GG:	Lovely. I'd like to welcome everyone on today's APRALO monthly call on Tuesday the 28th of May at 0500 UTC. On today's call we have Holly Raiche, Pavan Budhrani, Yannis Li, Emani Fakaotimanava-Lui, Lianna Galstyan, Siranush Vardanyan, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Anupam Agrawal, Hong Xue, Satish Babu, Maureen Hilyard, Gunela Astbrink.
	We have apologies noted from Julie Hammer, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Ali AlMeshal, Suhaidi Hassan and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I hope I haven't left anyone off the participants list. And from Staff we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber.
	And if I could just remind everyone to please state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Holly.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you Gisella, and welcome everybody to the May APRALO call. We have a reasonably full Agenda. It's going to include a review of Beijing, it's going to review what's going on with elections, we have a lot on the policy plate, which Olivier will kindly talk about, in terms of policy.
	There are a couple of other Items, including looking at the budget and discussing where we want to go with the possibility of having a Sub-Committee there. There are an additional two Items that YJ put on the Agenda, although she's not here. And an Agenda Item in terms of my discussions with [APEEK? 00:01:52].

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

So with that said, welcome. And I think we'll start with a review of what happened in Beijing and what were our takeaways, and some moves forward. Could I start, Maureen, with you; just to review a couple of things of what happened? I'll add my own impressions and then people are welcome to add their thoughts from Beijing. But Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Holly. Maureen speaking, for the record. Just very briefly, it's really great to see so many of our ALSes on the call, as that was one of the purposes of the gathering in Beijing; having as many of our ALSes as possibly there, was to engage more ALSs in ICANN activities, especially our APRALO meetings, so it's good to see you here.

With regards to the fellowship and capacity-building sessions, which I collaborated with, as the main coordinator in our ICANN activities. We were keen to involve as much as possible about ICANN, without it being too much of an 'information overload', and I know… I mean, Janice does it all the time so she's got a pretty good idea of trying to keep a balance, and I hope we were able to do that for you.

But I must admit… And I think it's probably a good idea if Pavan could perhaps provide some input here because I've yet to get a copy of the reports that were sent to him by the ALSes following after Beijing, and I'd be very interested in how ALSes themselves feel that it went. Perhps Pavan could add something to it?

PAVAN BUDHRANI: Pavan here. Basically I reached out to all of the ALSes separately, using different platforms like Skype and Google Chat and email of course, and I was able to get, I think, around eight or nine of them who replied back with substantial, good reports and feedback.

And I've put them up on the Wiki, which the Staff have made a special Wiki for me on the APRALO page – I put it up over there. The others – I'll still reach out to them one more time, but I think so far it's quite good and it should help us looking forward to 2014 and the Summit in London as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Pavan, could I ask if there are any themes that came through? Not only what we did well, but what we may not have done well, so that at the next meeting we can actually beef up what we need to beef up, or continue to do what we did well?

PAVAN BUDHRANI: That's good, yes, I'll take a look because some of the reports were actually quite long, so what I'll do is I'll quickly go through them, and if there are any similarities between any of them I'll put them down in point form and send it to APRALO.

HOLLY RAICHE: That would be terrific. That would be really helpful.

PAVAN BUDHRANI: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. On capacity-building, Maureen, how did the capacity-building go?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Capacity-building as in the activities…   This is still related to Janice's program, and I guess I sort of needed to get some feedback from people as to how they felt. Perhaps, would it be possible to hear from some of the Members who are actually on the call at the moment?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd welcome that. Would anybody want to speak up about what was well done or what was not well done?

MAUREEN HILYARD: You can put your hands up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just put your hand up. I know that some of you were there. Right. Well, I don't see any hands, but maybe I could send an email out later saying, "please get back to Pavan." And Pavan, if you could have a little look, and please put in what you thought about the capacity-building, what you learned and what you would like to have learned. It would be really useful to see what to put in the next meeting.

PAVAN BUDHRANI: Sure, I'll try to reach that and do that as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: That would be terrific, because there may be some lessons to be learned. And I notice the fellowship has opened for…

PAVAN BUDHRANI: Wednesday.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Would anybody on this call be eligible? And what are the criteria Pavan?

PAVAN BUDHRANI: ICANN Staff help out with that, maybe they can just send me over some bullet points and I could use those to reach out as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. There is a fellowship program that has opened up for Durban, so I'd really invite all of you to get in touch with Pavan and see if you'd like to go and if you'd be eligible. And it would be good to have some of you apply so that we could get as many people there as possible. It would be terrific.

I would say two things about Beijing in just reviewing Beijing. There were two events that Maureen and Rinalia and myself were instrumental in organizing; one was the Multi-Stakeholder two-hour session, one was on the New gTLDs and the other was on ID and variants.

I think they went very well. I know Hong was involved in one of them and after I finish, Hong, if you want to say something about the ID and variant discussion that would be fine.

The other thing that I thought went very well, and Maureen can take a lot of credit for this, was the showcase event where we had Fadi speaking and we had Steve Crocker speaking and then we had just a show of all of our Members – and it was very well received, at least the feedback that I had… I don't know. Olivier, how do you think that went?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [laughs] I'm unmuted. It's Olivier for the transcript. I think it went very well indeed.

HOLLY RAICHE: Good, all right, okay. Well, moving right along, the next Agenda Item would be just a review of where we're up to with… And we've got three elections processing that involve us. The first is really the At-Large APRALO selection. Now, I should first of all thank everybody either for not running against me or saying you'll support me.

I have been… Since nobody stood against me I am the Chair of APRALO until 2015. There are elections for the Vice-Chairs that are continuing. The voting ends June 7th, so, Gisella, could I ask you to send a reminder out to everybody, that the voting is still on for the Vice-Chair of APRALO? There are three nominations and the elections will close June 7th and we will have a new Vice-Chair.

The second process that's underway now is the nomination of a representative to ALAC. First of all, I'd like to thank everybody, including Olivier for the webinar that we held, in terms of talking about what it means to be an ALAC Member; what is expected of you, what ALAC is all about – those were very useful discussions and the slides and interesting documentation that's on the website.

So I would remind you that the nominations are open now – they've begun. The nomination period ends on the 14th. Following that there's a week in which all nominees have to actually accept their nomination and then the elections will be held from the 28th of June until the 5th of July. So that process is underway.

I actually asked people, when they are nominated or nominate themselves, to please put information up and people have done that, that's very useful, and anybody else who is nominated or wishes to nominate themselves, please put information about yourself on the website so that those who are not familiar with you or why you would like to run will have that information available.

The third process underway is nominations for NomCom. Now, we have not had a webinar about NomCom; what it is and does and what it involves. Originally, Rinalia… I had asked her to talk but she's actually given an apology, but she is an apology, so I've asked Olivier to say a few words about what NomCom is and does and possibly the time commitment involved.

 Then we can have an idea about who should nominate, or who might nominate or who might be nominated for NomCom. Olivier, if you could

just give a little information about NomCom, it would be really useful at this stage. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly, it's Olivier for the transcript record. And I was going to submit an apology but of course I can't because I'm here – so NomCom is a particularly important, I would say semi-independent Committee within the ICANN structure. It's a Committee that is given the task to appoint people to the Board.

And in fact, among the Board Members, out of the 15 Board Members, eight Board Members are not even nominated because they are actually selected by the Nominating Committee. And then you also have five Members of the At-Large Advisory Committee – one Member for each region that are selected by the NomCom.

You also have people that are selected over to be ccNSO and the gNSO and the NomCom effectively is a cross-section of all of ICANN's different SOs and ACs. The power of influence that the At-Large and the At-Large community has over the NomCom is quite good because it can select quite people – one from each of our regions – to go and serve on the Nominating Committee.

The gNSO has an equally… I think they have six or seven people that they can have on there. All of the other parts of ICANN don't have that much influence or weight. They usually have one or two Members that they can put on the Nominating Committee. And I'm doing this from memory: I think there are about 20 Members of the Nominating Committee altogether.

The importance of course is you need to have pretty good people on the Nominating Committee, to perform two main tasks: the first one is the outreach; to try and find some candidates out there – and out there being the whole wide world – to go and fill those positions. Good candidates. So the Nominating Committee starts the first half of its work by looking for candidates. Effectively going on a recruitment drive and asking for candidates to go and apply.

And trust me, it's quite a tough thing, because when you tell people what a Board position means or what a leading position means in any SO or AC – Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee – the question is, "Oh, so what's the salary?" and the answer is, "Well, nil."

And in the case of Board Members you do get some payment but absolutely nothing compared to the sort of salary that one would get by being on a Board that would be the Board of a large corporation, for example. Then you do get a smaller subset of people ready to apply, for voluntary positions especially.

So that's the first part of the work. The second part of the work is to then go through all of the candidates that have applied and then select the best of all the candidates that you have. And so this year the Nominating Committee is looking at appointing two Board Members, and they're also looking at appointing two people for the ALAC, one person for the ccNSO… I haven't got the exact list in front of me but it's around those sorts of numbers.

The way that we in At-Large deal with the selection of the people that will go and serve on this Nominating Committee, well, this year I think

we need to find one in APRALO because the representative on APRALO…
Well, in fact, we need to find someone from each one of the regions,
sorry. [laughs] Let me just re-say this: but some of our Nominating
Committee Members have reached term limits, and again I don't know
that by heart.

But anyway, each one of the… Each region, basically – and I'm saying
region, not RALO –, each region has to come up with a candidate
because we need one candidate from each region. And so the way that
things work is that the RALOs would be looking for candidates and we
have an overall nomination period that opens up, people put themselves
forward. The RALOs would then transmit the nominations that they
attach recommendation to over to the ALAC.

The ALAC would then choose – and it is up to the ALAC to choose –
which candidates they wish to put on the Nominating Committee. And
they might take into account… They will take into account the
recommendations from the RALOs, but there have been cases where the
ALAC has decided that a candidate that has not been recommended by a
RALO is the best candidate to go and serve on the Nominating
Committee.

So that's the way it works. The nominations open on the 27th of May,
which is – oh, that sounds like yesterday – and the nominations are
closing on the 7th of June. The nomination acceptance deadline –
because when you get nominated, sometimes you're not even aware of
it and you have to accept that afterwards and say: "I'm okay with being
on the Nominating Committee" – is on or before the 14th of June.

And then there needs to be a prioritization or some kind of endorsement by RALOs – that's between the 14th to the 24th of June. And each RALO, by the way, might use any kind of means to make its recommendation. Some actually have a vote, some don't, some just have a consensus call – that's really up to you to work out.

But just bear in mind that whoever is recommended by the RALO might not be the person that is actually taken up by the ALAC, because the ALAC will be making that choice themselves. So the ALAC then has until the 2nd of July to review the RALO recommendations, or look also at the additional list of nominations that were accepted, and the endorsement vote takes place before the 8th of July.

The nomination of two NomCom appointees has to be no later than the 12th of July because basically the new Nominating Committee will effectively start its work as soon as possible, and of course the old Nominating Committee – so this year's Nominating Committee – will pretty much finish its work in Durban, during the Durban meeting.

That's in the long way, but it gives you a fuller idea, since you have to start now and get candidates to be serving on the NomCom… Or search for candidates. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Olivier, and I have to say Siranush very kindly put some materials in the chat; just some details in terms of numbers. For those that can't see the char, it's three Members of the Board Directors, three At-Large, one is from Africa, APRALO and Latin America, and then two Members of the gNSO and one for the ccNSO.

So I think this is very much a call for everybody to put their thinking caps on and see who we, APRALO, want to put forward. It's very useful. The next couple of Items, I think we're going to have to call on Olivier again for just a run-down of what policy input we've got… What policy issues are up for discussion and how people can contribute.

And then I want to talk a little bit about the budget and the fact that… Olivier, you can tell me when the nominations are closed for making budgets for, I think, after November. But Olivier, if you want to talk about what policy issues are open for us, now, and then if people want to talk about what's involved in contributing, that would be great. So over to you again Olivier, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly, it's Olivier for the transcript, again. So we've had, as usual, a very busy month of policy work going on, and I thank all of the people who have been drafting statements, holding the pen to draft a first draft and then getting the input from the wider ALAC and At-Large to be able to refine those statements into something that we've either sent directly to a public comment or that we have sent to the Board.

We simply adopted ALAC statements.   There's the Trademark Clearinghouse and IDN variants – that's something that we sent directly over to… I believe…. I believe we sent it directly to the Chair of the Board of the New gTLD Committee, and this was acknowledged.

Now, the statements that are currently being developed or that are being voted on are as follows: first we have the Fiscal Year '14 draft

operating term and budget. This is closing in a few days actually, and Tijani Ben Jemaa is holding the pen on this. I'm not quite sure that it's actually been put on the Wiki page yet. It will appear later on, yeah, it's not on the Wiki page yet.

It will appear later on today, and I know that because late last night, just about three hours ago [laughs] – which is why my voice is a bit cranky – three hours ago I was reviewing Tijani's draft about this, so that will appear very soon. Just to give you a quick run-down, the process has changed again.

With the new leadership team in place, it seems that last year's process is not used anymore, so things are a little bit rushed again this year and we are promised that it's the last year that things will be rushed, because next year, hopefully, the same team will be around so they will use the same processes this year and at least they will know when their deadlines are rather than the deadlines ended yesterday.

The operating plan and budget is following now a matrix system. But you have to comment on… There is a PowerPoint presentation, which effectively looks at last year's budget and this year's budget and numbers that have changed and so on. And then you've got a second file that provides you with more details of the matrix that they are using to look at vertical columns of different parts of ICANN and then projects on a horizontal basis.

So check… Well, I'm saying later on today, looking at Europe and Africa but probably check tomorrow, when you wake up, check that Wiki page and please comment on Tijani's draft.

The next one is the ALAC statement. And yes, I know this year it says "At-Large ALAC statement," I believe it probably is an ALAC statement to the Board regarding security and stability applications of New gTLDs. And for this, Julie Hammer has very kindly held the pen for this one. I believe we still have…

The vote has started and so we should be reaching the end of this vote at the moment. The ALAC is currently voting on it. I don't know why it says "ALAC commenting on the drafted statements." That's a big strange, but theoretically we should be voting on this. And thank you very much over to Julie Hammer for having drafted this excellent statement.

The next one is the New gTLD Board Committee consideration of GAC safeguard advice. And the ALAC was considering drafting a statement. At some point there were thoughts that we could be stuck in-between some kind of conflict between the advice that the GAC has given at the last ICANN meeting in Beijing, where they basically drafted a long document outlining the New gTLD applications that there's likely to be opposition to from the GAC.

And the Board received that GAC statement and effectively asked for input from the community regarding GAC advice. And we thought it was… Being some Members of the ALAC looking at the policy and whether we would have to draft a statement or not. We're very concerned that we might be drawn into this fight between the GAC and the Board, and no matter what we said we would end up with enemies on one side or the other.

Upon further investigation, Alan Greenberg and I had a chat, both with the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC, and both of them said, "Well look, if you have constructive comments then please bring them forth."

And so as a result Alan and I will draft a very short statement on a few points that have basically, basing it on ALAC past statements, are a few points that the ALAC might be agreeing with or a few points they might be slightly disagreeing with and maybe say: "Look, we believe the GAC might have overreached in this, but on the other hand we think that this point is something we support.

Check in a couple of days and we'll have a statement up on there. Post final 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the RAA, big discussion going on on this. The ALAC is currently still commenting on this. Oh no, it's not. The vote has opened dear. I don't know why this Agenda is out of date but there you go. The ALAC is currently voting on this and there is a final version on that Wiki page. Quite a lengthy final version.

There might be a couple of words that might change, based on some input we've had from a couple of people who were voting. But the words are not going to change the meaning of the statement itself, so I have to thank the drafter very much for this, that's Carlton and… Oh! My dear, Holly Raiche as well. Thank you Holly, it's excellent work on this.

Next we have the questions to the community of the accountability and transparency of ICANN. That's one that is a little bit of a pet question that I had, since both Alan Greenberg and I are both on the

Accountability and Transparency Review Team. We had a little webinar that we staged a few weeks ago to try to get the RALO Leadership and the RALOs to submit comments into this process.

The ATRT – the Accountability and Transparency Review Team – effectively look at the way the Board operates, they look at the way the GAC operates. They look at the WHOIS Review Team recommendations and they look at the Security and Stability Review Team – the SSRT.

And they find out if those recommendations, which were made last time, a few years ago, three years ago – by the first round of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team –, find out if those recommendations were actually implemented properly. So that's the first part of their work – reviewing recommendations that were made in the past, to improve ICANN's accountability and transparency.

But then it looks at new points and new concerns that members of the community would have. And this is what this public comment period is all about. And in fact, it doesn't only restrict its input to this public comment period; it will actually be in listening mode all the way up until August.

So although you might notice that the initial public comment period is already closed and we're now already in the reply period for this, you're still very welcome to bring initial comments to the ATRT 2. I don't know whether the RALO is able to come up with a consolidated statement or whether the RALO can just ask At-Large structures to contribute directly to the ATRT 2 process.

But the more input the ATRT 2 gets, the better. Because if you have a problem with the way ICANN is run or ICANN's transparency, or you believe that ICANN is not accountable, that's the time for you to be able to air your problem. Don't not say anything and then six months from now suddenly go: "Oh, well, whatever we say, ICANN doesn't listen."

Well, that's just a very general statement. Maybe you could expand on why it doesn't listed, give some examples, give us… What are your concerns about the way ICANN is run? So that's a very good forum for you to be able to say that, and I do hope that we will get into it and I hope that there might even be some consolidated input from the RALO.

The ALAC itself is not considering drafting a statement. I think mostly because the Chair of the ALAC is on there, oh, so it's one of these things where we could provide a drafted statement but at the end of the day, by Alan Greenberg and myself being on this, we could always relay the input from the ALAC directly into that group.

So next, the statement on the WCIT outcomes. That's a statement that I'm supposed to be holding the pen on but unfortunately I've not had much time. The World Conference on International Telecommunication; obviously there's been a follow-up recently that took place in Geneva a couple of weeks ago.

Unfortunately, I was not part of that conference but I have been on webinars that have since been staged from several organizations, to try and see what the follow-up was. And I'm afraid to say that the world is still in the same sort of position as during the WCIT and definitely two different visions of where the future lies.

Thankfully though, that has opened the eyes of many organizations that are part of the Internet eco-system, the current Internet eco-system, and that is therefore bringing in a number of opportunities and a number of new projects to try to bridge the gap between those that are pro Multi-Stakeholder model and those that are somehow not as hot about it.

That's all I can say at the moment, and I will really try and pick up the pen in a few days time on this. Five currently open public comment processes. There's the proposed modification of the gNSO PDP – that's Policy Development Process – manual to address the suspension of a PDP.

That's really an internal gNSO process and in At-Large we also have processes, and if we were to modify them I'm not quite sure if we would want the gNSO to start commenting on it. I guess At-Large Members know better how At-Large works, in that specific case – same thing with the gNSO. So no statement for that.

Next, the locking of a Domain Name subject to UDIP proceedings – that's Uniform Dispute Resolution Procedure proceedings – and that's an initial report, still very early on. It's not really worth spending much time on this, at this moment in time, and we do have some At-Large Members, I believe, that are part of that Working Group, so they'll keep us informed on how things move.

Note that I did say At-Large Members. You don't have to be an ALAC Member to be in a gNSO Working Group. You can put your name across

EN

and you could actually be our representative on that Working Group, even though you are just an At-Large Member, so…

Next one, the consultation on the root zone KSK rollover. That's Key… I don't even know what KSK means. I believe that's something to do with the Key… One of the two Ks. Maybe it could be Key Secure Key or something. Anyway, it's a very technical thing; not particularly influential. I don't even think that there's much knowledge of how these things work in the At-Large community. So no statement on this.

And then, finally, the revised proposal of the ACDR – that's the Arab Chamber Dispute Resolution, I think. I'm doing this from memory again. The Arab Center for Domain Name Dispute Resolution, has been selected to be one of the dispute resolution providers. As you know, there are going to International Domain Names as well in Arabic.

And if you ask the current Uniform Dispute Resolution Providers, which are all located in the US and Western Europe, about things in Arabic, I'm not quite sure that they'll be able to understand what is going on. So ICANN has now selected, also, and Arab Dispute Resolution Provider. And there is a proposal from them, and as per usual, a public comment from the community.

Ultimately, no statement. I think that the At-Large communities absolutely support having local UDIP providers rather than having them all in the US and Western Europe. So it's a breath of fresh air. So rather than just crowd the space and say yes, yes, yes, no statement at this point in time. And that's all for the policy advice. Thank you and I hope it's been helpful for you.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: It has. Thank you Olivier. It's Holly, for the transcript record. Did anybody have questions to Olivier in terms of the policy that we are contributing to or would like to contribute to?

Possibly, I'm not taking them now, but I advise everybody to go to the policy page to look at the various policies that are open for discussion, and if you have any thoughts, by all means contribute to our own Wiki log; as everybody is welcome to make their own comments.

There is plenty out there that is happening and you're all welcome to say anything to us or suggest [inaudible 00:38:53]. Now, YJ, you wanted to talk about two things. Are you ready to do that? One was about the progress on the regional IGF and the other was about the Cyberspace Conference. Do you want to…? You're on the Agenda. Do you want to talk now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly, Holly it's Olivier. Holly, I notice Hong has put her hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm sorry. Hong first?

HONG XUE: Okay, I've two observations. One is on ALAC and APRALO's comments as a public forum in Beijing on the TMCH and IDN variants. I notice that the ICANN Board recently received some response to the questions raised at the Beijing public forum. Unfortunately, our comment was not taken

into account. It was not even mentioned. So we can only hope that ALAC's recent statement are sent forward to the Board, could be considered.

The second observation is… This is actually a question to Olivier – things that we have represented from APRALO to ALAC, [laughs] I advise to stop attending ALAC conference calls. I recently know that two Agenda Items for the ALAC call are quite interesting. One is that you are appointing someone to be Member of Chair of the ALAC objection follow-up group.

That's interesting. Yeah. Olivier, I trust you're one of the Members of the At-Large New gTLD Working Group Members, right? And this has been the issue that has been discussed at the New gTLD Working Group for quite some time, and there was actually no follow-up in that Working Group. And now the same has been upgraded to ALAC level, but [inaudible 00:41:08] as the Working Group is working for ALAC.

That's good. And then the same is that many people in the Working Group have drafted the charter for this follow-up group. I think we need more information to understand what had happened and what is going to happen in any follow-up on this. Okay. So back to you Holly. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Hong, thank you. Olivier, do you want to briefly answer? Yeah, okay, go ahead.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely. Yeah, I'll be quick. Yeah, thank you very much Holly, and thanks for these questions Hong, very important indeed. First, with regards to the Trademark Clearinghouse – there were actually two statements that we were working on in Beijing.

One was the joint statement with the NCSG on the Trademark Clearinghouse Plus 50, and due to several differences in interpretation and points of view, there was no common statement that was released. So that was on thing.

The other one was, as Hong mentioned, the one that we mentioned, which is pretty much then expanded in the Trademark Clearinghouse and IDN variants. That was a short statement that we first made during the public comment, and yes, it doesn't appear to have been taken into account, possibly because the focus, really, of the Board, was on this Trademark Clearinghouse Plus 50 thing.

But Cherine Chalaby has advised me now that the Trademark Clearinghouse and IDN variants will be very carefully taken into account. Now we just have to wait and see if it will actually be. But certainly, looking at the statement itself, it is a very important statement on this.

With regards to the appointment of a Chair for the New gTLD objections process, well, the ALAC tasked first Dev Anand Teelucksingh… Sorry, the ALAC tasked the New gTLD Working Group to find… Well, to create a New gTLD Review Group. And that was then appointed by the ALAC, because only the ALAC can start Review Groups and Working Groups etc., and as you know, there were objections that were filed against three applications for .health.

Knowing that we're pretty much going into darkness beyond that, seeing as this is the first time that the ALAC had an actual acted hand on something that was operational, the objections were filed and they were filed by myself, the Chair of the ALAC, on behalf of the ALAC. The Dispute Resolution Provider, which is based in France, acknowledged this.

And then we didn't quite know where to go from there. Was the Review Group going to continue and follow up, if there was any follow-up with the Dispute Resolution Provider? Or how are things working out? Of course the Review Group only worked as a Review Group. It did not have any power of choice or direct discussion of how things were.

And of course the objections are filed by the ALAC; they are not filed by the New gTLD Working Group either. So the control of this process came back to the ALAC, and after having filed all of this, I had assumed an interim Chair position, for the time being. And there's been very little movement on this by the way.

There were some questions by the French Dispute Resolution Provider, on whether the three objections could be brought together under one flag, and it's not quite sure whether all of the participants accepted it or not. I note having read several replies saying yes, we're okay with it – I think from two out of the three participants. I believe the third one has decided not to have those cases consolidated and therefore the cases remain separate.

So we are currently still awaiting a new response, and there doesn't appear to have been any direct attempt from any of the applicants to

contact us. The email address from which the objections were filed is a generic… Well, it's an ICANN email address that goes to three people at the moment. It goes to Heidi Ulrich, Director for At–Large. It goes to Dev Anand Teelucksingh, since he was the shepherd for the Review Group, and it goes to myself.

Since we are all very busy, we decided it would be important to have someone who was involved with the review process to start with to follow up, if there was any follow-up. And as you know, because we have here the involvement of a Dispute Resolution Provider, you could actually have a call by them to bring parties face-to-face and discuss things.

Pretty much like lawyers would try to find a consensus or would try to find a solution with a mutual mediator being present. And for this we needed someone who had some knowledge of both the process, and was also a lawyer. Seth Reiss has very kindly, from before the end of the work of the Review Group, has very kindly said that he was ready to follow up with that, and he fulfills all of those conditions.

So the proposal that is going to be made over to the ALAC later on today, and I guess for everyone later on today, is that Seth Reiss then picks up, basically, the front seat on this. We really are not sure – we being the current team; so Heidi, Dev and I – really don't know what is going to happen next; whether Seth will be called upon or not.

What is sure though is that it's not likely to be a process with an enormous amount of work going back and forth and so on, and so keeping the follow-up team to a minimum, just being able to liaise with

the ALAC when something happens, is important. Especially since in fact some of the discussions in there might end up being confidential. We're not even quite sure how the information sent to the generic address, at the moment, by the Chamber of Commerce is. If it's actually like a law case then some of it might be confidential altogether.

So as a result, we've got Seth and Dev and Heidi and myself, and there was also a wish from Rinalia Abdul Rahim, from APRALO region, to be there. Especially since she was part of the handful of people that met with the World Health Organization in Beijing. We're not hiding this. We were asked for a meeting just to find out...

And in fact what we wanted to find out was really, what was the point of the World Health Organization in this matter. She was part of that meeting, so she's also aware of the discussions that took place and so I'll be asking for a consensus call; for her to be part of that small team as well, if that's possible with everyone. That's really the position at the moment.

Sorry it took a little while, but I think it needed some clarity and it needs to be there, so that's for people to be able to make a wise choice. I hope that answers your question, Hong, or questions, Hong.

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, thank you Olivier. Second of all, Hong, if you have further comments I suggest that you take them up directly with Olivier, Dev and Heidi, and possibly Rinalia. And for anybody else who is interested in what is actually quite a complex problem, I would suggest you get ahold of Hong. That would be great.

Now, Hong has got her hand up. Nope? Okay. The next Item is YJ; you had a couple of things that you wanted to talk about, briefly, with us? YJ? Gisella, is YJ on the phone? Oh, she's typing. Okay.

GG: Sorry, Gisella here Holly. YJ is on the Adobe Connect, so I see that she writes, "Yes." Her connection is not working, we are happy to dial out to her, I'll follow-up with her.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. In the meantime, just a brief reminder – the budget discussions are going on. I will be sending out an email reminding everybody to put your thinking caps on to what is it that you think we should be thinking about, possibly applying for and once I get… I think there is a finance meeting coming up. I will report back on that to see where we're up to.

But in the meantime, I think there's stuff on the policy page about that… Sorry, on the [inaudible 00:51:38] page. I'll keep you informed about that. There was also on the Agenda, which maybe… No, we're still sorting out YJ. There's an Agenda Item on #7 – Pavan, who is [Gisella alone? 00:51:57] the idea of APRALO calendar idea. I think we…

PAVAN BUDHRANI: Yes, Pavan here, for the transcript record. I got an email from Rinalia, and then she asked me to basically use the information from Beijing, which is the context of all of the ALSes, and try to get a calendar running.

So in this calendar, basically the ALSes would be able to submit any event that is felt was useful, which would also actually help the finance and budget aspect as well, because we could see that… You know, if we could fly someone there, or maybe the ALSes in that region and they could join that event and so on.

We can put the ICANN event on there, maybe our monthly APRALO meeting as well, so they get a quick notification. So I'll be sending out an email to Staff and working with Staff to get that in order as soon as possible.

HOLLY RAICHE: That would be great. Now, what Gisella has said is that is they link to the calendar. If we can have that calendar populated, that would be very helpful. And Gisella has raised a hand. Gisella?

GG: Yes Holly. Gisella for the transcript. If everyone would just… And Pavan as well – I think you know this calendar very well. It is on the At-Large front page of our website. This calendar is populated, and if you look in June – May doesn't have any ICANN external events on it – but if you click onto the next month, which is June, there are quite a few…

On my calendar, on the calendar I'm looking at here it comes up in yellow. Those are all the At-large external events that I pick up from emails and populate the calendar with. They all get sent through by the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team. And we try and update this with all the external events. And you will see that all the monthly calls of all

the RALOs are on this as well as the ALAC calls. And I actually populate this calendar and check it on a daily basis.

So if you then want to create another on, which is specific to APRALO… But just so that… The most important thing here that I'm trying to get through is that everyone needs to be aware that there is this calendar already.

PAVAN BUDHRANI: Okay, so basically, maybe we just reach out to the ALSes and tell them that this is the calendar and to keep on checking it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, I will get back to Rinalia and see what she had in mind. But Pavan and Gisella, that sounds very sensible and it sounds like a very useful resource where we could populate stuff for each other, which would be fantastic. Have we sorted YJ yet? YJ, can we hear you?

YJ PARK: Yeah, can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep, good. Go ahead.

YJ PARK: Okay, thank you for sorting this technical problem. I sent two different meeting-related documents. The first one was about the Cyberspace conference, which I mentioned all year – that is more like it is used by a

participation process, so I think I informed in Beijing that we will post this kind of [SA test? 00:55:32], but the details were not clear at that time, so now we have more specific process information.

So there are three issues the users can participate in sending their [SA? 00:55:49] to the organizers. So there are three topics highlighted; the economy growth and social culture benefit. And then cyber security and capacity-building-related ones – so as I said before, I hope [inaudible 00:56:06] can circulate that kind of information to local communities so we can have more participation from the different parts of the world.

And another very attractive benefit for this process is the organizers are willing to select the three teams or individuals who can actually participate in the October meeting. Basically, this meeting will be held in September in conjunction with the APrIGF.

So initially we thought to host this at the same venue, like in Seoul, Korea, here, but some people pointed out the fact that maybe the [inaudible 00:56:54] University may have more convenient access if they do not say, you know, that Seoul…

So basically, this was finally chosen as the conference place, and then the [inaudible 00:57:12] APrIGF, and some of you who participated in this process, the Multi-Stakeholder Group in APRALO community, you probably heard this at the WSIS Conference.

And those who are not in that process, I [attack? 00:57:32] the [inaudible 00:57:33], which provides more detail about the kind of [people/details? 00:57:41] that [they all go for? 00:57:42] the conference and the kind of program as of today.

But again, taking advantage of this [inaudible 00:57:51], I wanted to participate in this process and if you are interested, and also I encourage you to send some [inaudible 00:58:03] or any kind of [inaudible 00:58:07] to the conference organizers and also you can send it to me directly as well, because I am also involved with the [Cyber? 00:58:17] Committee here at the local level.

So this is the brief information and if you have any further questions about these two conferences then I would be happy to answer them. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you YJ. The competition looks absolutely amazing. I've got students tonight and I might actually give them a lesson [laughter] on what you can do. But for everybody, have a look and just… There's a nice little award for it.

Also, I'm trusting everyone on the call has information about the IGF in Korea, regional IGF in Korea, but YJ, do you just want to resend something about that to the discussion list? In case anybody hasn't seen that?

YJ PARK: You mean some kind of discussion at the Multi-Stakeholder Group in Asia?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

YJ PARK: Okay, so basically we have the open-ended forum of this [inaudible 00:59:27] structure. We can call this a Multi-Stakeholder Group. Anyone who is interested in participating in structuring APrIGF, you are welcome to join us, and the mailing list is provided by the .asia people. Maybe Pavan can give you more instruction later.

So we have the mailing list on which we mainly discuss how to move forward, and so one of the main discussions so far is how to institutionalize the so-called [Cola? 01:00:04] Committee, but we usually call it Multi-Stakeholder Group, where we bring all those related Agenda Items and we discuss how to implement all those issues.

We have bi-weekly conference calls. Unfortunately last week we couldn't really have the call because there were some conflicting time schedules of those who attended the IGF meeting in Geneva, like there was a purgatory process. But we will have the meeting either this Friday, which is not really confirmed yet, or next Friday.

So on the calls we talk about how to institutionalize this Multi-Stakeholder Group in Asia Pacific, and also the program itself. And one of the issues at this stage is that we are expecting a [little like a? 01:01:03] 17 different panel, and so far we have received 11 proposals.

So obviously we do have a lack of interest presented, so again we encourage you to think about the interesting topics for the discussion here in Korea; APrIGF. Okay… Yeah.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: That's fantastic. Could I just draw everybody's attention to the Chat – we have got an emailed possibility here for the Secretary for the Asia Pacific Regional IGF, if you want to join the Multi-Stakeholder Group. And the other… For more information it's just www.aprigf.asia. So there's the possibility of joining that group, which really sounds very interesting as well as some information.

And what I'll do is I'll probably be sending out a little report on this thing with those links in it, because it looks very interesting. Thank you YJ. Now, we're over time, so I…. We're down here from words from myself – I don't think I need to say anything. I think Olivier's gone back to sleep. Olivier, are you still awake and do you want to say anything? Or are you… [laughs]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, I wish. I'm still awake and getting more and more awake at the moment. Thank you Holly. It's Olivier for the transcript. I'm not really quite sure what words to say. This is words from an APRALO Chair, Holly Raiche, and ALAC Chair – what was that about?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm not sure. All I was thinking is that I wish everybody either a goodnight, a good morning, good day and [laughter] I will be sending an email to everybody and Olivier, who's [inaudible 01:03:08] good night, or tomorrow. Whatever it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, thank you everybody and I will be sending out an email, but just a reminder of YJ's links and her competition, which looked great. I will be wanting some feedback on budget suggestions. I also remind everybody of what's going to happen with the calendar, and Pavan, thank you very much.

And just to wish the rest of you… Have a lovely day, or whatever it is… It's not the day for the Asia Pacific region. And we'll talk in a month's time. So thank you very much. Bye.

[General goodbyes]

GG: The meeting has ended and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]