

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC monthly conference call on Tuesday the 27th of November 2012. The time is 15:04 UTC. We have a medium-sized agenda today; lots of statements to discuss and hopefully we'll get through this in the one and a half hours today. Let's first adopt the agenda, does anyone want to add any additional business or any other business to the current agenda that we have? I see no one putting their hands up at the moment, so the agenda I believe is adopted and let's start then with a roll call please, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, welcome to everyone on today's call. We have, on the English channel, Alan Greenberg, Carlton Samuels, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Ron Sherwood, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Julie Hammer, Garth Bruen, Yaovi Atohoun, Eduardo Diaz, Evan Leibovitch, Wolf Ludwig, Sandra Hoferichter, Sebastien Bachollet and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

We have no participants on the French channel, and on the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambroner and we should have Natalia Enciso, who will be joining shortly. Apologies from Cintra Sooknanan and Dr. Vivekanandan. From staff we have Matt Ashtiani, Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself Gisella Gruber. Our interpreters today are, on the French channel, Camila and on the Spanish channel we have Sabrina and Veronica. Sorry, and on the French channel we also have Claire.

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.

Welcome to you all, and if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And it sounds as though we might have lost Gisella, because she sounded as though she was right in the middle of a sentence, so I'll finish the sentence, which is – oh god this is great. And we're getting some beeps as well. Well I guess you can all hear me, so let's try and continue in the face of adversity. I think the beeping will stop. There you go, it has stopped. So have we missed anyone on the roll call at the moment?

I don't hear anybody shouting out, so let's then move on directly over with the review of the action items from the ALAC meetings in Toronto. I invite you all to turn to the page that has the different action items, and we're going to go through a few of them because some are not actual ALAC action items per se. First, the ALAC and Regional Leaders Workshop, and this one had four action items.

The first one being, Silvia Vivanco to follow up on the Indian ALSes liaising through staff so as to better associate themselves with the multi stakeholder process within ICANN. Could we have an update on this please?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, this is Silvia. I am still working on it, so I will give you an update on the next conference call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Silvia, that's in progress. Next one, Silvia again, to you, to work with Bart Boswinkel and GNSO staff on IDN Working Group members being asked to join the ccTLD discussions. I believe in the recent ExCom call we somehow changed this a little bit for you to find out what the process is and whether ccTLD discussions allow for non-ccTLD members to join. Have you got any update on this Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Not at the moment.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah we have the whole policy staff in the Playa Vista Headquarters this week so we can follow up to date and get back to you on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect, as long as you let them go home afterwards that's fine.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's up to them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's up to them. But you've got them all, so great capture. Next, Matt Ashtiani is to work with Bart and update the mapping of the ccTLD operators. I gather this will also fall under the same batch of work to do. And finally, the ALAC is to ask for a meeting with the Board Finance Committee, the timing is to be discussed. And this we haven't progressed with yet. I think parts of the work is to prepare for this first, and find out a little bit more about the finance, the financing schedule and how things will progress.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes Olivier, this is Heidi again.

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: The Board Finance Committee members are in the Playa Vista office this week. So if you can let me know when you might want to call I can approach them directly. And I know that they're also speaking to the Finance Department this week, so they may have more information.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. So thank you for this update, Heidi. What I suggest doing is to then speak to Sebastien offline after the call and see how we move forward with this. Because I gather that Sebastien is also in Playa Vista.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, he is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I can see a green tick from Sebastien, so let's move ahead. Let's move forward with the next one, At-Large Future Challenges Working Group Public Workshop. I'm not sure whether this is something which the ALAC should be reviewing. Shall I just let, whether Jean-Jacques and Evan wish to deal with it in their future call, or are these just specifically just ALAC work?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier this is Jean-Jacques, perhaps we could just give an indication to other ALAC members that this is now being dealt with between Evan, myself and the staff. We have opened a public comment period, and on the other hand, we have asked staff to help us organize the meeting or the discussion of the R3 paper in Beijing. Specifically we had a call with David Olive and with Sally Costerton to ask for their advice and we're following up on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques for this update. So I think we can mark these three action items as done. Or at least in progress for the Future Challenges Working Group and with staff. Next, the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Working Group meeting; this of course is another working group meeting that took place. And I gather, Cintra, not being here, it's going to be hard to have a follow up on this one. Do we have any updates or, not sure if anybody else would like to say a few words. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier, Holly Raiche for the transcript record. We did have an email from her saying apologies. However I sent an email to her and to you, given that we have a statement from the Board as to what are the outcomes of their response to the WHOIS report, it does impact on RAA. It wasn't a bad thing that she hasn't completed the task that she was going to do, because I think that probably we need to take into account the Board response before we look at the outstanding action items from the RAA Working Group.

So it's not necessarily a bad thing the work hasn't been done is what I was telling her. I didn't say she couldn't not do it, I just said that there's work to be done but we need to think about what the response of the Board and the compliance is to factor in what still has to be done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well I think the working group has to work this one out, I guess. Shall I leave it in your hands, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Follow up with Cintra on that. Next is the Outreach Subcommittee, and here that's again something that was created in Toronto. So, Matt and Heidi are to follow up with Sala regarding a call on capacity building for mid-December. Of course, this is – just as I read this I notice this hasn't been changed. The Outreach Subcommittee and the Capacity Building are two separate things. I would like those to be separated please. And

I can hear – the Outreach Subcommittee is something that’s run by Cheryl, and Capacity Building..

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which is why Cheryl has her hand [checked] down again, because she’s going to correct you on the fact that that had not been corrected since we had yesterday’s meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I’m going to correct myself for not correcting. There you go. And that’s incorrect of course, but there you go. If we can make sure that these two are separated. It’s not called Outreach Subcommittee, it’s Capacity Building. And Matt and Heidi, has there been any progress on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, are you on the call? I believe that we are planning a meeting of the Outreach Subcommittee for early in the month, next month.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Quite probably Heidi, Cheryl here, but just get it right. That action item is about Capacity Building and Sala, not Outreach.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Heidi, and I’m really sorry about this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I got it. I see what you’re saying.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, Outreach Subcommittee out the window, let's not think about it now. Capacity Building – good thing to start with, if you could follow up on that please that would be great. Next, the At-Large IDN Working Group and the issue of languages to be taken into account of the ALAC statement on the draft recommendations overall policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings – that's done. So we can move on.

The At-Large Capacity Building next steps. There you go, that's where the other AI should be. Matt and Heidi are to develop a human resources matrix, any progress on this Heidi, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Not yet. This is Heidi, not yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In progress. And next the ALAC is to vote on whether to establish a working group on capacity building in the wrap-up session on Thursday. And as you can see by the small tick on this page that's been done. And that's why the Capacity Building Working Group exists. The Academy Working Group session, we'll have Sandra give us a little update later on in this call. So we can pass over those. And then the APRALO meeting, that's purely an APRALO thing, so not something for us.

And finally, the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap-Up One meeting where I asked the gTLD Working Group to take the time and present the draft letter regarding the registry SG DIDT on Trademark Clearinghouse to the ALAC when it has been finalized. That has been done. And finally

the issues of visas is to be linked to the other travel related issues discussed at the Toronto meeting. That was done, it was discussed. I understand there might be a statement coming from, or a push for a statement coming from EURALO.

I'm not sure if there's been a follow up on this – Wolf, or Yrjo if Yrjo is on the call. So perhaps Wolf Ludwig, are you able to speak?

WOLF LUDWIG: Sorry, I didn't get the question Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm looking at the issue of visas which is to be linked to the other travel related issues discussed in Toronto. Now, the discussion took place but I recall that in a recent EURALO meeting there was a push from some members to see if a statement could be drafted; starting as a EURALO statement but maybe something that would be an ALAC wide statement. Do you have any follow up on that?

WOLF LUDWIG: This is Wolf Ludwig for the record. I have no news regarding the follow up on this. It's one of the action items from the last EURALO monthly call where Yrjo actually suggested to draft a letter to ICANN to have a closer look on visa regulations for our future meetings. Because as a matter of fact, at the last Toronto meeting it was three members from the ALAC community at the NomCom who couldn't go to Toronto and this affected the balance of the NomCom discussions. And therefore this should be done in an official demarche to ICANN, and we will follow

up with Yrjo on this so that we can have a draft set up on this and then we can give it to ALAC for some further support or action.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. And of course, this matter was also touched on in the recent ALAC statement on the consolidated meeting strategy proposal, which we'll be touching on in a few minutes. Any questions or comments on any of our action items that we have here? I don't see anyone putting their hands up so let's then move on swiftly to the next part of our conference, which is the review of ALS applications.

And for this I should let perhaps Matt Ashtiani go on the call and take us through these please.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi, this is Matt. The first section is recently accredited ALSes. We have the Computer Society of India, APRALO. We also have a few new applicants from organizations that are currently undergoing the application process. The Asociacion De Escribanos Del Uruguay – we are waiting the regional advice from LACRALO. This expected imminently. The National Association for Digital Inclusion – we are also waiting for regional advice from LACRALO, which is expected imminently.

We have the Association ATPDIT – AFRALO has asked us staff to follow up with some additional questions regarding this, we should have the answers by AFRALO very soon. There is Ray Services for AFRALO – additional information is also being researched on this ALS application. There is the University Community Partnership for Social Action

Research – ALAC is to begin voting shortly, most likely today. There is the connect.nyc – which the ALAC is to begin voting shortly on, most likely today. There is the Nova Scotia Community Access Program – again, the ALAC should be voting today.

And two new recent applications that were just received is dothIV for EURAOL – the due diligence should begin on that shortly. And then there's the Armenian Association for the Disabled Pyunic and the due diligence should also begin shortly on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Matt for taking us through those. First thing of course I think is to have a round of applause and welcome for the Computer Society of India. Great to have another ALS in that part of the world, especially when India is one of the fastest growing regions as far as internet is concerned, so that's really, really great to see that. With regards to all of the other applications, you can see there are many, many of them. There is one which I have asked for a small delay in the vote, which is the University Community Partnership for Social Action Research, which I know there's been a discussion in NARALO about that one with regards to the geographic limitations of where they are based geographically.

As you know, our ALSes have to be primarily based in one location, and the rules about this are somehow a little unclear. If an organization has members in other parts of the world then in the main part that they are in, are they eligible to become an ALS. And I can see Alan having put his hand up, and I know that he has had much discussion on this, so first Alan, then Heidi and then Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes thank you Olivier. I put my hand up because I disagree with what you said; the rules are not at all unclear. They just don't coincide with what this organization appears to be. And there's a feeling that this would be a good organization to be an ALS, but the subject is asking for some information which we have not yet gotten, they likely do not meet the criteria. The criteria are crystal clear though. So it's not that there's confusion on the criteria, it's confusion as to whether they meet the criteria or whether we like the criteria based on this new experience. Thank you.

Just to be clear for those of us who hadn't participated, this is an organization with worldwide membership and the Bylaws, and therefore our criteria say that people who are residents or citizens of a single region must predominate, must control the organization. And although it may be by happenstance that that is so in this case, it certainly isn't by design of their structure and that's the problem. Although it's deemed by people who have looked at the application to be a nice group to have as an ALS. But it doesn't seem to fit into the regionals width that ICANN has designated for ALSes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I see that Heidi has deferred to Tijani, so next is Tijani.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, Gisella here, just to say that we can't get Tijani on to the audio bridge again. I'm not sure he'll be able to speak...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I gather trying to get him on the studio bridge we've lost him, so in the meantime, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier, this is Evan for the record. I guess I'm sort of near and dear to this issue because in my day job I actually work for an academic collaboration that's very similar to the applicant. What we have is a situation in which we have a couple of academic institutions, of which the two core ones are based in North America, have put together a proposal to become an ALS. Yes they have membership from all over, however the organization [also] is firmly based in North America. It's Secretariat is based in North America.

And so we're asking for a little bit of due diligence in finding out where the membership is from. I just wanted to add, in addition to this, that I want to, I'm very, very concerned about not creating a situation in which there are ALS applications which fall through the cracks because we can't accommodate them. I don't want to have a situation where we shrug our shoulders and say "Well our structure doesn't allow you because you're too spread out. So instead of being anywhere you can't be anywhere."

I'm watching, with some concern, in the GNSO as an organization tries to create a constituency for associations of cyber cafés. And I'm somewhat distressed by the reception they're getting in having every constituency that already exists in GNSO saying "This is a really good idea to have, but just not with us."

So as I'm seeing this occurrence, which at least in my own culture has a term called NIMBY – not in my back yard – to refer to everybody that says "this is a good idea to have but just I don't want it" or "I can't have it," I want to make extra effort to make sure that we don't have that situation happen with an At-Large. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan for these good words. Do we now have Tijani? Yes we can hear you, go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very good, thank you very much. I am okay and understand the application number 167 (inaudible). Is that the additional information I requested? But I don't remember repealing this application at all. So Matt, are you sure that the review had been done and you sent it to AFRALO?

MATT ASHTIANI: I can double check Tijani and get back to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani, thank you for pointing this out. And finally, Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes thank you Olivier. On the question of the Arizona based organization that globally has global membership; we did send a question to legal about that. Their initial response was that there should be, as Alan mentioned, some predominance of members within that region of NARALO, but they're going to look into that a little bit more. And they're also wondering whether NARALO or ALAC has considered how the membership from around the world would affect some of the issues in NARALO if it's accepted as a NARALO ALS.

So that's something that perhaps the ALAC or NARALO might wish to consider while legal considers their research on this issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. And Yaovi. It's a good point. Yaovi, you wish to add something?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you, this is Yaovi speaking. I just want to say hello and to ask permission, currently I'm in Sudan Khartoum for the AfriNIC meeting and there is a meeting of the national telecommunications corporations. So I would like to take the opportunity to go there. I'm very sorry because it's a very interesting meeting, but I want to apologize to ask permission to go. Thank you. If you can...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Yaovi for this. We are not going to conduct any votes today during the call, so that is no issue as quorum as such for the

decisions to be taken or ratified. And have a great meeting in Khartoum.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So back to our agenda. I gather then that the process for accreditation is moving forward with everyone. The one that should be on hold is number 170, and there will be a follow up on that. And of course, staff will also follow up on the Ray Services, 167, with Tijani to find out what's going on on this. I don't want to spend more time on the ALS applications. Tijani, you still have your hand up, did you want just to add one last thing. Okay thank you.

So next we are moving on over to the reports, not before me just expressing the great satisfaction to see so many organizations currently undergoing the accreditation process. It's really great and I note that there are several that are likely to very soon come in the pipeline from the meeting that took place in Baku, where there has been a lot of outreach going on. So it's really, really great to see more organizations joining.

Now the next part of our agenda are the reports and so I invite you all to the RALO and liaison reports page and also to the ALAC monthly reports page. The liaison reports, we don't have time to go through all of them. I'm going to ask just a very short summary from our GNSO liaison, are ccNSO liaison and our SSAC liaison. So just minutes, say 90 seconds from each person. GNSO liaison report first, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay thank you Olivier. Public acknowledgment I'm way behind on the formal report having to try to catch up on non-ICANN work after coming back from Toronto, followed by the Trademark Clearinghouse and a number of other issues that I'll be talking about today, have kept me far busier than ICANN stuff than they should have been. I will get all the reports done but they are lacking at the moment. I am however keeping ALAC and the ExCom as appropriate up to date on issues as they unfold. So I have no formal report but plenty to say. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan, and I do know that you have been extremely busy; just mentioning the Trademark Clearinghouse, no small feat – a 12 hour call, I hear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, great stuff. That was just one of them of course, but the more pressing one the last couple of days has been the Son of PEDNR – I'll be talking about that later in the meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Is that a new swear word? Son of a PEDNR?

ALAN GREENBERG: It is to me. [laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next the ccNSO liaison report, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. I did note that Tijani's hand went up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah I just noticed that now, sorry. Tijani you have the floor. And I believe you are muted probably, so you have to unmute. Tijani has dropped now. Okay, let's go on then with Cheryl and then come back to Tijani afterwards.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier, Cheryl for the transcript record. I've not done my normal update, which usually happens immediately after a ccNSO Council Meeting, because of a number of issues still being decided on the list. So once those are now finalized on the Council list, and I believe they're all done now, I'll update the Wiki page in the usual way and all of you who opted avidly will be up to date. So that's short and sweet.

I suppose I should mention however that most of the ccNSO workgroups are back up and operating since a small hiatus after the last meeting in Toronto. But that of course, most of those workgroups also met during Toronto and the reports from the Toronto meeting should be drilled down too to look at these individual workgroup activities. Other than that, I'll wait for workgroups a little later. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Cheryl. Are there any questions? Tijani, are you back online? Tijani doesn't appear to be back online yet. Are there any questions from anyone else?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Tijani we have you. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay thank you. I want to say thank you very much Alan and Evan about their work in Trademark Clearinghouse meetings. And it should be pointed out that the (inaudible) report, Alan was very clear and very detailed and very, very well done. And I want to thank him and thank Evan very, very much. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I think we can all agree with you on this. And I would say a round of applause is absolutely required here; virtual applause of course as we all try and do it online. But yeah, absolutely great work and great report as well. Great to see that we do have some real champions. So I see no questions about the GNSO or the ccNSO reports. Finally, the SSAC...

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan's hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan's hand is up, oh. It seems to be arriving very late on my screen for some reason. Evan, please go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. I just wanted to add one other thing and to not only congratulate Alan but to note that there were four people on the all that were sort of representing, shall we say, our side of things – Robin Gross, Kathy Kleimann, Alan and myself. Out of the four of us, Alan pretty well attended every minute of every meeting, with the rest of us sort of coming in as necessary. There was an awful lot of stuff on that and I want to underscore the work that Alan did on this because while my name is tacked on, Alan really did most of the heavy lifting on this. So I want to personally congratulate him and thank him for his masochism and perseverance through these three meetings he has done, and probably more to come. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks very much Evan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. So, now we'll have a very short SSAC liaison report. If we could have Julie Hammer please? Julie, I'm not hearing you at the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You might be muted Julie; star 7 to unmute if you're on the phone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's rather strange because I do see some movement on the Adobe, but...her microphone is moving but it doesn't seem to be...she's on the Adobe Connect...here we go Julie, we can hear you now. Go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Can you hear me now? I'll just turn the volume up, I was unmuted. Okay, the only thing I wanted to mention was the SSAC Annual Workshop which was held in Los Angeles from the 14th to the 16th of November. Unfortunately I wasn't able to get there in person, but I did attend a day and a half of a two day workshop remotely. And the SSAC staff, Julie Hedlund is currently working on the reports of the outcomes of that meeting, some of which will be internally held reports, but they are going to produce a public report. And as soon as that's available I'll make that link known to everyone.

The workshop was mainly looking at work party progress, but also determining and discussing future working groups. So I'm sure that will be of interest. So I think that's the main thing I wanted to bring to your attention.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julie, much appreciated. Any questions to you from anyone here? I don't see anyone putting their hands up, so thank you for your report and of course there's always the written reports for everyone to consult in their own time, all linked to that page. Then of course on the page you've got the link to the NCSG liaison report, the IDN liaison report. Now the NCSG liaison report, Evan, I have to pull your ear. I haven't seen any recently, but I gather there's been a lot of

discussion going on in Toronto and we've all been aware of the joint statement from ALAC and NCSG that took place on the URS. I'm sorry, I'm trying to do three things at the same time which doesn't help.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Well Olivier, essentially there's two things that have pretty well dominated right now the discourse between ALAC and the NCSG, one of which is the work that we've been doing on the Trademark Clearinghouse. And I was mentioning Robin Gross, and by the way for the purpose of the meeting minutes that's G-R-O-S-S, and so we've been working with them because they've been adamantly, even more than ALAC against blocking mechanisms.

And the other issues right now that are sort of dominating the discussions within the NCSG are NCUC elections going on now, as well as the issue that I mentioned before about the proper positioning of a cyber café constituency in the GNSO. There's fairly strong opposition to that happening within the NC group. I sympathize with them, I'm just kind of saddened that there might be a situation where the cyber café constituency is told "sorry we have no place for you, you can't get there from here."

I'm following it with a little bit of dismay, but I don't think right now that ALAC should be wading into GNSO structural matters. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Evan, and yes, we'll touch on that very quickly in our statements, the list of statements. And finally, the IDN liaison

report was very kindly filed as well this month. I'm not sure whether do I have a copy of this, I don't have the latest copy of it for some reason.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. Apologies, but it hasn't been posted yet. I will get that to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are you sure because it says here "November 2012 report is posted?"

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh okay, then it has been, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was just looking at the wrong space, but yes, the report is posted on there. I'll have to thank our IDN liaison, as well as Rinalia, whose been very much involved in the work of the IDN Variants Implementation Project. It's really, really great work and the At-Large community has been extremely well represented by our members of the team that are involved in I know very long conference calls, and who also were very much involved in this in Toronto. They arrived a few days before everyone else, and by the time the ALAC met on Sunday, they had already clocked up quite a few hours of meeting time and frustrating experiences. So some true masochists; great stuff.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier it's Alan. A comment on Evan's report on NCSG – I'll just note that the work on the Trademark Clearinghouse has been interesting in

that the positions of ALAC and At-Large do not coincide 100% with the NCSG and NCUC. We differ on a number of issues. We submitted minority reports in SCI on things that the NCSG folks there did not agree with. And it's been pretty satisfying that we've been able to work together acknowledging that we don't agree with each other on some issues, and that hasn't stopped the collaborative work where it did coincide. So that's been a good working relationship that hasn't always been the case in the past, so I thought I'd note that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan, and yes, absolutely. It's great to note the maturity, and I think the organization as a whole, but definitely both the NCSG and the NCUC, NPOC, ourselves have gone through some real development to be able to disagree on some things and to agree on others. And let not the disagreements block us from working together on other points. So thank you for mentioning this. I now invite you all also to the ALAC monthly reports for the RALO Secretariat reports. And here I must say I'm quite satisfied with most regions who have filed their reports.

It's of course very important that a report gets filed so as for your members, your At-Large structures to be able to have a quick glance as to what is currently going on in the region, and also what is currently going on in the other regions as well is interesting reading. I'm not going to go through all of the reports there. I notice that in the EURALO there was a report that was filed but it doesn't appear to be on the Wiki yet. If I could ask for Silvia I guess to follow up with the different Regional At-Large Organizations for their reports – it might be that they

sent them and it's fallen through the cracks with so many things going on simultaneously, the different meetings, etc. Any questions or comments?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, I'll make sure they are posted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Silvia. So we spent a long time on this already, and we are now moving to the next part of our agenda, and that's the new business. The items for decision, and of course I invite you all to the Policy Advice Development Page. One of the pages that I always tell everyone "this is one of the ones that you need to have tagged in your browser"; so when you turn on your browser, in fact you could use this as your home page.

So when you turn this one that's what tells you that's the order of the day, that's what's going on. Matt goes through a great amount of work to keep that main policy advice development page updated. And I must say I do have to thank Matt for this; if it wasn't for that I wouldn't know what is going on. With the number of statements we have had working in parallel it is really great to be able to see where they are, what they are about, when is the opening time, call for comments, closing, opening, votes, etc.

And let's now go through the list that we have. The recently approved ALAC statements documents are quite long. I already see two people having put their hand up, I'm not quite sure, well let's listen. First Alan and then Jean-Jacques.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah just a heads up to staff as we go through these as I noted in the chat a while ago, but it may have rolled off, three of the items under here look like links but they're not. So if we need to talk about them staff might want to fetch out the real URLs. It's Roman Numerals II, IV and V. It may not be necessary to look at them but if it is necessary to look at them we need URLs. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well caught Alan. I notice this now, yes. Well they're past statements so I'm not going to go into detail into them, just to read them to the record. First the community input draft [2014-2016] strategic plan; that was approved on the 11th of November. I think that was right in the middle of the Baku conference if I'm right. Thanks to Tijani for having to really held the flag on this one. And there is going to be a call for members of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee of At-Large. We need more members. There is a process that is going on now with improvements to the strategic calendar, strategic plan, development calendar, which Tijani is again holding the flag on. There will be a follow up on that very soon.

Jean-Jacques, you had put your hand up and I'm sorry I skipped you just a moment ago.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Not at all, thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. About the open statements, the chart, I was just wondering whether perhaps Matt had not had the time to add a few things in the columns, because everything is TBC, to

be confirmed, whereas I think that a call for comments at least has a date, and the call for comments closed also has a date, etc. So just to remark that not all the dates maybe have been included. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Actually, the call for comment and call for comments close are the ALAC call for comments and ALAC call for comments close. The closing date of the initial comment period that we have to submit a statement by to the public comments period is actually on the close date, the column on the left-hand side of the table. So perhaps it would be a good thing to add “ALAC call for comments,” “ALAC call for comment closed” – Matt? Hello, anybody there, Matt?

Okay, we might have lost Matt because I can’t hear him. Let’s put this as an action item please. ALAC call for comments – ALAC call for comment closed. And of course, there’s still TBC because there has not been a decision made yet on whether a statement would be drafted or what the timetable for the call for comments and the vote, etc. is going to be. So this is why they’re all on TBC Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, yes go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

The ALAC comments I believe and the closing date cannot be missed again on the table before the statement is already [picked up]. So it is something that we left on the table at the last meeting because we don't know when the statement will be finished and then to put it to the comments of the ALAC. That's why the comments are not seen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That's correct, yeah. You'll see, scrolling further down in the closing statements that they have the call for comments open and close, etc, drafts...Okay, let's move on back to our list. So, the second one was the use of a drawing for prioritizing new gTLD applications. That was approved on the 8th of November. The next, proposed Bylaws Amendments to align Board terms, approved on the 8th of November as well.

The next, the draft recommendations overall policy for the selection for IDN ccTLD strings; approved as well on the 8th of November. The Trademark Clearinghouse documents, that was a statement approved on the 7th of November. And the ALAC statement on community input and advice process was approved on the 18th of November. And finally, the R3 White Paper is not an actual statement, but as you all know is a paper that is now actually being released for public comment, so we're going full circle here.

The ALAC had approved the document unanimously on the 29th of September. That was then sent over to the Chair of the Board and it was distributed to the Board. The Board members asked and said "well has this gone through public comment as well; what do others in the community and the wider ICANN community think about this paper."

And so now it's gone through a full process where the whole of everyone in ICANN can comment on it.

It will go through a system that will be a little different from the usual GNSO call for comment. In the GNSO Working Group call for comments, any comments received need to be integrated in the final workings of the working group, or a suitable response needs to be given as to why the comment is not included in the text. In this specific case, we are the ALAC. This is the second time that a call for comments on an At-Large paper has been requested. We are not bound in this specific case to have to change or amend or modify the contents of the paper that is under public comment.

The idea is, and perhaps Evan would like to fill in on this, but the idea would be to have any additional comments in an appendix. And this would all form the basis of a wider discussion in Beijing, in the forthcoming Beijing location, ICANN meeting. Evan, you've put your hand up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. I just wanted to concur with what you're saying, just a little bit of clarification in that yes, Jean-Jacques and myself, the two co-chairs of the Future Challenges Group have essentially worked with staff to put in the solicitation for public comments with the understanding that well maybe some of the comments may have some influence on the comment expressed in the paper, but we will obligate ourselves to read all the comments, perhaps to comment on them and to collect them as an appendix to be attached to the document.

So they may or may not affect the original document. We would want to take it back to the original authors to see if any of these would be put is we say “friendly amendments.” But we have committed ourselves as part of this process to read, and in some cases where something is particularly thoughtful, perhaps to respond. But the one real thing that I wanted to add on this is that we are trying to make as much of an effort as possible to reach out for public comment beyond, shall we say, the usual suspects, beyond ICANN constituencies.

And I want to encourage everybody on this call to please go out beyond ICANN, go out to the RALOs and the ALSes, and we need to, one, we want to try and have this distributed and talked about beyond ICANNs walls. There was a very good session that was held in Toronto that was arranged by the nonprofit organization constituency where they explicitly invited from outside to come in and speak. So we had very interesting and somewhat refreshing attitudes that were brought in. And we really want to encourage this. We’ve made an attempt, the document itself is translated into six languages, explicitly for the intent of trying to get this as far out into the internet ecosystem as possible.

Perhaps this may be even discussed at future IGFs. So please if we can get some assistance to distribute this beyond the usual ICANN channels for public comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah just a quick comment. What was described by you and Evan as to the process to be followed is not significantly different from that which is followed in the GNSO or any public comment. That you're obliged to look at the comments and, certainly within the GSNO, and I think the staff generated ones, there's an obligation to comment. The comment may be noted or "the workgroup discussed this and we disagree"; it doesn't say you have to incorporate everything into a revised document. It just says you have to thoughtfully look at what people said. And I don't think that's sub-standardly different than what Evan described. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. So let's move on. The next part of this section is the statements currently being developed, reviewed or voted on by the ALAC. The first one is the ICANN consolidated meeting strategy proposal. The ALAC has effectively agreed with the strategy, although it has said that the most, the largest priority is the one to actually look at the visa issue and make sure that participants are not prevented from participating. This is something that has been shown recently in the problems that we have faced in Toronto, as we have touched on this earlier in the call.

The vote has already started. I don't think there is any need to discuss the matter any further. We'd already discussed it in the past. But I invite all of you who have not voted yet, in fact I think has actually passed if I get this correctly. I was just looking at the results. It's passed, yes. So this is started and done. It's passed and I think is at 14 in favor.

MATT ASHTIANI: Yes Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you and sorry for rambling on this one. Next, the IDN Variant...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, hand please, it's Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh I didn't see it, sorry. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a quick note of pleasure. When I saw this vote come up I was firmly in the belief that I was going to have to either abstain or vote against it because I had some strong differences with some of the opinions that were raised when the discussion started. And I had not followed the development process as the statement was being drafted, and I was quite pleased to see that what was stated was very different than some of the original gut reactions that people had when they first saw the policy, and I think this is a real sign of maturity that people are not simply taking a stance and putting their feet firmly in the ground.

But people are talking about it, coming up with ideas, convincing other people and coming forward with a statement which is not the one that would have been written as has been described in the past by one person and then simply rubberstamped by everyone. So the process is working a lot better than it used to. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. And I think part of the reason is probably due to the discussion that took place. The very fact that if one does the actual sums you find out that most of our regions would not have the number of meetings changing. It's a three year plan. It's even just a proposal at this stage.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we even need to discuss the appropriateness of the answer, just that we're actually having people discuss things and having substantive discussions and decisions made, and the statements reflect that. As opposed to what had happened so many times in the past of one person says "alright something," no one else even reads it and everyone votes for it. And it's really pleasing to see what's happening now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Natalia Enciso.

NATALIA ENCISO: Can you hear me? This is Natalia Enciso for the record. I wanted to say that in LACRALO we take the public comments and we have no time to draft these with AFRALO because Tijani had started the vote. So our replies got there a little bit later, so we made a LACRALO statement. And we considered the number of meetings in our regions and other opinions on the list. We took into account Tijani's opinion and included that in the public comment. Fatima Cambronero is also on the call and

participated. I don't know if she would like to add something. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fatima you are very welcome to add something if you wish to do so.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Hello, this is Fatima, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can hear.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, this is Fatima Cambronero for the record. Yes just as a follow up after listening to Natalia. We, as a RALO, thought it was important to come up with this statement because it had been a long time since we had drafted a statement along these lines, and it was very important for us to post it as a public comment. And also, we took into account mainly Tijani's statement and we adapted that statement to the reality of our own RALOs. And we also took into account the opinions on the list and tried to strike a balance among, if you will, opposing views.

And we want to thank the members of our region who appreciated this balanced statement, to take into account our regions voices on the whole. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this comment. I see Tijani has put his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Olivier. I do appreciate the statement of the LACRALO even if I didn't see it. But it would be perhaps better that they comment on the statement that the ALAC did before the ALAC have defined it. It would be the statement of ALAC which would be stronger. So I didn't see the content of the LAC region intentionally because I assumed I would include it in the statement of the ALAC statement more opened and better listened to. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Yes I guess that is noted. I don't wish to engage in discussing the histories past, it's good to see statements both from RALOs and also from the ALAC on this matter. I just note one small thing, that the LACRALO statement does mention the impact on the real participation and the ALS members in Latin America and Caribbean. And I'm a little concerned, due to the fact that if one does the sum, and we are looking at t three year cycle, there is no change in the number of meetings in the Latin American and Caribbean region. So this might need to be explained later on.

But I wish to move on to the next statement, because otherwise we'll be here for a few hours. We've already been in this call for an hour, so let's get on with things. The IDN Variant TLD Program interim report examining the user experience implications of active variant TLDs. Edmond Chung is going to draft a statement on this, and I believe, I'm

not quite sure actually. Did we have a quick update on this? I know Edmond is not online, is Rinalia able to give us, do you know anything about this? I can't hear you Rinalia.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl here. You've got 16 days at least anyway, so I'm quite sure if Edmond and his team has undertaken to write a statement it will come in. I guess a question to ask however, and perhaps Silvia could follow up with Edmond on this, if you don't directly Olivier, is can it come in as early as practical for sufficient time and consideration of the ALAC before it would vote on such a thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Yes, it's Olivier here. I understand that the statement will be coming in late for the initial comment period and would be filed in the secondary part of the second parts of the comment period. And the draft is, as I note from the Adobe Connect room, draft is to be developed in the next few days. We'll follow up. I know we have followed up with Edmond, I think it was yesterday or the day before yesterday so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier is I may, Cheryl here. As one of the architects of the reply and reply comment from the ATRT, we really have to remember, and you need to keep coaching your ALAC to remember, as well as the regions as well I guess to remember that the reply comment period should be addressing things specifically that have come out of the comment

period in anything. And if we can't do that, then ALAC should be using its trump card and just making a statement directly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. I think that's what's going to happen, the use of the trump card. And thank goodness we do have this trump card, because as we know it's very difficult sometimes to come up with statements in time. The expired registration recovery policy – I thought I'd let Alan take us through this one very briefly please, Alan. Because I've just noticed that a proposed statement has just come up online. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: When you say "just" I don't think there was anything in the last hour or two. Okay, the story is in an email and posted on the web. I don't know if people have had a chance to look at it. I think it was done late last night my time. Two of the recommendations in PEDNR – I have an echo on my line, I don't know why. Two of the recommendations called for registrars to post certain information on their websites. The presumption in the workgroup, or the understanding in the workgroup was that if a registrar was obliged to post something that if they used resellers they were obliged to have the resellers post something.

And there were strong oppositions from the registrars within the workgroup to have explicit language talking about resellers, so we let it be, not believing there was any substantive difference. When we looked at the final draft of the actual policy that was the implementation, staff had included specific language about resellers

and took pains to make sure that we understood, the implementation understood, that they had added this. It wasn't clear why they had added it at that time.

It has since become clear that the view of ICANN Compliance, and presumably ICANN Legal, is that without that language there is no ability to enforce that registrars do have resellers post the required information. The first reaction to the change was a posting my Michele Neylon who is a registrar and was on the workgroup and is the registrar person on the implementation team, recounting essentially what happened in the workgroup and that we decided not to post that; not to have explicit language about resellers.

He has since, as of today, acknowledged that it was indeed the belief in the workgroup that the policy was enforceable for resellers and was certainly the belief of the workgroup that it applied to all registrant. So he's not talking on behalf of all registrars that we should change the language, but he acknowledges that the intent of the policy was to apply to tall registrants. I have suggested a way forward in this, and that is I will, as past Chairman of the working group and a member of the implementation team who explicitly asked compliance for a ruling and got it, I will post that on the public comment.

And I'm proposing the ALAC follow up with a brief statement, and I have drafted one, basically saying that the ALAC feels that it's important that the language be maintained to ensure that the policy that was approved by the Board applies to all registrants and not a subset of them. And I would suggest that statement may need to be revised a little bit

because Michele has posted his statement after that, and I need to look at it carefully to see if the wording needs some perhaps subtle changes.

But I think it's probably pretty close, and once I have a chance to look at it later today, I will be sending it to the ALAC list and suggesting that if no one has any specific updates that we start a vote on it soon. The deadline I believe is the 5th or 7th of December for putting a comment on. I think we have enough time for that. I'll take any questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan, and yes, at the moment on our pages it shows that the reply closing time is the 30th of November, 2012. This has been extended to the 7th of December, so we do have a bit more time. If I could ask Matt to update this on our pages it will stop me from having heart attacks when I see those closing times. Any comments or questions? I see no one putting their hand up, so Alan we look forward to your note then on the ALAC list as a follow up pretty shortly, since we do need to give five days of voting time for our members. These are usually five working days, so December the 7th will come very, very fast indeed.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There should be no problem and I note I've reached out to at least one other member of the working group to see if he would post a note supporting the concept also, so we'll see what happens on that one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thanks very much Alan. And then finally in the statement currently being developed, reviewed or voted on by the ALAC we have the IDN Variant TLD Program, the procedure to develop and maintain the label generation rules for the root zone in respect of IDN A labels. The IDN Working Group has worked on this and Rinalia has very kindly drafted, worked very hard with our IDN liaison, Edmond Chung on putting together a statement that is very good indeed. Voting is in progress. Any of you that has not voted could you please look at your mailbox or ask Matt if you can't find your vote.

Currently open policy forums, there is the proposed modifications of GNSO PDP manual to address the suspension of a PDP. I'm not sure whether we had made a decision on this. Alan, any point of view on this one should an ALAC statement come out on that; bearing in mind the comment period closed on the 12th of November and the reply period closes in a few days' time.

ALAN GREENBERG: My belief is that both I and Cheryl, who was to some extent involved, both recommended that no statement is necessary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is correct Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan and thank you Cheryl. That will be updated. Next, the intra-registrar transfer policy, otherwise known as IRTP, Part C policy development process recommendations for Board consideration. This is

marked as “no statement,” it was discussed recently I guess. We have in the past – at ExCom, yeah – we have in the past submitted some statements about some IRTP parts, A, B, C, D, etc, however on this occasion it was decided not to have a statement. Expert recommended improvements to ICANNs accountability structures. There’s been no statement on this. Alan, you’ve put your hand up again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes just quickly on the IRTPC I’ll point out that statements at the time the Board is going to approve it are rather late. Unless we’re pushing home something that we said earlier and it is being ignored, and it’s certainly our right to do it at that point, we do need to focus on things earlier in the process, as we did in this case. So it shouldn’t be a surprise we’re not commenting on things before they go to the Board. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. Absolutely correct, and finding out whether or not statements are necessary are sometime not to arrive after the battle has ended. The expert recommended improvements to ICANNs accountability...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Holly has her hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Oh Holly has her hand up does she? Yes she does now. Okay, I seem to have delay here, so sorry about that. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Are we doing anything about Part B where in fact the process is still open?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I haven't touched on that yet, it's further down. I will be looking at this in a moment.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, the expert recommended improvements to ICANNs accountability structures, no statement was deemed necessary on this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl has her hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can't see any hands. Oh there you go. Cheryl go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you for that Olivier, Cheryl for the record. I just wanted to mention for the ALAC my rationale, which I certainly presented to your ExCom but also alluded to in the APRALO call today. Your desires, as in the At-Large community and the feedback of course of the more wide ICANN community, literally helped the ATRT build these

recommendations. I was a penholder on these things and it seems to me, seeing as the ALAC has already endorsed all 27 including these actions to come out of the first ATRT review, that there is probably no need for us to bother doing a formal statement at all. And in my view, and it's certainly a biased view, the plan was not perfectly enmeshed to what we in the ATRT may have envisaged at the time, does the job admirably well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. So let's continue. I notice the time is ticking. Applications for new gTLD constituency candidacy, the public internet access cyber café ecosystem. It was discussed previously and no statement was deemed necessary for this. The preliminary issue report on the intra-registrar transfer policy IRTP Part D, that's what was just touched on or eluded to by Holly Raiche. Alan has suggested that no statement would be necessary. Would you care to expand on this Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes certainly. This is a period where the comments are either to correct errors or point out omissions in the preliminary issue report. And based on my knowledge there are none that I've located. I'm not an expert on these areas, but I didn't see anything glaring. And to, if we believe it's appropriate, give support for carrying out the PDP, for continuing and initiating a PDP when it finally goes to the GNSO. Given that this is the last part of a process that has been going on for about 8 years now, or something close to that, I cannot imagine it is not going to go through, I

would like a sense of the ALAC that we do support it; I don't need a formal vote.

A consensus and if no one objects is fine with me, so I can speak up on behalf of the ALAC in the GNSO meeting whenever this comes up for a vote. But I don't see anything in it that requires a comment at this point. If someone else who has more interest and more knowledge in it, I welcome their input. I do note that there are a number of issues to be discussed which relate to protection of registrant rights, and I strongly suggest that when a PDP is initiated, as I expect it to be, that we do have At-Large people participating. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I heard Cheryl saying something, but I was going to ask Holly whether she had anything to ask or add.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, that's a good summation, thank you Alan. I'm happy with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. And I can see that instead of her saying this, Cheryl Langdon-Orr has actually typed in our confluence "hell yes Alan." Let's move on – the At-Large White Paper on future challenges entitled *Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected; the R3 Paper*. Well that appears of course here, but we had spoken about it earlier, so I invite everyone to move to the next thing, the items for discussion, starting with the ATRT 2, what's known as the ATRT 2; the call for membership on the Accountability and Transparency Review Team Number 2.

There was one which Cheryl was in and now there's one which is asking for candidatures until the 5th of December, which is in a few days' time. I did have an interaction with the people who have sent, the ICANN staff that have sent the request out. And it appears that whilst the ATRT 1 was restricted with regards to the number of people from the ALAC itself, or that could represent the ALAC as such, it appears that in this case now there is no restriction as such.

The selection itself will be made by the Chair of the GAC and the Chair of the ICANN Board; the actual composition of the review team. What we need to do is to perhaps, well we could collect some candidatures and voice our preference on some candidates. Or we could just have all the candidatures sent over to the Chair of the GAC and the Chair of the ICANN Board, or at least sent to the email address for the candidatures I note that several At-Large members were interested in this, and I open the floor for a discussion. I see Alan and Jean-Jacques having put their hands up. So Alan Greenberg first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay just noting I think this one is the CEO plus the Chair of the GAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No sorry Alan, Cheryl here. Sorry, it's Cheryl here. The first one was, this one is both Chairs; Chair of GAC and Chair of the ICANN Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh okay, so it changed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It has shifted from the first to the second.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh thank you. I wasn't paying attention to that. My only comment here is that the GNSO has or is in the process sending a letter, number one, asking to make sure that are at least four seats from the GNSO so they can represent their various stakeholder groups. I fully expect them to get the same answer as Olivier got, but just recording that it has gone out. They're also asking for an extra month in that to approve people through a bottom-up procedure within the stakeholder groups they say will require significantly more time than the deadline given allows. And it remains to be seen whether they get a positive answer on that or not. It's not clear that the process will be nearly as complex for At-Large, but that's not my issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. The letter which I received was that there was no predetermined or number of seats predetermined per SO or AC. So as you said, yes, the GNSO is likely to receive an answer. The selection of the ATRT 2 members among the applicants is really down to the selectors. The endorsements that the SOs and ACs are going to be making are probably, I would imagine, are going to make a difference in the applications that are going to be sent over to both Chairs.

However, I have also been told that the actual selectors are going to meet on the 7th of January, 2013. So although the applications should be in by the 5th of December, the endorsements could be received after that time. And that gives us, the ALAC more time if we were to make

any specific endorsements. I see Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Tijani. So first, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, this is Jean-Jacques speaking. Olivier, I'd like to take up the point you just made, which is to what degree is the ALAC prepared or supposed to give some sort of endorsements to any candidates coming from the ALAC. I would be thinking of sending in my candidature, but before doing that I'd like to know whether you have, or whether you have discussed this already on the Executive Committee, as to the type of profile which the ALAC should favor. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. There has been some discussion. I'll first let everyone speak and then perhaps add afterwards. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Olivier. Do you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes very much, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello. Okay, I think that it's an opportunity for ALAC to endorse the right person. I think that it is everyone's comments can be directed to ALAC, anyone can be a candidate. But if you only go through ALAC they will let those people that decide to be endorsed because I know, that has the minimum requirement to be endorsed as a representative of

that [branch] in the ATRT. I think we have a lot of debate. I think that we need to choose one that must be on this ATRT 2. And then it will be our person and then we can endorse the others or not according to the profile, according to their capabilities, etc. But I want to say that in this particular duty, particular task, it could be, people have to be treated very carefully. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Next we have Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll speak a little bit about the last process because I did oversee that selection. We don't know how many people the ALAC will get this time, it could conceivably be more than one, which is the number we had in the first go around. So I would heartily suggest that we don't only nominate, only endorse one. However, I think it's a reflection on the ALAC to ensure that any one the ALAC does endorse is really a good candidate, and someone we're willing to let, to allow to represent us and serve on the review committee; if not representing the ALAC formally because I'm not sure that's the right word, but at least someone that we feel will serve the community well.

And last time we had a significant number of applications from people who certainly in some of our opinions did not have the kind of background; they had little knowledge in the overall concepts of accountability and transparency. They had very little knowledge if any on ICANN. And they had very little knowledge of At-Large. So they met pretty much none of the requirements that I would think are important,

and yet they were strongly endorsed by people from their own regions in some cases, and in some cases a wider group.

So I think we really need to make sure that the people we put forward are ones who indeed will do a good job and then leave it to the selectors to decide exactly who is picked, assuming we have more than the final number that they allot to us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Yes there certainly is no knowledge as to how many from ALAC and its community will be agreed. It could be one, two, three, four, who knows; very difficult to know. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes this is Eduardo for the record. I just would like to know how this endorsement works. The endorsement is endorsed by the whole ALAC or the Executive Committee only? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Eduardo, and that's actually what we're trying to work out as we speak at the moment. So if you have suggestions then please make them.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan, I'll point out the Executive Committee has no such powers unless the ALAC specifically grants them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, it's Cheryl for the transcript record. I think we need to look backwards as well as forwards on this. Furthering on what Alan said, and I totally agree with everything he did say, we should also look at the fact that when we've had other review teams have statements of interest be called for, communities, including our own, have had people who are literally unknown to us, or the communities that they're trying to represent or say that they would like endorsement from put their names in.

So there is no limitation to who can put in an SOI. And if they say "I want to represent ALAC," then the ALAC has to decide whether they can or cannot. So to answer Jean-Jacques question, we do need a mechanism that will sift and sort any and all applicants, those known to you and those not known to you, into some sensible order. Recognizing of course that all the ALAC can do is endorse or otherwise those candidates, or perhaps as we have done in the past, put them in some sort of subset in priority order so that the selectors can be well-advised.

Now that said, we have in the past, and specifically for something that the ATRT in particular used a subcommittee, so this is going to Eduardo's question. We endorsed a subcommittee to; sorry we created a subcommittee to look at the endorsement discussion. And that worked, I think, very clumsily and not very effectively. Alan was rather polite saying that people from regional interests seemed to think that only their region should be there. It was a dog's breakfast in fact Alan. I think that's about a nice a thing as I can say about it.

It would have ended up, if the ALAC had not voted in priority order, with something as poorly represented as we saw from other support organizations in the ATRT. In other words, people who held seats at the table but did little if any of the actual work and drafting. So I think that needs to be said so that the ALAC understands what they're doing while they're making these decisions. I would like to propose that because of the timing that what the ALAC should consider is that it does do some sort of delegated authority to a subcommittee; it can be the ExCom, it can be the ExCom plus whatever, or it can be the committee as a whole if you so desire.

But that you do use a very analytical and unambiguous matrix tool. And I know to that end, Alan who's led this process in the past, and Rinalia have already worked together and I've had a look at what they've done and it certainly seems very fine, fair and reasonable to me, on a matrix already, which would allow a totally clear, transparent and accountable criteria to be either yes, no, or ranked one to five on any or all of the SOIs that would come to the ALAC for endorsement. And that could be done, I think, in a very reasonable time, hopefully before the end of the calendar year, and certainly before the 7th of January deadline.

So really the questions before the ALAC are, would you like to look at using an empirical mechanism, which I would strongly encourage you to do so, such as the matrix that I know Rinalia has already organized for your consideration. And I would strongly suggest that if you're not going to do it as a committee as a whole and have a full vote after an additional meeting for full and frank and fearless discussion of the candidates, that you do empower a subcommittee, be that the Executive of the Executive plus to do that.

And as Rinalia has put, I think, considerable time, effort, and great systemic thought into how it could be done, and as she's not tainted as Alan and I are by past experiences, I would also strongly recommend that she be the leader of that effort. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for your suggestions Cheryl. I can Rinalia currently being so excited about all the forthcoming work in this wonderful month of December. Let's go through the whole comments and then I'll come up with my comments. Jean-Jacques Subrenat next.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. So to build on mainly what Cheryl has said, I think that yes it requires an analytical approach. And I'd like to suggest that we keep in mind the fact that we have to aim at providing ALAC input or user input not for the past ICANN but for the future ICANN, which has been set in place just now with a new CEO. It's a new world out there and I think we have to be very conscious of that. So experience of the past is important naturally, but also a fairly robust view of what we expect in the future, or what we would like ICANN to be in the future would be very helpful.

But I'll wait for the final comments by Olivier before deciding or not to send in my candidature. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. I can see from the discussion that is taking place here that definitely a tool appears to be the right way to

move forward, certainly with a number of people who are going to be, well, probably applying but at the same time also the number of people who wish to bring their input in the process. If we don't have a tool it's going to be an absolute mess. And I'm somehow concerned always with these things to have dissention and hard feelings because some people will not be selected and they'll be asking why or how, and it's not that great for a community.

I see Rinalia has put her hand up. I know that she might be able to share her proposed matrix. I just wanted to announce one thing, just to make things quite transparent. I am also planning to apply for a position on the ATRT 2. Namely because it follows from what Cheryl had done in the ATRT 1 and being close to the action I think is important for the ALAC Chair to be on this. But that of course doesn't preclude anyone else from applying as well, and I do hope that it's not being seen as blocking anyone else's chances.

I am absolutely convinced that with the additional amount of, well certainly the new season that we have today, we're not going to be restricted to one person. I'm hoping that I would be selected by the two Chairs, and this is again, I need to emphasize this, based on what Tijani has said, we absolutely need one person, we must have one candidate and then recommend others. Well in fact we can't actually have one candidate. We can only have recommendations for people and we should remember that.

There are chances that any of our recommendations might not be allowed. There are chances that all of them might be, who knows. So

that's something to keep in mind. And now I'll ask Rinalia Abdul Rahim, I can see several hands having gone up again. Rinalia.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's Alan. Can I have a word first before Rinalia?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you wish to jump the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it would be appropriate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's just to note that as I've told a number of people, I also plan to apply and I really think the crucial thing is, and this is sort of a comment to Rinalia, is that first of all we do not, the ALAC does not endorse people who truly are not qualified. That's – we didn't do that last time in the end. We gave weak endorsements to people who weren't qualified, and that I don't think reflected well on us. So I'm less worried about whether we prioritize the candidates we have that I think are good ones, or simply present them to the selectors.

But I think the real issue is making sure that we come out looking as responsible, as a responsible group to the selectors in who we present. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you Alan. And certainly a tool might be able to highlight who is and who is not qualified. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: There is one thing that I'd like to table, and that pertains to the selection of the ALAC Chair for ATRT 2 Review Panel. Whether he would be subject to different criteria based on a consensus and the other candidates be subject to the matrix assessment. That's one thing that I'd like to put on the table for clarification. And let me rephrase that by saying whether the Chair together with all the other candidates that are applying should be subject to the same criteria or should the Chair be subject to a different one, meaning that the ALAC can have a consensus decision that the Chair would go into the review panel regardless, and any other candidate from the ALAC would be subject to the assessment. That's one point.

The second point is that with regards to the analytical tool, we will be using the criteria that the ATRT Review Panel has put its call for volunteers. But in addition to that, and this alludes to what Cheryl had said earlier, we should be adding two additional criteria – one specifically an accountability to the ALAC itself, and that could be in the

form of an elected official or an elected capacity. And the other criteria would be known or trusted by the community. And for this we would have to come up with a specific proxy indicator. So I have – sorry for speaking so fast.

I have developed a draft matrix and I will share that with you, I'm just not quite sure how to share it. Should I just email it to the ALAC internal list, or the ALAC working list, or what?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rinalia it's Olivier here. One of the problems is we are running out of time on this call, and reading through the matrix now on this call might probably be something a little hard. I have read through what you've sent and it's quite extensive. Perhaps emailing it to the internal list would be a good way forward, but first let's here the others in the queue. I note there's Alan and ten Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry that was an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay then, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay thank you. Two things, first one is (inaudible) that we will need a committee to review the applications according to the objectives. This is another thing that we have to do and it can be perhaps completed

(inaudible). But it is a good thing to have it organized in each of our working teams.

The second point, Olivier, you said you cannot give preference to one candidate. And I'm sorry, we have to. We have to because if we decide to pick only one from ALAC it must be the one that we choose according to our metrics and according also to the consultation of the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Tijani. Unfortunately, we might be placing one person as our number one choice and a list of number two, number three, number four. And the two Chairs can choose not to go for our number one choice. So I know it might be really annoying for us, but that's unfortunately the name of the game. Okay, so I see even more suggestions here also where we need to ask the regions on this issue, we need to agree to a minimum of which entity approves – there's a lot going on on the chat at the moment as to how the process should take place.

What I suggest is that there should be a subcommittee created. I do wonder though whether this subcommittee should include anyone who would be a candidate. I have a feeling that this might bring a whole number of conflicts if that's the case, so I'm open to suggestions on this one. But I certainly would think that the creation of a subcommittee specifically to shepherd this process of running the matrix and answering the questions on the matrix, is something to look forward to.

There is a question we could have the whole of ALAC filling the matrix on each one of the candidates. But that's a lot of, that's a number of people but I guess that there's at least three of us that will be off that – Jean-Jacques, Alan and I would not be on this. We'd have 12 people. Tijani your hand is still up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Oh sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you, go ahead. No, okay. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Last time, if you recall, Cheryl was a candidate and she did not participate in it. I can't remember, Cheryl, if we named someone to replace you to maintain the regional balance or not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah we did, and I certainly didn't anticipate – and I really think that this does not need to be bigger than Ben-Hur either. You've got to remember all the work that you put into it could be ignored, and probably will be if you don't come up with the right ranking. The Chair of the GAC and the Chair of the ICANN Board will decide. They are doing you the courtesy of saying "Do you like some of these people or not." So yeah, put it in perspective guys. And just to reply to Natalia's desire for regional representation of one from each region, yeah that's the kind of crap that the GNSO asks for, and yeah you might even get it.

But what actually works and what actually makes any influence, is not just six at the table, it's people actually having trust in what those people say. And it's those people working and working hard. And I can assure you that whilst another support organization in the ICANN matrix had many more seats at the table than the At-Large Advisory Committee did, we had influence. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember if I said anything. I don't think I had the chance. But I'll say something very similar to what Cheryl said. If a region wants a representative put forth, endorsed and put forth in the final list, then find a candidate who is going to meet the criteria and is going to work like a dog when they get there, because that really is important. ALAC has endorsed candidates for AOC reviews who did not represent the ideas of ALAC, and who did not necessarily put a lot of effort into it. We don't want to do that again.

And I'm not speaking as a possible candidate; I'm speaking as someone who cares. So the real issue is we need really good people and it would be delightful if the selectors have a really difficult job picking among them; the ones that we put forward. That's a delightful position to put them in. We don't want to be in a position where we put forward names where they look at it and say "Huh, what were they thinking?" And that is not only based on criteria, but after the fact when the whole process is over, a year later, how hard did these people work and how

did they contribute. That's going to be the real measure of how well we do the job. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Finally, and I do want to end this discussion, Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. At this stage, I gather from this discussion that we don't see very clearly yet whether it is in the interest of the ALAC to ask its Chair to be its representative in the ATRT 2 or not. What I would like to say is that if that were the case, if the Chair were to represent the ALAC, naturally I would not put in my candidature. On the other hand, if that were not the case, depending on what the agreed criteria would be, then I would or would not put in my candidature.

So I say this because you mentioned earlier Olivier, that there were three of us as candidates. I just want to renounce that by saying that at this stage I have not decided yet. It depends on where this discussion goes. And finally, I do agree with the matrix approach which has been suggested. I think we really need to do that. And I insist once again on the fact that we should look forward at what type of new ICANN we want for the user community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. But I do remind you there is likely to be more than one person coming from our community, so the very fact that I am

running for one seat doesn't mean that all seats will be taken. And in fact, there should be at least two if not more. So, I do hope that you consider this when you make your choice. I see Tijani having put his hand up again, and I really want to cut this conversation. We've got six minutes remaining until we've reached the full two hours. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Olivier, I want to remind you, remind every one of you that 5 December is the deadline. So Jean-Jacques, please apply and then you can grow. It is very tight now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Tijani. So yes, the way forward. All those people who wish to be candidates, and the call has been sent out already to our community, all those people who wish to be candidates to send out all their paperwork and so on by the 5th of December. In the meantime, I think that a subcommittee should be created. We would be looking at at least one person from each region, so that the subcommittee itself is balanced. This subcommittee, I think, should be Chaired by Rinalia since she has – and this is just my thoughts and I'd be interested to have feedback on this suggestion, that Rinalia would be Chairing this subcommittee to basically get that matrix done, ready and then to decide on whether it would only be the subcommittee that then decides based on the matrix or whether the whole of ALAC would be deciding based on the matrix.

The subcommittee should not have anybody in there who would be applying for the position. And I also believe that if there were any votes

to take place, and I don't know whether there would be or not, but if there were any votes to take place, I would say that the people who are going to apply should not vote. Just to keep things absolutely clear. Any further comments Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Olivier? I am fine with Rinalia to Chair the subcommittee, but I think that it is better that the subcommittee chooses its Chair. She can be the interim Chair and then the subcommittee can confirm her. Second point, I think that the subcommittee has to have knowledge of Charters because how it should be done and every one of the members of the subcommittee would score each candidate, and what will be the solution if there is a conflict? A lot of points need to be initiated before the work starts.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Tijani. The subcommittee does not need to provide, to work in seven days and provide its results in seven days. We have until January for that. So let's start the process rolling as soon as this call is over. Let's follow up on the internal list please. Actually with regards to the policy itself I think no we're not going to discuss candidates, so it's not going to be an internal list thing, sorry. That would be an external ALAC list, and continue the discussion on that.

Tijani have you put your hand up again? Thank you. I think we've got a way forward. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, just one last thing. If the ExCom, and I believe the ExCom is a regionally balanced group, you have put yourself into the ring, so you would be withdrawn from any such subcommittee. But I do think that the ALAC and indeed the ExCom should strongly influence if not absolutely select the Chair of this small, and I underline small hopefully regionally balanced group. And I would like to suggest that whilst wll of this other fluffing about goes on over the next few days between now and the 5th of December that you put to your list that the ALAC Take nominations to at least have a Chair, and I'll certainly hear Rinalia put forward in that name, and I guess if anyone wants to compete against her, so be it.

But it really would be a very silly thing, in my view, when you're asking for advisory committee endorsement for this not to be Chaired by an advisory committee appointment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. That was noted as well. Let's follow up this one on email. I gather we'll have some notes about this. Okay, we're really late on everything here now. We've got an update of IGF activities and an update of selected At-Large Working Groups and an update on WCIT and a call for completion of statement of interests. So the call for completion of statement of interests I gather is already done; I've just mentioned it. Please submit your statement of interest and there's a link on that page.

The update on IGF activities – it's just a quick note from me to show you the link to the At-Large activities in Baku. Absolutely incredible amount of work done by our At-Large structures, by our RALOs, by many of our

members who were there. You will notice there's a huge long list on the page which is linked to the agenda page. It's really great to have seen the community work in so many workshops and really convey the ICANN and the At-Large perspective in the Internet Governance Forum.

A big note of thanks to ICANN for having funded two of the workshops – the LACRALO – sorry, not the LACRALO, the AFRALO Workshop and the APRALO workshops. And if you're interested you can actually read all about the reports on there, the APRALO and AFRALO activities at the IGF and Baku workspace are linked from there. A huge round of applause and thanks for both Tijani Ben Jemaa and also for Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and they're a team because this was not just an effort of one person on this slide, but they're a team as well; really, really incredible work.

So I would like to propose an actual, it's not really a motion, but I guess it's a round of applause and thanks for both Tijani and Rinalia and their team as well. Next year the meeting will take place, the IGF will take place in Tunisia. And of course, I hope that we will be able to submit some proposals for ICANN funding to send some people over in Bali, which is the location for this. And continue to work to develop and bring more people into the ALAC model and into the At-Large model.

As I mentioned earlier there was a lot of interest from many organizations to join At-Large, and we are going to see a surge in applications; very much thanks to the work that was done there. If you're interested in deeper amount of detail, then as I said you can read through the reports which were filed on the IGF 2012 website, but also

on the APRALO, AFRALO activities and the meeting reports that are linked to that page. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So, next the Asian Regional IGF update – Cheryl you have two minutes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I won't even need that long, thank you. Cheryl for the transcript records, just to inform the ALAC and the others intending the meeting that we are delighted, from the Asia Pacific region, to inform you that at Baku a whole bunch of our multi stakeholder people met using both traditionally and now in the future involved in our Asia Pacific regional IGF planning. And we have confirmed that the 2013 AP Regional IGF will be held in South Korea. And we can also confirm that the 2014 will be held in India.

My exact dates will be forthcoming in a report back to you some time after the following week or two because our first planning meeting for 2013 is happening this Thursday. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. And one last round of applause or appreciation before we close this IGF activities chapter for someone who has proved yet again that he is a machine, and that's Matt Ashtiani

who has not slept for the full length of the IGF this – I don't know how he does it, but really well done Matt. So thank you for doing all the work that you do and all of the work that you did then in both being able to submit statements whilst at the same time having other duties to perform and bearing in mind that there was no internet and sometimes it was very, very hard.

I still don't know how you managed to get internet when no one else had it, but there you go.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He had it all. He got in the door and got it all. All the IP addresses went to Matt.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Update from selected At-Large Working Groups, and I do realize that Avri has been on the call for a while and been listening in because I had asked for her to provide us with an update. But first we have Cheryl for a quick roundup on what's happening in the Rules of Procedure Working Group and the Metrics Subcommittee.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My pleasure, Cheryl for the record again. It will be even briefer than the last report I just gave. We had sessions, grouped for the whole sessions that were also public in the Toronto meeting. They were reported on during the reporting back to the ALAC then. Since then, absolutely nothing has happened in terms of face-to-face meetings, but we have a committee as a whole, in other words the full Rules of Procedure

Review and Metrics. Doodles will be coming out shortly for a meeting in the next seven to ten days. And we also have started taking requests for the individual drafting teams who still have work to do to just finalize one or two things to put their meeting plans together.

So we will be looking at an online, probably, January ratification from the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Next is Avri, the New gTLD Working Group. Avri Doria? Avri, I'm really sorry it appears you were transformed yet again into C3P0, or is it Darth Vader.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Try again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you try again? Unfortunately I'm unable to hear anything from Avri. I'm not sure anyone else can understand that, but that certainly is not a language which I'm able to understand. Should we ask the interpreters if they do know this language, or have we lost the interpreters perhaps? Thank you Avri, yes. I got a note from the confluence. You will file the report and we will read it then. Thank you. And apologies for this.

Next, the New gTLD Review Group – Dev, you have a couple of minutes. Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev Anand, can you hear me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you, you're very faint but we can hear you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay thanks. I just posted a link in the chat. Essentially the time for comment for consideration by At-Large for filing objections for consideration by the RALOs and of course ALAC ended on November 15th. However given the comments regarding the extension of the objection period from January to March 2013, although there is no official announcement from ICANN we are expecting that this will be an answer we will need soon.

And with that we will update our activities and reissue the call for comments, which will most likely then take us to at least till mid-January for that comments from At-Large. We went through the comments received. We received a request for further comments on dot nyc. The page has been completed but we have yet to receive the comments so that is still out. And that's about it. You can read the list there that I posted for more details.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev. And finally, we have the At-Large Academy Working Group – Sandra could you please give us an update? Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hello Olivier, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you, go ahead Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay great. The At-Large Academy Working Group is currently following up on two meetings that we had in Toronto; those two meetings were very well-attended and had a very good outcome. One of the most important outcomes was a survey was drafted by a drafting team and sent out just recently to all Chairs of stakeholder groups and advisory committees and supporting organizations.

We gave them a deadline until 20th of December for their feedback, and the intent of this survey is to find out about their needs, about what is already existing, what they wish to establish in terms of capacity building, and then follow up and adjust our strategy for the ICANN Academy Working Group. Overall the scope of the Academy Working Group is currently two-folded.

On one hand we are looking into a framework, to set up a framework structure for ICANN, and on the other hand looking into detailed capacity building provisions where the ALAC Capacity Building Working Group can then feed into this process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sandra. And unfortunately all of the updates from all of our At-Large Working Group Chairs are particularly interesting we don't have any time for questions since we are way over time. But I do thank all of you for doing the work that you do in Chairing those

working groups; very important part of the work that we do. And definitely is able to share and spread the load among more people, so keep on moving forward and thank you.

The update from the WCIT, the World Conference on International Telecommunications, I will require just 30 seconds to let you know that there are several people from within our community that are going to be present in Dubai in a few days' time. As you have heard from Avri, telecommunications are a forte in Dubai. It changes your voice to some indescribable noise, but hopefully we will all be still available when we are over there, and be able to relay back over to you the progress of those discussions that are going to take place.

If you haven't heard about the WCIT discussion, I suggest you wake up and pick up a magazine that deals with telecommunications or computing, and you will find a lot of articles that are coming up. So that's the news for the time being. I'm not quite sure how telecommunications are going to be when I'm there, but I will of course keep you all updated. I'm sure email will work and we'll continue work in this way.

Finally, call for completion of statement of interests – we've done that already, so perhaps can we move over to number 12, any other business. And I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So thankfully the end of this call was pretty fast. I note Matt has notified me separately that I missed the At-Large new SOIs. No, I have actually done that earlier whilst you were moving rooms.

Anyway, thanks to everyone for having lasted that long; it's two hours and 15 minutes into the call. The last reminders – At-Large SOI Wiki

page, only a handful of people have filled in their SOIs. It would be great, in fact it's something that is needed, that we all fill in our SOIs as you can see on the Adobe Chat. Thanks to all of you for having lasted that long. The big thing, big follow up as we said, is going to be with the ATRT 2 setting up, and we'll continue the discussion on the list.

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This call is now adjourned. Thank you all.

[End of Transcript]