lot easier.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (inaudible)

Alan Greenberg: Evan, if I may interject, regardless of whether there is a precedent – and there is – many public comments are put into the process by working groups, by committees. They don't have to have any standing whatsoever.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, so then the advice to actually put this in a public comment process is not only valid but it's reasonable.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yep, totally.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So essentially as a result of the consent given at the meeting yesterday the intention is to ask for translations of this into the five UN languages, put this up for the public comment period; have the public comment period... The proposed deadline that Jean-Jacques and I suggested was July 6th which is the week after Prague. It's an arbitrary date but essentially it was designed so that comments could be received and incorporated into a final document to be given to the ALAC, to be

ratified and then submitted to the Board for consideration and hopefully engagement in Toronto. So that's the proposed timeline of this.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Now Evan, you mentioned public comment closing July 6th so does that mean that you wish the public comments to open before Prague?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, open.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I thought that you were going to ask for the public comment to open after Prague, so for the...

Evan Leibovitch: Oh no, no, sorry. I would like-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...to be actually able to present what it does in Prague and perhaps open it during Prague.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, the intent was open it as soon as possible so that Prague would actually be in the middle of the comment period together with the public workshop on it; and if so requested by ALAC in fact to have a special purpose policy phone conference on this if needed. So essentially the intention is to have it for as long as possible, start as

soon as possible and have Prague actually right in the middle of the public comment period, so if there's questions that people need to have answered before they submit their comments there's a place to do that face-to-face. And if there's a need for either an At-Large- or a community-wide policy call based on this then we're perfectly happy to do that as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Alan, you've put your hand up?

Alan Greenberg: I did. To answer an implied question that Evan just had of how long can public comment periods be, they can be as long as you want. There are some that are several months long.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sixty days from what I've seen – a 60-day first run is not unusual.

Alan Greenberg: It's up to the person putting it in.

Evan Leibovitch: Well let me work backwards then. If the intention is to have this in front of ALAC, if it goes for instance to the August ALAC meeting for consideration and hopefully approval then the public comment period can run well into July and we can basically have it as long as we like. My goal is essentially to try and make ALAC's goal easier by having the

comments incorporated and put forward to ALAC in a timely manner so that it can be hopefully ratified and sent to the Board.

Alan Greenberg:

Okay, a couple of comments: first of all, I really would have liked to see this opened up for At-Large comment prior to the version that goes into the public comment. I just think the optics of that as a paper coming from the bottom-up roots of At-Large would have been more effective, as opposed to a small number of people who have drafted it on behalf of.

Evan Leibovitch:

Well, it hasn't been ratified by anyone yet.

Alan Greenberg:

I understand. But I think there should be an opportunity for input from At-Large before it becomes an ALAC draft statement, which is what it effectively is once it's put up for public comment – so that's number one. I would have preferred to see that.

Number two, I think it's essential and maybe Evan has already agreed to it tacitly that if this was going to be discussed in Prague that the comments be open for at least a month afterwards. A week or two after a meeting are completely lost, and if we're expecting any other parts of ICANN to actually think about it and formulate a public comment – in light of earlier discussions we had about how long public comment periods should be – it's got to be at least a month after the ICANN meeting.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, then...

Alan Greenberg: I'll be finished in a moment and then you can take it back. So I really would have liked to have seen an ALAC, At-Large comment period first and have an extra iteration then but at the very worst it needs to be at least a month after the Prague meeting for comments. Otherwise I think it's a sham and we'll be accused of the same thing that we're accusing others of. Thank you.

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

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, well if that's the case then I have no problem having it on rather than the 6th, putting it to the 20th or the 27th and then putting it forward to the subsequent ALAC meeting in August.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Now let me just ask you something, Evan, because I tend to agree with Alan, with what Alan has just said. If you want to open it up for public comment today you are effectively putting any public comment from any ALAC members on the same level as any public comment from every Tom, Dick and Harry out there who wishes to make a comment on it, which in my mind is quite detrimental to the point that we've always been saying, which is any comments that come from the ALAC would

take precedence over other comments, especially since this Future Challenges Working Group is a working group of the ALAC.

So I think that initially when we spoke yesterday, my view was that we would first have comments from ALAC members and from At-Large; that this would run until Prague; that in Prague there would be a public meeting and then the public comment would be opened. We could actually open the public comment whilst in Prague, and that would then run for a full month or the 40-day period that we mention ourselves. And effectively we would still have time to ratify this after – to incorporate the comments and changes and then ratify it in August prior to the Toronto meeting.

Alan Greenberg:

I thought that's what we decided yesterday at the ALAC meeting, that there would be a short but non-trivial comment period from ALAC and At-Large prior to the two weeks from now when we had to post it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Because that gives you more advantage of being able to already amend it before putting it for public comments. You'll already have the first round of feedback from At-Large members; you can make whatever amendments you might wish to make or not make and then put it up for public comment, whilst if you do it in one go for public comment right away then you're just going to have a mishmash of things, many of which might be very similar to each other. And At-Large input risks being lost in the whole flood that will come in there.

Evan Leibovitch:

I guess I don't have an answer for that because I've been taking At-Large input for the last three months on this. You'll notice by the membership of the Future Challenges Group it encompasses most, but not everyone in ALAC but it encompasses most of ALAC. There have been numerous comments made, some by ALAC members, some by non-ALAC members. We've been taking At-Large comments on this for quite a while now. The intent of doing the snapshot and the translation and the public comment period was to be able to allow the time for this to get out to the RALOs, to get out to the ALSes – that's why we've been asking for the translated version of the document.

And does it mean that yes, ALAC comment, that At-Large comments are going to come in and they're going to be mixed together in the public comments space together with comments from contracted parties and other people? What are we worried about? Is there so little faith in the authors that we can't tell the difference between something coming in from an ALS and something coming in from a registry? This is all considered at the time that the public comments are being brought in and that they're being looked at. I really myself don't understand the concern of why this has to go through another go around of ALAC, many of whom have already put in public comments before this gets put out to a public comment period.

It's been on the Wiki for months; it's been on an open Wiki for months and-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Evan, it's Cheryl here. I'm aware of it; as you know, I'm part of that group. But I'm also equally aware that my ALS has not discussed this

and my region has not discussed it. Now maybe that's just a problem for APRALO [but you should know that].

Evan Leibovitch:

No Cheryl, the whole point – and in fact, one of the reasons why I want to have the thing translated into Chinese amongst the other languages is so that when this goes back to the ALSes and the RALOs that it is translated; that when it goes back to LACRALO that there's a Spanish language version so that there's no issues with having to do the translation; and that it can go to a broader group so that there's an extended amount of time given.

So for instance, if we start a public comment period now and it ends the end of July, that's a full two months to do a translation, to have the word go out to the RALOs, to the ALSes in the languages that people are speaking; that the translation is done and there's eight weeks or more to go out, get that comment and bring it back. And the fact that it's mixed in with comments from other communities within ICANN? My answer to that is well, why is that such a big deal? If there's comments coming in from ALSes and there's also comments coming in from AT&T we can tell the difference. We know where they're coming from and the authors of the document are capable of figuring that out as it's being incorporated.

Public comment is public comment. That includes ALSes, RALOs and everyone else who's out there. I don't know right now why-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan, I'm not debating that point. I was pointing out when you said it's been out on the Wiki and everyone's had a chance-

Evan Leibovitch: Oh no, no – not everyone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't agree with that argument.

Evan Leibovitch: No, I didn't say everone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...the way you want or the way Olivier wants to be honest, I don't give a shit literally. I do not care which way this goes as long as it goes in a forward direction. How it gets there I don't care – definitely you're passionate about it. But I did want to pull you up on "but it's been on the Wiki and everyone has had a chance."

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, that's a limited definition of "everyone," okay. Being out on the public Wiki has almost by definition a very, very limited space. It's why I want to take the special effort to put it out in the public comment period as opposed to continue to have it on the Wiki. I deliberately want this out to a big audience, and when the comments come back, be them from ALSes, RALOs or from Vint Cerf that we're capable of making the distinction of where things are coming in as the authors consider the comments before putting it forward to ALAC.

I agree that this thing needs all the vetting it can get from At-Large and from the rest of the community. I don't think there needs to be any fear of the fact that we're going to ALSes as well as letting this thing out to the general public. I mean believe me, in NARALO we've heard plenty from contracted parties that say "Well, when I go home at the end of the day I'm an end user, too."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

And I agree wholeheartedly with them.

Evan Leibovitch:

So trying to make a distinction of well, we can get feedback from At-Large and they want to have at it before anybody else, I can understand that in certain circumstances. I don't think that's an argument that holds water here.

Alan Greenberg:

If I may get in, it's Alan speaking.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes, Alan.

Alan Greenberg:

I wasn't worried about the group being able to distinguish where the comments came from. I raise the issue purely as one of optics, to be able to say it has gone through an iteration of generally open and soliciting comments from At-Large prior to disseminating wider. I recognize it would have been a lot nicer if we would have had this

discussion a month ago but we didn't. So maybe the time has gotten past us and we don't have that flexibility anymore.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Evan, I have a question for you. I wonder why the rush to go to public comment right away. If we give a one-month public comment starting in Prague, does that not give everyone enough time to go through it? That would certainly provide at least an opportunity for you and Jean-Jacques and the Working Group to explain what's behind this Future Challenges, rather than having it out there for public comment and risking already having floods of whatever it is – contracted parties or whatever, whoever this will annoy – to start shooting at it before it even gets presented in Prague.

The second thing is you are speaking about a webinar that you could organize before Prague. The bandwidth at the moment that staff has is very-

Evan Leibovitch:

No, I never, sorry, I never said Prague. If the public comment period is closing the end of July there's lots of time to give a webinar. I had no intention of doing it before Prague.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, so you know, my first concern is Alan's concern, which I share.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, let me answer your first question. The goal of this is not to introduce this to the public in Prague. The goal is to have an informed public come in that has substantive questions to ask at a workshop in Prague. Other than that the Prague is just an introduction and it's a lecture, that's what we're doing. The intent is to try and put the document out, give people time to gel on it and have people come to Prague to the workshop with substantive questions that either we're able to answer or that make us have to rethink things. We're not scared of that.

And I don't understand... I mean you're saying "What's the rush?" and I'm saying "What's the point of delaying things?" I want to have this in the hands of as many people as possible as fast as possible and bring as much comment as it can be; and if half of it is hate mail, well then we're capable of dealing with that. We knew full well what we were getting into. So my goal was to have a meeting in Prague that would actually have people coming to the meeting informed and having questions based on it as opposed to this being a launch party.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay so effectively yeah, I understand then – you want wider dissemination before Prague so that people can come in and you're not just dealing with an introduction of it but an actual discussion about it among people who have already read it, etc. The [part of Alan's statement] that I agree with is the fact that the At-Large community itself has not been provided much time to comment themselves on it prior to everyone else having-

Evan Leibovitch: Why is that so important that At-Large has to be able to comment on it before everyone else? Please, I don't totally understand that.

Alan Greenberg: Because we want it to be viewed as an At-Large paper.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, it's being done by an At-Large committee that is going to have input from everyone, and at the end of the day it's going to be endorsed by At-Large or not endorsed by At-Large, but the intention is that this is a document that came out of an ALAC-initiated process that eventually is going to be ratified by ALAC and then sent by ALAC to the Board. I mean this is at the end of the day an ALAC-initiated process that is now going through a period of taking eight weeks to solicit information from every RALO, every ALS and every individual community member we can find.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just, why argue? Just let it run the way the authors want it to run, Olivier. I think your risks have been highlighted and you've got strong support with Alan and me and a whole bunch of others on what those risks might be. Let the Work Group, because the Work Group after all can put things out for public comment sink or swim or otherwise on its own.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So just one more thing then because yes, I understand the work groups can, any work group can ask for a public comment. However in ALAC

we have not done such a thing yet. I believe that every public comment that we have initiated so far has been one where the ALAC has first ratified the actual document that's put out for public comment. Now, I'm not saying that we need to ratify this but this is a public comment that is being initiated with no official if you want timing for the ALAC to provide its feedback and for the community to provide its feedback. It really is a case of taking the risk because if we are asked this question and we're being asked how this got the support of the At-Large community, the answer at the moment is "I don't know."

Even Leibovitch:

No, the answer at this time is no.

Alan Greenberg:

Olivier, the answer at this time is not yet. The answer is not no but not yet, not no because we didn't ask.

Evan Leibovitch:

The answer is at the meeting that took place on May 22nd we told the Future Challenges group that it could go ahead and disseminate this for further public comment without endorsement.

Alan Greenberg:

Okay, I thought we said though that we would put a version out for comment by the RALOs which is why we were asking for translation in five days or something like that, so that there could be at least one very short iteration before it's published-

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, if we have a short iteration we're not going to get feedback from ALSes.

Alan Greenberg: ...under the distribution date for the meeting, sorry.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, ultimately I understand that you wish to push-

Alan Greenberg: I agree with you, Cheryl.

Evan Leibovitch: If there's a real need to keep this up on the Wiki and not put it out for a public comment period I don't understand the rationale, but if there's a real sense that that needs to happen first then so be it. I mean yes, the risks have been stated. I frankly think that this is as much... You know, why should At-Large not be given the ability to comment on it before the rest of the community? To me that's as much a matter of optics and pride as it is in any logic of getting out a good statement, because so many people in At-Large already have given input and if we need to go back to the RALOs and we need to go back to the ALSes we need to give them more than the time between now and Prague, which is why I'm saying a wide open public comment period that lasts from before Prague until well after; as opposed to a little abbreviated At-Large comment period followed by another abbreviated public comment

period. Why not have one large comment period that allows everybody all the time they need?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: No, no – I understand what you're saying about the risks. And yes, are people going to complain? People are going to complain no matter what because this is going to ruffle feathers, so if they don't complain about this they'll find something else. We know that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Pick your battles, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. Well you know, ultimately we don't have any of the other three ExCom members onboard. It's very difficult for me to say yes or no on this one. Ultimately, Evan, you know what the risks are.

Evan Leibovitch: We know what the risks are-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...the way that it's done then you know that it's fine with me, we can just move forward on that. I presented you with the way to do it in a more orderly way and a way which would actually make it less risky than the way that you're putting it forward. But if you are absolutely

adamant that the way you'd like it to be is for it to be thrown out to public comment for everyone to be able to comment on it from Day One then assume the risks. But ultimately if it goes down in flames then the ALAC will have very little it can do to save it.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, then give me the timeline that you're proposing. You're saying that there's going to be a time where this will stay up on the Wiki as a public "Hey ALAC, have at it until when," and then so you're saying that Prague should be an introduction – that basically it should be introduced in Prague to the world.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yes, or what you can do is you can have two weeks of comments here just before Prague, and then basically start a public comment just before Prague if you would like to do so. But you can already have an early warning of what sticky parts you would like to change the language of prior to sending it for public comment: you know, one last community look at it to enhance or amend anything that might need to be enhanced or amended. You know, it's not only going to be At-Large eyes; you do know that there are also non-direct ALAC or traditional At-Large people who read our lists, and it would be interesting to see immediately what they might be saying here so as for you to already know what you might be up against when it comes out in the public comment.

If it comes out in the public comment in one go like this you cannot take it out of the public comment before the whole public comment is done,

and you might get a wall of abuse. And I know that you don't shy at receiving abuse but I'd rather not have abuse being sent on this and immediately know what we can avoid having.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, so here's my suggestion of what I think might be a reasonable compromise. Between now and June 8th this stays on the Wiki but goes public to At-Large and is broadcast to At-Large to put comments on the Wiki; and we use the conventional methods of Confluence to solicit comments on the current version until June 8th. So that's about three weeks from now.

The authors of the document basically have about one week to incorporate comments and we start a public comment period on the week of June 18th. That basically means that about a week, if we're lucky maybe a little bit more than a week before the Prague meeting we start the public comment period.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yep, and I'm happy with that.

Evan Leibovitch:

Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

I'm not sure there's any merit in starting the public comment before the Prague meeting but I don't think there's any harm in it either. The only potential problem with that time schedule you put out is that it misses

the posting period for the meeting by four days, because I think the 14th is the-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, [you can thumb it back I guess].

Alan Greenberg: Heidi, is it the 14th or is it earlier? Do we still have any staff in the meeting?

Matt Ashtiani: Always.

Alan Greenberg: I don't know, after three hours I'm-

Matt Ashtiani: Heidi stepped away to go to the bathroom. Can you repeat the question please?

Alan Greenberg: When is the deadline for formal public postings for document distribution for the meeting?

Matt Ashtiani: I think the formal deadline is June 4th.

Alan Greenberg: The 4th, okay, so we're not going to make that clearly.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, that doesn't bother me because if we have a formal public comment period then there's a place on the ICANN website where the document and its translations will be in soliciting comments – is that right?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's right. Yes, that's right.

Evan Leibovitch: So essentially rather than having to put up a formal document in the Prague meeting space we can essentially just put pointers to the public comment period where people-

Alan Greenberg: And as long as the meeting in Prague is to talk about it but not to solicit comments on it, I mean they may come but as long as that's not the formal reason I don't think we have a publication deadline issue.

Evan Leibovitch: It's a workshop about the work of the Working Group – that's basically it. The agenda is a single item talking about the document, and of course Jean-Jacques will be there with me taking notes.

Alan Greenberg: We might be subject to some criticism but I think we can handle it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so I think we have a deal here on the timeline and I feel a lot more confident about this timeline than having it directly out for public comment right now.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, I'm not trying to be strident. I'm trying to do this in the best possible way. I want to make sure that the ALSes and the RALOs all have the time to be able to do this and it's one of the reasons I asked for the translations. Olivier, the only thing I would ask you now is which version should be translated – the one we put out now to ALAC or the one with the comments incorporated that we put out in advance of Prague?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Now, if we have a deadline for the comments and we have a deadline for the next version, your next version to be ready, we can already provide advanced notice to the Translation Department of this text coming in. And since I don't believe that there will be extensive rewrites – in general the amendments are minor amendments, or there might be a paragraph that needs to be rewritten but not the whole document from A to Z – I suggest that we send the current document to get it translated and advise the Translation Department of any amendments that might have to be made with the next version.

Evan Leibovitch: That works for me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'll have to check with Heidi on how workable that is so she checks with Christina, but at least that would then make sure that by the time the Prague meeting takes place all of the language versions are ready as well.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, okay. And so Cheryl, I hope you understand my intent with this is by having translated documents I absolutely want this out in AP and in Latin America. I want this discussed in hopefully as localized a version as possible. I want this debated on a local level as much as possible.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I understand that perfectly. To that end if Silvia is still on the call it might be appropriate to ask [Pavan] to have the discussion of this [foreshadowed] paper on the APRALO meeting agenda during Prague.

Silvia Vivanco: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Great, thanks Silvia.

Silvia Vivanco: Yes, I am on the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I just think we need to have [Pavan] make sure that this topic gets an agenda item with an appropriate lump of time associated with it for the APRALO meeting we'll be having in Prague.

Silvia Vivanco: Okay. And this is on the draft agenda already so (inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, you'll just have to make adjustments.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so the action item for this... And Alan, first, your hand is up?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I just want to point out I'm much happier with this than what we had before, and I'm not expecting a huge number of comments. I think it's really a matter of optics and being able to state that this has been vetted perhaps quickly but vetted by the overall organization – not vetted but you know-

Evan Leibovitch: The once-over.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The opportunity's been there, yep.

Alan Greenberg: And if we get zero comments I think it will have been successful, because most people... It's a matter of what everyone outside is going to say and what those insiders are going to say when they finally read it four months from now; and we say "You had a chance at least," and that makes a difference. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, and hopefully I want to go even further than that and give enough time for localized vetting and discussion to go out as locally as possible.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: But you see, Evan, that all shows a track record and that's really what's important if we want to be taken seriously. So I'm glad that you're agreeing to this time scale now.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm not trying to be the obstacle here.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So the action item is for staff to put this out for At-Large comment as soon as possible, please. And the timetable we've agreed on is to close this on the, so let's have a quick look at the calendar: close this on the 14th of June, you said?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, that was the suggestion when there was a thought that there was a deadline for documents to go in for Prague. But if we're not bound by that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

That's the 4th of June, that's too soon.

Evan Leibovitch:

Yeah. So my suggestion right now is to have the ALAC comment period end on the 15th, and then to have the authors work on something and release something in the public comment period sometime the week of the 18th. No, that's cutting it too close before Prague, isn't it?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

That is cutting it too close. Make it the 14th at 0:00 hours, so that gives us a full three weeks and then you've got a few days and you can pass it on to staff over the weekend; and on the 18th this can go out for public comment. So it'll either go out on the website on the 18th or the 19th, but at least it'll be a week before the ICANN meeting starts.

Evan Leibovitch:

It'll give people something to read on the plane.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Exactly.

Heidi Ullrich:

This is Heidi, if I haven't already mentioned we have major staff issues here.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Heidi?

Matt Ashtiani: Heidi, you cut out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We heard “We have major staff issues here.”

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She’s on mute.

Matt Ashtiani: One second please. I’ll make sure that if she’s on mute she’s taken off of mute.

Heidi Ullrich: Sorry everyone. Just to point out that we have a lot of issues coming up. We have several webinars, we have CEO [pre] things; we have last-minute prep for Prague and there’s a lot of staff work that goes into putting something out for public comment. So I just want to point out that by doing this we are stressed and stretched, and the support that you expect to get from us will necessarily need to decrease if you keep on adding more issues to us.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. So the launch of a public comment period on the 18th would overstretch you then, because we’re not going to have any webinar before that.

Heidi Ullrich: It's not really the webinar. It's the webinar, the Policy webinar that-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a lot.

Heidi Ullrich: It's just a lot.

Matt Ashtiani: The website updating...

Heidi Ullrich: And we want to provide you with 110% support but we just don't have bandwidth for 150%, and I really feel like this is stretching us to that extent. And the more you add to us the lesser quality you're going to get back.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Hmm... This is another one, another problem that we have to think of. So how much work is involved in launching the public comment? Is this something that will [take much staff]?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Quite a bit.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Quite a bit.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, I mean when Cheryl and I did that for the-

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, just trust me on this, Olivier. If it was not immediately before Prague or any meeting the answer would be different. I can't think of a worse time to try to squeeze a public comment period in from a logistics perspective. I understand the rationale from the Work Group's perspective but from a staff logistics perspective, you might end up just getting what you pay for; and at least that would be a place holder in a public comment document. But you can't expect the level that you would normally get from staff at this point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Hmm, Evan? I understand your position which is to have this document available to the wider community, but if staff doesn't have the bandwidth for this then it [poses] a major problem.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, it's conceivable that we can publish the document while the public comment period is still pending.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: How do you mean?

Evan Leibovitch: Just what I said: publish the document for public consumption and say that a public comment period is pending and will start when it can start.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If you're okay with that that's fine.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, what are the other options? That's as good as it's going to get unless we want to delay release.

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan. I've done that several times, that you publish a document and say "a public comment period will be started immediately after Prague" or whatever the right timing is.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, I'm find with that.

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, and that would actually allow us then to put in the proper internal procedure that allows forthcoming PCs to be announced. So we can do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That works perfectly.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, perfect. Okay, let's do that then because at the end of the day that still gives us a long amount of time and we'll be able... What I suggest by the way is we've been on this call for more than three hours now. I think it's getting [the very best] of all of us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, it's not as if we have another call to follow, do we Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No, it's not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We do, sorry. I'm just saying staff do. There's another call booked to staff whenever this call finishes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Exactly. So I think we've got that done, and the public comment will last for the month of July. But we can work out the details.

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, in fact it can go into August. Essentially the intention is to have the public comment period go into August and just work backwards from the August ALAC meeting to give you as much time as ALAC needs in order to peruse the finished, final document.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, that's fine and the dates I will send later; we will work out the exact dates of the public comment in good time but they will start after

the Prague meeting. In terms of the actual asking for the At-Large inputs, this is something which needs to be sent out immediately or tomorrow, or within the next 48 hours or so.

Evan Leibovitch: Well, the mail can be sent out just on the announce list. The thing is already on the Confluence page so there's no work that needs to be done there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And it can be sent on the announce list closing time the 14th, and I'll leave it to you, Evan, and Jean-Jacques to take the comments yourself and work it all up, and basically have something that will be then released afterwards. We also have to do some of the work ourselves. I realize staff is really overworked with a lot of things, and some of our At-Large members and ALAC members are not helping by the way.

Alan Greenberg: Olivier, it should also be mentioned on the ALAC list, telling members of that list that it has been sent on the At-Large list and they should rabble rouse and consciousness raise within their own groups.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: Alrighty, send an email to me or Jean-Jacques or alternately to the Future Challenges mailing list just confirming how things are and just make sure that's all out, and Jean-Jacques and I will take it from there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Evan, that's fine. Right, so the last thing is any other business. I haven't got anything specific to bring forward or at least something that I remember at this late time over here. I think we're all raring to go and to finish with this call. So anyone else has any points? If that's not the case, going once, going twice...

Well, thanks everyone for this marathon call – three hours and 16 minutes. I don't think that we would have ever done something as long as that but we had several very important decisions to make so I appreciate that you all remained behind and I appreciate Carlton managed to last a few hours as well. And thanks to the staff for this. This has been a tough one but we've made a lot of progress. This call is now adjourned, thank you.

[End of Transcript]