

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So let's get going, then. So good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Monthly Conference Call on Tuesday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> of January, 2013. The time is 15:01 UTC and so the first thing that we are going to have on our agenda is to have the roll call please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, welcome to everyone. On today's ALAC call we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Yaovi Atohoun, Carlton Samuels, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Titi Akinsanmi, Evan Leibovitch, Alan Greenberg, Eduardo Diaz; and Rinalia Abdul Rahim will be a little late on this call. We also have Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Oksana Prykhodko, Ron Sherwood, Winthrop Yu, Yrjö Länispuro, and Siva Muthusamy. On the Spanish channel we have Natalia Enciso; nobody on the French channel so far.

Apologies noted from Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Holly Raiche, Sandra Hoferichter, Arnold Tric, Fatimata Seye Sylla and Jose Arcé. From staff we have Matt Ashtiani, Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. Our interpreters today from the Spanish channel are Sabrina and Veronica, and on the French channel we have Claire and Camila.

If I could also remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, and also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel; and also to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. Also if you are on the phone bridge as well as in the Adobe Connect room, please do

---

*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.*

---

remember to mute your speakers as well as your microphone. Thank you, over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella, and whilst you were reading through the roll call I noticed a few people that have arrived as well. I note in the chat that Fatima Cambronero mentioned that she is on the Spanish channel as well; Sebastien Bachollet is online too, and I think that a couple of other people have arrived. I gather... Will you track them? Have I lost Gisella?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, Olivier. We'll note that and I believe Avri joined, so we'll note all of the people.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You'll note it. Gisella appears to have dropped or is unable to speak. Anyways, thank you.

Welcome everybody, and welcome to this new year of great work that we're going to have to do. I hope you all had a very good break during the holidays and I hope you're all full of energy to get going and to get involved more in many of our activities. And my goodness, do we have a lot more activities that are all going on simultaneously and a lot of volunteers required.

The first thing we're going to do is the adoption of the agenda, and a call for any other business or other amendments. On the agenda it says

---

that it will take 23 minutes – I hope it will take less time than that and I therefore open the floor.

Okay, I hear no one running up and down or jumping for any additional business so we can move on, that's great. We've won quite a few minutes from those 23 and we can go directly to the review of the action items from our last meeting of last year, the 20<sup>th</sup> of December, 2012 ALAC Meeting. So I invite you all over to that page and you will notice that it has both long-term goals and the in-progress goals, and open action items.

There are several recently closed action items. I could read through them; yeah, let's just read through them for the record. The first one is Olivier to send the ALAC Demarche to ICANN to the ICANN Board Chair, copying Fadi Chehadé and the Chair of the PPC. Jean-Jacques Subrenat has very kindly added a few lines. This was a complete discussion with regards to visa issues and the problems that many of our members had to reach Toronto. There has been some feedback so far with regards to it but nothing official yet letting us know how the PPC would be taking part in any work regarding the obtaining of visas, etc.

The next three are to contact John Curran and in fact also Louie Lee on three different statements to ask if a statement was necessary. I did not receive an answer so with no answer I guess it's not that important. So these three did not have a statement drafted.

The next action item is Heidi and staff to help organize at At-Large conference call on the World Conference on International Telecommunications subject, the WCIT. That has taken place and we will be quickly speaking about this later on on this call.

Finally, Silvia Vivanco is to work with the Secretariats to send the information on the New gTLD applications and the filing of objections directly to the At-Large structures. That one I think that we will also be touching on shortly in our call.

So then we can just look at the newly assigned action items. The first one has to do with myself drafting a statement of my experiences at the World Conference on International Telecommunications. Unfortunately that's still not finalized, it's still not finished. I am working on it and it should be another week or so until I finish it. And the one after that is Evan Leibovitch and Jean-Jacques Subrenat to lead the Future Challenges Working Group on a more extensive statement on the issues raised at the World Conference on International Telecommunications as compared to the first statement. So without the first one being finalized the next one is still pending as well. Any questions or comments?

Now, if I could just add there has already been an ExCom call taking place earlier on which I believe was last week, and in that there was an additional action item which was to extend not only the future work that would take place in At-Large – not to have it only dealt with by the Future Challenges Working Group but also the ALAC itself. There are several tracks which I think we are going to have to follow, from capacity building on one side to outreach on the other side but also what does it mean for our community to be active and what does it mean for the multi-stakeholder model? How do we interact with all of this?

---

Okay, so I guess we can then without any additional comments move to the review of the current At-Large Structure applications. And I will ask Matt to go through these, please. Matt, you have the floor. Matt Ashtiani, we cannot hear you at the moment.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. May I go ahead and do that for Matt?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Heidi. You seem to have staff that is mute today.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, it's my plan. [laughing]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wow!

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I'm kidding.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a great bottom-up, fantastic! [laughing] Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm wondering where everyone is, that's what I'm wondering. Okay, recently accredited ALSes, we have Asociación de Escribanos del Uruguay, and apologies for my Spanish – and I don't know why that says EURALO, that should be LACRALO; Internet Society Philippine Chapter –

---

that is in APRALO; and dothIV – that ALS is in EURALO. And again, just to point out that with those three we have 151 ALSes so a big milestone of over 150 has been reached, so congratulations to everyone. And several more are in line.

So organizations that are currently applying: Ray Services in AFRALO – AFRALO actually asked that they're going to suggest that that organization consider applying to the Business Constituency as a business organization; the University Community Partnership for Social Action Research – Matt is going to go back to that applicant and ask some questions as there were a lot of questions on the NARALO list regarding their governance, regarding their membership, etc.; the Armenian Association for the Disabled "Pyunic" – that is awaiting regional advice from APRALO; University of Library Studies and Information Technologies – that is in EURALO and ALAC will begin voting shortly on that application; and the Swiss Privacy Foundation – that actually has withdrawn their application because of some issues with the due diligence process that are actually posted, and they had some concerns about that. And that's all, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi, and I note a few names in the list of participants on the Adobe Connect at the moment including Winthrop Yu from the Internet Society Philippines Chapter if I understand correctly. Winthrop, are you there?

WINTHROP YU: Yes, good evening everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome! It's always great to have new members joining on the ALAC call as guests and I think it's a great thing. I hope that you have an interesting couple of hours or hour and a half, and just to let you know that the calls are open to everyone. So if you have any questions you're very welcome to put your hand up on the Adobe page and basically ask questions and take part in the discussion. Do you have a few words for us?

WINTHROP YU: Yes, we're glad to be a part of the ICANN At-Large and we hope to participate more actively once we get up to speed. Thank you for having us participate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great, thank you very much for attending. Yaovi Atohoun, you have your hand up. Yaovi, you have the floor.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you. Can you hear me?

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

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you, Yaovi speaking. I have a comment and this is regarding the At-Large Structures. It is a general comment, and I want us to maybe

---

think about the criteria of the structures that can be At-Large Structures. Like I have to give a general example: if somebody has a business organization who wants to become a member or who wants to become an At-Large Structure, sometimes it can be very difficult because primarily we like to have these Structures being constituted by users, end users. But if I take a case of a university for example, you have thousands of students that are users; but if we have an association of students, that can be something different. If we have a university, that is an organization that would like to be a member or an At-Large Structure.

So I just want us to think about it. Maybe I'm wrong but sometimes I'm wondering myself who should we receive as At-Large Structures. This is just a general comment so that we can all go back and think about the organizations that could be members or At-Large Structures. I can be wrong, this is why I'm saying that I have to go back also and read, and maybe I'm wrong. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yaovi, and I note that Tijani has put his hand up. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I think that an application for an ALS is acceptable if it is not a commercial entity. At the end, everyone is an end user, everyone – the student is an end user, a teacher is end user, so any university or any association of I don't know, students, etc., they are all users. And they could be a member. But if they are a for-profit



---

organization we cannot accept them because there will be... We have to think about the public interest and we are defending the public interest. So any end user without interest, without financial interest is eligible to be an ALS. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani, and there is strictly speaking, the ALS membership does not mention that the organization should be noncommercial as such. But it is left to the appreciation of each RALO, and I do know of some applications that have not been given a green light due to the fact that they were too commercial in nature. But you are absolutely right that universities or student associations might be eligible. I see Carlton has put his hand up. Go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Olivier, this is Carlton for the record. I wanted to add to what Tijani was saying, that there's always been a concern for associations or groupings that are funded by the government. And at one point it was a blanket opposition to that, and some of us have pointed out – and there've been deliberations on this in the ALAC – that for example, students' associations, universities in our part of the world, most all of them though it's changing now, get some kind of public support. So we couldn't use the fact that they were financed in part by the government as a sole determinant of them not being accorded ALS status. I just wanted to put that on the record, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Carlton. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I think we need to highlight what the rules are because they're buried so deep in the website they're almost impossible to find. But we had long discussions when these rules were being established, and we went through all the iterations of what we want to allow, what we don't want to allow certain things; and came to the realization that in many parts of the world, things that in North America might be completely ridiculous in looking at a user organization, in other parts of the world that's the norm.

So government involvement, commercial involvement – all of those are not disallowed as long as the organization is controlled by users from that region. There's probably some other extraneous things but that's the core part of it, and we can't differentiate because otherwise there are whole regions where – and specifically in countries and small countries – where things are very intermixed. And it's not our job to tell them how to run their organizations as long as they're user-controlled. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. Yes, Alan, I understand your concern but an organization or an association or a grouping can be funded, not completely funded but can be helped via financial support from government but it's mainly an end user association or grouping. In this case it is eligible. But for those who are fully funded by the government

---

so they are controlled by the government, I don't think that they can defend the public interest inside At-Large. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. I think we are all understanding each other on this so I don't want to extend the discussion-

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I'd like a comment on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Alan, go ahead and-

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think we have to judge it on the merits of the specific case. I know of plenty of organizations that subsist on government grants – that's where their money comes from but they're not controlled by the government. So I think you have to look at how the organization runs and I don't think we can make global statements like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I think that's what Tijani meant, the control by the government in opposition to control by the users.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but that's not the same as funding.

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, that's true.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, and I see agreement from Carlton. Okay, I think that we can move on, and I guess that so far the way that we've worked it out was working rather well. I can see many RALOs, well maybe not many rejections of applications but those applications that clearly did not respond to end users, that were not controlled by end users were very clearly pushed out of the way and were told to move elsewhere. There might be other homes for them in ICANN.

So anyway, let's move on now to the next part of our meeting and that's agenda Item #5 where we have the reports. And I see here only five minutes allocated to this one – I think it might take a little more time, maybe six or seven. If we can just have the reports from our GNSO Liaison and our ccNSO Liaison, and also our SSAC Liaison. If we can start with the GNSO, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Nothing that needs verbal report. There are two meeting reports actually on the Liaison Wiki site because there was a special meeting yesterday to attempt to select ATRT endorsers or do ATRT endorsement – and I do say “attempt” because they ended up not being able to do that. But you can read the details there, nothing particularly startling. And there's a lot going on but nothing I think that warrants spending time here right now.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. If you do remember anything else, I guess probably in parts of the discussions that we'll have later on?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, there's a few things that will come up as we go along but nothing that needs to be highlighted right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And now the report from the ccNSO Liaison, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Cheryl for the transcript record. Like Alan, there's lots of little things going on but of particular note in terms of interest for the ALAC is, and I think at the moment I'm just checking down – I don't believe Hong Xue is on the call... No, she isn't. The ccNSO Council has recently gathered its surveys for feedback for the ICANN Academy, so I know that is pending and forthcoming. So I think that's important to note, and I would like to think that the other AC and SO feedback is coming in as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I see nobody having put their hand up so there are no questions so far on the GNSO or the ccNSO reports. Then I'll ask Julie Hammer if she is ready to provide her SSAC, just a briefing on her SSAC report.

---

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Olivier. Can everyone hear me?

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

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you – Julie Hammer for the record. I've just posted my January monthly report. We haven't had an SSAC meeting in the last month but the SSAC Activity Report for Q3 and Q4 2012 was posted during this last period and that contains a summary of the work planned and the activities of the SSAC really over the last twelve months. And it also gives some details about the active work parties as we go into the new year, so I've included a link to that document in my Liaison report and just a summary of the active work parties. That's about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julie. It's very good and thanks for all the hard work to all of our Liaisons. The work they do in At-Large is only part of the iceberg of all of what goes on on the other side, in the other parts of ICANN. So it's really great to have them, to know quickly what's going on in that part of the world.

Just one thing: you will note, everyone will note that on their Adobe Connect screen there is a link to the agenda which is on our Wiki page. Now, that agenda has the link that goes over to the RALO and Liaison Wiki page under "Reports." It's just to let you know that that At-Large reports from work groups, Liaisons and RALOs is something that I really recommend everyone bookmarks. I often hear people are unable to find

information and that's one of the key pages. Being able to refer to these reports very quickly, bookmark them in your web browser and you'll be able to jump directly to that.

And I am mentioning the bookmarks because the next part of our agenda is going to look at the new business, and that's the items for decision. But just before that there is an NCSG Liaison report, IDN Liaison report and well, sadly no .mobi Liaison report anymore but you can also consult those directly from those reports from work groups, Liaisons and RALOs. You can also have access to the standing working groups, all of the pointers to those, so it's a very helpful thing indeed. And further down of course there are all the RALO reports – AFRALO, APRALO, EURALO, LACRALO and NARALO.

I don't think we have enough time to go through all of the RALOs but I do thank everyone who has submitted, all the Secretaries who have submitted their RALO reports. It's very important at the local level for someone to find out what is going on locally. And Heidi has just quickly texted me that she is going to hound the RALOs and the Liaisons to give their reports in time for any who have not, so thank you very much, Heidi. I paraphrased in a rather stronger way than you said you're going to ask very nicely, sorry. [laughter]

Okay, so moving on, the new business, items for decision – Policy Advice Development Page. Now this is another of these pages which are particularly interesting that you can bookmark. That provides details with all of the open statements and all of the closed statements underneath that. It's a wonderful Wiki page. I would say that this is

---

something which you can look at every couple of days to keep track of what's going on and where work is required.

And so we can quickly go through the recently-approved ALAC statements, and the first one was the Trademark Clearinghouse Strawman Solution. There was a discussion as some of you might know... Perhaps, should I just let Alan explain what the Strawman solution was? Alan and Evan were involved in this specifically.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, Olivier, I'm not going to go into the details. We've talked about it a number of times already. These are essentially some... They came out of a list of requests that the Business Constituency and IPC made in Toronto to ICANN staff. A meeting was held in Los Angeles which we participated in remotely which evolved some of these issues and they became the Strawman. Some are deemed to be implementation and they will likely go ahead. Some are questionable – the staff has deemed them implementation; others including ALAC have said they sound like policy to us and it's not clear what's going to happen with those. And lastly there are some which everyone agrees are policy issues.

There was a significant discussion at the last GNSO meeting on this because the item was on their agenda also. It bears reading in my report I think. The discussion started off with very much a tone of "GNSO is the policy organization for gTLDs – if the idea doesn't come from us, no one else should be on our turf and this idea is ridiculous and we should tell them..." They didn't quite say it like that but basically tell them where to go. By the time the discussion ended they seemed to realize that the Strawman concept is not necessarily at odds with a



policy discussion and is the start of it, and maybe they need to do some work on the items that are deemed to be policy. They can't just say "It didn't come from us, we're not talking about it."

So I think things are heading in the right direction. It's still not clear exactly how this will proceed but I think the relationship between these kinds of discussions is far more healthy than it might have come out. There's an interesting parallel and it's quite interesting – someone from the Registrar Stakeholder Group had said that basically the GNSO is the policymaking organization, this Strawman is ridiculous, it's done the wrong way. However, the discussion that is going on right now between ICANN staff and the registrars on privacy and proxy services and how to essentially take those under the control of ICANN and accredit them or some process like that – what they're coming out with now they're calling a Strawman. And everyone seems to agree that this will feed into a PDP.

So once we started using the term it's now being used somewhere else and it's being used in a very healthy manner, and I think... I was the one who told the GNSO about this because I had heard about it in another meeting and I think that helped to focus on the fact that just because it's developed by a private group where not everyone is invited doesn't mean it can't have good ideas that merit discussion. So I think things are going better than they might have gone. It's still unclear what path is going to be followed to actually resolve these issues, though. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan, for this summary and this follow-up beyond the response that we had provided regarding the Trademark Clearinghouse Strawman Solution.

The next one which was passed was the Protection of IGO and INGO – so that’s international governmental organization and international nongovernmental organization – Identifiers in All gTLDs. That’s the famous Red Cross/International Olympic Committee – RC/IOC – discussions which we had for a very long time and which did generate a lot of discussion in the past. So we had a statement that was drafted on this. Thank you very much again to Alan and to Evan who did most of the work on this. There was a lot of input and also some significant input from Jovan Kurbalija of the DiploFoundation, someone who knows the ins and outs of IGOs, INGOs, etc. It’s a very good statement and I understand this was then taken by the GNSO working group that is working on this and was quite well discussed. Alan or Evan, were you on the call that took the inputs?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I was on the call. As it turns out the deadline was I think last Thursday or a few days before the meeting that was last Wednesday and it turns out that ALAC was the only one who had submitted a statement on time; since then a few others have come in. So we were given the opportunity, well I was given the opportunity to review it and there was some discussion on it including some good questions.

There is a fair amount of objection to some of the concepts we’re putting forward because we’re saying that this cannot be purely objective, mechanically-derived; that if someone is going to get

protections they should apply for it and should have a good rationale – that we shouldn't be granting these kinds of protections just based on some sort of status if there is no indication of any need. And I'm actually working on a little document to submit to the working group, which I'll of course share with ALAC, looking at some sample IGOs. And you find they're quite different, IGOs and nongovernmental organizations. There are IGOs that basically have registered their own .name and have absolutely no defensive registrations at all, and the names are used by other people, but apparently they've decided that that's just fine.

So there's certainly examples that exist of why we shouldn't grant special protections for some IGOs or at least if there's no evident need for it; and others there clearly is a need. It's quite interesting. There are services around that will tell you how many domains are owned by the same email address that owns a particular one. So if you go to [www.microsoft.com](http://www.microsoft.com) and see how many other domains are registered to the same entity you'll find it's about 450,000 – clearly a lot of defensive names because they don't have 450,000 trademark names that they're registering uniquely. On the other hand, if you go to some other ones you'll find that there's one or two or three and they're very, very different situations and they vary heavily between them.

So it's an interesting world we're in. It's not clear how this is going to unwind. The registries have come up with a statement basically saying "Keep the IOC and Red Cross ones that were recommended on an interim basis" – which I think in my mind translates to "Let's not fight with the GAC over this, it is not worth it" and offer no other protections.

---

---

So we're seeing some very extreme ends to the spectrum. It's not at all clear how this is going to unfold. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier. Alan, I'm sorry I wasn't able to make the last meeting but I'm curious to know one reaction to a particular point that ALAC perhaps uniquely has raised, and that is that there are non-treaty organizations such as Oxfam and Médecins Sans Frontières that in our belief are actually more deserving of protection than the INGOs that are asking for it. Was there any comment on that? Because this is a concept I don't know has been raised within this group and I'm curious to know what kind of reaction.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, it has been raised by others, or at least one other person who has pointed out that the wording in the charter – and it came right out of the issue report: it talks about international nongovernmental organizations that are protected by treaty or perhaps and national law. And first of all it's not clear whether it's treaty and/or national law – is it one or the other or both? And the implication from the history of the Red Cross and IOC is it's both. And she's pointed out correctly that there probably are no other organizations in the world other than the IOC and the Red Cross that meet that criteria, and do we really want to limit it to that narrow a scope or do we want to offer some level of

---

protection if we're going to offer any protection at all to other organizations? And the kind we're talking about are the examples.

So we're not unique. There's not an awful lot of support. It's clear that there are potentially tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of international nongovernmental organizations of various sorts, and people in general are reluctant certainly to opening it up to all of them and don't want to have to make judgment calls to decide which are worthy and which are not. The full concept of worthiness is very objectionable to some people, partly because of the effort and work involved and partly because they may exclude them if we start measuring worthiness.

So we're not unique. It wasn't discussed a lot in the context of our paper. It has already been discussed a fair amount in the context of exactly what INGOs are we talking about – is it just the two or is it a wider group? And the wider group almost surely implies non-treaty based. So that's completely unresolved. I suspect the group will end up taking the easy way out and say "Let's not make our job more complicated and add more groups, and subjective criteria into it" but we'll see where it goes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and I'd like to move on. I think we've gone through a good review of these two. So now the ALAC Demarche to ICANN I touched on a little bit earlier in mentioning that the email was actually sent to Fadi Chehadé. I actually checked and it was sent to the Chair of the ICANN Board with a copy to the ICANN CEO and also a copy to Sebastien Bachollet, the Chair of the Public Participation Committee.

---

We have received no official reply yet. Sebastien was online – do you have anything that you can add since you were one of the recipients?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello. Yeah, I can add that it's on our agenda for the PPC meeting on the 31<sup>st</sup> of January and it will be also discussed on some meetings about specifically Beijing issues. And I will check with the Chair of the Board on where and how we can (inaudible). But as we have a retreat the 31<sup>st</sup>, the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February we will take care of that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Sebastien. So now we are looking at the statements currently being developed, reviewed or voted on by the ALAC. The first one is 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 that's the second public comment draft. You will note I am speaking slowly specifically on this because I think the interpreters might be having problems if I go through this at full speed.

The ALAC is voting on this statement and I have to thank Edmon Chung and Rinalia Abdul Rahim for their hard work in the IDN Working Group to have drafted this. There have been a lot of IDN statements recently because there's been a lot of work with respect to IDNs – so really, really great.

Next, the Statement on the WCIT Outcomes...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi, if I could just add something?

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, sorry to interrupt without putting my hand up but I've just seen that Rinalia is not on the call. She has asked that if there is interest by the At-Large community when an IDN, a major IDN public comment comes up that an IDN Working Group webinar be scheduled to allow staff or other experts on the IDN to explain that public comment so it will help At-Large in the development of their statement. So that's a new development, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Heidi. And of course, when one mentions IDNs one often thinks of the Chinese, the Korean scripts, the Japanese scripts; but in fact, IDNs are also scripts that would actually include accents on the "e" and "a" and there are many, many different scripts that are considered IDNs – anything that is not standard A-Z script without the accents is considered an IDN. So there's also Greek script and Cyrillic script, so lots of interest in this I'm sure and lots of movement going on.

So that's noted then. So then we can move to the Statement on the WCIT Outcomes. I've just mentioned that a statement will be forthcoming from myself.

The Report on the GNSO Working Group on Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition – Evan has kindly drafted a first draft on this. I

---

will work with him to make a few amendments and I expect within the next few days we will have something that will be ready to go out for voting and to be able to send a statement out.

Next, the Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group and the ALAC is voting on this as well. And I also have to thank everyone who was involved in drafting this. I know that Alan was the main person who held the pen but there was again a lot of input on it. Anything to do with thick WHOIS is something that has become highly discussed by a lot of people and of course we have a working group as well, so that's really great. Any comments or questions on any of these?

I see no one putting their hand up so let's move on-

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan put his hand up but slowly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan was too slow in putting his hand up but I'll let Alan speak. Go ahead, Alan. [laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Input is feeding into the Thick WHOIS Group from other stakeholder groups and individuals. And it's interesting – there is a potentially huge battle on the privacy issue. The NCUC as can be expected, and I think I forwarded these statements to the ALAC – the NCUC has an extensive answer on why privacy should let everything lie within WHOIS. And VeriSign in fact has come up with a statement sort of similar to it although a lot sparser.



---

And I'm having an awful lot of difficulty understanding why having a domain WHOIS information moved to a company in the US makes it any more publicly available than a rule from ICANN saying the registrar in whatever country it originally was in must make it publicly available; and that that database is echoed and copied and mined extensively so that there are copies available in many other places. I really don't understand why it's more accessible. If there's anyone on this call or anyone else who understands why I really would like to know. But it looks like there's going to be an interesting discussion going on there, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, just quickly, as a quick reminder for those people who are not well-versed on what thick and thin WHOIS are, what is the difference between thick and thin WHOIS?

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope there aren't too many of those people since we're voting on a statement on that right now, so I would like to think-

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm talking about some of the observers here.

ALAN GREENBERG: In a thin WHOIS, and currently there's only a few TLDs but they include .com and .net, the bulk of the-

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: .net is no more.

ALAN GREENBERG: The bulk of the registrant data is kept solely at the registrar. In a thin WHOIS, all of that data that is typically visible in a WHOIS is moved, is copied to the registry and the registry is the distributor of that information.

CARLTON SAMUELS: You meant to say “thick WHOIS,” Alan, in the last sentence.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’m sorry. In a thick WHOIS the registry has the bulk of the data – the registrar likely still has a copy but the registry is the official repository of it. In a thin WHOIS essentially the only information the registry keeps is when does the name expire and who is the registrar and a few other bits of information. All new registries are thick.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Maybe we should use another term. [laughter] And the corrections, by the way – for the transcript the corrections came from Carlton Samuels. But first we have Fatima Cambronero, please. You have the floor, Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Olivier. I am Fatima for the record. I would like to ask a question more than a comment. I was following the discussion in the list and I see that a very interesting issue is the WHOIS issue, but

---

this is a topic that is not quite clear. So my question is, is there any possibility to have a webinar regarding this issue? That's my question, thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima, and actually we can ask the Chair of the WHOIS Working Group, and that's Carlton Samuels who just happens to have his hand up. Go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Olivier, this is Carlton for the record. Yes, Fatima, we have had the webinars on WHOIS before but we'd be happy to put on another one. We are going to have a meeting at Beijing and we intend to, we can use that as a basis to bring in some WHOIS experts to say what the issues are. What we've done is that we've, and I've been deliberate about this, is to make entries on the list that is provocative, that will allow people to say... Well, you see rehashing of most of the positions but you also see nuances developing.

One of the nuances is the issue of the privacy and how you get around that. Let me tell you what the real key issue is, it's this: the current policy says that WHOIS data, and this is a very circumscribed bits and pieces of information about a registrant, must be publicly available to internet users. And it says you must put it on a website or you can have it by (inaudible) entry, but I mean those are details.

The US government as part of the Affirmation of Commitments specifically requires that that aspect of WHOIS is observed by ICANN. There are people who believe that to fulfill that obligation is diminution,

---

reduces the privacy rights of people, registrants. And when you have a thick WHOIS, and remember now, Alan has told you that the two largest thin WHOIS registries are .net and .com, which have the bulk of registrations. The fact that they are US-based and the fact that they then, if they are made to become thick they would be subject to the general policy positions of the US government. And that is why some people think it is a real problem for those to migrate to the thick WHOIS model.

That's one of the things you're seeing there, this fear that if the thick WHOIS PDP then agrees that all registries should be thick then the two registries with the bulk of registrations would then become thick; and therefore, because they are largely located in the United States of America they would become subject to the public interest perspective of the United States government. That is one of the major things.

In the discussions so far you will see that there is some movement from the major proponents of privacy to say "Well yes, you can retain the right of end users to access the WHOIS data but with certain safeguards," and that is where this argument seems to be moving: "Yes, you have to be registered, you have to be willing to say who you are and why you need it, etc., etc."

So we are seeing some movement, not in the whole group but certainly in some of the major proponents of privacy – absolute privacy in other words. Yes, it is. I suspect they are beginning to understand that you will not get through this process with an absolute privacy requirement; that is to say, end users should not have access to WHOIS data. But what I think is emerging is the reality check that you probably will not

---

have a 180<sup>o</sup> change in the policy perspective from the United States government. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much, Carlton, and thank you for this long intervention on WHOIS – clearly a very, very interesting subject indeed that touches on privacy, it touches on a lot of different things and there are many different views around WHOIS. I don't wish to turn the ALAC call into a WHOIS discussion. I think there is enough interest in the community and I have to thank Fatima for even popping the question on this. There's enough lack of knowledge perhaps, of in-depth knowledge in many parts of the world that it would be really good to have a WHOIS webinar – not only as a webinar but perhaps having people take part from the At-Large community that have vastly different views and different points of view on this.

I can see that Avri mentions "Thick WHOIS doesn't only diminish the privacy, it also increases the danger in some cases." I can see Garth Bruen mentioning another point of view with regards to the workload and obligations of the registries. This seems to be quite an extensive subject and a webinar will be really helpful. I still have Alan and Tijani in the queue. I'll close the queue after Tijani. So Alan, you have the floor.

**ALAN GREENBERG:** Thank you, just a very quick statement. I think it's really important that we try to separate the issues. There are some very real and very significant and possibly very difficult privacy issues associated with WHOIS. When WHOIS was designed decades ago they weren't

---

considered. They're relevant now and they're going to have to be addressed if ICANN is ever to get out of this jungle that it's in right now.

It is less clear and there are very different opinions whether these privacy issues change between thick and thin. So I think it's important to try to the extent possible to separate them and not merge the two arguments together. The discussions that have been happening on the At-Large list over the last few days are very much WHOIS discussions and you can see there are many different positions. They're not necessarily thick and thin WHOIS although there's some difference on that also. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I also note that many other parts of ICANN have discussed this. There was an SSAC report also about WHOIS. There is some discussion also going on on the technical side of things. It really touches on a very wide range of things and I hope that we can have a webinar that will touch on those, that might be an hour or maybe even an hour and a half long since the subject is so wide and so complex. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. If you think there is a lack of knowledge about WHOIS I think it is a very good subject for the Capacity Building Working Group to [present] (inaudible). So as an action item I propose to the Working Group the request of ALAC to put in the WHOIS issue. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Sorry, I didn't understand your last sentence. Did staff catch this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. Yes, I caught that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay perfect, thank you. And now I'll have to read the action item from staff then because I didn't catch it, sorry. Okay, fantastic, well thank you very much, Tijani.

So we'll move on then to the currently open public comments. I didn't think we were going to speak so much but I guess that we had important matters to discuss. A few statements still in the pipeline at the moment: first, the Consultation on the IANA Secure Notification Process. The comment period has been extended to the 28<sup>th</sup> of February. So far we have decided there would be no statement on this; it's a highly technical thing. If anyone thinks that we should have a statement you're very welcome to either put your hand up now or type into the chat.

Otherwise, the next one is the R3 White Paper on Future Challenges entitled "Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive and Respected." That was of course the R3 paper. The initial comment period closed on the 11<sup>th</sup> of January and the reply period will close on the 1<sup>st</sup> of February. Past that time the Future Challenges Working Group will be looking at responses and will proceed forward. Evan, just a couple of words – what's your plans after this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Olivier, this is Evan. Right now Jean-Jacques and I are going to be working to coalesce the various responses and produce a reply to them. In some cases I can see how this may actually lead to perhaps some changes in the document itself which will be brought back to the Future Challenges Working Group – it won't be arbitrarily done by Jean-Jacques and myself. But at the same time there are a couple of comments that we saw that will probably not be leading to changes in the document but at least will provoke a response from the Working Group at least to explain why we did not implement them.

Right now the work on that is ongoing at this time. There will not be any changes to the document itself made without the full consent of the Working Group. Because that was approved by ALAC, any modifications like that will be coming back here. But right now we're in the process of seeing what if any changes need to be made in light of the responses we've received.

One thing that we are planning to have right now is a workshop on the R3 Paper in Beijing. There will not be a formal meeting of the Future Challenges Working Group in Beijing; however, we will be running an open ICANN workshop on the document. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Evan. So next we have the .cat Cross-Ownership Removal Request, and the reply period closes on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February, 2013. The comment period closed yesterday. No statement so far and I



---

haven't heard anyone jumping up and down in the past few weeks for this to have a statement.

The next one: the Amendment to Article VI Section 2.3 of the ICANN Bylaws, and that is the DNS Root Server System Advisory Committee – the RSSAC – are looking at changing something in their Bylaws. The ALAC is currently considering a statement. I wonder would anybody be able to speak on this who is aware of RSSAC? I'm not sure if Julie Hammer has had a look at this or whether Alan Greenberg can help us out – anyone who is closer to RSSAC than any of us?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have not, this is Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. So perhaps-

JULIE HAMMER: Julie here, I haven't either, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You haven't, okay. That's okay – we can quickly have a look. Effectively it is just something that changes in their Bylaws. In the past we have not, except in exceptional circumstances we have not looked too closely at Bylaw changes or commented on Bylaw changes elsewhere except when we were in support. No doubt there is a valid reason for these bylaws to be changed, and our knowledge of the RSSAC as I can see here is not as great as it could be or at least as the members of RSSAC

---

are. But I see Sebastien has his hand up. Maybe Sebastien Bachollet can help us out?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's Sebastien, I may try at least. It's really... To summarize the situation, it's to align the RSSAC to how the SSAC is working, and to allow for example to have a period of participation, that the Chair is not the Chair indefinitely, and some other small things. If you want the main idea is to align that and we are obliged to do that within the Bylaw because currently it's in the Bylaw. But in our mind it would be better to go to another document than to change the Bylaws every two days because we have to change a little thing in the working of one SO or AC.

That's also something that we will work on in the future, to have shorter Bylaws with the main items and ideas to run ICANN but not each and every AC and SO within this document. I hope it will be coming soon and that it will allow less change in the Bylaws itself. But for the RSSAC it's really to allow a better view on how it's organized, who is in charge of for how long a time – that's the goal of these Bylaw changes. Thank you. Now I say that as a member of the Structural Improvements Committee who is a member of the subgroup to discuss with the current members of the RSSAC to evolve that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you very much, Sebastien, that's very helpful. Certainly any improvements to the system and to how things work is always something that is welcome by this community. So I don't think there

---

would be any objection in this community for the RSSAC improving itself.

So we can then move to the next one which is the Preliminary Issue Report on the Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information. Now, this one is interesting. It is a preliminary issue report so it is very early, something that's coming very early on; and it's to do with well, as it says, translation and transliteration of contact information. Any comments on this for the time being? I must say I have not got very much knowledge on this. I read through this and I didn't think that something specific was necessary since we are so early on. Does anyone think otherwise? So I see no one putting their hand up. I gather that at this point in time we could decide that the ALAC will not be making a statement. Okay, thank you.

Next, the Consultation on the gTLD Delegation and Redefinition Performance Standards, and the Consultation on the ccTLD Delegation and Redefinition Performance Standards – now, these two are effectively using the same language but one is relating to the generic TLDs and one to the country code TLDs. There has been a discussion on the ExCom call last week and both Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Alan Greenberg have announced that they would then prepare a draft joint statement since the issues are similar. And one is our ccNSO Liaison and one is our GNSO Liaison.

Do any of the two of you wish to just explain quickly what is at stake on this?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, Cheryl here. I'm rebooting my computer so I'm not in the room to put up my hand. Very, very briefly these issues are extremely important for internet end users and global internet communities. I think it's important that as I presented and Alan and I agreed in the Executive Committee meeting that we do make a comment.

I doubt that it will be of a particularly novel or substantial focus, but we do need to make sure that things for example, and the questions being raised in these two separate but identically-worded inquiries are answered, and issues such as key performance indicators for IANA on these delegations and redelegations – if we are to be assured, for example, that the internet end user and internet community in any particular area that's being affected, be it a G space or a ccTLD, has sufficient time to have been properly informed and whatever community interaction and opinion being sought from that community to happen, then for example a 60-day IANA time may or may indeed not be suitable.

So we need to look at the performance indicators that are being set; ones that actually reflects internet end users' best interests, or should I also suggest the public interest as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this summary and we look forward to seeing the first draft of this statement. Next is the IDN Variant TLD Program – yes, more internationalized domain names – Draft Final Report Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs. The comment period closes on the 8<sup>th</sup> of February; the reply period will close on the 1<sup>st</sup> of March. We have asked the IDN Working

Group whether there will be a statement on this. I cannot see Rinalia on the list, nor can I see Edmon Chung unfortunately. Is anyone aware of any of the workings? I think we'll just have to keep this one to the side for the time being but I believe that there will be a statement that will be drafted on this.

So any questions or comments on any of our comments that we're responding to? Just a quick reminder, one thing I am concerned about – I have seen many statements drafted by Alan, and well done to Alan for having done all the work. But really this is a joint effort from everyone and I would really like to see more ALAC members and even non-ALAC members hold the pen in those statements. It's really important that we get diversity of main authors in addition to having a diversity of views that comes in.

So please, I do hope that there will be more volunteers in future calls when we do have some wave of comments that are required. It always comes in as a wave, usually just before an ICANN meeting so things will get hotter as we reach Beijing, and at that point I think it will be absolutely both unfair and impossible for one person to hold many, many different pens for many different statements.

But I do have to thank Alan very much for the work that he has done here in the past month during the holiday period when many people were unavailable; and I do also have to thank Evan for having been able to both tour around India – well, maybe not tour around India but the work he's done while he was away. He was still able to remain in touch and cope with things back in the ALAC world.

---

Did I just see “Welcome, Rinalia” here? Has Rinalia just made it? Yes, she has. Rinalia, I’m not sure if you can hear us. We just touched on the IDN Variant TLD Program Draft Final Report Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs. Will the IDN Working Group be drafting a comment?

And the response from Rinalia is she needs to consult Edmon. Edmon’s the lead on that one, oaky. So we will wait on Edmon Chung’s reply to this, thank you.

Okay, let’s next go to the Items for Discussion, and the first one, agenda Item #7 is the Post-WCIT Discussion – Moving Forward with At-Large. We have a webinar that took place last week and everyone was invited. We had an excellent turnout for this. Heidi, how many people did we have in the webinar in total?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

This is Heidi. We had 39 which is a new total. I was going to check those figures but I believe that is correct.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thirty-nine, 39 attendees; an excellent panel and I have to thank all of the panelists. For those of you who were not able to attend, the recording is available. I think it has been publicized everywhere and I believe there is also a transcript that will be available very soon. It was a very interesting webinar and now we need to think about what we do next. And one of the things which I mentioned earlier and which I will do is to provide my point of view or some of the insider discussions that

---

took place whilst we were behind closed doors, and effectively where the really sticky points were.

One of the things which I have noticed, well, there are two main things I have noticed. The first one is that several of our At-Large Structures were involved both on the ground in Dubai but also with their own governments back home; and not only their governments but also with their own communities back home. And so this ability to act locally is a real force that we need to make sure we tap into and that we make use of. And I think it's a real force that has been recognized already by Sally Costerton, who is the new Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement. I had a meeting with her in London last week, or was it the week before last week – sorry, two weeks ago. We had a long discussion and there certainly is going to be a lot of things that ICANN has to do; but there's also going to be some involvement from our community and we need to be prepared for this.

There are a number of things that I'd like to put on the table with regards to moving forward with At-Large. The first one is that of local community engagement worldwide. It was quite clear that the local community is not only the civil society sector but we're also speaking about governments, we are speaking about all of the actors – whether they are private sector or civil society, or governments or non-governments as well. All of these actors really have to have their hands held to bring them to the multi-stakeholder table.

It's a real shame that when you speak about multi-stakeholderism many organizations, many people in countries that support democracy and that support the internet believe that the current institutions are not

---

doing the job that they should do to bring them to the table. I've had a number of people that have come to me between the sessions and have said "Oh, we've heard you are the Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee in ICANN, but you know, we have tried getting involved in ICANN with no success whatsoever. We were pushed back. It's like an insider club."

And I've heard this accusation a number of times, and really it is up to our communities to do the work to change this. We can change this both inside ICANN, and I do hope that our working groups will be able to present some work and some propositions to the Public Participation Committee and to the various parts of the Board that deal with stakeholder engagement; but also that our ALSes will be able to work on the ground to engage their local stakeholders. And for this we really need to have some renewed work with the Outreach Working Group, and this is getting... I think it really is the right time to start pushing on this.

Also the inreach is very important – capacity building. And I can hear Tijani already putting his hand up, going "Yes, yes, capacity building," and many actually. We really have to take this seriously. I believe that this is going to be taken seriously at an ICANN-wide level, but the work that we have done so far on a shoestring budget has been recognized and have already shown thanks the events that have taken place in Dubai – have already shown to really help. So we do have the knowledge that is required for capacity building and our General Assemblies and local works, such as the Showcase – well, all of the work that has taken place in our regions and our RALOs in Dakar, in Costa Rica, in Toronto and that's going to also take place in Beijing is



---

something which is knowledge that we have now put in. And we need to finalize this and put this into some kind of document and the knowledge management, and let other parts of ICANN also learn about this.

So I'd like to open the floor for a brief discussion on this, because we have on the one side, for capacity building we have the ICANN Academy Working Group that's working on things and then we also have the effort that Sala is leading, and of course the work from Tijani who is co-chairing the Capacity Building. Where do we go from here and how do we basically take the first step into moving forward with and engaging the communities, and bridging that digital gap that we have between those who understand the model, the multi-stakeholder model, and those that don't so far? Feedback required. I might have just rambled a little bit too long... Tijani Ben Jemaa, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I don't agree with you when you said that people come into ICANN and were pushed back; at least for AFRALO it was never the case. But continually we are always trying to find people and to bring them to ICANN. I think that this is not real I think because everything is open in ICANN, in our RALOs – everything is open so everyone can see everything we are doing. And if someone comes and tries to be involved in a RALO as an ALS, for AFRALO for example we rejected only two applications because they were more business [groups] and we thought they could not defend the public interest.

Don't forget that At-Large is always defending the public interest. But all the others were either accepted or rejected because of other things,

---

because they are not real, because there are lies inside the application. But most of them were accepted. On the other hand, everywhere we go, every fora we go even if it is not sponsored by ICANN, we try to lobby for ICANN. We try to find other ALSes. So I think this is not... If someone says he was pushed back please give him to us and let him tell us why he was pushed back.

A second point regarding capacity building – you are absolutely right. We need a lot of effort in capacity building and I think that now we have more or less a rational scheme of how we can do the capacity building in a good way. We have the Capacity Building Working Group to define the needs in capacity building in our community, in the At-Large community. And we'll define also the trainees, the people who need the capacity building. This Working Group also will define the time, the best time for this capacity building and the tools to be used. And then the Academy will take over and the Academy will design, will define a curriculum for this piece of capacity building that will be done inside the ICANN Academy in the future.

So I think in the future it will be very well done, but now we still need to do capacity building outside the Academy because the Academy is not yet ready to work. It is under construction after all, so now we need to continue to do the capacity building and to excite our community as we did in Dakar, as we did in Costa Rica, etc., etc. And I think that the effort has to be supported by ALAC and by ICANN as a whole. It is very important, and I think that for example within AFRALO, we did the capacity building of Dakar but we showed that we need a complementary (inaudible) of the capacity building and we decided to do it virtually.

---

We are still working with the staff to define how it will be done and what are the pieces that need to be emphasized or highlighted in the future. So I think that it is an ongoing effort. We will never finish with it, and if we want our community to be really involved in ICANN and participative in ICANN we need to make the capacity building something that is really an ongoing issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. I totally entirely agree with what you've said. Just the first part when you mentioned whether there was any criticism, the criticism was not aimed at At-Large in particular – it was aimed at ICANN. And I think that part of it comes from the involvement or the reception that participants from developing countries get in the GNSO working groups or GNSO processes and also maybe some other parts of ICANN; but definitely not in At-Large where I know that this community here has been very welcoming of newcomers and there's been a lot of work done to involve the community into the processes.

I have Alan Greenberg and then Fatima Cambronero. So first, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just very quickly yeah, I was going to comment on what you just did – I thought your comments were made at ICANN in general, not necessarily At-Large although At-Large has been criticized similarly, not because we didn't welcome people but because we talk in such jargon and on such complex issues that without the timely ability to educate people that people get turned off. But I think generally it's an ICANN

---

issue, not necessarily an At-Large issue, and it's not limited to people from developing countries. There are people from other organizations who have tried to get involved and you know, have not necessarily been treated well when they start trying to get involved without being up to speed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Next is Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier, this is Fatima. Just a brief comment: somehow I sort of do not agree with what Tijani was saying in terms of the creation of capacity building and in the fact that we need lots of effort. I think, I personally believe that in some cases we do not need that much money and time – we need just goodwill and collaboration. So since Costa Rica, LACRALO has been developing in all our monthly calls the capacity building sessions. So we have been inviting, and we invited last year members of different constituencies and members of different parts of ICANN to come to our meetings and explain new issues.

So this year we'll keep on working with this program. We launched a survey for the LACRALO members, for the members themselves to be able to say, who are able to speak on topics. So we don't need to go to ICANN and ask them for money and we do not need to resort to foreign speakers because we ourselves can train among ourselves. So I think that's a very important step forward in order to stop asking for money, and that is something that we talked about with Natalia Enciso. We

---

know it is possible and we're working on that. So that's my comment, thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. And certainly yes, this total capacity building can be done on several levels. I must say yeah, I have attended several of the LACRALO monthly calls and the capacity building part of the call was very, very interesting indeed.

Just a few hours ago you had invited Andres Piazza who is working for LACNIC to share his experiences, and certainly that also raises the interest in many members during the RALO call because it's something new – it's not only the usual discussion about RALO problems. And it just changes the nature of the call from being routine to being something that you really look forward to.

And I hope that other RALOs will look at this very interesting suggestion because I certainly have seen the interest in LACRALO being raised thanks to these calls and thanks to these interventions. It's very helpful indeed.

Okay, I think we've gone around full circle on the Post-WCIT: Moving Forward with At-Large. The next step of this is of course for me to send that long report and we'll follow up next month on that. Next we have the Update from the Selected At-Large Working Groups with our working group chairs – three selected groups today: the Rules of Procedure Working Group chaired by Cheryl Langdon-Orr, the New gTLD Review Group with Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and the ALAC Subcommittee on the ATRT2 – that's Accountability and Transparency

---

Review Team 2. First, the Rules of Procedure Working Group, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Olivier, Cheryl for the transcript record. A very brief but important update for the ALAC on our pathway towards completion I'm calling it now of the Rules of Procedure; and indeed we need to remember that the Work Group is inclusive of other aspects of work such as the Metrics Subcommittee as well. But let me speak specifically for the Rules of Procedure which I'm sure all of the ALAC are waiting impatiently to get their hands on the draft – and I'm equally confident that they've bookmarked and they have updates from pages that are regularly being worked on by the various drafting teams (she said tongue-in-cheek) and that I won't have to do much in the way of introduction to the Draft for their review when it comes to them; and that I am perhaps slightly less keen to.

It may be, Olivier, that it may be appropriate to offer a specific, short, single-purpose teleconference should the ALAC so desire but that's something we can arrange once they have the draft Rules of Procedure in their hands. We still intend to have it in your hands, dear ALAC, probably between now and the February meeting – my guess is closer to the February meeting even though it was our intention to have it closer to the January meeting. And we are still aiming to have you discuss and interact and work with your work group for any conversation and creative and hopefully complimentary comments on the draft Rules of Procedure intercessionally.

---

What I do need to update you on, however, two particular matters, one of which will impinge upon activities in Beijing and one of which I would like to propose to you should impinge upon ALAC, Regional At-Large Organization and more importantly At-Large Structure activities between Beijing and the Durban meeting.

We have one particular line, I think the whole thing packs around 22 words in the current drafting stage of the Rules of Procedure which the Drafting Team has recently discussed in... I'm just trying to get my E's and S's and D's in the right order – it's the ESDT which is the Elections, Appointments and that piece of it Drafting Team. In Rule 27.7, that's the current number – it will probably be a different number when it comes to you in draft form, and 27.7 is the heart of the elections/selections rules which is focused on the ALAC and At-Large selection of the Board member to occupy Seat #15 of the ICANN Board – we have come to a particular point in the current draft of 27.7 which talks about what the definitions of the "electorate" is.

As you are all well aware, the electorate – thank you, Alan, yes, ESADT is now in the chat; I obviously couldn't get my E's and my S's and A's in the right order to know it, then again, it is 3:36 in the morning. The particular definition of the "electorate" which we currently work on is the 15-person ALAC and a vote being drawn, and probably under normal circumstances being held by the Chair or their designated delegate from each of the RALOs.

I would like to ask the ALAC that they accept the Rules of Procedure in their draft form for your consideration with that particular part, the definition of the "electorate" in 27.7 as uncompleted work; that it is

---

currently as it is the defined and community-established electorate, but that it takes on notice a need that has been discussed both in the long and indeed the short term for the community to have an opportunity to perhaps review and if needs be modify that definition.

To that end I'd be asking for you to accept your new Rules of Procedure as draft and hopefully accept them in their final form then; adopt them knowing that they will immediately have a community review process begun on that particular and only that particular aspect of 27.7. There will be a number of other things that have to be going concomitant to that – for example, should the community decide to change that definition of “electorate” then there are a couple of other parts of 27.7 that would be null and perhaps indeed declared void. But that is a sort of editorial thing that we would be able to do as we review that rule, and any effects that a change in the definition of “electorate” would mean to it.

The proposal that's currently on the table would be for the definition of the “electorate” for Seat #15 to in some way, shape, or form include the At-Large Structures. Now assuming that after the appropriate and might I suggest very short as possible amount of time devoted to having this worked out in the community – it certainly should be put to bed before the Durban meeting and I think ALAC has to accept that this is a priority issue for it; and you would probably be well advised to allow your existing Rules of Procedure Work Group with all its Drafting Teams to bring its expertise together to assist you in that – that that particular change in the definition of “electorate” would bring with it a number of other requirements.



---

For example, one would immediately see the need to have the inevitable, but it would need to be brought up in time now to sooner rather than later, full and conclusive audit of the continuing suitability and standards for all of the At-Large Structures that have not been recently appointed; in other words, those of us like the Internet Society of Australia and many others who have been At-Large Structures under claims and statements of appropriateness that go well and truly before the formation of the Regional At-Large Organizations. It's time that we would need to re-audit those and a process for a recheck and a fair and equitable redo I'll call it at the moment of due diligence, etc. as a report card for want of a better word on the At-Large Structures is probably going to have to be timed along with that.

If that is the case I've already raised with the APRALO meeting today that we would have as a region no problem in becoming a pilot to run such an audit or reaccreditation process once that is developed, and that would have to be done across all of the regions under the control of the ALAC obviously. But it would need to engage all of the regions for that. And we as a region, APRALO, would be able to put forward a suitable number if not all of our At-Large Structures to go through that as a pilot.

But it's a very long report. It is why I asked for time on the agenda. It's a heads up and watch this page. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this very extensive report indeed. And I have to thank the Rules of Procedure Working Group and working teams for all of the work that they have done to reach this level and this

---

moment where their mammoth task of rewriting our Rules of Procedure is proceeding forward. With regards to the first point that you made, the discussion of the “electorate” for Seat #15, Article 27.7 I believe – the suggestion that was made was that this should be discussed in a wider setting, perhaps even face-to-face. And my suggestion was to actually have some time set on the Sunday of our Beijing meeting to discuss this out in the open; have a frank, face-to-face discussion on that and to be able to reach consensus or fine what direction we will take on this in Beijing.

So I had asked Heidi when building our timetables, which she will be able to speak to us about in a moment, that there should be some time allocated specifically to this point since it is one which has already raised a lot of discussion on the call. With regards to the rest, the moving on with the rest of the Rules of Procedure and update them ASAP – does anyone here at the moment on the call think this might be a bad idea? I guess I can ask for a consensus call on this. I don’t see anyone putting their hands up believing it’s a bad idea, in which case we should move forward and having those Rules of Procedures updated ASAP with the provisions you have made in your report.

And I see here you’re happy to do a Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> session so that’s great.  
Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, Olivier, what I understood from your statement now is that the discussion will take place in Beijing and the adoption of the new Rules of Procedure will be later, isn’t it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, if I may?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Cheryl for the record. Tijani, what I am proposing that the new Rules of Procedure go ahead as planned; that they accept however that as they approve the new Rules of Procedure they are also immediately undertaking to review that one section. And that section, the “electorate” section of 27.7 can begin its community discussion and review at the Beijing meeting.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So Cheryl, the adoption of the new Rules of Procedure will not happen at Beijing?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Before Beijing. It should be well and surely done before Beijing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I do not know why they cannot be adopted in Beijing at a face-to-face meeting. All the ALAC people will be there.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani, they can be but we are already behind in our schedule. We would be better to have all of the discussion of all of the rules done online and intercessionally, and you either accept them before or during the February ALAC meeting; and then just deal with the outstanding issue in Beijing – unless you're going to give me nine hours in Beijing, which I don't think you'll be doing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, any response?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, I think my point of view is that in the face-to-face meeting we will have all the ALAC members present and it is better to vote when all the ALAC members are present. So the discussion can take place before Beijing and the adoption, the final adoption, the vote can be done in Beijing so that everyone will be there and will vote.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Tijani, Cheryl here. The tallying of the vote is a matter for the ALAC Chair. You're on the Executive; you can advise him in any way you'd like. But the Drafting Teams will have finished their work and you, the ALAC, will have your Rules of Procedure in a final form for discussion well before Beijing. I'm not answering any more about that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, understood.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. Next is Alan Greenberg and I want to move on. The time is ticking and we are still on time at the moment – I just want to give enough time to the New gTLD Review Group and the ALAC Subcommittee on the ATRT2 as well. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to point out that our intent is to have the Rules ready for approval by the ALAC by the end of February. My personal recommendation will be that the ALAC very soon try to schedule a specific dedicated meeting for that purpose, a teleconference. If that fails for some reason then yes, of course it could be delayed but it would be really nice to have those rules in place by Beijing and we can be operating under them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I think yes, the concern is if we do not do our homework by Beijing then we will waste... We might waste a whole day or three or four hours in Beijing to discuss those things. I'm thinking here as we the ALAC. The other concern is there might be some members that might not be able to make it to Beijing so an online vote for these things is always the better thing because I've actually very rarely seen a unanimous fifteen-member decision at a meeting. There is always someone that has to run out or that is not able to make it to the meeting for various reasons, that sometimes may not be able to even make it into the country.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, Olivier, one more comment: there is a tendency also in face-to-face meetings that people defer having any discussion on the list and wait till the face-to-face meetings where they bring issues up for the first time. And then we're in a position where we have to redraft things and can't approve it in a meeting like that. So I think it's going to be absolutely crucial that people actually read the documents, come up with any questions, do it online and that we can resolve things and have a vote.

In my mind if we defer it to Beijing we will almost certainly in Beijing find there are things we then have to change and redraft, and these Rules are important enough that we don't want to be drafting them on the fly in a meeting to try and approve at that same meeting. That's absolutely disastrous with ending up with Rules that conflict with each other and things like that. So it's really going to be up to the people to do their work ahead of time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Alan. Next we have Yaovi. Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Yeah, Yaovi speaking. (Inaudible) also it will be good normally to vote in the (inaudible). I agree that we should plan to do the work before Beijing. So I think what we have from this meeting is that the link [is sent to the lists] so we have to [find] and approve, and then we have to maybe share information with our groups so that more discussion can happen before the Beijing meeting. And this (inaudible) people or members (inaudible) and then we can really... So my personal opinion is

---

[we may not need] to spend (inaudible) in Beijing. That work can happen...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've missed part of the last sentence of Yaovi but I think he agreed that the work should be done before Beijing-

YAOVI ATOHOUN: I think we're (inaudible)... Yaovi speaking. I was saying that we may not need in that, (inaudible) successful voting before Beijing or a very long meeting (inaudible). Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Yaovi. So I guess the action item from this is as soon as the Rules of Procedure Working Group provides its work to the ALAC we will be giving maybe a week or two weeks for ALAC members to read through those and then we will be convening a single-purpose call for the ALAC to discuss the work and those Rules of Procedure. And we can then take it from there onwards, whether we want to have a vote prior to Beijing or in Beijing or online. I think that that gives us the most options as the ALAC.

And I'm eager to move on – we only have ten minutes until the end of this call. The New gTLD Review Group, Dev Anand Teelucksingh – go ahead, Dev, if you are here.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. The New gTLD Review Group held a conference call on Monday, January 21, 2013. Before that with the new deadlines established by the New gTLD Program, moving the objection period deadline to March 13, 2013, the Review Group has of course adjusted its timetable and has set a deadline of January 16, 2013, for At-Large comments for consideration on limited public interest grounds or community objection grounds.

So well, the ICANN At-Large staff has sent a one-page PDF earlier this month, and this was published around the 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> of January and all the RALOs were notified. And of course I think at least two reminders were sent to all the RALOs with the deadline of the 16<sup>th</sup> and so forth. Literally I would say hours just before the deadline there were several comments received. Comments were received by the New gTLD Review Group and were posted to the New gTLD Dashboard, and I'll post the link in the chat... I see Heidi has done that already, thank you.

So we received comments on .amazon, .cba, .nyc, .patagonia. There was a comment by RJ Glass on multiple strings and there was a comment on .africa by Baudouin Schombe – I hope I pronounced his surname correctly. To date there's only been one comment on each of these that has been posted to the Dashboard so I encourage the At-Large community to really discuss and leave their comments on the Wiki pages.

On the call on Monday, January 21<sup>st</sup> regarding .amazon, no limited public interest objection concerns were raised. The Review Group is continuing to review the comments to determine whether such comments meet the threshold for community objection grounds. Just



to elaborate further on community objection grounds, the Applicant Guidebook Section 3.5.4 describes four tests that will enable the dispute resolution service provider panel to determine whether an objection on community grounds will be successful. So the Review Group will continue to review the comments to determine whether such comments meet that threshold.

Regarding .cba, there were no limited public interest objection concerns raised. And as CBA is an acronym which has multiple significance the comment does not raise sufficient community objection concerns, so no formal drafting of an objection statement will be done.

Regarding .nyc, no limited public interest objection concerns raised. The Review Group will continue to review the comments to determine whether such comments meet the threshold for community objection grounds.

Also for .patagonia, no limited public interest objection concerns raised and the Review Group will review the comments to determine whether such comments meet the threshold for community objection grounds.

With regard to the comments on multiple strings by RJ Glass the comment was directed towards the New gTLD Program. No concerns on limited public interest or community objections for a particular gTLD application were raised so the New gTLD Review Group acknowledges his comment and will bring it to the attention of the New gTLD Working Group for their consideration.

---

Finally, regarding the comment on .africa by Baudouin, this comment was an expression of support for an application of the .africa, and thus no limited public interest or community objection grounds were raised.

So the Doodle for the next New gTLD Review Group conference call was planned for either Friday, January 25<sup>th</sup> or Monday, January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013, to discuss the comments on the other three strings - .amazon, .nyc, .patagonia. So I think that concludes my update, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, and thank you for the work of your committee that's doing an excellent amount of work. It's important because it's the first time At-Large has an operational issue at hand. And I note there have been some concerns by some parts of the community, perhaps some applicants that were concerned that the ALAC would be objecting without any due process and of course there is due process. And I'm very pleased to see how well it's being pursued and what the process is that has been all entirely built by this community. Alan Greenberg briefly?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, very briefly. Something that we don't have to deliberate at this point but I think it makes sense to consider it as we're going through this process is are there things that we believe sort of in our stomach or in our heart we should be objecting to but they don't meet the criteria set out – either the criteria that's set out by ICANN for the formal objection rules or the criteria that ALAC has set for how to handle these processes? Because this is a learning experience. There'll be a second

---

round and we really need to know did we do this well? Not just did we follow all our rules but did we do it well and meeting the intent of the objection process? And similarly, did ICANN? Are the four objection grounds that they laid out not sufficient to really cover things that we should have been able to address in the objection process?

So I think it's something that in parallel we need to be filing away notes so that when we come around for a second iteration, should that ever happen, both at the ICANN level and at the ALAC level we can provide input into that process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Okay. So this is a good review, thank you Dev. Just a takeaway from this: you are hoping that you will receive more comments from everyone on the remaining applications - .amazon, .patagonia, and .nyc. Is that correct?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. Yes, indeed. You can go to the New gTLD Dashboard. Well, I posted the link in the chat and just comment on the various separate Wiki pages that are linked from that Dashboard. So yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Dev. Next, the ALAC Subcommittee on the ATRT2, Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Oliver, this is Rinalia for the transcript. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There appears to be some echo at the moment. Go ahead, Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. There are four individuals who have applied as ALAC representatives to the ATRT2. They are Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Alan Greenberg and [Daniel Reed], who is not an ALAC member. The Subcommittee has recently (inaudible) with three of the four candidates. We met with Olivier and (inaudible) and tomorrow we'll have our standing meeting to confirm the results after which I will send our recommendations to the ALAC. And a ratification vote on the recommendation will need to commence immediately because the results will need to be conveyed to the ATRT2 Team by the 28<sup>th</sup> of this month.

Also when I sent out my message to the ALAC that the workspace will be updated, and (inaudible) is working on it right now so that ALAC, the ALAC members can review the application materials submitted by all the candidates. That's it from me, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia, and apologies to the interpretation channels for the lack of interpretation due to the static. Alan Greenberg, you have put your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm just wondering since some of the applicants are ALAC members, does the ALAC consider it a conflict of interest for those

---

members to vote? I think we should have consistent position on that so it's something we may want to think about before the vote is opened.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: My personal feeling is that since the recommendation is coming from a group which does not include as voting members any of those candidates it is reasonable to confirm the recommendation of this subgroup. But again, I think we should have a consistent position among the three candidates. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, thank you Olivier, Carlton for the record. I wanted to make that same suggestion as Alan because somebody raised it with me, and my personal view is the same as Alan – because the group that's recommending is not the one that the candidates are part of I think the vote should take place and they should not be excluded.

I also wanted to put on record that Oksana in the chat raised the issue that she had applied for the ATRT2 as an independent expert. I'm not so sure if that is related to the issue that we're discussing which is the

---

ALAC-endorsed candidates, and I wanted maybe from Rinalia a clarification if she's seen that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rinalia, can we have a clarification please?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Definitely, Olivier. ALAC members who apply as independent experts do not fall under the purview of the Subcommittee on the Endorsement of ALAC Candidates because the individuals who apply as independent experts are not considered as representatives of the ALAC to the ATRT2. It's a separate process altogether.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia. Next is Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. If we consider that the ALAC members that are candidates for the ATRT2 have to vote, we have to do the same for all other kinds of votes. I remember that Sebastien when he was a candidate, he didn't vote and EURALO appointed someone else to vote instead of him. So we have to be consistent and we have to do everything in the same way. We don't have to have [speaks French] – I don't know how to say it in English. We have to take the same rule for everything, thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. The process is different, though. The process here is that the group itself would be making the choice of candidates. The only thing that the ALAC would do would be to ratify the choice of the Working Group, whilst in the choice of Seat #15 for example, the vote was actually done by the ALAC members. There is a difference there. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, since we have a rule that abstentions don't count as negatives we can survive either way. I just think we should be consistent. I don't believe the Board selection issue is a precedent – that's currently a Bylaw-mandated rule. Normally when we vote for Chair or we vote for Liaisons or any of the other positions that ALAC votes for we've never had a rule saying that anyone who's a candidate must abstain, you know, and we've done lots of votes like that.

So up until now it's normally been a matter of conscience. Some people have chosen to abstain, some people have not. I just think in this particular one we should have three candidates doing the same thing just for consistency. But you know, I don't think the Board one is a precedent. It's under a different set of rules which are different than any of our other election rules and it's an ICANN Bylaw-mandated issue. Thank you. Certainly our new Rules of Procedure have not added a new rule saying people cannot vote on any issue where they're a candidate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Tijani, is this okay with you?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, no problem. I agree with Alan that the three candidates have to be treated in the same way – they have to do the same thing. This is normal I think and it is a good thing that the rule applies on all people in the same way. But I don't have a real problem with that, but I don't want ALAC to address issues not in the same way. That was my remark only, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Tijani. And with this we have just a few more minutes because we are over time now – it is eight minutes past the hour. I think we're going to jump to agenda Item #9. Thank you very much for all your work, Rinalia, as well on this Subcommittee on ATRT2 – excellent job. And thanks to Dev and to Cheryl for their work as well.

Review of the At-Large meetings schedule for the 46<sup>th</sup> ICANN meeting in Beijing. I just wish to go quickly through the schedule of ALAC and At-Large meetings and also a quick update on the APRALO Beijing Events. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much; this is Heidi for the record. So I've put in the workspace for all of the At-Large meetings in Beijing that are currently scheduled. There are 23 At-Large meetings including the APRALO ALS meetings.

So just very briefly: on Sunday there is an introduction for the ALSes 8:00 to 9:00, then there's a full workshop working session for the ALAC Regional Leaders and the APRALO ALSes are welcome. During that session there's going to be a working lunch for 90 minutes with the



APRALO ALSes so we can get to know them, and there will also be a 90-minute session in the afternoon on the Article 27 issue.

Then if you click on Monday you'll see that there are some of the key meetings of the At-Large taking place including the Whitepaper Roundtable sponsored by the Future Challenges Working Group. There's also the APRALO Roundtable on the Multi-Stakeholder Model, and in the evening it'll be the APRALO Showcase.

Tuesday there is the Constituency Day. I've heard it will remain the same structure this time – it may change in the future. So there's currently scheduled a Board meeting with the ALAC 8:30 to 9:30 in addition to the joint sessions with the Fellows for the APRALO ALSes. There are also, let me take a look... There's also the APRALO GA on Tuesday afternoon. And on Tuesday during the afternoon there are two two-hour sessions of the ALAC Policy Discussions; and again, those agendas are still open.

On Wednesday, in addition to the joint Fellows/APRALO morning meetings on capacity building there'll be a Technology Taskforce meeting, and that's actually going to be a Wiki and web training session. That's a request from APRALO but everyone is welcome. And there's going to be a WHOIS Working Group and an At-Large Regional Leadership meeting in the morning and then in the afternoon the traditional APRALO/AfrICANN joint meeting followed by the New gTLD Working Group and finishing off with the At-Large IDN Working Group for 90 minutes.

On Thursday there's two meetings: it's the Wrap-Up Session for two hours in the morning and at lunchtime there's the APRALO monthly

---

---

meeting. And then on Friday there is a three-hour ExCom scheduled this time 9:00 to 12:00; and again, the agenda is open at this point. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi, for this... Well, it's just a few meetings we're having over in Beijing. It looks like a very, very busy week indeed already and of course the agenda will continue developing as we reach closer to the meeting then. If any of you have any questions or comments on this can you please just make it over to the ALAC list and we'll be taking this discussion online.

Now a quick update on the APRALO Beijing Events – who is going to be able to speak to us about this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so Rinalia is asking me to do that – this is Heidi. So again, there was a call of the Organizing Committee my evening yesterday, I guess it was early morning for Cheryl and others in Asia. So again, there are going to be several meetings. We have 31 APRALO ALSes coming to Beijing including some new faces, new organizations, so this is going to be starting on Sunday.

There'll be one hour for introductions of all ALSes – they'll be then asked to join either the ALAC Working Session on Sunday or some of the Newcomer sessions on Sunday. Then as I mentioned on Monday afternoon there is the APRALO Multi-Stakeholder meeting. The discussion subjects are just about to be agreed to. In the evening there'll be a two-hour APRALO Showcase which is going to be very

---

similar to the Summit affair that was held in 2009 – lots of tables and interesting material from those ALSes.

Each morning Monday through Thursday the ALSes from APRALO will be joining the Fellows for their sessions and then asked to join the ALAC meetings as well. And then there's a GA, General Assembly for APRALO on Tuesday evening followed by a regular monthly meeting of APRALO on Thursday. And I think that's it... And also there'll be some outreach activities taking place during the coffee breaks and lunch breaks as well. I think that's it, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. It's a very exciting set of events and we look forward to seeing them develop as well. And so now we've reached the end of our call – we just have the Any Other Business part. So does anyone have any other business? I do have something to bring forward...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier? Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You don't need to remind me, Heidi, it's still in my head. [laughing] So here's the question. We have had a number of new At-Large Structures joining us recently and it's great to see at least one representative from an At-Large Structure having survived the two-hour ALAC call – well done, Winthrop. But other At-Large Structures might not be as persistent in being able to understand everything that is going on or

---

trying to understand everything that is going on. And one of the suggestions was to make a number of calls, maybe two so as to be able to accommodate the right time zones around the world – two calls for our new At-Large Structures and for us to be able, and “us” as in any members, any volunteers that would be interested in being able to share a bit of our knowledge and some background material about what is going on in At-Large, what is going on in ALAC, what is going on in ICANN so as to soften the cliff that needs to be certainly climbed by newly-arrived At-Large Structures.

I could have probably said all of this in a sentence lasting 20 seconds but I’ve taken a minute for it. So I just want to take the temperature of the room here as to what we think about this suggestion. I see the temperature of the room is either totally dead or just wants to go... [laughing] I don’t see anyone objecting to this idea so what I suggest is that we will, well, I can ask staff for us to have a couple of calls within the next three weeks or so? And we’ll take this offline and see who can attend and who can do their little part.

Fantastic. Any other “other business?” This is the first time I hear absolute silence – I hope I’m not just speaking to myself... I see some people have lost audio. Okay, well Heidi, you can still hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes I can, this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so if Heidi can hear me that’s fine. I can therefore mention thank you very much to everyone. Thanks to the interpreters. Thank you for

having stayed an extra fifteen minutes for us. Thank you to all staff and thanks to all of you who have attended this call. It's been very, very positive and this call is now adjourned. Take care, bye-bye!

[End of Transcript]