

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the NARALO call on Monday [inaudible] 2013 at 19:00 UTC. On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Allan Skuce, Chris Gundemann, Darlene Thompson, Dharma Dailey, Evan Leibovitch, Garth Bruen, Glenn McKnight, Gordon Chillcott, Joly MacFie, Kerry Brown, Norberto Cruz Cordova, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, and Peter Knight. We have apologies from Eduardo Diaz. And from staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber-White, and myself, Julia Charvolen.

Bear in mind, all participants to please say their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much. And over to you.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much. This is Garth Bruen. Because, as Evan has noted, we do have a few first-timers or long-time no-see people on the call, so we'd like to remind everybody that you must state your name when speaking. And if you are on the Adobe chat room, please raise your hand and either myself, the secretary, or staff will acknowledge you and put you into the queue for speaking. And now I will turn over to Darlene Thompson to read the Action Items. Thank you.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Thank you. Action Items NARALO. Our call time will observe Daylight Savings Time until its end on Sunday, November 3.

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.

2.4, staff please advise the status of the ISOC CA ALS application, and that will come under number 5.2 of this call.

2.5, staff, on a March 18, 2013, ALAC briefing call on RAA changes, staff as in Margie Milam and Sam Eisner were asked to identify ICANN's economic advisors and provide the economic study document that was the basis for the changes to RAA 3.3.6 and 3.3.7. Will At-Large staff please forward this request again?

2.6, staff, please advise on the status of the request to supply ICANN's Whistle-Blower Policy. Thanks. That's it.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Darlene. This is Garth Bruen. Silvia Vivanco from staff has her hand up. Please go ahead, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Garth. I received today [inaudible] Pam Eisner and she informed me that the summary on the economic advisors document will be public in about two weeks, so I will follow up with her. As soon as we see it, we'll send it to the list.

GARTH BRUEN: That is much appreciated. Alan Greenberg has his hand up. Please, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to let you know, the ATRT has formally requested information on the Whistle-Blower Program and policy, and we are assured we will be getting it shortly.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much, Alan, for that update. That's good news. Okay, Silvia, you still have your hand up. Did you have an additional comment?

SILVIA VIVANCO: No. That's an old one. I'll lower the hand. Sorry.

GARTH BRUEN: No problem. Alright. This is Garth Bruen, and thank you very much for everybody for attending the call. Moving right on to Item 3, the Durban Meeting ICANN 47, which is our next meeting. I have a general question out there which is really for thought. It doesn't have to be answered immediately is I'd like to get feedback from the region about what should the NARALO's subject be and what should our goal be for this meeting? I want to give everybody a moment or time to think about it. I'll put this question out as a formal item to the mailing list, and I'll be looking for feedback on that.

Item 3.2, Darlene will be attending remotely, and Dharma will be assisting in person at the meeting, and I want to thank you both for working together on this item, and especially for Dharma too for stepping up to the plate and coming down for this meeting. The link for the meeting itself and the agenda so far is Item 3.3, and I'd advise

everybody who is interested to refresh yourself with that information and keep checking because it does change frequently.

Moving on to Agenda Item 4.1, the Chair – that’s me – sent a draft test editable PDF application form, which is based on our existing ALS Word version. In order to speed up the process and make it a little bit more user friendly for our potential applicants to fill out an application, we’re working on speeding up the process and moving away from the old Word form. And the folks who were on the recruitment subcommittee have been testing this particular form and giving me some feedback. I’ve also heard from some people who wanted to try and make it a Google form. I’m going to see about getting some staff feedback on that. I believe I sent copies of the PDF to Matt Ashtiani and to Heidi.

There’s an out-of-order item here, but that’s okay, 4.3, there’s been a lot of discussion about the indigenous populations and including them in NARALO and possible fellowship opportunities for them for the meetings.

4.4, I’m going to be doing some recruitment efforts personally, and I’m forming an informal meeting here in Boston with groups and interested parties in the area possibly for forming an ISOC chapter and also for recruiting ALSs, and I’ll keep everybody updated on that.

Item 4.5, is Murray on the call? Okay, well, we’ll wait to hear from Murray. Evan has his hand up in the meantime. Evan, please, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Garth. I think you noted about the aboriginal membership as an out-of-order. I think the reason why it's there is because I think we want to bring the issue that, I believe, it's currently ICANN policy to exclude North America from the fellowship program. And I think we wanted to try and raise the point that indigenous populations from within North America were, indeed, deserving to be part of that program. Thanks.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you for the brief, Evan. I just mean out-of-order, meaning that I had skipped 4.2 and went right to 4.3 but, I mean, those are important notes, and I thank you for bringing them up.

Okay, moving on. This is all part of our overall strategy for our communications within the region, and it's something that we're constantly working on. Moving on to Item 5 – and specifically 5.1 – and by invitation, we have Chris from ISOC Colorado, who wrote an article at CircleID – which I noted in red – about changing policies at the RIPE, which is the regional ISP delegation authority within Europe. And we have a similar one here in America called ARIN, and every region has one. And while it's not under direct control by ICANN, there is a structure over it within IANA. They don't have a direct policy link, but this is still something that really is very, very important to us as Internet users, so I asked Chris to come on the call and just kind of brief the region on the concerns in his article. And, Chris, if you're ready, please go ahead.

CHRIS GRUNDEMANN:

Sure. Thanks. I apologize in advance for any background noise. I tried to find a quiet spot, and it seems to be less than ideal. So basically all five regional Internet registries throughout the world are basically coming down to the ends of handing out their free pools of IPv4 addresses. The IANA pool, the global pool itself, is empty, and as a result, one of the things looking forward is many of the RIRs have changed their policy to allow transfers directly between resource holders.

So if an ISP, for example, were able to free up some addresses somehow – maybe they lost customers, maybe they moved to a CGN architecture, maybe they bought another company – whatever the case may be, if they were able to free up some addresses, they're able to transfer those through the registry system to another ISP, which hasn't been available to ISPs before. Within the last couple of years this has happened.

And now that that's happened, basically what we've seen is the policies that applied to free pool allocations, that is when organizations were going directly to the regional registries and getting addresses from them for free or a nominal fee basically, there were policies in place that required a technical justification of need. So you had to show the registry, "Yes, I'm actually building a network. I've actually bought gear. I actually have customers. I'm building this network, and this is why I need these addresses." That's basically been carried forward to the transfers, so that when you go to transfer addresses between two organizations, rather than dip into the free pool, you still have to justify the need for the addresses you're receiving if you're on the receiving end of that deal.

And there are folks within the communities, basically all the major communities that have each run out, which is the Asia-Pacific region, the European region, and the North American region is very close to run out, there has been lots of talk about removing that needs assessment from the transfer process, and basically that would make it a completely free market so that the highest bidder gets the addresses without any restriction on whether or not they actually are using them in an operating network.

The article I wrote was specific to the RIPE region. RIPE NCC is, as was mentioned, the RIR for Europe. And they've had a proposal put in that's active right now to remove all of the needs assessment basically completely. Their free pool is empty, and so they don't have any need to balance between free pool and transfers. Obviously, any addresses moving around now are going to be transfers, so this would only affect transfers.

What was put forward is basically a way to cut down bureaucracy and not have to fill out the paperwork required behind the needs assessment, which I think is obviously a fairly weak argument. And there are a lot of bigger picture items involved here, such as speculation and hoarding, and so it's definitely something that's on top of my list for address policy. It's the big issue right now and, I think, something that definitely needs to be thought about by everyone involved quite a bit.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Chris. Joly has put into the chat a question. Chris, is this an inter or intra region transfer or both?

CHRIS GRUNDEMANN: Yeah, that's actually a really good question. So with regard to transfers between regions, what basically happened to give you a little bit of history here kind of briefly, the Asia-Pacific region (APNIC) when they initially started doing transfers when they initially ran out of their free pool, they removed the needs assessment, and then they also put in place a policy that would allow transfers between regions. ARIN, the North American regional registry then kind of – I want to use the word counter kind of loosely – but they countered that by basically putting in an interregional transfer policy that allowed transfers between regions but required a needs assessment on the other end, which caused APNIC to go back to revisit their policy, put needs assessment back in, and now they have compatible needs-based assessments as those transfers work.

If the RIPE region were to put this policy in place which is basically a local policy for their region, but it would basically exclude them from any interregional transfers. So it would mean that transfers could only happen inside of the RIPE region. Transfers to and from ARIN and transfers to and from APNIC would be barred by current policy if they remove this needs assessment. So it affects both even though it's specific to their region.

GARTH BRUEN: Chris, great. Thank you. Evan, you have your hand up. Did you have a question on this? No? Okay. I don't hear you, Evan, if you're talking. You have a red slash through your microphone anyway. Okay, and he took

his hand down. Alright. Does anybody else have any questions for Chris on this topic. I have a link to the article in the agenda, so I would encourage anybody to read it. Going once. No questions. Oh, wait. Olivier has his hand up. Please, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just have a question for Chris. With regards to these transfer policies and the complexity of them, how they might evolve in transferring between regions and so on, is there a chance that this is a way to make such a mess of the IPv4 address market that people will naturally move to v6?

CHRIS GRUNDEMANN: Yeah, I mean, it's definitely possible, and there are a lot of conflicting arguments in that space whether or not removing the needs assessment will cause people to stick with v4 or push them to move to v6. The opposite of that argument is also made whether keeping the needs assessment will do one or the other. And then, obviously, just kind of the complication and the whole thing. So there are a lot of conflicting opinions there, but it definitely plays into it. And like I said, I think there's a lot going in an often overlooked area of policy.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Chris. Peter Knight has his hand up, and after Peter, I'm going to close the queue on this topic because we have a full agenda. Please, Peter, go ahead. If you're on mute, Peter, please unmute yourself. Okay, Peter, we're going to move on because if you're talking, I

can't hear you. Okay. Now, moving on, thank you so much, Chris, for that overview. Much appreciated. This is all important technical stuff, and everybody here is very busy and not everybody has the time to go into the details in-depth on every single topic, which is why we have a great region of people who can explain these different areas to everybody else. It's fantastic.

Just quickly in terms of moving forward the spotlight, next meeting in July, I will give a video presentation of my ALS. And then after that, starting in August, we're going to go through each ALS in alphabetical, and Darlene will be coordinating with the ALSs to schedule each one of those. I think we're getting some noise in the background. Can staff mute that particular wherever that's coming from? Thank you so much.

Alright. Moving on to 5.2, does staff have an update on the application on regional advice on ISOC Canada?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes, Garth. It was already approved, and the result is the number of the ALS is 178.

GARTH BRUEN:

Fantastic. I would like to welcome ISOC Canada to our region, to NARALO. This is fantastic, and welcome to our new ALS and we're looking forward to your input.

Next Agenda Item, 5.3, just continuing on with the potential de-accreditation of Alberta Community Network Association. They have been out of communication for a while. I have sent them a postal letter,

and I'm waiting for either a response, no response, or for the letter to be returned. And whatever the result is, unless they actually reach out to me and I hear from them, we're going to begin the official process of de-accreditation.

Okay, 5.5 – which should be 5.4, that's my fault – very important, it is election season. And I'm going to turn the floor over to Darlene and staff so they can let us know about what: what posts are up for election, who: who is running for these posts, and when: when is the election and what is the process. Please. Thank you.

DARLENE THOMPSON:

Okay. Let's start here with the ALAC delegate to the NomCom from NARALO. It was currently held by Glenn McKnight, who served two full terms and did an awesome job. Unfortunately, his term ends on the 20th of November and he is not eligible for reselection because it is term-limited, so we were looking for a new person. Louis Houle has been nominated and seconded. Now, the timeline on that is the nominations are closed on Friday the 7th, and Louis Houle was the only one nominated. So Louis now has until the end of this week, the 14th, to accept his nomination. Then, assuming he does accept the nomination, NARALO doesn't even need to prioritize or vote on it, and it will go straight towards ALAC and notification, which the Chair will send by the June 25. So that's the easy one.

Then we have all in the same timeframes is the election for the Chair, the Secretariat, and the ALAC position. Now, these nominations open June 3, and they'll run to the 2nd of July. Then July 9th is the deadline for nomination acceptance, and then from the 10th to the 17th, we will have elections if and where necessary. Now, for our ALAC position, this one is

being held by Eduardo, and he can be reselected for a second term as he has only served one term. And his current term ends on the 20th of November. The new one would start on the 21st of November and run through for two years. So far, Eduardo has been re-nominated, and nobody else has been yet.

For the Chair and Secretariat, Garth Bruen has been nominated for Chair, and for Secretariat we have two nominations, one each for Glenn McKnight and Darlene Thompson. So, again, we have until the 2nd of July should anybody else wish to nominate someone or if someone would just like to run. You don't need to be nominated. You can just put yourself up there. So depending on who runs, we will have elections as needed. If only one person runs for a spot, obviously, there's no need for an election. That's it. Thank you very much.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Darlene. Evan, you have your hand up. Please, go ahead, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks there, Garth. I just want to make a small point about the process for the NomCom position. That, in fact, does not even have to be an election. The selection of the NomCom positions is made by ALAC, and NARALO is welcome – obligated – to make a recommendation to ALAC who it would like and, in fact, those recommendations have not in the past always been 100% followed. So just so it's very clear, what is going on as far as the NomCom is concerned is that it does not have to be a formal election. It can just be a resolution of NARALO to be presented to

ALAC saying, “These are our preferences.” In fact, more than one can be offered or zero can be offered, and the selection itself is made by the ALAC. So I just wanted to be clear on that, that that particular selection process is not done the way the others are done. It’s not necessarily requiring a formal election. This is just an option that NARALO has to make a recommendation to ALAC whether or not to submit a recommendation for ALAC to put forward. Anyway, thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Evan. Alan Greenberg has counterpoint. Thanks. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not quite a counterpoint, but just to note that I don’t believe formal elections are required for any of our positions. In fact, in most years, the positions have been filled even if on occasion we’ve had more than one person and we chose to have an election for privacy, in other times we’ve had multiple people and we’ve had an open discussion and a decision. So I don’t believe elections are required for anything. We may choose them for issues of privacy. We may choose them because we feel it’s a close call. But I do point out that if we have a formal election, there are quorum issues which we have to make sure are going to be adhered to. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Alan. Evan, you have your hand up again, and then Darlene, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Yes, I do. Darlene mentioned that there was one name. Louis had put himself forward for the nominating committee appointment. I'm aware of one other person who has expressed interest. That is Murray McKercher. He's not on this call. I thought he would be, but I do believe he has expressed an interest and that has been supported, so there are two names that have been put forward to my knowledge, Louis and Murray. Thank you.

DARLENE THOMPSON:

Evan, Murray did not put his name forward onto the list, and the nominations closed on the 7th, so unless he can show proof that he did put his name forward to the list, he won't be able to be considered, I hate to say.

As per what Alan was saying, this is very correct. Our new Rules of Procedure under Item 12, it does say that any of these positions can be done through rough consensus. It has, however, been our practice that if more than one person is going for a position, that we run a vote.

Now, as for quorum, I have already requested of staff that they go through and see which of our ALSs are even eligible to vote. As per our Rules of Procedure, if an ALS has not participated in the discussion lists for a year and they haven't voted in the last three votes, then they are not eligible to vote. So I have asked staff to make a list of which ALSs are eligible to vote. And it also says in our Rules of Procedure very clearly that if it is a tie, then the Chair will cast a tiebreaker. And that's all. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Darlene. I think that there was some confusion about the election process, which is something I'm going to get into in the next agenda item. And I also believe that Peter Knight put his name forward for something. And if he's still on the call, I know he couldn't speak earlier but maybe he could put something into the chat or send an e-mail later.

So getting into Agenda Item 5.6, I'm going to put Olivier on the spot here a little but just because we did receive a sort of sudden change request for the election cycle, and this sort of threw the region into a bit of confusion and there was some question about how our bottom-up process is supposed to work. So I'm hoping Olivier can shed some light on how this change happened and why we got such late notice. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Garth. The whole scheduling of those elections, selections, and the whole process, if you want, is one which does usually take several weeks. And one of the things that we have recently learned is that the Nominating Committee – the NomCom – was going to make its decisions very early on and was going to make its decisions at the beginning of the Durban Meeting.

So one of the things is that because we have many of our region this year with new selections for people who have reached their term limit, usually what the NomCom does is to try and balance things out. They balance the skillsets. They try and balance the gender balance that we have or gender imbalance that we might have. And so it's a lot more

helpful if all of the regions have selected their people or their ALAC members for example before the NomCom does so. So that was one thing.

The other thing, our staff is seriously overworked at the moment for various reasons. There are a lot of things going on in ICANN, a lot of changes. And of course, there's a lot of stuff going on also in At-Large. And so being able to actually synchronize everything together does help. Sorry, not synchronize everything. Synchronize the regions together does help. And so for some regions, things have gone according to their original plans, and for others it has been a little bit of a rush.

I do have to remind everyone that most of the time, our selections have actually taken place over the summer – over July and August – and this was particularly hard on staff and on volunteers because many people were away for holidays and that wasn't the best of time to actually make selections. So it was found that maybe let's try something a bit earlier this year and see how this goes.

I understand it's a bit confusing because you've got both the Leadership selections and also the ALAC selections and also the people that would serve on the next NomCom, but we've been asked to provide the details of those who would serve on the next NomCom earlier than last year. This was a request we received very recently, and that's again because the NomCom wants to give itself more time for the next year's selection. It's all moving goal posts, effectively. And it was because we needed to make a choice very quickly, it would have been totally impossible to ask each one of the regions what they thought.

Working with Heidi, Heidi and I just worked through a schedule which seemed to be providing all of us with enough time to discuss the selections but at the same time make the selections before the actual NomCom makes the selection, and therefore giving the Nominating Committee more chance to balance the regions out, etc. I hope that answers your question.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Olivier. You're not going to get much sympathy from North Americans to cooperate with the European endless summer vacation. Alan has his hand up. Please, go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I support the consolidation and doing anything we can to ease the work of staff in this whole process, but please, we shouldn't be using the NomCom ALAC session as a rationale for us doing it this year because for both North America and Europe, there are no ALAC people being selected. So I support the overall process, but let's not mess up the rationale with reasons that just don't apply. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Alan. Olivier has his hand up, and then I'm going to close this topic. Please, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Garth. Just in response to Alan, because some regions have to select their people earlier, being able to get all the regions to do this

at the same time is a lot less work for staff than staggering them and having a process which they start running at one go and then running again and doing twice as many calls and things like that. Especially, and I will say it again, it's not only the Europeans that are away on holiday. I'm looking here at staff. Staff is away. They have to take holidays at some time in the year, and so we run on a thinner number of staff in the summer.

In fact, a couple of years ago with a number of factors taking place, there was only one staff member running everything during the summer, and this is something that would be totally impossible today with the amount of activity that we have. And when you are overworked, then you suffer mistakes, errors, balls that get dropped, and people getting very frustrated. So while I do apologize for the amount of stress this has induced here, it's probably for the better for everyone. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Alright. Thank you, Olivier. Moving on, the next Agenda Item, 5.7, is something that Eric brought up for discussion, but I don't see Eric on the call. Are you on the call, Eric? No. Okay, we will hold that over.

There's a bit of a disconnect. There have been some questions about why unaffiliated members need to submit statements of interest. And the reason is the line between documented participants and workers. And for those of you who aren't aware, we do have many people on our NARALO mailing list who are neither At-Large members and do not live in North America. We have many a European-based registrars who

listen in on our list and other types of industry folks who are actually not really considered to be At-Large members, and they don't live in our region, and they don't actually contribute much to our internal policy. So if you're an unaffiliated member, having a statement which declares that you are in North America and declares that you're not an industry person or not an employee of ICANN, etc., is very, very important. And Alan has his hand up and probably has some more critical, accurate information. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. First of all, just for the record, being an employee of a contracted party or, I believe, ICANN – although I need to check that – is not a prohibition from being an unaffiliated member. We removed that requirement several years ago. And I'll point out we made a strategic mistake when we enacted that set of rules. We called this declaration that you are not a member of an ALS, that you are a member of the mailing list, and that you are a resident of North America a statement of interest, a term that's used for 14 other ways within ICANN, within At-Large, and we made a very strategic error by calling it that.

The next revision, we need to change that name. I think we should be using in practice, even though the principles have not yet been changed, some other term other than a statement of interest. Call it an attestation or whatever you want because otherwise it confuses people quite reasonably with the other things we call statements of interest, which are completely different. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Alan. And it's clear from my bollocking up of the explanation that we do need some more clarification. Okay, 5.7, there is a new ALS webinar, which I believe everybody should have received a direct link to. This is something that's very important. Something that I discussed in a past meeting we're going to keep looking at is a way of expanding our presence at the meetings, potentially getting more officers. It's something that we're still kind of working through and thinking about.

So jumping down to Agenda 6, very quickly, these are links to the At-Large Summit and the North American General Assembly, which is a little bit down the road. These are things to keep in mind.

Moving down to Agenda Item 7, I don't believe that there has been too much activity on the new gTLD front. Unless I'm completely wrong and anybody has anything that they want to discuss in this area, I'd love to hear from you.

But seeing nobody stepping forward, I will move on to Agenda Item 8. I have consolidated a number of items underneath Agenda Item 8. This originally was just for the NomCom, but because we have so many people working on different working groups, I believe it's important to document all of our work. And for the first Agenda Item on NomCom, Glenn has supplied an extensive report card to the membership. And it's on Skype, and I believe he sent it to the list too and we appreciate. Glen, do you have any additional comments that you want to share on the call right now?

GLENN McKNIGHT: Yes. Due to time, every month we do generate a report. Just to let you know, we've had a really great last run. We extended our deadline so every week – every Tuesday morning – we have a call, and we're going through and shortlisting. It's a trying process, but we'll be meeting every week, and then we will be doing the deep dives on our selected individuals. So, yes, just to let you all know, we have a great collection and it's going to be tough. That's it.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Glenn. Next Item, I guess we will call this our Future Challenges working group report. This actually refers to a letter to the ATRT authored by Evan and signed by many of us within the community on a call for ICANN to embrace its inner regulator. And underneath, I have noted that there are two letters of support from outside, and those letters are linked here in the agenda. And with no further ado, I'll go over to Evan to discuss the details of this letter and what's going on with it. Please, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you, Garth. Which is good timing, since I just stepped back to the mic after a second. Okay, essentially, the letter that was sent to the ATRT started off as a bit of a personal rant basically in frustration at the way that ICANN was running and how it was not running in the public interest. Without going into the details of the letter, it was essentially trying to give a couple of examples of how ICANN has been – to use the terms that I put in – essentially captured by a compact between domain buyers and domain sellers. And that not only Internet end users, but

also the suppliers of information that they're trying to reach have, by and large, been left out of the equation of a lot of ICANN policymaking.

So as a result of this capture, we now have ICANN policies that have given us, for instance, this Wild West expansion of the gTLD space without a lot of preliminary thinking about the effect on the public interest. So we essentially have a process in which everything has been wide open. And so all these public interest things about trademarks confusing, about NGOs and charities having their names possibly squatted in places, applicant support issues and things like that, all these things have sort of been tacked on afterwards as the public interest community desperately tries to bring something in. So without getting too deep into this, the letter tries to essentially express dissatisfaction with the way the public interest has been treated within ICANN as a matter of accountability and transparency.

So it started off as a personal letter. I shared it with a couple of friends, and before I knew it, the letter had had multiple authors and was being recommended for submission to the ATRT. It actually started life as a column I was planning to do for CircleID, but it now has multiple authors, multiple signatories. And I'm very happy that it has achieved the support that it has, not only from within the At-Large community, but I even noticed that now that it has been submitted to the ATRT, some people who I have never heard of have gone into the list and offered their support for the letter.

So it's fairly strongly worded. In fact, when I first penned it, I never expected it to get endorsement by a larger body, so it has somewhat of a sharper tone than is used to being seen from At-Large statements. If

you read that, you notice the use of terms like “the industry compact” and flat out using the term “capture” is not something you tend to see a lot in At-Large documents, probably for good reason.

In any case, though, I strongly believe in what the letter says, and I’m very heartened to see that there are others within the region that support it. And certainly if there is region-wide support for this, then it would help advance this as being a good statement of reflecting the public interest view of what has happened to ICANN. I’ll leave it at that. I’m happy to take questions, but I know you’re on a tight schedule, Garth. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Evan. We might have a question or two. Gordon Chillcott has his hand up. Please, Gordon.

GORDON CHILLCOTT:

Thank you, Garth. I’ll try to make this as brief as I can. Two quick observations: firstly, the central message of that letter and just about everything that Evan described just now is something that I strongly support and so do several members of [IALS]. However, that being said, my second observation, there are a couple of rationale arguments in there that are questionable. The major one of those – and I’m only going to mention one because the others are very much like it – the “growing success of search engines” with the implied statements that kind of supplants the DNS, which it does not. Statements like this can dilute the strength of the rest of the statement, which as I’ve said I not only strongly agree with; I consider it critical. Thank you, Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Gordon. If you have a brief response, Evan. If you don't, that's fine too.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, I do, and hopefully I can keep it very short. Gordon, I totally understand the point behind what you're saying, and my response is I believe contained in the letter. And, essentially, it's saying that as public confidence has waned with ICANN and the DNS, alternatives for people getting to the information that they seek on the Internet as opposed to typing in memorable domain names – using search engines, QR codes, Facebook, homepages and so on – has become a growing alternative. So essentially it was just mentioning that while ICANN in some ways thinks that it has a monopoly on how people get to Internet information, in fact it does not, and public confidence eroding in it is actually turning people to alternatives. I can talk offline with you more in-depth than that. That's the very quick answer to your concern.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Evan. Okay, so moving on, we have Item 8.3, ATRT status, which I put Avri in quotes and I think I meant to type Alan. Alan had an update at the beginning of the call. Is there anything else that we should be aware of in terms of ATRT, Alan or even Olivier?

ALAN GREENBERG: Only that we're still accepting input, and the input does not have to be in response to the specific questions we asked. We welcome any input

with regard to the Section 9.1 of the AOC that we're reviewing, which has to do with things like: confidence in ICANN, does the policy development process work. There are a lot of different things. I can go into it in more detail if you like, but just that we would like input. We haven't gotten all that much, and the quality of the output is going to depend purely on the quality of the input.

At-Large has tended to be very involved in the WHOIS, in all the aspects of WHOIS. It's one of the things that we're reviewing. Has ICANN and staff and the Board implemented the WHOIS or are they implementing the WHOIS recommendations properly? We've gotten very little input on that kind of thing, so anyone who has any feelings about that, don't be shy. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you very much, Alan. This is important. I mean, this is why we're really here, and this is how we put our interests on ICANN's table. It's an important channel for all of us, and if there are things that you are concerned about, bring them to this forum. I mean, and if you're not sure how to phrase them or make them fit within the accountability and transparency framework, just talk to me, talk to Alan, talk to Evan, talk to Olivier – talk to somebody who will be able to find the right spot for you. Alan, you have your hand up again, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, just to make reference to the timeline. The target is for the final report to be out by the 31st of December. What that translates to is we're going to be getting input from the various ACs and SOs in Durban,

and we will then have approximately five weeks in which to process all the information we've received from multiple sources and come up with a set of recommendations. The rest of the time is going to be in refining that document, putting it out for public comment, redoing it after the public comment comes out. So by mid-August, we have to have our recommendations ready. So if you plan to say something, don't delay. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you very much, Alan. So going on to 8.4, I'm going to start asking that working group leaders from the region help us out with the monthly reports. So far, it has mostly been the Chair who has submitted comments or submitted items to the monthly report. I think if everybody in the region just at least supplies just one line for these reports – just a brief update on whatever it is you're doing – it's going to help exposure of the region, and it's going to help exposure of your ALS, and it's going to help our documentation within At-Large. So it's just something to keep in mind. Review the monthly reports and think about things that you do that you feel should get some more exposure, and we'll make sure that it gets that exposure and gets documented. Evan, you have your hand up. Please, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi. Sorry, Garth. I'm just for the moment going back to 8.2. Was there actually an interest in having an action item of having NARALO endorse this letter? Is there a discussion? Is there a potential to have that at this meeting, or did you plan to have a formal vote, or is there a follow up?

Because right now as it sits right now, 8.2 doesn't have an action item associated with it.

GARTH BRUEN:

Evan, my apologies. I believe I do recall seeing that put forward. I wholly support it, and I am more than happy right now to put in a checkbox to say that I think that we should as a region, not only should we discuss it, but I absolutely support moving it forward and pushing it up to ALAC. Is that what you're talking about?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Basically, I'm just trying to see whether or not there's a formal endorsement from NARALO and/or a direction or a recommendation as one of the ALAC reps from North American to bring that forward potentially for ALAC endorsement. So as an Action Item, I'm just trying to figure out what the next step. [inaudible] at the last meeting, and we're really just sort of at the point is, "Okay, here it is. It's nice." So the question is, is there actually an action item for NARALO to endorse it and/or move it to ALAC or neither? Thanks.

GARTH BRUEN:

Alright. Well, I put my checkbox forward to endorse it. Is anybody opposed to doing that, or does anybody else want to put their own checkbox in there? And if anybody has a comment, you can raise your hand as well. So far I see, Alan, you have your hand up. Please, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm speaking purely on my own behalf, and I'll let Olivier speak also if he chooses. I don't think how ATRT is going to respond to these kind of things and think about them is going to be altered very significantly by having NARALO support it or not. The document is there. There are a number of supporters, so I wouldn't put a lot of time and effort into doing this. If we're talking about a checkmark here and that's it, fine. But I think getting the information out and viewable by others and viewable by the ATRT members is the most important thing. Olivier says he agrees, so I wouldn't put a lot of time and effort into it. It may make people feel good, but I don't think it really is going to alter. These are serious comments, and they are going to be considered seriously. Adding a few more checkmarks I don't think changes the equation all that much.

GARTH BRUEN: Evan, you have your hand up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just to ask Alan. Alan, is there value then for NARALO to suggest that ALAC take this up and make actually endorsed advice or at least to raise it for consideration that way? Would that matter?

GARTH BRUEN: Alan's response, then Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My gut feeling is probably not significantly. I'm not saying more people supporting it doesn't have more weight, but you've already got people on the ATRT – me and Olivier – who speak to it, that whether it's a formal statement of the community or not, it has weight behind it. It will not be ignored, but I'll add, to the extent that the issues raised are really things that the ATRT has within its mandate and scope. And the ATRT is really grappling with some important issues that we feel in our hearts are critical to ICANN but they're not really our problem in terms of the ATRT review. And some of the things within that paper fall into that category, and so we're going to have to make some hard decisions. I've already spent more time on it than I said I think that we should. So I just don't think it's of that great importance given all the other things we have to do. I'll let Olivier speak.

GARTH BRUEN:

Olivier, please, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Garth. I totally agree with Alan. In fact, I should add – and of course he can't say that but I can say this – we have a Chair and Vice Chairs that really mean business on the ATRT 2, and Alan being one of the Vice Chairs is to his credit as well. I think we've decided as a group to really dig deep in those issues that are particularly sticky. And so I don't think there is a case of the ATRT 2 wanting to push work away or having to choose what points have more weight in the community than others. It will really be down to going to the points that we really

feel very strongly about, and many people do feel very strongly about it.
Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Okay, thank you very much, Alan, Olivier, and Evan. Alright, moving on, as I was saying, I want to capture as much of our work as we possibly can in the formal record. So contribute to the monthly reports, send your work to me, and we'll get it in there.

Moving on to Item 9, our ALAC At-Large Advisory Committee issues queue here, the first one I put up, 9.1, concerns an item that I've seen quite a bit within the ALAC discussion and that concerns language issues. Does anybody from ALAC wish to discuss this before I open it up to other issues? No? Okay. Is there anything that folks from ALAC – Eduardo is not on the call – but Olivier, Evan, and Alan wish to put forward to the region?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have nothing at this point.

GARTH BRUEN:

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There is an item with my name on it at the end which I don't have any document, anything prepared for yet.

there is a discussion about dotless domains, and this was quite active on the mailing list in the last 24 hours. And, Evan, do you care to comment on this at this time?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Garth. Actually, the recommendation I meant in the e-mail chat is that the discussions are so new that it's probably not worth doing anything in this call. We need more discussion. The board still has yet to do some reporting on it, so there's a lot of education. As we saw in the last 24 hours, there are a lot of people that aren't even sure what the ramifications are of dotless domains. So the first thing I would want to do is to encourage everyone on the call to get Report 53 from the Security and Stability Advisory Council of ICANN which deals specifically with that. It addresses it very nicely, and so I would ask in advance of further work that we all inform ourselves about the issue. And I'll leave it at that right now. Thanks.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Evan. I just put in the chat a request for staff to provide a link to the report that you mentioned. Okay, does anybody else within the region on the call have any other business or something that they want to bring forward? And I'll let a moment go. Seeing no hands up and hearing no voices, I'd like to thank everybody for their time on this call. And if anybody has any issues.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Sorry.

GARTH BRUEN: Oh, yes, who is that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Heidi. This is Heidi. Sorry. You're zipping through this, so I didn't get my hand up in time. Are you under AOB?

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. May I take just a moment to announce some exciting news?

GARTH BRUEN: We'd love to hear it, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. On this past Friday, there was an announcement made by a Fadi of some staff changes. Currently, that announcement is on the main ICANN website, so you can take a look at the entire announcement. Just some key points. I'll just say some very key changes.

As of 1st of July, Akram Atallah is going to be moving from the COO position to become division president of a new division called Generic Domains Division. Taking his place as COO is Susanna Bennett, who is an accomplished financial and operational executive. I've had the pleasure to meet her. She seems fantastic.

For NARALO, the big news is that Jamie Hedlund, who is currently Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement, will become an advisor to Fadi, while also continuing his leadership of the North America government relations. But turning as the new Vice President for Stakeholder Relations in NARALO will be Christopher Mondini, who is the former Chief of Staff under Rod but has now currently moved to a position within the global Stakeholder Engagement division of Vice President of Business Engagement. So we've had long talks already about this new position. I think he's going to be an excellent person in this position. And I would suggest that perhaps we have a call with him definitely in Durban and perhaps even sometime prior to that as well.

GARTH BRUEN:

Okay. Thank you, Heidi. That's interesting and, yeah, we'll see if we can arrange a call. Glenn, you have your hand up. Quickly, go ahead. Glenn, if you're on mute, we can't hear you. Okay, I'll go to Olivier. Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Garth. Just to add on what Heidi has just mentioned here, the announcement. Jamie Hedlund was, of course, allocated to the NARALO region. And I know that there has been some noise and some comments in the past that there wasn't very much involvement from that person. Of course, he was very busy with relations with ICANN in Washington, D.C., and I'm very happy to see that he continues to work in this and that someone else now is being able to step into this position to be able to be the Vice President for the NARALO region. I

think it's very important, and I'm very happy to see that it's actually Christopher Mondini who is going on this because I have spoken to him in the past and times when we were having our SO and AC afternoon meetings, and Christopher was part of the meeting. And I was able on several occasions to speak to him a lot about At-Large. So he doesn't start from knowing nothing about At-Large. He's actually quite knowledgeable, and I look forward to being able to work with him, and I hope that the region will be able to work with him and that he'll be able to help this region as much as the other VPs have helped their regions. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Okay. Thank you, Olivier. I'm turning it over to Glenn. Glenn, please.

GLENN McKNIGHT:

Just prior to the Durban event, there's an African Internet Governance Forum. NCUC, APC, a number of groups are involved with it. I should be live streaming. I'll be attending the event prior to Durban, so it should be an interesting event, and if anyone is interested, they can contact me for more information.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Glenn. I'm turning it over to Alan. Please, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just a note for the people here. Somewhere in the agenda – and I can't find it right now – was a pointer to the NARALO Principles of

Operation or Operating Principles or something like that, which is an obsolete version. So if you're finding that link, don't use that one. Find the right one, or ask someone who will point you to the right one. For the life of me, I can't see it right now, but it was there somewhere.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Alan. It's probably a good idea that nobody can reach an obsolete link.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it's there historically. It's just not the current one.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Alright, if nobody else has any further comments, I will thank you all for your time, and I will talk to you later. Bye, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]