

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the ALAC Monthly Conference Call on Tuesday, the 26<sup>th</sup> of February, 2013. The time is 15:03 UTC and the first thing I'm going to ask is for all of you to have a look at the agenda page and adopt the agenda or ask if there is any other business that we need to add to this very long agenda today?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up so the agenda is adopted, and so we can start then immediately with the roll call. Gisella, if you could please?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Gisella for the transcript. On today's call we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Yaovi Atohoun, Holly Raiche, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Alan Greenberg, Sandra Hoferichter, Evan Leibovitch, Eduardo Diaz, Rinalia Abdul Rahim. We have Oksana Prykhodko, Garth Bruen, Winthrop Yu, and Dick Kalkman will be joining us late. For Liaisons we have Cheryl Langdon Orr and Julie Hammer. On the Spanish channel Natalia Enciso will be joining the Adobe Connect.

Apologies noted from Vivek Aanand and Seth Reiss. From staff we have Matt Ashtiani, Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Nathalie Peregrine, and myself, Gisella Gruber. Our interpreters today on the Spanish channel are Veronica and Sabrina; on the French channel Fernanda and Camila. Apologies also noted from Carlton Samuels. If I could remind everyone to please state their names when speaking not only for transcript

---

*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.*

---

purposes but also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel. If you happen to be on the audio bridge and on the Adobe Connect please do remember to mute your speakers to avoid any interference. Thank you, over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. So have we forgotten anyone in the current list? It doesn't look like it. I see a lot of people so that's really great. Welcome, everybody, and let's go directly into the action items which is Agenda Item #2.

The 22<sup>nd</sup> of January, 2013, ALAC Meeting action items – now, I just wanted to take a little bit more time on the action items today because as you will notice there are long-term goals and there are also open action items, recently closed, newly assigned action items; and having a look through the long-term goals, thankfully staff and I have noticed there are a number of things which have been completed and which could really be taken out. So I wanted to read through those since we have to officially close those action items; otherwise they'll just linger on in the ether space.

The first one, if we look at the long-term goals, in progress long-term goals with no update required unless updated once and for all, the At-Large staff is to move forward with the SOI and COI page. These are the statements of interest page, and I have to thank everyone for having provided their SOI. I think we have a full house. Matt, is that correct?

---

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi everyone, this is Matt for the record. We have everyone except for one individual who I've been working with.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well that's really good and of course now that we've got these SOIs I ask all of you to make sure that they are up to date. We're not going to have a regular call for SOI updates at the beginning of all of our calls but it is important because we can use those not only in the ALAC world but we can probably point to those from wherever we are in the ICANN sphere of things.

So the next one, Gisella to prepare a document showing ALAC members' current membership in working groups by the next ALAC meeting. Now Gisella has done that, it is completed. Unfortunately we haven't really acted on this yet so it would be good to update this. And Gisella, if you could just cross check that an updated version is there and then that will be shared with the ExCom and we'll see where we go from there.

Okay, after that, next – Gisella is to send Evan the transcription of the comments made and to work on the calls for comments. Of course we don't know what transcription of the comments made and what call for comments that was so I gather that was completed.

Letter from the Chair of the ALAC to the Chair of the Board is to be sent with the Improvements Report – that was done.

Carlton Samuels is to draft a paragraph on the request for community input on formulation of 2013-2016 Strategic Plan public comment and post it on the Wiki. That's completed and I just noticed that I am speaking fast for the interpreters so I do apologize.

---

Heidi is to add the At-Large New gTLD Working Group and Review Group meetings for Toronto – well, that’s done and that happened.

Matt Ashtiani is to update Aotearoa Maori Internet Organization of its recertification, and that was completed and of course that organization was recertified.

Staff was to start the vote on the NomCom rep today – thank goodness we didn’t wait one year to reach 28<sup>th</sup> of August 2013. We’ve got 2012 with a close date of September 1<sup>st</sup> – obviously that was done.

And Heidi contacted Steve Antonoff and Constituency Travel with regards to a global account, and from the sum I gather this had to do with the IGF and of course that has also happened. So this is completed.

And then we have the in-progress long-term goals with an update that is required but which we haven’t got updated for quite a while. The first one is to do with the metrics, and I gather that this is all still in progress apart from one part which is 1C, which asks for help to be sought from Kurt Pritz and Carole Cornell. Well, Kurt is not at ICANN anymore so we might just say this part is completed and the rest of this action item is still very much in progress.

Secondly on the Board consultations, the ALAC is to refine its goals regarding its advising of the Board, and this of course is all to do with how the Board accepts and responds to ALAC advice. And it also has to do with the templates for policy statements, executive summaries in our policy statements, etc. Now, there has been some discussion with Board members on whether there was a preferred template. The

---

response has pretty much been “No, you can supply it in whatever is easier to read.” So I think that we have over time with staff and with those people who have held the pen found a format that is pretty helpful for the Board and for what other comment periods there is to read our advice. The response has been quite positive. I don’t know if anyone else wishes to add anything to this, and if you will notice we’ve marked all of the Board consultation parts as being completed. But now I open the floor if anyone wishes to add to this.

I see no one putting their hand up so I gather there is agreement here that this is all completed. So now let’s... That’s pretty good, that certainly will clean up our plate a little bit.

Let’s look at the open action items – there are two of them. The first one is with regards to a statement on my experiences at the World Conference on International Telecommunications, this is forthcoming. The long report which I was drafting is complete, has passed through the UK government for clearance and so I will soon be releasing this; and then of course shortly afterwards be drafting a statement on this. And I guess that Evan and Jean-Jacques will then lead the Future Challenges Working Group to expand on this statement specifically looking at the issues raised at the WCIT. So these are still in progress.

The recently closed one is for Heidi to work with the Chair of the WHOIS Working Group to set up a webinar on WHOIS. That webinar has taken place last week. I invite everyone to have a look at the webinar’s page and to either listen to the webinar itself or to read the transcript if you’ve missed this because it was particularly interesting. We had a really great lineup on the panel and I for one learned a number of things

---

during that webinar, and I thought I knew it all but there you go. You learn something new every day and I think it's such an important issue, it's really great that we have the ability to have such experts at hand.

So that's one, and I'm not sure – has staff sent a follow-up regarding this? Because I know that one action item was for a follow-up to be sent to the lists to send a pointer for everyone to be able to review this at their leisure. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't think – this is Heidi, for the record. I don't think that I have done that yet; I will do that. But I have just put in the agenda in the At-Large chat the link to the recording and I believe the transcript is on there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great, super. So that's one. And of course if anyone has ideas about other webinars that you would like to see happen we're, I'm certainly very much open to suggestions. I think it really falls as part of our capacity building for our membership and for everyone, and I'm – how many people did we have on this webinar, Heidi? I can't remember the exact number but it was very well attended.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe we had 30. Thirty people, which was a really high number.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thirty people, that's really great so thank you. It's really good to have such a good attendance and it certainly means that there is a lot of

---

interest in these webinars. Good resource to draw from, Sala, yes – that’s right.

Alright, the newly-assigned action items: the issue of WHOIS is to be added as an issue to be addressed by the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group. This one I’ll have to check on; I’m not quite sure what that related to. Can anyone help me on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi.

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe it’s basically an action item saying that the interest within the community for WHOIS would make it a good topic for capacity building.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah okay, thank you Heidi. That certainly makes sense; it’s something we just said a moment ago. So yeah, perfect. I see Tijani has put his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Olivier. We indeed highlighted this point at our last teleconference of the Capacity Building Working Group and it is one of the if you want [sticky] points that we’ll get very soon in our program. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani, that's very helpful. Okay, so we'll continue on this. So that's a great start for the Capacity Building Working Group.

Next, regarding the Rules of Procedure Working Group, once the ROP Working Group provides its work to the ALAC the ALAC members will have two weeks to read through the work. There will then be a single purpose call for the ALAC to discuss the work as well as discuss how and when the ALAC will vote on the new Rules of Procedure. I see Alan has put his hand up, so Alan, you have the floor – Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not quite sure how this is worded and I must admit I didn't review it. I would suggest that the single-purpose call come well early on in that two-week process to give people an opportunity to make comments and stuff. Otherwise we're going to add another two weeks onto it to receive input and things like that, so that's number one. Number two, it's not just for the ALAC to read through it but to accept any inputs from the community that they feel should be passed on forward. So it's a two-week review period but I think the call should be early in the two weeks, not late in the two weeks – or relatively early to the extent we can schedule it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that was the original intent, and to basically proceed; but the reason why it's an action item is just to make sure we know the path to take and that staff can quickly action what it needs to do as soon as the ROP work is provided over to the ALAC. Of course we will be discussing this in a moment later on in our agenda.



ALAN GREENBERG: Right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So this one is still in progress as well. Any comments or questions on any of these action items that we've gone through in the past ten minutes? I don't see any comments. I see Sala has put just a note in the chat: "Action item capacity building would include webinars as resource material for At-Large?" and yes, that can just be amending the issue of WHOIS in the newly assigned action item just as a reminder.

Okay, let's move on and go over to our next part which, if I can scroll back up takes us to the Review of Current At-Large Structure Applications. And so for this I hand the floor over to Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi, this is Matt for the record. I'm just actually pulling up the agenda right now. One second, please. So for the ALS applications, the current status is for #167 Ray Services – AFRALO has suggested that the organization [cannot be seated] as Ray Services is a business organization.

The next applicant, #170 – the RALO has requested some additional information from the applicant. So once that additional information is up then we can proceed with the application.

#177 – LACRALO is still producing its regional advice. Once it has its regional advice we can proceed with that application.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Matt. Any questions or comments on these applications? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Just again to note my satisfaction that we have a constant trickling of new applications coming in and it really is great to see this community continue to grow. So it's good to see it. Of course we need to keep those applicants interested but with all of the work that this community is doing I'm feeling pretty positive about it all.

So let's have a look at #5 on our agenda, that's the Reports. And of course once again I thank everyone who has produced the monthly reports for the work that they've done. It's very, very important to have those reports published for the simple reason that, well – let's have a look at Agenda Item #4, review of current ALS applications. New At-Large Structures coming into our community will not know what's going on without having up-to-date information being published and made available for them to be able to look at. And you know, communication is one of the most important things that we have to deal with in At-Large; and keeping information hoarded in one part, one working group or in the head of a specific Chair or person is not helpful at all to the rest of the community.

So without going into detail into all the reports I invite you all to have a look at the Wiki page which has links to all of these reports, and I will just ask the GNSO Liaison and the ccNSO Liaison to give us a quick summary of what has been happening in their part of the world. So starting with the GNSO Liaison, Alan Greenberg – would you please step up to the floor?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. It's been relatively quiet. There's a lot that should be happening but the GNSO is not extremely active right now. There are responses going to Fadi on Trademark Clearinghouse but not really substantive, and I'm hoping some discussion will start but it has not happened yet. They were asked for input on the closed generics and I suspect nothing will come on that because the GNSO's not really in a position to give unified responses.

So there's a lot pending; not a lot that is very active. The only thing I will highlight is that a new PDP started yesterday. The first meeting was yesterday, that is IRTPD. I'm on it but don't plan to be very active. Holly is on it but the meetings are happening at a rather awkward time for her and it's not clear... I'll let Holly speak for herself to what extent she will participate. It would be really good to get some At-Large people there. There are some issues related to transfers of users and specifically transfers of domains from a registrant's point of view. And there is one particular question of should a registrant be able to lodge a complaint about a transfer? Currently there's a formal process that either the receiving or the giving registrar can.

So I think it's something we should be participating in plus as I've highlighted before, we need to get more people involved in GNSO activities. So I'm not quite sure how to do it and I'm not just talking about ALAC people; I'm talking about At-Large people. There are likely to be several other PDPs starting in the near future. IRTPD is a good one because it should be a short one. It is exceedingly well-managed. The people running it have a lot of experience and they're more organized

---

than I've ever seen a PDP in my life or perhaps a working group before in my life so it's a good one to try if you want to try one whether you're knowledgeable about transfers or not. That's all I have to say at the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I'll immediately ask for our ccNSO Liaison to provide us with an equally as informative report. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [laughing] Thank you very much, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record who's been very naughty and not put the recently-received minutes from the most recent ccNSO Council teleconference which thankfully actually happened on the 12<sup>th</sup> of February. It usually happens just a few hours before our call but life has got in the way recently and I haven't updated my space with those minutes but they will be up shortly.

Just to report on that it was very much a well-attended meeting, and predominantly whilst there was a lot of work on the agenda it was very well administratively focused. And it may be an appropriate time perhaps towards midyear for us to look at where the ACs and SOs are in terms of harmonization or lack thereof in some of their administrative processes because it seems to me that the GNSO has gone through a lot of this; the ccNSO is going through a lot of this. ALAC has gone through and is going through a lot of this so perhaps that might be something, Olivier, that you'd want to discuss with the rest of your leadership team

---

because reinventing the wheel – which I certainly see happening – probably isn't a good use of volunteer time.

Of significance however is one particular thing, not so much out of those meeting minutes but circulating loosely since then and that is the ccNSO is formalizing... It's just put out a request to its membership for a formalization of mechanism for ccNSO Council submissions for ICANN staff to track PDPs, etc. So there's an awful lot of... To call it "housework" I think is underrating it. I'd certainly call it significant DIY renovations going on and we have a fairly full agenda prepared for Beijing, not only for the Council call – which is an open Council meeting and for not only ccNSO members but anyone else is welcome in that room; but also it's a two-day members meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And I now open the floor for any questions or comments both on the GNSO and the ccNSO Liaisons' reports. I see or hear no one putting their hand up, okay...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There is a question from Sala. Sorry to cut across, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Sala's put her hand up. Go ahead, Sala, you have the floor – Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

---

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you, Olivier. Sala here for the transcript. Cheryl, thank you for the report. I just wanted to very quickly ask what I asked sometime last year but there wasn't any clear answer from... I'd asked somebody within the cc, but I'd just like to ask whether the Capacity Building Working Group is active within the ccNSO. When I asked last year they said it wasn't so I'm just checking because I remember seeing it on their website.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sala, Cheryl here. Can I ask you to clarify what do you actually mean by capacity building within the ccNSO remembering that the ccNSO is an approved members list of active and accredited ccTLD operators.

SLANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Yes. I was referring to something that they had put up on their site, on the ccNSO site noting that not all ccTLDs are accredited.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, my forward breath was when you said something about the state of accreditation of ccTLD operators. All ccTLD operators whether they're members of the ccNSO or not are of course fully accredited and that is managed by the IANA mechanism. But I do understand that there is a terminology used in the ccNSO website and indeed in our meetings that we refer to things as "capacity building." If that's what you're referring to and I'd ask you to confirm that, then I'll do my best to answer it.

---

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Yes, Cheryl. Just interested in – Sala again for the transcripts. Just interested in finding out who the contact person is for the capacity building within the ccNSO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure. The answer is the closest, Sala – Cheryl for the record. The closest you would get to a contact person would be to have staff contact Bart who is Heidi's equivalent and then of course there are a couple of other staffers, Gabrielle and a couple of others to ensure that the members meetings that run in a face-to-face context are successful and that is very much where a sharing of experiences happens; and that is what we would tend to describe as capacity building. In other words, when there are sessions in Beijing where presentations are made from certain sets of experiences – they may be security or they may be technical – from one ccTLD operator to the rest of the ccNSO members. But that's all a matter of a focus on getting together that happens to happen during ICANN meetings.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I see.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Cheryl, and thank you Sala for raising this subject. I want to swiftly move on and just wanted to give the floor to our SSAC Liaison who is Julie Hammer to provide us with a quick update on the SSAC activities. Julie, you have the floor.

---

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Olivier – Julie Hammer for the transcript record. Can everyone hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. Just a quick one – we did have an SSAC meeting this month which was really an update on [work party]. As you know Jim Galvin participated in the WHOIS Briefing call and I haven't had a chance to listen to the transcript yet but I will do; and I gather that that was a very successful call with everyone participating in that. My own, I'm involved in two of the SSAC work parties both to do with abuse, internet abuse and DNS abuse. They both just are fine tuning their scopes and they're quite closely related, but as with Sala and Holly and Cheryl most of those meetings are at not very pleasant hours.

One thing that I often find quite difficult in reporting to you is that I'm really only allowed with SSAC to report information that is publicly available so it makes it a little bit difficult to give you additional insights without finding that I'm treading beyond where I should. So I guess in that context I'll end my report at that.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julie, and of course you're able to tell all of us what's going on at SSAC but you would have to kill us afterwards [laughter] which judging by the number of people on this call would be a blood bath. [laughter]

[crosstalk]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this very interesting, and of course we will be looking forward to seeing more of the SSAC's work once it is published.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's move on but before I close Agenda Item #5, I just want to remind you – and “you” as in working group Chairs, RALO leaders and all the people who basically have to draft these reports – that you might be receiving a very kind reminder from staff because we are looking at the groups that haven't provided an update recently. As I said, it's really important that we get the communication aspect right, and there's nothing worse than having an At-Large Structure member coming out and saying “Well, it doesn't look like anything's happening in such and such an issue. I've looked at the reports and there's nothing there.” So we'll be tightening things a little bit in that department and I look forward to next month when we meet and we'll have more of a more complete set of reports.

---

So let's move on to the next thing, the next Agenda Item which is New Business Items for Discussion, and I invite you all to the Policy Advice Development Page – very much thanking Matt for keeping this up to date. I must say that ever since this has been implemented it's been increasingly easy to find out and understand where we are and it's been very good because we've had an increased number of public comments that have been asked of us recently which if we didn't have a proper system to track those things would have been an absolute mess. So thanks again, Matt, for that.

Now, the recently adopted ALAC statements, documents, or groups: well, first we had an endorsement of ATRT2 candidates – that's the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. The Board has asked for a call for candidates. There was an endorsement of a number of candidates and the ones who were chosen at the end by the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC were both Alan Greenberg and myself representing the ALAC. And there will also be someone who is in At-Large circles, who has been very active in At-Large circles as the Chair of the New gTLD Working Group – that's Avri Doria who will be wearing a GNSO hat in that group. That group will be meeting the week after next if I get this correctly, in two weeks' time and will be starting its work with a face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles.

Next, the Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group and that has been adopted with 14 votes in favor, zero against and zero abstentions. I very much thank you for drafting this. It's always good that we have people holding the pen. I'm often concerned that it's always the same people holding the pen and we will be touching on this in a moment.

---

The next one is the At-Large IDN Variant TLD Program – that’s a Procedure to Develop and Maintain the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone in Respect of IDNA Labels. And there was the second public comment draft that was adopted with 13 votes in favor, zero against, and zero abstentions. And I’m glad that this one is through because that must have been probably one of the longest names of public comments that we’ve had to ever work on.

The next one is the ICANN Volunteer Engagement and Travel Support Issues – that’s turned into a correspondence that has been submitted. And I just invite you to have a quick look at it. That’s been sent over to Sally Costerton with a carbon copy over to Steve Antonoff and there is some follow-up. In fact, I will be speaking to Sally later on this week on a quick conference call to touch on various issues and we might be touching on this depending on how much time we have on our call.

Any questions on the past recently-adopted statements? I see Alan has put his hand up so Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. On the Travel Issues, number one I believe Steve is no longer part of that process and the group now reports to Diane [Schroeder], so that’s number one. Number two was there any outcome of it? Is anything going to change for Beijing or is it all sometime in the far, long, dark, deep future? You say you had gotten a positive response from Sally.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Alan. The positive response is that matters apparently will be looked at on a case-by-case basis for the time being but Travel is going to be providing further details soon – details are forthcoming. And this is really the question I will be asking Sally because I was told this a couple of months ago – I was told this in January and there hasn't been any further communication since January on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, I was one of the ones that was told they had to leave Friday despite the Friday morning meeting and I-

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I have a minor interest of financial value to me so I'd like to know. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Me too, I could say the same thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand, and Evan too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're all in the same boat and the question will be asked.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I just want to make sure if the answer is yes that someone finds out about it so we can benefit from it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes is the answer. Next, statements or endorsements currently being developed, reviewed, or voted on by the ALAC. I see Tijani has put his hand up. Tijani, is it on the next part?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, Olivier, it's on the passed one, the last one. It is very important for us, for At-Large that it will be decided definitely that the travelling day has to be the following day of the last working day; and the arriving day must be the day before the first day of the work. If this is decided everything is easy because everything is clear, the scheduling is clear. Everyone has a duty and people know their duty, so the arriving and departing days should be very clear. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Tijani. So let's move on. Let's go to the statements or endorsements currently being developed, reviewed, or voted on by the ALAC, and the first one is the report on the GNSO Working Group on Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition. The statement turned again into a correspondence, a letter to be sent to Cherine Chalaby who is the Chair of the New gTLD Working Group on the Board. As you know, the Chair of the Board Steve Crocker is conflicted so a subcommittee was created to deal with all matters related to the New gTLD procedures.

---

This statement underwent a lot of discussion with several people being involved and I was very pleased to see a thorough discussion taking place; and as a result this correspondence will be sent to Cherine and the correspondence effectively says that the set of metrics which was developed by the GNSO Working Group was in the ALAC's view incomplete and the proposition, the proposal is that the ALAC puts together a team quickly that will consider additional metrics and send this to the Board or to the Chair of the Working Group by the ICANN 46<sup>th</sup> Meeting in Beijing.

I'm pleased to also note that I will be having a conference call with Cherine Chalaby, I think it's either tomorrow or the day after tomorrow and by that time I believe that he will have this letter in his hand. So we will be discussing this letter and have an immediate reply on timings, etc. I see that Evan has put his hand up, so Evan, as the main drafter of this please, you can have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks very much, Olivier, this is Evan as you said. Two small points, one of which is a suggestion I put in the Adobe chat that as a matter of courtesy that a copy of the letter go to the SO and AC Chairs since this is of course reflecting on a GNSO comment. And also I want to take the opportunity to put out a call for anybody who is interested in participating with me on this team that is going to try and augment the GNSO work by putting in some end user-centric measurements that we think ICANN ought to implement as part of the metrics program. The team doesn't have a lot of time. I have a couple of specific people in mind, people who have already commented on the letter and who have

---

been involved in the discussion of the letter so far but if there is anybody I have missed... I know Alan has indicated an interest; if there are other people on this call or other people that you know that would be interested in participating, in helping to create some end user-centric metrics on the New gTLD Program please get in touch with me or with At-Large staff. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And thank you very much, Evan. This is a little ad-hoc taskforce somehow, so of course everyone is very well encouraged to join. Right, so let's move on. The next one is the Statement on the WCIT Outcomes and I have spoken about this a little bit earlier with a statement that is forthcoming.

The next one is the Consultation on the gTLD Delegation and Redelelegation Performance Standards and the similar Consultation for the ccTLD Delegation and Redelelegation Performance Standards. That's with Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Alan Greenberg, and having heard "hand up" for the second time from Cheryl Langdon-Orr I gather that she has her hand up. Go ahead, Cheryl. [laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, this is Cheryl for the record and I have a totally flaky Adobe Connect. I have no chat in my window, no ability to communicate with you in any other way other than by voice. So not being for sure that you heard me the first time I made it for sure by the second; in future I'll wait to be called upon if it's a problem. [laughter]

---

With regard to this particular statement, it's the same set of questions relating to the gTLD and ccTLD delegation and redelegation issues – Alan has been as you'll hear unbelievably heroic with the amount of volunteer time he's put into other activities for us recently and he and I have gently touched but not put pen to paper on the responses to those questions. And he and I have also discussed the fact that we've got version 46 or 47 of the Rules of Procedure drafting done and they should be in your hands soon. We may be able to see light at the end of the tunnel by the end of the week to have a quick call to respond to those asked questions that we can draft up.

This however does mean that the deadline for the comments, for you to have your ALAC look at the work that we briefly put together for you, would not fit in with the call for comments period. The proposal is that one thing the ALAC could do is put in during the last couple of days before close of comments a small note saying it intends to put in a letter directly to staff in charge of those comments with the response to the questions asked in the discussion paper. If that doesn't suit you then your other option would be, should you still wish to make a comment that you ask for a small extension. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and just as a question – the initial comment period is the 28<sup>th</sup> of February. The reply period closes on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March. Do you foresee any problem with being able to, or any difficulty with being able to submit something well before the 21<sup>st</sup> of March?



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Cheryl for the record again – if you didn't think that your ALAC would need seven or more days to chew over what Alan and I will pen you can have something in by the 28<sup>th</sup> of [February]. That's not probable, therefore we'd be looking at having something for your ALAC to look at by the end of this week and therefore that advice would be able to be integrated into the system in whatever shape or form it is going to be integrated into the system in the very first week of March. [You'll have] the ALAC to look at what Alan and I send for them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So in this case I think that we can ask staff to ask for an extension, and if we are able to provide the input by the end of the reply period then we'll do that. If we are not given that opportunity then we will be submitting the comments directly to the staff who are in charge of this. Is that okay? I'm not sure who's doing the Als – is it Matt or...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Matt can continue to work with Alan and I, he has done to date. But you just need to remember that if you put in a note before the 28<sup>th</sup> of [February] that says ALAC will be shortly forthcoming with a response to the questions asked in the paper that that is in fact a response in the comment period. A reply comment period has to be limited to things that are raised in the comment period-

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Cheryl. I haven't checked whether there was already a comment in the initial comment period so this is why... I'm not sure, is

---

there nothing at the moment? Oh, I see – it's empty. Okay, fair enough. [laughter] So if it is empty...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now you're on the page with me, yes. [laughing]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, now I'm on the page. No, I'm not even on the same page as you because you're on the ccTLD and I'm on the gTLD – I gather it's the same person in charge of both but I gather they're both empty. So if I could ask staff to contact [Michelle Cotton] who I believe is in charge of both these comments periods and advise her of our forthcoming comments. I'm not sure that they would wish to keep the initial comment and the reply period open for the full length but what they might do is to give us an extension if we are the only part of ICANN that is providing a comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I see Alan having put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I just wanted to note I support what Cheryl said; and I don't know the rules but it is possible they would cancel the reply period if there's nothing to reply to so it is important to get something in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That is the rule, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. Next is the Closed Generic gTLD Applications – now, this is another one of these public comment discussions that has really been particularly interesting and with a lot of people taking part, and certainly two very different viewpoints. Some in At-Large have voiced their concern that closed generics are harmful; and some have actually voiced a concern that they don't believe closed generics are harmful – they don't think that they're a great thing but they're not harmful. Indeed, the question which was asked by the Board in a quite unusual way is whether the community felt that closed generics should be allowed or not allowed or whether they are harmful or not harmful.

I refer you... I'm just paraphrasing here but I refer you to the page which asks these questions. Evan Leibovitch has very kindly picked up the pen on this and has been very thorough in his research and listened to a lot of people. There was some discussion that took place on several occasions both in the mailing list but also I believe in the New gTLD Working Group that had a call yesterday and that discussed this in detail. And so the single purpose call came up with a statement that will effectively show the two general camps and ask for ALAC members to choose between Option #1 and Option #2. And that it is hoped will

---

give the Board a good idea as to how our Committee stands by giving the point of view of both camps and effectively showing a little bit which way our community – hoping that the ALAC members are an extension of the whole At-Large community, which way our community stands on these things.

I know Evan has put his hand up so I'll give the floor over to Evan since he is the penholder on that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks very much, Olivier. I don't have much to add to this so far. It was a very productive call. I just want to call attention to a number of private conversations I've had with people who have asked for something slightly more nuanced than simply a numbers game. In the call we came up with sort of enumerating the two widely-held and somewhat opposing points of view and figured that we would just do a poll of ALAC members and report back on what the numbers were. Since then I received a number of communications, some were private.

One was very well expressed by former ALAC member and Board member Roberto Gaetano who posted a very good follow-up message on the Working Group list essentially saying that there ought to be something that detailed a little bit more about the struggles we had that made it a little bit more than a numbers game; and also perhaps might want to put in the suggestion that making such a binary choice of simply closed or open might be part of the problem – that the way this current process has been painted may lack innovation in a way that is forcing people to apply for closed things when really they would rather not.

---

So there's a couple of other issues that were discussed on the call. Alan and I in fact are going to be talking directly after this call to try and figure out the best way forward. And also, Oliver, I want to thank you for chairing the meeting yesterday. I found myself in the awkward position of being both the penholder being asked to be the surrogate Chair and having a very strong view of my own on the issue. So having you in the meeting certainly made sure that things were nice and neutral and that no particular point of view was going to bully anybody else. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Do you have a date or time at which the finalized statement will be ready or we'll be able to launch an ALAC vote on this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'll let you know as soon as Alan and I speak immediately after this call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. Now, I note that there's a question on the chat which asks for an Option #3, an "abstain" – or is it an Option #4 now.... I'm not sure. The question from the Board is do you think that these closed gTLDs are dangerous or not or do you think they're good or not? I'm not quite sure you can say... Well, if you say "Well they might be or they might not be" I'm just a little bit confused at that point because it really is a binary question somehow.

---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, my hand's up – it's Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan, sorry. I've just noticed your hand now, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. As Evan was alluding to, the nuance which I think Roberto was referring to and Evan was referring to is in my mind a flavor of "A" – which is closed generic TLDs owned privately are a bad thing. It's not a binary decision in that case; it really is a nuanced one because there are some cases, and the example I gave or I used in the discussion yesterday was .live by Microsoft – it is a generic word but they're not using it as the generic word. They are clearly using it in reference to their own trademark whereas .book is very much a generic word. Other purveyors of services like Microsoft Live do not call it "Live" whereas every publisher calls their books "books."

So it's a nuanced issue, and I suspect, Evan, what's going to come out of our discussion with input from Roberto is something of a gray shade of "A" that is we're not saying that every generic word as a TLD is a bad thing; it depends on the details of how it's being used. So I suspect the fourth version will be a flavor of "A" but that's having a discussion we haven't had yet, so...

---

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

ALAN GREENBERG: It's conceivable we will end up with a third option in the middle but that's not what I'm predicting at this moment not having had the discussion yet. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And having had the discussion yesterday, having followed this I can barely understand what is going on now and I suspect most other ALAC members are completely confused. [laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: And I just looked at Evan's comment in the chat – we're doomed. [laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just for the transcript, Evan has mentioned that he sees a nuanced position as a flavor of "B" whilst Alan sees it as a flavor of "A," so there we go.

Now, let's move on then because we're not going to get anywhere with all of those flavors and let's get on with the next which is the WHOIS Registrant Identification Study Draft Report. And Carlton Samuels is going to reply, or has been asked whether a statement is necessary and at the moment the comment period closes on the 9<sup>th</sup> of March, 2013. So we'll be expecting an answer from Carlton soon. Of course, if anyone else here believes that they have a strong view, a strong point of view

---

about this they're very welcome to raise their hand or shout out that they'd like to hold the pen on this.

Next, the currently open public... No sorry, we did that – oh, I'm confused now. The currently open public comment Consultation on IANA Secure Notification process. This is a technical matter; we have not mentioned much on IANA's internal processes in the past. The comment period was extended till the 28<sup>th</sup> of February which is two days from now but no statement from the ALAC will be forthcoming except of course if anyone decides otherwise.

Next, the IDN Variant TLD Program – the Draft Final Report Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs, no statement on this either. The user experience implications were actually discussed on a recent IDN call and these of course are sometimes technical. They vary from browser to browser, application to application and the IDN Variants TLD Working Group seems to have this well in hand.

Next, the Policy versus Implementation – that's a staff, ICANN staff that has put together a method to discern policy versus implementation. Again, no statement on this. The initial comment period closed on the 21<sup>st</sup> of February; the reply period closes on the 14<sup>th</sup> of March. If you believe that anything that has already been said in the comments that have been submitted contravenes our points of view then you're of course very welcome to raise your hand or send an email out to the list and hold the pen for an ALAC statement on this.

Next, the Interim Report on the IDN ccNSO Policy Development Process; this is marked as no statement. The comment period closes on the 26<sup>th</sup> of February, so we're on the last day today. I know it's an IDN ccNSO



---

Policy Development Process. Cheryl, did you have anything to add to this or not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier, Cheryl for the record. What I'd like to add is [our] continued support for the [whole] statement. We have been involved in the whole of this working group, in fact it's a two-parter – part one and part two, there's two separate working groups that operate in this area. And we've been penholders on the process from the very beginning and ALAC has done itself well with its representation. So I think we should just let sleeping dogs lie on this one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great, thank you very much Cheryl. Next, the revised New gTLD Registry Agreement including the Additional Public Interest Commitment Specification – the comment period closes on the 26<sup>th</sup> of February, 2013; the reply period closes on the 30<sup>th</sup> of March. Last month I did ask whether the At-Large was going to draft something about this. I thought that there might be some interest in our community since there was public interest commitments coming to light on this but unfortunately there hasn't been any feedback on that. Would anyone wish to add anything to this by any chance?

I take it that either everybody is fully aware and happy with the New gTLD Registry Agreement or we haven't read this yet. The reply period closes on the 20<sup>th</sup> of March so we could always send a note before the end of the reply period if nobody has any comments. Holly, you've put your hand up, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I've had a look, I'm not sure what I think at this stage but I'm not sure of the way they're worded and I'm not sure of their enforceability. I think there are some real issues with it. I'll have another look and I'll probably, I'll get back to you in the next couple of days as to what I think, okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's really appreciated. Thank you. Holly, if I could just ask you to get back within the next couple of days that will be really great. Alan, you've put your hand up – you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think we have to make at least a token statement saying that a voluntary commitment is better than none but it's really sad that ICANN has to resort to that. [laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I think that feeling is shared. And if one looks at the historical facts and the track record, voluntary duties are not something which have been taken up with very much happiness. So let's do this as an

---

action item. So let's have the action item for Holly to have a look at this statement and suggest some text if needed.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I was going to ask Alan to have a look at this but I know Alan is currently deeply into revision #245 of the Rules of Procedure-

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, if Holly forwards something to me I'll look at it; Alan speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan. Okay, next let's have a look – where are we? I have to find the right screen again. Now, we have a couple more to look at. Now, the At-Large Preliminary Issue Report on Uniformity of Reporting Workspace, and Evan was supposed to confirm whether a statement was necessary. Evan, have you had a chance to have a look at this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Not really, I'll get back into it. I'd gone into it but just haven't found much at least that interested me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So any comments or questions on any of these policy development items? I don't see any hands up so let's go to the Items

---

for Discussion, and the first item here – Item #7 – is the ALAC and At-Large Involvement in GNSO Activities, and that’s matching supply with demand. I’m going to ask Alan for a very quick summary of this point since he was the originator of the email that started the discussion about the resources that we have. So Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. It’s basically just what I said before when I was talking about the specific PDP. I believe the ALAC must get out of the mode of commenting on things after the fact, and to a large extent if it wasn’t for me and one or two other people who have been participating in a number of working groups that would almost always be the case. And I think we need to get involved in the policy discussions at the level that the recommendations are being made and things are being investigated because we have far less leverage to change things after they have been settled after sometimes hundreds of hours of discussion and thousands of person hours of discussion. So I don’t see any other way out of it.

The email I sent became a philosophical discussion of what should the ALAC be doing and where should we be putting our resources, and I don’t think I was asking that question because certainly it should not just be an ALAC issue. And I think we have a Bylaw-mandated responsibility to make sure that policies that are passed reflect the needs of the end user, and I don’t see how that’s going to happen unless more people get involved. Some of these topics are specialized, some are not, but somehow we have to change our mode of operation or I think we’re going to be... It’s fine to come up with an infinite number of statements but people are going to I think start looking at

---

the substance of it more and to what extent are we actually helping to meld policy as opposed to commenting on it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Did I hear Cheryl say “hand up?”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, you did actually, and I actually tried to – Cheryl for the record. I did try to put my hand up but that part of my AC room is still crashed. Look, I couldn’t support Alan more on this and I think it’s something else that needs to be said. Getting involved doesn’t mean just putting your name on a list and then leaving your name on a list. We don’t need to do the analysis although some of us have – there are a significantly larger number of people who volunteer for input into these processes than who attend as regularly as is required to both get the voice you’re bringing to the table trusted and heard and to indeed make a difference.

If a meeting of these types is meeting fortnightly or monthly or weekly or several times a week, well there’s only one way to make a difference and that’s to be at all of those meetings. Missing a few of them is fine but there are far too many listings of work group volunteers where in some cases, and here I’m thinking specifically in the ccTLD and GNSO world, we’ve fought and have been mandated up to five regional representatives on some of these work groups; and you can count not on one hand but on one finger how many regularly attendees there are. Thank you.

---

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

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I'll second that and I'll note it's somewhat embarrassing that on occasion people do volunteer and then show up for one meeting out of 30 or something like that. And attendance stats are published. Now yes, in theory these people could have been listening to every recording and commenting vociferously on the list but the reality is they don't. So I guess I can support what Cheryl said – if we want to be perceived as caring about how policies impact users and registrants are users, then I think we have to start becoming part of the process.

I mean some of these questions are really difficult and sometimes we actually have significant input on it. If you look at the results of the several recent meetings of the IGO/INGO Working Group, you know, I sent out a message that triggered an enormous discussion. How it will come out I don't know, it doesn't really matter but at least we're surfacing ideas and getting some people to think that they're important that might not have been brought up otherwise. And I think that's the only way we can work, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and if I could just add a couple more words to this. I think a while ago the ALAC did ask for more cross-community working groups; the idea that the whole community would work on subjects rather than just having the same discussion taking place in each room in parallel and then all of those different points of view ending up at Board level. I think that it has been well understood by the Board

---

and by the community, although some have fought against this, that tackling the issues early on and having the different points of view expressed and discussed earlier on rather than at Board level at the end of the process is a lot more productive.

And I'm very pleased to see that the GNSO is opening up its working groups and has very much welcomed people from At-Large, and I say people from At-Large because we're not only speaking of ALAC members, of the Committee members being welcomed in those working groups but everyone in At-Large being able to take part; and not taking part maybe in an official capacity for some of them but in some cases it's individuals being able to be on those working groups.

So I'm really concerned when I hear from Alan that, and I know how many of these working groups that he is on – we have a very poor showing in there. And it's really drafting our comments and our public comments is one thing, but actually being part of that working group that does the initial work is in my view even more productive because we're able to shape the policy right at the beginning rather than hammering it at the end when it's finished, that's all.

Alan, you have your hand up again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes I do, just to correct one thing you said. You said it's encouraging that the GNSO is opening up their working groups to us – they have always been open. Certainly in my tenure they have always been open. We are being treated like a more real part of the community and our issues are important more so than before when we were simply allowed

---

there as a courtesy but were not really viewed as representing an important constituency. So the perception of how important we are has certainly changed but certainly for pretty much all of my tenure they have always been open if people... Ever since we had the concept of working groups which only started around 2007, they've always been open to us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, well thank you very much, Alan. So what I suggest then as an action item on this is that the staff sends out a call for volunteers for these working groups. So the first thing that would need to be done is to find out what working groups, GNSO and other working groups are out there that require our input; issue a call for volunteers and then find out if there is interest. And the call for volunteers is not only to be sent to the ALAC because I know that several of you are absolutely overloaded with work, taking on so many positions; but also I think it's unfair to ask for people to go to three or four different working groups bearing in mind some of them meet sometimes twice a week.

So the request can be sent to all of the RALOs as well, the At-Large Structures and that really is a first good step for our At-Large Structures to get involved with policy development; and at the same time it would spread the load. I mean we have 130 At-Large Structures. That's a serious amount of people, and at the moment I'm really concerned that on the one side we have At-Large Structures who are saying "We want to help, what can we do?" but they're not told what opportunity there is for them to join and get involved. So this would not only open up our own working groups which I'm pleased to see are functioning better and



---

better but also be able to spread the load and influence in GNSO policy in the early stages.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth, I'm just going to put my hand up on this issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: I'm sorry, I'm not on the Adobe Connect. Within NARALO we have started a program of outreach of our own, our own subcommittee, and part of our agenda is increasing participation in working groups and using that as a way to reach out to new ALSes and folks in particular who are useful and are not necessarily fully participating; and getting them to the meetings as well as full members of certain working groups. So that's something that we've been working on actively, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth. For the transcript that was Garth Bruen. A question for you actually, as the Chair of NARALO I'm very pleased that you are pushing for this but is it something... Have you reached a stage where you could share this with other RALOs?

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth again. We can certainly absolutely share what we've been working on as a framework for outreach and inreach and recruitment – that's definitely something. And we're going to be scheduling another

---

call in the near future for our subcommittee so we can certainly have other folks on that call from other RALOs if they want to participate. As far as the strategy goes for placing people on working groups we're not at that point yet, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Okay, so now we have, I'm looking at the action items and I see the action item recorded, so to determine which working groups require ALAC input and a call for volunteers will then be made to determine if there is interest in joining the working groups. So if I could ask as far as the GNSO working groups are concerned, for Alan to provide a list of the working groups that require ALAC input – I'm sure he has that at hand. For our ccNSO, if there are any ccNSO working groups that allow for At-Large members, for Cheryl of course to provide us with such info; and for staff to provide us with a quick update on the working groups we have within At-Large. And I guess these we already know about. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, yeah – I don't have a simple list on hand. If there were a list like that at hand I would certainly send it. It is on my list of things to do, to put together a list of what's active and what's coming. Unfortunately on a couple of PDPs we're close enough to the end of them now that it's probably not appropriate to start new participation – the learning curve I think is going to be too steep and the person will feel a bit lost, but there are others that are not there at all. And yes, I will be doing that, thank you.

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Cheryl. Go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just noticing what Heidi put up – that's the At-Large Working Groups, that's the tip of the iceberg. It's important but it is just the tip of the iceberg. If it's all a rose in particular the Support Organizations that Alan and I are particularly going on about because I think yeah, that's the outward facing stuff that other people will be looking at.

It is important to recognize that all of these things run a particular course, and as Alan said jumping in at the end of these things may not be all that wise. So a simple exercise of just running a list up and seeing what's populated and what's not populated may not be the best way forward in my view; but having a, as Garth has indicated in NARALO and I know I'm aware of activities along similar lines in other RALOs – having a framework which is effectively getting this information not just out to the ALSes but also encouraging the regional meetings to follow up or at least have their Secretariat specifically follow up on the calls or however it works for you is important.

---

I know we keep talking about capacity building and inreach – these are topics that perhaps ought to be integrated into those agendas as well. But it's not just as simple as running up a list of what's running and what's not. If I was to suggest people suddenly jump into some of the more highly technical works at the moment it would be fraught with even worse disasters than not having them there in the first place. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Of course I leave the listing of these working groups and what the needs are over to both Alan and to you as far as the GNSO and ccNSO are concerned; and certainly engaging a wider strategy is what we need to do in the longer term.

Okay, I think we need to move on and I note that I have been told that Tijani has to leave in five minutes, but he wanted to provide us with just a few quick details about the African Strategy and the discussion of the upcoming meeting in Addis Ababa. I don't see an agenda item here but I thought we could just slot this quickly before Tijani has to go. Tijani, can you say a few words on this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Olivier, thank you – Tijani speaking. So as you all know ICANN is organizing two events in the Middle East and in Africa. The first is in Dubai; it is for the multi-stakeholder internet governance and the aim of those two events is to, how to say... It is to encourage, is to empower or is to encourage people to go more into the domain name industry in those regions. For Addis for example it is more or less a follow-up on

---

the steps of the African Strategy of ICANN; and in the Middle East also they are working on a strategy for the Middle East and this event is in the same space. So there will be a two days' event in Addis Ababa for the African community, especially the African registries and registrars and the private sector to push them to go and to enter the domain name industry; and also for all the other stakeholders in the internet governance ecosystem.

Before that two days' event there will be a two days' training especially for the private sector about everything concerning the registries – how to... There is a whole program, and we will have the privilege to have with us at least three or four Board members. I think Steve Crocker will be there, I am not sure but I am sure that Sebastien Bachollet, Ray and George Sadowsky will be there. So there will be the training two days and then two days of this event. It is more an outreach if you want event.

In the Middle East it is the same. It is almost the same event but the first is done by the Vice President for Africa, Pierre Dandjinou and the second is done by the Vice President for the Middle East which is Mr. Baher Esmat. Those two events are if you want in the same direction of the new vision of the new management at ICANN, so more engagement with communities in developing countries to make them if you want reach the internet development. I think that's all. I'm not saying more because it is not yet done. It will be done next week, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Just one question: is it just you from At-Large who is going to go there or are there any others?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very good question. At Addis Ababa there will be seven from At-Large. In Dubai there will be two from At-Large.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's really good to hear so I'm really glad to hear that the community is involved in this part of the world.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: We're participating actively in those events, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Super, okay thank you. Now I also, since we are dealing with this any other business item there is also the Latin American and Caribbean, the LACRALO Strategy that is currently being put in place as well. I understand that Dev Anand Teelucksingh might be able to provide us with a quick update on that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier, this is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. Yes, myself and Fatima Cambronero have been involved in the Latin American and Caribbean Strategy Working Group that is being led by Rodrigo de la Parra, the VP of Latin America and the Caribbean for ICANN. We had a retreat on the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> of February in Montevideo in Uruguay. Fatima Cambronero was there along with persons from LACTLD, persons from the GNSO, from LACNIC and some GAC members as well; as well as

---

persons like Vanda Scartezini and Alejandro Pisanty participating remotely.

Also I myself participated remotely in that retreat as well as [Tracy Hackshaw] also from the GAC. So during those two days, well, it was quite intense actually. Various groups made their presentations and afterwards we then started discussing the strategic plan; and we then broke up into various working groups to try to come up with a draft strategy. This strategy was completed at the end of the two-day retreat and right now the documents are being translated and in fact were just sent by Rodrigo within the last 24 hours. And the intent is to continue working on the strategy as well as to identify strategic projects that could achieve the strategic objectives.

The intent is to try to have it ready by Beijing but if not then have it ready by the next LACNIC and LACTLD meetings which are happening I think in May. So I think that's the full summary. Fatima Cambronero has been well documenting this entire process and I point you to the link there, and it will go into much more detail as to what was done and so forth. So I think that's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, that's really great. And it's good to see now two regions being involved directly with the strategy and the work of ICANN in their part of the world. I really hope that this will continue panning across all of our RALOs. I heard a "hand up" from Cheryl so you have the floor, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, I was going to – Cheryl for the record. I was going to raise this under the any other business so it's appropriate that I pop in now rather than wait till the end of the call. Just a very, very preliminary but I think very potentially rewarding update from the Asia-Pacific world and with direct reference to this topic: as many of you all know, APRICOT which is a regional meeting, is running at the moment in Singapore and on the weekend, on Sunday we held what is traditionally held in a number of gatherings across Asia-Pacific – something called the APSTAR which is pretty much any organization with anything to do with the internet or internet governance gathering together in a room and talking at each other, occasionally to each other.

We had the pleasure of Fadi not only giving a presentation to that gathering but also staying for the afternoon's and evening's proceedings, and I was very pleased to hear him as he was listening to us talk about our Regional Internet Governance Forum to be held in Seoul, South Korea, in the fourth week in September or July – I'll get back to you on the dates. Anyway, he wondered whether or not it might be appropriate to try to run a week in parallel with that activity if not to do so with another regional activity in the not too distant or read that "closest as possible" point in the near future.

He also informed us that interviews had been conducted for some of the candidates at least for our new Asia-Pacific Regional Vice President so we look forward to very similar things happening in our part of the world although he did recognize as was pointed out by a number of us that we're a rather more complex region than many. And so he is aware that there are some regional diversities as well. Thank you.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Great to see *three* regions with a lot of movement at the moment. So let's get back to our originally designed program and jump back from the any other business to Agenda Item #8 which provides us with an update from selected At-Large Working Groups. Of course we don't have time to look at all of the working groups that we have. The two really critical items this month are the ALAC Rules of Procedure Working Group and also the At-Large New gTLD Review/Working Group. And so for the first one, the ALAC Rules of Procedure Working Group you have five minutes. I'm not sure whether it's Cheryl or Alan who wishes to have the floor and provide us with an update on this, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl will start and Alan will finish – Cheryl for the transcript record. The amount of work that the team has done, and here when I refer to the team I'm talking about a coalescence of all the individual drafting teams – we've come back from the section-segregated world back into the penholders plus doing a huge amount of work. But a huge shout out needs to go specifically to Alan who for fair means or foul, and I think he may regret this at least at 2:00 AM in one of his mornings, said he would hold the pen on the drafting of these last versions. But there's been significant input from really each of the regions but we should note here, the ALAC should note here that the members of the Work Group have been heroic in these last couple of weeks and particularly Alan.

---

I should also note that there has been considerable input from, if I count them, about half the ALAC. So about half of your ALAC has been pen holding or putting primary input into the finessing of your final draft document. And Alan, I think you've still got it measured at version 46 but I suspect it may be a bit higher number if truth be told. I want to ask you to give the ALAC a very brief review of the state of nation and also give them the full head's up on the fact that they should be going to the place and space on the Wiki where this is about to be repository'd; and that they should start reading through it, that we will be doing a call in the not too distant future and then getting them to vote on it – in other words, repeat everything I think you said earlier but with a little more embellishment. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much; a couple of specifics. For the record we're at [version 48] right now. [Version] 46 had gone out last night but Word had decided that we really didn't want our paragraphs numbered – it eliminated all the numbering. Somehow I got them back; I won't attempt to describe it here.

I also have to note that Rinalia, who had not been participating very actively in the various drafting teams has been a very active reviewer of the consolidated document and has contributed significantly both time and quality to the document.

Currently I think we will be finished this pass, I hope we'll be finished with this pass in a few days – the number of comments is getting smaller per document and I'm waiting for the rest of the penholders to tell me if there's anything substantive that they feel would be needed.

---

The document will then be put out to the ALAC and At-Large for comment. We have specifically said that we're not in a position to handle individual comments and rebut them but if people have comments they should be funneled through their ALAC people. If their suggested change or criticism or comment has any merit and is going to be supported by the ALAC then it's got to come through ALAC people; otherwise we're opening the floodgates with no real mechanism to address it.

So my hope is we'll be out in a few days. We've said we'll give two weeks which means we should be able to vote online prior to the Beijing meeting and that's the intent. There are a couple of adjunct documents which should be presented prior to that. There's a way to finesse that if we can't get them done but you're going to see a couple of those from me in the next few days. Some of them are documents that already exist with a new title on them. One of them is in that category, one has some minor modifications to it and we'll see what happens to the others.

The way to finesse it if we can't get the adjunct documents done is to make the Rules of Procedure come effective as soon as the documents are approved. So we may choose to do that, and I haven't discussed that with anyone so Cheryl may disagree strongly or Olivier.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You've got a yep from me, then.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, because that's the way to get the substantive work out of the way and then finalize the details later without jeopardizing the major work. I think that is about all. We have committed to have a discussion in Beijing on the Sunday I believe, on whether we want to keep the electorate the same as we currently have or change it; and I think we'll be sending out some informational material or someone will be sending out some informational material well before the Beijing meeting to frame that discussion.

And I don't think there's anything else to report. It has been an enormous amount of work. Cheryl, you're correct – I might not have volunteered if I realized how many hours it was going to take. But I think the document is in pretty good shape right now if the numbers don't all disappear again. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan, and thanks Cheryl. And I want to echo your thanks to all of the people that have been involved in this massive project – massive in that it's taken a long time. It's pretty hard for a large group to look at these Rules of Procedures, and you're looking at several hundreds of person hours I think that have been spent on this. So it really is great to see those taking shape. I'm mindful of the time and I wanted to continue, since we only have ten minutes allocated to the overall update.

There's an equally important update and that's the At-Large New gTLD Review Group where Dev Anand Teelucksingh is going to be able to provide us with five minutes of what's going on there.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you Olivier – this is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. It's been a very busy month for the New gTLD Review Group, having to deal with comments from the At-Large community on various applications and strings. On our full reviewing and discussing the various strings we made several decisions regarding the various strings on .amazon, .patagonia, .nyc, .cba, and .health.

We went through all of the comments received and had extensive discussions, and we tried to match the comments to what was expected of our community objection grounds. The community objection grounds list four tests that will enable the dispute resolution service provider hearing the objection to determine whether there is substantial opposition from a significant portion of the community to which the string may be targeted. And most critically, all four of these tests must be met for the objection to prevail.

So what we did is that we ranked... All the Review Group members, we created a template, we listed all the factors for each of these four tests and asked Review Group members to well, rank based on the comments and the discussions whether it was a pass or a fail or an uncertain for each of these factors. And based on that, the comments on .health, our initial review showed that there was consensus and that all four criterion were met and therefore the decision was made to draft objection statements on the applications for .health as well as the IDN application called .jiànkāng, and I apologize for probably mispronouncing that name. It translates to either "healthy" or "health."

---

So once we did that, the penholders within the last ten days have been trying very, very hard to really get the statements ready in time for the RALO review. And on our call yesterday we decided that the statements are ready enough for the RALO review, so the statements have now all been put up. If you go to the New gTLD Review Group Dashboard, Wiki pages have been set up for each of the five statements. So you can read the application by the applicant, the objection statement and also the comments that we referred to in making our decisions and so forth. So all of that information is there.

So the RALOs all need to review each of these five gTLD applications and decide if the objection statement drafted by the Review Group supports the criteria for community objection; and most importantly the RALO has to advise the ALAC as to whether the RALO either 1.) supports the objection statement being filed by the ALAC against the new gTLD application, or 2.) does not support the objection statement being filed by the ALAC against the new gTLD application. The RALO cannot change the text of the objection statement.

So this advice for each of the five objection statements needs to be sent to the ALAC by March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013. The reason is because the ALAC has to then review the RALO advice and of course the end of the objection period is March 13, 2013. Well, I'll stop there right now and then ask does anybody have any questions or comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, and certainly that's a very, very tight schedule that your group is working on. I must say that I'm really thrilled by the amount of work that the Review Group has done. Just to

---

remind everyone, most of the people in that group are not the usual suspects. They are totally independent in that they're not in any way conflicted. There was a great amount of work that was done to make sure we had totally un-conflicted people on that group, and certainly the amount of analysis that has taken place to make sure that if an objection statement is to be drafted it really satisfies a large set of specifications was really, really good.

So and of course that's all thanks to the Chair of the group – that's you who's done excellent work in moving this process along. Any questions or comments on this from anyone? I don't want to open a full discussion on what happens next; I think you provided good details on what happens next and I suspect there will be discussions at RALO level and there should be discussions at RALO level first, and there should be discussions at ALAC level within the next three weeks. So the floor is open... Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Olivier, this is Evan. Just to repeat something I'd mentioned in the Adobe Chat – Dev, are we talking about multiple objections being advanced for each RALO to consider, one against each of the .health applicants? Or is there one sort of, so to speak omnibus objection against all of them that needs to be [fettered]? When the question gets put to the RALOs is it for multiple objections or just one?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thank you, Evan. This is Dev. It is against each individual application, so the RALOs are looking at five objection statements. So for example the

---

RALO can look at what the comments are that have been provided, and in fact one of the applicants while our statements were being drafted actually responded. So again, it's important for the RALOs to look at the comments.

So a RALO can decide to say it wants to support one objection statement but not the others, for example, because they reviewed the evidence and they think perhaps the applicant does not cause detriment, one of the community objection criterion. So it's five separate applications; it's not against the string in general. I hope that answers the question.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, thanks. My concern was I saw what happened in some of the GAC early warnings wherein I think for instance .green the Czech Republic objected to all except one and it seemed like they were trying to game the competitive process, or at least that's how it appeared to me. So I guess we have to be really, really vigilant of making sure that kind of thing doesn't appear to happen with us.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thanks, Evan, this is Dev. Well yes. I should say that in a sense the GAC has much more leeway in their advice whereas we have to then, after we decided to look at these comments we had to see if there was any limited public interest concerns and there were none that could be applied. And we then looked at the community objections and we tried to really look at the four factors, the four tests for a community objection to prevail. So yep.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think we want to be careful about using the word “gaming” in something like this. I think it’s quite conceivable that one could have problems with four out of five applications for the same string and not have that problem for the fifth. If you believe for instance that a particular string should be a community one and bottom-up organized, and one of them is and the others aren’t, then yes, you’re implying that you support the one that you’re not objecting to but I think that’s an implicit part of the problem if there are multiple applicants for a string. So I’d be careful about using the word “gaming.”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. There was some feedback that some of the language used in the text which is currently available was a little bit difficult to read and certainly difficult to understand for those people who are not native English speakers. Is there any leeway in being able to simplify this text, Dev, or is the text in this format due to the requirements, the legal requirements for an objection to be drafted?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Olivier, this is Dev speaking. I’m not sure if I follow. Are you referring to the IDN application, I take it, that an objection statement was drafted on?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not only the IDN but all of the objection statements – some of them are a little complex in the language that they use.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed. This is Dev. Unfortunately it's very difficult. Once we started looking at the comments and looking at the community objection criterion and realizing that you know, the four tests for the community objection criterion are very strict in terms of the factors and so forth; and that most critically for an objection to prevail all four tests must be satisfied. And that was why after long discussions objection statements were not drafted against certain strings that we received comments on simply because while one or two of the tests were satisfied, especially the detriment test was not satisfied and we felt we could not draft a statement that could adequately satisfy the detriment criterion.

So unfortunately there is no easy way to do it. So there is some homework for the RALOs to read the applications, to read the objection statements as drafted and to read the comments as well. And of course the RALOs are also invited to post comments on the Wiki and for everybody else to discuss.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Dev. Holly, you've put your hand up – Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I just [noticed] on this private chat that I'm having with Matt and Alan, just to point out that the comments about the public interest commitment specifications are due today. I just won't have time to do it

---

today so we have to get something in to say that we're going to be a little bit late. I'll have time to do something, Alan will then have time to at least have a look, just to let people know because otherwise the public period is for Australia anyway today and I just can't do it in the next twelve hours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry, Holly, what was this relating to?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm sorry, this was way back but it's what Matt's drawn my attention to. The public interest commitments specifications on new gTLD registrations – I just realized the comments are due today. So I've got a (inaudible) tonight to do something that I can't do.

[crosstalk]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, that's well, okay... So that's out of the current discussion but that will be taken care of. I think there's a note to be sent out anyway.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great, thank you Holly. Alan, you've put your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I was going to elaborate on that but let's go back to the topic on the table. I'll just put a note in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we should, yes. I'm a little concerned, mindful of the time – we still have five minutes until the end of this call and in fact we would probably need a little more than five minutes; probably need about ten to fifteen minutes more and I'm hoping we can fit within the ten to fifteen minutes. I have to thank both Dev and also Cheryl and Alan for their feedback and their update on these selected working groups. Clearly some work, some real work for not only RALOs in the case of the At-Large New gTLD Review Group but also for the ALAC in both the Review Group and the Rules of Procedure Working Group.

I implore the help and the diligence of everyone here to make sure that this work gets done. It's critical in the next three weeks I think, about three to four weeks but three weeks – it's critical that this work gets done and it's critical that we do it in time, that we don't come up when everything is done and dusted and on one side the Rules of Procedures are printed and the ink is drying and on the other side the objections have been sent, that someone doesn't raise their hand and says "Oh, by the way, I think we totally forgot something." That would be quite embarrassing, so I'm hoping we can catch everything there and with more pairs of eyes that will certainly help.

So let's move on to the next thing. I see Alan, you've put your hand up again?

ALAN GREENBERG: Old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Now the next agenda item is again a very short agenda item and I'll just be quickly reading through this – that's the Meetings Strategy Working Group. You will have all seen requests for candidates sent on the ALAC list, the ALAC Announce list. I just wish to explain what the next steps are. So the announcement has been sent out. It was sent out a while ago by Sebastien Bachollet who is going to be one of the Co-Chairs for that working group. And there was a repeat announcement, a reminder which was sent in the past 24 hours.

All candidates should send their candidatures to the email that is provided, the [mswgcandidatures@icann.org](mailto:mswgcandidatures@icann.org) email and carbon copy staff at [at-large@icann.org](mailto:at-large@icann.org). The selection of the candidates will be made by the Chairs of the working group; however and endorsement will be asked of the ALAC and the endorsement will be asked after the closing of the candidatures between the 3<sup>rd</sup> of March, and Heidi, if I get this correctly... I can't find the right paper, I think it's the 14<sup>th</sup> of March. So the ALAC would have five, well a week and a half let's say to make a choice, make its choice of candidates' recommendations.

I'm just mentioning this here to... Well, let's take this thing offline since we are taking time on it but I'm just trying to find out by what process the ALAC should be selecting those candidates. Do you all believe that there should be an overall vote of all the ALAC or should it be a small team like there was for the ATRT? Bearing in mind we have very little

---

time in front of us which of those options would you say is the option to go for? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I'll keep this as something that we can follow up with on email, but Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, it's Alan. Unless people feel very strongly about it why don't we delegate it to the ExCom? It's a group that will meet in the next little while and can typically meet on short notice if necessary, unless people feel this is an onerous enough task that we need to have a separate group for it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay Alan, thank you. Any thoughts on this? Okay, I don't see anyone jumping up and down and saying "No, no, no, no, no!" so let's take it at that. There is one question, though, because I think all of the applications will be made public and I think that one of the people on the ExCom wishes to apply to this. But what we will do then is to work out a case regarding their candidature, that ExCom member will not be voting or will not be party of the discussion. Let's take this offline.

And I see here, okay – AI from Alan, so on revised New gTLD agreement should have added...

ALAN GREENBERG:

That was a message to the staff.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, a follow-up on an earlier AI, okay, no problem. Right, let's move on then and I do apologize for the longish wait. We're now down to Agenda Item #10, Expired Registration Recovery Education Needs, and Alan Greenberg is going to be able to speak to us about this. But we have staff members Mike Zupke and Caitlin Tubergen who are joining us. And Mike is Registrar Programs Manager and Caitlin is Registrar Relations and Contracts Manager. So if we could spend the next five-ish or so minutes on this... I'm not quite sure who is going to present on that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I can certainly introduce it but I suspect I don't have very much to say on it. Heidi, is it possible to get up the text in some window that I provided earlier?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Nathalie, can you give that? In the meantime I'll put it into the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Part of the Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery PDP, some of the recommendations or one of the recommendations was that a significant part of the problem was due to registrants not knowing what the rules were and being caught by surprise, and therefore it was strongly recommended that there be some educational material made

---

available by ICANN, posted and displayed by registrars so that registrants would have less excuse for saying “Oh gee, I didn’t know.”

And it was suggested that this material not be developed solely by ICANN but in cooperation with the registrars and with ALAC to help guide what should be there and to critique it as we go along to make sure that the final product really meets the original intent. And that’s as much of a prefix as I can give. There is a copy of the recommendations which may be posted in one of the chat windows or something, or it is posted by Heidi there. And I turn it over to Mike and Caitlin, and I hope I haven’t said everything you were planning to say.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

[laughing] Thank you for that introduction, Alan, and nice to meet you over the phone. Thank you also for all of your hard work on this policy. So the policy is going to be announced this week, and so the next step as you said is for ICANN staff to create educational materials in consultation with interested stakeholders to help registrants properly manage their registrations. And just to be clear, we’re not asking ALAC to draft or create these materials; we just wanted some feedback as to what form you wanted these educational materials to take if you had any, so whether that’s a webinar or a video tutorial or some sort of booklet – we’re open to suggestions.

As I understand ALAC is also the most multilingual of the groups and so if you have suggestions as to what translations you would like these materials to take. Matt has created a workspace for us which I believe Heidi has put the link to, Mike just put the link to, so we will be interested in receiving feedback within the next two weeks as to what



---

form you would like these educational materials to take, if you have any ideas.

Also on the workspace Heidi posted yesterday the *Beginner's Guide to Domain Names* which as I understand was created by ALAC, and we think that's a great resource. And we would be interested in updating it to reflect these policy changes, but if you have any other ideas we would love to hear them. I don't know, Olivier, if we have time for questions on this call right now but I'm happy to provide my email address if anyone has any questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you very much, Caitlin. I think one of the things of course is by having the workspace already here the best way to use your time and our time is to get people to fill and comment on this workspace and bring their input on there. I'm very pleased to see that you have the *Beginner's Guide to Domain Names* in your hands and that you will be updating this – that's certainly a very important resource that needs to be updated. On this view of languages, we operate and this call included operates in English, in Spanish, and in French. I think that as a real minimum those three languages should be supported. I think that on a more standard basis nowadays ICANN should really look at supporting the five UN languages, so this one is one which will echo very much with our community.

Now with regards to actually providing you with direct input here, right now I'm not sure after two hours of call whether anybody still has their mind working correctly and in place. I'd be quite surprised but I open the floor for a couple more minutes if anybody wishes to add anything

---

to what I've said. Okay, as you can see most people are sleeping. [laughter] I can hear virtual "Zzzzzz's" coming across. Oh! One person who is just waking up and that's Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm far from just waking up; I've been up for a ridiculous amount of hours. It's only 4:00 AM here in Australia, isn't it Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As one who has a particular vested interest in this because I happen to be involved in education and outreach for our ccTLD operations which is not a dissimilar issue, and I also had a little bit to do with it as Alan did through the development of this process and the whole PDP we did. What I'd ask you to do is make sure that not only do we look at language diversity, etc. but we look for things that are written in such a way as are extraordinarily plain language and simple and easy to understand. I don't need to tell you professionals about avoiding jargon, etc., etc. but we do need to also recognize that some of the ways we would like to promulgate this material out to the edges to maximize its penetration will actually need very short, little bites of information – so things that can be carved up and taken in small sections might be quite useful.

We should not forget podcasts and radio use of podcasts because not all of us live in incredibly well-connected internet-rich environments with

---

24/7 electricity; therefore radio and some of our less (inaudible) and high bandwidth usages of material need also to be considered. And other than that I'm always happy to contribute. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. So let's take this as a follow-up item, and I guess we can have it as an action item for the At-Large community to... So for a request to come out and for input to be sent over to that Wiki page which was created. I'm not quite sure, I didn't quite hear when, what are your timetables for this or when do you think that you will get drafting and have some material?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: We would like to have all suggestions provided in the next two weeks, so by March 12<sup>th</sup>. And then March 12<sup>th</sup> we'll take a look at the ideas, and then if anyone has comments after that period we'll also take a look at those. But please try to provide them by March 12<sup>th</sup> and we will get to work on this.

MIKE ZUPKE: This is Mike, just in kind of in terms of what happens after that, the idea was you know, we'd like to use the ideas that we get to figure out how long it will take because as Cheryl mentions, we might want to do podcasts, there might be some written things. And so those might all take a little bit different tracks so we just sort of want to figure out kind of first what the landscape is before committing to a timeline.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Well, I think it's all very exciting and we very much welcome more material for internet users.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hand up, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, yes I can see you now, Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, just a practical point – it's infinitely easier to get comments and critiques when people have something to comment on instead of on a blank page. So although it's fine to ask for input now so you get your marching orders you're likely to get much better input and perhaps more input as well, but certainly better quality input when we see something and can identify what's missing in it or where the direction is inappropriate. So just give that fair notice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I gather that once Mike and Caitlin have started drafting there will be some opportunity for feedback afterwards, is that correct?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Yes, definitely.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. Well thank you very much for coming online and visiting us virtually I guess and providing us with some details on this. It's exciting as I said and I look forward and hope that the community looks forward to bringing their input into this in a couple of weeks' time. The action item on this is for staff to send out a call on the mailing lists.

Now, Agenda Item #11, we're reaching the end of this call. We do have to go rather quickly but I hand the floor over to Cheryl, not Cheryl sorry – that's it, I'm starting to get names wrong – Heidi, Heidi Ullrich for a review of At-Large meetings schedule for the 46<sup>th</sup> ICANN meeting in Beijing. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much. I'll make this very brief, just that all meetings have been scheduled for Beijing. We do expect that the draft ICANN schedule will be posted this next week. What we're asking you to do now is look at the Wiki pages I'm going to be putting into the chat. These are questions for example for the Board and other public forums, etc. So we'll be putting those in an email and sending those out, all of these pages so you can add your questions you have for these particular events. I think that's all. I think the ExCom will also be looking at the agendas a little bit more tomorrow during their call and at this point that's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Heidi. That was very fast but I was going to mention specifically the Board questions workspace and the topics for Public Forum workspace. I know that there was a closing date for the

---

topics for public comment which was on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of February – do we still have time to provide such input? I notice only two people having brought their input into this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I do believe that we can still send those in. But again, if we can get those in by this Friday at the very latest that would be very useful, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect, thank you. And of course we also have the Board questions. We are going to meet with the Board and so it's really vital that we get those questions in as soon as possible. As far as other meetings are concerned these are not confirmed yet. If we do meet with the GAC we will have a Wiki page that will ask for the questions and topics for the meeting with the GAC and I'll spare you from going through the whole list since we have 27 minutes. I'm quite sure we could add even more time in those 24 hours every day.

We are reaching the end of this call now although we are on #11-B, update on APRALO Beijing Events – that's probably our penultimate agenda item here. Who is going to provide us with an update on this?

---

Is that Rinalia or staff or anyone else? Holly? Ah, thank you Rinalia, so Holly you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm talking about Beijing... Sorry, I walked away from the phone briefly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Did you walk away or just wake up?

HOLLY RAICHE: Wake up is more like it. [laughter] Are we talking about Beijing? Have we finally got there?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We are talking about Beijing and do you-

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, fantastic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The shorter you are the quicker you can go to bed.

HOLLY RAICHE: I can't wait. As you would have heard and as (inaudible) here we had a meeting today, ah yesterday now, of the Beijing Organizing Committee. Pretty much everything is in hand. I've got to say Maureen is doing a fabulous job, Rinalia is. We're going to have a Showcase where we're arguing about how many speakers we're going to have; a Multi-

---

Stakeholder event on Monday. We're going to have an event particularly just for Chinese ALSes on the Thursday. We are finalizing the whole schedule which we can send around to everybody but since everybody's been on this call for a very long time, Heidi, I think the one thing to do might be if people are interested they can go to the Beijing Organizing Committee website and just look at the calendar. We're pretty well on track for everything to be finalized. Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. That's very good, Holly, and thanks for all the work that your group has done to prepare for Beijing. I know that when it actually happens on the day it sounds and looks like it's always very easy to do but I also know that the RALO leaderships from each one of the RALOs have gone through this amount of work to prepare for events. And well we're all looking forward to going over to China and to really enjoy our time over there.

I don't wish to make this call that much longer – any other business, Agenda Item #12? We have dealt with some any other business earlier. Heidi, I know that you keep track of this – is there any “any other business” that I might have not picked up?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, no – not that I am aware of.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And I don't see any other hands up so I thank everyone for the two hours and fifteen minutes that we have spent together. I thank



---

everybody for this call and I guess that this call is now adjourned. And thanks of course to the interpreters for their extensive work and for having spent a little more time with us. It's been really, really good and I do apologize once again if I speak a little bit too fast sometimes. Thanks and bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]