

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC ExCom conference call on Friday the 17<sup>th</sup> of May and the time is 13:03 UTC. Gisella you have the floor for the roll call and the apologies.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you OLIVIER. On today's call, we have OLIVIER Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Evan Leibovitch, Julie Hammer, Alan Greenberg, and now Rinalia Abdul Rahim has not yet joined yes, Cheryl Langdon-Orr is on the call as well. Apologies from Carlton Samuels. And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Matt Ashtiani, Silva Vivanco and myself Gisella Gruber.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to OLIVIER.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fantastic. Thank you very much Gisella. And have we missed anyone by any chance, who is on the call and whose name has not been called? Okay. So let's go directly to the review or action items from our last meeting, the 29<sup>th</sup> of April.

There are several, well there is no open action item as such, there is some long term action items, and I did forget to go through this with Matt offline, and we'll probably do this right after this call or later on.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

The next thing in here is the recently closed action items, there was just one, Matt, to set up a standard vote in the five working days on the trademark clearing house and IDN variance, the statement was sent to Steve Crocker with a copy to the Board Secretariat, and they head of the IDN variant program.

The newly assigned action items at the bottom of the page, there is the webinar for the RALO leaders and the ALAC on the ATRT 2. The questions for the community on the accountability and transparency within ICANN. The webinar went very well, it lasted for an hour, it took place this week.

For any of you that hasn't been on the webinar, but I think you were all on the webinar, maybe not Julie, but I think everyone else was on there, just you can listen to it...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No Olivier, I wasn't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Oh you weren't on this? Oh I thought that you were Tijani. Okay. So I invite you to listen to it. And in fact, it's very important for you Tijani to listen to it, or to get AFRALO leadership to listen to it, and to look at the material there.

What we basically asked for, was for the RALOs to bring input into this process, and on top of that, there is the very fact that the whole public comment closes, the initial public comment closes on the 19<sup>th</sup>, but in

---

fact the ATRT 2 group will listen to public input all the way up to the end of the public comment period.

And in fact, all the way up to Durban, but it would be really good for each one of our RALOs to bring in some input. Anyway, I'm not going to go through the whole webinar, but please Tijani, when you have time over the weekend, listen to it. It's only an hour, and it has got all of the information there. And of course, you've got the details.

You can go directly to the public comment for this. Any questions on this actually? I see Alan has put his hand up, Alan please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I put my hand up quite a while ago [laughs]. Actually...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Sorry. I was reading one page, and I can't read the two at the same time. So I apologize. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

...against you. The talk actually was on IDN variance. There was a really good presentation on the GNSO call on IDN variance, and I'll call attention to the presentation in email in the next day or so. But we may want to look at getting it done for one of our meetings. I guess about 15, 20 minutes.

It was really packed full and it was useful. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent Alan, thank you for this. I'm sure that has been recorded, so if you could send the pointer to it, both on the ALAC list but also on the IDN mailing list, that will be a great help.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will try to remember to do the latter. If I don't, someone will fix it for me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you don't...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll point to the presentation and to where the audios are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you don't, I'll personally take it against you and then we can cross out each other's taking against, and it will be fine we're even.

ALAN GREENBERG: That sounds reasonable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] okay next. Holly is to be the ALAC representative to the GNSO work on policy and implementation in the ICANN context. Should it become a CCWG, actually it's – I'm not sure why this was recorded this way, but she is to be our representative on this working group.

---

In fact, there has been a public call for candidates on this working group, that has been sent to all of the lists. And I have reminded Glenn [? 0:05:38] that Holly will be our representative on there. So she's already go her in the list, and Holly is already apparently going to be added to the mailing list there.

Has it become a CCWG, a Cross Community Working Group? No it has not. Have we had any feedback from the GNSO regarding our suggestion to make it a Cross Community Working Group? No we have not. Any questions or comments? Oh, I see three people have put their hand up, goodness.

So Evan Leibovitch first. Go ahead Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. This is Evan. I think part of the reason it was noted that way after the last executive meeting is because having this as a CCWG was a very big deal to me, because this is an issue in which I frankly don't think the GNSO can be entrusted to even create the correct questions, let alone answer them properly.

So I have a very, very big concern about his being given to the GNSO and to be made... This is the exact kind of thing where you don't have the silos. As far as I'm concerned, I would go as far to say – and I don't think this is too strong – that having this as a GNSO working group and not demanding that this not be a cross constituency one, is that there election of [fifty 0:06:55] by the Board.

I am extremely upset that it is being done this way. Frankly I want nothing to do with it, and if I had my druthers, I would be boycotting

---

this process because it is an absolute – it's absolutely abhorrent that ICANN would take something that demands all sectors of its community participating as equals, and it gives prominence to the one that is simply making the most noise about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. You don't think that the fact that we are invited, we as the ALAC is invited to provide candidates for even the charting of the working group is good enough?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Absolutely not. As you know, we have already been in instances where we have been invited to participate in working groups, in GNSO working groups. This is... It's tactically a very bad move by ICANN, by not making this a broad community wide thing.

You have a group that is charged with making policy to make the distinctions between policy and implementation, and this is not just an ALAC thing, this is something that the GAC has to be involved with. This is something that the ISOC has to be involved with.

This is something even that staff has to be involved with because they are going to have to execute the rest of... This is something that we have... This is the exact kind of thing that does not need to be siloed, and in fact, demands not being siloed. Like I say, it is absolutely inefficient to say that we have a couple of representatives there.

Absolutely not. This is still the GNSO that's driving it. It's the GNSO that's going to have to ratify it, regardless of what ALAC does. And this

---

is, to me, absolutely an abomination. That's not... That is not understating the issue, this is something that must not be siloed. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I've got the point, thank you very much Evan. Next Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. But I suspect Alan might be going to say what I was going to say, so I will cede to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: No I want to hear you say it first please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Laughs] I was just going to say that for the record, this is Cheryl. And the, what has gone out is of course a call for a charter drafting team, not for the working group itself.

And Alan I would suggest that you probably pick up on most of it, how this came about.

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

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alan speaking. I was going to say something quite different. This is the GNSO group that, in my mind, yes the Board should have probably done something different. They didn't. We can call it an abrogation of Board responsibility, we can call it whatever we want.

The GNSO was asked to put together a group, they are doing that. I think we need to be participating in it because if we disagree with what comes out of it, we need to make a strong statement saying we disagree, whether we have a vote or not is mute.

We do have a voice. And as Evan keeps on pointing out, we can give advice to the Board, and if the advice to the Board is, "We think this is an abomination what comes out of it," then that certainly will be listened to. I don't think that the work is uniquely done by the GNSO.

I know ATRT is going to be looking at, whether it would come out of it, I don't know. So I think we need to participate in the game, if and I say if, the GNSO had decided this really should be a cross-constituency working group, we would be mired for the next six months in how do we charter it?

And how do we get... Whose working rules do we use? And that's the last thing I think we need right now. It is sad we don't have any mechanisms for cross-working groups, but we don't right now. So I think, we work in this. I'm a little bit perturbed that Holly is always the one that says, "Yes, I'll work on a group."

This is an issue that does have interest to many people in At-Large, and I think there should be larger participation, and the more participation, the more likely they will not get away with something which is



---

inappropriate. And I'll point out that in many areas, many on the GNSO are agreeing with us on what the divisions should be in policy versus implementation.

So it's not as if they are looking purely for their own territory. I think there are some rational minds there. So yes, I think we should be participating and it is the way I would have unfolded the world if I was king, probably not. But I'm not. And I think if we worry that something bad is going to come out of it, it is absolutely essential that we at least try to be playing in the game and altering that outcome. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Just to fill you in, I think that the decision to ask Holly if she could be in that group, took place in one of the calls that where you were absent, and there was consensus to get Holly to be on that group.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not worried about....

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...she said it was fine. No it's just to show, it's not just Holly, it's a case of well we need at least one person to be assigned there. Obviously, we need more than one person. So we would... I would seriously suggest that others also look at this.

Although I'm a little concerned about you Alan. The number of groups that you are in, I thought you were trying to pull out a little bit rather than be more and more scattered [laughs].

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, to be clear, I was not planning to participate very actively in this. I'm not objecting to Holly, and I'm not objecting to us asking Holly. I'm worried that we don't have other people stepping forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well I know that Cheryl is already in the design team as well. So we've also got Cheryl on there. And it would be good if we had someone else as well. And I think Tijani has been patiently waiting with his hand up as well. So Tijani you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. When Evan start speaking, I put a green check because I agreed with him. And I'm really upset about giving to the GNSO this task. Normally it is a cross-community working group.

But when, at the end, when he said we don't have to participate, I remove my check. I don't think that the empty chair is a good position. I think that we have to shout. We have to say that we are not happy to give this working group to the GNSO.

And inside the working group, we have to be there and to shout every time we are not happy with everything. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Tijani. I mean, do you think we should not make it, show our displeasure with the fact that it's not a cross-community working group? Or should we just take note, and then basically say if things are not going in the right way and the working

---

group is captured in one way or other, we can then shout and use our power to comment directly to the Board about this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that we need to tell the Board that we are not happy with this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And also inside the working group, we have to always shout and say what we think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I just put in the note what I was going to say. If indeed this was charted purely based on a Board request to the GNSO, and I don't remember the exact wording of the request, then we also have the ability of saying to the Board, "No." We weren't happy with the process followed. Period.

That's in addition to anything else that we might do.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Could I have an action item that we check how this decision came about, whether the Board asked specifically that the GNSO should do this, or where the Board asked the community to do this?

And I mean, it's basically drafting of five lines, putting into question the reason why the Board has done what it has done, if it charged specifically the GNSO to do this. That really is the only thing. And I can volunteer to check this myself.

I'd be happy if someone [CROSSTALK 0:16:17]... maybe with you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: If nothing else, staff has come out with a paper on policy versus implementation. If we haven't commented on it, and we think it's ill advised, or we think it's great, we should.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I think we did comment on this, didn't we?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is just so much. Okay. Well, let's follow up this after this call and check. So I see the action item, to check how the decision was made and if the Board charted the GNSO to do this. It would be helpful if we actually knew what this related to, because right now it makes sense but just reading this line doesn't make sense at all.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: This should be policy versus implementation working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Yeah. Policy versus implementation working group. If we can have this somewhere in the notes, or I could edit the notes as well. Well, I'm not going to edit the notes as well. Anyway, let's continue then. Welcome Rinalia. We are looking at the moment at the action items, so we are looking at Holly Raiche to be the ALAC representative in the GNSO work and policy and implementation in the ICANN context.

Next, there is an agenda on the next ALAC agenda regarding the GNSO work on policy implementation in the ICANN context. So okay, fair enough, that needs to be put in there. And so we'll be discussing this during the next ALAC call.

Next, Heidi is taking such with CCS staff and see if there is any interest in a joint ALAC CCS NSO meeting specific to the status of the [Geo 0:18:07] regions. The progress framework of interpretation, and an update on the study of country and territory names. That's in progress. Is there any last minute update on this Heidi?

Okay. I can't hear you Heidi, you might be muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: That sounds more like a briefing than a joint meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes that's... Well, it sounds like some kind of briefing and discussion that will be followed afterwards. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, go ahead.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Nicely, I picked up Alan, in fact one of the things that we discussed when I spoke to this issue at the recent ccNSO council meeting where Heidi's request was discussed, and the thinking is though I believe we'll be getting back to Heidi with the agreement in principle for a gathering of some form, with RALO.

It depends on logistics, and planning, and how much time everyone has and everything else, of course. But they would like to see a small task team involving a couple of key staff members, Matt and Heidi come immediately to mind. And obviously the chairs or the delegates, and Ron to make sure that such a meeting gets put together properly and appropriately and with a reasonable agenda on both sides on it.

They also felt that this looked a little, particularly with some of those topics looked a little more like a briefing. And if it was particularly work based group briefings we were after, we probably should do those then alone, which they were more than happy to do.

And I did mention that there was an action item out of [? 0:20:10] for that to happen with the framework of interpretation, so that they can be prepared for that anyway. So Alan's point is well made because it was noted by the counsel as well.

And finally, if I could just push my husband to try and stop him from snoring so I can hear myself think let alone anyone else, that the option of it being a leadership and leadership gathering was also suggested, and that might be a fallback position. Thank you.

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

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah I just wanted to reiterate, when I looked at that initially, these are briefings which the ALAC may well need, but the ccNSO is likely to have had in spades and in more depth. So having them sit in on a briefing so we can ask five minutes of questions as a joint meeting, I think is ill advised.

On the other hand, having their leadership or perhaps the select number of people who want to participate in a bit of discussion about it at the end of our briefing, I think would do very well advised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. So let's amend this action item and make sure this is not called a joint ALAC ccNSO meeting, but perhaps a briefing session from the ccNSO to the ALAC. So that does not imply the full ccNSO having to meet with the ALAC.

Does that...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you wait on that... Sorry, Cheryl here for the record. Name it rather than alter it and say that that needs clarifying, the suggestion will come back that it's small teams put together to make some appropriate meeting happen in Durban.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So my suggestion in order to, because time is running by, let's not have an action item on this, let's wait for Heidi to come back to us and for you to work with Heidi on making the amendment. Yes, hello Heidi.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry I had to step away for just a moment. On this action item, I have been in touch with [Heart 0:22:24] a couple of times and I'm still waiting for feedback from them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's my only [? 0:22:30] there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, Heidi, Cheryl here sorry. It's [? 0:22:35] brought it to the counsel two nights ago, so they probably haven't enough time to get it back to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, that's one of the... I asked them like a week ago, and he said you would bring it to the counsel and I would follow up after the counsel on the 14, but not yet. I've not heard back yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Any comments on the whole list of action items that we have there? Or can we just move on? Okay. I see no one putting their hand up, so let's move on to the next agenda item. And that's the number three, the policy advice development page.

And for this, I invite you to have a look at the statements or endorsements currently being brought up to be reviewed or voted on



---

by the ALAC part B. The first one is the FY 14 draft operating plan and budget. And both Tijani Ben Jemaa and I have been on a finance budget call sometime, a couple of days ago I think.

Tijani do... Because Tijani will be holding the pen on this statement and I gather that he is has been as interested as I have to be on this webinar that took place. I have also sent... Well, there has been a call for comment sent to the finance and budget subcommittee, including a copy of the presentation that was given by ICANN finance.

Interesting plan. Tijani, do you have a few words to share with us please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. As you know, on Wednesday, we had a call with Xavier and his team about this operating plan and the budget. It is a new process based on the new management vision. It is done in the usual manner because we didn't begin from the [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 0:24:39] of this budgeting plan.

The plan wasn't [? 0:24:47] plan was done before Fadi and the new vision came with Fadi. So it is, we will not have this kind of framework. We have directly, the operating plan and the budget plan that we have now and that we need to comment on. I think that everyone has to look on it and give me your vision, so that I can draw up something which will reflect the vision of the whole At-Large, at least the representatives of At-Large.

If I don't receive anything, I will start drafting something for the first plan. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. And actually I note that there has already been a couple of comments on the plan, that you can see on the public commenting space. Not our own public commenting space, but the actual ICANN public comment space.

And one which I found particularly interesting to look at, which was drafted by Mikey O'Connor, asking several questions on process and on numbers, and on just points that I think that, while reading through, I was actually quite much in agreement with. It might be worth looking at as well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sure. Sure Olivier. And sure that it cannot be something that you will agree with as usual, because it is something which is not usual already. In Beijing, we said to Olivier, that this is not unusual, it's not the normal process. It is a shortened process.

And we have a lot of remarks on it. But I think that this year we have to accept it, because we don't have any other choice. We are by the end of the period, and we have to comment on it. So we'll comment, and I don't think that a lot of things will change from this project.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani one more question for you before I open the floor for anyone else to ask questions. There was one question which was asked, I think that it was actually Mikey O'Connor that asked the question. How much of this budget proposal is already frozen?

---

Because if you looked, it was already pretty well cooked, and yet they are opening it up for comment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's exactly what I said Olivier. He said that a minor change may happen, but the whole project will remain, it was mostly frozen. I think that we need to be positive and to try to find things that we can enhance, we can make better. Rather than try to change everything or give remarks on things that are not usual, are not [? 0:27:48].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani. Any questions to Tijani or myself, or comments on this? Okay. Thank you, let's move on. The next one is the WHOIS information status policy. And Matt has asked Carlton, and he is the chair who is working group, whether a statement was necessary.

Have you had any feedback on this Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi this is Matt for the transcript record. No I have not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I see Alan has put his hand up, so Alan Greenberg. Go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well I wasn't asked but I'll give an opinion anyway. This is about as far away as something that we want to comment on as possible. It's the

---

implementation of a consensus policy which was approved so long ago that I can't remember. And all it says is if registrars or registries are going to publish status of a domain, they must use official status designations.

This is the implementation of a policy which is already approved. It's about as straightforward as can be. Let's learn to walk away from things which are boring.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Alan thank you. I take it that we do need to write five documents that we can send to the Board, with a copy to the Board Secretariat, send to all Board members, plus circle ID. Or perhaps we shouldn't. Perhaps we should...

ALAN GREENBERG: And they should be at least three times as long as the one and half page implementation itself. So.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] Okay. Thank you for this Alan. I think we can, with your input here, we can safely then put a cross on this one and say that we won't be submitting a statement on this. Are you suggesting that we're not...

ALAN GREENBERG: You can be polite and ask Carlton if that is okay, but I just can't...

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Okay, thank you. Matt can just follow up with Carlton please, and just let him know that our GNSO liaison has mentioned that this is probably not something, in fact 99% chance that it's not something we should comment on.

And Carlton might just say yes, let's not comment on it. Thank you. Next is, as my screen has scrambled, here we go. Next is the ALAC, well At-Large ALAC statement to the Board regarding security and stability implications of new gTLDs. The ALAC is currently commenting on the drafted statement, which I believe has come from Julie Hammer.

Julie, have there been huge amounts of feedback.

JULIE HAMMER: [Laughs] Julie Hammer for the transcript. Olivier, the only feedback has been the thumbs up from Rinalia. Thank you Rinalia, but there haven't been any comment added to the page. And I think the comment period was due to close today, so I think we can accept the statement as proposed unless someone here wants to suggest any changes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anyone? I see a green tick from [Michelle 0:31:31], anyone else wishes to – there is a green tick from Rinalia as well. So the call for comment closes today, the vote starts on Monday the 20<sup>th</sup>. Do you think you'll have enough time to add all the amendments during the weekend, and it's camera ready for...

---

JULIE HAMMER: I will work very hard to try and do that Olivier [laughs]. One query I do have is, should it be At-Large ALAC statement or should it just be ALAC statement? I'm really not sure. That was the title that was put on the policy development page, but I'm not sure what it should be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, this is a double employ isn't it? The At-Large ALAC, we'll just have it as an ALAC statement.

JULIE HAMMER: ALAC statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...what happens. I see Evan's has put his hand up so Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. I was just going to speak specifically to that. If it's going to be called an At-Large ALAC statement and that it implies that it has been sent to the grass roots, and been examined at the RALO level, which it hasn't.

So if it's going to be something that ALAC comments on and votes on, then it's appropriate to be called an ALAC thing. If it's going to be called an At-Large thing, then that's going to be imply further and deeper consultation, which I don't think has happened. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well it has. There has been a public comment call for comment.

---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: ...RALOs have not given input on this specifically, have they?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No input is agreement.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. They've had plenty of opportunity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There has been a lot of opportunity, yeah. And Julie has spoken about this in prior ALAC calls and there has been some, a lot of requests. In fact, we have left this open for a very long time, so I think we can make it an ALAC, because often all the ALAC statements come out of the ALAC anyway.

I don't think that there is that much importance on the title whether it is At-Large or ALAC, however what I do think is we should have either one or the other.

WOMAN: Yeah. I agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...ALAC statement. So ALAC statement is the answer since this really is what it is. It is the committee in the end that votes on the statement, so it is an ALAC statement. Thank you very much for this Julie. I mean, the lack of response shows how wonderful that statement is.

---

And you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to click onto like, which means not only Rinalia likes this statement, but I do too, so there you go.

JULIE HAMMER: You're very generous Olivier, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] I don't often do that, you know, it's [laughs]... So next is the... So the voting will start on the statement. The next one is the proposed modification of GNSO operating procedures concerning the deadline of the submission of reports and motions. And Alan is to confirm whether a statement is necessary.

I hope that he's going to mention that we have to put it aside because it's a darn long name. Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will be delighted to write a statement on this, however if the ExCom and ALAC have any sense of propriety, they will tell me it's far too rude to send them [scrap 0:35:03]. [Laughs] is my message coming across?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It could be a little obtuse, be clearer dear.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I'll be clearer. The note will have to have a number of rude words in it, and it would be inappropriate for the ALAC to be criticizing another part of ICANN in that way.



---

So let's just be silent on it. But the word anal does come into the discussion. [Laughs]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Keeping our composure. Let's see if we have any other questions or comments? I see Rinalia is okay with her silence, she has silently but a plus one in the chat. And I don't see anyone else jumping up and down to speak.

So I guess this one can also be put aside. And I do agree it is a little, a bit of a concern to wonder whether this – well, what place do we have to comment? Next is the proposed final [CROSSTALK 0:36:17]... yes, go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a further comment. Number one, why are the GNSO rules say this should go out for a public comment? It's interesting in its own right. More interesting is the number of emails that it took to settle on what this ended up saying. If anyone wants to see an exercise in over concern about process, it's a good one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well question Alan, actually. Just out of curiosity, how did it end up being there? Why was the public comment actually put there? Was it because some people cried wolf and said this is terrible this should be a public comment? Or ...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, no...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...a hard fought thing?

ALAN GREENBERG: It turns out the GNSO rules say that there must be a formal public comment on change of the rules.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: So that's a consequence of a decision made a long time ago, probably made sense in some context when there are massive changes, it makes little sense in this case. The origin of the issue itself is the rule was you have to submit a motion eight days ahead of time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: There was discussion a while ago about whether that means eight days counting on the calendar, or eight days, 24 hours times eight days from the minute the meeting is going to start. And if a motion is submitted three minutes later than that, then it has to be rejected.

And a variety of things like that. And it went on from there. So.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So I have a question to ask the GNSO counsel, if you could please relay it. In how many ways can you split the hair?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, they're going pretty far in answering that question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] this was a tongue and cheek question, by the way...

ALAN GREENBERG: And how many ways [CROSSTALK 0:38:15]... How many ways do you have to worry about how the hair is split?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, let's ask for a public comment on this one and see what we get. Let's move on [CROSSTALK 0:38:24]... final new detailed the new registry agreement, Alan is to confirm if a statement is necessary on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't realize that was in my court. I really don't know. I haven't looked at it in any detail. What's the deadline? Two days...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The deadline for this is in two days, yeah. I mean we can always reply in the reply period if need be. I thought that Matt...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I suspect in many cases we don't care, in other cases we strongly support it. I'll look at it, but I don't know what's going to happen. It's one of those things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're very interested in replying to the RAA, and this is the registry agreement so that this one is I guess is somehow also very important. If you could please check after this call and come back to us.

We could ask for an extension or we could submit a response during the...

ALAN GREENBERG: You realize that at least some registries are exceedingly upset over this, and if we are worried about pissing off people, as we seem to be these days, this would be a good opportunity to piss off registries who generally are our friends.

But I will look at it and see if anything screams at me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anyone else has comments on this? No one is putting their hands up. Let's move on. The new gTLD Board Committee consideration of GAC safeguard advice. You'll note that it actually says ALAC is still considering drafting a statement. There is just a quick follow up on this. I know that on one of our previous call, we could say that we shouldn't get involved in this.

---

However, Alan and I have had an off the record conversation with someone during the HRT, and have been told, well, you know, it's time for everyone to chime in, and if there is stuff that you don't like on the GAC advice, then it would be interesting for the ALAC to point it out.

Did I describe this correctly Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I think there is a stronger statement on that. I think they will welcome input on it, and it's not a matter of upsetting people. But it's important to point out, this is not on the GAC communique, it is on the Annex one, the safeguards.

So it's only a subset of it. But the message we got, what was that yes, input would be welcomed. The Board asked for input with the agreement of the GAC chair. There was a significant amount of discussion preceding that. And if we have anything to say, plus or minus, they would welcome that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you Alan. So what I would suggest is if we all have a look at annex one at some point in the next few days, and perhaps look at any of the points that we definitely do not agree with... I don't think we should pick on every single point in there, but I know that there are a couple of things.

Evan has said earlier in prior calls, there is a lot of stuff that we agree with, there are some things which we think the GAC has looked at a little too far, and certainly when we look at prior occurrences of GAC

---

advice, such as the IOC, RC, these things have sometimes not been directly in line with us.

And it has been suggested that it would be healthy for us to comment. Evan? Comment? Constructively, that was the word used. If you can comment constructively that would be welcomed. Evan? Go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. Considering that we are, like the GAC, an advisory committee of ICANN, I'd be very weary of jumping into a process mindful of the possibility that we simply open ourselves up. That perhaps ALAC advice should also itself be the source of public comment.

There is a precedent here that sort of bothers me. And considering what I saw during the public forum at the Beijing meeting, I am very, very mindful of the idea of putting in advice that, as I've said in the Adobe chat, is piling on to the GAC.

They are a strategic partner of ours, and I'm not interested in any comments at all that only deals with the parts of it that we don't like. If we have something to say, we've got to be... I would just assume chime in on the many areas where we've got something in common with them, and in fact, leave out the things that we don't.

If we are going to have something to say, as you say, make it constructive, focus on the things that we agree with them. Because I'm seeing the GAC as being a strategic partner of ours as we go along through this. And right now, it seems like the call for public comment on GAC advice was, to me, something quite extraordinary.

---

And really something that I'm concerned about the present here about having advisory council advice be subject to public comment before... And anyway. Sorry I'm rambling because I'm tired. But you get my point. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. And this is certainly a concern that I had, and this is why I did call for a quick impromptu meeting with Alan whilst we were in Los Angeles. Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I've got to make one comment. If we ever give such controversial advice to the Board that they weren't sure how the community felt on it, I would think it is their duty to ask for input on it. I don't think that's something we should be worried about, or shy away from.

If the Board is going to make a decision based on some advice, the Board still has an obligation to at least test the pulse of the community on it before acting. I think that's the Board's responsibility in a multi-stakeholder organization.

They openly have to make a decision, but the decision should be an informed one based on what the community believes. They may go against it if they feel that's what the organization needs. But I think if we were ever in a position where giving advice that is radical, the R3 paper is an example, I would expect them to go out for public comment on it.

---

I wouldn't be afraid of that. I would [CROSSTALK 0:46:02]... negligent if they did anything else.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, except in that case, we explicitly did create a public comment period ourselves. It was toward to created public comment period on....

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry that was a bad example that I gave. All I'm saying is that the Board has an obligation to sense the feeling of the community. If it's already been done, fine, but if it hasn't then I think that's exactly what we expect of them.

We don't want them to act unilaterally with no understanding what the community feels on anything. And we rarely [CROSSTALK 0:46:37] certainly do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So I know, I'm mindful of the fact that we did speak about this already during one of our last calls, and we really need to think of this as a follow up and what are we doing next. The time is of the essence since the response, the comment closing date was actually a few days ago, and I don't know...

There is a reply period, so we do have until the 4<sup>th</sup> of June. I'm mindful of all of what's been said. And really, I'd like to try and see where we go now. Because on one side, yes it would create a precedent of an advisory committee advice being commented on by another advisory committee.



---

On the other hand, it would also – we have been given a green light in saying, well it would be welcome if the ALAC did say something. And if you said something, mindful of the fact that we do support what's been said, then perhaps saying what we support, and mentioning what we don't support, or where we're not that supportive of things, would be welcomed.

Both by the Board, of course since they have asked for this, but also by the GAC chair. This is all the matter of friendly discussion, pointing out what we might not be agreeing with. Are there a lot of things in Annex One that we don't agree with?

Are there a number of things, or a lot of things, in Annex One that we agree with? My suggestion is to have just a simple statement that this is what we agree with, and what we're not so happy with. I would shy away from having just the negatives on there, because that just transforms into a shooting gallery.

And on the other hand, I am a little concerned now that if we don't say anything at all, we would effectively would not be showing what we support in Annex One, and that effectively shows us shying away from our responsibility to give our point of view on these things. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. This is Evan. Two issues. Number one, we're perfectly capable in giving our own comments on the kind of things that the GAC spoke about, with or without it being a reaction to a GAC document. The other thing is that we do have a precedence of sorts. It's taken a lot

---

of resources, but if you recall we also have very explicit point by point commentary on the GAC scorecard in Brussels.

In which we went through the GAC scorecard and say we agree with this, we agree with this, we don't agree with this. It was a very good document, but it took an awful lot of effort on our part, and it was very, very comprehensive in saying that there were things we agree with, there were things we didn't agree with.

I personally play the front of... The consequences of that is some of our friends from NCSG essentially complained that we had abandoned them by daring to agree with the GAC on some things. I don't have a problem with that, but I'm just saying that there is precedent with the way that we handle the scorecard. I would just note that that effort took an awful lot of personnel hours to do. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Evan. Mindful of this. So, it's really now down to a yes or a no. And I would like to ask you all... I mean, I sense that there is a mitigated feeling here, it's not even a rock consensus. Who would be okay with having the advice drafted? If you a green tick, and we're talking here about the friendly advice basically being drafted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Could you clarify... Cheryl for the record. Are you talking about a predominately positive document which is outlining where we agree with particular points and then in that document also, if and when there are things where we disagree with making a note of them?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well... Thank you Cheryl. It's Olivier for the record, for the transcript. We're looking specifically at Annex One, safeguards on new gTLDs. There are six safeguards which are being laid out in this document. WHOIS verification and checks, mitigating abuse activity, security checks, documentation, making and handling complaints, and consequences.

And looking at these six, I'm not quite sure whether we disagree on any of them. And what I'm saying is, we could basically just list those six and say whether we agree or don't agree. And there might be somewhere where we might say well, WHOIS verification and checks, yes. But with a process to make sure you that you don't throw the baby out with the bath water. I'm paraphrasing here of course.

But it's a case where you have a due process, and for most of these things, mitigating abusive activity. But you see mitigating abusive activity starts becoming a bit more controversial because at that point, it starts looking at distribution of malware, operation upon it, bot nets, phishing, piracy, trademark, copyright infringements, you're starting to look at content.

So that's where the question goes. Does the ALAC agree that there should be a measure of looking at the content at those domain names or not? That's why I think, there is something important for us to mention on there, and maybe we might need to the frame the question specifically to the ALAC for us to be able to discuss this.

Evan and then Alan. Evan you have the floor.

---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:                   Sorry. Old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       Okay. Thank you. Alan Greenberg go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:                   We may not agree with the full list of what they're giving, but I don't see how we can disagree that consumer safeguards on some of these domains would be a good thing. I mean that's what we fight for all of the time.

And ICANN is always involved in content, we like to pretend we're not. The UDRP, the URS, all sorts of things relate to content.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       So perhaps that's the kind of feedback that we should provide. It's Olivier again for the transcript. The very fact that these questions are being asked, shows that the Board is either undecided, or is expecting that there might be a wave of replies that would go against these.

I know that as soon as one mentions content, everyone says, "Oh no, ICANN, this is outside ICANN's remit." And yet, as you just mentioned, and I totally agree with you Alan, ICANN is one way or another involved with content.

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Once we started talking about gTLDs, which have very meaningful content to people, I don't see how we could ignore it.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I also don't have a clue how the Board could possibly implement this at this late date.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What I'm hearing, I'm in agreement with, don't get me wrong but I'm deeply concerned how much of your ALAC meetings tend to be chewed up by this. Because with the ad nauseam conversations we had both prior and now the clarification and significant points you're discussing now.

I'm just am fearful of getting anything done in a timely manner. Unless what you do is bite the bullet, agree to draft something, which is as Rinalia is I think has very nicely outlined in the [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 0:55:12] ...and sensitive response from the ALAC members, we constructively see that, etcetera, etcetera.

Looking at the common points, I also suggest that we draw upon reference to our prior statements because most of those things we've made lines in the sand before. So if we can draft something, and then put that draft to the ALAC for comment before your meeting, you might just have a chance of getting some sort of consensus on it.

---

But otherwise it is going to become a very complication, drawn out, and genuinely unrewarding experience otherwise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Cheryl. I see Evan with his hand up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. Thanks. I agree totally with Cheryl about the potential of this to chew up all of ALAC's time. I'm wondering if we have the luxury of time to be able to punt this to the gTLD working group, let it percolate into something at the level of [Avri's 0:56:23] group, and then have it come up to ALAC somewhat cooked.

Do we have the luxury of time to be able to do that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan, I think while this would work, we don't really have that much time. We've got until the 4<sup>th</sup> of June when the reply period closes. So it's 15 days. Now what Cheryl did mention was to start with a just a simple first small draft, and take this as a discussion document.

And I think that would be a draft that would just be looking at those six points, yes, no, no, yes, or yes with, yes, but, but. I think that it would be yes on most of the things, but it would be but on...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And some annotations.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And some annotations, that's right. And what I can do is to ask staff to look at, or Matt specifically to look at the past comments that we have touching on these things. I mean, each one of these things is a straightforward WHOIS, etcetera, and we can just refer to these statements.

Would that fly? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I totally agree with Cheryl and I don't think that we have time and we should pass it to the working group, the [? 0:47:48] working group. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani, sorry, I'm against that because they would take too long. They couldn't do it in 15 days.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think the question...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do I need to volunteer to hold the pen on this? [Laughs] You knew this was coming up. Thank you for all volunteering...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I'll draft something before the end of the weekend, it's going to be very short. It's not going to be specifically targeted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Alan. Just a seed, just put a seed there and I'll also add something onto it. That's perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: The person who spoke saying he'd do it is Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thank you Alan. And the person who said he'll add to it is Olivier. Right, let's move on. I note that there was some question as to why, well we didn't want to comment on it last month and now we do want to comment on it.

That's because of the discussion that we had with, let's just say with the GAC chair, asking the questions and basically saying, "Would it be appropriate in a way which would be positive?" Not positive, but friendly comments basically.

Anyway, let's move on. The next thing, proposed final 2013 RAA. There is a statement at the moment that has been drafted, accompany we still are with this part of the call, but I guess it's very important.

The RAA final draft is to be voted on. Now there was a lot of text and a lot of discussions based on this. Where are we at the moment? Has anyone followed this closely? I think we just started voting on it now, aren't we?



---

The vote will start soon.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it is still subject to comment, but...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. They're still commenting. We won't discuss this, there is a lot of material in there now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I think some of it is ill-advised by the way, but I've tried to influence it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I've noticed your comments on there. There is one concern I do have. It appears to be very long-winded, and that will definitely require a summary, a very short summary.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe we can have Matt chime in here. It was unclear to me if the statement Carlton added, if anyone looked at that Wiki, was up until a line of equal signs, a separator, that's all he added in his last edit when he said he put it on.

There is a lot of stuff following, I thought it was background information, but some of the dialogue implied it was all meant to be the statements. So I don't exactly know what the statement is that we're

---

commenting on, and I may well have only commented on the first quarter. I would like a little bit specificity.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi this is Matt...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: So it's my understanding that Carlton sent Holly brief notes for her to look over, and some text. Holly then reviewed Carlton's work, added a few things, posted it on the Wiki. Carlton saw what she had done, looked at it, reviewed it, and wrote a more finalized version.

But put it above what Holly had placed on the Wiki, and used the line of equal signs just as an indicator that it had been updated. And he did it on the [? 1:01:27]. So it's my understanding that everything above the equal sign is the most current statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Which sort of is not agreed to in the interchange between Rinalia and Holly later on. But good, if that's the statement, then at least we know what it is we are commenting on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. We've got a couple of more days, so please, comments are very welcome on this. Let's move on ourselves,

---

otherwise we'll be here for another two hours. The trademark clearing house and IDN variance, the ALAC is currently voting on the drafted document.

And I have to thank Rinalia on her work for getting this moved forward, and of course, the main drafters of this who were Hung [Chewey 1:02:15], well who was Hung [Chewey] as well. The next one is the questions to the committee on [? 1:02:25]... transparency within ICANN.

Quick note on this one. There was a webinar and the different chairs of SOs and ACs were asked to get the RALOs to work on this. We have until the end of the comment period to comment on this. Next... And I'll ask you all, by the way, to check with your regions, if they're picking up the ball and moving forward with this.

If they're not, you have my personal green light to go in and give them a kick into action. That's one which is very important because it affects internet users. If we're not actually ready to comment on this, then really I'm for scraping the whole thing and starting from scratch again. Cheryl, you've put your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Have you finished Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl? You have your hand up.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. I wasn't sure if you have finished because I was a follow on the related point, not a...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is nothing that goes further than scraping after that. So go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thank you very much. I just wanted to, a follow up question, issue that was raised in the webinar and one that I am quoting in my response to the question. Saying that I would like to make good use of such a tool if we create such a tool. And that was building on Garth's proposal in the first section where we're asked to make somewhat blanket responses to have successful, or otherwise we felt the implementation of the ATIT once recommendations are, and of course, it depends on which ones you are looking at, doesn't it?

He suggested that having a dissected listing of those could be quite useful. The proposal at the webinar was to have a title of some description put up for that purpose. Is that going to happen? And if so that might also help the region's response.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. The table was actually expertly put together quickly by Matt, and was sent to Garth to find out if this is what he was intending, or what he was speaking about, and basically to ask him whether he wanted to improve on it. We haven't received a reply from Garth yet.

Have you received a reply Matt?

---

MATT ASHTIANI: This is Matt for the record. Not yet. [CROSSTALK 1:05:09]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...in the absence of response, can I say, can we just go with it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well what the table basically is, is the different works of the ATRT 1 chopped into bits, and put into a sort of different order so that it would be aligned by subject. For those of you that have followed the recent work of the ATRT 2, it has gone through the staff implementation of recommendations.

And what Matt basically did was take that table, take away all of the staff recommendation and implementation columns, and just basically put the issues, and the next to it the comments from the community.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And might... Cheryl here for the record. Might I ask it seems like we're doing this in a black hawks development, planning. It would be useful if the community was going to be using this tool for it to have some sort of little one, two, three; one, two, three, four, five where one is fully or not at all implemented, thank you.

Which by the [? 1:06:23], that type of thing, if that could be integrated into it that would be... Because for example, the Board GAC relations has neither been completed nor properly implemented, but it is in process that should score somewhere around a three, for those in the know. For those not in the know, it might score nothing, I don't know. But we need to tease that out.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you Cheryl. So are you saying that we should get Matt to share this with the ALAC, share this table with the ALAC, just go ahead, put it on the Wiki and you can just....

Okay. Let's do that then. Let's do this. Okay. Thank you. Matt, you're clear with this?

MATT ASHTIANI: Yes. I'm doing it as we speak.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thanks very much. Let's move on. Statement on the WCIT outcomes, low bandwidth will come later. Thank you. Next, currently open public comments, I think we are already working on. There is nothing that we need to address that has come up today. Matt has there?

MATT ASHTIANI: No I haven't seen anything come up. But, to be fair, I think I've been away for an hour and fifteen minutes. As of now, I don't think anything popped up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right thanks. So next, the ALS decertification, certification issues agenda item number four. This is just a quick announcement basically. We've had requests from two ALSs for two ALSs to be decertified. One is ISOC Pakistan, and ISOC has effectively advised us...

---

ISOC HQ has advised us that ISOC Pakistan itself has ceased to exist. And the other one is a request from [? 1:08:18] to delist, or de-accredit the Internet Users Network in Tokyo, since he is winding it up. So with this, we looked at our rules of procedure, there was nothing specific in the rules of procedure talking about this.

However, there is a page which is linked from our agenda, the framework page, which effectively explains how an ALS is accredited and is de-accredited. So with regards to the de-accreditation of ALS, it mentions that there needs to be an attempt to try and get in touch with that RALO, and to find out if – sorry not with that RALO.

With that ALS, with the At-Large structure, and then there needs to be a vote by the ALAC afterwards where there should be a two-thirds majority to decertify an ALS. And I was going to announce here that I will ask for the vote to take place during the ALAC call, our next ALAC call, but the de-accreditation at least of the Internet Users Network, since it is a request made by the ALS representative.

But also I was going to ask for the vote to take place on ISOC Pakistan. Having tried to email the, or having emailed the ALS contact address, I have received a bounce. Having tried to email the other people listed in the application, I have not had any reply yet. And we have another week until the reply should be there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And the apparent voting advice, the apparent advice is fairly significant.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. Yeah, yeah. The apparent body advice is there. I mean that was advice which was given about a year ago already, so we have just been a bit slacking, but because we were working on the rules of procedure, etcetera, there was going to be [CROSSTALK 1:10:23].

I notice Rinalia says, “We need to give advance notice to ALAC members about this vote.” Yes, I believe that should be shown in the agenda isn’t it Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The agenda of the ALAC meeting you are saying. This is Heidi for the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Heidi [CROSSTALK 1:10:42]...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. I just added to the topics for the May 28<sup>th</sup> ALAC meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And it will be ICANN’s for decision. And generally, Rinalia, it will generally... In fact, everything that is under items for decision, works as either a consensus call or a vote since a decision needs to be made.

So on this case I think that, because it does mention a two third majority, we will need to have an actual vote and not a consensus call. I’m starting to get to know some of the procedures and now Alan has changed them, terrible.



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, they have not changed that much. Don't be...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] Alan Greenberg, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just note that it is two thirds of those voting. So it's not two thirds of the ALAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's great.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. [CROSSTALK 1:11:42] ... majority of the members of the ALAC who cast the vote. Yes, a two thirds of those voting. Any comments or questions about these two? I know that there are other RALOs that are looking at de-accreditation of ALSs. Some of them appear to be straight forward with the ALS having actually be proven to have disappeared.

Some others are little more confused because some say that the ALS does exist, others say that they don't. I don't wish to go through the whole list now. Let's just wait until the RALOs start seeing how this first vote moves forward, and start suggesting de-accreditation of some ALSs. Alan and then Rinalia. Alan go ahead please.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just to note that if we go ahead and have an abstain option on this vote, the abstain counts as no's. So I would suggest that we don't need an abstain option, but someone makes a decision, yes or no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. This is Rinalia for the transcript. I would like to make a suggestion. Sometimes the fact is they are sending out meeting agenda for the ALAC, if there is [? 1:13:00] for decision, in particular that requires a vote, I'd like that copied in the message itself so that members will pay particular attention to that and make a mental note of that.

Otherwise, some people just note it, that the message had [? 1:13:13], okay this is going to be next week at this particular time, and they don't even take on the agenda. And then they get caught by surprise. So I would recommend this as practice to start.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Rinalia. That's an excellent point...

ALAN GREENBERG: Strong support.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Shows strong support. Staff could we [AUDIO BLANK 1:13:32] ... please make sure that this happens?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. This is Heidi. That's a good idea Rinalia, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Now this part of the call also speaks about the certification, because there is decertification. There is also the question of certification. What I will ask at the time... Well, there are a number of things. First is updating the revised ALAC rules of procedures. And I guess that Alan, are you going to work on this?

What is the next steps on this? With regards to decertification first. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: My strong recommendation is that we formally approve the current rules. I have asked for an opinion back from Sam, which I would appreciate if Heidi could follow up on, to verify that if we change the numbering and the heading in the document, it does not require Board approval.

I have no problem sending it to them for information. But I'm presuming that we, as Rinalia suggested, we take out decertification, which is stuck in halfway through the certification procedure, under the title of certification, and put it in its own section for clarity. That it will not constitute a change, that it requires Board approval.

---

Regardless, that we either approve the new adjunct document as I submitted it, or if Sam agrees, we segment the decertification process but that we not make any changes at this point. Let's get the new rules of procedure operational and we need three of the adjunct documents approved to do that.

And once they are approved, we can then go in through an orderly process of making changes as necessary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. And I guess in the meantime, we'll just be using the process that is described on this webpage, on the framework webpage.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have no choice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The feedback from Stan with regards to accreditation and de-accreditation, or decertification and certification within ALS, is that the Board would have to give its green light to any changes that we decide to do. I don't think at the moment we can see this as being an actual change to the rule.

I don't know how that page, that framework page was drafted, but I gather this was drafted in full agreement with the Board wasn't it? Cheryl perhaps?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes it was. And I...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: ...relevant documents. The only question right now is, does changing the numbering and the title constitute a change which requires Board approval?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I presume the answer is no, but we need to know that for sure before we vote on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, staff will follow up on this then please. And Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I just wanted to slow down and approach on this, and I think getting it very clear with Sam is a very useful thing. But I did want to just make sure that everyone was aware that the actual At-Large at ICANN dot org for such a framework document, is a construct that the page itself should reflect the, may not reflect the actual text that was approved.

---

It was intended to reflect the actual text that was approved. Providing the process isn't changed. I shouldn't image that a sensible re-editing to make things easier to understand and more simple language, and a better following of process enabled, would affect the process at all.

So if we do shift it around in terms of layout, etcetera, I think there is no in principle change to the charges. So it should be a no-brainer, but we should get it checked, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And my last point... It's Alan. And my last point on updating rules of procedure, there is a third action document that we need to improve. It is the one on Board selection processes, and I will need some help from staff and Cheryl in finding the right documents to put together for that one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just giving a heads up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. [CROSSTALK 1:18:26]

ALAN GREENBERG: ...is a fourth document, which is not an adjunct document, that is the mailing list one and that you'll be seeing from me in a few days.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. Staff you have that noted.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi? Silvia? Whoever. [CROSSTALK 1:18:47]

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes. I'm thinking that's the right. I'm think that's [things working 1:18:50] in the last part and that's [? 1:18:53]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan will require, yeah go ahead Alan. You are better to explain it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure what the last part was. There is a third adjunct document on At-Large Board member selection processes, which I will need some help from staff and Cheryl, in identifying the right documents to group together.

---

And there is a fourth document that is not technically an adjunct document, but which is necessary on mailing lists, and I will be sending another draft of that shortly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Thank you very much Alan. Let's move on. Oh I see still Cheryl and Alan still have their hands up. Are these old hands or new hands?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very old hands.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah [laughs].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Right. Let's move on. So with regards to decertification, I think we touched on everything. With regards to certification, as you know there has also been a recent discussion with regards to a LACRALO, possible application from a LACRALO ALS, and so the question is, whether it would be time to look at this in more detail.

The suggestion that I might have is that we could have a working group that would look at the certification process, certainly looking at the tightening of the certification process and amending of that. Of course, that's something that the working group would do, would then submit recommendations to the ALAC.

The ALAC would then have to pass it by the Board, etcetera, etcetra, go through the whole process of course to do this. It's just that we've



---

recently seen varying levels of acceptance or refusal of new ALSs. And it seems that on some good days you can get through, and on bad days you don't.

It really is not something that is exact science. [CROSSTALK 1:20:58]... so go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Cheryl for the record. First of all, at the moment, we don't have any variability on this. And yes, the only way to change it is to have the ALAC do it as late a date, as Alan just I thought went through in detail.

The variability that you're getting from your regional advice, can be remedied in a number of ways, not necessarily changing the rules. It can also be remedied in service training with those people who apparently are in a position to make these decisions. But the most important thing to remember, from an ALAC position is, it is an opinion they are giving. Nothing more, nothing less.

You are then accepting or rejecting it, because only the ALAC makes the decision. And it was in fact a mechanism when we built this to have regional input involved. It was a mechanism to try and get a piece of local, I admit at regional level, but at least it's not somebody sitting in [Marian del Rios 1:22:16] as it was then, only relying on due diligence from a set of webpages and perhaps a Google search.

So it was a way of trying to tease out whether there was more local information that could be of use. I personally wouldn't die in a ditch over this just yet. Because yeah, it can be variable, that's because it is

---

politically and personality driven. If it's an interpretation of guidelines, then there are a number of ways that you can fix it, and you might want to explore some of those.

But right now, you're creating work in a time when you actually don't have the bandwidth to do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Cheryl. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Although I certainly can come up with some changes that I think would be advised based on what we've seen recently, I think we have a healthy process right now. The due diligence may or may not be done well, but people are actually reading the applications, are the reading due diligence, and calling us, the group as a whole, and the RALOs out on when things don't make sense.

That's rather refreshing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Thank you. Any other concerns or false... The concern I have at the moment is that the way the due diligence is performed, and the way that this is read and analyzed by the regions...

The RALOs aren't taking time to look through it and to make the recommendations, but then the ALAC itself is being asked to make a choice very, very fast enough. In fact, the input from the region is given,

---

and then the ALAC is called for a five day vote, and that's the usually the first time that the ALAC starts looking at things.

And so we're in a situation today where I'm having to suspend a vote because of questions that are being asked, whilst the vote has already started. So maybe that needs to be done something in that respect. Cheryl has put her hand up and down and then back up. You wish to comment Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah. I was going to comment. I was actually going to respond to Alan and Rinalia in text, and just let them know that in fact the forms are easy to change in the process. So yes, getting more clarity in the forms, and the paperwork is nowhere near as problematic as changing the actual process.

And there is a whole bunch of reasons for that, not the least of which is the ombudsman in this report, which is a binding set of advice on the Board and on us. That I did want to state one, I had my hand up and down. Was to try and put the due diligence into perspective, which of course is always the instance this process is being placed. The role of staff because we had trusted them to be more independent than Mary Jane or John Smith, who may or may not be serving them, this is the ALAC.

And certainly these volunteers. There is absolutely no reason why the ALAC cannot be engaged as early as the regions. They can run the information seeking and individual education on the issues in a parallel process. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       Okay. Thank you Cheryl. I see Tijani Ben Jemaa. Tijani, I can't hear you at the moment, you might be muted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:               Sorry, I was muted, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       So welcome back.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:               Thank you. I do think that the region has the duty to verify the application before the ALAC starts looking at it. And it is the case now, but the problem is that sometimes there is not enough attention in the region about the application.

And in this case, that is generally there is a discussion, there is a problem. I think that this thing, it cannot be solved. It will always be like this. What we can do is to perhaps to advise the ALAC members to start looking at the application from the beginning.

Don't wait for the advice of the region, and start looking at the application before. So that if there is a remark, it could be considered also by the region. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       Thank you very much Tijani. I see two main points that seem to be emerging from this. One, we don't appear to have the bandwidth to

---

create yet another working group, or even an ad-hoc working group to look at these issues and make some recommendations.

But two, there are some amendments that need to be made and certainly the one where the ALAC could have access to this information and being asked to comment, or not to comment, sorry, but to look at the applications earlier and not just being given the details of the recommendations or the point of view of the RALO, and then being sent directly into a vote, seems to be something that we can do at the moment without needing any major changes.

Alan you have put your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. Thank you Olivier. As far as I understand, that is happening right now. Certainly on the ISOC Canada, the application went to the internal list, and people identified some questions that were clearly answered wrong.

We ask them, “Are you going to help support the ICANN organization and tell your users about us?” And they said no. Well, it was an error, but that was caught by some ALAC members who actually read the application. So it is happening now. How many people have the bandwidth to read these applications when they happen to come in is pure blind luck however.

If you look at the [Key Nic 1:29:07] one, the question asked, “Tell us about your general membership characteristics.” And they listed six or eight named people, somebody should have called that out and said, “Is

---

that your whole membership list?” Because we were asking for characteristics and we got a list of names.

So if it’s not being done by ALAC, it should be done by the due diligence process. I don’t know exactly what that process is, and whether one staff member gets something for five minutes, and has to turn it in, or if it’s a good effort. All I know is, yes we can make it better, yes we can ask better questions, but all the problems we’ve had to date were identifiable on the application form.

And somehow we have to make sure that we catch those. This time we have, by blind luck, some of them early, some of them late.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Right. Thank you Alan. I’m mindful of the time. It is already one and a half hours into our call. I don’t think we’re going to reach any decision here. In fact, I wasn’t looking for a decision. But what I will do is to have an agenda item that we will be dealing with, at least certification.

If we do have time, we will touch on the certification, but I will not suggest, because I was going to suggest to have a working group look at this. I am mindful of the bandwidth this is taking on our volunteers. Accept of course, if our discussion starts growing on the ALAC list, in which case, I will be asking then at that point if we could have a side discussion, and therefore an ad-hoc working group looking at this.

I did speak with Yaovi a few days ago, whether he was interested, possibility interested in the issue and it appears that he was. So there might just be a leader for this process. But it could just be a few members, members of the ALAC that, as Rinalia just mentioned here,

---

would agree on some form of small subcommittee and not even need to create an ad hoc committee, but they would just actually concentrate on this for a month, let's say.

And come back with their findings and their thoughts, rather than all of us having to [CROSSTALK 1:31:36]...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. Be really careful when you're reinventing wheels, that you're not reinventing lemons. Because there has been an awful lot of things that have actually been done before, and changes were made for very good reasons, and all of that needs to be taken into consideration. So don't lose touch with history when you're doing that, that's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. No the concern... The reason why I'm spending time on this is because, we have had this recent problem, we've had a recent problem before that. In fact, there have been some potential ALSs who have come to me at ICANN meetings, and have complained to me that the system, as seen from an outsider's point of view, is an absolute mess.

That's what I've been told, and they told me, "You guys have to sort this out, because I'll tell you something, as a first step into At-Large, possible front door, this is not the sort of thing we were expecting." And so this is why I'm elevating this to the point of actually spending time on it and discussing it.

---

All right, let's move on. The next one, is Non Comm update on the schedule, no sorry. The ALAC objections summit, goodness we're only on number five. I'm just going to be a couple of minutes on this one actually. So far, there hasn't been very much going on as far as the follow up to objections.

As you know, there was a meeting with the World Health Organization representative in Beijing, and nothing has followed up after that. There has been apparent consolidation of cases, so there are three cases were marked for consolidation. The feedback which I am aware of, which we as in, ICANN staff, myself, and Devon and [? 1:33:36] who are on that return address, are aware of is that a couple of the applicants have said they're okay.

I don't know about the current applicant, the third one being spruce goose, or goose fest, I don't know if it is spruce goose, or goose fest or anything. So that's what the objections follow up is at the moment. In order to lead, to be the leader of any follow up discussion that might take place, or direction action with some applicants, it is created that we do need to have someone who is a lawyer, who is also aware of the process, who is aware of how these things, how mediation might work out.

A suggestion was made to have Seth Reece, who was part of the review group, to start with. So he is aware of what's been going on. He has the historical knowledge. I have asked him and Seth Reece has replied positively and said he would be happy to serve as our front person for this process, if it was to move forward with a direction interaction with the applicants.



---

Or if the international chamber of commerce, that's the resolution provider, would require direct representation. So my plan, and first plan is to ask you if you would be okay with this. And then, the next thing is to ask the ALAC, and basically ask for a consensus call on the ALAC call, that Seth would be basically given this responsibility.

Of course, working closely with myself and with Devon and [? 1:35:25] who would historically, as you know, was the leader of the review group itself. Comments, questions. Don't see. Do I have your agreement to go ahead with this? I see Rinalia, I thought she volunteered for...

I'm sorry, could you please advise volunteer... Is that related to the follow up group or... Yes the team. No, the team is something else. I'm just talking about someone who would lead on this. Now afterwards, there are several people who are, who were interested in being in the team.

I know that Rinalia is one of them, I think I've got a couple of other names on there, but those would just be... First we need to have Seth as our front man. We've had no direct response, and no direct engagement from any of the applicants. But if we do, we do need to have someone who can take the lead on this. That's all. Okay. I know that everyone is fine with Seth in the consensus call, so let's present this over to the ALAC during our next ALAC call.

Next the agenda item of the six Nom Com update to schedule selectee announcements, on the schedule on the selectee announcements and the impacts of ALAC representative selection schedule. As you know, as several of our RALOs need to select there ALAC representatives, and

---

there has been some discussion going on in the RALOs with regards to making the selection later rather than earlier, etcetera, etcetera.

And so the main question really is, what is the current schedule for the nominating committee? Since as we know, the nominating committee is there to somehow balance things over. Usually the Nom Com has to make a selection after the ALAC has made its selection, if I get this correctly.

But perhaps I should hand the floor to Cheryl Langdon-Orr to explain this to us briefly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you kind sir. Yes, indeed, in a perfect world, that's exactly when and where we would be doing these things. But if your regions can't get their acts together in time, my reaction is tough shit. And you'll get what we give you. And if the geographic balance doesn't work then back to my first statement.

Tough shit. If your regions can't get their act together in a timely manner to give us enough time, we will work with what we have to work with. And you'll have to work with what you get. There is not a damn thing we can do about it because we've done our best from a committee point of view, to try and get and encourage, and jump up and down, and do our best to cajole and insist that you regions make their appointments to your ALAC.

In advance of us having to deal with our work, but we will deal with our work, and I won't say the rest be buggered, but I'm not far off saying that. However, there is another matter that we do need to deal with,

---

which is in fact, what is on the agenda, and that's this schedule for the nominations that you will be – sorry, the appointments that you will be making as an ALAC into the next nominating committee.

Because there is also a process that goes, and one would consider a fairly important process because a singly I would suggest the power to commit five seats onto any year's nominating committee. And to ensure that the voice of the At-Large community in a regionally balanced way, with the ALAC making their size geographically based appointments.

That's a huge power, appointing eight members, over any kind of period is the ICANN Board. And of course, important memberships into all of the councils and committees, the ACs and the SOs. And we would, I suggest, need people of a caliber that may in fact be held in even higher regard and to a higher set of criteria than any of the other appointments, that any of the RALOs would be making.

And the ALAC needs to, according to our rules, it says take into consideration or correspond, or take into account regional opinion. What is the exact words? Let me refresh. After consultation with each RALO annually, the ALAC will appoint five voting delegates, no two of whom should be citizens of the country in the same geographic region, to the nominating committee.

I had hoped that each of the chairs of the ACs and SOs who appoint the Nom Com, and indeed the GAC and others who appoint the Nom Com as well, but certainly all of you who have the power to appoint voting delegates, would have already had our letter. But it would appear that you will probably would be now getting it next week.

---

You may appreciate particularly, Olivier, that you might understand with a posing of a statement of interest date, this week, Nom Com leadership and administration has been a little bit busy [laughs] we haven't got the other bit out. It is our intention to be requesting from all of the appointing bodies, so ExCom, you all are getting an advanced heads up, I hope you appreciate it.

That your processes, whatever they may be, will need to be completed with information back to the Nom Com via [Joe it 1:42:04] of your five appointments than by no later than the 31<sup>st</sup> of July. That would mean, Olivier, that you may be in a position to finalize these deliberations, votes, or whatever else you want to do with it, on your meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> or actually it's the 4<sup>th</sup> of any month, a five week.

So you might be doing it on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, but if it's the 22<sup>nd</sup> or no later than the 29<sup>th</sup> in regards for your own sanity's sake. Which means you'll have to get the regional information and any proposals of names for your consideration in well in advance of that, by putting our call out as early as next week, or I would be saying as late as next week, we're hoping that the constituencies in the GNSO, and the regions in the ALAC, and other components such as in the ccNSO, will have a clear month to do their own regional advice giving.

Is there anything else I can tell you? By the way, there will be no extensions. It will be 31<sup>st</sup> of July or nothing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Cheryl. So two questions. I mean, the first comment I have with regards to the selection of people that will serve in

---

the nom com is that last year the process was a lot later, I remember that the discussions were still going on in August. So you're basically telling us, this time around the nom com has decided to pull back that sort of thing. Is that...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You will definitely need those names in to nom com by 23:59 UTC on the 31<sup>st</sup> of July.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fine. Thank you. So that's one. The other question... So that's noted and so staff will work with myself to look at the schedules, working back as to when we need to start the process and the RALOs. Any comments from anyone with regards to the process last year, which as we know was a lot later but the, I guess, the chunk of time was that enough?

The chunk of time that was allocated last year? Or was that rushed for you? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not answering that question, but I have another comment to make and specifically, I think we need to make a relatively short, concise statement to the RALOs what we expect of these people. It is past the time that we simply put our favorite son, or a retiring ALAC member as a present on to the nom com, so that they get support. Thank you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I respond to that? Okay. Cheryl. I'm going to respond to that. Alan, one of the hold ups is the fact that I want to actually have the key criteria and the desirable traits that are clearly enunciated in the call for these selections to come forward, in the letter form the nom com going out to the chairs and the ACs and SOs, so that they will be in a position to pass exactly that information on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And the other thing Alan, I might just point out, and it will be made clear on the website, if not in the letter... If we put too much in the letter, they move it forward and not bother reading it anyway. Is, of course, now gone are the days where one's performance as an appointee is not known, because we have our report cards going back to community.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. I wasn't aware of that. I'm pleased. So it's not an automatic two year appointment if you got it the first time, you go the second?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct. And it's also if you miss a meeting, then you don't have to be a rocket science to look at our report card and work out if only two of the five regions within the At-Large advisory committee were represented for the majority of the report cards, and you look at who sends out the report cards, they are probably the ones that are turning up.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. I'm back online now, sorry I was cut out for a short time. But I did listen to the discussions through Adobe. Just one point, I am in touch with [? 1:47:08] who does provide me, and I guess I do have to ask him again now, provide me with regular updates on the attendance sheet of our representatives.

And this is, of course, possibly important. With regards to the report cards, I have noticed that it is not something they all send out. There was... Last month, I think they all did, some of them did not. This month, one of them did already, the others did not yet. As you mentioned, it might be because they were not present at the call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Probably. [CROSSTALK 1:47:47] ...two levels to your report back there, remember it's just not a... An attendance is more now is redesigned because of the report cards, which is a new thing. Chair to chair, you would also be giving advice as to whether these people were feeding or should be taking out to the back and nested.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I'm looking forward to this. So that the last question on this, and I would like to move on since we are way over time now, with regards to the selection of ALAC people. You mentioned earlier that the nom com will be going ahead with making its selections, no matter what, regardless of geographic location.

I think you mentioned...

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Diversity...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think it was gender diversity, or were you speaking about local, geographic, depending on the region.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let me be really clear. What I'm saying is, we will be making our appointments to the best we can, and the only way we can take the optimal view of diversity, is if the regions have appointed and we know who they have appointed.

For those regions who have not appointed, I go back to my quote, tough shit. You'll get what we give you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So by when do you need the regions to have appointed their people, because... When will you make your decision? That's the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Before Durban.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Before Durban. So that answer is provided very clearly, thank you. Okay. So let's move on then. At-Large meeting schedule for the 47<sup>th</sup> ICANN meeting in Durban. If we can have Heidi take us through the various questions, agenda, etcetera please.



---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you. This is Heidi for the record. I'm just trying to put in what we would have, the workspace that has all of the days for Durban. And you'll see that for the most part the ALAC, ExCom, and working group meetings have been scheduled.

I will be adding the... There are just a few of the RALOs that would like to hold meetings. So for the first time, in several meetings, it's relatively light, I don't want to jinx it, but light schedule. There are no capacity building sessions going on.

I just wanted... I don't know if Tijani wanted to very briefly go over the showcase plans. That's going to be on Monday. Tijani, do you want to go over those? Or should I briefly go over what we discussed?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you can just quickly fly over it because we are a little out of time. Yes Tijani we can hear you go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So Heidi you were asking me about the showcase presented.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Very briefly just go over what we had talked about. It might be a different type of reception this time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Exactly. So we tried to make showcase with some things different. We'll try to have the local community come, and it is not only for the

---

showcase, we will try to make them come and participate in the meeting, ALAC meeting, as it is possible.

But for the showcase, we will bring them, we will try to hear from them, and we will try to learn from them. Because we don't have a lot ALSs in South Africa, we have only one. And this one is not active. So this time, we try to bring them, to bring people, to bring NGOs [? 1:51:56] organizations, universities, etcetera.

And this showcase, and we will try to discuss with them, we will try to have some control show during the showcase. So it is still under development, but it will be different from what we did before.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. I just said it sounds exciting, I look forward to it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Cheryl your hand was up. Was that an old hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can put it down because I'm typing with Alan. [Laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Back to you Heidi.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So what we would like to talk about very briefly are the informal meetings, so again we're waiting [? 1:52:51] ...for the flash in the informal meetings with the ASO, so I've written to the SAS support for that, haven't heard back yet.

From Lily or the other person on that. As discussed earlier, I'll follow up the part on the ccNSO and we've heard that there will be a small group from the ccNSO on that. So informal meetings, what we would like is on Saturday the ExCom dinner with the liaison. On Monday, we're thinking of having an At-Large dinner.

So again, ICANN is [? 1:53:22] dinner arranged after the showcase. I think that's it people for the informal meetings at the moment. There will be no [? 1:53:33] interaction [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:53:39]... Gisella would you...

GISELLA GRUBER: I'm sorry. Gisella here. Yes that's correct Heidi, and no interaction with the Board except from two stem, one in regular meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. Correct. So basically if you have time, or if you are going to postpone it slightly, go over the initial discussion of agendas particularly for the ALAC summit session, and the ALAC, the two policy session on Tuesday. Olivier...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes I'm here. Well I don't know if we have time, you're asking whether we have time, I don't think we have time, but let's just quickly go

---

through them. Of course it is ambiguous and [laughs] you know the answer. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. So very briefly. On Sunday, we normally have that... Well we have, invite Fadi in the beginning, we invite Sally and her team GSU team after that, and then if we have time, then we have initial discussion of working group updates. Did you want to keep that on the Sunday? And then just have various...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm very much okay with having Fadi and with having Sally, I think it's particularly important. What I'm concerned about that whilst we're building those, you can see that it goes nine to 9:20, and then 9:20 to 10, and then 10 to 11, then 11 to 11:15, etcetera.

First, there doesn't seem to be any break anywhere. That's one problem. The other thing is, when people walk into the table, or if any of these people are slightly late, which is something that has happened in Beijing by the way, then it delays everyone else behind it.

And when people swap at the table, you lose five minutes. And by the end of the day, you've actually lost 45 minutes. And I don't know whether it shows, but I'm rather stressed about this [laughs].

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think all of us are. So what, we had this discussion before where people have asked to allow time in the agenda for more lengthy time. But then as the days draw closer to the actual meeting, then people

---

start requesting additional meetings, etcetera, so that's why the agenda [? 1:55:56].

So if we wanted to agree to just keep it like that, then we would need to also agree just to say no to some additional length requests for meetings. [? 1:56:07]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we've got Fadi, Sally, Christ Gift and Jim [? 1:56:13], Sebastian, Maggie [? 1:56:16] and then the Atlas 2 with Sebastian.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. This is... For the most part, this is still from Beijing. I haven't updated this yet. I think the first couple of agenda items, up to three, will remain the same. I don't know if we need to have Sebastian this time, it depends on when Maggie is available, when she – normally in the afternoon. This is just an one off I think.

So it's up to you. How you would like to schedule your Sunday sessions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well I think we'll still need a session with Maggie, that's always contractual compliance is very good. We'll need something on the Atlas 2 because – I mean, maybe we can do it on another day, another Sunday, depending. Probably on another day since we'll have a committee.

So let's do it another day...

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: ...correct...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. The Beijing reporting and the working session wrap up is something that is standard. But that will probably have to happen a little earlier won't it? Because Beijing was a little special in having... Oh no, sorry, that's Sunday.

So that's fine.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. I believe it was on Sunday so it will go on to eight...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Earlier than that, it really depends on who is able to see us. I would have hoped that we were going to be able to see David Olive as well at some point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Did you want that on Sunday? Because normally you've got the ExCom.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What's your thoughts? Anyone? I think everyone is pretty much fried at the moment, so they can't really... I can sense very little pulse on the line from anyone at the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh hang on. I'm still here [laughs].

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl you're just waking up, so that doesn't count.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's midnight there, what do you mean she's just waking up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 1 AM, it's not midnight.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is it 1 AM? I thought it was early in the morning.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No its 1 AM.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, okay. Let's not argue about the time.

ALAN GREENBERG: ...early in the morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's not argue about the time. Heidi, I think the answer that you have at the moment is, yes let's have the first three, let's give a bit more space though, let's air this a little bit. And then we'll have to deal with things on a case by case basis.

I repeat to everyone, the reason why things mess up at the end, is that we can spend hours on putting something together, and then two

---

weeks before the actual meeting, things get shuffled around because suddenly things turn up on calendars.

So Heidi, I'm a bit concerned, if we spend so much time now, that it's going to be thrown away anyway. Let's do the main framework. Then... Can... Do we need to look at the other days? Or just...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Two more questions. One is did you want to do the ALAC on Sundays? I thought that was a good question. Did you want...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes that's correct. And if I recall there was an action item on this that we would need for longer, was it 90 minutes this time?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I think it was, correct. Okay. And then the other question... Okay. So we'll add that. I will just put more air into the agenda, and hopefully at minimum that will then allow a little bit, at least a coffee break in the morning. I'll put that in there too.

Okay, and then very quickly the other day was Tuesday, the Tuesday session. Did you wish to fill, for the last two meetings during the ALAC policy sessions, the topics have been basically more effective relations with the working groups and the RALOs. Did you wish to have that still?

Or did you wish to return to more of like a hot topics slash policy session? And I just do note that during the last wrap up session, there is a lot of rather frantic discussion on some of the policies that were being



---

voted on. So did you wish to have more of a policy discussion on upcoming ALAC statements at that point, during one of the Tuesday sessions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's hear from the floor. I see Evan and Alan. So first Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. I'm sorry, I was just calling attention to a comment that I made in the chat. In wondering if perhaps we can free up some time on Sunday by having Maggie and the compliance group actually do their presentation for the regulatory working group, as opposed to the entire ALAC?

Wondering if that would free up some time, make things a little bit less stressed out on the Sunday. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a regulatory working group?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think a regulatory working group would first have to exist before Maggie was to appear in front of it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, I believe it has a time slotted for it.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Olivier may I end on that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So this is a suggestion of Evan that was agreed to by the list. This is sort of a merger of the WHOIS and the RRR working group, so the first meeting will be held in Durban. It's called the At-Large Regulatory Issues Working Group. And they've been scheduled for Monday 11 to 12:30.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. But that's not a working group. I mean, it can be a regulatory group, but it's not regulatory working group, because a working group would require an actual ALAC vote to setup. I think I mentioned that in our last discussion.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Good point. I'm taking off the word working right now on the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I mean, I'm all for groups working together, but maybe as a first step, get them to have their joint meeting to – joint meeting in Durban. And then maybe see from there if the two groups want to merge and then we might actually have the ALAC vote in Durban at that point.

---

I think that was the plan to get the ALAC to vote and decide at that point if it wants to merge the two groups together. Alan Greenberg? Sorry, back to you Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: ...meeting together that one of the things that could be done to ease some of the pressure from Sunday is to have Maggie speak at that meeting instead of on the Sunday. So that's all I'm saying.

If the intent is to try and free up time and make things a little less stressful on the Sunday, that's one of the things that could do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very good point Evan. Any thoughts on this? I see Alan has put his hand up. Are you going to speak on this specifically?

ALAN GREENBERG: I will speak on that as well as a number of other things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: In terms of what that group will do, I think this should almost be what the GNSO calls a drafting deed to come up with a charter, so we understand what the group is responsible for and what it isn't. In terms of Maggie presenting to that group, I think that is one of the very few

---

things that there is general interest in the ALAC, and I would not want to move that.

However, back to my original hand being up. We scheduled, as I heard correctly, 90 minutes with [F Sack 2:03:28]. Is that correct?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes that's correct Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: We had a fantastically interesting meeting in Beijing. I think that was largely due to the specific topic, and 90 minutes may be perfect or way over till, depending on what issues we are going to be talking about. I mean, the [F Sack] is a lot of important stuff, but it is often of less general interest than some of the things it does.

So I'm a little bit reluctant to schedule 90 minutes not knowing what it is we're going to be talking about, even though we had a very good meeting in Beijing with the [F Sack], and it would have been nice if it was longer.

That's point number one. Point number two, the question you asked earlier was, should we have policy discussions on Tuesday? Last time

---

we didn't really schedule any time for policy, and then we on Thursday we crammed in both votes and discussion of some of the issues.

I believe strongly that Tuesday, which is essentially our working day, clip on to the constituency day for the other groups, is when we should be having substantive discussion on policy, and then a vote maybe with some drafting in between the two days, on Thursday. So. My two bits.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you Alan. On the [F Sack] point, maybe we can just task Julie, well keep it 90 minutes for the time being, because it is always difficult to extend time, it's easy to chop this off. So keep it 90 minutes for the time being, and ask Julie as soon as possible to makes the [? 2:05:22] to what projects to be discussed on this occasion.

And then if there is a lot of interest, we can just shrink it. If there is not that much potential for a good conversation, or an excellent conversation, then we can shorten it to 60 rather than 90. Correct?

I also... Thank you. And then, no I think 30 is not enough, bearing in mind that there are a lot more issues that are about to come out in this [F Sack], of which I've had a discussion with Patrick [? 2:06:02] on this and there seems to be a lot more going on.

With regards to Maggie, I also feel inclined to keep Maggie on the Sunday for the all of ALAC, because that is something which has really been of much interest to the majority of the ALAC. And bearing in mind, that a working group might clash with other working groups that take place at the same time, so I'm a little concern that people might have to

---

choose between having a discussion with Maggie and doing something else.

IDNs on one side and Maggie on the other, just a little concerned on that. So let's keep it at this. Now that said, if Maggie is able to perhaps spend some time with that working group as well, to look at deeper issues, than that really is for her to choose and to find out.

But I'm a bit concerned about taking this out of the main ALAC, when this has been really, very lightly session. Yes keep Maggie on the Sunday please, for the time being. So any other questions? And Heidi do you need any other...

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. So on Tuesday, did you want to again keep the first session, ALAC Policy Session one, the update from the various working groups, and then the ALAC Policy Session two, to have that discuss RALO working groups in relation with ALAC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry. Can you say that again? I didn't hear that very well. There was some...

HEIDI ULLRICH: On Tuesday we currently have those two policy sessions, ALAC Policy Session One, that is the last two meetings, it's been dedicated to working group updates from the various chairs. And then the policy session two has been a discussion of how to make working group and

---

RALO relations with the ALAC increase their effectiveness and the development of policy types.

Did you want to keep that as well?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So let's first look at the working group updates. I think that they've been very helpful because they actually allow all of the ALAC to know what's going on in the working groups. One of the concerns that I've had is that members of the ALAC come back from the meeting and say, "We spoke all about process, but we didn't have discussions on policy."

And they forget that a lot of the policy now takes place in working group. In fact, that is also the whole point of the working groups is to off-load work from all of the ALAC, so having an update from the working groups to the ALAC is, I think, very helpful. Does anybody think otherwise?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds okay to me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So that's fine. So that's one. Now with regards to getting the RALOs to work better with the ALAC, and the RALO relations with, and ALAC working group relations, etcetera. You know, I must say, I feel a little disappointed about the impact, or rather the lack of impact that this has had so far, and I'm up for suggestions from the group here.

Rinalia.

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: This is Rinalia for the transcript. May I suggest that we keep that, because I think it's somewhat important. Until we get really good working relationship between RALO and ALAC on policy matters, then we have to keep at it.

I would like to suggest a different format than having discussions. Rather than just a call from the region, actually have the RALO chair on the panel and some other region, preferably you, so you are each one of them and hand off, you know, what's the plan for the region in terms of policy engagement, etcetera, etcetera.

And then have a discussion based on those, rather than just have it open. Just a suggestion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yup. Thank you Rinalia. Any thoughts on this? I think someone... Alan has a green tick. Rinalia agrees with herself, that's good. Anyone else? Any thoughts on this? It's the first I hear on this suggestion, and I must say, oh I see Alan. So I'll let Alan speak first and then let me think a little more before I give my reply. Alan Greenberg go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah thank you. To some extent, in some regions, without pointing any fingers, the regional chair is a very passive position. I think changing that is a good thing. I'm done.

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



---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    You can add your own drippy sarcasm.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        No, there is no sarcasm at all. I think that's a good point here. And I was going to suggest actually that this session be led by Rinalia. I've seen how she has led the session, the multi-stakeholder session in Beijing, and yes, I hereby ask support from everyone else if Rinalia could lead this session.

I think that she has a very good point here on actually getting the RALO chairs to do work and to speak policy as well. It sounds good. Any thoughts on this? I mean do we have consensus?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:            Can I help?

ALAN GREENBERG:                    I agree with... This is Alan speaking. I agree Rinalia would be great at it. I'm really reluctant to penalize people who have come up with good, productive, new ideas however [laughs].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:            ...tradition Alan, I mean...

ALAN GREENBERG:                    I understand the tradition, which may explain why we have so few of them.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. And I think we also need to change this idea that this is a penalty for making a suggestion. I'm not pinning something on Rinalia and saying, "Right. This is your baby now, you go ahead with it." What I'm basically saying is that, she has a good idea, I think she should be given the opportunity to be able to present and to expand on this, and actually put it into action.

Just having heard the idea there, I think it's an excellent idea. If you want co-moderators, if you want me to be there, yes of course, I'm fine with co-moderating. But that's no problem. I don't see why it's a penalty. Goodness, what should I be saying [laughs]? Or maybe that was said, wasn't it? [Laughter] at the time, I don't know.

I'm mindful of the time now, we've gone way beyond any other, anything that we can think of. Just one thought, with regards to Maggie, coming back to Maggie's appearance before the ALAC, perhaps that session could be shortened to 30 minutes rather than an hour on the Sunday, and then Maggie could spend her hour with the regulatory working group.

So at least she provides a full details to the ALAC on what's going on with compliance, and then based on what she said, we can tell ALAC members that they can join the next session, or the session on the Tuesday with the regulatory working group, or regulatory group sorry, to ask further questions and push on this.

That's another suggestion. I see, I'm losing everyone at the moment. So Heidi any more from you?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I think that's fine for right now. We'll move forward on that and then the next meeting we can discuss more. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. Number seven, topics for the 28<sup>th</sup> of May. How fantastic. There is, there are a couple of things on there, we've got [CROSTALK 2:14:46] policy implementation on the ICANN context. Sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought we did some of these at the last meeting. Cheryl here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not quite sure. I'm trying to see, yes. Thank you very much Cheryl. I'm trying to find a link to the next ALAC meeting and I can't find it at the moment.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You still have that setup, that agenda page? It might not have...

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry Heidi, it's Gisella here. Which agenda page?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The ALAC meeting...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...20<sup>th</sup> of May.

---

GISELLA GRUBER: The ALAC meeting, 20<sup>th</sup> of May... Yeah it should be setup, I'll double check, but we usually one month to the next for the 28<sup>th</sup>.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well I've already provided some details to staff on subjects that need to be added to it. Since we've run out of time and we just definitely don't have time to look for pages, let's cut this short and ask everyone to receive a note on the ExCom list about the link to the next ALAC meeting, and for suggestions to be made if there is anything they would like to suggest.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah just very quickly. Right now I would suggest that we have the action item that includes the GNSO work on policy and implementation, that was an action item from the 29<sup>th</sup> of April meeting. Then I would suggest Durban action activity, and we've agreed to have an ALS certification vote and items for decision.

So definitely those items.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you. Plus all of the stuff that I've sent you as well please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, yes.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So let's move on [CROSSTALK 2:16:44]... Yes go ahead Heidi [laughs]. Oh sorry, I see both Alan and Cheryl. So Alan first, sorry about that. Alan Greenberg go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just wanted to make sure that we had an item on the rules of procedures documents so we can talk briefly about them and schedule the vote soon after.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan that's a great point. Let's add this as well. How long do you need?

ALAN GREENBERG: I... Rinalia is the one who has made most comments, and I'm not sure if she wants to make a lot more, I would hope under 10 minutes, hopefully well under 10 minutes. Since all of the documents will have been distributed well ahead of time, just a heads up that they're coming.

So I would think five minutes is enough, but you never know with the way these things go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. And next Cheryl.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. I just wanted to inform you all that the meeting is the 28<sup>th</sup>, I will be late attending. The nom com meets now every week, and the first hour of your meeting is clashing with the nom com meeting. So I won't be there until one of your hours, at the very least, it may be a little earlier than that but I won't be there for the first hour of your meeting.

So anything that you do desire my input or commentary on should be put into the latter part of your agenda. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Cheryl. Right. Let's move on. I see no one else wishing to comment on this. So then we have an update on the next beginner's guide on ALAC policy. I wonder if we can just have a one minute update from Matt please.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi this is Matt for the record. So I will be producing an initial draft of an ALAC beginner's guide to policy development. The beginner's guide is going to be pretty brief. It's just going to cover a few topics, I came up with a brief list and sent it to Olivier.

It's going to cover just a few major, so that is WHOIS, RAA, IDN, ICANN strap plans and budgets, the concept of the public interest, new gTLDs. Since new gTLDs is a bit tricky, Olivier has suggested contacting Avri and seeing what she thinks her group are the top priorities in the new gTLD program at this time.

---

As I've written the briefs on each of these, I will most likely work with the subject matter within the ALAC or At-Large, and make sure everything is good, and then provide a draft for the group to review.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Matt. That's good. Any input from anyone at this time? I'm a little concerned that I think most people are a bit fried at the moment, so it's really not going to happen. Can you just send the call out over to the lists please, or to the ExCom list, and then we can bring in some input Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: Sure. Just please note that there will be a pretty tight deadline for me to produce a first draft. So if everyone could please respond after I send the email within the next few days, preferably by Tuesday at the latest, that would be great.

Because that will give me enough time to work on it and follow up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fine. That's fine. Thanks. Right, anything else on number 10? Any other business? I don't see any other business. Okay. With everyone being pretty much fried I think at this time, and a lot of people walking off and having to go.

I thank all of you for these two and half hours of an ExCom call, which is very long. I do apologize for the length. But we had a lot of stuff to discuss. And thanks to all of you... I did, but it says after the call closes, so I do need to close the call the first and then [CROSSTALK 2:21:34]...

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...not hanging up. [Laughs]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've put sure, as long as staff is aware that they shouldn't hang up either.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine. I don't mind staff hold on or not, as long as the call continues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much everyone, and this call is now adjourned. Bye bye.

[VARIOUS GOODBYES]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]