

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So let's start. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC monthly December conference call on Thursday, the 20th of December, 2012. The time is 16:02 UTC and we have a [medium sized] agenda but we have two hours which are devoted to this call. And so the first thing I'll ask is for the adoption of the agenda. Does anybody wish to add anything or take anything, add anything in addition to what's there? I see Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Olivier. I would like to add in the any other business or elsewhere if you want the issue of the travel support for ICANN meetings.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Issue of travel support for ICANN meetings, if I hear you correctly. You came out a little bit faint...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So the issue of travel support for ICANN meetings, that will be in the any other business. Then I see Garth having put his hand up. Garth, you have the floor.

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.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much. I'm sorry to do this at the beginning of the call but I have to drop off for another meeting at noon. I got kind of a troubling message from a registrar, a registrar who is seeing what he calls some unethical practices within the industry. And he came to me because he wanted to actually talk to ICANN in person. And he's in Australia and he went to the Sydney office, and he tells me that the Sydney office is closed. Can anybody confirm that this is true?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Garth, but the only thing that we're doing at the moment is adopting the agenda. It's a very fair question but is it possible to take this off the call afterwards if you're not able to stay until any other business? Or can we treat it in any other business?

GARTH BRUEN: That's fine, I mean I just want to make sure it gets in there because as I said I have to leave for another meeting at 12:00 and I didn't want to miss the opportunity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for putting this. We'll put it in the any other business and if you are not on the call by that time we do have the question here. Heidi, I gather you've taken note of this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes I have, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. And I guess that you'll probably have the time to find the answer by the time we reach this point. Tijani, your hand is still up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, right. Well, so we've adopted the agenda and let's go on now with the roll call, please. Julia?

JULIE CHARVOLEN: Yes, this is Julia, thank you, Olivier. I will proceed with the roll call. On today's ALAC monthly call we have on the English channel Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Yaovi Atohoun, Garth Bruen, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Sandra Hoferichter, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Evan Leibovitch, Oksana Prykhodko, Holly Raiche, Carlton Samuels, Ron Sherwood, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. On the Spanish channel we have Natalie Enciso, Fatima Cambronero, and Juan Manuel Rojas. We have nobody so far on the French channel. We have apologies noted for Jose Arcé and Cintra Sooknanan, and from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani, and myself, Julia Charvolen.

Our interpreters today are on the Spanish channel Veronica and David and on the French channel Claire and Fernanda. May I also please remind everyone to state their names not only for transcript purposes but also for the interpreters to identify the speakers on the other

language channel? And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for an accurate interpretation. Thank you and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julia, and this is Olivier for the transcript and for the interpreters. Just a question: have we missed anyone? If we have missed anyone please say so now. If you have not said your name, and I don't hear anyone shouting out so let's proceed forward with the first go, and the first part in our agenda is the review of the action items from the ALAC meetings in Toronto.

And you will notice if you open the page that there are some very fancy little tick marks now on the side of the action items so we can see which ones are completed and which ones are not completed. We'll have to go through this list. I'm happy to note that quite a few action items are completed now. We will just go through those ones which are still in progress and I'll leave you the chance of looking at those that are completed in your own time.

So first, the ALAC and Regional Leaders Workshop: Silvia Vivanco is to follow up on the Indian At-Large Structures, liaising through staff so as to better associate themselves with the multi-stakeholder process within ICANN. Any update on this, Silvia? And we can't quite hear you at the moment, Silvia. I did hear that you had left; I'm not quite sure whether you are on the call or not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. I believe she has followed up with that. Let me just see if I can get her on Skype for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well there's another one after that. Well, let's move on to the next action item which does not involve her, and that's Matt Ashtiani to work with Bart and update the mapping of ccTLD operators. Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi Olivier, this is Matt for the record. That's still in progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Are you planning to get in touch with Bart soon or is this all channeling... Because I note that Silvia has been in touch with Bart so perhaps would this be channeled through Silvia?

MATT ASHTIANI: I think it would still go through me but after the break then I'll follow up with Bart.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Next, the ALAC is to ask for a meeting with the Board Finance Committee. The timing is to be discussed. That's still in progress. There is going to be a small call with Tijani and I to speak with Xavier Calvez who is the Chief Financial Officer and we will be discussing the process forward to start filing for our large At-Large Summit II. As you know, this is quite a large endeavor and we thought it would be a good idea first to find out how this could be arranged and how this could be filed. So we will report back to you when this has happened.

Then the At-Large Future Challenges Working Group Public Workshop – well, all of this was completed. The Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Working Group Meeting – well, that’s a Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Working Group thing so it’s not an ALAC thing per se. I should just ask that there should be a follow-up on this. Jean-Jacques, you’ve put your hand up. Go ahead, you have the floor. And I’m afraid at the moment we can’t hear you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello? Can you hear me, yes?

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

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. First, sorry for being late. Second, just in case Evan did not mention that yet, we had the R3 Paper Webinar and Heidi said that it was quite successful with a large number of attendants. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. I think we may have a little follow-up on this later on, looking at the work, just looking at this – perhaps not. Well, thank you for advising us of this now.

Let’s see, the At-Large IDN Working Group, that’s another working group. Then the At-Large Capacity Building Next Steps – there was one outstanding piece of work there which was Matt Ashtiani and Heidi

Ullrich to develop a human resources matrix. Is this on its way, Matt or Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, this is Heidi, Olivier. That's still in progress. I think maybe early in the next year we can get to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. And then finally at the bottom of the screen, the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap-Up I meeting – everything was completed there. So I'm glad to say the majority of the action items from Toronto were completed, which is great news. Does anyone have any comments or should we just move on to the next part of our agenda? The floor is open for comments on the action items. Well, I don't see anyone jumping for joy or jumping for the mic alternatively, so let's then move on.

We can go directly into agenda Item #4 with the Review of Current At-Large Structure applications. And as you can see there have been a couple that have been recently accredited and a large number of applications going on at the moment, which is absolutely excellent news. I will hand the floor over to Matt to take us through these.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. We have two new ALS applications, #171 Connect New York NYC, and application #172, the Nova Scotia Community Access Program. We have a few open applications right now - #158, the Uruguay Association of Notary

Publics. They are to begin voting on this application on Friday. This is also with #159, the National Association for Digital Inclusion. Application #166 APPDIT, we're awaiting...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Matt, this is Heidi. Olivier, may I update what it says on the agenda for that please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes please, Heidi, please go ahead because I note that some of these appear to be in the wrong box at the moment.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a few, well just this one I think, actually. This one, we've just now received the official regional advice from Fatimata and the regional advice for that particular application is to ask the organization to withdraw their application until they have further developed. So that's what that status is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's fantastic, thank you. Back to you, Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: Thank you. #167, Ray Services from AFRALO, the due diligence is in progress...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Matt, can you adjust your headset please?

MATT ASHTIANI: Yeah, is this better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's more like it, yes. You sounded as though you were about to drown in a moment. [laughter]

MATT ASHTIANI: Okay, I'll speak up. #167, Ray Services, the due diligence on this ALS application is still in progress. #170, The University Community Partnership for Social Action Research – the ALAC is to begin voting on this shortly. This will also start on Friday.

#173, the Internet Society Philippine Chapter – we are just awaiting the regional advice from APRALO and if we can receive it before the new year it will also start hopefully tomorrow. #174, the Armenian Association for the Disabled – the due diligence for this ALS application is in progress. #175, .HIV – we are awaiting the regional advice from EURALO which is expected shortly.

#176, the University of Library Studies and Information Technologies – we are just waiting for the regional advice from EURALO. And #177, the Swiss Privacy Foundation, the due diligence on this application is being conducted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Matt. There are a couple of things I'd like to say about the number of applications we have, the first one being that it's

really great to see that there is much interest in organizations joining the At-Large community and bringing their voice to the multi-stakeholder input that we have at ICANN. But I also recognize very much that many of these applications are the result of people from already-established At-Large Structures, people in our community going out there and reaching out to those people that they meet in meetings and at the IGF and in other local meetings that they go to.

And I think it's really important to recognize this, because without all of this work that goes on behind the scenes it would be very hard for these organizations currently applying to know about At-Large and to know about our community. So I really want to thank everyone who has been part of helping out for that, the work behind the scenes that I think often doesn't get mentioned but really has to be recognized. Any questions or comments on any of the applications or relating to any of the applications?

I hear no one. I just wanted to point you to one thing. Application #158, Asociación de Escribanos del Uruguay and #159, National Association for Digital Inclusion – these two had already started being voted on and a few months ago I stopped the vote from taking place due to the fact that there was somehow some missed understanding as to what the advice from LACRALO was with regards to these applications.

I understand that LACRALO has been working and discussing these applications quite extensively now and so there has been new advice being provided by LACRALO. I wonder if I can give, I'm not sure if Jose Arcé is with us or if Silvia is with us to provide us with a quick detail? I

see neither of them on the call at the moment... And we don't have either of them, okay. Fair enough, so they're not present, never mind. It was just to give them a chance to explain the reasons why LACRALO provided the advice that they provided. Just enough to say that I am absolutely convinced that the advice that was provided by LACRALO is very much in line with the reality on the ground, so I really would say that I'll support totally the advice that LACRALO provided with regards to these two applications.

And without spending any more time on organizations currently undergoing the accreditation process, let's move over to the reports. And I am aware that our GNSO Liaison is currently in the GNSO and working for us in a very, very long GNSO call but what I will ask is perhaps to have the report from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, our ccNSO Liaison. If you can spend a couple of minutes telling us what's been happening in the ccNSO, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Certainly, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. The December meeting for the ccNSO has been held. It was very much a process one with a number of internal matters of deciding who's going to be doing what sort of reports on various things being allocated out. It's a time of year when many of the ccTLD operators of course are also looking to their annual windup but I've noted the forward planning. The ccTLD draft agenda for the Beijing meeting is now out and I think that's got to be a record for advanced planning. [laughs] I just thought that was well above and beyond the call of duty to have the meeting for Beijing's agenda already organized, which is kind of amazing.

Jean-Jacques, I'm talking through a headset microphone and it's right in front of my mouth so I can in fact start projecting and I'm sure my husband will appreciate knowing even more about the ccNSO community. [laughter] What I would suggest with this situation in terms of volume is that I don't try to give you too great of detail and I draw your attention as I often do to the updates that happen on the ccNSO Liaison website. There hasn't been any new ccTLD membership applications come in since the November meeting and of course that's one of the things that Matt would be keen to follow as we track the countries where ccTLD operators are joining the ICANN clan as well as matching it up to where we have At-Large Structures and where we have opportunities to perhaps find new At-Large Structures via those ccTLD operators in the local internet community.

And Matt, with that work in the future with Bart and while you're talking to him do mention that I'm more than happy to give you some assistance on that. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl, can I ask if there are any questions please? I'm sorry, I didn't hear this just now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's just the Spanish channel coming in, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It sounds like we're having the Spanish channel now piped into the English channel, that's great. Okay, it's stopped being piped into the

English channel, fantastic. Any questions from anyone to Cheryl? No questions, okay.

And just to quickly whisk through the GNSO Liaison update, as you know Alan is on the call. There is going to be, he has already put up a page on the Wiki which provides full details on the different motions. There's a motion on second-level protection for International Olympic Committee and Red Cross/Red Crescent names. There is a motion on consumer trust, the Consumer Trust Working Group, and you've seen some discussion already go on on some of our lists about this. There's a discussion about the suspension of the policy development process and the proposed revision to the GNSO PDP Manual. There is an update on the Trademark Clearinghouse Strawman proposal, and you will have also noticed on our email list some movement on that.

There is a response to a GAC letter, ATRT2 developments, WHOIS Board resolution and GNSO Council review and a Structural Improvements Committee update. What I would suggest is that when Alan comes back to our call, when he's finally finished with his marathon GNSO call we can ask him for a quick update on what's been happening simultaneously, at the same time as this call.

Unfortunately our SSAC Liaison is also unable to make it today to the call so what we have is her report, the December 2012 report which I invite you to have a look at. Not very much activity in SSAC, well various working groups and so on are all reaching this time of the year which is all very much a festive season. So our Liaison attended one meeting on the 13th of December. There was also a conference call on the 19th of

December regarding Identifier Abuse Metrics Work Party, and I'm just reading from the page at the moment.

Some of you might know the DSSA, DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group is in hibernation until just before the ICANN meeting in Beijing and that's due to the fact that the Board Risk Committee is currently also working on a very similar project to the DSSA, taking into account some of the input from the DSSA. And finally the SSAC report is still being finalized for public release, and so we'll soon see that. And I'm sure that Julie Hammer, our SSAC Liaison will be able to tell us about this either in writing or on our next ALAC call.

We are somehow running out of time on the NCSG Liaison report, IDN Liaison report and the unknown .mobi Liaison report which doesn't exist anymore really. Evan, do you have just a couple of words on the NCSG Liaison?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Absolutely, and thank you, Olivier – this is Evan for the record. I just want to note that there has been significant collaboration between ALAC and the NCSG on the issue of the Trademark Clearinghouse and the processes that are bringing it about. Also it appears that there's going to be a change in the NCSG Liaison to ALAC and I believe that from what I've been reading so far, it appears that Rudi Vansnick who's familiar to ALAC I believe is so far unopposed for this position. I have a good chemistry with Rudi. I'm looking forward to working with him going forward and I'm just very happy to report that, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan, and in fact I saw Rudi yesterday, or was it, no, the day before yesterday I met with him in Frankfurt and we had a good discussion about this. He's really looking forward to take on the position so I think we'll have a very good relationship with the NCSG and I look forward to this. Good information gathering and exchange on this.

Now we also have reports of course from all of the RALOs and I thank all of the RALOs for having filed their report. I'm not quite sure – some regions are a little more up to date than others. Please, if you are behind please go and file your report. As I say each time every month this is really the first way that At-Large Structures, and especially those new At-Large Structures coming into ICANN, coming into ALAC, these new At-Large Structures find out what is going on in their region and what is going on in At-Large.

Any questions or comments on any of the reports? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier. Although he's probably a little bit too shy to boast about it I wanted to give explicit acknowledgment to the work that Garth has been doing. He has elevated some of our issues with Contractual Compliance and tried to get to the bottom of some of the things that would make ICANN safer for use. He's been extremely diligent at this and I just wanted to acknowledge that here, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan, and yes, a round of applause for Garth. It's been really, really great working with him and I'm very happy that

there's been follow-ups; and the NARALO event that just took place in Toronto. And it's one less thing that I have to worry about as one does.

So let's move on and we will now look, oh, I see here there is an "Even if I mess up call timing?" Yes, Garth, that's one point that you're losing but you have such a huge capital of points at the moment that you don't risk being brought into the red danger zone if there is such a thing.

Agenda Item #6, the Policy Advice Development Page. There are a number of recently approved ALAC statements and documents, etc. There was one on the ICANN Consolidated Meeting Strategy Proposal, that the ALAC adopted on the 24th of November, 2012. There was an ALAC Statement on the IDN Variant TLD Program: the Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels. And I'm slowing down because I gather the interpreters must have such a fun time when I'm reading through those.

The ALAC Statement on the Expired Registration Recovery Policy, and the ALAC Statement on the IDN Variant Top-Level Domain Program: the Interim Report Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs. I have to thank all of the people who have held the pen on those statements and also all the people who have commented on those statements. It's a vital part of our work to respond to public comments and to draft statements even outside public comments, and without having someone holding the pen we wouldn't be able to publish those. It's really, really important.

I note there is a lot of work that is going on in the IDN Variant TLD Program and I wanted to specifically point out the excellent work of our IDN Liaison Edmon Chung, but also of Rinalia Abdul Rahim who has

provided a lot of work in this Program as well and is currently enjoying some wonderful holidays. And I think she absolutely deserves them, so a round of applause for both Edmon and Rinalia.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Here, here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And this really is a festive call because we actually have a huge number of other statements underneath that – statements currently being developed, reviewed, or voted on by the ALAC. But before going through them, actually, does anyone have any question or comment on our statements that have been filed? I see Tijani? Oh no, I don't see Tijani, okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It was a mistake, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. Well if you clap your hands and then put them up it could be taken for Macarena but we haven't reached the point of the call yet to dance because it's our last call of the year.

So let's move on – the statements currently being developed, reviewed or voted on by the ALAC, and the first one is the ALAC Demarche to ICANN. And here it says the ALAC is to vote on this during this meeting. I invite you all to go onto that page. There was a first draft which was submitted. This actually started up in EURALO and so this is actually a

letter which is to be sent over to Fadi Chehadé, the CEO of ICANN and signed by myself. But I do have to provide the credit for drafting the first draft to Yrjö Länispuro from EURALO. This is a case of a region raising a point and then passing it and widening it to the other RALOs. And there was a lot of support for having this letter drafted. I invite you all to read through this letter because hopefully we can actually vote on it right here, there and then with a consensus call.

I'm not quite sure if I have to read through the whole thing. It's just taking time. Tijani, you have your hand up, so let's start taking questions and that will let everyone else read through the letter in the meantime. Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, Olivier. I noted that the compilation of the comments has not been done inside the original text. If this was done we can perhaps vote on it today, but today we have the first draft. We have other comments – how will we vote on something which is not compiled?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

No, the compilation has been done, Tijani. Your comment has been taken into account by Rinalia, or who was it that edited this? Someone edited this... Yeah, that's right. So Rinalia had drafted an improved version and then your comments were taken into account by Rinalia's as far as I can see here.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, not all of them, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And then there was a comment from Evan and one from Yaovi, and when I drafted the final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC I've added Tijani's notes in there which replace NomCom with ICANN AC/SO staff. So there are small amendments which were made to the letter. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier, this is Evan. I'll simply restate the same thing that I stated on the actual page and it's more a matter of procedure than it is of the content. I agree with the content of the letter. My issue is that in its current form it should be sent in the form of a letter from Olivier to Fadi as opposed to officially endorsed ALAC advice. Because there is not a lot of advice on what should be done to eliminate this and given the fact that it doesn't reference existing ICANN moves to try and address this I really think that it's overblown if we pass this as advice.

There is an issue of ALAC passing too much to the Board as advice and I think this is one of those things that is best expressed as a letter from the Chair of the ALAC to the CEO of ICANN to be dealt with by senior staff. And I think we need to take a proactive role in the meeting strategy going on, understanding that the existing work of the Consolidated Meetings Strategy, while it has many flaws at least it has the intent of trying to maximize accessibility of the meetings. So I think we have a role to play in that.

As far as this particular letter, I believe it's relevant, I believe it's important but I don't believe it constitutes advice. I would prefer to see

it endorsed by consensus as something Olivier should send to Fadi but I do not believe that it should take the form of an officially endorsed piece of advice. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Next is Yaovi.

YAОВI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. I am also in the same mind like Evan, but [dealing with] there are some suggestions in this document. So my point is the performance issues. So [by supporting], my comprehension is that we are supporting the Chair of ALAC to send this letter (inaudible) because we already [coordinated] a meeting. So we are looking to support the Chair of ALAC to send this letter and at the same time we're also looking forward to follow up regarding the next steps for this [considered] proposal. So that's my comment, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Yaovi. And next is Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Olivier, this is Carlton Samuels for the record. I want to add to what Yaovi and Evan have said. I early on fully supported the letter; I still do. I just think that we should machinate a little bit differently. I think we should not send it as a formal advice but send it as a letter from the Chair, and I added one other issue there which I think most people haven't picked up on – the Public Participation Committee of the Board is chaired by Sebastien Bachollet and he has been involved in the

discussion, and we would not wish to... If we send it as formal advice it seems to me that we might be actually undermining the role that our own member is playing in this issue. So I would respectfully suggest that while we send the contents to the Board we not send it as a formal ALAC advice but to the Board Chairman from the Chair of ALAC copied to the Chair of the Public Participation Committee. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Carlton. And next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Jean-Jacques, we can't hear you at the moment. You might be muted. Still cannot hear anything.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Olivier, this is Heidi. He's not on audio.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, now we can hear you, Jean-Jacques. Welcome back!

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, sorry, the microphone was muted. This is Jean-Jacques, three points. The first is to agree with Evan. I think a letter is sufficient and perhaps more efficient. It's less formal and it's person-to-person, from Chair to Chair. By the way, we have history of previous successes within ALAC of such letters from Chair to Chair. The second point is I was a bit puzzled by what Yaovi was suggesting about we supporting the ALAC

Chair. Of course – I don't think that any Chair in his or her good mind would take the initiative of sending a letter or an advice or anything without the full consent of the ALAC of course so I think that is superfluous.

My third point is about the content. I very much agree with the draft prepared by Yrjö and I think it's very well done. May I just suggest an addition at the end, which would be to suggest that on this issue, the PPC, the Public Participation Committee consult the ALAC? I say this because you must remember that although Sebastien has all the credentials of an At-Large history, as soon as he became a member of the Board he was no longer a representative of the ALAC or of any other part of the ICANN world – he was only a member of the Board. So I think this would make things more clear, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. And by the sentence do you just mean that the PPC should consult the ALAC on this matter or how would you word that sentence?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, whilst you've gone to another subject I'll put in the chat room here a sentence which I will submit to colleagues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's perfect, thank you. And so what I've heard from everyone is that this should remain a letter and not be a statement. I do point out that this is a letter which is for Mr. Chehadé, that's the CEO. Some of you

have mentioned that this should go to the Board Chair. I'm okay with sending a copy of it to the Board Chair and a copy of it to the Chair of the Public Participation Committee who is Sebastien Bachollet. If that's okay with everyone, and this is really where the consensus call will go then we can proceed forward. Jean-Jacques, you've put your hand up again.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier, for allowing me to come back into this. Very briefly, I think that we can gain something and certainly have impact by respecting the symmetry of forms – so Chair-to-Chair is I think the most efficient with a copy to Fadi and a copy to whoever else might be interested. But from my experience in the past at least two years, the most efficient, the one that has elicited the strongest and most immediate response was the letter from Chair to Chair. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. I see Carlton Samuels has put his hand up. Carlton, you have the floor.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I put it down, I withdraw, Chair. I'm endorsing Jean-Jacque's comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. Evan, you have put in the chat that the letter should be to the CEO and cc'd to the Board Chair and the Chair of the PPC.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Who gets the original and who gets the- Sorry, this is Evan for the record. Who gets the original and who gets the copy is sort of less relevant than the suggestion that it goes to the PPC and the CEO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I think we'll follow then the advice from Jean-Jacques and send it, address it to Steve Crocker with a copy to the CEO, so to Fadi and a copy to Sebastien Bachollet. And I see others agreeing with this. Carlton, your hand is still up?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm withdrawing my hand, Chair, sorry about that, but I agree with that suggestion from Jean-Jacques.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Carlton. And so what I'll just ask is for a consensus call here with everyone who is on the call at the moment agreeing to this letter being sent, putting a little green tick next to their name. And "This is not a vote!" in some favorite words that we've heard last week. [laughter] This is just to get the temperature of the room.

CARLTON SAMUELS: You have to see how these things work. [laughing]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've learned from the best, so there you go. And I see that there are a lot of green ticks that we're not going to count because that would make it a vote. Thank you very much everyone, so we'll proceed forward and do this as an action item, please: Olivier to send the letter out....

CARLTON SAMUELS: Now you get it. [laughing] Don't count, now you get it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, it gets better as it goes. [laughing] Anyway, let's move on because we are taking time here and I do wish to have those ITRs ratified, sorry, have rest of this work done. [laughter]

So the Trademark Clearinghouse Strawman Solution – now, this is a statement which was currently being drafted. The comment period was extended to the 15th of January, 2013, so sometime next year. I note that both Alan and Evan are going to work on this. Obviously there's going to be some changes based on what happens on today's GNSO Council call, so perhaps we can wait until Alan gives us a little bit more details later on when he joins the call.

Next we have the currently open public comments which have either somehow had no statement or not been allocated yet. The first one is the proposed modification of GNSO PDP Manual to address the suspension of a PDP – that's a very technical GNSO-related thing. I think that in our last call we had decided that there was going to be no statement, and if Alan thought otherwise he would have told us about it. The initial comment period closed on the 12th of November; there is

a reply period that closes on the 3rd of December. Needless to say both times have passed so I think we can just put this one behind us.

Next, the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C Policy Development Process' recommendation for Board consideration – if you remember, we had actually submitted a statement in the earlier part of this process. Now really we are at the 11th hour, the point where it just goes to the Board and it was decided that no statement was required since our prior comments had been taken into account.

The expert-recommended improvements to ICANN's accountability structures – again, that's a very technical thing about ICANN's accountability. No statement was deemed necessary on this at this point in time, and there might be future times when we can comment on the expert-recommended improvements or not.

Next, the application for the new GNSO constituency candidacy of the Public Internet Access & Cybercafé ecosystem – that's again a very tricky GNSO political item and well, let's just let the GNSO deal with its own backyard. I'm sure we wouldn't want to have the GNSO telling us what to do with our own backyard so ultimately this one has been decided as a no statement.

The preliminary issue report on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D – no statement on this for the same reasons as the Part C public comment. Then, the At-Large whitepaper on the Future Challenges' "Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive, and Respected," the famous R3 Paper – I don't think there should be any comment from this community because this is a public comment that is actually launched by the ALAC itself. And I note that it is the second such public comment request that

was ever done by the ALAC – I can't quite remember what the first one was but this one is particularly important. And there was a webinar that took place yesterday about the matter. It was very well attended. I just wonder whether we could have a couple of words from Evan or from Jean-Jacques about this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Jean-Jacques, do you want to go or should I? Okay, I'll just speak very briefly. The webinar went extremely well. I believe Heidi reported that there were a very large number of people on the call, actually unusual for a webinar of this kind from many, many different communities. There was a Q&A. I would have liked it if more people who were listening to the call participated but what it does tell me is that there's significant interest from throughout the ICANN community on what we're saying.

We're getting the attention of people, not all of it is positive. We've already heard from some people that have said either we're rocking the boat too much or there were comments made about trying to bring ccTLDs at least into a certain commonality of practice with gTLDs and that appears to have gotten some people's noses out of joint. As a matter of fact we've been told to expect a formal comment from the ccNSO – that's okay, that's part of the conversation that we need to have going forward and I'm hoping that this will end up being extremely positive. And that's all I have to say right now on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan, and we now have also Jean-Jacques who has put his hand up. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. Just to complete what Evan has said I'd like to make a couple of points. The first is that this webinar gave us the opportunity to develop an interest in this ALAC whitepaper as you pointed out, but also to give an indication of our timeline and the way forward. So we did mention the public comment period which is now going on and the preparation towards Beijing where we hope to have an open session.

And the important point in my mind is that that session would be or should be attended not only by the usual suspects from within ICANN but also with people from outside the ICANN world, because as I pointed out in the webinar yesterday government has a far more wide remit than simply internet matters. And very often the challenges of governments or good governments are the same broadly regarding internet governance but also governance more generally. So it might be interesting to make a comparison between the two, and Beijing should offer that opportunity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Any questions from anyone on this? I just must say that I'm very glad that this process is moving forward. Whilst in Dubai I was accosted by some people from ICANN asking me about this whitepaper, although there was a little bit of a misunderstanding I think from some in that this was advice that we had

given to the Board and that needed to be implemented. It is really good to see an actual dialog taking place across ICANN. I note that the ccNSO is expected to file a public comment and I also note that some specific parts of the GNSO are probably going to comment as well either in individual contributions or as SG contributions, official contributions to this process.

But let's move on since we know this is just one part of the process which will culminate in a session hopefully in Beijing, so we'll have plenty of time to discuss the Future Challenges' whitepaper. And let's go now to the Item #B-7, the consultation on IANA's secure notification process – the public comment period closes in January, 2013. I'm not quite sure what to draft here. I don't know if many of us are particularly knowledgeable about IANA operations. I was going to suggest that we perhaps say something, send an email over to the Technical Issues mailing list. We do have a Technical Issues working group; they might know.

At the same time what I might do, and in fact I already have is fire an email off to John Curran and to the ASO basically, Louie Lee and John Curran and find out whether they knew anything about this and whether it was worth the ALAC drafting anything on this. It seems highly specialized. Does anyone have any points of views or ideas on this?

I don't see anyone jumping up and down so let's move on to the next one, the protection of IGO, so that's intergovernmental organizations, and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs – now, this is a working group which has not actually issued an actual public comment process but it has

actually sent out a survey to ask the ALAC and At-Large of our input. And I know that this is a subject which has taken a serious amount of time in one of our previous ALAC calls, so what I would ask perhaps is if I can have a concerted reply.

We have a bit of time; I don't quite know what the deadline is for providing our input... I think it's sometime in January, mid-January, yeah, the 15th of January. If we can have someone holding the pen on this and responding to the questions it actually deals specifically with questions where we were going to make a statement or whether we have made a statement in the past. For example, the separation of the Red Cross and IOC issues, etc., it really is input from the ALAC and from At-Large into a GNSO working group and I think it's something we really need to take part in. Evan, you've put your hand up, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Olivier. I just wanted to mention that this is ongoing and in fact that particular issue is going on right now during the GNSO meeting that Alan is attending. So on one hand you can say that there's a very timely issue going on. On the other hand, this is something that is probably going to go in large part into a PDP and also something on which we have the ability to comment. Some of the issues in fact, the Board has taken a temporary judgment to block IGO names pending what happens at the GNSO. So there is activity happening. It's still left to be said how urgent this is because some of this activity may be put into a PDP and in fact one of the arguments going on right now, or one of the differences going on right now is that the GAC has sent a letter believing this is an

implementation issue whereas the GNSO appears to be pushing back that this is a policy issue.

So this debate is ongoing and we are keeping on top of it. Alan and I are both part of the working group and there might be others here that are, so we're definitely following this issue and we'll certainly have something that we are going to suggest ALAC has something to say on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, er Evan, sorry – I was just thinking of Alan at the same time. Thanks very much, Evan and Alan for keeping a close track of this. And I note that the chair of that working group is Thomas Rickert, is that right?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes, yes that's right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, just mentioning him and thanking the fact that we have received officially through the channels a request for the wider input and for our input on this. I think we can just leave this aside I guess until after this call and perhaps this might need to be discussed during the Executive Committee call since we will know more from Alan at that time about what's been happening in this. If I may say an update should be sent over to the ALAC mailing list and anyone who will wish to take part into the input that we bring in there is very much encouraged to step forward when this email is sent out.

Next is the statement on the WCIT outcomes – as you know, the World Conference on International Telecommunications took place last week and the week before. I will be providing an update shortly, but one thing though that I think should be done, and it will come from the lessons learned that I will be speaking to you about, is a statement to the Board supporting the visit of Fadi Chehadé at the WCIT. He was invited by Dr. Touré, the President of the International Telecommunications Union. And he was invited to address the audience on the first day, on the opening day and I think that was a good warming up of relations.

At the same time there is a lot more that ICANN needs to do as part of the multi-stakeholder process out there, and most of it is due to the fact that ICANN and the work that is being performed by ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model that it works on is currently totally misunderstood and not welcoming enough for many countries around the world. So I'll be speaking about this in a moment. Jean-Jacques, you have put your hand up.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques speaking. I'd like to just give a sense of what I take away from this. I was not in Dubai but I've read pieces here and there. I have a very strong feeling especially about one feature or one fact. It's that in the long months building up to the Dubai meeting, people in ITU and perhaps some governments were trying to pursue the public that it was very much about either governments or the rest. And what became quite evident during this meeting is that actually it is not on the one hand sovereign states and on the other

hand the service providers, the general public, the general users, etc. There is a clear division among sovereign states.

So that is a new fact, it is a political fact of great importance I would like to underline because now we know that governments are divided, and although we knew about this because we are in the ICANN world I think that many people outside of our circles were not as conscious as we are. So I'm sorry for laboring upon this concept but I think it is of great importance and we should integrate this into our thinking for Future Challenges, for instance, because we cannot consider the states or the GAC as one with one voice and with one advice. They are very different positions, so that's something we have to work on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques, and that's duly noted. I totally agree with you very much on what's going on at the moment. We saw an East/West/North/South divide more so than a government versus civil society divide. Cheryl? Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, it's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record and I'm doing my best to try and get as much sound into the microphone as possible. Just to follow on from what Jean-Jacques Subrenat just said, I thought it was worth noting that the additional exposure that is happening in the landscape, in the (inaudible) landscape means we do need to be prepared as At-Large Structures to be more engaged in our local internet communities and with the

decision makers from these communities which can talk to government and other influential people in our own backyards.

And point in case would be what I think is probably not unrelated to the wonderful world of WCIT but basically also of the increasing awareness in government and in other circles of the importance of ICANN and what ICANN does would be the fact that our Minister of Communication, [Minister] Steven Conroy who is well aware of ICANN I can assure you because we, via AUDA and me meet with him at regular intervals; but for the first time – and these are people with very busy schedules – to my knowledge a serving Minister of Communications has now put in an expression of interest to serve on ICANN’s ATRT2. That’s a huge elevation.

That’s something of great significance but it’s also something that we with our At-Large Structures, and of course with our outreach, need to be ahead of the game on because there’s now multiple points where we need to see how we can influence and get the voice that we need to bring to the table. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Cheryl, and great news to hear. And certainly the number of ministers that took part in WCIT and actually decided to talk to everyone and to meet with civil society that was present there was really good. But anyway, I’ll be speaking about this in a moment. So this statement on the WCIT outcomes is something I’ll be drafting. It’s not time sensitive as in we don’t need to file it by next week but I think there are a number of things which ICANN should learn from the two

weeks that have taken place there – maybe not the most obvious of things, and so that draft is coming soon.

The next, #10 and #11 are both consultations on the Internet Number Resources’ performance standards and a consultation on the IANA Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process. I am again not quite sure whether we have had any knowledge of this. I note that a question was sent to the Technical Issues mailing list regarding the second one of those, or maybe both and there was no reply – again, something to follow up with John Curran and with Louie Lee. That’s an action item for myself.

Alright, any questions on these parts of the agenda? Otherwise we’ll move on... Great, so Agenda Item #7 we’ve already dealt with so this goes forward and then it’s not a statement and it was not a vote.

#8, update on the WCIT – ah, well that takes us to the not a statement, not a vote, not a treaty thing. [laughter] So I was very lucky to spend two weeks in Dubai locked in a metallic box between 8:00 AM and 1:30 AM – yes, that’s about 17 hours a day trying to mash together a treaty which had to be updated, the previous version of this treaty having been published in 1988; yes, that’s 24 years ago. And the big difference between 1988 and now is that since that time the internet has turned out to be one of the most prolific means of telecommunications around the world.

As a result, several members of the International Telecommunications Union, members which by the way are only states – so we’re talking about countries and a few monopolistic telcos or ex-monopoly telecommunication companies. These members decided that the

internet needed to be included and these ITRs needed to be brought up to date by including this. So the process prior to WCIT took place for several months and we reached the point of having the two-week meeting, having to go line-by-line between the different proposals from the different member countries.

It was a very onerous process, very tiring. The Chair of the conference was the Chair of the National Telecommunication Regulation Authority of the United Arab Emirates, Mr. Mohamed Nasser Al-Ghanim, and the Chair of the Conference of course was Dr. Touré, the Chair of the ITU. At the beginning of the conference, the audience was assured that the internet was not going to come into the regulations at all due to a huge media campaign that took place prior to the two weeks starting and several news outlets saying that it was the battle for the internet and whether or not the internet was going to be taken over by the ITU.

So we were told there was not going to be such a thing and that governments were not going to take over the running of the internet, there was no chance of that and that the regulations themselves were not about any kind of content. It was just going to be telecommunications and that was it. Actually, over the week several proposals came out. It was a week that was full of drama, should I say, an interesting way of doing things with countries basically having the chance to comment on each and every line of the treaty; and in fact, some countries did comment on each and every line. In fact some countries commented on each and every word of the treaty which was quite time consuming and got a couple of, well a few of the nights to end up at 1:00, 2:00 in the morning which was very late.

The atmosphere was rather tense because in the first weekend there was a proposal that certainly sprung out at the very last minute of the plenary meeting on Friday that the United Arab Emirates along with Saudi Arabia and Russia and Egypt and a couple of other countries were going to have a consolidated proposal that was going to include some of their common points between several Arabic countries but also countries in Africa. This proposal was actually never seen, or rather never officially seen because what happened was on the Saturday as things happened the document was leaked via WCITleaks and the different delegations over the weekend spent much time looking at the document but refrained from commenting on a document that did not officially exist.

This of course raised so much noise because of what the document was asking for, basically asking for the internet governance to be passed over to the ITU and to relevant countries and we are talking here about the names, the addresses, all of the resources including also the IANA functions to be handed over to governments – quite a shocking document indeed. Thankfully it was then withdrawn on the Monday, but then suddenly on the Tuesday resurfaced as a ration proposal, hooray! Rather strangely indeed actually, it just sort of being rebranded effectively as a ration proposal which then never got taken into account because the Chair of the meeting steered everyone away from this apart from one clause, one regulation which remained in the list of regulations which was that for the numbering resources. And that was removed at the very last moment on the Wednesday of the second week.

On the Wednesday night of the second week, a section which... Well, by that time basically we had gone through several battles but on the Wednesday night the section about the internet certainly came up again. That was not a regulation; that was just a statement about the internet. No one had read it before. It was proposed in the evening about 10:00 PM; it was vehemently fought by several governments including the United States and several European governments and others, and so the Chair decided that he was going to take the temperature of the room in his own words, thus getting the people around the room, the countries around the room in favor of including that resolution in the final document to raise their lollipops – the lollipop being this big board with the code name of their country.

A quick count was made in those in favor and those who were against it, and then the Chair decided to pass that resolution and say “This is resolved and therefore this resolution will be in the final document.” That raised a few points of order from around the room asking if this really was not a vote, and yes, it was not a vote yet the Chair made it some kind of consensus call – still it’s not quite understood how this worked.

This unfortunately raised the level of mistrust from both sides, those in favor of the ITRs and those against the ITRs to a new level with also a level of mistrust towards the Chair of the conference. And it did not help at all, which meant that by Thursday of the second week the atmosphere was particularly tense and the level of unhappiness in the room on both sides and frustration on both sides was pretty high – frustration because many of the African countries and Arabic countries who had come with a number of proposals that were fought off one by

one were of the view, the point of view that they had made a lot of compromises whilst Europe and the United States had not done any compromise on anything; of course a similar frustration in Europe and the United States that they were the ones about to lose the control of the internet and standing the most to lose. But they had not come up with any additional proposals so they had already made a lot of compromises.

It's always the same thing, isn't it – is the glass half full or is the glass half empty? Anyway, the last day which was the Thursday, the last day of discussions, European governments were actually quite close to being able to sign but the last plenary was particularly dramatic again because a consolidated proposal from the Chair, which was actually quite good because it got rid of most of the particularly bad language and most of the offending regulations but kept – and one has to say there are a number of very good regulations in the document. It kept those.

There are a couple of regulations which are still very, very touchy. For example, Article V-A which deals with security and talks about the security of the networks needed to be ensured by governments when really the proposals from the UK in particular was to use the word resilience or robustness or availability or words which would not include any chance of having some kind of control over the accessibility of the network, such as for example having your identity linked to your accessibility of the network; words which would effectively stop you from having free speech and be misinterpreted to be able to filter the network, etc.

And then Article V-B which relates to spam and which was then renamed to sort of other words for spam, I don't have the actual article in front of me but really it's saying that spam was not about content and this just doesn't make sense at all. In order to be able to classify some email or information as spam you really have to read it. So that was a big question mark and especially putting this in parallel with the recommendation, sorry standard number Y2770 which had been voted on, prepared at the WTSA two weeks earlier. And that's a standard which makes it mandatory for all of the next-generation networks to have Deep packet inspection performed on them, the DPI, and that actually specifically speaks about the detection of spam using DPI. So a very suspicious article which got some member countries to say "We are not going to sign an agreement which has this article in it."

Anyway, to tell a long story short the last plenary was very abruptly interrupted by Iran who asked for a vote to take place. The vote took place. The United States voted that they were not going to... Well, the vote took place on something that was unrelated to telecommunications, actually, on basically the inclusion of language with regards to human rights – that none of the regulations would impinge on the human rights of people. And there was also some push by some countries to add something about the right of states to have telecommunications.

That infuriated other countries because they thought you could not put an individual right which was a universal declaration of human rights along with the right of a state to have telecommunications services, especially when that state lost its telecommunications privileges because of their activity in human rights. And it's one of these things

where the whole discussion broke down very quickly. A vote was taken and both the line about human rights but also the line about the states' rights to telecommunication were both included. That got the United States to declare they would not be signing the ITRs and several other European countries would not be signing them, and a handful of countries outside Europe and the US also following suit.

Some might find in the future they will just take more time to read through those and perhaps sign with a reservation. In fact, if you look at the document itself, the final document with all of the list of reservations, several countries have signed the ITRs but they have admitted a reservation which basically says "We reserve the right not to follow any of these ITRs." So it's interesting because you can sign and say you're not going to follow anything or you can not sign and say you might sign later.

So the overall thing, though, is that the consensus which the ITU has wanted to have doesn't seem to have happened, and so now there are a lot of big question marks around the ITU, around the process by which these ITRs were drafted and where we're going. On a personal note I found the whole process to be absolutely fascinating. There are a number of things which I have noticed, though.

The first one is the fact that yes, you do have political, well you do have countries with all sorts of political agendas and so their choices into signing or not signing or coming up with suggestions for the ITRs is very politically motivated, sometimes to actually solve a problem that they have at home by bringing it onto the international stage. That's one thing. The other though is that yes, you do have this North/South and

East/West divide that certainly came on the scene and it was I think quite unfortunate but I guess this is how the geopolitics of the world relate to telecommunications.

One thing that I have seen though is there are many countries in lesser served parts of the world, in Africa for example, where the representatives of those countries were not totally aware of what the multi-stakeholder model was and of what ICANN does, and how multi-stakeholder compares more favorable to multilateralism where it's just countries talking to each other. I do think that there is a lot of work that needs to be done in outreach in those countries, and this is the gist of the statement that I wish to send over to the Board. I think it's important that we continue in our work, recognizing that many – maybe not many but several of our At-Large Structures had a direct input into the process, into the group that was in Dubai.

I certainly liaised with many of our ALSes over there that were there and it has really helped in getting the message across and certainly having some discussion outside the main room. I really think that there is a lot of work to be done in there especially when countries turned to me and said "Well listen, we understand that there is this multi-stakeholder process out there but what has the multi-stakeholder process ever done for us? We tried going into ICANN, we didn't know where we would have to go, what fora were available for us to bring our input." And I'm speaking here not only about governments but also other organizations that are from those countries.

Some of them have benefited from programs that were run by the ITU in their country, development programs for IT, for local work and of

course there hasn't been very much done by ICANN in there. So I hope that with the new season that has been described by Fadi Chehadé we will be able to have something and I think that At-Large, we are the community that is able to make this happen and to bridge the gap. So it really puts the light on us to make sure that in the future we will not have another WCIT where the world just divides itself North/South, East/West.

I'm sorry for the length of time it's taken me to say this, I'm just saying this ad-lib but I see several hands up and so I now open the floor for comments and debate. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you are first on the list.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques for the record. My first remark is welcome to multilateral diplomacy. So you did see the complexity of this at its best. Actually your account, your verbal account, Olivier, was so brilliant and so tantalizing that I've chewed my pencil to its core and now I have some lead in my stomach and you're to blame. [laughter]

I do have a question. On the Wiki page I see that the people from the ALAC who were present, never mind which RALOs because they were not sent by their RALOs, but I see that you for instance were part of the UK delegation. So does this mean that actually ICANN did not manage to integrate its various parts as a team and therefore it somehow did not exactly strengthen the visibility and presence of ICANN as a whole? Is that true? And then I have a couple of remarks if you can just give me a quick answer on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Well, as I said earlier Fadi Chehadé came for a couple of days along with Steve Crocker. After that we had Nigel Hickson who was there for the full two weeks and who provided quite a deep daily briefing of meetings that he had had, bilateral meetings that he had had but also at the same time also providing an input about what's been happening during the day's plenaries.

There is as question, though, with regards to everyone being able to speak. It's only governments that are able to speak, and yes, some of us were part of country delegations. I was part of the UK delegation; others were part of the US delegation and were really able to not only attend the plenaries but also the workshop, bearing in mind that the workshops could not be attended by some people – civil society for example that was not affiliated to any members were not allowed in the workshops and some of the ad-hoc workshops that took place. So there was a certain level of opaqueness I guess, and the plenary sometimes appearing to be just for show and for the webcast rather than the actual work that takes place there.

The coordination, though, between ICANN and the Regional Internet Registries and the Internet Society and the various people that were in their national delegation was very good. It happened through Skype, it happened through email; it happened through some mailing lists and through face-to-face discussions that we had sometimes in the evening or at lunchtime. So although yes, ICANN was not present as a force in itself it is not a member of the ITU. ICANN was there and I think it was very, very helpful that Nigel at least was there to be able to navigate through all of what was going on.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier, may I just follow on with a suggestion? One of the specific items you mentioned though briefly is DPI, Deep packet investigation. Now this may seem rather bland or mild to people in Australia, Canada or Denmark for instance but it is one of the most dangerous things for humanity. It's the ultimate tool which will allow the destruction of privacy.

So my specific suggestion is that we should now embark upon preparing a statement or a paper rather, a whitepaper which would be something like "The Outcome of WCIT and the Global Public Interest," and we could use this opportunity to take up a certain number of issues such as DPI but other as well and to gauge their importance or the possible impact widely on the general user of the internet because that is certainly not something which was first and foremost in the minds of the delegates, the country delegates at the ITU. And I'm sure that Evan and I would be able to prepare for the ALAC a draft at least of some major points which could then be developed by members willing to join a work team in the Future Challenges Working Group on what I think is a very important subject. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. That's a very good point you've made here and I would be fully supportive of this, and if I can help you on that I'd be very interested in doing so. Let's put this on the side for the time being. I mean there's also a question as to whether we could have maybe a panel discussion or maybe we can have a follow-up meeting in Beijing about this WCIT.

I see others... Jean-Jacques, I'll come back to you in a moment but first we'll have Yaovi Atohou.

CARLTON SAMUELS: He's disconnected.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you have disconnected, Yaovi, oh dear! Well, we'll come back to you as soon as you're back to being connected. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. You just explained how the work is divided, and the work is divided between cultures. We have to recognize that sometimes, even if they are with the governments, even if they are on the GAC they still have concerns, big concerns about the internet control. So we do need to find a way to elevate these concerns or perhaps to remove them, and to remove them we need a lot of effort. We need efforts to make ICANN more international, more international, I'll say it twice. We need also IANA to be international; this is also a concern for people.

I am absolutely [indentured] to the multi-stakeholder model. I am absolutely [am against] control of the internet by governments. But I want this model to work and this model cannot work if we don't improve ourselves, if ICANN doesn't improve themselves, if governments don't agree on improving this model. And I think that we have to work together within At-Large to raise awareness inside ICANN

that we need more effort to make those governments more, how do you say it, [secure]. They are already on the GAC but they still have concerns. So we need to do something.

We need to do more to make them more [comfortable] and to make them more secure. It is our internet, it is the internet of the world. It is the internet of the [internet] but it is the internet of the world. So I think that there is an effort to be done inside ICANN also and for sure we have to make more outreach towards those governments. We need to explain more but [before that], in the meantime we need also to improve ourselves, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Tijani, and I absolutely agree with you, and I think that any statement that we make to the Board will need to take this into account. Certainly some of the feedback that I have had from governments that are unhappy with the multi-stakeholder model stem from the fact that they have tried to take part in the GAC and maybe the GAC needs to improve also. They have tried to take part in other processes in ICANN and have found them to not be to the level that they were hoping they were going to be. So there definitely is a lot of effort for ICANN to make itself more international – very, very important points in this, Tijani.

And in fact, I've also heard from governments in Europe complaining about some parts of ICANN and saying how they're not satisfied with the way things are running at the moment. So there certainly is a lot of criticism going on but there's also at the same time an absolute support of the multi-stakeholder model. And I think it's good to hear so much

support from so many governments but certainly we can do things better. And we need to work on doing things better.

With regards to the Deep packet inspection which Jean-Jacques spoke about earlier, yes, very, very dangerous and it is understood by many governments already that allowing deep packet inspection to take place on the internet will be the biggest danger to human rights and to freedom of speech around the world. So of course, many countries already use deep packet inspection but it is not the norm; and allowing this to become the norm, the normal thing to do, is really a big setback for freedom of speech and for human rights and we will really have to fight for this.

Yaovi, are you back with us?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you, I'm back. Can you hear me?

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

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you. I have one suggestion. Before the conference we had a lot of discussions going on mailing lists, websites, and the main question is, is ITU going to take over the control of the internet. So I have one question, after this conference can we say yes or no? That is my question. Now, the second point is a proposal. I would suggest that we have a webinar to more inform about the ITRs, because before the

conference there are many things related to telecommunications in general that many people were not aware of.

So I think it's really important for our ALSes also to know what is happening on the ITU side, and before that conference in (inaudible) for example, we wanted to talk to... We were asking the government people what is your position about the modification people want to introduce that the ITU wanted? And we were never able to have these meetings before that conference, and we can see that also (inaudible). But I'm wondering if in reality people signed this document they were able to (inaudible) everything. So this is to support again the idea to have a webinar on the outcome of the WCIT conference so that we are more informed and then we can more interact at the local level before our government people. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yaovi, and thank you for these questions. I think I can answer at least one of the two. The one on the question is the ITU going to take over the internet, and I think that there is a misunderstanding that we all fell into – the fact that the ITU was going to decide. It's not the ITU. The ITU is a member organization. Members, which are countries, come up with proposals and then as a whole they vote on these proposals or they agree to them, and to put them in the ITRs, in the regulations or not.

Whether the ITU is now going to take over the internet based on the new recommendations and the new regulations, it looks as though this is not going to be the case at least for the time being. There is no specific clause that asks for the names and the numbers of the internet

to be run by countries. As I said, some articles are ambiguous and it might be used by ITU member countries to push for an agenda to start trying to take over bit by bit parts of the internet but it's something that is yet to be seen.

There is a planning Potentiary conference coming up. There are many other conferences that will come up and I gather that what's happened at WCIT is just one of many battles that will be fought in the future because those countries that are pushing for the ITU to take on more responsibility in running key parts of the internet are going to continue asking for these.

With regards to having a conference call on the ITRs themselves, it is worth remembering that the regulation proposals were only available about a month before the conference started. So when we had our conference call that took place there was no knowledge of all of the proposals that were in by then – a very good idea. Perhaps should we have a conference call in January where Nigel Hickson could provide us with good details of what those regulations are? And perhaps could we have the final version of the document available on our WCIT working space for us to be able to read through them at our own time?

You'll be seeing many of the regulations are actually very good. Some are absolutely terrible. And I see Avri having a point of view with regards to the camel getting its hooks or nose into the tent or internet. I'll get Jean-Jacques Subrenat back on the call and I wonder if Avri could have a few words afterwards if you're okay with that, Avri. First, Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques speaking. Yes, Olivier, you mentioned the idea of a brainstorming – I don't know whether you used that word but the idea was an exchange of views in an informal way about my suggestion. Yes, I completely support that but I would say that it requires adequate preparation, and I think that rather than launch a very large discussion like this without adequate preparation it may be a better idea to submit to those who will be participating a preparatory paper which can first be discussed within the ALAC or for instance within the Future Challenges Working Group and which could be posted on a Wiki page. And I'm sure that Evan would agree with me that we should launch this. If you agree we would do this very gladly.

Just a remark about the importance of DPI as one of the main challenges or dangers for civil rights, for human rights, for very basic things – DPI is used currently by North Korea, Iran, China, but also by the USA under the aegis of homeland security. And this is of extreme importance to be mentioned because it is because of measures taken like this by democratic countries like the US which lead other governments which are not democratic, let's say Russia or China, to say "Ah-hah, but you see even Washington is using this in a very common fashion, so who are you to tell us that we should not be doing this?"

So this leads me to underline how important it is that we have a broad view which would be the results or the outcome of the WCIT and the global public interest, and in that we could include a very pungent chapter on DPI. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Then we have Fatima Cambronero and I'm going to close the queue after Fatima and give the last word to Avri if we can have a few words from her. Fatima Cambronero, please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima for the record, can you hear me?

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

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, thank you, Olivier. I would like to make a brief comment on this subject. First of all I am not able to make an analysis of the WCIT because I am not an expert in telecommunications. I might be able to speak out about content, on human rights or if internet was included without mentioning the word "internet" and all of the other issues that have been discussed. I think it is important to take into account this cooperation period that is being started between ICANN and the ITU and if this is so well, I welcome that.

I also consider that ICANN, since ICANN does not want the ITU to intervene in its issue the ITU may believe the same. So I believe that we need to focus on ICANN and on the multi-stakeholder model because we know how they work. And this event of the ITU was useful for us to understand that governments are important but they are just one part, one actor that participates in the model. So the GAC is their place or it's an area where they can participate and they have to express their views there, and if there is any other place where they can participate, well,

they can do so in those places. But we need to pay attention to that and not to intervene in other issues that we are not able to understand. We need to be in touch with the functions and roles that we are focused on and we need to reinforce our multi-stakeholder model. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. That's noted. We definitely have to, before trying to fix what's outside let's try and fix what we have inside. And there is definite push for this to happen. If at all, like I said, one thing that this meeting, these two weeks have done is to open my eyes and the eyes of several other people about things that still need to be done by developed countries for developing countries and for those countries that have not yet got the access that they should have to the multi-stakeholder model.

Avri, are you able to say a few more words because I know you had a slightly different point of view. You were also in there as part of the US delegation. You were part of the US government delegation, goodness – how shocking to see you, Avri, as a government person! Are you able to say a few words?

AVRI DORIA: I can try, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can barely hear you. You don't sound too well at the moment.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, well fine. If you can hear me I'll just say a few words. I think the idea of having a larger, longer conversation on this is a good idea. This is only the first act. Between now and the planning Potentiary in '14 there are several more occasions. The panel will work on getting itself further, further into it and the less of [us four] kind of keeping it out.

I think there's a lot of work in joining the discussions. I think this one was a draw. Each side got a bit. Nothing is over on a treaty that doesn't take effect until 2015. Folks may still sign, who knows what will change? Who knows what other resolutions will be made? I think ICANN and ITU are a separate piece among themselves and that ICANN is relatively safe on that front for as long as the ITU decides that it's relatively safe and the treaty holds up. I think it's really good for ICANN to get its house in order but I don't think WCIT or the planning Potentiary (inaudible). I think if anything ICANN may be under the microscope again after the planning pot. '14, but for this next year and a half, two years I think [the separate] treaty will hold. That's about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Avri, and I note that your voice sounded as if it went through a ringer or something. Maybe it was already the DPI that was taken apart, analyzed and then put back together by some device, who knows? But it's good to hear this. I totally agree with you. So ICANN has some time to get its house in order and we know that there are a lot of things it needs to do.

I suggest a couple of, a number of action items. One is to have a conference call in January that will deal with this where we will have Nigel Hickson and perhaps a handful of other invitees to let us know,

give us their impressions one month on about what's happened in Dubai. On top of that, I'm going to suggest a first statement that I'm going to draft specifically addressing a handful of points in Dubai and also supporting the visit of the Chair and the CEO.

I see here Heidi asks is the webinar only for At-Large? We could have it for more than just At-Large. I think we can host this and have an ICANN-wide webinar on this. I don't think there's anything wrong with it in us doing that. I don't see anybody else in ICANN being able to host a webinar about this subject. So that's one thing. Now, my screen is flashing all over the place – I don't know what's going on now. Okay, so let's pause for a second; apparently we've run out of space for notes. [laughter] Are we okay with moving on? Can you take more notes?

So that's first. Now, an additional action item for the Future Challenges Working Group perhaps to look at this specific point of what ICANN needs to do along the lines of what Jean-Jacques and Evan have told us. And that would be for a statement that would not be an immediate statement; it can be a statement that can be done in January for the Working Group to be able to work on – so that's another action item.

And I think that's enough action items for this subject for the time being. And now we are mindful of the time – this was supposed to take only ten minutes but now can we have an update from selected At-Large Working Groups and from the working group chairs? We've got Cheryl, Avri, Dev, Sandra, and Rinalia, and I'll just ask for each of the chairs to let us know what has been happening in their working groups since the last call we've had. First, the Rules of Procedure and the ALAC Metrics Subcommittee, Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, I thought I was second [cap] off the rank after Avri but I'll pop in – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. A very brief but positive report: the Rules of Procedure Review Working Group including the metrics work met as a committee as a whole, I think it was only last week but my life is a blur at the moment for personal reasons. It was a very positive meeting but the intention of the meeting was to have each of the Drafting Teams give clear guidance and timelines and planning for what else needs to be done before we will be presenting the ALAC with a completed draft.

At the moment, and I will update at the Executive Committee meeting between now and the ALAC's next meeting in January, we would envisage that we will be presenting the ALAC documentation for consideration between its January teleconference and its February teleconference which would mean the ALAC would be encouraged to vote online during that time. But in the work up to that and particularly during the mid- to late-January period we would strongly encourage, request, and desire that each of the ALAC members keep a very close eye on the updates of the documentation that will be going up onto our Wiki space.

And to that end, if I may Mr. Chairman, I might be so bold as to ask if you can instruct staff to perhaps send to the ALAC links, at least a little mention if anything significant goes up so that we can have sort of little reminders during the January period that "Here is a Wiki page; it would be wise for you to go and read, comment on and contribute to the process," so that when you put the draft together, or I'm sorry, when

you call for your vote you've effectively had a fairly long amount of time for your ALAC members to both discuss and contribute to the final documentation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Is this something which can be done using the notification part of the Wiki, when you sort of click a "watch this page" type of thing?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Look, anyone who actually is actively involved in the Wiki and is logging in and doing all of that sort of thing, yes, that would work ideally. And those members of the ALAC who do that will find that will help them particularly if they're watching the pages or the [spaces]. I don't live in a Utopian world – I know people don't do that. I'd like it pushed as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So let's have Matt make sure this is tracked. Okay, any questions or comments on this? I see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'd just remind the group that in Toronto we did make a commitment that the draft Rules would be going out, would be available to the rest of the community and input channeled through the ALAC, through their respective ALAC members so we need to make sure that happens as we're going through this process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan. Yes, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Cheryl just to make the action item clear for Matt where I said ALAC list it should be ALAC and regional lists. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. We'll have that. So next we have the New gTLD Working Group – Avri Doria, please, you have the floor.

AVRI DORIA: Okay hi, this is Avri. I hope you can hear me better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you sound a lot better than a moment ago. You must have cleared your throat.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, I decided that the Adobe talk method does not really work so I dialed in. I was hoping not to have to. In any case, in terms of monthly reports of the New gTLD Working Group, and I did submit a report but at the very last minute while this meeting was actually ongoing. First point, I've pretty much been missing in action for the last month. We cancelled the meeting for this December as I was not prepared and did not send out notification in time, so that's the first status item.

The second status item: I did not have a chance to get updates from team members who were working on the outreach evaluation and recommendation sub-team. Now, in point some of them like I believe Tijani and Dev and probably others are members of ALAC so of course they can directly say where the various sub-teams are with the various [editors] if this meeting wishes and if they wish.

Finally we were asked or I was asked if the Working Group wanted to recommend a statement to ALAC on the Trademark Clearinghouse debacle, I mean Strawman. It does not seem like there was any bottom-up drive in the Working Group to do one so I declined the offer on behalf of the Working Group to recommend a statement on the Trademark Clearinghouse Strawman to ALAC. That's about it. And there's another meeting – we have a meeting planned for January but I forget when it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Avri, for this comprehensive feedback. I see that Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll just note what Avri said about the statement on the Strawman is correct, but based on the GNSO meeting held today I am going to be recommending that the ALAC formulate a statement and I'll go into that in a little bit more detail later. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In a while. Okay, thank you. Next, and I don't see anybody put their hand up so thank you very much, Avri, for this report. Next we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh for the New gTLD Review Group.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier, this is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Are you hearing me?

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

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Oh okay, good, thank you. Well, ICANN formally announced on December 11, 2012, that the objection period for the new gTLDs has been extended from January 12 to March 13, 2013. So this now again, we've reorganized our activities and we've updated the one-page summary on the objection process, and now we are looking for comments from the At-Large community by January 16, 2013 in order for the Review Group to then consider these comments, draft possible statements and of course enact the whole process – getting RALO approval and then ALAC approval.

So there has only been one comment, a requestor-created comment for .nyc but to date that comment has yet to be filed by the person asking for that page to be opened. And I think that's it. I sent out the notifications last night.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, and we have Avri Doria with her hand up. Avri, you have the floor.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, this is Avri. I have just one quick question which is on the outreach to the ALSes in terms of them knowing that they have an opportunity and that opportunity has been extended. I was just wondering has that been done or is it just that the RALOs were notified and that they within their processes would notify the ALSes in time? I'm just wondering have we reached everyone that needs to be reached during the last few weeks of the possibility of using the At-Large objection? Obviously I'm not hankering for any but I want to make sure that every ALS knows that it has this opportunity, and I don't know whether that is the case or not. I belong to one ALS and they know because I told them myself but it didn't get there by any other means. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, thank you, this is Dev speaking. Thanks, Avri, for the question. Yesterday what I did is I actually emailed all of the discussion lists for all five RALOs and also posted it to the At-Large worldwide. And so hopefully I think all the ALSes that should be on these mailing lists will hopefully get a chance to read it. And I also attached the documents, the one-page summary and the timeline documents as part of the email so they have all the information they need to understand the process

and what they need to do. So hopefully and given that it's only till January 16th that yes, we will get some more comments from At-Large or at least that the At-Large community is fully aware that there's still some time left.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, for this answer, and thanks for having emailed all the RALO lists, the local lists which should reach all the ALSes. I see three hands up – Avri, you still have your hand up? No you don't, so Alan and then Cheryl. Alan Greenberg first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I'll just make a comment that I think the world has changed significantly from when the Working Group made the decision when the comment came in, I think it was on .book, I don't remember exactly. And basically the Working Group response was "That's an interesting comment but it's really out of scope. The decision was made and we have to live with the ICANN decision at this point."

I think the world has changed a lot since then. The comments that have surfaced from a variety of sources indicate that there may be a lot of opposition to the generic words being owned by people, and sufficient opposition that it may even come down to the Board exercising their prerogative of public interest and not delegating if it were to come to that. And I think we need to make sure that the ALAC is comfortable in not making any comment on the general issue at this point or are uncomfortable with it, because I think the world has changed a fair

amount in the last two to three months in terms of the perception of how the gTLD namespace is unfolding. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Very briefly, I just wanted to pick up on what Avri was saying. I think we probably should make sure that we can show best effort at doing exactly what you're suggesting, Avri, which is ensuring that the ALSes have every reasonable opportunity to be aware. With the email Dev was suggesting and now I've heard what Alan says, of course that could be something that goes up as sort of a comment somewhere on one of the Wiki pages and a link to get at discussions going could happen or whatever – that's up to the Working Group.

But whatever it is that is in this email, I wondered if Silvia would suggest to the regional leaders, whoever is running their Secretariat function that particularly at this time of year we could, rather than just send things to the list – and I'm not denigrating that; I think we have to do that and that's already been done. But I would be very keen to actually push it directly to contact emails that each RALO would have for ALS representatives. It's very common for things that get done at this time of year to be heavily criticized because "We weren't looking and how would you have expected us to look at this time of year?"

And so I think if we do, at least if the Secretariats can push directly to any or all of the email addresses for their contacts at each of the ALSes then at least we're closer to having made a best effort. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Silvia Vivanco?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, this is Silvia Vivanco. I just wanted to mention yes, I can do that. We can reach out to each ALS through the mailing list and I can coordinate with Dev and copy him and reach out to all of them so they are fully aware of the process. So I will take that action item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Silvia. And I note that since you will take the action item you will record that accordingly.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So now we can move on to the next which is the At-Large Academy Working Group, it's actually the ICANN Academy Working Group I guess as well. Sandra Hoferichter? And Sandra, we can't hear you at the moment. You might have been muted.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you. Go ahead, Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, perfect, thank you. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to say a few words. I'd like to use this opportunity to urge all the participants on this call to participate in the survey which has been sent out through the RALO Chairs and the RALO Secretariats. And we just learned that it is extremely important to raise awareness, to build capacity and not only in developing countries but elsewhere to explain the benefits and the beauty of the multi-stakeholder model.

The ICANN Academy is one tool, a structure tool and it should be developed and ICANN should definitely put more input into capacity building than in the past. To go forward in this project at this very critical moment we have to have a really, really good outcome from this survey because this will be the basis for our future work. And I really ask you to participate in this survey.

Another update is that unfortunately our main staff contact point Filiz Yilmaz is leaving ICANN by the end of the year. I'm very sad about this because she was at least the one who brought this project forward and who put it on the agenda jointly with the At-Large at the very, very beginning. I learned that our new main contact will be Denise Michel. I don't know her. I'm very much looking forward to working with her because we have a lot of tasks ahead. So please do participate, and I posted just the link into the Adobe chat room for the survey.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sandra, and it is also worth noting that there was a call earlier this week about capacity building, the Capacity Building Working Group which will work alongside the ICANN Academy Working Group to cater primarily for At-Large Structures and the work that they are going to do is also very important, especially when one looks at the outcomes of the WCIT. It was decided that a Steering Committee would be created rather than just have one or two co-Chairs and the Steering Committee will follow up.

I thought it would be a little premature to have an update from the Working Group yet and I look forward to hearing about process from that newly created working group in our next call, sometime next year. Any questions or comments regarding the ICANN Academy? If I can say, if you have not seen this survey yet from your RALO leadership please hound them, ask them for it, make sure that it is distributed. This is a very important piece of work.

The At-Large community and At-Large Advisory Committee have been one of the main driving forces behind the ICANN Academy. If we don't provide the level of input that is high enough and don't lead by example I don't know how other parts of the community are going to be able to follow if we don't do that ourselves, either. So we have to show the amount of support we have here.

Okay, let's move on. We now still have an update from the ALAC Subcommittee on the ATRT2, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team #2. Rinalia Abdul Rahim, are you still on the call? I see [RAR] being there – you have the floor.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you, yes.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Excellent, this is Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcript record. I am pleased to provide an update regarding the ALAC Subcommittee on ATRT2 Candidate Endorsements. The Committee had its first meeting yesterday on the 19th of December for approximately 90 minutes; we had full attendance. The members of the Committee are all ALAC members and the Committee is regionally balanced. The members are Yaovi, Sandra, Holly, Eduardo, Dev, and myself. I've been confirmed as the Subcommittee Chair via unanimous vote and Olivier is an observer of the Committee, but he will not observe discussions related to candidate assessment based on the concerns expressed by various ALAC members.

During the meeting the Committee reviewed our mandate and agreed on the confidentiality policies and practices that will govern our work, and on this confidentiality policy we draw from the best practices of the Nominating Committee of ICANN and we added our own additions. We reviewed our task timeline and we noted that we have five weeks to deliver results to the ALAC, and I am confident that the Committee is up to the task. We also discussed various points on the overall endorsement process. We went through the candidate assessment method and agreed on a revised version of the matrix that takes into consideration the input that ALAC members have provided.

We are still working on refining measurable indicators for assessing candidates based on agreed criteria and we will continue to refine them until our next meeting in early January.

There are two things that the Committee discussed and agreed on last night that will impact applicants or candidates. The first is that we will require two additional things from candidates – the first is confirmation of English proficiency because this is the working language of the ATRT2, and we will figure out a way of confirming this. The second one is we require written responses to three key questions to support the assessment process and I will briefly read through this and this will be circulated widely in the relevant At-Large lists.

The first question is for the candidates “Why do you believe that you are in a position to fairly assess ICANN’s mechanisms for accountability, transparency and public input?” The second question is “Why do you believe that you are in a position to assess ICANN’s focus on the global public interest?” and the third one is “Why do you believe that you will be able to do the above from the perspective of the ALAC and the global ICANN At-Large community?” Now, the written responses should be submitted as part of the complete application package to the ATRT2 staff.

To make sure that members of our community are aware the requests will be announced and circulated widely via relevant lists shortly and we will also ask the ATRT2 staff if they can also post a request on the official call for volunteers on the website. Finally, we will be providing the ALAC with updates regarding the work of the Subcommittee without

revealing confidential aspects of our work. That is it from me, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia, for this very comprehensive report and excellent work that this ad-hoc working group is doing. I'm not sure if there are any questions but I think that your report was very explanatory so I can see several people going "Yes, well done, thank you." And I note that you are taking on this task at a time which is of the essence during the holiday period, so I have to thank all of you members of the Committee for having volunteered to be on this.

I think that we can move on to our next agenda item very swiftly in fact, the At-Large statements of interest. Just a reminder for any of you that have not completed your SOI to go over to the Wiki and to fill those SOIs. I think it's important. I remind all ALAC members that there was a resolution that was voted for all ALAC members to have an SOI so it is important to have your SOI published and of course up to date.

And finally we have any other business, and there was one point which was raised by Garth at the beginning of the call. I was going to take that point and then also give the floor to Alan for a quick feedback on what's happened in the GNSO call. So is Garth still on?

GARTH BRUEN: Yeah, I'm back from my meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay perfect. So Garth, you have the floor.

GARTH BRUEN: I mean I don't need the floor for too long. I got a call from someone who said that they were a registrar and they tried to go over to the Sydney ICANN office because they were seeing some unethical business practices, as they said, and when they got to the office they said the office was closed. And now the person is even more concerned than he was before. So we're just trying to determine if the office is in fact closed and that's all at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Garth. I live quite far away from Sydney so I'm not sure if I can help you on this one. Perhaps may I ask Heidi whether she has heard any details about the Sydney office?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, thank you Olivier. As I've noted in the chat, an announcement on the status of the Sydney office will be made shortly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So that's the answer for you at the moment, and we'll follow up on that and come back as soon as we know about this. Tijani, you've put your hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. As I said to you at the beginning of the meeting I want to address the issue of the travel support for the ICANN meetings, and I want to make you know that starting from the Toronto meeting I

began to have problems with the travel support because in Toronto they asked me to leave the room at 10:00 on Friday and we have meetings until 12:00 on Friday. And it was very difficult to make them accept that I'd leave the room later because I was in a meeting, because they had to pay something if I leave the room after 10:00.

They want us to leave on Friday and Friday is a working day for us. So it was for Toronto and in Toronto I had a chance to have a flight at night – that's how I managed to leave on Friday and to attend the meeting of the ExCom. For this meeting, for the next meeting in Beijing they asked me to leave on Friday and on Friday there is no flight late. So I said I want to leave on Saturday, they said "You have to pay your night." I will not pay for my night and it is not normal. They said okay, they'll try to find a flight that will leave at midnight on Friday. I said "You will pay the night anyway if I leave at midnight – the hotel will be paid for this night. Why do you want me to fly at impossible hours and yet you will pay the same?"

At the end they asked me to ask for an exception to leave on Saturday morning at 9:00. This means that at 7:00 I have to be at the airport, that means that I will not enjoy the day. I am not asking for that. If I want to enjoy anything I have to pay for it and I know it but it is not normal, it is not possible to leave on the same day that you are working on Friday. It is not normal. I have been financed by UNCP, I have been financed by my organization, by an international organization and always you leave the day after the last working day. I don't understand why now starting from Toronto the staff tells us we have to leave on the same day.

So it is a big problem for me. This time they asked me to ask for an exception for the hotel and they told me “You will not have the per diem accordingly; you will have your per diem until Friday only.” I don’t mind, it’s not my problem now but my problem is that I look like someone who is begging, if you want, and I want them to understand. I told them by email I am a volunteer and I come there for a full week, a full week apart from my house, apart from my office. I don’t think I have to pay for that.

So I think it is a huge problem. It’s not a Tijani problem. If ALAC wants to do something for this point, for this issue, it’s okay. If ALAC doesn’t want to do it I will not come to the ICANN meetings if they want me to leave the same day as the last working day. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Tijani. I see several hands up. I see also Jean-Jacques agreeing with you. This is not one of these things – it’s not a Tijani problem. I see several people with the same problem. Alan, you’ve put your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I support Tijani. I thought we had fixed the problem that if we’re meeting in the morning, even if it’s only in the morning that the formal departure day be the next day. If anyone is going to take a whole three or four hours and abuse the ICANN privilege and do some vacationing well so be it, we’re contributing an awful lot of time to the organization. But more important, if someone really has an opportunity to leave late in the day they will anyway. So I really think

this kind of penny pinching sends just the wrong message. If you're expecting us to work in a meeting that's scheduled to run till noon, could well run until 2:00 or something like that, it happens all the time – I think this kind of... I can't think of the word to use in a public forum but this kind of behavior on staff is just inappropriate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan, here-here. Let's take this up after this call. We'll discuss this on the ExCom tomorrow I'm sure. I see everyone absolutely agreeing. I must say I myself have made it known on several occasions that I think it's really taking the Mickey for us to work like crazy, arrive a few hours before we start work and leave a few hours after we've finished work – and yet also be billed for one more night if we're absolutely exhausted and can't even lift the luggage out of the hotel on the same date.

Anyway, I think we've touched on that, thank you Tijani. We'll be touching on it tomorrow and perhaps a statement or a letter to Steve will be the right way forward. And asking for exceptions is really something else because I think that...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's ridiculous.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Asking for an exception is effectively asking for the kind closing of eyes from the Travel Department on a case-by-case basis. I don't think that it is a privilege to get one more night when you finish at 12:00. I think

that it should be a right and it used to be normally dealt with; nowadays of course travel has changed. Perhaps we should be unhappy about that; in fact I know we are unhappy about that. We have made it known.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, just for the record, when Board meetings ended at noon hour on Friday the GNSO, which was always allowed to stay for the Board meeting had a Saturday departure. That was standard [written] practice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Well that was then, this is now. It's a new season of ICANN where we pinch pennies for fun. Yeah, "sigh." Okay, Alan, you have the last word on this call to give us an update on what's been going on in the GNSO call today, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, I will not take a very long time. It was a remarkable call in a bunch of ways. I have never, ever suggested that someone else go and listen to a GNSO call or read the transcript – I will be doing that this time. There's some specific parts that are worth listening to and probably listening is better than reading the transcript because it gives you the tone.

It was a remarkable call, not necessarily a good call in some areas but some of the issues discussed will be coming back to the ALAC either because of the policy substance – and as I noted in the case of the

Strawman proposal I am going to be strongly recommending that we write a statement and do it quickly. And in terms of policy issues, in terms of administration issues such as the concept of is it allowed to have a second vote on a same motion if it failed one time and people believe there's a reason for doing it – I found it remarkable that people were saying on purely administrative and bureaucratic grounds “We should never do that” even if it was for the good of the organization that perhaps something needs to be revisited.

So I found it a remarkable meeting. It will be showing up in a number of things that I'll be pushing out to the ALAC over the next couple of weeks. I tried, I've been very poor as some of you know in getting the GNSO reports up. It takes a very significant amount of time to go over the conference once the GNSO minutes are available, to try to do that. This time I tried doing it live. It was somewhat of a challenge trying to type in what happened in a previous section while not losing the train of what was going on in the next section. I think I generally did it; I'm going to try to do it again. It was an interesting experience and I don't have much more to say.

As I said, you'll be seeing substance in a number of issues but it was an interesting meeting and when the transcript is available or the mp3 I will be suggesting to people you may want to spend a few hours and just listen to it. It was a different meeting in many ways than a typical GNSO meeting, so it won't give you an example of how the GNSO normally acts but I think it will be an interesting meeting. Anyway, that's all I have to say. This group has been meeting even longer than I have so I'll stop at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and I note that the point that we passed over which was the Trademark Clearinghouse Strawman Solution Statement currently being drafted, comment period extended till the 15th of January, 2013. Is this the statement which you are recommending that we draft something on?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is the statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay perfect, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It will not purely be on the Strawman itself but on the issues surrounding it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. Any other “other” business? And I see no one putting their hand up so I have to thank all of you for having spent the last two and a half hours on this call... Oh Yaovi, yes, do you wish to add something?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yes, my comment is very small. I just want to ask if you don’t have my SOI because I remember I sent it, so I just want you to confirm is it not appearing?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Your SOI is appearing, Yaovi, on the screen so thank you very much for it, we have it.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, thank you. So I just have to thank all of you very much for having lasted the two and a half hours. The time is 18:31 UTC. Just one last thing, for me to wish you a happy holidays and well, we will be speaking to each other next year. So you've lasted another year, you've managed to survive. Next year is going to be a whole lot of work more, but in the meantime do enjoy your holiday break for those of you who are able to take a break; and for those of you who are not able to take a break, well, that's tough. [laughter] Thanks very much and goodbye everyone.

[End of Transcript]