OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	So good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. This is the ALAC Executive Committee conference call on Thursday, the 14th of February, 2013. Yes, it's Valentine's Day and the time is 14:03 UTC. We have a medium-sized list here so I'll immediately pass the floor over to Gisella who will be doing the roll call.
GISELLA GRUBER:	Thank you, Gisella here. On today's call we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Julie Hammer, and Alan Greenberg. Tijani Ben Jemaa will be joining us in thirty minutes. We have apologies noted from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Carlton Samuels, and Sebastien Bachollet.

From staff today we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani, Nathalie Peregrine and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I can also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Olivier. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you very much, Gisella, and have we missed anyone by any chance? It doesn't look like it. Okay fine, so let's get going and move briefly to Agenda Item #2, the review of the action items from the 22nd of January, 2013, ALAC meeting. I invite you all to have a look at the Wiki page that has the action items. We shall be looking only at the open action items and at the newly assigned action items. |

So under the open action items we have the first one, which is myself, Olivier, to draft a statement on my experience at the World Conference on International Telecommunications, the WCIT. That still needs to wait because a larger report needs to be finalized. I finished drafting it; Heidi has part of it in her hands. The British government has another part of it in their hands – they have to unfortunately vet everything that I have to say due to some of the descriptions being on things that took place behind the scenes. But hopefully that will be released very soon.

And then of course the second part here being Evan and Jean-Jacques to lead the Future Challenges Working Group on a more extensive statement on the issues raised at the WCIT. I gather this will follow immediately afterwards. Any questions? I see much chatting going on on the chat here, and I see that some people couldn't hear me but I guess everyone else can. Any questions?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I just want to clarify, before Jean-Jacques and I get deeper involved was there going to be any staff work in summarizing the comments or is that something that Jean-Jacques and I and the rest of the Working Group going to go through ourselves? Is there any more action on staff's part or do we just go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, Evan and Olivier, if I may?

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, that's in progress, sorry for the delay. I mean obviously you can go ahead and start working on your discussions about incorporating those but I'm working on the analysis.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And if I could just say there appears there's been a bit of lateral thinking here because were you speaking about the statement on WCIT outcomes or was it actually the R3 Paper that you were talking about?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, I was talking about R3 which had gone through the public comment and which was getting some results and had received some results; but yes, also on response to the WCIT. I mean in some ways actually I see some kind of a meeting of minds on that because they seem to have some issues in common, but I guess we'll leave that for the further analysis.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Evan. Let's have a look at the newly assigned action items then – Heidi is to work with the Chair of the WHOIS Working Group to set up a webinar on WHOIS. And that's been done. Heidi, do you have any details on when that would take place, or Gisella?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella would have details on that. It's the 20th I believe, Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Gisella here. It will be Wednesday, the 20th of February, next Wednesday at 15:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Gisella, that's really exciting, that's great – a really important subject here. Next, the issue of WHOIS is to be added as an issue to be addressed at the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group. I gather that's been done. There hasn't been a Capacity Building Working Group call since the last time just by my mind here.

And third, 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. Then there will be a single purpose call in order for the ALAC to discuss the work as well as discuss how and when the ALAC will vote on the new Rules of Procedure. With Cheryl not being with us, Alan, do you have anything to add to this? I know there's been an update on a couple of the work teams.

ALAN GREENBERG:	No, there's nothing really to add other than the schedule that we tentatively agreed upon has slipped. I should have the document out later today I'm hoping or if not sometime early tomorrow for the Review Group to start reviewing. Other than that, that pushes all the dates back slightly but still within reason and still presumably, unless there's some major outcry it will still be adopted prior to Beijing.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, thank you very much, Alan. Any questions or comments on these action items here? Seeing no hands going up then we can go over to the ALAC ExCom action items from our last call being on the 25th of January, 2013. And there we have a number of newly assigned action items.
	So the first one is Heidi to work with Cheryl and send an explanatory message to the ALAC noting the next steps of the Rules of Procedure Working Group, so that follows in line. Heidi, is there progress on this or are you still waiting for well basically the next steps to start taking place?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yes, this is Heidi. Yeah, I'm basically waiting to see where we are with the exact timing of it and then I'll work with Cheryl and/or Alan on sending out a schedule and an explanatory message.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, thank you. Next we have a number of action items relating to the Chinese Multi-Stakeholder Forum in Beijing. The first one is for Hong

Xue to email the Global Stakeholder Engagement group cc'ing, carbon copying Heidi Ullrich and send the group a written proposal for the planned Chinese Multi-Stakeholder Forum in Beijing. Shall I just read through all four of these action items and then Heidi, I'll let you comment or Rinalia if you wish to comment, or in fact anyone else who knows more can comment on this.

Heidi working with Hong Xue to determine if any part of the planned Chinese Multi-Stakeholder Forum in Beijing is already being addressed by other sections; Gisella is to find out the logistics for a room that is large enough for the planned Chinese Multi-Stakeholder Forum in Beijing; and Heidi is to determine the protocol for engaging and inviting VIPs to sessions. I gather since Heidi, you are in three of these four action items perhaps I should ask you for an update on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you Olivier, this is Heidi. Yeah, on this issue the Forum has now been reduced in scope and in people who are being invited, so it's basically the Chinese-speaking ALSes. The two topics, which are the IDNs and new gTLDs are being covered by several other meetings both within the At-Large and APRALO events as well as ICANN events. However, it is now my understanding that it has now been approved by the APRALO OC for us to find this a time. My tenants of time would be, and we can talk about this a little bit later would be Thursday morning 7:00 to 9:00 AM, so that would be taking the place of the joint meeting with the Fellows – that would be the fourth joint meeting with the Fellows so I think it would be okay to have that timeslot be found. I think that's it.

And finally, to determine the protocol, I'm not sure if VIPs need to go to this new smaller format. That's something that Rinalia and the OC can discuss. I have now been informed of the people who would be speaking at the Showcase but we can talk about that at a further point in the agenda. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. Rinalia, do you have anything else to add from the OC side? "No" types Rinalia. Okay, right, so any questions on these action items from anyone?

And seeing no one put their hand up then we can certainly move on to the Items for Discussion and the Policy Advice Development Page is the page I now invite you all to open and have a look at. Now, we have several recently adopted ALAC statements, one on the ATRT2 Candidate Endorsement, one from the Thick WHOIS PDP Working Group; one was from the At-Large IDN Variant TLD Program. As usual, thanks very much to the penholders. It's important, of course the concern being that we never have enough penholders and that's probably something we'll be discussing in a moment later on in this call.

Now with regards to the statements or endorsements currently being developed, reviewed or voted on by the ALAC, the Statement on WCIT Outcomes has already been talked about. The Report of the GNSO Working Group on Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition is something we should discuss and I think it is now the right time to discuss this. We'll probably take about ten minutes on this. And I'm not quite sure if you've all followed the discussion on this but Evan Leibovitch has drafted a first statement and then there was another

draft, and a few more changes and then a discussion. It has actually brought a lot of discussion into play and now I understand there is another statement which Evan has proposed.

Now, if I invite you all to open the page itself automatically there should be a new statement appended at the bottom – Evan just notified us earlier of that. Do you want to explain a little bit what went on, Evan, and then we can see where we go from here?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, Olivier, this is Evan for the record. Essentially as Olivier says, there's been a number of iterations back and forth on issues of consumer trust starting from a Board mandate to the GNSO. There were a number of At-Large participants within that GNSO working group. There were some metrics produced that may have been of value but there were a number of things that were either declared either out of scope, too difficult to scope – and in the case of some things there were interventions by the domain industry that essentially wiped out a couple of metrics that were believed to be of value.

So in response to that I crafted an original statement that essentially said that this was incomplete, and so there was some fairly vigorous conversations including a number of people from the Executive. And so essentially in response to all of that, part of the issue was well, it's one thing for us to say "Well, there's not enough." Okay, what does that mean and what are we going to do about it?

So in the latest version of this, I'm going to paste the exact link into the Adobe Chat at this moment… So if you go there it should skip

immediately to the most recent version that essentially says we did participate, it is incomplete and the ALAC immediately commits to putting together a team of people to figure out what was missing and then to submit that. And so that statement like I say is now on the Wiki, having been under development; and in fact, a number of you on the Executive have had a look at it when it was in its formative versions as a Google Document.

Everything basically that's been suggested has been incorporated. Rinalia, you had a lot of input into it; Olivier, so did you. And the result of that right now is on the Wiki at this moment. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Evan, and also I wanted to add that the original versions that you had drafted I personally felt were, I would say a little harsh because they might have been taken by the Board that the ALAC does not support any of those metrics; and therefore the Board might have taken the view that they should just not implement any metrics from this list which was drafted. Far from it. I really think that it would be in the public interest to have not only these metrics but more than these metrics to be implemented and hence, I think that the statement which you, the last stab that you gave at it was actually good because it also gives a set of proposed metrics in addition to the ones which have been drawn up by the Working Group.

Now the concern, or it's not a concern actually but you will notice at the bottom of that, so the last line of that statement mentions "The team will provide the end user-centric metrics for ALAC approval at the ICANN 46 meeting in Beijing which will then be forwarded to the Board

as ALAC advice." Now, there are two questions which comes from there. The first one is that if that's the case we would need to have a team put together to do this. Whether it's a formal working group or whether it's just an ad-hoc thing I think is something that is open to suggestions. My own suggestion would be that because it's just a single task it probably is better to be just a taskforce or a team, a work team or something – I don't know the exact naming of it but we'll think of it here.

The second thing being how much time should this task take? As we know, the Board runs at a certain pace and if it has already dealt with a subject and it's already behind them, and they've already made their decisions then it is absolutely no use taking our time to produce advice when the battle has already been fought. So I have asked Sebastien, for him to try and find out where the Board is with regards to this subject. So far there hasn't been a reply yet, and I was hoping we'd have a reply before this call.

So I open the floor for discussion now. So Evan, you've put your hand up?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier. My main response to this is number one, of course the Bylaws allow us to comment on anything at any time, and I think one of the things that we tried very hard to do is not to say that any of the metrics that have already been endorsed by the GNSO for putting forward – we're not suggesting not to do any of those. Everything we're suggesting is additive to those. So I don't necessarily know if… The

Board can approve what the GNSO has suggested and still have room later on for us to say "Okay, there's more that need to be added."

My intention with this statement, by putting it forward now was essentially to give notice that we intend to do some more. The Board has not given staff go ahead to start to implement the metrics, so I think right now if we can in due course put forward a statement to the Board, or at least in fact a letter from you to the Chair of the Board saying "Look, we've considered this, we consider it incomplete. We have some additional things so don't close the door on this until you've heard from us" was essentially the main intent of doing this particular statement right now.

And I'm hoping that, I mean we've seen resolutions from the Board. The Board has not closed it off yet. The Board has not given instructions from the staff to start implementing this, this, this and not that one. So it hasn't gone in that detail yet so I'm hoping that we can in fact… If we can approve this letter, not necessarily as an ALAC vote because that'll take another two weeks but if we can essentially have this perhaps go as a letter from you to the Chair of the Board to say "Look, if you're planning on something please wait for our input" – I'm hoping that will be sufficient. It's not as if there's a very, very ticking time bomb on this. They haven't designated the first TLD and there is some time to be able to do the metrics, even snapshots of the status quo.

So I'm hoping that by sending this particular message, assuming that it's accepted as quickly as possible that will at least buy us some time to do the rest of the work. Thanks.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan, it's Olivier here. You just mentioned the ALAC Chair sending a letter to the Board Chair, but I thought this was going to be a statement. Are you saying that you think this [thing] that we have in front of our eyes might be better at the moment as a letter from the ALAC Chair to the Board Chair?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, it's my suggestion to do it that way simply as a matter of expediency – perhaps to still put it forward for ALAC endorsement, but there's an expediency issue that we need to tell the Board "Wait, the issue is not done. We have something to add to it and please wait for us." So I essentially would leave it to your discretion. You've got a good working relationship with the Chair of the Board to essentially determine what form this should take. My thought was there is, as you say an expediency issue.   Rather than asking the Board "Where are you?" we ought to be able to say to the Board "Look, please hold off until you've heard from us" is essentially the gist of all this, that this statement is saying "We're committing to doing something. In return for that, please wait until you've heard from us." Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Understood. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, just to note, Evan, your voice is sort of muffled – I'm not quite sure what the problem is, almost as if you're speaking too close to the microphone or something but maybe it's a line problem.

Two comments: number one, I presume this is going to go to the gTLD Committee of the Board and the schedule for their meetings may be different from Board meetings. So it should be easy enough to find out if there is a meeting before Beijing or not and what the timing is where they intend to look at this issue. And I think we should get that information as quickly as possible. If they do indeed intend to take action prior to Beijing, even if it's the weekend before, a quick letter saying something is forthcoming if it's not going to make that deadline is certainly reasonable.

My only comment is don't make promises we can't keep, and is there really enough time prior to Beijing to do something and present it for approval to the ALAC before Beijing? That sounds awful tight given where we are and given the last few weeks are usually close to lost. So I'm not asking for the answer but let's make sure we don't make promises that are totally unfeasible or unreasonable. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan, for this. So two things: I think the first action item is for Heidi to find out the scheduling of the New gTLD Board Subcommittee – I'm not quite sure what their name is.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm assuming because this is related to the new gTLDs primarily that it will be this subcommittee that will be looking at it.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, Alan, yes. I have high feeling that it is. I also am on very good terms with Cherine Chalaby who is the Chair of this Subcommittee so I could very much send the email to Cherine rather than sending it to Steve.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, hopefully we don't need good relations to find out what their schedule and agenda is in terms of openness and transparency. [laughing]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi has fantastic relations with everyone! [laughing] But okay, so that's great. So that's one thing. The other thing, yes, we still need to copy Steve – of course I will still copy Steve. Steve has to know what's happening in his own house, Steve Crocker that is, the Chair of the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not actually sure about that – it's Alan speaking. He's not supposed to be connected to it. I mean you can inform him but presumably the gTLD Committee also informs him, so….

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, he will be carbon copied; it's not a case of asking him to take part in the discussion as well. But certainly I understand your point, Alan, on this. Evan, I'm not going to put you on the spot and ask will you be able to put a small group together and deliver something in a couple of weeks. Should we just leave it to you to work out with, I know that

Jean-Jacques was involved as well and a couple people have all commented, and perhaps find out if you'd be able to put together an ad-hoc group on this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Well okay, Olivier, it's Evan. I'll give you my intent with this and you probably understand that already – the intent is to get them to listen to us and if they want to set the timing for when something should come in from us that's fine. I simply didn't want to have an instance where they would say "Well, you're going to be too late, we can't wait for you." So I would love to have some feedback on what the optimal timing would be for when we need to bring in the end user-centric metrics. If we have to have something for Beijing we can probably do it. It will not be extremely polished but it will be there.

I hope to have already laid out some of the basic subject headings in that message itself so that already gives a little bit of focus to the group to move forward. But in any case you're absolutely right. You're both right in terms of there is not a lot of room between now and Beijing, and so essentially, if there's a deadline of having something ready for Beijing we'll have something. If we have a little bit more time we will have something probably better. But the thing is, right now I feel like I don't have any control over the timetable of this so I'm perfectly prepared to work in whatever timetable is imposed in us because we really have no choice if we want to be heard. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Evan. Now, Heidi has asked two questions on the chat. The first one is whether it was agreed by the New gTLD Working Group to hold a call in two weeks on this subject.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The issue was brought up at the, sorry – are we talking ALAC's New gTLD Working Group or the Board's?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ALAC's New gTLD Working Group.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I raised this issue at the most recent meeting that happened this past Monday and it was sort of the sense that this was not something within the scope of this Working Group, that the team was not going to be… Certainly there was a feeling that the team either should not or need not be under the auspices of the New gTLD Working Group. So I'm sort of on my own in that sense.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well that somehow answers Heidi's second question, whether this should be a subcommittee of the New gTLD Working Group or Metrics or something else. I think it could just be a task for a taskforce-

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah, that was already asked and answered of the Working Group and the answer I think was generally no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, okay. That's of course something we'd need to just check with Avri just to make sure she's okay with this.

ALAN GREENBERG: She was leading it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly, yes, she mentioned it. Okay. So any other questions or thoughts on this? I think we have a plan on that, so the first AI is for Heidi to find out the scheduling of the New gTLD Board Subcommittee and then perhaps I should fire an email off containing the points that are listed on this Wiki page…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Olivier, this is Evan. One last thing that I think is being taken as an assumption that I want to make absolutely clear. Is everyone here okay with the wording of the statement as it exists now? It's been through, as you all know a number of iterations. Is it now considered fully cooked enough to be able to serve either as a statement or as a letter as the case may be? It's essentially untouched since the last modifications that went on the Google Document.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I for one haven't read it yet but I will in the next day or so, or you can ignore me altogether. Either way.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I would never ignore you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well thank you very much, Alan. What we'll do is because if this is going to then be a correspondence with the Chair of the New gTLD Board Subcommittee at that point it does not need to go through the formal ALAC ratification process with a full vote. However, what can be done is a consensus call – in other words this, and I would highly recommend that this happens, that the comments and this letter be circulated to the ALAC; and there should be a consensus call then saying "Does anyone actually object to this? Any ALAC members think that it's out of place or that there needs to be a modification on it?"

I think that might just be like a two-day consensus call, two or three days. That will provide Alan with time as well to read through it and then we can send this out. Everyone okay with this? Okay.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: As long as the timing allows. Again, it's a matter of finding out as you said what the Board and the gTLD Working Group of the Board Committee is…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, it would be all these things happening in parallel. Now there's also something to bear in mind – I will be in London next week. I'm not sure whether Cherine will be in London next week. If he is in London next week I might actually even be meeting with him so that might also be a channel to deliver the message in addition.

So let's get moving then to the next point, and that's taken a little while but let's see… The next one is the Consultation on the gTLD Delegation and Re-Delegation Performance Standards and the Consultation on the ccTLD Delegation and Re-Delegation Performance Standards. Cheryl and Alan are drafting a joint statement on this. Any update on this, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have done nothing on this yet but we will soon. I think from my point of view the Rules of Procedure have taken up most of my time. I hope that will be over by tomorrow, or at least for a few days, and my hope is to get to that.

I did put my hand up for something else though, just to point out I have to leave on the hour so if there's anything else you need me for make sure it comes before then. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. Well, we were going to require you for several questions here, that will be fast, and then further down I think there will be less demand on your services. And hopefully we can finish by the top of the hour, who knows? So let's put this one as ongoing.

Then the currently open public comments: the Consultation on IANA Secure Notification process with no movement on this. There was no statement drafted.

The IDN Variant TLD Program Draft Final Report Examining the User Experience Implications of Active Variant TLDs. Now, Edmon was

supposed to confirm if a statement was necessary. There was a webinar that was run yesterday by ICANN staff specifically on this and I know that several of us have attended it. Rinalia, you were there yesterday – do you have any comments to add or to say, bearing in mind the consultation, well the webinar that took place yesterday?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, before Rinalia answers can I ask for a clarification? There was a webinar yesterday on something where the comment period closed on the 8th.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, just making sure I understand. [laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, absolutely Alan. You totally understand and in fact this is something, and funny enough it appears that the At-Large was the only AC out of all the SOs and ACs that somehow understood this bizarre occurrence. And I emailed the people in charge of the comment period to ask whether it was possible for the ALAC, if it was going to file a statement to file it after the webinar taking place since it made a lot more sense. The response was positive.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But you are absolutely quite correct. So Rinalia, you have the floor.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier. After attending the webinar last night I have the same opinion that I've had in reading the report earlier in the sense that I personally don't think that there is much that can be said from the end user point of view apart from saying "Okay, find a solution for this but don't break the internet while you're doing that." Having said that, I did receive a private word from Edmon a few days ago saying that he thinks there should be a response and basically I'm waiting for him to articulate what the content of that response is. So that's where we are right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Rinalia. I had the same feeling when attending the webinar yesterday. It's a highly complicated field and it looks very much like a rabbit hole, and you think well how deep does it go? The more you dig the deeper it goes and certainly there seems to be a lot of work going on in that. I'm not sure whether users have anything to say – "Just don't break my toy."

So what we can do because we are past the initial comment period I would edge towards saying that there should be no statement on this, simply because we've just gone over time and we are also reaching the end of the reply period; and it doesn't look as though it is going to add anything to the debate for the ALAC just to nod its head and say "Yes, yes, yes, just don't break the internet." I think that's a given.

That said, we will be waiting. If Edmon does decide to send something then maybe at that time we will have to decide whether we want to move forward or not but I do feel a bit uneasy about filing things certainly at a moment's notice the moment it comes out. Should a deadline be given to Edmon? Well, the deadline really was yesterday, or let's say the end of the week perhaps. Hopefully we'll have either something or nothing. Either way I don't feel particularly strongly on this – I don't know if anybody else does. Alan Greenberg, you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In my response to the ALAC, At-Large and GNSO Rinalia suggested, not for the first time it being suggested, that we need to be more picky on what we work on. The rule of thumb we came up with quite a while ago which we don't necessarily follow is that if we don't believe we have to correct their path, whoever the "they" is, and we support something but don't believe that there's going to be significant opposition then we don't need to make a statement. And it sounds like we're not going to be adding anything new, "Don't break the internet" everyone knows.

The whole issue is a user one. We're talking about making these things usable by real people. So unless we're going to add something new to the topic or tell them the direction they're going on is wrong I don't think this is one that we need to comment on. Not that it's not important to us, it's just that our comment is not necessarily going to add anything unless one of those conditions is met. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and in response with my tongue firmly in my cheek, having another statement does bring up our averages which is great. You can say more, more statements! But no, I totally agree with you – the previous comment I just made was completely the opposite of what I was meaning. So yeah, let's do that then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oliver, I have to answer that. I think we've been using the wrong metrics if number of statements is how we're measuring ourselves. Now maybe at one point it was important to convince people we were actually doing something – I don't think that's where we're at right now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I think the tone of my voice, sarcasm did not go across very well. Anyway, let's move on. Let's go into the next one. So this one, just to make sure we'll have no statement. It just doesn't seem to be adding anything except if Edmon comes up with something that is so ground shaking that we need to consider it again, in which case I will send a quick email or we can forward it quickly to the ExCom and find out if there is a change in our position.

Currently open public comments, #C-3: Policy versus Implementation. The ALAC is currently drafting a statement and the comment period closes on the 21st of February, the reply period closes on the 14th. Alan, I'm just wondering any thought on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: That was assigned to Evan and me; I know I haven't worked on it yet. I presume Evan hasn't either since I haven't heard anything from him other than him saying "We should do it."

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well I can simply state what my priorities have been and if it's the desire here to shift those priorities I'm perfectly happy to do so. Until now my efforts have been concentrated on the Consumer Trust comment and lately I've been turning my attention to the mandated statement from At-Large on the whole issue of closed private TLDs. That right now has been taking most of my energy. If there's a preference that I divert it to this one I'm happy to do so but I guess I'm just looking for some instruction. I guess just like Alan, you're working on the ROP stuff – I guess it's a matter of prioritization

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, I'll be candid. I haven't even read over the staff statement so I'm not sure to what extent we need to. It's on my list to review. If anyone else has read it and has any thoughts feel free to comment, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Yeah, I must admit I haven't read it either unfortunately. Heidi does mention that there will be a session on Policy versus Implementation on Wednesday in Beijing, and one sometimes wonders if you toil away in drafting a statement just before an ICANN meeting if that statement then gets taken into account at the same level as people who just put their hand up in the room during the session and shout out what their point of view is – sometimes even being an individual point

of view rather than a well-articulated point of view from an SO or an AC. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I actually skimmed through that document sometime back and if I can recall I thought that it was fairly straightforward.   What they're proposing is very reasonable in the sense that their benchmark basically touches on obligations of the parties implicated in implementation. Anyway, what I would suggest is don't toil before Beijing. Go to the session, see what they say and then give input after that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia, that sounds like a good plan.   So we'll put no statement on this unless any of us suddenly raises the flag.

Next, Interim Report on IDN ccNSO Policy Development Process – ALAC is considering drafting a statement. I'm not quite sure who I had asked Matt to contact on this. Matt, can you help me?

MATT ASHTIANI: Sure, one second Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I see Rinalia has her hand up. Perhaps, Rinalia, you wish to speak?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, I don't know who you contacted to hold the pen on this one but there was a discussion in the IDN Working Group where Jean-Jacques

raised a question and it was addressed by other members of the Working Group. I think Hong responded, which basically said that there really is no issue. What Jean-Jacques was concerned about was addressed. So my sense from that conversation was that there's nothing that we really need to comment on but that's just my feeling.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Rinalia, thank you for this feedback from the IDN Working Group. Perhaps conveying this feeling, just crosschecking with our ccNSO Liaison before we close it would be a good thing. Alan, you've put your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I was just going to ask who do we have on the Policy Development Process?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: On this I'm not sure. I imagine that because this is a ccNSO thing there would be Cheryl on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: I imagine so but because it's IDN it's-

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Hong is probably in this as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, it would be useful to know who we have on this and what they think of the draft report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Should we check this? Yeah, the email I sent to Matt was to ask both Cheryl as well as the IDN Working Group, so Cheryl, Edmon, Rinalia. So now we've got the response from Rinalia – perhaps can we just follow through with the response from Cheryl and also check who we have on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Olivier, specifically I'm asking do the people who are in the group and who presumably helped draft it support it or do they believe there's something we need to say?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, correct. So staff to find out who are in this group please, as well. That's an action item.

MATT ASHTIANI: Will do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next the Closed Generic gTLD Applications – we've heard already that Evan is working on this and the comment period is just one without a reply period and it closes on the 7th of March. Evan, when do you think you might have this ready?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm hoping to have the meat of it done over the weekend at least for examination and review. It's taking quite a bit more time and effort than I expected. What's happening is that there have been two points of view generally expressed on the issue and the more I dig about it the more I realize that there's actually a third buried point of view in this that needs to be brought out as part of our analysis. And so that's essentially what I'm working on. There's, buried underneath the discussion of whether this is ethical or not is a question of the level of competition and innovation in domain allocation at ICANN really wants to do – is this a matter of protecting proof of its existing contracted parties or is there something else going on here?

So I'm trying to get to the bottom of all this. Carlton, Rinalia and others have provided input and I'm actually looking forward to being able to put something that will be both thoughtful and actually contributing something significant to the larger discussion. Thanks.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, the issue did come up or at least was on the agenda for the GNSO Council meeting earlier today and including Chris Disspain who was on the call. And one of the issues that came up is Chris asked, they had formally asked the GNSO "Can we provide a bit of history on how we got to where we are now, to what extent were these things discussed?" And some of them were discussed very early, even before I got involved

and there was a conscious decision to not put any restrictions on innovation.

The specific type of question we're talking about now was brought up during the various Applicant Guidebook discussions and the question actually was explicitly asked – what if Kraft Foods applies for .food? You can't get much more specific than that. And the answer from Kurt Pritz is, after thinking about it, "That's fine." So it's clear this was considered and the decision was made, and it became largely a staff decision which no one objected to violently or people forgot about along the way.

So it would also be nice in this process to understand the staff rationale for why they thought it was going to be okay because they considered it far later in the process than the GNSO policy deliberations did. So just pointing out this was a complex issue and it's rather late to be reopening it now but it's opened and somehow it has to be closed again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Of course the fact that staff that might have made that decision is not even in ICANN anymore might even complicate it further.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've almost surely guaranteed that they aren't in many cases. [laughter]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Olivier, I'm not on Adobe Connect – can I just have a quick moment on this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: One of the things I'm noticing, and I guess this is in response to some of the very historical stuff that Alan's been talking about, there've been also a couple of things that have been fairly recent additions – what they're calling the "equal access" provisions of the Applicant Guidebook, depending on how you read it essentially you can lock a registry into having to deal with the current mechanism of registrars and resellers. And that could be an imposition that effectively has led to a binary thing of "Well, either you have to work with this entire imposed secondary channel or you have to close things off."

And I admit that that's a part of this whole discussion that I intend to get into, that I intend to delve into a bit because this whole binary thing of is something closed or is it open is itself to me a limitation on the extent to which registries can operate under the new regime – that you either have to resell through any registrar that wants it or you have to close everything off. And I think that's provided a very, very nasty binary choice for a lot of applicants and it's possible that a number of things that are currently marked as closed are only doing that because the only other option would have been to lay themselves wide open to the open access.

	And I'll leave it at that. I mean there's a discussion to go on this whole topic but I hope to at least try and address it in the At-Large comment on the issue.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay, thank you very much, Evan. Heidi, you've put your hand up.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yes, thank you Olivier. Evan, since you're not in the Adobe Connect, or actually I see that you are so I'm not sure if you're reading my question to you…
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	Sorry, I stepped away.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Okay, so I'm just confirming that the generic names issue is going to be the topic of an upcoming special New gTLD Working Group call in two weeks – that's what Avri is telling me, to discuss the draft statement. Is that correct?
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	This is news to me but I'm certainly amenable to doing it.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Okay, let's go offline on that. I just need clarity on what the topic of the New gTLD call in two weeks that was discussed on Monday's call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Heidi, for this reminder. I'm afraid I can't remember whether there was actually a decision to have the call in two weeks' time specifically on this but I'm sure we can work it out after this call. I see that Alan is about to be off in five minutes and we do have two more things with him which should last a total of 25 minutes but I'm sure we can go faster than that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I'm not chairing the next meeting which I have been in the last few weeks so I can be a few minutes late but not much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. The Revised New gTLD Registry Agreement including additional public interest commitments certification – Avri is to confirm whether a statement is necessary. Have you had any reply from Avri yet, Heidi or Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi, this is Matt. No, Avri has not yet replied but I sent her a reminder yesterday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope Avri will be consulting with others on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Avri Doria, well I'm sure she'll probably ask the New gTLD Working Group on this. So we've gone through all of the public comments and the policy development that we're doing. There are now a few items which deal with our own activities in more of a procedural thing, a process and bylaws, etc. The next thing on the agenda is the status of the Rules of Procedure revisions. I gather that Alan, you've been holding the pen on a lot of things recently. If you can give us a quick update on this that would be really great.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought I already did. Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Alan, yeah?

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought I did when we talked about the earlier item on the timing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, that was your full update, oh.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I can give you a more detailed update. I've been taking the four sections and trying to put them together. It has taken an infinite number of hours. Word is not the most flexible document or tool to work with. It's almost ready for the reviewers. There are substantive

changes in the section on elections, selections and appointees primarily because one of the sections on recall was not really discussed at all in the Design Team – it was sort of put in at the very last moment and no one has commented on it, but I in the process of integration have actually read it and there were some substantial problems. So I've talked to Cheryl about it and I'm making some suggestions on how it can be changed and the reviewers will see that.

Other than that there are no substantive changes, not many substantive changes in the document – an awful lot of reformatting. The version that's going out to reviewers will still have things that are in the wrong place. It turns out once you put all the document together things start popping out such as process things which are in the descriptions of people and you know, appointment things which are not in the appointment section that will have to be moved around – that will not be done prior to the review. So we're getting close. I had planned to finish it yesterday; I didn't. I had planned to finish it today; after four hours sleep last night I'm not quite sure about my abilities to do it properly today but I'm still targeting getting it out by the end of today or perhaps the middle of tomorrow.

So I think that's about as much as I can say. If anyone has any specific questions I'd be glad to try to respond quickly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan, for this quick report on the progress. I must say I'm very impressed with the amount of work that was done by all of the people in the work teams. It really is great and many of those teams were populated by people who were not the usual suspects.

Agreed, some of them were but there were a few who took part and who really did a pretty good job, so it's pretty impressive to see that this community is able to rewrite its own Rules of Procedures without requiring the assistance of an external lawyer – although we might have several lawyers among our team.

There was a question with regards to elections and selections that Avri had brought forward and wanted to discuss. I think that you've informed us of this the last time. I just wanted a quick update from staff. As you know, or maybe you don't know, we will have a session that will be speaking specifically about the selection of the At-Large Board Director chair and just a session on the process. Alan, you've put your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I just wanted to review it for those who aren't aware of it. Avri is suggesting that we include some larger form of electorate other than what we have right now. I'm personally somewhat irked by it because she's presenting it as a brand new concept that's never been discussed before. She did present it to the North American RALO at its meeting earlier this week. I don't believe she took part in the process but as many of you remember there was some exhaustive discussion about it. So I'm not really sure why we are reopening it but Cheryl has given the commitment that it will be reopened and a meeting has been scheduled for Sunday I believe to discuss it.

We're going to have to present some information to the ALAC prior to that to make sure that we can hopefully discuss it and come to closure on it because we really can't afford to have it hanging over our heads

for the next few months. We are going to have to start the process of selecting a new, or reappointing the Board position sometime relatively soon to meet the appointment deadline. So it's on the books for Sunday. We'll discuss it. We need to get some stuff out prior to that, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Heidi or Matt, would you know how much time we have on Sunday for this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'll look that up and I'll put that into the chat in just a moment. I think it's 45 minutes, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 45 minutes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's 45 minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Well my point of view on this is we're not, like some of the rest of ICANN – when a subject is brought into the arena and might not please a majority of people, I'm all for actually discussing the thing openly rather than putting it under the carpet and hoping it will go away with time. I know that we are regularly challenged in this community about having the edges basically too far from the top of the whole stack and I think it's absolutely ridiculous to be saying that. And

so I just want that to be openly discussed and those thoughts to be effectively discussed openly so as to know why it's not the way some people want it. What are the pros, what are the cons, what are the dangers – and I'm particularly concerned of the dangers, that's one of the points. Alan, you briefly put your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, I'll save it for some emails I'll be sending. Anything else you need me for?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we do, we do because there is Agenda Item #6 which is ALAC and the At-Large Involvement in GNSO Activities – matching supply with demand. And if it was not taking place with you then I'm not quite sure what we would do since you're the originator of that email that you sent over to the list.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have not had the chance to comment on the comments on it. I will be in the next couple of days. I'm happy to leave my discussion until after I make my formal comments. And I think all the points raised, including some of those by Avri that you disagreed with, I think some of them are more valid than you alluded to. But I also think that, as Avri did allude to, this is a very generic problem. The only group within ICANN that is in fact representative of the groups whose name they bear are the registries, and that will change when all the new gTLDs come online. Every other group, the ISPCs do not represent all of the ISPs around the world. Most of them don't know ICANN exists. The registrars are semi-

representative; the Business Constituency is certainly not representative of the world's business community – they're very vocal but they're vocal on what they believe. They are doing just what we do, that is we're representing the interests of the users and not purporting to survey them.

Unfortunately, bad words got written into our Bylaws which implied something a lot stronger and I think we need a lot of discussion about how we're going to address that either to fix the problem or fix the Bylaws. It's a complex problem. We've been given a task which is completely impossible and as long as we're given that task and people believe we're going to do it and we sometimes confirm that we're working on doing it, that I think we're going to have continual problems in that area.

That is not central to the discussion that I started, and that is we need to get more people involved in GNSO activities and working groups. It's not going to make the whole world perfect but we do need to fix that one problem, and again, I'll be making some suggestions on that. But I think it morphed into a much wider discussion that is proper to have but I don't think is necessarily relevant to this particular issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I actually personally deplore that it went into a much wider discussion because I see this as a diversion from the actual points that you have brought forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed that is correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And you've got the one-man orchestra going on at the moment, what the hell are you going to do about it? That's really what the point is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's not only a one-man orchestra, it's a one-man orchestra who's getting awful tired in it and doesn't want to do it for life, and I don't want to see the whole process of the At-Large and ALAC being involved in the gTLD world which is a large part of what ICANN does. And that's what we have to try to fix and it's going to take actual work to do it. So yes, you're correct – I think it's morphed into a larger discussion which is a good discussion to have. That wasn't what I was trying to trigger at the time, and so I think we need to make sure we have the larger discussion but also get back to the questions I was raising. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And by the way, it's disturbing that there has been that interesting discussion on the ALAC list. I do not believe there was a single post on the At-Large list. That's the problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, was your question copied on both?

ALAN GREENBERG: I sent it to the At-Large list also, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As well, eh?

ALAN GREENBERG: I may be wrong. There may have been an answer but I don't think there was, but before I put an answer I will do my homework. In any case, I'm not sure it's worth discussing it much more than this. I will be putting some thoughts in writing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So two things, Alan. I think that the wider discussion of involvement of ALSes is something which we've had for a long time, which comes recurrently and which I believe we all have on our minds. And I think that we are doing what needs to be done. It might have taken a long time to reach the point that we are at now but with the creation of all those outreach working groups and inreach, and capacity building and all this, I have seen some ALSes in parts of the world where things were moving a little forward with capacity building. For example, in LACRALO I have seen some good involvement from ALSes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, let me interject because I really have to leave. This is not an ALS issues. We're looking for some warm, caring bodies to work on work groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well wait, I've not finished what I've told you. This is one side. I think this one is in hand. The issue of being able to put warm bodies or warm bodies with intelligence, which is really what we would need, on these working groups is something which we really need to take very seriously. And what I was going to suggest is that we all, well first that this matter gets discussed in the next ALAC call specifically bringing back the discussion always to who are we going to put in these working groups rather than looking at the wider set of how do you get people involved from Timbuktu and the Outer Hebrides because that's something which I've seen in the Internet Society as well, I've seen in the [IGT] and in the IGF, I've seen everywhere around the world. That's a little bit like trying to resolve the problem of water being wet and rain stopping the sun.

But if we can actually go into something where we can basically maybe identify people or have a program within At-Large to identify those people that wish to take part and that wish to go into these working groups and do work, that really is a step that we should move forward. That's the feeling that I have on that, and if we can discuss this on the next ALAC call that will certainly be helping. I mean there were questions about yeah, the working smarter, not harder if you recall that Cheryl had brought forward and the whole idea of a mentoring and shadowing program perhaps. I mean Cheryl is doing this with regards to her successors in the ccNSO…

ALAN GREENBERG: But Olivier, we also do need to work harder, some people need to work harder.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that brings us back to the metrics, that brings us back to the whole discussion on volunteers, etc. Okay. Are we all okay with having maybe ten, fifteen minutes in the next ALAC call on this where you can put your point across quite clearly, Alan? And I will absolutely support you on this by the way because I know how much work you do, and I know how much work many of us do in all of the working groups, not only in ALAC but outside.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine with me. And I will see you whenever our next call is together?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, bye-bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I think we can then move on to the, well, we've already dealt with one thing under the Items for the 26th of February ALAC meeting because we've just decided that we can have this subject on there. Any other subjects for the next ALAC meeting, suggestions are welcome. Heidi, do you want to take us through this quickly?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, thank you Olivier. In my mind this would be Beijing, because this will be the... Well the next ALAC after that one will be March which is really too late to plan anything for Beijing. So I would like to spend some time in setting the agendas, reviewing the agendas, reviewing who the other groups are that you'd like to meet which is going to be the discussion in the next agenda item today; get those questions sorted out, etc. That's really… And then also the status of the ROPs which need to be on the next ALAC agenda as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that's all fine. Any other comments from anyone, Rinalia or Evan on this? They're all big items, yes, and unfortunately we only have, well we used to have an hour and a half now we only have two hours for these.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can I ask one other question? For the ALAC call, which working groups would you like to have provide an update?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I was going to ask for any of the working groups that have met recently and that have had significant progress. To tell you the truth I just can't remember offhand which ones have recently had much of a move. I know that there has been capacity building going on. Of course there's the Review Group as well. Yeah, I see Rinalia has put it on there. The New gTLD Review Group has done a lot of work and we definitely need to have them on this because we need to be told what's the next step. And I see that, thank you Rinalia.

Certainly everyone has gone into typing mode which is really fantastic. Maybe I should start typing and we'll have a long silence during the recording. "What about the endorsement for the new Work Group on Meetings?" That's correct, yeah, that's another one. I was going to touch on this here, but go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, so as requested Olivier, this is Heidi, I spoke with Sebastien on this yesterday. He is asking that the ALAC endorse candidates. He is looking; he suspects that there'll be one to four ALAC or At-Large representatives on this new group but he would like to see more candidates so that they will have a chance to have a selection to choose from. But I think this is something that we should start moving on as far as putting a call out the regions for this new group and then maybe having the ALAC check this, an update on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yeah. Well, the view I had on that was that we should have at least five candidates, at least one candidate from each region, because the concern I have in regards to this is that this Working Group, which is an ICANN-wide working group will be made up of the usual suspects from the North and the West just to serve its own purposes. And I'm really concerned that the South and the East will not be represented particularly well on this. So as the only part of ICANN that really is very much sort of balanced throughout the world – geographically balanced, that's the words I was looking for – we should have that with the five candidates.

Now, I'm not sure what kind of response we're going to get to this, whether there will be several people per region that will come forward. What I was hoping is that the RALOs would make recommendations on who'd they like to have and we can then suggest those, or the ALAC could then suggest those. The only concern is that we start going into this whole heavy-handed method of selecting people with elections and I don't know what else, and ratification lists and whatever. We go through this heavy-handed stuff to get people on committees and then afterwards only a handful of them attend.

I'm not going to read all the chat that is going on here at the moment – it feels like I'm reading a telex at the moment. If anybody would like to comment on this please, using their voice.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, may I? This is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, sorry. Thanks for bringing us back a couple of decades. I am just thinking that perhaps an update from the FBSC, the Finance and Budget Subcommittee on the F2015 budget planning, and perhaps an update, a discussion on the Summit planning might be connected?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think there could be an announcement on the Summit planning. The problem I see right now is that we only have two hours for this ALAC call, and as Rinalia has already mentioned, having three big subjects plus all of these will only take us four, five hours maybe. I'm just very mindful of the time that we have allocated to the ALAC call.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I did put my hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh Evan, yes, your hand has just come up. Evan, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You were concentrating so much on what was being typed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, I was actually falling asleep but anyway, go ahead, Evan. [laughing]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Oh great, oh, I almost forgot what I was going to say. No, I mean the primary way of trying to reduce the ALAC call itself is to try and make sure that the working groups are more proactive; that a lot of the actual comment churning and a lot of the actual discussion churning actually takes place at the working group level and comes up to ALAC only after a lot of the original heavy lifting and researching and penholding has been done. And the ALAC gets to be actually a sober reflection on that. I mean that's how you reduce the size of the ALAC calls or prevent them

from being five hours, is by trying to have more done in the working groups.

Of course, then that goes more to Alan's point of how do we have more people involved in the working groups that are involved in the churning of this in addition to the 15 that are on the ALAC? And so we get ourselves into a bit of a circular loop but I mean the fundamental issue is we need to spread the work around. It could also be argued that there's an awful lot of people on the 15-people in ALAC that are shall we say underutilized and maybe that needs to be approached, but at a certain point it really boils down to once again too few people doing too much of the work. And every place you have those few people that are getting together the work gets done, but then you have things like five-hour calls because when there's things to be done and nobody else is doing it then this is how it gets churned unfortunately. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. There was also a suggestion from Heidi that perhaps there could be some quick text update from the different working groups – in other words, you would find the quick three-sentence update that would be put either in the chat or that could be put in the meeting record so we would know what the working groups are doing. I think that I agree with you. We don't need to have feedback from all the working groups anyway, and yes, you're right – perhaps the error on my part is to have a working group provide its report and then ALAC members being present asking questions, basic questions sometimes and a whole discussion moving on about the

subject of the working group without those ALAC members actually taking part in the working group itself.

Perhaps asking for a working group report and then saying "Anyone who is interested in this working group or who has questions, please get in touch directly with the Chair of that working group and take it offline" might be the answer.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No complaints from me on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, and I see Rinalia has also just spat it out, hasn't she, that the Review Group will be objecting every objection except for .health – that's the possibility. Hello Tijani, welcome. We hopefully are arriving towards the end of this meeting but we still have a couple more things to discuss.

So back to the items for the 26th February ALAC meeting, I think we should be careful on the total number of items, Heidi, so that we don't get fully rushed. Certainly an update from a couple of working groups… If you could update the latest version of the ALAC call and then just circulate it to us afterwards, or just ping us afterwards on this we can all have a look and try to do the calculation of how long that will last. Okay, thank you very much, Heidi, and I see everyone's back to typing away. I'm not quite sure what happens after a while.

So Item #8, the At-Large Meeting Schedule for the 46th ICANN Meeting in Beijing. We have a lot of work again to prepare on this and hopefully

we're going to go through this pretty fast because we've already lost a number of people unfortunately. Alan already has had to go and we've had a few people who were not able to join us today but the development of the ALAC and ExCom Beijing agendas is something that we need to look at. Heidi, I guess I should really give you the floor so you can take us through it, and we can make our decisions here.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you Olivier. Just in the interest of time I'm just going to go to the sub-points of which group's additional meetings ALAC would like to schedule. So those are the key points for this week – for example, would you like to meet with the registrars? If so, when and would it be just an informal meeting? Would it be a formal meeting? Would it be just with the ExCom and a few of the registrars or would it be with the whole group? That's one question.

Another one is do you wish to meet with the GAC? Do you wish to meet with the ccNSO like you did in Toronto? There's a question on meeting with the ASO as well, so we just need to know if so, any of those meetings would you like them to be within some of the normally-scheduled meetings or would you like those to be additional meetings, formal or informal? So if we can maybe discuss that, that would be the key point today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Heidi, and yes, these are the big questions today because they are starting to [come in]. Now the first one being having a meeting with the registrars, I know that we've had both formal

meetings and also a lunch with the registrars. In your view what was more productive, what do we need more of or should we just give it a break for the Beijing? The floor is open.

I don't see anyone jumping up and down the moment one mentions the word "registrars," however I think there is a lot of work going on at the moment both on the RAA side of things, and there's a lot of discussion going on on there and certainly our last meeting did bring some interesting points when discussing the RAA; perhaps also discussing compliance was another subject which I thought was going to be interesting and perhaps discussing also the…   Well, I'm not sure about the closed generic TLDs, maybe we shouldn't be talking about that – we can think of talking of something else, other points.

I personally feel at the moment it might be helpful to have yet another lunch with them rather than a full open meeting with them. Does anyone think otherwise or do you just think that we shouldn't see them at all? I'm just concerned at the moment there's a lot going on with new gTLDs; it's important to be able to talk to the registrars in these matters of changes. The silence is deafening. "Sorry for that strange noise," says Heidi – I'm not hearing anything at all. Is that the strange noise?   Let's call on Evan first because, Evan, you've had quite an interesting set of discussions with the registrars in the past and you usually are the crux of the discussions?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Me? Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely. You and your brother Michele.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Well, I can tell you that in the chat I've been talking about efforts to try to privately bring along people that I've personally identified as being able to contribute an awful lot more to At-Large than had been the case. Actually, there's part of me that would like to go in-camera for maybe the next five minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, we can do that. Can we do that, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Certainly. Sorry, I've just come back. I had some very strange noise. I did not hear the last three or five minutes' worth of discussions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was not a strange noise; that was just me talking, don't worry.

[recording is stopped and turned back on]

GISELLA GRUBER: This is Gisella, the recording is back on, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. So we've just discussed the various topics that might be discussed with the registrars and the discussion would be

centering specifically on RAA and on compliance, specifically, with some touchy points that might have to be discussed across from registrars and ALAC with a view basically to be cleaning up all of the bad actors out there; and a firm agenda, a specific agenda being discussed ahead of the meeting which would be of course mutually agreed so that we can effectively reach some conclusion to this meeting. And it would be a lunch that would take place – it makes it much more productive for a private room. The ExCom would be on one side and the registrars on the other, hopefully being able to have a full meeting between the registrars and the ALAC at the July meeting this year.

Let's move on. The next one I think on our list was the GAC. There is always much interest with the GAC, but in Toronto we had a lunch with the GAC. Do you think it was productive or should we have a full meeting with the full GAC? Any thoughts on this? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi Olivier. Actually, to me both have worked. They serve different functions. One is more intimate and allows us to deal in more detail with very specific issues, but I also found that the larger meeting is also very useful and very necessary to bring the wider members of the GAC more with the understanding that we actually share more in common with them than probably with most other ICANN stakeholder groups. So I'm okay with either of what you're saying. They both have their functions; they both work well. At this particular time I don't even know if I have a preference. Regardless of which route we go I think we're going to be able to accomplish something useful, thanks.

But the only thing I would absolutely agree on is we need something. We don't want to have to go through a meeting that doesn't have some kind of a contact, whether formal or informal, between GAC members and ALAC members. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Next is Tijani. And Tijani, I'm not able to hear you – you might be muted. I see that Rinalia in the meantime has drafted, has written on the chat that her preference is for a small group and private setting with the new leadership, with the new GAC leadership. And Tijani unfortunately has been dropped. I noted that Tijani did agree with you, Evan, earlier.

What I would suggest, because I see that Rinalia would like the small group, private setting with the new leadership – I'm a little concerned that if you remember, in Toronto we did have a meeting with the GAC leadership and we only met with was it three people from the GAC whilst we had the full ALAC Executive Committee that was there: Tracy, Peter, and Heather – that's right. And I'm a little concerned that we then end up off the radar for all of these other countries that are out there if we don't show our face in the GAC room from time to time in the wider sense of it.

What I would have preferred on this occasion that we meet with the full GAC and do both maybe, yeah – if we can do both why not? But as we know the GAC has a lot of work on their plate. They are able to provide the GAC advice and the GAC objections during this meeting – I understand they even have one additional day that they have to work on. They are likely to start on the Saturday first; they'll be working on

Saturday and Sunday and the rest of the week. But shall we ask for a full meeting with them with possibly a lunch with the GAC leadership, even if just involves Tracy, Peter and Heather or whoever else is in their leadership now? And I'm afraid I don't even know who is in their leadership now.

Tijani, are you back with us? I don't see Tijani back, everyone's back to typing again. No, Tijani isn't. Are you disagreeing with this point of view, Tijani? So the point of view being… He agrees, okay. Thank you, Tijani, so you agree. And I note that Evan has also said "Rather than leadership only make it ExCom and any GAC member who RSVPs." That's a good point but I think we have to leave it to Heather on this. It would be difficult for us to tell her "Oh, make it any GAC member who RSVPs" because I'm still to this day not quite sure of what the internal politics are in the GAC. And as you know, there's a lot of internal politics there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, the only point I was trying to make is we've noticed during some of our previous conversations in the larger room that there have been some GAC members who may not be on the GAC Leadership but who have indeed expressed an interest in participating and collaborating together with ALAC. I noticed specifically, and I forget the person's name but previously the people for instance from Portugal and the EC had been very vocal in the larger room comments, the larger room meetings between the ALAC and the GAC. And I would not want to exclude them from a more casual conversation if they were not technically on GAC leadership. As you say, it's Heather's call but I would

make the suggestion to her that rather than just GAC leadership, not all of which who would show up at meetings based on past performance, but to essentially find out who in the GAC is interested in working with us and sitting down. It might not be leadership but it might be other people. That's all I was getting at, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Evan. I will suggest this over to her when we ask. So that sounds like we have a plan on this as well. Heidi, what else do we have? I'm mindful of the time now; it really is going into overtime.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, ccNSO? Is there an interest in meeting with them?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now, ccNSO we haven't met with in a long time if I recall….

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, sorry – no, the ccNSO you met with for the first time actually in Toronto on Sunday morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The first time was in Toronto, okay, yeah. Perhaps on the matter of ccNSO maybe we should ask Cheryl for this. So we'll punt this to the side. A question with regards to the ASO… Oh, I see Tijani can now put his hand up. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. Yes Olivier, it's true because Cheryl is the Liaison for the ccNSO. But for the (inaudible) but for the practical I think it is one of the best and the most important contacts we need to have with the ALAC constituency. The only way, we didn't do a lot of (inaudible) with the ccNSO and I think that we need to be more open to them because we need to have more cooperation with them and gTLDs and ALSes. It is very important I think, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Tijani. It's a good point.   Certainly bilateral collaboration is very important and we have seen some of that going on in some countries, but certainly not across all of the RALOs. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. One of the things that might be worth noting is that the ccNSO has actually for the first time made a comment on something that the ALAC has done and it wasn't particularly positive. In fact, the ccNSO is one of only two comments to complain about material that was in the R3 Paper. There was a specific mention within R3 that country codes might want to consider some common standards, and even that – what I consider to be fairly timid recommendation – was met with a very, very forceful repudiation.

So on one hand, as far as I'm concerned to me this opens the door on a very, very interesting engagement. From the public interest there is not a difference… From the public internet end user there's no functional difference between .com and .co, and yet what they don't know is that

the background of both of them are very, very different from each other. I think that At-Large has a role to play in trying to address the end user issues of how things are functionally no different at the end user point but very, very different from the backend and the end users don't know that the policies are very, very different.

I don't know if this is something that is best engaged in a meeting like that but I certainly know that the R3 has now provoked a conversation between the ccNSO and at least some parts of At-Large that are definitely going to be I think of interest. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. I agree with you and I wonder, since there will be a session on the R3 Paper taking place in Beijing whether we're not duplicating the discussion in the R3 session and also a discussion between the ALAC and the ccNSO on this.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I agree with you. Unto that end I guess I would extend a special invitation to the Chair of the ccNSO and to other people that found themselves interested in that issue to come and start that engagement. You're right – I agree it would be redundant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that, I think, might be the way forward. If we do this and keep in mind then that we can then follow up in July with the full ccNSO and at least then we'll have something to follow up on; then we're not duplicating our efforts.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Absolutely agreed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so on this for the time being…. Unless of course the ccNSO really asks for a meeting with the ALAC, and I will be checking of course or staff will be checking with the ccNSO Leadership and finding out if they absolutely want to meet with us. If they don't then for the time being we'll just invite them. We will send formal invitations to the Chair of the ccNSO for the R3 Paper session.

Next, I'm not quite sure who else… Oh, the ASO, that's correct. The ASO, Address Supporting Organization is divided with two seats – one is the Address Council which is Louie Lee, and one is the ASO itself which was John Curran and which has changed this year. It's now a person from Europe, from RIPE NCC who has taken the position – I believe it is someone from RIPE NCC, maybe it is APNIC. But anyway, because there is someone new and because there was discussion previously of collaboration between an RIR and a RALO, this collaboration seems to have really launched off well in LACRALO. And in fact, many people from LACRALO have been invited to several events that have been run and sponsored by the Regional Internet Registry.

There has been some interest in North America for this to take place, so collaboration with ARIN. I think it should be something to discuss at a high level and to really try and spread worldwide. The floor is open. I see Evan has put his hand up. Evan, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Oh sorry, that's an old hand. You already mentioned what I was going to about NARALO and ARIN, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Would you then say that it's a good idea then to meet with the new person and to basically get things in motion on this? Perhaps a 45-minute meeting where they come and visit us, just the Chairs?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I am of two minds on this. On one hand I think that would be a good idea; on the other hand, I think at this point having an explicit direction to the RALOs to try and encourage, to encourage direct conversations between RALOs and their own RIRs might be in line because here's another issue in which there's regional splits within ALAC and there's regional splits within the RIRs and there seems to be a logical way to… As you say, LACRALO is engaging with LACNIC, NARALO is engaging with ARIN. I think this is the kind of thing where interregional collaborations and communications should be encouraged. I think that would be a good thing. I would actually prefer that to simply having it between ALAC and the Numbers Council. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much, Evan. And I think… I just wonder now then, should we suggest to the Secretariats to invite the ASO Chairs to their meeting since it is something specifically for our RALOs? Any thoughts on that? I don't see anyone being particularly happy about this… Oh, I see a positive reply from Rinalia.   Any thoughts on that, Evan? Do you think the Secretariats?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm okay with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would certainly bring the RALOs closer. Now, the question though is getting the RALOs to engage with the RIRs – I'm really hoping there that the RIRs would not only have, the ASO would not only bring Paul Wilson along who is the new NRO Chair but would also bring some of the, maybe Raúl Echeberria from LACNIC who could come down, who could be there and could explain really what they're doing in the Latin American and Caribbean Region – or even Andres, yeah, Andres Piazza, that's right. Good point.

There is a lesson to be learned from that region and it would really help if the other regions are doing things and moving forward. I know that AFRALO is also now really much involved also with AfriNIC and with the African Initiative that has been taking place. I know Tijani has been taking a lot of heart in that but that was partly done through external go-betweens and it wasn't an At-Large-led or RALO-led initiative and I'd like that to happen. I think it would be really helpful for all the regions. Anyway, I might have spent a bit too much time on this so let's leave it at that.

Anyway, so no meeting with the ASO but perhaps informal discussions with the ASO in order to have them invited to the Secretariats. Perhaps one action item is to contact the Secretariats and suggest that they proceed forward, and I can always make the introductions if that's

required. Is this clear? Hearing no one saying that it's not clear let's move on to the next. Who else do we have, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think that's it for the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well there was SSAC of course who is probably going to come to us and ask us, and then of course we're going to be asked about the questions and the subjects we want to discuss with the Board; also the questions we want to address… Because I gather that we will be meeting with the Board, won't we? I don't have any answer so I assume that we are. And also the…

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Olivier, Gisella here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, the Board meeting will be on Tuesday morning 8:30 to 9:30.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. That's good.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, if we can just switch to Friday quickly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, please Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so currently we have the ExCom scheduled for 8:00 to 12:00 and I know that's not expected to take the whole time. And I've heard that there may be a Board meeting with ISOC at that time. So we may not be able to get Steve, for example, or other members of the Board. Sorry, the ExCom is scheduled from 9:00 to 12:00 on Friday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hm… Well, at this stage two things come in mind: one, I don't know when everyone has to leave, if we're now finally leaving on Friday or on Saturday and I don't want to reopen the discussion on that because otherwise we'll be on the phone for another hour. But the second thing is, if we do have leeway to move the ExCom forward or backwards, and instead of starting at 9:00 we might start at 10:00 then let's take it when it actually happens when we know if the Board is going to meet with ISOC. I'm a little concerned about these moving goalposts but we're still early on enough to be able to make a decision. Is that okay? Hello?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so in terms of scheduling the meeting, Olivier, should I still go ahead and schedule it 9:00 to 12:00?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's do it 9:00 to 12:00 for the time being and I'm sure between 9:00 and 12:00 we will have the opportunity to have Steve in the room. I mean what's the alternative – do our ExCom meeting in the afternoon when we're all supposed to be at the airport?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I was just pointing out that you may not have some of the…. Just in the past you've wanted Steve to speak so we may not get him, that's my point. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Tell me more great news and I'll rejoice but maybe not these ones. I'm somehow cynical of the Friday schedule but anyway.

Any other groups that we might have forgotten on the way? I don't think we have for the time being. So really that's all. Anything else, Heidi, on this agenda item?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, not anything that can't be discussed later.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So then we'll have a quick update on the APRALO Beijing Events. It is our second hour on the phone right now so we can have a quick update on that, Rinalia, please, or Heidi, whoever wishes to?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Heidi, if you don't mind I'll go first and then you can fill in the blanks. I just want to update the ExCom about the Multi-Stakeholder Policy Roundtable that I've taken the lead in organizing. It's going to be [two sessions]. The first session is going to be on New gTLDs and end user protection and the second session is going to be on community readiness for IDN Variant TLDs. For the first topic on New gTLDs and end user protection, I've received confirmation of participation as lead discussants from the GAC – that's going to be Peter Nettlefold. He is the Australia delegate and he is the GAC lead on New gTLDs; also confirmation from Jeremy Malcolm who represents Consumers, International; also [Zahid Jamel] who represents the Business Constituency; and also Maguy Serad who is the VP of Contractual Compliance in ICANN.

Those are the main views and I've also requested for ICANN Legal and there was another department that I can't remember, if Heidi can remind me… Oh yes, Law Enforcement is going to be in the room. Other than that we're going to issue invitations to all the SOs, ACs, and the Board in case they are interested in our discussion.

On the IDN Variant TLDs there are some key questions that I've posed, and I'm trying to bring a group of lead discussants that represent communities, language or script communities at varying levels of

readiness for variant TLDs to get real responses in terms of how do they feel about this and how do they feel in terms of moving forward with the way that ICANN has been proposing? And the SSAC has indicated that they are interested in participating so we have the Vice Chair of SSAC representing that group. And I was informed that there are other members of SSAC who would like to attend as well.

So I'm still in the midst of trying to get confirmation from about eight script or language communities, and once I have an update on that I'll be able to circulate the agenda to the At-Large. Heidi, over to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you Rinalia, fantastic job on the organization of that. That's been just very helpful and very professionally done. So just going through the other activities for the APRALO Beijing Events, we have a Showcase scheduled Monday, 19:00 to 21:00 – that's coming together very much.   Speakers are a very short list; it will be Fadi, Olivier, and then the ALSes will be introducing themselves. And then yes, Steve Crocker will be coming after Fadi just for a very few minutes; I think everyone's getting about three to five minutes. Then there'll be an introduction of the ALSes by most likely Holly, so that's coming along nicely.

Capacity Building sessions will consist of two tracks. One will be the Introduction – I believe Rinalia and Maureen and Holly are leading that. That's going to take place Sunday from 8:00 to 9:00. That will include an introduction to the week, what some of the aims are; and also Olivier will be giving a presentation on the role of the ALAC and At-Large during that session. Then the other track will be the joint sessions between the

Fellows and the APRALO ALSes. Maureen and Janice are working on that just to make sure that everything is being planned so the topics discussed will be of interest to both.

The General Assembly is scheduled for Tuesday, 16:00 to 18:00 – the schedule is still being developed for that but coming along. Thursday, currently there's the APRALO Monthly Meeting 13:00 to 14:00, but what I'm thinking of proposing is to move that to early morning which would be the 7:00 to 9:00 slot, so a two-hour slot which would include Hong's smaller session now with the Chinese-speaking ALSes. So again, two things: that would be sort of a combined event, a monthly meeting as well as a smaller format for the Chinese-speaking ALSes that anybody else can go to, but that would also mean that the fourth joint meeting between the Fellows and the ALSes would not take place. So I'll be writing to Holly and to Rinalia formally to see if we can go ahead with that.

And I think that's it… Also, there'll be also some informal outreach and inreach activities going along including lunches, small lunches with the RALO officers and some of the ALSes to get to know them better, which is a great initiative. And I think that's it, Rinalia, with coffee. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi, it's Olivier for the transcript record. Did you mention the lunch between the APRALO and the [ALAC], the lunch?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes sorry, so on Sunday there's a planned working lunch between the At-Large and APRALO ALSes just to get to know each other. Now currently it's scheduled for 90 minutes. In speaking with Janice who is taking over the Newcomers' Track she's going to propose a new format to the Newcomers' Track on Sunday which might mean that that lunch can only be 60 minutes. So we're looking into that and Gisella is also looking into ways we can provide a lunch for that event.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. But I was also mentioning the James Seng email invites. That was an ALAC thing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh Gisella… Yes, we're still getting some more details on that. Gisella or Olivier, if you wanted to [staff to add that in]?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Gisella here, just bear with me for a second. Olivier, further to that email that was sent I sent out an email just summarizing the social events in Beijing and to be clear, on the ALAC Dinner that James Seng has proposed, is it only the 15 ALAC members? And to this date there's also only two possibilities for that dinner.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So it's either Sunday night or Tuesday night, isn't that correct?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, both nights you've got the ISOC on but I don't see when else you'll be able to have it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can probably miss one of the ISOC meetings if it just hinges down to me. I think it's more important to have a dinner with our hosts than just meet with people I meet with regularly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oliver, this is Heidi. Do the other members of the ExCom know what this is regarding, this invitation?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, yes. Very kindly James Seng has sent an email to me and carbon copied I believe it was Hong who was copied on this, that it is very traditional for hosts to invite their guests to a dinner. And so they wanted to invite us to dinner, well invite "us" as in invite the ALAC to a dinner at some point during the week. So that's where the request came from or the question came from, and this is how we got to where we are now. And that's an email which I received I think yesterday or the day before yesterday.

Anyway, we'll work this out closer to the time or in the next week or so. Any other questions or comments on the scheduled Beijing events? I have to thank both Rinalia and thank Heidi for their very efficient feedback on this and reporting on this, and I now move to the Any Other Business. I realize that the coffee is starting to wear off in the

minds of some people. Oh, and Alan has just come back from another conference call I gather, the fifth hour of conferences today.

Right, I don't see anyone putting their hand up for any other business. I thank each and every one of you for having lasted this long. It's been very productive and so have a great weekend coming up! And this call is now adjourned, thank you.

[End of Transcript]