
GISELLA GRUBER: The recording has started, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everybody. This is the ALAC Executive Committee Conference Call on Friday, the 25th of January, 2013. The time is 13:04 UTC and we have a small agenda but it might take the whole hour and a half. So let's get going right away and let's start with the roll call and apologies, please. Gisella, you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Gisella here for the transcript. Welcome to everyone. On today's call we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Carlton Samuels, Julie Hammer, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Hong Xue. From staff we have Matt Ashtiani, Heidi Ullrich and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes and a transcript of this call will be made available within 48 hours, so two working days from the call. Thank you, over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Have we missed anyone by the way who is on the call and whose name we have not called? I don't hear anyone shouting out to let's get going and welcome to Hong, who will speak to us in a moment about the planned Chinese Multi-Stakeholder Forum in Beijing.

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.

In our agenda first we do have to go through a review of our action items from the 22nd of January, 2013 ALAC meeting. I am surprised we don't also have to look at the action items from our last ExCom call as well – we might have to look at those as well. But let's first look at the page which has the ALAC meeting action items, and we'll just look at the open action items.

And the two open action items relate to the WCIT, the World Conference on International Telecommunications and starting with Olivier, myself, to draft a statement on my experiences at the WCIT. That is still in progress, and as long as this is in progress the second action item which is Evan Leibovitch and Jean-Jacques Subrenat to lead the Future Challenges Working Group on a more extensive statement – that is in progress as well, awaiting the first completion of the task. I should be finished within seven days I think. I'm reaching the end of that report and whatever time I have I've spent writing and trying to write something that actually makes sense; and that is diplomatic enough so as to not ruffle too many feathers while at the same time making the points that it needs to make.

So the newly assigned action items, there are three of them: the first one is for Heidi Ullrich to work with the Chair of the WHOIS Working Group to set up a webinar on WHOIS. How is this progressing? I see Carlton has arrived as well so maybe I should ask the Chairman of the WHOIS Working Group, Carlton Samuels. Hello, Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Hello.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello, Carlton yes, we hear you twice over.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay, let me cut out of this one here. I'm having a little trouble here... I don't know why.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're hearing yourself. Okay, well having been carbon copied on the correspondence I understand that this is in progress at the moment. So Carlton and Heidi are currently working together to set up a webinar on WHOIS. I know that Carlton has provided the details of the dates when he would be available to lead this and a list of invitees is currently being drawn together.

Next, the issue of WHOIS is to be added as an issue to be addressed by the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group – I guess that's in progress as well because the At-Large Capacity Working Group has been put in motion and Sala who is currently leading this is going to hold a meeting of the leadership group of that Working Group, I don't know what you call it – the Program Committee.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Steering Committee, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Steering Committee – oh well, Program Committee, Steering Committee, it's all... Anyway, it's in motion. And after that there will be

a meeting of that Working Group so this issue can be added to the agenda.

The third action item is once the Rules of Procedure 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. That's also in process. Any comment or question regarding these action items?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I say something?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I am having some difficulty with my machine here so I'm on audio now only – I can't see the Adobe Connect room. I don't know if you would have noticed, Olivier, there was a question... This is Carlton for the record. There was a question about what the process was for the output from the Rules of Procedure Working Group, and I think there is some concern or worries that [we] were not as involved or we would not have a review process of the work of the Working Group. And I tried to explain on another list how it was really [objective] and what the process was going to be.

I think for the record you should just go over that again so it's down, so that everybody can see it. I would recommend that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Carlton. Do you think that a message should be sent to everyone then to explain what the next steps are with regards to this?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I would suggest that that happen. I know we're just repeating ourselves here but it's important for us to get it on the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely, thank you very much, Carlton. That's very clear and so let's make this an action item, to send an explanatory message to the ALAC as to what the next steps are with regards to the Rules of Procedure Working Group. If I could... Because this needs to be clarified, and I know that Cheryl Langdon-Orr is leading the work on this: could Cheryl work with staff or could just staff draft that note as to where we are going from here? And we can send that over to the ALAC lists.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, Olivier. Yeah, I'm happy to do that but I don't appear to have any ability to get internet connection which would include emails while I'm down here at the lake, so it won't happen until Tuesday, my Tuesday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Your Tuesday. Well, the work of the Rules of Procedure Working Group has not finished by Tuesday. Or is this the week of the end?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It'll be meeting after that. I'll just point out however, for the record, that this is hardly grounds for (inaudible) concern. It's our voices which have an agenda.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton, again, I can't see the room. I want to agree with Cheryl that there's no groundswell of agenda but I like to be forearmed since I'm forewarned. And let us just nip it in the bud because it's like the second time I'm seeing something that says "The ALAC is a rump group that is running away without any input from the ALSes," which to be is slightly disingenuous because of the way that the ALAC is structured and what happens with the representation and how the representation goes. But and I think in this case, because it's the Rules of Procedure let us go the extra mile and lay out the process again. I just thought it was important to put it out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Carlton. We have a queue with Tijani and Alan, so first Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you hear me?

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

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Olivier, I want to say that... It is Tijani for the record. I want to say that the notice that will be sent to the At-Large to explain the next steps for the Rules of Procedure must be accompanied by the last draft of the Rules. We will not send them a next step announce without the Rules already drafted. So I propose to wait until we have the final draft and then we send it with the next step notice so that people can read and know what will come after that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Tijani. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I guess I disagree with Tijani. I think that the ALAC is mature enough that we need to tell them what is coming and not just when we have the document. There's still a fair number of steps left until we have the finished Rules of Procedure but we're going to have moderately little time and we do not want to be accused of not making the information available in a reasonable timeframe. We have said explicitly that we want input from the ALSes and from At-Large to be funneled through ALAC members so I think we have to alert them to the process and make it really clear. I don't see any harm in doing that and I don't think we should wait to put it in writing.

We've already said it several times. We said it in Toronto, we said it in meetings – I think we need to put it in writing and make it clear what the process is that we're following so people are aware and (inaudible) to it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. I think that I do agree with Alan and Carlton and Cheryl that there is currently some dissent with regards to these Rules of Procedure, them being rules for insiders by insiders. I think this needs to be nipped in the bud in that we are dealing here with disinformation. This couldn't be the furthest from the truth and therefore just an informational note letting everyone know what's coming up next on this, with perhaps also an announcement that the final draft will soon be made available can be sent out. In addition to this note, when we will send the draft out we can repeat that note just to remind everyone if they've missed it the first time around, and that does happen from time to time.

Of course as we know, the ROPs will be reviewed by the ALAC. I don't consider them to be the final-final-final, you know, you-can't-touch-these-rules-anymore. I think there might be some review and polishing and I know that the Rules of Procedure Working Group itself, reading the Rules myself I've seen several small typos, errors and things like that – I know that the ROP Working Group itself will be polishing it, giving it as Cheryl would say a toilet. And we may need to get some more toileting done, I'm sure some of our most sort of (inaudible) and most thorough will be able to give it an additional toilet in addition to what's in there.

Alan, your hand is up again?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, my hand is up and forgive the dogs barking in the background. It makes it hard to concentrate, though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You will have to translate what the dog says if you want it transcribed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. With regard to the interest expressed in changing the Rules of Procedure regarding how the Director is selected, Avri, who is the only one who has been vocal on this to date again in the chat in the ESADT meeting yesterday at the end thanked everyone profusely for letting her speak despite the fact that she had tried valiantly to become part of the committee and was not allowed to.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Rubbish.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like to ask of this group is there anyone who was aware of anything which could be construed as not allowing someone to participate in one of the drafting teams?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Nope.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, there is not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Nope.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That is what concerns me because I have been shuffling within these three groups, and I can't ever recall anybody who was ever volunteering for work... I don't remember ever any At-Large group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did we put out a call? Now Avri is on the ALAC list.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, we put out a call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please let me finish. So I don't know to what extent we put out a call on the At-Large lists. We certainly made it known on the ALAC list. Cheryl, as the person who oversees this, I think you need to call her on this in a private email copying perhaps the Chairs of the Drafting Teams and ask her to document exactly who was it and when who said she was not allowed to join because it's going to be raised again and again as an issue that she tried and we didn't let her. And I think we have to address that – privately yes, but I think we need to address that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Cheryl here. Yeah, I do understand but I would suggest that the open nature and the fact that it was deliberately populated with a minimum of regionally balanced representatives which were from the regions, the ALSes; and that yes, there was ALAC members on it as well but it was the Rules of Procedure and there was a call made for that –

all of that goes out. We'll remind the community, apparently who's notably unconcerned with the exception of Avri, that of course we also said very clearly that these were minimums and that the Work Group was open and all comers were indeed welcome provided they were willing to work; and that to our knowledge there has been no impediment pushed in anyone's way in terms of contributions to the Drafting Teams.

There is perhaps no formal listing of her as a member and that may I suppose be the issue. But the absence or presence of one's name on a Wiki page I would have thought was hardly the point here. We're going to just keep hearing more and more of this because this is a universal suffrage agenda that Avri is currently on, and she's trying to continue.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I understand all that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I don't think it needs to be private, Alan. I think it needs to be dealt with in the response that we'll be putting out. So if staff can draft something along those lines (inaudible) of the call, where the call's been, etc., etc. – by "call" I mean call for membership – then that's fine. In fact, the ALAC Rules of Procedure are the business of the ALAC. It need not have in any way, shape or form have gone further than the 15-person ALAC. The ALAC I think quite wisely took it well beyond that. It actively encouraged regional representatives and ALS members.

We've had people dropping in and dropping out. We do however have a minimum formal representatives to whom any casting of vote, should

a vote ever have been called for if a consensus was not going to be a clear 100% consensus, their voice would be what counted. And I think that can be done publicly rather than privately but don't expect Avri to [get back in her box]. She's not going to at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, I understand all that and I have no problem outlining the process – when we summarize the results, outlining the process is fine. But she's already put it in a blog entry. She's done it in other public forums so I think privately we would like to say "Please explain just who was it who said that."

CARLTON SAMUELS: I don't think we should do it... I'm sorry, this is Carlton. I agree with Cheryl that it should be public. It's already public and therefore we should ask the question publicly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps, but I really think that on the assumption that she's right somebody at some point told her no she can't. I want to know who it is and I don't want to ask that question publicly. I'll be quiet if everyone says I should but I really think we should put the onus on her to document who refused or stop saying it. Okay, that's my opinion, I'll shut up now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, thank you very much. If I can jump into this before I give the floor to Tijani, the note which she has put on the chat in that last call I think I

remember vaguely that I quickly responded to that. In that respect I could actually, as the Chair of the ALAC I could email her and say “Why are you saying this sort of thing?” or “Since you’re saying that would you be able to tell me who told you you’re not allowed or document the fact that you’re not allowed?”

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s what I’m asking. Either she has something that we’re not aware of or she doesn’t have anything, in which case either way I think we should you know, bring it into the open – not publicly but give her an opportunity to present one or the other.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I say something after this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We don’t want to spend too much time on this. Carlton, Tijani has been waiting first so first Tijani and then you, Carlton, you can close the debate on this. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I want to remind you that on the Wiki page of each Drafting Team, there is a table in which there is the names of the members of the Drafting Team; and anyone can add his name and he will be included by the staff in the mailing list. So I don’t think there is anyone who prevented Avri to be inside one or several of those Drafting Teams. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but I think it's important to get her to admit that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Tijani. Next is Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton, thank you Olivier – Carlton for the record. I wanted to just add one small piece which is very critically important to me because we raised it early. One of the objectives of the Rules of Procedure is that we were going to try and harmonize where necessary and possible the Rules across the regions. And it was for this major objective why we requested to have regional input and balance in the Working Groups. And I don't want us to lose sight of that because we started on the proposition that the output from this Working Group was going to be input for regional Rules of Procedure. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Carlton. So let's just be clear on the AI: a message will be sent out by staff about what is happening next on the Rules of Procedure. I will send an email to Avri asking her how did she come to the conclusion that she had to thank us for allowing her as if it was a privilege to be on this call when in fact those calls are all open and the call for membership is sent for everyone to become a member.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, she is on the ALAC list. It's not as if we forgot to do it on some public list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, that's correct, so I'll just ask her and we'll see what the answer is. But that's really it. And I don't want to spend any more time on this subject when we do have Hong who has been waiting very patiently, and I do apologize – the first part was supposed to take ten minutes but we often have discussions and debates that start immediately with those action items.

So I invite you all to move to agenda Item #3 and that's the planned Chinese Multi-Stakeholder Forum in Beijing. It's a proposal by Hong and I thought it would be a good idea if the ExCom could have Hong on the line, so Hong, you could provide us with details on what this Chinese Multi-Stakeholder Forum proposal is in Beijing and how do you want it linked or do you want to have it linked with the APRALO activities in Beijing or not, etc., and what the procedures are with regards to it.

And so Hong, I thought that the first thing is you could just basically give us a background on it and what the plan is, because the information I have so far is off an email and no direct discussion on this. So Hong, you have the floor and welcome.

HONG XUE: Thank you. Thank you, Olivier, for having me here. I'm very much honored to join you. I guess I'm solely and specifically coming here for agenda Item #3 so I do trust you're going to excuse me after that.

What is the idea of this Chinese Forum? Now, we changed the name from Chinese Multi-Stakeholder Forum into a simple one – it's going to be called as the Chinese Forum. That's because APRALO is going to have a Multi-Stakeholder Policy Forum and we wouldn't like to be confused with that, and of course we wouldn't like to distract [from the invitation] of that very important APRALO Multi-Stakeholder Policy meeting.

A little background here: at the very beginning I worked the APRALO local engagement program in Beijing. And APRALO originally was going to have the very first General Assembly in so many years in Beijing, and we're going to use this opportunity to bring many At-Large Structures from this region to Beijing which is very important for APRALO. And there will be a meeting series just like the one in Toronto for the North American RALO. For the local engagement project, from the very beginning I thought it was a small one and I wanted to involve the seven Chinese-speaking At-Large Structures from China mainland, Hong Kong, and Taiwan; but when I talked with the At-Large Structures in Beijing and the other stakeholders in the Chinese community I was kind of surprised by their enthusiasm in having a meeting completely in the Chinese language.

And everyone told me they have been disadvantaged by ICANN for many years – they can only listen and they can hardly speak because of the language barrier. And there's no Chinese translation or interpretation available notoriously at ICANN meetings, and for that reason we can only watch the others, the English speakers go to the Public Forum to express themselves so freely. So I guess at this meeting in Beijing, this meeting in the Chinese language will very much stimulate

the Chinese community to join ICANN, to participate in ICANN's processes. So this is the background.

And then I believe although our At-Large Structures, the seven Chinese-speaking At-Large Structures and also APRALO will be very important stakeholders since they're still under the umbrella of an APRALO meeting event in Beijing. This is very important because we need to engage the other stakeholder groups because the other groups are interested in this meeting, especially the Chinese domain name industry – the registries, registrars, new gTLD applicants and ecommerce, businesses, they're actually interested in this. And they like to dialog with the user community.

And fortunately we've also got the support from the Chinese government. To my preliminary knowledge there will be some high level officials from the Chinese government, such as the President of the Internet Society of China, and many people know her – Madame Hu Qiheng – will be joining this meeting. And also the Minister of Industry and Information Technology, MIIT, will be invited. He has not confirmed but probably he will send his deputy to the meeting, and also the Director of the State Internet Information Office. If we use a metaphor, this is something like the Internet Czar in the United States, Mr. Wang. He's also invited and probably he will come or send his deputy.

So it seems it's very much supported, strongly supported by the Chinese community. What we can very much use in a dialog right now, right here is how to more effectively connect the At-Large community, and not only APRALO that's already strongly connected to this event but also ALAC – our At-Large community generally with this meeting. What

I'm thinking, the general idea probably is that it will be a meeting in Chinese language but hopefully it can be in the main room with translation available to everyone. And especially we want the Chinese leaders such as the Board members, the CEOs, the stakeholder groups' leaders, the leaders from the constituencies would be available in the room to listen to the requests or questions or comments from these Chinese participants.

So we can really work this scenario in ICANN. The Chinese will be speaker this time; and ICANNer will be listening. I've said we're going to invite several high level officials so I think certainly we need to invite the CEO, the Chair of the Board and I hope Olivier as the Chair of ALAC would also be giving an address to showcase the At-Large community. And I don't know whether Holly would like to speak on behalf of APRALO as well. The seven Chinese-speaking At-Large Structures will be cohosting this event from the perspective of the Internet Society so this is very much multi-stakeholder now.

Olivier, you want me to go on to talk about subjects or you have questions? I'll leave it back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Hong, it's Olivier for the transcript. Thanks for this great introduction of the overall plan of what you're putting together. There were several questions which came from I think several people but specifically I'll just ask the questions that I have. When you described the whole process here, the first one you mentioned the Chinese language, and I understand the whole meeting will take place in Chinese. But it is my understanding that there will be Chinese

interpretation available for all of the sessions which are usually interpreted in addition to all the other interpretations. So that might not be an issue because everything is going to be interpreted in Chinese.

But one thing you mentioned there was that you were looking at this to be linked first to APRALO, so I wasn't quite sure how, whether you wanted this to be an APRALO event or whether this was going to have as I see many ALSes from APRALO. And the other thing that you mentioned was the main room, which usually gets me to think hang on, that's something that you usually need to deal with the Meetings Team. That somehow comes out of the [greater] At-Large.

HONG XUE:

Olivier, okay, thank you for these questions and comments, thank you. Yes, for the meeting requests yes indeed. I guess Heidi and her team will be taking care of that. Regarding this being an APRALO event, what I can present here is that I hope this is a part of the APRALO events in Beijing just because there's many categories of APRALO meetings in Beijing. I trust Cheryl or Holly can sufficiently present all that. For example, there will be APRALO Multi-Stakeholder Policy Forum and this one is for local engagement. We'll engage the local people but this is also a purpose for APRALO's meeting.

And also this has been organized, as has been discussed in APRALO biweekly conference calls in preparation of the Beijing meeting so I trust it is under the umbrella of the APRALO meeting series for that week. I'm not sure whether I answered your question, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Hong, it's Olivier for the transcript. I have one main concern which is that the Multi-Stakeholder Forum that APRALO is putting together has a somehow similar agenda, perhaps a slightly different audience but a somehow similar agenda. So I'm a little concerned that we end up with two sessions that would effectively have a similar agenda and that I wouldn't say compete against each other but certainly duplicate each other.

The other concern is the mentioning that you wish this to be in the main room, and I note from what Heidi has put in the chat that the main room is in very high demand. And that really, for anything to happen in the main room or even in the GAC room, this usually has to be an ICANN-wide agreed part of the main event. I know for sure that the SO and AC Chairs are asked by the Meetings Team a few months before the meeting about the subjects that would be populating the main room discussions. And usually, I mean very rarely is a single SO or AC able to run anything in the main room. It would usually be a case of a cross-ICANN thing. So that's the concern that I have on this.

I see Alan has put his hand up, so Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I guess I have one other concern and it's related to that but a different one. Hong said that they're planning to invite some senior officials and I don't think that can be done outside of the auspices of ICANN proper. We're stepping on protocol toes and certainly I don't think that can be done without... If this is going to be viewed as an ICANN-wide meeting which it sounds like is the intent, I think we have to be very careful where invitations come from, making sure that the

counterparts on the ICANN side – and Hong referred to the President, CEO and Chair of the Board – are going to be available for it and are willing to. This sounds like an ICANN event now. The idea has come from Hong and the APRALO organizers but I think it has to be funneled into the meeting arrangements group and essentially have them own the meeting because it's just fraught with so many problems if we class it as an APRALO meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. It's just apparent that we can hear some heavy breathing. I'm not sure who that is but they might be breathing a bit too close to their mic. It does sound a little strange. Still breathing, still there... I'm not sure who's holding the mic close to themselves.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, that might be you. This is Heidi, Cheryl, that might be you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Cheryl, you might wish to... [laughing] Okay, thank you. I see Tijani and then Hong, so Tijani please, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. Yes Alan, I understand very well your concern and I think that it must be well prepared. But I do think it is better to have it inside ICANN so that it will be an ICANN meeting. It can be well prepared by the ICANN Meetings staff contacting Hong and the local organizer to see how to arrange that so that there is not a conflict – any conflict, any problem, any protocol problem. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Back to you, Hong.

HONG XUE: Thank you. Thank you for all the comments and concerns. They're all very much enlarging to me. Let me address them one by one. The first one, whether it's the duplication of the Multi-Stakeholder Policy Forum of APRALO – the answer is no. Well, even though both of them are multi-stakeholders they will have different topics, orientations and focuses and they will be for a different audience. For this Chinese Forum specifically we will address some subjects that are most interesting to the Chinese community, the Chinese community's concerns they want to raise at ICANN. The subject has been drafted as the new gTLDs so this is the most recent, relevant, and multi-stakeholder topic.

And with it there will be three subtopics: one is the IDN variants issue – this is coming back. The variants issue is very much critical. It is haunting the Chinese community and it is a very big issue for evaluation, the process going on right now to dispute resolution and to delegation. This is very critical. For the non-Chinese speakers this issue is very much complicated and is not so much interesting as it is boring. You need to learn Chinese characters in order to understand this issue. And so I guess this variants issue has been raised across the stakeholder groups in the Chinese community.

The second one, they want to address the issue of the trademarks. It's very interesting. Actually, the people from Chinese Trademark

Association will be joining the meeting. They've also learned that the United States government and trademark holders have raised this issue many times to ICANN. They want to express the Chinese concern to ICANN about trademark protection and all the protection through the domain name system.

The third topic will be a couple of application or implementation issues, such as internationalization of registration data. And of course the new privacy law is going to be implemented in China from this year. So these are the three subjects. They primarily address the concerns from the Chinese community and are different from the topics completely from the APRALO Multi-Stakeholder Policy Forum. As far as I can see, there's ten topics that have been drafted for that Forum and I guess there's no duplication at all.

That's one issue Olivier raised. The second one is about the room. Olivier currently addressed that the main room is in high demand; Heidi also kindly commented on that. Oh yes, we are aware of that, and also the timing is a big concern for us. I think that we want to put it after the Welcoming Ceremony on Monday. If the Welcoming Ceremony could finish by 10:00 then our Chinese Forum could start from 10:30 to 12:30, in two hours. Why the main room is because it can accommodate more ICANN participation, more ICANN participants; and also, after the Welcome Ceremony those Chinese officials who had addressed the Welcome Ceremony can wait a little bit then join the Chinese Forum afterwards so it's easy to arrange.

Of course I really understand the difficulty of that – probably I should talk with Heidi for the details. Alan raised another issue about the

protocol for the official presence – thank you very much for raising that. Oh yes, well, I’m not so sure what is the protocol but ICANN has set up a new Meeting Bureau and probably we can submit the application through that to see whether these very busy people could be kindly available? But anyway, I hope Olivier and our At-Large friends could be present to show your support to the Chinese community.

And thank you very much to Tijani for kindly suggesting all the solutions. Back to you, Olivier.

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

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton, can I say something? I’m not on the Adobe Connect and I can’t raise my hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, go ahead Carlton, go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you very much, Olivier, this is Carlton for the record. I have listened to Hong’s explanation of why she thought this meeting was necessary and I doubt if we could second guess, especially with respect to the New gTLD Program the three main issues that she mentioned as of high importance to the Chinese user community, especially the At-Large Structures. I would not second guess them at all. I have a feeling that she would probably know more about these than I would and so I

am willing to accept and go along with those things as necessary for this meeting.

I am a little concerned that we do not... We show support for the Chinese At-Large Structures and their desire to communicate with each other and to get a face-to-face meeting going. I don't know – it's a huge country, maybe they're not all clustered around Beijing, so this might be an opportunity for them to get together face-to-face and speak about the issues that are important to them. I am a little concerned that because of the logistics this might not be seen as something that we support, because I certainly support that.

The issue of the protocol is the one to me that has the greatest concern, and to the extent that Hong says that they've issued invitations as a group of Chinese hosts to Chinese government officials then I am willing to accept that they understand how that works in their area of the world better than I would. The issue now becomes how do we harmonize this in the meetings space under the tent? I am not so sure that just sending an invitation to ICANN staff is going to work. I think what we need to do, and might I suggest that if we believe that the objective of the meetings are important to our colleagues in China then we find a way to at least demonstrate our support for those issues. And if we believe that there is mediation required for acceptance in the ICANN tent then we concentrate on seeing what we might do to make that possible. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Carlton. I'm now getting a better idea, and thanks for listing the different subjects to be touched on, of the event

itself. Yet I'm still concerned with regards to the logistics of it, specifically the issue with the main room itself post-Ceremony. I think usually this gets booked very quickly very early on. I wonder if I can ask Heidi, because staff might have already had a tentative meeting schedule showing some of the main lines of what rooms will be used and when. Do you have something like that, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, yes, this is Heidi. Yes, we received a very tentative block schedule already and I can see that Monday the Ballroom is totally booked, Ballroom 2 is totally booked, Wednesday as well. Thursday, Ballroom 1 is booked through the Public Forum.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

So the only thing I can suggest, thank you, Heidi. What I can suggest because I do realize the size of this is rather large. And I wonder also whether it's not something that's a little bit large for At-Large to chew. Since it is something that is ICANN-wide – If it's out of the usual At-Large room it's an event that would be ICANN-wide, SO- and AC-wide – if the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team should be involved with this as soon as possible. Have you gotten in touch with the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team yet, Hong?

HONG XUE:

Yes, I talked with Sally briefly. She's generally supporting the idea and I guess she needs more details from the Chinese side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you because I think that this, the very size of this and due to the fact that it would involve high government officials and the President of the Internet Society of China; and there is some concern here with regards to the protocol – the GSE team are the people that would be able to make it happen if it were possible to make it happen. For us to try and make it happen just like that would be a tough one. Because of the fact that we don't have exclusive access to the main room or exclusive access to any of the large rooms, we have to fight for our rooms with everything else, and with all the other SOs and ACs as far as both interpretation and where the location is concerned.

So the earlier you get in touch with the Stakeholder Engagement and perhaps provide a formal proposal to her listing exactly what you've told us here. I think that's a perfect overall view. We've got the scope, we've got the length, who will attend and these questions basically that we've asked. And then we can have a lot more chance to have that happen because at this point in time I'm very concerned that if At-Large asks for a room or if the ALAC asks for a room it's a 99% chance that we will be told "No" because of the fact that we haven't involved the GSE Team and because of the fact that it would come from an At-Large point of view; it wouldn't come as an SO- and AC-wide point of view.

I see Alan and Hong have put their hands up, so Alan first and then Hong.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I'll reiterate what you're saying but from a different slant. Given the list of topics that Hong has identified, a couple of things: first of all, if we're not already addressing those topics in this

meeting in a way that is friendly to Chinese ICANN has a big problem and someone needs to alert them to that. But if we are going to address these topics one way or another it's not only the CEO and the Chair of the Board that needs to be there; there's a whole set of staff resources that need to be around talking on those particular subjects or listening on those particular subjects. So that just reinforces for me that this is an ICANN issue that doesn't reduce the importance of it. I'd like to think that we're already covering these issues in a focused way that will be very accessible to Chinese-speaking and everyone else listening but I don't know of that for a fact because I'm not privy to the agenda. So I think the issues are very important. I think they're a little bit outside of ALAC's scope. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. Hong?

HONG XUE: Thank you. Thank you very much for all the kind help and ideas you've offered to me. I'm very much appreciative. Yes, I now fully understand it's probably not following the protocol to let ALAC raise the request to ICANN, so yes – probably I should talk with the ICANN Global Engagement project to see whether they could raise this. And what Alan said is very important to me, actually, whether ICANN will sufficiently address all these issues efficiently and comfortably to the Chinese community. Many people have criticized ICANN's insufficient outreach and very few applications from Africa, from Asia. Even though there's 300 applications and from the Chinese community around 100

applications presented in this new gTLD round there's still many communication problems.

And what is the most important thing is that the Chinese community believes ICANN does not understand the needs of the Chinese community. So it's not only for Chinese to understand the ICANN process and policies; it is for ICANN to understand the Chinese, for the various issues that have been addressed for so many years and ICANN is still doing the same. This is not so much comprehensible to the Chinese community. So that's the primary purpose of this meeting. Alright, so I'm very grateful. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Hong. I'm trying to put together an action item for the moment from our discussion which has been very helpful. And what I would suggest as an action item is for yourself to engage the Global Stakeholder Engagement Group, the GSE Group which is headed by Sally Costerton in order to send them their proposal – what you basically just told us there but a written proposal. I guess this has to be done as soon as possible because time is really of the essence, since I know that rooms get booked very, very early on.

So if you can engage Sally on this, carbon copying Heidi which therefore would make us all.... Because Heidi would let us know what's going on as well. I understand it does include some At-Large Structures and the local community which is important. But at the same time also to find out with Global Stakeholder Engagement if there are any parts of your proposal that are already dealt with by other sessions that have already been planned. I understand several sessions have been planned and so

there might be some parts of your proposal which are already dealt with. That's the concern that I hear from people here.

And once this is done... Also, the third part of this action item would be for GSE to be able to let you know if there are indeed any rooms available for the logistics of this; and the fourth part is to do with the actual protocol for inviting the guests since we are dealing here, from your list we're dealing with high-ranking guests so they need to be treated accordingly. Does that sound okay to you, Hong?

HONG XUE: Oh yes, of course, thank you so much. That is very much clear to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's Alan, can I make one comment?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'll make a comment which you might consider either humorous or sad. As I've worked around the world, no matter where you go people will come up to you and say "We're different here" and cite something, and it might be a food they eat or it might be a cultural issue. And almost invariably what they're describing is not unique to them, and you know, the details are different and it may be more or less important but rarely are these things unique.

As Hong just went through the list of why it's so important to do these things it strikes me as with relation to intellectual property and rights protection, the IPC and the business communities will say the exact same thing. It's not an issue of we're speaking the wrong language but they will say "We've been yelling and screaming at ICANN for years now and you've ignored us completely. You don't understand." And with regard to variants I and many other people have been telling ICANN staff for many years "You can't ignore variants" but they did, and now we're scrambling to try to do something at the very last moment.

It strikes me that these are real problems in China and the language certainly has contributed to it, but interestingly they are real problems everywhere else and we're dealing with an ICANN that hasn't been very responsive to some communities. As I said, you may consider that either humorous or sad, but I can't help but note it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan and next is Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. For those who think that this is not an At-Large event, it's an ICANN event, it's a wider event – that's right, it's a wider event. But since Hong who with CNNIC and is a ccNSO Council member, she chose to implement it through her At-Large perspective, I think that we need to be the leader for this event. And we did before; we did for the ICANN Academy even though the Academy is not At-Large at all, it is an ICANN Academy but we were asking for the room, we were planning for the meeting, we did everything and it is seen as an initiative from At-

Large. So I think that perhaps ALAC should ask Sally or should speak to Sally about this event rather than a single person or Hong without her hat of At-Large people. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. I'm not quite sure I agree with you on this and I'll tell you why. I have seen the response there is when a project is presented initially as ALAC, and even if it is a project that would actually help everyone throughout ICANN. And I've seen that in the ICANN Academy which for a while was really penalized by the fact that originally it was called "At-Large Academy." So this is why I welcome the ALAC's involvement in the panel and in the organization of this in some way, but to actually have ALAC make an official request for a room which would then make this session appear under the banner of At-Large, or ALAC is something which I think actually might not help. It might hinder progress rather than help progress. I don't know how others feel about this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's Alan. Having worked with the GNSO extensively, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. So that's the position. Oh, I see that Hong has just dropped unfortunately. So Tijani, yeah, I would urge caution on that. It's not entirely clear whether this would be helpful or not, and ultimately I think that we will know a lot more with the AI, the action item which is effectively for... If Hong carbon copies Heidi on her request then we will be completely synchronized in the process and we

can always lend our support on the points or provide more information on the points if there are any additional questions from Global Stakeholder Engagement.

The drafting of the proposal is something that she has to do anyway. The finding out if parts of the proposal are already dealt with in other sessions is very important. Certainly any proposal that duplicates a session that already exists and that we are unaware of, and that we would be unaware of because it's Global Stakeholder Engagement and the Meetings Team that would know at this very point in time – if there is any duplication it's got very little chance of succeeding. If the logistics are not there, if we cannot get a room there's very little chance that something will happen; and also making clear that we do respect the protocol for engaging and inviting VIPs because there is a protocol and I would imagine in China doubly so since there are very high-ranking government officials that will be coming to this meeting.

So now I'm not quite sure, is Hong back on or...

HONG XUE: Oh yes, I'm back. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You are back, okay. So are we clear on this?

HONG XUE: Yes, yes, it's very much clear. Thank you very much for everyone's kind suggestions, comments and feedback. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I really appreciate that you managed to come and talk to us about this and I hope that you can get the ball rolling very quickly on this. My suggestion would be to do it as soon as possible because from the discussions I hear at the SO and AC Chair level we have been asked about the usual questions, the subjects that we would like to touch on in Beijing, etc., etc. or that our communities would like to touch on. So having GSE and Sally Costerton notified as soon as possible with a proposal will make it a lot more likely for it to happen, and I do hope that it happens because it sounds like an excellent plan.

HONG XUE: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well thanks very much, Hong, and we are now going to continue in our next part... I realize Rinalia who is from APRALO is not on the call. I gather that she will be listening to this recording and of course the transcript will be made available within a few days. And of course we've got the action items. If you do have any additional questions please do update me and Rinalia as much as possible, and Heidi of course so that we're all completely synchronized. Communication is the key.

HONG XUE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Hong. And so now we're moving to the Policy Advice Development Page which is unfortunately not as exciting as the fora in Beijing but we have to do those. And so we are going to look through the recently adopted ALAC statements, the statements or endorsements currently being developed, and the currently open public comments. I think we are pretty much well aware of all the recently adopted statements and I've already thanked those people who were holding the pen on those. Does anyone have any comments to make on those recently adopted statements, agenda Item #4A?

I don't see anyone, so next the statements or endorsements currently being developed. The ATRT2 Candidate Endorsement is currently being voted on, and I do have to thank the ATRT2 Team that has made the selection of candidates very much... It's been very hard work but they've managed to do in a very short span of time. I see Alan has put his hand up, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm just wondering, since this vote was structured so that we can't see who voted – I'm not quite sure why that was done, but for whatever reason or accidentally can we have a report from staff on is the voting progressing and will we have a problem both meeting quorum and getting a result?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and I guess Matt will be able to let us know about this. If you need a few minutes, Matt, we can go through the other recently adopted ALAC statements.

MATT ASHTIANI: No, it's okay. I actually just looked this up a little while ago.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: Yes, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

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

MATT ASHTIANI: The reason why it's anonymous is because it concerns individuals, so in the past whenever a vote has been with specific individuals it's been anonymous. I can actually tell who has voted just not how they voted, and as of right now 14 out of 15 members of the ALAC have voted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh wow, that was very fast! My goodness. [laughing] That's probably one of the fastest votes ever bearing in mind it was open just 24 hours ago. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, do we know who hasn't voted? Are they likely to?

MATT ASHTIANI: Yes, this is Matt for the record. I know who hasn't voted and I sent them a message. This individual usually votes so I don't think it'll be an issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, because it would be nice if Rinalia can get the results to the selectors earlier rather than later. As all of us know, computers and networks break down at just the wrong time so if we can get it in a day earlier that would be nice.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Tell me about it. [laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and no doubt there will be a safety mechanism – if I don't manage to send this to the selectors then someone else will. And I think it will be staff that will be providing these details over but yes, there could be a tsunami or whatever else disaster in the computer – just a tsunami in the form of a [comfy cat] entering itself on the keyboard, who knows.

Let's move on to the next one, the Statement on the WCIT Outcomes. I've mentioned this earlier – it is in progress so it will be coming soon.

Next, the Report on the GNSO Working Group on Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition – Evan and I need to work on this.

Evan, is there a time when we could perhaps either later on today or possibly over the weekend that we can spend a few minutes on this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi Olivier, it's Evan. I think the onus is on me. You've made some comments that I need to deal with and I'll commit within the next 48 hours to make some proposed edits I think you'll be okay with, and we'll take it from there.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, can I be copied on those also?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, and we're working on the Wiki page so...

ALAN GREENBERG: Then point me to it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll carbon copy if there's anything in the email as well, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, is the Wiki page pointed to by the Policy Page?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then I'll look, no worries. Don't bother then.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, next the Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group, and that has been transmitted I believe, hasn't it? Let me just check the final solution... Yes, this has been transmitted over and this has been sent by myself over to the Chair of the GNSO, sorry, to the Secretariat of the GNSO and that has been forwarded. I have received a confirmation that has been forwarded over to the Working Group. I do have a question on these: I see Alan has raised his hand again, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: You can go ahead, go first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well thank you, Alan. The question I had was with regards to the times when I send such correspondence over, whatever is being sent out – whether it is staff sending it to a public comment or whether it is myself sending a correspondence to another working group or a chair of a

working group, or another part of ICANN – I usually carbon copy staff and this is then put on the archives, this is put on our Correspondence page. Do you believe that more should be done to publicize the fact that this was filed by copying the ALAC list for example? Or do you think that this just would add to too much fluff? Because there is an extensive amount of correspondence that goes out there. Alan, you may speak.

ALAN GREENBERG:

To answer that, the ALAC is clearly aware of it because the ALAC voted on it; and I presume the announcement of the success of the vote goes to ALAC. I presume it does – maybe it just goes to At-Large Announce or something, I don't know, but I don't think it's necessary to copy the letter. People know where to find it if they really want to. I don't think we need excess copies of that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, my hand was up for a different reason though, and not directly related to... It's related to the statement. There are other statements coming in right now and there is strong opposition on some, in some areas on the privacy issue. And I'm pushing to try to get it explained because I don't really understand the substance of the objection. But we really need to make sure that the ALAC people who are nominally on that list, on that working group, actively participate when we start

talking about these subjects. Otherwise I'm going to be a lone voice and we know how effective a lone voice is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much, Alan. That's noted and we do have several members. If you do have a list just email them as well just to remind them if they're not on this call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right, so let's move on. The currently open public forums: Consultation IANA's Secure Notification Process – no statement. At-Large Whitepaper on Future Challenges; the reply period closes on the 1st of February so we will know I guess in our next ExCom call about progress on this. The .cat Cross-Ownership Removal Request – no statement. The Amendments to Article VI Section 2.3 of the ICANN Bylaws DNS Root Server System Advisory Committee – no statement, I guess. We all said that we agreed with the process, that there was no need for a specific statement especially when we are busy with a lot of other things.

The Preliminary Issue Report on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information – no statement. The Consultation on gTLD Delegation and Redelelegation Performance Standards and the same with the ccTLD: Cheryl and Alan are to prepare a draft joint statement. Have you had any chance to look at this? "No" from Alan, okay. I notice that

Evan has put his hand up, possibly for an earlier statement. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Olivier, and you're absolutely right – it was in some of those things you'd gone quickly through before, and specifically just a small update on the Future Challenges Working Group. One of the things that we may be taking on soon that I can see some support from the Working Group on is the issue of continued failures within the Contractual Compliance Department.

This is something that was in fact one of the first agenda items that the FCWG was considering. Garth has been knocking his head against the wall and I think what's going to be happening soon is an attempt not to allow for the personalization of Garth's ongoing battles with the Compliance Department. It is possible that the FCWG may choose to get involved in that area and tray and escalate and turn this into an At-Large issue as opposed to allowing ICANN to simply [continue] it as a Garth issue. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you Evan. Do we have, are we all on the Compliance Department newsletter here, because there is a newsletter that is regularly sent out. I think that we do need to keep close track of ongoing disagreements, ongoing problems that Garth has with the Compliance Department; but we should also look at it with a balanced view as well in that there might be something that we're not aware of or some development that we're not aware of. Perhaps having an

update from Compliance would be a good thing and perhaps having a discussion with Compliance and Garth would be a good thing as well.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Actually Olivier – this is Evan again – I would in fact make the suggestion. And like I say, this has to go through the Working Group to get churned out a bit before you're called into it but I suspect what's happened right now is that there's been a poisoning of a personal relationship going on and in order for proper communications to get involved it might be necessary in fact for you to make a phone call to the Compliance Department, or failing that the CEO, to try and address some of the issues we're dealing with.

I mean clearly one of the primary things in fact is breakdown of communications, so the updates are necessary. And part of the problem is we're not getting any, at least of the kind that's been requested. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you very much, Evan. Can I just ask, traditionally has this been an RAA Working Group matter or has this been entirely separate?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I can't speak whether or not it's been dealt with in RAA issues because those specifically dealt with contractual negotiations. Compliance issues are assuming the RAA has been completed, has been agreed to at a certain revision level and then dealing with the enforcement of that RAA. So it's my understanding it was not part of that and in fact was

part of essentially one of the two agenda items for the Future Challenges Group when it formed. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Evan. So I think you're absolutely right with regards to the personal relationship part of things, and we do need to institutionalize the discussion by making it as a Working Group discussing things with Compliance rather than a person being in touch with Compliance. So let's work on this; let's have, when you're ready let's... I have no objections to the Future Challenges Working Group working on this apart from a small concern that it might just be diverting its attention from future challenges when Compliance is not a future challenge and Compliance is an actual operational matter. But that's just a point of view.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That's understood, Olivier. If there was a better place to deal with this I'm all ears. Right now it was put there essentially for lack of a home elsewhere.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. If anyone else has a point of view on this can they please follow-up by email afterwards, after this call? Right, let's move on. The last of our currently open public comments, the IDN Variant TLD Program: there has been an email sent out to Edmon Chung to find out if a statement is necessary. The closing period for the initial public comment period is the 8th of February. I have put some pressure on Edmon to come back to us with an answer "yes" or "no." There hasn't

been a reply yet and we will just have to work to see if we don't get a reply soon enough.

The concern I have with these IDN issues is that we always end up sending a statement in the reply period, which sometimes makes it send statements that are very pertinent indeed but that are not replies. So they don't get treated in exactly the same way as other statements do that come in the first part because no one actually replies to the statements that we send out. It's just one of these things. I know we're able to send whenever we want but it just seems that it adds more stress onto staff having to always do things at the very last moment and very last minute.

Okay, let's move on, let's continue and let's have a look at agenda Item #5, the At-Large Meeting Schedule for the 46th ICANN Meeting in Beijing. And I hand the floor over to Heidi I guess who can take us through the points that she wanted to take us through.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you everyone, this is Heidi. I will see if I can go quickly. Can you all understand me or hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. It's fine with me and I think it's fine with everyone else.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I have put the schedule, the At-Large Meeting Workspace into the chat so we can go quickly through the schedule. I do so on the ALAC

call so you may not need to go through the whole session, just some points.

We currently have 25 meetings so that was up two. The additional two were an Outreach Evaluations Meeting for the SARP hosted by the New gTLD Working Group and also a Capacity Building Working Group. That will be on Monday morning. So again, right now Olivier, would you like me to go through the entire week or would you like to start focusing on agenda items?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think we need to go, we've already gone through the entire week on the ALAC call as you've mentioned. Is there anything, and we are running out of time for this call so is there anything you wish to point us to specifically?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, not in terms of meeting schedules, the actual meetings, but we do now need to start working on the agenda items. Olivier, you've been in contact with me about a few of them; I've been in contact with the NomCom staff support, so there'll be 30 minutes where Yrjö, Cheryl and Adam will be coming to see ALAC. That's going to be Tuesday during one of the ALAC Policy Sessions. And then I think we just need to start working on some of the agenda items. We can create pages for the questions for the Board, etc.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, Heidi. That's a well-oiled mechanism and I guess you can build it based on our previous meetings. And we will have to send out the requests and try to populate those pages with the questions that we'll want to ask and the subjects we'll want to discuss.

I do have one note to make, one point to make with regards to our Sunday agenda and the agendas where we have back-to-back meetings all the time. I hope that perhaps you might have to air some of the agenda a little bit. I note that when you have a meeting between 15:00 and 15:30 and then the next person at 15:30 to 16:00, etc., we always lose five to ten minutes in between changes of personnel and we always end up being late. And this is something that Alan has mentioned on the ALAC call as well; many have said so.

Is it possible to try and work out if we have to lose five minutes here and five minutes there so as to not be pressurized for time as much as we usually are?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Very good point. Two points on that: one point is that Meetings staff understands that and actually they have now put in blocked times for certain days during the ICANN meetings so we need to submit our meeting forms into those blocks. And then secondly yes, in the agendas themselves I will allocate more time so that we can incorporate that time needed to switch the meetings.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. And I see some people have put their hands up so first, Julie Hammer. You have the floor, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Oliver. Just a quick one, for this Friday ExCom Meeting schedule it's currently down from 9:00 to 12:00 and I have a flight with taking me out at 4:30 PM which I thought was pretty good timing. That flight's now been cancelled and I've had to be rebooked on a 2:40PM flight. So I remember that that meeting last time I attended went quite a long way overtime so I just don't know whether other people may be pressured with flight times either, so I tried to accommodate it but I've been caught.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. The answer to that, Julie, is that we all seem to be pressured for this flight problem, and there has been a discussion and an email sent over to Sally Costerton about this. The feedback that we have received is that ICANN will be able to accommodate us so that it doesn't impinge on our ability to be at that meeting. It is three hours for an ExCom meeting, it is a little long but if you can work with Heidi, if she can work something out with you-

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, Olivier, to interrupt but I booked my own flights because David comes with me, too, and so I can't change them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, so unfortunately you will have to miss the end of the ExCom meeting I guess; either that or you have to have a taxi and everybody

waiting for you as you leave the room. [laughter] And a policy motorcade to the airport. Okay, thank you Julie. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, with respect to Julie's last comment, if ICANN is indeed changing the rule that she can now leave on Saturday instead of Friday at the last moment they should be willing to pay change fees also I would hope, but maybe, maybe not.

With regard to the Sunday schedule, I thought we had had a discussion maybe at the ALAC or the earlier ExCom meeting that we're going to try to discuss and put to bed the issue of Director selection process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Isn't this on the Sunday?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't see it. Maybe it's there under words that I don't catch. It would require a moderately large chunk of time I would think and all I see is a ten-minute update on Rules of Procedures. Maybe I'm missing it somewhere.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi, can you help us on this please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, yeah, a couple of things. Those schedules right now, I have not updated them except for maybe one or two items. So those agendas,

I'm just now starting to do them so please disregard. I think it says "to be changed" or "to be confirmed."

The second point, Alan, I just need to correct you. ICANN has not changed the rules for travel, leaving on Saturday. [We see] that Steven Antonoff has made an exception for the Beijing meeting, that if the ExCom need to leave on Saturday they can.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what I was talking about. Sorry, I wasn't thinking global ALAC, I was thinking ExCom attendees. Yeah, sorry, I was talking about in relation to people on this call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Heidi, for this. I see still Heidi and Alan with their hands up?

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand is down.

HEIDI ULLRICH: As is mine.

ALAN GREENBERG: But by the way, Heidi, if I got my Friday paid I wouldn't be objecting.
[laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so thanks very much everyone. Heidi, any more on this item, this agenda item?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I think in the next meeting we'll have a lot more. Sorry, this is Heidi for the record. I think that the next meeting will have a lot more to discuss in terms of the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Heidi. And I think that next time with Rinalia with us we will have a better update on the APRALO Beijing events as well. I think we might just pass over this and move directly over to the Any Other Business part of this call.

And I just wanted to provide you with a quick update on the Budget and Finance Subcommittee call which took place yesterday. The FBSC met and discussed the progress and process for this year's Finance requests. Just to summarize for those who were not on the call, and I know very few of you were not on the call – to summarize, the SO and AC requests will be made in two stages. There will be some fast track requests for any event, any funding that we require for things before end of October, early November 2013. And there will be a normal track that will be for anything that happens after November 2013, that you would like to have funding for.

There will also be a request by the ALAC for the staging of a Summit and we are working out ways to not impinge our ability to ask for funding for other events additional to the Summit but at the same time, events that will not duplicate what the Summit is going to achieve; in other words, a General Assembly in a region would duplicate the Summit because there would be a General Assembly for that region during the Summit as well.

So the ball has gotten rolling and what's important now as next steps is that the RALO leadership, so RALOs and their Secretariats will be informed of the new process by their respective members of the FBSC and we will meet I think in the next two weeks again to detail the process further and get the ball rolling. And I think that's the whole summary of what's happened. Did I miss anything, Tijani or others who were on that call?

MALE: No.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No Olivier, you hit everything.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Any other Any Other Business? And hearing that no one is putting their hands up or shouting out I thank you all for being on this call. It's been very good and I was very pleased to have been able to speak to Hong and get some movement on this as well. So with this, the time is 14:38 UTC. Thank you very much. Have a good weekend

everyone, wherever you are, and we'll see you soon. This call is now adjourned.

[End of Transcript]