OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC Executive Committee conference call on Friday, the 31st of May, 2013. The time is 14:06 UTC, and I'll have the floor over to Julia for the roll call and the apologies please.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you Olivier. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the ALAC ExCom monthly call on Friday, 31st of May, 2013 at 14 UTC. On the call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Carlton Samuels, Julie Hammer, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and Alan Greenberg.

We have apologies from [? 0:00:44]. And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, and myself Julia Charvolen. And I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thanks very much and over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julia. Have we missed anyone on the call? Did we not mention anybody? Nope. I don't see anyone that we missed. So let's go directly to agenda item number two, and the review of the action items from our previous ExCom meeting and our previous ALAC meeting as well.

Matt and I are still yet to clean those up a little bit, because I think that there is some long term goals which we can probably start cleaning up

with time, so that will probably be a small action item for Matt and myself.

But just looking at the open action items, there is a webinar specifically for the RALO leaders and the ALAC to be setup on the questions to the community on accountability and transparency within ICANN. That's been done, completed, thank you. It was well attended. I didn't check where there were a lot of inputs from RALOs in the ATRT 2 process.

We will check afterwards and see. The next one, Holly Raiche is to be the ALAC representative for the GNSO work on policy and implementation in the ICANN context. And of course there is a thing there that says, should it become a CCWG. So it hasn't become a CCWG, it's a GNSO working group. it will remain a GNSO working group.

The response, or rather lack of response I've had to asking for a CCWG, but the informal response I received is that this was not considered. And Holly is in that working group. I'm glad to also mention that Eduardo Diaz has also stepped forward to be another person from the ALAC directly in the working group, especially in the chartering group.

There is to be an agenda item on the next ALAC agenda, regarding the GNSO work on policy…

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Alan. I was going to go through all of these and then open the floor afterwards.   So as to try and [CROSSTALK 0:03:08]… thanks Alan.

Agenda item on the next ALAC agenda regarding the GNSO work on policy and implementation in the ICANN context completed.

And finally on the open action items, Heidi is to get in touch with CCNSO staff and to see if there is any interest in a joint ALAC CCNSO meeting. And this has been completed. We've had some feedback, and Bart has come back to us and has basically come up with a suggestion that maybe we would not have meetings together in Durban, but let's have a working group, working so as to prepare something for Buenos Aires.

The floor is now open for comments, questions, additions, etcetera. And Alan, you now have the floor. Alan Greenberg go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. My only comment is that we have never before for a GNSO working group or [jousting 0:04:11] team, had a representative of the ALAC. We have always had people who speak on their own behalf, and on occasion go back to the ALAC for discussion of a certain issue, so that it can presented as an ALAC position.

But in general we've never a person who is only there as a representative. I don't object, but I'm just pointing out that's the case. And I'm saying that on GNSO working groups, we have done it in other venues before. Thank you.

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And I wanted to comment on two issues, so I'll respond to Alan's point first. It's Cheryl for the record. Yes, Alan I hear what you're saying, but the GNSO rules which were hard won and carefully designed, and our own rules regarding liaisons to work groups, was specifically worked around that way so that they could be a formal voice and a required nexus, a feedback between a sending body, in our case the ALAC and the now open, more open, GNSO and other working groups.

So I think if we use the term rather than formal representative, small "L" liaison, because that is literally fits in with the actual rules for an actual GNSO work group, that we would be fine and we would be setting the correct precedent, recognizing that we had set liaisons to the cross-community work group jazz, etcetera, etcetera.

But for a pure, and particularly, drafting team, I hear what you're saying Alan but it's definitely, in fact this is probably what we should be doing, and I guess from now on is a good thing, a smaller liaison is excellent. And obviously for the record, Alan and I are also on the drafting team.

You're on the drafting team as well, aren't you Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure if I put my name in, but I will if I haven't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [CROSSTALK 0:06:35]… and that's what I think it is important that you have Holly listed as the small "L" liaison for the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, for clarity, I wasn't objecting, I was just pointing out that this is a new set of words that we haven't used before. And I want to be sure it was unconsciously and not slipped into something because we ran and we picked new words.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. Understood. And in fact, I was making the point not only do I think it's a good thing, but it was sure to be not an ALAC representative of ALAC small l liaison.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That sounds understood. Can we move on to the next point please Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have practically forgotten this. What was the first thing you talked about?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] The webinar for [CROSSTALK 0:07:24]… no you wanted to deal, I think, probably with the ALAC GNSO meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's correct. Yes, I just wanted to say there is no reason why not, who simply forward the – is now circulated from that to the leadership. Why not forward that to the ExCom, and then they've all got it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah that would be done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can forward that. Okay. So one quick note than for Matt based on the discussion that we just had, when he writes the action item, or tags the action item with Holly Raiche as being completed. Matt if you could please change the word ALAC representative to ALAC liaison with a small "L," so that for the record this is correctly interpreted.

Let's move on to the next thing, and that's the newly assigned action items, still from our last ExCom call. Olivier is to check how the decision was and if the Board charted the GNSO work on policy and implementation in the ICANN context, with a possible statement to the Board to be drafted if needed.

Right. This is one thing which I have not done, so I will have to check that. Leave this over to the side for the time being. The next one is for Heidi to include the ALAC agenda items and the main body of the ALS decertification and certification issues. And that's, all of that is done.

So that's completed. Any comments on those last two points? I'll get around to checking on the Board how this working group was charted. Right. Let's go for the next set of action items, that's the ones from our last ALAC call. Again, there is some clean up required, we will look into the open action items.

EN

There are the two action items regarding the WCIT that… Okay. Am I still here?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes you're here, carry on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Temporarily you were here, but you're gone now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Have we lost Olivier temporarily?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. He cut out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I'm going to have to come back into the AC room, it's playing up badly for me. Grumble, grumble.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	People are we dialing in back? Okay.
GISELLA GRUBER:	Sorry. Heidi, Gisella here [? 0:10:34] thank you. We are just… Gisella here. We're just [? 0:10:44] to get him back online.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okey-dokey. Is it an upper case "L" or a lower case "L"?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Lower case "L." [Laughter]
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	I'm back.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Hey.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. So that [CROSSTALK 0:11:01] has not arrived for some reason. Where are we now? [CROSSTALK 0:11:05]… No but the WCIC, so the

WCIC, that's still pending. And then the revised ALAC rules of procedure is to be translated, that's still pending as well I believe, this is in progress.

And then the newly assigned action items, Olivier is to follow up on the drafting team on the straw man proposal TM plus 50 derivations. I have followed up and email Robin Gross with the copy to the different members of that team. We haven't had any reply yet, unfortunately.

Olivier is to begin that discussion regarding ALS accreditation on the ALAC mailing list with a possible view to form a taskforce. There has been some discussion on this, and in fact we'll be speaking about this a little bit later on during this ExCom call.

Matt Ashtiani is to ensure that the first draft of the ALAC statement, FY 14 draft operating plan and budget is posted to the corresponding workspace, that's been done. And the… Is the FDFC notified? I think that all of the ALAC was notified by email. Perhaps there also needs to be a note to the…

MATT ASHTIANI: This is Matt. Yes they have.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They have, oh perfect Matt, thank you. And finally, so that is completed as well. And finally Olivier is to work with staff on a decertification vote, wording process and implementation. In fact, Alan has been dealing with the wording, and we'll be speaking about this in a moment.

Any comments regarding this? I see Alan putting his hand up. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Not quite on the subject, but related to the last bullet on open ones, on the ALAC rules of procedure. Heidi, regarding the decertification wording for the adjunct document, I'm assuming you haven't heard back from Sam. Can we assume that a slight heading change is okay?

And I can issue the motions on this? And if we have pull back, we'll pull back.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Alan, I'm sorry I didn't follow up on that. I'll get to that, that's on my list today.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you want me to wait until I hear from you?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It should be mid-morning.

| ALAN GREENBERG: | Okay. I can't imagine a heading change will trigger a Board review, but I sure hope not anyway but thank you. |

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thanks very much Alan, and thank you Heidi for this. Let's move on then. Let's go for the items for discussion, if no one else wishes to pursue the action item. Okay good. Let's have a look directly at 3B, the statement or endorsement currently being developed and reviewed or voted on by the ALAC.
	The first one, the FY 14 draft operating plan budget. Tijani has kindly put a statement together. It's not a very long statement, it's quite short, just pointing out a number of things. Somehow finding that we shouldn't really spend too much time on this.
	And I have to record my disappointment with the process in that the data submission, the closing date for this comment period is the 21st of June. The Board has to vote on the full budget by the end of the month, that gives them less than a week to read any of the comments that's in there.
	I'm not quite sure how much of an impact the comments would make to…

| ALAN GREENBERG: | Olivier, it's better than a few years ago, when a comment period ended at noon and the voted at 1:00. |

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's good when you have institutional memory like Alan. I was the only one, I believe to submit a comment to that particular period. It may have actually be 52 hours, I'm not sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan for reminding us of this. In fact, I shall slap myself on the wrist then for having been a grumpy person and not being happy about the great improvement [laughs].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Absolutely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughter] Okay. Right. That will teach me, that will teach me. Okay. [Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: …they don't know when they are going to vote. They could do this on one hour too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that's the first one. I think that we'll submit it as is. It's open for comment at the moment. I'm very happy with it. There is one point in there which notices something to do with the ATRT 2 professional

EN

service being only $37,800. In fact, this matter was discussed on the ATRT 2 call yesterday, and an explanation was given.

Which [laughs] I didn't find too convincing, it's software problems and things [CROSSTALK 0:16:07]…

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, Denise sent around a note saying it's 90,000 not 37, so…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: She said it was 90,000 but 37 only shows up on the budget, and I thought that when you actually present a budget to the community, the number is the actual number not another number.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can point that out [laughs].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So maybe, Tijani if you are on the call, maybe yes I hear you. Tijani please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you Olivier. You're right regarding the short time between the closing of the public comments and the working group of the budget. But this year, a special year. I think that the next year, the upcoming years will be better because you have all our time to do the process as it was planned before.

So I don't think we have to blame them for this year. Regarding our statement, today is the deadline for submission to the public comments, I don't know how we will proceed. Shall we have a vote? Shall have it after submitting the statement? I don't know. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Yes today is the dead line for the initial closing date. There is a reply to those to date on the 31st of, sorry, 21st of June. And so we will be submitting our statement in the reply period. So they effectively, the call for comments opened yesterday for the At-Large community, closes on the 7th of June for the At-Large community.

And then the vote would take place for the 9th until the 16th, and the date of submission would be the 17th of June. Which at the end of the day, is ever so close to the end of the period. Yes, Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. The reply period is to reply on the other comments, and I don't think our comments will be kind of reply for the others. So perhaps we, we should perhaps submit our comments now, and add the comment. And then the statement would be voted later and sent later, if you don't mind.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I thought that because we are in the case for several statements at the moment, we are in the reply period. I thought we would use our right to be able to comment on anything and everything

at any time. If you do believe that because of the fact that we are submitting the statement in the reply period, it will not be taken into account, then I'm open to suggestions about this.

Matt, I noticed that you put your hand up. After Matt, I would like to hear from others on the call regarding this. Matt Ashtiani please.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi this is Matt for the record. I just wanted to let everybody else on the call know that I submitted a note to the PC yesterday, stating that the ALAC would be submitting a statement during the reply period.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Super. So Tijani, does this…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, okay. But Olivier, if I may, to be considered it must be done in the comment period, inside the process of the public comment. And then we have the right to submit any statement at any time, so we can submit it later when we want.

But [? 0:20:13] now with the comments. And they will try to consider them, so perhaps we will have to take the advantage of this opportunity to make our comments inside the others.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are you saying Tijani, that they are going to compile the initial comments now? I'm surprised. I thought that they will wait until all the comments are in.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	No, the second period will be a period of comment, of [glide 0:20:47] of the comments. So the reply on the comments we complete the comment period, but the main comment period is this, is now. And I don't think they will have time to compile all the comments and to reply to comments in so short of time, to give it to the Board afterwards.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Very fair point. Alan Greenberg?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. Despite the best intentions of the ATRT 1 in recommending this, that is they accept all comments and will compile them. They have to go back and adjust them because of something they didn't consider, they will. But the very action of a reply means that they have to go back and change the summary if necessary.
	So whether they choose to do a jump start and do some of the compilation before the very end and then fix it, is a staff issue. There has been no case that I'm aware of that a comment submitted in the second period is ignored because of the timing.
	So I have no problem with submitting a draft and saying we're going to vote on it, but in… So far what Tijani has been discussing has never happened, and there is no indication that it's going to happen on this one. So…
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: …receive any way we want, as long as we get something submitted, and preferably said we voted on it before the end of the reply period.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. But you see on the contrary, I'm quite concerned about issuing a call for comments for our community on the 29th, and just giving them two days to come back to us. If we're going to submit the comment, it needs to be something in which our whole community has reviewed. So…

ALAN GREENBERG: If we submit the text now, it has to be, this is a draft which is still under discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, we're not. It's likely to change, and we've been different a number of times, where we submitted… Except when we are at the point of voting. But if we are at the point of still commenting, Sometimes we've had some drafts changing dramatically, and it would make an absolute farce of the ALAC if we were to submit a first comment and another one afterwards that goes directly against the first.

ALAN GREENBERG: And form my point of view, I don't think it's going to make a difference in terms of how it's treated by staff and the Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good. Thank you…

ALAN GREENBERG: We've never seen an example where that's the case.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Let's move on. The second one. The new GTLD Board committee consideration of GAC safeguard advice. The statement was very nicely drafted by Alan, and I've just put it, a few minutes ago, on the Wiki. And so that's open for consultation by everyone at the moment. I hope that Matt can send out the note as soon as possible.

It's interesting because it's actually been renamed for some reason. So the first draft is in there, the timing is going to be as well, going to be out of date since the initial comment period closing date was the 15th of May. But they reply closing date is the 4th of June. That's a very, very tight thing. So what we will do on this, actually, is to close the comments on the 4th with at 12:00 UTC, and then start the vote, and submit this and follow up with the vote afterwards.

That's when we get the ratification vote. And that's been done in the past as well. The next one is, if I can go back to this. The next one is the proposed final 2013 RAA. The ALAC is voting on the drafted statement, and I'm glad to have seen so much discussion going on about the language through this.

It's a very important statement. The next one, the questions to the community on accountability and transparency within ICANN. I'm not sure how much impact we've had on this. I don't think the ALAC should

be drafting a statement, because we're going to meet with the ATRT 2 in Durban.   So that's a time when we can probably, if we prepare correctly, we could probably have a good structured brainstorming discussion with the people from the ATRT 2.

And finally, the statement on WCIT outcomes that's still in my pocket, it needs to come out at some point. The open public comments, WHOIS information status policy and it was decided to have no statement. Any comments on this? I see Alan has put his hand up. Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: On the ATRT, I really think we have to at least submit a brief, one paragraph thing, identifying the topics that are of major concern, and that we want to talk about in Durban. The meeting in Durban is likely to not be satisfying as we want. These meetings never have enough time to talk about things in depth.

So I think we at least need to identify the issues, and we can follow up with you. I mean, you and I know that the schedule for ATRT is such that, if we get something in by the end of Durban, then it's still going to be considered because that's where the discussion is going to happen.

But I think we need to go on record is identifying the issues that are important, at the very least.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. There was a statement, not a statement sorry. There was a text that was drafted by several members of the At-Large

EN

advisory committee, that was sent to the ATRT 2, and co-signed by those people.

And that's the one that asks for ICANN to assume its regulating function. I wonder where there is any traction for this to be included in a wider ALAC statement. I did ask the office whether they were interested in trying to see if there was support, but I didn't receive any feedback on that. Are there any thoughts here about this?

I know that several of the officers are on the call. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a thought. Having discussed in both open meetings and privately, there are number of issues with Ryan. The first questions he is going to ask on that comment is, and exactly what is the relevance to the remit of accountability and transparency?

And I'm not sure that that statement makes it very clear. And if we want ATRT to consider it strongly, I think we really need to tie the two together. There is a lot of problems with ICANN which have nothing to do with accountability and transparency. So I think that link has to be made clearly, because otherwise it is possible that the group will look at it and say it's really outside of the remit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. Anyone else? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Well, there seems like there is no traction to go with a natural longer statement than just identify what our main issues are. Does anyone have any suggestions as to what the main issues are for us?

ALAN GREENBERG:	On the ExCom, I already said I will send something out and I will. On the ALAC meeting rather.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	On the ALAC meeting, yeah. Okay. Good. Thank you. Let's move on to the next thing, the review of the ALAC meeting of the 20th of May. That's our last call. You've got the agenda that is linked to the current agenda. Is there anything that you would like to focus on specifically? That we think we haven't addressed.

This is going rather fast as a meeting today. I know that ALS decertification is something we will touch on in a moment. But a consensus call on the naming of the members of the At-Large objections follow up group.

Okay, I can just follow up and say that both Seth and Rinalia are in the objections follow up groups. The discussion of the GNSO work on policy and implementation. Not very much to report on this. RALO selections earlier results are requested, that that call has been made to all of the different RALOs.

Can I just ask Heidi a quick update, what's the follow up on this? Are things proceeding in all regions? Heidi or Silvia.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	This is Heidi. On the election so, let's see. We're getting to have… Okay. APRALO is voting already on its officers and ALAC members. AFRALO, Tijani we're going to be sending out a note to you and [?

EN

0:30:15] later today, announcing the ALAC schedule, officer schedules, suggesting that we start it on Monday.

EURALO, there is a schedule for the officer elections set, again we'll notify Wolf [? 0:30:32] … ALAC schedules. LACRALO, the same. Actually no, the officers elections are seated and we'll notify them today about the proposed ALAC schedule. And then their RALO, there's been some discussion on the schedule – it looks like they are going to go ahead and start very shortly.

I just need to confirm [? 0:30:55] …and Darlene, and when they would like to start it. It will be somewhat in tune with the others, I'm hoping the elections will still end before at least the end of the Durban meeting. That remains to be seen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you. Thank you very much Heidi. Actually, may I take the opportunity at the moment to mention that you and your team are doing an excellent job. I know you've got very little bandwidth at the moment, there is so much going on.

And I'm asking everyone on this call if in your region there is anyone who is placing high demands on staff and thinking why they are not getting their answers back within two minutes or two hours, then that's because staff is currently quite overstretched.

So I would appreciate if we don't make too many demands on our staff at the moment, due to variance things and I think one of them is the fact that the Durban meeting is only a few weeks away, six weeks or something.

EN

So that's kind of very, very close to us. Let's continue through the monthly ALAC call, I don't think that there is anything else in there that we need to really look at specifically, but some of it is duplicated here, especially the mid meeting schedule, etcetera.

I'm a little concerned just with regards to the At-Large working groups. Some working groups are putting… You know that we're running actual reports during the ALAC, but then some working groups are not finding any monthly update, or bi-monthly update as to what the working group has been up to.

It's a bit hard for newcomers to keep track of this. It would be good, if you are a member of the working group, or if any of you are chairing some of the working groups to check if it is up to date, that would be pretty good. Okay.

And next, let's continue on this.

WOMAN: Olivier, Rinalia has her hand raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh I see Rinalia. Yes, okay, go ahead Rinalia please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. During the ALAC meeting there was a discussion between Alan and Carlton, about the user experience study on the activation NCLD, and implications on users. I have been in touch with

Edmond, because I know that he wants to be a part of that, and he has drafted something.

And I've seen it. The challenges that it is not in the format of a response to the questions that were posed. So I think that I have to do a little bit of work within first before I can note that through the IDN working group, and the ALAC. So I think that we, because the deadline is the 1st of July, it will be done sometime in June.

That's just an update expected. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Rinalia. That's very helpful. That's good. I see that there is movement on that as well. And of course, one thing I do have to mention on the filing of the IDN and variance, and TNCH and variance statement that we completed at this month.

There has been a reply, direct reply from Crocker, the Chair of the Board. They're considering this, working on it. So it's been acknowledged and I have asked in my cover note, that we get a reply from the Board specifically on this since it is an important statement.

We also have a new form of front page, which we have pioneered with this one. There is a slightly different format to the statement, the statement staff first page, and it includes a little summary that are developed in the statement itself. Just a few handful of lines, I invite you all to have a look at them.

Right. Any other comments, or questions, or suggestions, or follow ups on the ALAC monthly call? I see Julie Hammer, please go ahead Julie.

EN

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Olivier. Just wondered whether you wanted to, from the issue that was raised, Jean-Jacques during meeting with the ISOC in Beijing, there was an action item on that which was embarrassed to admit at the meeting last time, had completely missed my attention.

The action was to look into possibility of sending a joint working group to, a bit packet inspection. I went back and looked at the transcript and what we actually discussed about that. And it wasn't really clear in that list discussion what aspect of JPI Jean-Jacques was interested in looking at.

So I think at this stage, we don't really have enough perspective on possible scope of that topic of discussion to go ahead and look at pulling together sort of a working group, and I guess some are just looking to the ExCom for some views on [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 0:37:06]…

Hello? [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 0:37:14]… Sorry. Can everyone hear me? [CROSSTALK 0:37:29]… I don't know what that noise was. So…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …ear wax, but that's fine.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. So I guess in considering this action item, something we might want to consider if the issue of DPI a high priority for the ALAC, and if it is then – if who is interested in this issue in addition to Jean-Jacques, and even if we aren't interested, do we feel we have the capacity put some effort into this topic at this point in time?

EN

Is it something that we want to spend time to discuss with SAC in Durban? And I guess in relation to that too, I am conscious that the F SAC itself and the members, very [? 0:38:41] in their commitment at the moment with all of the work going on in new gTLD in name space collisions and so on.

So I guess I'm really looking to the ExCom for some guidance as to whether to finally move forward on this action item, or to just leave it to one side for the time being.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julie. It's Olivier again. I'm just wondering whether the DPI is in ICANN's mandate, or remit, and I wonder. My suggestion would be to maybe for you as our liaison to ask the F SAC whether they believe the DPI is in ICANN's remit, and ICANN's mandate.

And I see a lot of people having their hands up. So maybe I should first open the floor to others, and then… Yes Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: May I just make one other comment before hearing what others think. I think DPI is quite a broad topic and Patrick alluded to that in that meeting. And some aspects of it are probably within ICANN's mandate, but other aspects may well be. So I think it would be important to understand the scope that Jean-Jacques was actually thinking about.

So I'm interested in hearing what others think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thank you Julie. Next is Alan Greenberg, Carlton, and Cheryl. So first Alan Greenberg please.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I thought Cheryl was first. I…
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Cheryl was at the bottom, she appeared and then disappeared. Okay.
ALAN GREENBERG:	What Julia just said. What Julie just said, sorry. I don't think at this point we should, at this point we should to the F SAC to ask them. The person and people who propose it, there was Jean-Jacques and a number of people who supported him.
	I think the onerous is on them, as I said in the ALAC meetings, for them to identify the aspects of de-packet session, that they think are in ICANN's remit and we are, involvement. It's surely an interesting subject, and relevant to many of us in many aspects of our lives, in a reality we're not going to stop regardless of what ICANN is going to say.
	But I think the people who proposed it have to explain what aspects of it they believe are within ICANN's remit, and to help make the justification for why we should be spending time on it. I think that's the order it has to be done in, not booting it to the F SAC to let them give the opinion. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very Alan. I see agreement from Julie on this. Next is Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Olivier. This is Carlton Samuels for the record. I was about to say that I don't think really it should be going back, I agree with Alan, to the F SAC to ask their opinion. What it should be is for those who thought it might be a useful thing to look at to explain why we think it is.

I'm not speaking for Jean-Jacques or anybody else, but for me personally, if you look at the packet inspection as one of the areas in which the government's attempt to [? 0:42:32] and look at what's happening on the internet. If you could make the case that in so far that is generic, and I use the word generic wisely, and topic.

The remit of stability and security immediately comes into play because one of the things that usually happens is that when people are trying to [? 0:43:07]… on the internet, it may have unintended consequences. To me, it's good to explore what kinds of unintended consequences may be. One of them that you may think of in our context, is the ossification that comes with [? 0:43:32] for example.

That's certainly… If I know I'm going to be surveilled [sic], than one of the things that I might do is to fight very hard to cover my tracks, and create a record that is nonexistent. That to me is just one possible response. And so I would want to hear from people what they think the response, a reaction is an equal and opposite reaction.

EN

What they think the reactions might be and how those reactions might in fact decrease the stability and security of the internet. That's my thinking on it, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Carlton. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, because Alan has hand back up and not too much of what I wanted to say has been recently been said by others, might say that everything I wanted to say [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 0:44:31]…

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you say it anyway Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no, no, go ahead Alan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry this is Evan. Sorry to butt in. Just to let you know, I've just joined the call and I'll be putting myself on mute because I'm walking around.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Evan, thank you, welcome. Alan first and then Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was actually going to be checking something while Cheryl was talking, so I'll speak without checking first. My recollection is we, ICANN has the remit of security and stability of the DNS, not of the internet.

So perhaps we need to be a little bit careful about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record. And yes Alan you are absolutely, as is often the case, correct in that. Yeah look, what I wanted to quickly say was Julie, I think this is one of those topics that, because there are so many passions in the At-Large Community, we're going to have to bite off into enough little bits and chew over the parts that are relevant to ICANN.

I'm not sure that it has to be done post haste. I think it's a very reasonable, it seemed to suggest that we had a small sub team, and obviously Jean-Jacques has one or two others, would obviously like to come over to frame a specific set of areas or key points where the issues of the packet session do have a clear nexus, if not absolute relationship, with the very narrow remitters of ICANN.

What is that is done, and if that is done by Durban, than we can talk about it in Durban. But if it isn't done by Durban, than we can talk about it between Durban and Buenos Aires. And once we have a proper framed, what we like to lose is, and we would like to have a conversation about type questions, and then that can go forward.

If strikes me that this is one of the topics that means that a 60 or 90 minute session even in the wider Atlas Two activity. So I don't think it needs to be rushed, I think it can be a pot that's put on a very slow

simmer, but we do have to get the recipe right. And I think that's enough one metaphor for one conversation, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And there are so many similes in a single discussion. Thank you. [Laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if I can just lower my hand, I'll be right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, thank you very much everyone. I think we've had plenty of discussion on the DPI thing. Let's just see what aspect of DPI Jean-Jacques and the people who are in support of this point would suggest looking at, and then we'll have to look at this again and be quite careful to make sure that it is within ICANN's remit.

There is one misunderstanding about the DPI, is that it's only de-packet inspection, it's not information tampering. There are ways, these days, to basically take a packet, change the information inside of it, and reinsert it in the stream.

And when one looks specifically at [CROSSTALK 0:47:57]…

ALAN GREENBERG: …interesting to me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: When one looks specifically at the DNS, for example, a DNS request you send the DNS request, you would have a name that then asks a name server, the name server comes back with a record of an IP address.

That IP address, that record, could be changed and therefore you might think that you are on your bank's website, and in fact it has changed that DNS request and sent you to a totally different website, which is a fake bank website. And using DPI of course, that could be something that could be used politically.

I don't think we should aside from the fact, but certainly the technical effects are an important thing. But let's see how this is dealt with. Julie and then…

MALE: …could I…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …move on. Carlton, sorry, then Julie and then Alan, and then we have to move on.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I just want for the record to, for what you said there, to be recorded because that is the [? 0:49:04] of my concern. That man in the middle possibility, and that speaks to the DNS attach, the DNS stability, that I thought was a bit interesting to look at. Thank you very much Olivier for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Carlton. Next Julie Hammer.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. Julie Hammer. I was just going to summarize, Olivier, I will to see them by contacting Jean-Jacques and in the first instance, working with him to tie in, put some words that can then be sent out and I'll take your guidance on who they should be sent out to, to see who is interested in coming up with a scope that we might then look at within ALAC.

And then decide what aspect of that scope may or may not involve F SAC. So I will contact Jean-Jacques to take this to the next stage if you're happy with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you. And with a note, if one looks at the societal benefits, or the effects of the DPI, the societal effects of the DPI, that's probably outside ICANN all together, in dealing with societal effects we're looking at the technical. Next Alan Greenberg, and then Rinalia, and we're going to have to move on. So Alan please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to point out that both Olivier and Carlton, we're moving into a discussion of the subject instead of being an executive committee if the subject should be looked at and who are, so careful. It's a fascinating subject, we could spend hours on it, let's not try to do the work…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] thank you Alan. I think we're just trying to provide a guideline as to what kind of work could be allowed, and for Julie to be able to go out and perform her liaison work. Rinalia Abdul Rahim to close on the subject.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. Rinalia for the record. In the likelihood that it becomes apparent that the DPI fall under the F SAC's remit, it would be useful if a suggestion can be made to Jean-Jacques and the fringe that support it, the suggestion on other forum where he can raise the issue.

Because it is a concern to consumer. It's a worthwhile issue to pursue, it's not okay to say, "Well, there is no forum for dealing with it in ICANN." That's the end of the story. That's not sufficient in my opinion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. Yes, let's take note of this and make sure that in the response, if not within ICANN or if not within the ALAC, then which way to go. Good point. Right. Let's move on then.

I think we have pretty much looked over the whole of the last ALAC call, and let's look at the next agenda item. And that's the ALS decertification. We just have five minutes for this. Staff has done some work since it looks as though there were a lot of strings, lose strings with regards to ALS decertification.

And I've actually identified four ALSs now that officially gave their, well two of their, three of which gave their resignation, and never were

actually decertified. One is [Alpha Ready 0:52:57], one is the National Consumers League, one is the Internet Society of Pakistan, and one is the Internet User's Network.

I just want to inform you I guess, that we'll probably have to follow the procedure and conduct a vote on each one of these. Staff [CROSSTALK 0:53:19]… Sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Alpha Ready] was voted on when it happened.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well then we need to have some institutional memory because that's not what I'm told by staff. So first Alan Greenberg and then Cheryl… [CROSSTALK 0:53:34]…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Can I go into the queue too? It's Evan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh Evan, yes sure. [CROSSTALK 0:53:44]… Yes, thank you. Yes Evan you'll be in the queue. So we'll have Alan, Cheryl, and then Evan. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think Bo [? 0:53:53] organization should be in that list also, which he had said when he was [? 0:53:59] many times, the organization no longer exists. There are no people, there are no emails,

EN

there are no nothings. I was very disturbed by a number of comments on the mailing list the other day, I'm afraid Carlton issuing one of them, which basically said that if an ALS was only awake for one day a year, that's still a valid ALS.

I…

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, no, no, no. You totally misinterpreted what I said. What I mean by [LAUGHTER]…

ALAN GREENBERG: Than you need to write clearer.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, no, it's very clear. What you have done is that you have internalized it to mean something else. What I'm saying is that some of them only takes it once a year, and therefore it takes a little while longer to exact what it is we need to do to get them decertified.

I was cautioning a more deliberative approach.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. Nevertheless, I think we need to socialize are that we've had since day one for what an ALS is. I mean, [Sala 0:55:02] made the comment that, "Gee, if those are the rules we're going to have decertify a lot of ALSs." Well, the answer is maybe.

EN

But it's better if we do it, then if someone on the Board charters a group or hires someone to check out on how relevant our ALSs are, so that some of them don't really exist. I'm just supporting the move to start doing something about this sooner rather than less.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Although I support the concept of what Dev said on making sure we use due process, I would hesitate to put things in like a 90 day waiting period. I'm not sure we have the luxury on those, and I don't think that it's required on the ones that are certified dead and buried. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I was actually surprised by a 90 day waiting period, because of the fact that there was a 90 day accreditation period. When I thought the 90 day was actually the maximum amount of time that could be taken, and as a measure of service to say that any application would be dealt with fast enough.

So on the 90 day period it's bizarre. So next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just… The only reason I think I had my hand up, but if I do, I shouldn't be. I was just saying that I will stretch my memory and try and remember exactly what teleconference we agreed to accept their resignation.

EN

Carlton you might be able to assist me with that. You were still secretary of the LACRALO when that happened. It was your last term as secretary. Your last term of secretary was either in September or October. So what year were you?

CARLTON SAMUELS: It was 2009.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 2009, that's right. It must have been…

CARLTON SAMUELS: But your recognition is absolutely right Madam Chair.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: We did have a [? 0:57:13] vote to accept the resignation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Look to September or October 2009 then. [CROSSTALK 0:57:23] … have to go backwards…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Please follow up on this. I see Heidi says in the chat that the announcement was made on October 2009. So okay…

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Heidi, you're on the ball.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's task follow up with you on this. It says yes, but there was not a vote according to Heidi. So please just follow up after this call, we're not going to be able to resolve this right away but we need to align our ducks in order before we proceed forward. Next is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. Thanks Olivier. Can everyone hear me okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes very well.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay great. All right. Two comments, one of which is based on this conversation and the other one is something that I've been meaning to say for a while. On this conversation, the 90 issue essentially, I have no problem with what's being suggested.

In that we should be quick to certify and slow to decertify. I don't have a problem with that as an overall point of view. But in general, one of the things I noticed as a mistake of what we're doing, is we're lumping everything together and what I'd call the voluntarily decertification and the involuntary ones.

The voluntary decertification are the ones like [0:58:27], and ones like Bo's, where they came forward and they said, "We don't exist anymore,

EN

please decertify us." And this is done with the consent and understanding that the people that did the application in the first place.

If we had a specific thing that says, "In order to be decertified, send us a letter that states this, that indicates that you have the support of the membership and/or…" That says certain certifications this has to be said in a letter that is sent to ALAC, and based on that the accreditation should happen fairly straightforward and without much controversy.

The issue where we have problems, is when we are decertifying because a group cannot be reached, and that's the point where things like the 90 days and so on come into play. I don't have a problem with a slow deliberate process to do everything possible to make sure that an ALS is no longer functioning, and…

So I don't have a problem with things like the 90 days idea or anything like that, the kind of due diligence after going to ISOC and finding out what their status is, as was the case in ISOC Pakistan. I mean, I don't have a problem with these deliberative issues, as long as they don't get in the way of like [? 1:00:08], where I believe he's been coming back to us and said, "Look, I asked you to decertify us, we don't exist, you have me on board as saying that. What's taking so long?"

So I think we don't need to treat them all the same way, and maybe our problem is that treating them all the same way. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. I certainly can agree absolutely with you, and it is frustrating to see some of the debates that went on lumping everything together. There are some special cases of course, you might

EN

have someone who was the ALS representative, who have been kicked out of the chapter of the organization, and wishes to come down and destroy the organization by having, by asking it to be decertified.

But these are special cases, and of course, there needs to be maybe a process to receive the decertification request, and then afterwards find a way to make sure that this still is the right person, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. But we're not going to design this whole process here. I see Alan and then Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I support everything Evan said. I think it's relevant. I think when we come to rewriting, and we need to do it really soon, the decertification rules, I think that's one of the issues we need to address. I'll simply remind people that we have a time constraint.

We are going to be going to be a Board member selection process. There are a number of votes which might need to be taken by ALSs to follow through with that process. Some of the things require formal approval of an ALS, just to approve an extra candidate added in, a variety of directing votes and things like that.

And we may well have a quorum issue in some RALOs, if they have a large number of ALSs that don't really exist, but are going to be counted as long as they are that nebula status. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Next is Tijani. [CROSSTALK 1:02:25]

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes now we hear you, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you, thank you, thank you very much. This question of [? 1:02:37] is very important for me, to address that. If it is critical to certify or to accredit an ALS, I think is more important and we have to be more careful about decertify any ALS.

I don't have any problem with everything, only one thing. I found that the main of depth was very wide. Yes we need the comment, yes it is not sufficient to have the call or Skype with [? 1:03:15] to tell please decertify us.

We need something formal, written. This is very important and this is what Dev has said.   And I think that everything we do has to be documented. And we have to be careful, we are not in a hurry. Yes I understand Alan that we have the election of the Board members, but I don't think this will justify any hurry in this matter.

We have to be careful, very careful. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I think we all agree on this call. Can I just ask Heidi whether the space for previously certified ALSs, whether that space is ready?

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Hi Olivier. I got the… This is Heidi for the record. I've put the link in the Adobe Connect chat. At the moment it's not very much filled in, we can start putting in information as we collect it on the various ALSs.
	I'm just, if I can get an agreement that we do add those [? 1:04:33] … to this list please?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Evan, probably have to ask you since you are in RALO?
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	Sorry. Okay. I would put Conservers Union in the same group as [? 1:04:50] and that we had an official request from Bo [? 1:04:53], who is still alive and probably still reachable, to say this is not this anymore please remove us.
	I don't think this is the kind of, well have they gone away? Consumers Union still exists, it's the web watch program specifically that doesn't, and I think it's possible for us to verify that. And I believe Garth is still in reasonable contact with Bo, and we need a letter from Bo basically saying it doesn't exist anymore, please decertify us.
	And we say this is the format of what the letter should say, I think we'll be able to get it. Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thank you very much Evan. And I note that, so we'll basically be storing all of the information on there. Just on question to you all, should this former At-Large structure workspace, the additional

information, should this actually be public? Or should this be protected by a password that all At-Large members, or all people have a password can reach?

The difference between one and the other is that one would actually be identified and indexed by Google, the other one would not. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I do think that we need a password.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You do?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Please put me in the queue.

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

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I guess I would argue in favor of openness. Number one, on general transparency issues. And number two, in the case of we're trying to

track down this ALS, but we can't find that. Having that information publically available, might be able to help us find people to step forward where we didn't know they existed, they didn't know we existed.

So being open in that respect, they actually help us try to make contacts that we didn't know existed at ALS that we think are dormant, but they may not think so because they had a change of leadership and the new leaders don't know what's going on.

So that's my argument in favor of openness, not to mention just keeping with general transparency issues. If you think of this, there is other organizations. ISOC has this rejuvenation process which I believe is also pretty open, so there are precedencies for this kind of thing.

And I guess I would error on the side of openness, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Next is Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. A question and then a comment. You say password, is that different from saying the pages are only accessible to ALAC members? I've never seen the concept of a password in…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The page is only accessible to those people… It's Olivier here. The pages are only accessible to those people that would login.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay fine. It's not a password for the page, but you have to login to confluence, and then be authorized, okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct yeah. And this is not only restricted to ALAC members, of course, because you do have a lot of people that are not ALAC members that have passwords, they have accounts to be able to…

ALAN GREENBERG: No. But we can setup access, rules that only ALAC members get on I think, I hope.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. I was not going to suggest that only ALAC members would get on this. I was just going to ask whether it… Effectively I was asking, do we want this to be indexed on Google or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's the bottom line.

ALAN GREENBERG: My overall comment applies then, regardless of the mechanism. We have gotten into hot water by publicizing due diligence. And we've had our hand slapped and told not to do that. At least not to do with the whole document unless it is parts of it redacted.

EN

Let's make sure we don't fall into the same problem here again here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. You said more or less what I wanted to say. The password doesn't mean that only the ALAC members will access it. It is public for all people who have password. I think that during the process of the decertification, we needed to be protected.

To have it on the space, for people who have password. When the decertification is done, in this case, everything will be public in the public space. That's my point of view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I should point out Google gets passwords for an awful lot of things, so having a login on confluence may not be enough to stop it being, just to presumed it won't be indexed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, even if it's indexed by Google, if you then click onto that page and do not have a password, you can't actually consult the page. Google will not actually cache it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All I'm pointing out is, we had our hand slapped before on similar issues, let's be careful this time.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. This is Rinalia for the record. Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes I can hear you, go ahead.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. I'm trying to envision what the site would look like for the decertified ALSs. And I think, for transparency, could be a problem. And the reason why I say that is if we have to, in a way, restrict the information that we put in terms of what goes behind the reasons for decertification.

For example, if you can imagine a page that lists [? 1:10:40] organization, next to it would be a column that says, decertified, and it would list as one specific request for decertification and it ends there. But for some ALSs, they have really been [? 1:10:53] with the – that may not be good publicity for them, and they may not want that to be transparent people outside of the internal circle of ALAC members.

So I think that the general class or category of the decertification can be made public, but the details of it should not. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. Tijani, you still have your hand up.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. The next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is Cheryl for the transcript record. Just following on from Rinalia. Yes I couldn't agree more, I was taken aback but I'm taken about often by what I hear in some of these calls, about it being a page decertified. I actually think that whole concept is blatantly unnecessary.

The one place that we have, all be it not necessarily kept it totally up to date. A repository of every single At-Large structure application exists, than that's a good thing. It's all about transparency and it's time. It exists from the moment that the ALS puts in its application, and it is updated in places through this process.

When an At-Large structure is either not certified, or certified, it gets a note on the bottom of that file, which is public and searchable on the internet, that says it is stage seven certified or not certified. All we need to do is have stage seven, or stage eight if you want a new stage, that says decertified, and do not go into any more gory details than that.

The transparency is there, the accountability is there because the processes can be looked at, if you need to. But there are no gory details because these can be highly contentious and inflammatory otherwise. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. And you know, I'm hearing a lot of different points of view, all of which I find very interesting indeed. I don't think we actually have a consensus on this subject specifically. My personal point of view, having been on the receiving end of abuse due to theoretically or perceived information that could have been – that would be confidential or would actually have a nature that might hinder once chances to find a job afterwards.

Was that I was going to have this information available, but behind passwords so that if those people would wish to get hold of this information, especially for the record, that if anyone from that organization comes up later on and says, "Oh by the way, we used to be here. Why are we not here? Can we apply again? When we will be gone as leaders of this community and have replacements of people."

It would be interesting, or it would be good for them to be able to have access to that information and to that history. I'm just concerned about the historical side of things. Already we can see that we have organizations that were decertified that no one knew about, or at least that decided to leave and/or disappear over time, and no one knew about.

I'm really concerned about the loss of institutional memory here. And this really is the solely for the loss of institutional memory. Cheryl again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just to say in response. Could I encourage, and perhaps it could be done on a shared screen if it's important now, do it now. If

EN

not, I suggest we do it at another point in time. But what you all need to do is literally go to the, on this Wiki site, go into the Wiki site, go into the list of ALSs, take on any ALS you choose from number zero to number 77, doesn't matter which one.

And that record exists, that is a cradle to grave record. If you are going to remove all public information about the state of the ALS certified or un-certified, and its process of being certified, than that's an entirely different argument, and I had a horrible argument that you were heading down that pathway a little bit, that's why I put my hand up.

But you do already have in existence is a very simply archive which, on a single line on the bottom of every single one of them, is the status, only that the status needs to be changed. With a date, and a reference link if you want to, but that's entirely different to having all of those gory details out there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. The question though I have for you, and let me just go onto that page. So let's look at the dot HAIV for example…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just pick any damn one that you like.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we have the application as an At-Large structure [CROSSTALK 1:16:34] …sheet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: …at the bottom, only should have the status. Stage whatever should be written at the bottom. If it's not…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All I see is the application itself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, well then [? 1:16:49] number nine, let's use [? 1:16:50], then you've got one that's concerned about was giving wrong information. [CROSSTALK 1:16:59]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …last one. I'm just concerned that this list is completely out of date.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The system that was originally put together hasn't been maintained…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, yeah. [CROSSTALK 1:17:13]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: How it is supposed to happen is how it was happening. If it's not still happening that way, well I'm sorry it's not my fault, but I suggest you go back to the way it was meant to do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Cheryl, I note what you have here, yes, I clicked on Alpha Ready, and that's got the full details.   And I also note that it's on a

EN

www.atlarge.icann.org website, which is the one that needs to be dynamited.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It doesn't matter where it comes from, what I'm saying is that's part of archive that was supposed to happen as a result of the ombudsman report, and all of the things we implemented.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thank you for this, because I was not aware of that, and I think staff should look at this before proceeding any further, we need to look at this quite carefully. [CROSSTALK 1:18:07] Good.

Well I note that it's not being done on any of the other ALSs, so we're going to have to follow up on this and the difficulty is that it's on the At-Large site, which is an absolute mess. [CROSSTALK 1:18:23]… possible to update more than just updating one or two pages a month.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, that archive in that file, those sets of files, needs to be brought across to a proper site and place in a new web page anyway. When and how that's done, let's make sure Matt sets it up in such a way, that how those forms are supposed to be permanently maintained, is the way it is maintained.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's just hope that Matt doesn't retire and play with his great-great grandchildren by the time we actually get that done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He needs an understudy, [? 1:19:00] standard operational procedures to make sure anyone who does the job does it right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rinalia please. Rinalia Abdul Rahim. Let's move on. I think we have to shelf this for the time being. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. I just want to say a few short things. I really like what I saw in terms of list of the ALSs, I think that it's exactly the way that it should continue to be done. And it's very clear in terms of the steps, the number of steps or decertification, etcetera.

I like what Cheryl is advocating in terms of the status of decertification it can even be done. I have one request, and that is to please not list the ALSs by the number of which they are accredited, but rather alphabetically.

Because the numbers, people cannot remember that. The people remember the names. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we can color code them and priority sort them, so that the active ones [CROSSTALK 1:20:07]…

ALAN GREENBERG: I point I thought we could filter them and sort them online. I'm not sure that [? 1:20:12] is there anymore or….

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No you used to be able to Alan, because there was the seven stages and you could sort by stage, but that may come back when they report from the crop.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's move on. Just before closing this, I want to ask this group whether you believe there needs to be a working group looking at this because Alan did say, certification/decertification, can we punt this to a small ad hoc taskforce or working group that would work on this?

And I'll ask Alan specifically your dealing with the rules of procedure and the adjunct documents. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is yes, but please, please do not announce it until we approve the current set of rules. We need to get those on the books and then change them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah I agree. I agree totally. But I was going to suggest that we actually own it, the executives could own it because the key people who need to be involved are actually your executives anyway.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: That may well be true, but let's not make any formal announcement that we are doing this because otherwise people will say let's prefer doing the approval until we change the rules, and that requires Board approval. It's going to take many, many months.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I couldn't agree with you more Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's a good point Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And hopefully I will have an answer from Heidi today, and then we'll start tomorrow, or Monday or something.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Let's move on then. Let's go back to our former agenda. Let's have a look. The next one is the review of the At-Large meeting schedules and agendas for the 47th ICANN meeting in Durban. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much. I'm going to just focus on three issues. This is Heidi by the way. We've seen now, staff has seen the draft meeting schedule. The good news is that on Monday there was some fantastic meetings that the community At-Large is going to want to go to.

Literally in the morning, there is a long applicants, or focused agenda or meeting, a lot of interesting topics on the agenda. The other piece of good news is that for the first time, I have been asked by senior executives to ensure that members of At-Large come to their meetings, or certain meetings, which I have never done before, which is kind of the key to your success.

The bad news is that there is going to be a lot of conflicts, particularly on Monday. Everyone could please go, I just want to focus on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday very quickly. You'll see on Monday that I had to start our day very early. I'm going to go ahead and put Monday onto the workspace, in the Adobe Connect.

So Carlton the first change really affects you. Yeah, so it's going… The meeting on the regular [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:23:25] which is Monday. So the regular [? 1:23:31] meeting, I had to move that up just from 7:30 until 9:00, right before the walking ceremony. It's the only way I could fit everything in.

So that's now 7:30 to nine, and followed by the welcome ceremony. After that, it's this fantastic [applicant 1:23:46] session, then there is a lunch session 12:30 to 14:00, Academy working group, [? 1:23:52] just approved that. I'm just waiting to hear back from meeting staff in connection during lunch.

I suspect we can. Then Rinalia, as I mentioned to you yesterday, I had to move back the multi-stakeholder policy round table from 14:00 to 16:00. I kept it two hours, but I'm just wondering, have I read correctly that there is only one panel now versus two? And if so, do you really

need those two hours? Because right now you're going through the 30 minute coffee break, which is sort of the no-no as well.

So Rinalia, if I could just ask you are you okay on that one? [CROSSTALK 1:24:32]…

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: This is Rinalia for the record. Two hours would be very good, given that we are covering a broad range of issues. We can try to do it in 90 minutes, but it is a stretch. But if we are running into coffee break, I think Heidi we can have the flexibility for extending it, no?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well [CROSSTALK 1:24:56]…want to have everyone over by the coffee breaks because…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You don't want to do that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. We'll try to do it within 90 minutes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay thank you very much. That will help a lot. So that will then end at 15:30, there will be a coffee break. What's coming immediately after that is a long session for the five year strategy for ICANN, and obviously had a request that we get as many ALAC people, At-Large members at that meeting, if possible.

So that's 35 minute session, [? 1:25:37]… yeah, that's 16:00 to 17:30, so that is a 90 minute session. We need to have as many people there as possible, then from 17:45, so it's the 10ᵗʰ Anniversary of GTNSO travel discussions. So that's why I had to move everything back earlier in the day.

I'm hoping that that ends around 18:30, I don't know Cheryl maybe you know more about that. [CROSSTALK 1:26:02] I'm sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It will be prompt yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. At 18:30, Johnny agreed that we can move the showcase starting at 18:30 to 20:00. So if everyone is okay with that, then that takes care of Monday. [CROSSTALK 1:26:21]… Yeah, so now the showcase is 18:00 to 19:30, but it might be later depending on when that [? 1:26:31] and…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that's the 13 or 14 hour day, that's lovely. After the Sunday, it's so great…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's what I was about to point out Olivier. That that extends that day to 14 hours. [CROSSTALK 1:26:47]

HEIDI ULLRICH: …asking for longer meetings. I mean, normally we have one hour meetings, and now most meetings are 90 minutes and two hours. That's what is happening. [CROSSTALK 1:26:58]… On Tuesday, just a really quick question. I've heard yesterday from the GAC support whether the ALAC would like to meet with the GAC.

So again very tight on Tuesday in the [? 1:27:13] here. So the only time that I can see on Tuesday, is within one of the policy discussions. So what that would mean, that we for example could shorten one of those policy discussion, ALAC policy discussion, one or two shorten one of those by an hour, and then have everyone go to the GAC room.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That would work.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If you are okay with that, I would suggest the policy discussion part two sessions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The afternoon one?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. The 14 to 15:00 one, just reduce that to one hour and have everyone else go over to the GAC, and that's possible 15 to 16:00.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that works. I mean, traditionally what we've actually had is to have a meeting with the Board, and then a meeting with the GAC, all in the morning. But of course we've got the meeting with the ATRT 2 on this time. So you know, let's do that.

But I'm just wondering… I'm concerned that by cutting our policy discussions, we're not going to be able to discuss some of these things, or we might have to add part three policy discussion at some other time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. A couple of points on that. This is Heidi again. But there is a long session on Sunday for hot topics, so that could be less open for policy topics. Yeah, it's an one hour session, 16:00 to 17:00. So that's more… You can actually say well that one hour we're losing on Tuesday is actually [? 1:28:44]…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: This is Evan. Can I get in the queue?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. First it's Alan then [CROSSTALK 1:28:52]… then we'll open the discussion up. Okay go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry Evan, I just need… I'll be on the call, but I'm not going to be on the computer in about two minutes. So on Thursday, a couple of things there. So right now we have a three hour wrap up session, which is

EN

eight to 11. Okay then we have 11 to 12:30, the DSSA with a no [? 1:29:20] here.

But also I was able to get Sally's stakeholder engagement session early in the morning, and that would be a conflict with the ALAC session. I was able to get that back to the 11 to 12:30 slot. But I'm just seeing this morning that there's a call and I can move that back to 9:00, it's going to be smack in the middle of the ALAC session.

So they don't know that the reason being is that you have that three hour session in the morning. So I think I can hold that back, but that means there is going to be a conflict of the DSSA and the stakeholder engagement.

Which I think is better than having a conflict with the stakeholder engagement and the wrap up sessions. So I'll let you discuss all of that. And I'll be on the call, but I'm not going to be on the computer for the rest of it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Heidi. I think you used the wrong word, it's not better, it's less worse. But then, whichever. Let's just open the floor. I see Alan and then Evan. So Alan Greenberg first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I hate to be the Grinch. Those that don't know the story of the Grinch can go look it up, but virtually all of the items that we have listed under policy discussion are process discussions.

EN

There is very, very little there that has to do with policy. IDM may be the only one, there may be something else that I've missed.

I find it regrettable that what we're supposed to be there for, at least a large part of it, is not what we ever get time for. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan, that's a very valid point. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually what I was going to say goes nicely with what Alan said. Now I'm not a Chair of the regulatory working group, I'm merely a member of it that wants to get actively involved. I think having it at 7:30 is going to be a massive mistake, you're going to have people straggling in late, you're going to have people straggling in tired after a long day on Sunday of ALAC work.

And I think it is a massive mistake considering that the regulatory working group is going to be a prime source of ALAC's actual policy work. And moving it to 7:30 I think is just going to be an awful mistake that is going to result in subpar production from a group that has to be [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:31:57]… thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can make it work but make it 7:30 on Thursday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] okay. Thank you Evan. Next Tijani Ben Jemaa.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, can I just ask as a follow up one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Heidi, you mentioned that there is this applicant group that we must not… This applicant meeting on Monday that we must not miss…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No its strategy group. Strategy. Society strategy for ICANN.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, no, no. But there was another… You mentioned another… You mentioned there was an applicant meeting. Sorry I'm not at the computer screen.

WOMAN: [? 1:32:36]…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry it sounded like applicants.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So what we could do, just while I have the floor really quickly, we could… If you don't want to start at 7:30, then we could… sorry. We could [CROSSTALK 1:32:54]… We could have the Academy group at the same time as the regulatory workshop.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Look I'm not a Chair, I'll defer to Carlton and Holly on this on the call. I mean, do you have an opinion on this? Or is this just, you know, I don't want to say anything that the Chair wouldn't want to do.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Well, if you see my note in the chat Evan, I had a difficulty with it but I was holding my fire until I hear from Holly.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm not in the chat, sorry.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah. I was not going to say anything right now because I wanted to hear first, I didn't want to prejudice the discussion with Holly. I was sending a note to Holly as I speak to ask her whether or not she thinks this is okay. Personally don't like it, if for the only reason that I, you know, let's [have a ship at the same time 1:33:51].

It's burdensome, and I don't wish to be burdened at this time in my life. But I'll wait on Holly to tell me something.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Carlton. Next is Tijani then Cheryl. So Tijani first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking for the call. Heidi, I remember last thinking in Beijing, we had problems at the end of each meeting because we start later than planned, and after our meeting there is

another meeting starting just after it. So [? 1:34:40]… and another group starting at 14 is not from my point of view doable.

So perhaps we have to think about some time, a slot of time between the end of meeting and the beginning of the other. I know there is a lot of meetings and they are longer and longer, but if we want the meetings to finish in the right way, we need this small time for the handover if you want. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, thank you Tijani. And I agree with you that there needs to be sometime, but really it's down to the meetings themselves to work themselves on maybe finish five minutes early, and let the others start five minutes late, so there is a ten minute slot to change from one to the other.

I'm concerned about having more time, because we'll end up going home at 10 PM.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier if I could just have the floor really quickly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so basically there is supposed to be a 15 minute break between sessions. There is just no way we can manage that because we're getting increasing requests for meetings, as well as longer meetings. So

simple math is that this cannot just happen unless we start earlier in the day. I mean, there has to be some choices I guess.

CARLTON SAMUELS: You're absolutely right. We need to cut our cloth to suit our coat. We are asking too many meetings. So we need to get back on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I was going to say something else to start with… It's Cheryl for the record. That I think listening to this last couple of conversation, I think you just might have to say no to the longer meetings sometimes. And I suspect that the request for longer meetings may in fact be a by-product of meetings starting later, because of the issues of transition which Tijani was highlighting.

I mean, having a 10, 15 minute break and making it a hard stop, might just have to happen to make future meetings successful. I would strongly encourage you not just to make a suggestion, but Olivier that all meetings mandatorily start five minutes, no later than five minutes after their advertised time and finish five minutes earlier than their advertised time.

I think you could go a long way to making more work be more productive. Because it will also force the chairs to manage their discussions a little bit more promptly. I wanted to ask a question, though, that's why I put my hand up. Is there a downside to, and I

didn't hear a response. Is there a downside to having the very important, I've just lost the word.

Oh dear, that's the problem. Regulatory, you wouldn't think that would be a word that I'd lose, regulatory work group running in parallel, or in partial parallel, with the ICANN Academy? The ICANN Academy was seeing an ICANN wide meeting I would have thought. [CROSSTALK 1:38:05]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's right. This is all down to the room scheduling, so I'll have to resort to Heidi to let us know on this one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If there is no downside, that seems to me to be the most appropriate solution. And Carlton if you're pinning a note to Holly, it's quarter past one in the morning in Australian time, make sure that that alternative is in there, because she like every other woman in the main name systems would want to be in the women in DNS breakfast, not that there is anything else on 7:30 on Monday.

So I think I know the answer to your question, and to pose a solution, a probably situation might also be wise. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Heidi?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. I'll note that.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: Really quickly. I think the room that holds the 14:00 won't be a problem, because it's one time, so multiple [? 1:39:04] meeting. But the issue might be interpretation. So I would need to… I could find out if there would be two rooms with interpretation available at that time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is the Academy working group interpreted?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes it is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is the… Does the regulatory work group need to be? It's an ALAC workgroup, what's the makeup in terms of regional input? Carlton, Evan, do you know?

CARLTON SAMUELS: No I don't know for sure Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Unless it's absolutely needed to be, I would have thought having an English and in the room as needs be Francophiles, working with Francophiles, etcetera, might be a better solution than having [? 1:39:52]

CARLTON SAMUELS: There is wisdom to what you say without knowing all of the facts.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We've got the suggestions, we'll follow on. Heidi, anything else on this? I'm mindful of the time and we are 15 minutes over already.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So again, just to confirm that you want the three hour wrap up sessions, because again that's… In the past, they've been two and the last couple of meetings they've been three, and you know, you're still using every minute of that.

So I'm just wondering if you still want to do a three hour session?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, Heidi if we have votes, then we do require the three hours…

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. That's fine… [CROSSTALK 1:40:36]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry to jump in there. Olivier, sometimes you already know at this point in time before a meeting that you're going to have a reasonable set of things to vote on. Are you aware of that schedule yet for Durban?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: At the moment, I'm not aware of any specific votes, but I do know is that we're in for a very noisy Durban meeting [laughs]. There are a whole lot of things that are coming to ahead in Durban. Some of which will be the response of the Board to the GAC and the, and a number of other things.

Also to do also with maybe the scheduling of the launch of the new gTLDs, which I've asked several people about, and still no one has a clue when the first ones will be launched, if they will be launched. There is a lot of unknown unknowns in there, that might require us to draft statements that would have to be voted on.

These are really the statements that have to be voted on. And as you know, we're just before the final wave of public comment period that suddenly arrived before the ICANN meeting, and so we are likely to also to have perhaps some statements that we have to really [? 1:41:59] them, in response to national security.

So we're just maybe… Ask me in two weeks' time, I'll be able to tell you. Okay. Thank you everyone. Let's… Is that all you needed to know Heidi? You know which way to run now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: [? 1:42:22] I have to go unfortunately, so I'll check up on what's going on next after the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. There will not be a recording for the next part for you, so I'll brief you separately [CROSSTALK 1:42:40]… you. Right. So in fact, what I would say is we'll have to continue working with Heidi on the movement of those session in Durban, because it looks to me like a nightmare already, and we are six weeks away from Durban.

The last meeting, things went to a head about three weeks away from Beijing, so it's not looking good at the moment. Last, or sorry [?

1:43:13] part of our agenda, the security studies on the use of non-delegated top level domains, and dot less names.

That's a part which Julie and I will be speaking to you about. However, what I would like to do is to hold this agenda item in camera, which effectively means no recording. And just the ExCom and staff on the call.

Looking at the current attendees on the ExCom on this call, I note that there are no people who are neither not ExCom or not staff. Is that correct?

[AUDIO STATIC 1:43:57 – 1:44:10]

JULIA CHARVOLEN: The recording is back on Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julia. So just welcome back. We had a short discussion regarding security studies that were asked by the Board on the use of non-delegated top level domains and dot less domain names.

There is a concern that with regards to dot less names, and perhaps also some aspects of the use of non-delegated TLDs, the information received form the ISOC was quite clear, and therefore it was decided that the Chair of the ALAC, IE myself, would be sending a letter to the Chair of the Board to ask for the Board rationale behind the launch of these new studies.

And that pretty much closes that agenda item, and we will now move over to the last bit of business. And that's any other business. Julie, you still have your hand up. Is this a new hand?

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, sorry. I'll put it down, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Just [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:45:31]… in the next week, should have been today, but you know how things are, once legal finishes with it, you will see an announcement, excuse me, for expressions of interest for the Chair elect of the 2014 nominating committee.

And I don't know whether the community, the ALAC and the At-Large community would have people who would consider suitable to put themselves forward. But in fact, I did want to just remind the ALAC and the At-Large community that the 2013 nominating committee has been run in fact by ALAC, and so it might be deemed politically expedient, perhaps not suggesting that people shouldn't put their names in, but I would not be crestfallen if the Board decision, based on Board governance committee, advice may not be…

We will not continue to expect Chair and Chair elect to basically come from ALAC and At-Large. So I just wanted to let you all know, that that announcement was coming out so that any of you who were interested

names, can put their expression of interest together, but at the same time point you have had a 2013 nom com that's seen chair and chair elect.

And indeed, if you look at the assistant Chair with Adam taking that, Adam Peek taking that role. He had a very strong guiding hand from the At-Large community this year, perhaps that shouldn't be expected to be the norm forever more. And with the announcement, you will notice something that is I think is relatively exciting, and I wanted you to all know that I am 100% is support of.

It actually is a call, because all future calls will be, we believe, written in this way, for expressions of interest for 2014 Chair, and Chair elect. So Olivier, have you got your head around that? The reason being, what we wanted to do, and [? 1:48:15] are in absolute agreement with the Board governance committee here, is in through the accountability and transparency nominating committee [? 1:48:24], and that includes its leadership.

Therefore in this June/July period, both [? 1:48:33] will be undergoing a proper 360 degree review process, and obviously whilst it is assumed that the Chair elect is the incumbent and will be concerned as the Chair of the following year, it is going to be a, in the future, standard operational practice.

It has been merit tested with a 360 degree feedback system before that actually happens. And I thought that would happen would all be rather pleased to hear that, particularly those of you who found the mysteries of what happen in a nom com a little bit challenging in the past.

So when you see the call for chair and chair elect expressions of interest, fear not. Read the whole document properly, there is an absolute presumption that I will be taking the mantle, unless for some interesting reason I totally fail a 360 degree review. And just to warn you, and this is the other reason for me bringing it up now in the any other business, because it should influence you as you make your selections for your nom com representatives, it is the intention of the Board governance committee.

And the presumed Chair of 2014 nom com, that in 2014 every member of the nominating committee will be having a 360 degree review, and that that will be available to the appointing communities as well. So.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Is this going to be publicized? The…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In an announcement, I'm surprised it's not out today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Because that's definitely something to mention those people that will…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry…

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: …on the nominating committee. Make sure that they know that they will be under…no?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Let me be really clear, that won't be in the announcement calls the expression of interests, and I agree while we were drafting that that would muddy the waters, but the nom com, this year's nom com will be told that when they meet, when Bruce comes to a meeting in two or three weeks' time.

So this year's nom com don't even know that yet. So it's a bit early to tell you all, I'm just giving you a heads up, so you will, as an appointing group, means that you've got an advantage now because you know standards will be applying from next year on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The question though is that I was asking you is whether the people who are candidates now for going on to the nom com, will those be told before they applied for the nom com, that they will be under 360 scrutiny?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Probably not, unless the note from the nom com meeting that we briefed this lot is made public in the report cards. What we can do is that once we… Let me deal with BGC on that. Because we were planning on discussing it publically in Durban, and of course they'll be appointed hopefully by Durban.

I might have to work directly with the Chairs of the different groups, the same as I am now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I just find that there is worth in actually informing those people who are going for the position that they will be subjected to a 360 review, because we might find that some people would be against that, especially if the 360 is made public.

So I understand the 360, the results of the 360 will be made public.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan. I'm sorry to interject here, but I really need to ask why this is being done as the executive and not in the full ALAC? There is nothing being said here that we got, and in fact should be brought into the entire ALAC. I don't know [CROSSTALK 1:53:01]…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: …would be happy to do that. We had this meeting. This has happened between the ALAC meeting and now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well the call is going on very long, and it's going on way off topic to something that is specifically…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay fine, if you find it irrelevant, that's fine…

EVAN LEIBOVTICH: No, no, Cheryl, Cheryl. It's not irrelevant, it's just really, really long. I'm about to cut out as I go into an elevator, and I'm just saying in combination of this meeting going really long and the subject should be in fact going to the entire ALAC, is just [CROSSTALK 1:53:52]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: …meeting, Olivier, and the timing of that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then you can add it. Okay, perfect. That's good that. Then let's have you for what? Ten minutes? Will that be enough.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, whatever.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Staff add that last, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just two comments. The news about 360 reviews will be made available to the appointing organizations, if not more public, is absolutely music to my ears. So I thank you for that. I hope that the people doing the reviews will be told to be exceedingly candid…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	In fact, they're independently run, we're actually the four governance committee, is employing a third party to do [? 1:54:19]…

ALAN GREENBERG:	I understand, but some reviews are done with the context of UK. If you can't say anything nice, don't say anything…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Oh no.

ALAN GREENBERG:	And I was hoping not in this case…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	That's certainly not the case Alan. And to that end, one would assume that in the 360 review of your nom com appointees, you as the appointing body, would also be putting someone in as a reviewer.

ALAN GREENBERG:	That's fine. My other comment is with regard to the three people who are instrumental in this year's nom com, coming from At-Large or ALAC, all of you have also had illustrious backgrounds in other parts of ICANN prior to that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you for noticing, but [laughs] I'm just saying I think you've had a great trifecta [CROSSTALK 1:55:06]…

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted and appreciated, but each of the three have also had histories outside of At-Large so thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's very true.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I just did raise my eyebrow when I heard the fact that maybe there would not be one more ALAC or At-Large person at the next Chair, or there might… It seemed that it's At-Large that's running nom com.

I mean, I would have understood if the job was not done correctly, but as I understand it the job was done correctly. So I just find it very bizarre that there is this [CROSSTALK 1:55:46] think is the word against people that come from At-Large. [CROSSTALK 1:55:50]

ALAN GREENBERG: …may not go down that well with the ATRT. [Laughs]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anyway. Let's just close this now. We're losing time, I know that it's been a very, very long call. Any other, other business from anyone? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I thank all of you for being on this call. We've done a lot of work today, so I really appreciate and I hope that you can have a good weekend after this, all of you.

EN

So good morning, good afternoon, and good night. This call is now adjourned.

[Various Goodbyes]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]