

GISELLA GRUBER:

We're going to start the call now. I'd like to welcome everyone today on the APRALO monthly call on Wednesday the 19th of December at 05:00 UTC. On today's call we have YJ Park, Gunela Astbrink, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Narine Khachatryan, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jack Qui, Rinalia Abdul Rahim and Siranush Vardanyan.

Apologies notes from Hong Xue and Maureen Hilyard. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. And if I could also just remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you very much. If people are on the Adobe Connect room, we'll see the agenda. Fouad would like to join us. Good. I think there are three main items for today. One I want to go through and update where we're up to on the Beijing Organizing Committee. Arising out of that, we need to have a bit of a brainstorm which Rinalia has suggested in terms of multi-stakeholders who we should invite and asking people to put their brains in gear to think about that.

But I think while we've still got Olivier slightly sleepy, one of the items that we really should deal with is an update on what happened in WCIT because there may be flow-on from WCIT that we would like to pick up in some of the events that we plan for the Beijing meeting.

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.

And after that Olivier, do you just want to run down if there are any policy items that are open that we should know about or closed ones that you'd like to bring to our attention and suggest that perhaps there are things that we might look at in the next week or so? So over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly, and it's Olivier for the transcript record. I think what I'll do with your permission is to just go through the agenda in its current form, so effectively going through the Policy Advice Development page and then the WCIT, so then the most fresh thing on your mind will be the WCIT.

So firstly, Policy Advice, and I invite you all to have a look at many of these links. I don't think we have much time to go through all the recently-approved ALAC statements; documents; the ALAC statement on the consolidated meeting strategy proposal; the IDN Variant TLD Program; the statement on the expired registration recovery policy and another IDN statement on the Variant TLD Program.

I just have to thank very much the people that have held the pen on these. It's far more statements and a large number of statements in total in the year and I really am very grateful for all of the work that has been done by those people holding the pen.

There are a couple of statements which are currently being developed. I can see here in the chat, "Fifty statements," says Heidi. It's a lot of statements but I really do also have to also congratulate the quality of the statements.

For example, all the IDN statements which were penned by members of the IDN Working Group and primarily Edmon Chung and Rinalia Abdul Rahim and really, really excellent stuff there – very good advice which has been very well received, both by the Board but also the IDN Variants Working Group itself. So it's not just the quantity, it's the quality of statements as well which has been really noticed by those people on the receiving end of them.

So currently the statements being developed by the ALAC – there's one which is called the ALAC Demarche to ICANN and that one is one which was originally drafted by Yrjö Lansipuro in EURALO because it started out as a EURALO statement or a EURALO initiative which then spread to all of the RALOs. And that's to do with all of the Visa issues which several of our colleagues had problems with in Canada and also prior to Canada.

And since we're looking forward to the next meeting in Beijing, China, there's just a reminder here that we really need to get ICANN to find a way to better obtain Visas for our travelers.

The next one is Trademark Clearinghouse Strongman Solution. As some of you might know – and I'll give you a quick round-down on this – the new CEO of ICANN spent a few days a month and a half ago to try and get some people together to amend the Trademark Clearinghouse so as for it to be implementable. The prior version was implementable but was apparently somehow costly.

And so a small *ad hoc* group was created and the CEO brought it to come up with some plans which for most of them were only based on the implementation side of things and so did not reopen the work of the

Special Trademark Interest Cross-Community Working Group or indeed, the Implementation Recommendation Team – the IRT – Working Group.

However, there were a few things which had to be changed; it wasn't just purely implementation. And this is why now this comes over to the strawman solution comes to public comment. There hasn't been very much input about it – that's why the period for comment has been extended to the 15th of January and Evan Leibovitch is currently holding the pen on this. If anyone else wishes to help him, please could they make themselves known by just sending me an email or sending staff an email on this?

Now there are several open public comments as you can see from the list. It just seems to be the time for these and it's quite unfortunate by the way because I think it completely forgets the fact that this is a very busy period for many of our members, not only the festive season at the end of December, but also the festive season in January. And I think that APRALO falls very much in that category.

Unfortunately, work does not stop, so we have the proposed modification of the GNSO PDP Manual to address the suspension of a PDP. The initial comment period already closed and although we had not made an official choice as to whether a statement would be drafted or not on this, I suspect that because this is quite an intricate, technical thing, procedural thing that happens within the GNSO, we will not be having a statement on this.

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, otherwise known as IRTP, Part C Policy Development Process Recommendations for Board Consideration – the decision was made that there would be no statement primarily

because we had filed statements on IRTP Part C in the past, so the input from the ALAC had come into the process and we really are now at the very, very last moment when the Board is just considering the recommendations.

Coming in at this time is really not time well spent, especially since if we did think there was something wrong in the actual recommendations, we should have come in way earlier than now. And as I said, we'd already looked at that in the past and made our statements on it.

Expert Recommended Improvements to ICANN's Accountability Structures – Again this is just to comment on the type of experts that was appointed to follow on these accountability structures. No statement necessary on this either. We really do have to pick our battles and this one was one where I think there was broad consensus that we're quite happy with the process currently being pursued.

Application for the New GNSO Constituency Candidacy Public Internet Access Cyber Café Ecosystem – Now that's a highly charged component when you start adding new constituencies in the GNSO. The overall consensus that emerged from the discussion – and you know, the discussion is one that takes place on the ALAC; sometimes on the mailing list but most often on the ALAC call itself.

What came out of this one is let's just keep out of GNSO politics so let's not have any statement on this and leave really the GNSO to work out whether they wish to have this new constituency or not. The Preliminary Issue Reports on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D – IRTP Part D – Again very much the same answer as IRTP Part C, so I won't repeat it.

The At-Large White Paper on the Future Challenges entitled *Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected* – Now that’s actually the second time ever that At-Large is sending out a public comment out there or asking for public comments. It’s a little bit different because what we are doing is to ask for comments, but we’re not bound to include those comments inside the document itself.

This White Paper, by the way, is sometimes called *The R3 White Paper*. If you haven’t heard about it, I absolutely recommend a webinar that will take place on this and perhaps can Heidi say a couple of words on this, just after I’ve finished this whole list of statements to be drafted. No comment from At-Large on the ALAC White Paper. It’s like talking to yourself which doesn’t really help.

Consultation on INS Secure Notification Process – Now the comment period closes on the 10th of January so that there’s been some delay given. Now this is one where I’m not 100% sure whether we should be filing a statement or not.

It is one of these internal processes which directly affects the operational side of ICANN. I don’t know whether we have the knowledge to follow with this. There is one point though. I would ask the Address Supporting Organization – the ASO – if there is a need for it, but I will basically wait for an answer from our colleagues – Louis Houle from the SO Address Council and John Curran from the SO itself.

It’s actually the same thing as also Sub-Part X... Well No. 10 – Consultation on Internet Number Resources Performance Standards and the one underneath, Consultation on the IANA Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process.

I am not sure whether anyone in our community has had much chance to deal with those. If anybody has actually, could they please come forward because that might help us in making a decision on what we want to do on these. So jumping back, Part 8 – Protection of IGO and INGO Identifier in all gTLDs. Now that's the Inter-Governmental Organization identifiers. You might have remembered some prior very long discussions that took place about the International Olympic Committee and Red Cross.

This has gone through a very long process. Initially, just to give you a little reminder, initially the GAC had asked the Board to do something about this and had batched the International Olympic Committee and the Red Cross together. They sent that to the Board; the Board, sensing that this one was a very hot potato, decided to pass it on over to the AGS and the GNSO Council, finding that its hands were about to get burnt, came out with a very fast working group.

Anyway, to cut a long story short, it was finally decided, upon insistence actually by many people, including insistence from the ALAC, that there should be a Public Development Process – a PDP – with a working group set up to discuss this and to find out what type of protection should be given to IGOs and INGOs.

Thomas Rickert, who is in the GNSO Council, is the Chair of that working group and he has immediately got the working group to put together a survey and that's the survey that we're talking about. I really believe we need to fill this because we have spent so much time on prior ALAC calls talking about this.

I will ask on the ALAC call tonight if anybody wishes to hold the pen on this and I invite... So don't answer right now, but if you do wish and you're not going to be on the ALAC call, then just drop me a line and I'll keep that in mind. It's important, really important, that we fill.

And what's interesting is that the very question that we have been arguing for – the separation of the issues of IOC and RC – is actually asked on there. Hm, I wonder what part of the community asked for that one to be in. But there you go.

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier, just a question. This ALAC call – I've got it down for Friday morning, Sydney time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes. For me it's later on; for you of course, you will have the joy of having some sleep prior to that and I'm ever so jealous.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, I think Holly's trying to say that it's actually your night and one day so it's not tonight for you, it's the next day. It's Thursday night for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's right. So for me, I've completely lost track of time anyways, so it's later on this week. At some point in the next 48 to 72 hours.

HOLLY RAICHE: Now is there anything else or can we do a quick WCIT? And by the way, I noticed that both Maureen has come in according to the chat which is welcome and Fouad has joined – welcome. And a reminder to both of you, Olivier has just gone through very comprehensively and very helpfully the outstanding policy issues and reviewed what we are or are not going to be making comment on.

So I would suggest you go to the ALAC Policy Page if you want to know more about any of these because the information is there, including the background information and anything that's been drafted. Right. Next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So the next thing I was just going to do was to ask Heidi just to briefly let us know when the webinar for the At-Large White Paper on the Future Challenges entitled *Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected* – when that webinar will take place. I don't have the information at hand and I know that there is a webinar coming up.

So for anyone who has missed or has not had the time to read through this R3 White Paper, then you can have a crash course into it pretty quickly. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. This is Heidi. Yes, the webinar on the R3 paper is going to take place Wednesday, the 19th of December at 15:00 to 16:00 GTC. I've just put the link into your Adobe Connect chat and it will be evening or very early morning for some of you if you wish to join that. And there's also going to be a recording if you are not able to join that.

HOLLY RAICHE: And if people will just have a look at the link in the chat, the information is there. And also that paper is on the Policy Page of ALAC for those who have not read it. Okay, now, Olivier, while you're on a run, can we hear a little bit about WCIT?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. It's Olivier for the transcript record. And yes, the WCIT – otherwise known as WCIT which stands for World Conference on Internet Telecommunications. Well, that's a conference that was set up by the International Telecommunication Union – the ITU – and that took place in Dubai.

The last one which took place was in 1988 which is 24 years ago, yes, it was quite a while ago and the big difference between 1988 and now is that the internet is now one of our primary means of communication, which meant that several countries in the ITU – and I'll quickly explain to you what the ITU is in a moment but several countries thought that the internet needed to be included in this year's update of the International Telecommunication regulations.

Now the ITU itself is a member organization that was started in the late 1800s as the Comité Consultatif International – International Consultative Committee – for Telegraphy and Telephony. And it was put together to deal with charging for telephony and telegraph – so international charging – but also international standards relating to telephony and telegraph.

The ITRs – International Telecommunication Regulations – are the backbone of those regulations that they have. And there was a push from some of the member countries – and note that I say “member countries” because the members are actually all countries and a handful of sector members – what they call sector members – which are usually large telecommunications conglomerates – what used to be the monopolies – telco monopolies back in the day – and also a few organizations that are... well some civil society organizations, but they don’t have very much to say. The people that have something to say are the countries themselves and mostly the...

[Interruption by operator]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So there we go – that’s exactly, the telco is trying to shut me up. There you go. Are you still here? So back to WCIT. So what’s basically happened is that those countries – the country regulators – have met in Dubai, have gone through the full list of regulations that were there and we’ve had two weeks of going line-by-line through those regulations and looking at proposals from countries to try and see if we can get consensus on an updated proposal.

The problem is that several countries basically brought in proposals that affected the internet directly and there was vehement opposition from other countries to have the regulations to deal with the internet. So we really ended up in a bipolar world I think where on one side you had the countries supporting the inclusion of the internet in those regulations

and on the other side, those opposing it, with very few people in the middle bridging the gap between the two.

Also, due to the highly political nature of these regulations, you do have to note these are regulations which are all dealt with by countries, so this is not a multi-stakeholder model; this is a multi-lateral model. We ended up with pretty much a trench war between those supporters of the multi-lateral model and those supporters of the multi-stakeholder model.

So on several levels the whole conference started pretty badly and went from bad to worse. Europe was a key component of this discussion because the member countries of the European Union stuck together and so they had a significant number of votes which could swing from one way to another way.

And they... most of them, in fact all of the European countries actually defended the multi-stakeholder model, which was a bit of a surprise to some, they defended the multi-stakeholder model and rejected the notion that the ITRs would have to do with the internet itself, would have anything to do with the internet.

And indeed, the Chairman of the ITU, Dr. Hamadoun Touré, before everything started, absolutely assured everyone that the internet was not going to be included at all in there. And also the second assurance that was given was that the ITRs were not going to relate to contents at all. So these were words which were meant to appease those countries that were concerned that the internet might be affected by those regulations.

As time went on, the first weekend, there was a, well I was going to call it a friendly amendment. Actually it was an unfriendly amendment where at the eleventh hour on Friday night we were told that there was a forthcoming consolidated proposal that was going to come from the United Arab Emirate and consolidated with several African countries, but also other countries from the Arabic part of the world, including Russia.

The proposal was leaked over the weekend using WCIT Leaks. Now can you imagine the high drama about this one. And of course it explicitly in there mentioned the internet and it mentioned the regulation of names and numbers by countries themselves. That's rendering ICANN - the organization which I believe we're currently in a conference call of - ICANN totally obsolete, so you can imagine the double high drama on this one.

Then a few hours later came a tweet from the Egyptian Communication Regulation authority, not the Chair but second in line, saying that they absolutely had nothing to do with that proposal and they didn't know how their name ended up on this. Really it started reading more and more like some kind of a TV soap series and the delegates that went to that conference could not wait until the next day to find out what was going to take place.

The proposal was not even suspended; was removed, so it was recalled should I say, by the proposers. So on Monday morning when we were supposed to receive the proposal officially, the member countries having filed it said, "No, we don't want to file it anymore."

On Tuesday Russia decided to file exactly the same proposal, thus doing another U-turn, but then under its own banner, so a lot of trouble finding out who was really behind those proposals. Anyway, as time went on, Wednesday of the second week, Wednesday evening, there was another vote... well, something that was quite puzzling for many people and that was a vote that was not a vote.

You might have heard about this. What basically happened is that the Chairman of the whole conference, Mr. Mohamed El Ghanim who is the Chairman of the Telecommunication Regulation Authority of the United Arab Emirate, was getting rather tired of the endless debates regarding the inclusion of the internet in not a regulation, but actually in a resolution at the end of the document.

And after a couple of hours he just turned round and said, "Well look, let me just gauge the temperature of the room and find out how people feel now because we're talking about this endlessly." And by asking a show of hands of people who were in favor of having this resolution in the ITRs or in the document and those who were against it.

What happened was he basically effectively took it that there was broad consensus for the internet to be included and therefore he said, "This resolution is ratified," which drew the unhappiness of several countries who objected... well first put their nice little yellow board with a black square which is point of order – and I think that we'll have some of these lollipops printed for our future ICANN/ALAC meetings because they really are fun when you can wave one of these in front of the Chair.

But the point of order was to ask whether this was a vote or not a vote and apparently it was not a vote, but it was just broad consensus with

the Chair making the decision of going ahead, even though there was really no consensus in the room. So I wonder how that would fare over in ICANN circles.

That really brought the whole atmosphere to a new low with a level of distrust between those in favor of the regulations and those against the regulations as they went forward to really be not good. The two sides did not trust each other.

And so we reached a dramatic last day of discussion on the Thursday last week where the Chair proposed a consolidated proposal, doing away with some of the harsher language - so doing away, for example, with the names and numbers regulation which some countries had totally opposed, but also including some language which some countries were really, really pushing for.

Tunisia, for example, asked for the notion of human rights to be included in the preamble, thus saying that the document should follow... or any of their regulations should be assumed according to human rights or human rights obligations. There was still a big bit of a squabble as to how this would be brought in.

Some countries were totally against this and said, "Well, you know, human rights have nothing to do with telecommunications. I don't know why you are pushing to put this in there." And again the world cut itself in two and it's worth noting that many European countries by that time were actually very close from being able to sign.

However the document, being a very fine balance, it was a case of a Mikado game, you know the Mikado game is one where all of the little

bits and pieces are all really holding onto other bits and pieces around. And if you pull one of those sticks out of the whole system, then the pyramid will absolutely collapse. I don't know whether you call it a pyramid, but the stack will absolutely collapse.

And this was pretty much the case. The last session was one where Iran asked for several points to be taken... well in addition to human rights, there would be a clause about the states having access to telecommunication and they wanted that in the same paragraph as the human rights sentence.

It drew a lot of criticism, primarily from Switzerland because Switzerland has been very much involved with all of the concepts of human rights and they were absolutely opposed to having both telecommunication rights for states in the same sentence as human rights, the reason being that telecommunication rights for states is not an individual right; human rights are a universal, individual right.

And also most of the time, states... well in fact, the countries who had brought forward the idea of having telecommunication rights for states were those that were under an embargo. We're speaking about Cuba; we're speaking about Sudan and a couple of other countries.

They are currently under an embargo, specifically because they have a very poor human rights record as well. Of course, there is also this political element to it – East/West, North/South. The whole atmosphere was poisoned by then. Iran totally understood that we were going around in circles and pushed for a vote to take place.

And although we had been told throughout the two weeks that if the discussion on the ITRs would come down to a vote it would be a failure of the complete conference, and therefore that there would not be a vote and that there would be consensus – these regulations would be adopted by consensus – in fact a vote took place and as far as I understand, the vote passed.

So the conference, effectively the discussion finished, the countries all decided whether they were going to go forward or not go forward with signing this document of regulations and 55 countries at the moment out of 144 countries that are able to sign, 55 countries have decided that at the moment they're not ready to sign.

Some have said they will never sign and some have said that they need to go back to their national government prior to signing. And as far as the European countries are concerned, I believe that most, if not all of the European countries have said no, we will not sign for the time being for some of them. The United States has not signed; Canada has not signed.

And that really somehow concludes my report. It was a very abrupt end to the whole conference, very disappointing of course, but I guess disappointing in that one would have thought that there was going to be consensus on having an updated set of regulations that would be useful.

I mean there are some clauses in there, some recommendations that are very useful – the ones on charging on roaming agreements. There are quite a few that are really great but there are a handful of

regulations that are absolutely terrible - one on security – security of networks.

The UK – the United Kingdom – really pushed for the word “robustness” to be used. In fact, several other words such as “reliability,” “resilience” – this was all to do with quality of service and really the reliability of the actual physical network.

Other countries absolutely pushed for the word “security” to be used. And of course, we all know that security is not only the reliability of the network, but it also has to do with access to the network so then you can put underneath that umbrella the making it mandatory for people who want to use the internet to have an identity card, a SIM card maybe. You really start “securing” the internet in more ways than one.

And although one might not be looking at the actual contents of the internet, if you’re going to lock the door to the internet or lock the door to any network indeed by having people provide with credentials on their entry in order to send information or receive information, you really are starting to quench freedom of speech and that’s not good.

There’s another good clause, for example, which deals with spam and this is where we reached the real low levels of understanding from some governments where the decision to include a clause about spam was made whilst at the same time none of the regulations deal about content.

Now I’m not quite sure how you detect spam. I know that spam filters the unwanted email filters usually look at the content, they filter it and they detect it from the content itself. I have not really seen any process

on how to detect spam without actually finding out... opening the email and finding out what it is.

If you do know about it, and you do know of a process, then perhaps you might wish to do a start-up and you will make a lot of money with the ITU now since they have decided they will decide on what is spam and not spam and combat spam without looking at the content part of spam.

So that's pretty much my reports. We had the support of Nigel Hickson who was there who was the official ICANN person. It's important to note that several countries, whilst the WCIT being really purely a question of countries coming together, so governments coming together, several governments implemented a multi-stakeholder model in their delegation. The United Kingdom was one of them; the United States was another one. There were several others.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Australia was one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Sorry, yeah, Australia was one as well; Qatar as well. A handful of African countries also had a multi-stakeholder list of delegates which was really, really good. And I hope that in the future this model will widen and will be more spread across the delegations because some delegations were clearly only the regulator themselves and a couple of other people from the ministry and it's unfortunate because you could actually notice the lack of knowledge from those few delegates as compared to the delegations which had a multi-stakeholder model.

So I've spoken for way too long now. I notice I've gone way over my minutes and I thank you for your patience and I hope that it's provided you with a good run-down on what happened over in Dubai. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

First of all, thank you very much. I think we won't have any questions of Olivier now but I think if you do have questions you can ask. And certainly there are a couple of issues that I still want to talk about before Gisella has her five minutes off early.

The main issue that's now on the APRALO agenda is the events of what's going to happen in Beijing. If people have not visited the Beijing site, I would suggest you do and you start looking at these events, what's available and the issues on the table.

There are a couple of... particularly Rinalia and Maureen have made really useful contributions. Now Rinalia has suggested in her timeline that we start to think about having in the multi-stakeholder event what are likely possible topics.

And the things that I would suggest, I do think it's probably useful to have a good look at WCIT and what it means for ICANN and the internet cause I'm sure others are going to be very interested. I'm suggesting that we look at the outcomes of the gTLDs which the numbers were drawn today, so there's going to be some information there.

I would suggest where we're up to with IDNs is probably very much interesting for APRALO. But if anybody has any thoughts, please go to the Wiki and put your thoughts down. Now, Maureen, are you on the phone, Maureen? Anyway, if she's not on the phone, she's also asked

some questions and Heidi, maybe I'll take these up with you and Maureen. But there will be... Maureen, are you there? Somebody tried to talk.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Holly, can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I can and I think everybody else can too. I was just looking up the questions that you asked.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I just put a little note to say that... Maureen speaking for the record. I just had some queries that I put on the WCIT site and I really would like some feedback on them. YJ, if you can help in any way, that would be really great.

I can't progress anymore until I get a little definite feedback from the other members of the team and anyone else who might have some information. So if you can have a look at the WCIT spaces for the showcase and for the capacity building, I'd really, really appreciate it. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: And, Heidi and Gisella, there's some specific ones maybe you can help with. One is, "Will the showcase introduction intro into the opening? Will that move directly into the display hall?" I think this is one sort of

what's the physical layout do we know so that we can start to think through, well, what do we mean by showcase.

The next question is, "Is there a display hall," which goes with the first question. I think it's the venue that we're looking at to see what's possible for the showcase. Will there be individual booths where there'll be tables and so forth? Maybe we can talk about that offline if, Maureen, you want to talk about that offline so we can get an idea of a suitable layout and therefore what is possible and what's not possible for our showcase event.

Another question I have for you, Maureen is - have you heard back from Sala on capacity building. I know that she sent out a Doodle for a meeting on it but unfortunately, the Doodle was for that day. It just wasn't possible for me. Did you see that?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

No, I haven't heard anything from Sala. I sent an email twice and I haven't heard anything back. But it's really interesting cause she has sort of like responded to other questions from other people. So I do need to get hold of her to find out more information.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. I think that's an action item. I'll go to that. Finally you asked whether we have a finalized list of ALSes. Now Pavan was working on it. He was down to two names that he wasn't sure about. He's had to go to the states quickly for family reasons, so I think that question can't be answered. Gisella, do you have any updates on where we're up to with Pavan after the states?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Holly, this is Heidi. If I may, I'll answer that. Yes, Matt and I have been working on that with Pavan and currently there are 12 ALSes that have responded – ALS reps that we have. So we are hoping to go ahead and send another announcement and give a deadline of this Friday for all ALSes. So again we're working off the Master APRALO RALO List and Pavan sent out the original note so this will just be a follow-up. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I think, Heidi, if you can send around or put in now just a link... we've got it already – the link which Heidi has put in for the Beijing work space. If people can have a look at it and start to contribute. We already have, as I advised last time, we have subcommittees which will be responsible for the promotion - that's Jack, Edmon and Cheryl. We've got the showcase which is really Maureen, Pavan who is not here now, but Edmon.

Capacity building we have put Sala. We've got the General Assembly which is YJ and myself. We've got local outreach that's really going to be Jack and Hong just because that's local and it will be concentrated on a youth forum.

The multi-stakeholder, Rinalia has already started to have a look at that because what she's asking, if people could just have a think about it is what are the topics because we want to see what topics we have and from what, Olivier, you said, I would suggest that maybe we even start with WCIT since in fact what you talked about WCIT, it absolutely was

not a multi-stakeholder model and maybe there is a lesson to be learned. Fouad, you've got your hand raised. Go ahead. And Olivier has his hand raised. Go ahead. Fouad?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Fouad, this is Heidi. We're working on the technical issues, but you can see how it has written what I believe he's trying to say in the chat.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fouad, I think it's a very serious problem and the paper that Olivier talked about, which is one of the things that are on the policy, was a comment about Visas and the problems that we had in Toronto.

What you are talking about is probably much the same thing but a problem in Pakistan. So maybe take offline, Heidi, can you have Travel deal with Fouad's problem cause it looks like he's got a real problem. Pakistan's Ministry of Interior has run out of passport paper. I know it's crazy; it is crazy. Now Olivier, you also had your hand up?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. It's Olivier for the transcript record. I was just going to add a couple of more things on the WCIT and I'll be very brief, I promise, on this.

There is, as you will have noticed, a statement on WCIT that will be drafted. I will be holding the pen on this. I will be drafting first a report for ICANN to let ICANN know and the ICANN Board know what's happened. And that will effectively be relating what I told you as a summary on this call.

However, I did notice one thing which is the absolute importance of capacity building. Lost in the sea of countries out there, there are some countries which are highly supportive of the multi-lateral process that the ITU provides them with because it is the only forum that they are actively invited to participate in.

And I know that we keep on saying that the multi-stakeholder model is open and that we accept At-Large structures from around the world – not only governments that go to the GAC, but also civil society organizations, internet users – all of those processes are open.

But I really believe that we are not doing enough to bring those people to the table because when I spoke in between session to the people responsible for these countries and asked them, “Why are you supporting those regulations which are flawed,” the answer I was given was, “Well, ICANN has never done anything for us and in fact we have tried to be involved at ICANN and the reception we were given was very negative. Our experience has been very negative with the so-called multi-stakeholder model. It’s an expensive process and it’s very hard for us to support it if we have to go and also pay our way across while the ITU is paying us to take part in the model that is here.”

That somehow falls in line with some of the new CEO’s point of view that ICANN should be doing more to engage the world’s community and I think that a statement that pushes in that direction is really required, especially when I note the amount of hassle and problem and justification we need to provide to ICANN when one of our regions or when our ALSes ask for funding for local projects.

And I'm looking specifically at the General Assemblies, for example, which are there for in-reach. But also with any other participation that IGF, for example, that provides this outreach that we absolutely need to go out there and search for participants from those countries that are not currently represented in the ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

It really is something which has come straight in the face there and I was really surprised at the size of the problem. So I'm really looking forward to draft something and I hope that the Board will listen to us because one thing is sure is that I don't want to see another WCIT like this one happen again where you had those for the multi-stakeholder model and those against it and those in the middle that were somehow torn between the two and not really knowing which way to go and just going for the multi-lateral ITU model for ease of choice. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Olivier, and I think our time is up and Gisella's got to go. But could I say I'm looking forward to that report and particularly for Rinalia. What I'm hearing from Olivier is some very interesting topics for the multi-stakeholder model and what it really means.

So I will be putting stuff and I hope other people will also have a look at and put stuff on the Beijing Organizing Committee page. Please, everyone, have a look at it and start putting your thoughts down. We'll have a meeting I'm sure in January and I hope we've all made progress on organizing the Beijing meeting.

In the meantime can I wish everybody a Happy Holiday season, whatever you're celebrating and Happy Christmas or happy whatever to all of you and thank you very much for your time.

[End of Transcript]