EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC monthly conference call on Tuesday, the 28th of May, 2013. The time is 14:04 UTC. And the first thing is just looking at our agenda with the useful set items, the review of the Beijing At-Large ALAC meeting, the review of the ALS applications, the reports.

And then the items for discussion today, sorry for decision today, the ALAC policy development activities, which we always do on every month. Then we'll have a small section on the ALAC decertification process. There will be a vote taken at that time, so I urge all of you to remain online until then at least, remain on the call.

All those of you who vote, so I hope we can go through this quite quickly. And then after that, we'll have a consensus call on the naming of members of the At-Large objections follow up group, that also will require a quorum to remain on the call.

And after that, we just have the items for discussion, discussion of GNSO on policy and implementation in the ICANN context, the revised ALAC rules of procedures, the RALO selections 2013, and the update from the selected At-Large working groups.

Finally, closing with the review of the At-Large meeting schedule for the forthcoming 47th ICANN meeting in Durban. Does anyone have any questions or comments regarding the agenda? And if not, can we see if we can adopt this agenda please?

I don't see anyone having putting their hand up in a way… I note that someone has asked for the meeting to take place. Gisella, I note that your microphone is on at the moment, and that's probably because I'm just about to the floor over to you for the roll call and for the apologies. Gisella, you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much Olivier. I'd like to welcome everyone on today's call. We have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Holly Raiche, Sala Tamanikaiwaimaro, Eduardo Diaz, Yaovi Atohoun, Carlton Samuels, Evan Leibovitch, Sandra Hoferichter, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Winthrop Yu, and Ron Sherwood.

Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is on the Adobe Connect and will be joining the audio bridge within the next 50 minutes after her nom com call, and we have Julie Hammer as well. Tijani Ben Jemaa will be joining us in approximately 30 minutes.

On the Spanish channel, we have Alberto Soto, Carlos Vera, Natalia Enciso, and Michelle Chaplow. Apoligies noted from Siranush Vardanyan. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself Gisella Gruber.

I hope I have not left off anyone off the attendance list. We also have today as interpreters on the Spanish channel, Veronica and David. And on the French channel, Claire and Camila. Matt Ashtiani from staff has also joined us, thank you.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes but to allow the interpreters

to identify you on the other language channel. And also to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

And if you are on the Adobe bridge as well as the Adobe connect audio, please do remember to mute your speakers and microphones. Thank you. Over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Gisella. I have some good and some bad news. The good news is that the roll call has taken more than two minutes that are allocated to it because there are so many people on the call, so it's really great to see you all here.

The bad news, of course, is that we're already late in this call. So let's move quickly to the Beijing, ALAC, and the At-Large action items on the 7th to the 12th April. And the action items are all listed in red on this page, and so we'll quickly look through these.

And the first one we have is on the ALAC working session one, ALAC and regional leadership, where the action item was for the ALAC to look into the possibility of forming a joint working group to look at deep packet inspection. And that's during our discussion that we had with the ISOC.

And there hasn't… Has there been any follow up on this by any chance? Could I maybe ask Julie Hammer if she has… Oh no, I see Jean-Jacques has put his hand up. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. I raised my hand just a little bit too early I think, we should listen first to Julie. I'd like to comment a bit later just to express

my interest in this because I was not aware that work had started on this subject which I brought up many times over the past few weeks. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. So yes…

JULIE HAMMER: Olivier, Julie Hammer here. This wasn't something that came up with the SO, it's not something that I've been following at all. It wasn't in the S SAC session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It was not in the S SAC session. Okay. That's interesting [CROSSTALK 0:06:24]… recorded as such. So let's put this to the side and workout where this was. Because this appears on the S SAC session. So let's move on from, yes, hello?

Sorry who was that?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. Could I just say a word now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes please. Go ahead Jean-Jacques. You have the floor.

EN

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you.   Now that Julie has spoken, I just wanted to note my interest, my strong interest on this topic, whether this or that for ISOC or anyone or else.   I'm interested so I would like staff to please take note on the fact that I would like to be working directly.

I have noted on several occasions in ICANN public sessions and of the ALAC calls meetings, but I could ask a question that should be to the whole of ALAC, because it touches upon a very fundamental likes of the general user of the internet.   Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques.   And I think what we'll do then is just to work out what part of the session this relates to and then take it from there.   Alan, you have the floor. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.   I just would like to make sure that whatever we do is within in the remit of ICANN.   It's an exceedingly interesting subject, let's make sure that we're doing something that is ICANN related though.   Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan.   And that's noted.   Let's follow up after this call until the next ALAC call.   Hopefully we can follow up on emails as well on this.   Next on our sheet is the Monday 8th of April, 2013 that's the R3 White Paper.

Then after that, there is the ALAC NCSG meeting, here we go, that's one.   So there were two actions.   The first one was the ALAC expressed

interest in drafting a joint statement with the NCSG, on the process straw man proposals, trademark plus 50 derivations. The TM plus 50 as they put it.

The [? 0:09:02] that the proposal is problem [? 0:09:04]. And Alan Greenberg cautioned, we need to consider the language carefully. In fact, the discussion was such that there did not appear to be consensus between the NCSG and the ALAC members where assigned to this task.

So no statement actually came out, no joint statement actually came out during the Beijing meeting. I have written to the Chair of the NCSG in letting her know that we're still open to follow up work beyond the Beijing meeting, to perhaps have a joint statement on this, with a bit more time to find out what the common part is between the ALAC – the common points of view are between the ALAC and NCSG.

It doesn't appear to have been any follow up on this. I know that Alan was definitely, well was one of the main drafters. Has there been any follow up on this at all Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: As far as I know there has been no follow up. There was discussion about, either the last ALAC meeting or an ExCom meeting of, should we revise this to have a written statement? I don't believe there has been any discussions, that I've been purvey to, to do that.

Certainly the effort at the meeting was such that we could not come to an agreement in time for the public forum session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. But I would suggest that if I follow up again with Robin [Gross-vitch 0:10:38], the Chair of the NCSG, and find out if there is interest on their side, having not had a response from my… Or I might have a response, just a neutral response, to see if there is actually a drive to push this forward.

Is there still time to comment on this Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: It depends what your view of the world is [laughs]. I mean there was a Board reconsideration request, which was rejected. I suspect it will live on in some other ways. And the implementation is not done, so the ALAC position is being, certainly at Beijing and before, has been the only part of it that we have reacted to strongly is the two for two aspects.

Number one, the fact because of the wording it may well be 50 times a large number per mark. And the second part is the process, whether this was policy implementation, whatever, I did write a rather long note to the ALAC a little while ago, which I got a few comments on, but then it sort of died quickly on the whole issue of policy versus implementation.

And that on my review, I questioned whether this review was policy, which we did say in a statement. I think we need to follow on that track, although not in this meeting. So I would like that discussion to continue. I think there are some substantive issues that have come out of this, and I think we need to understand what our feeling is.

On the specific subject, I think the only thing that we would want to comment on is the 50 times X, which is really a matter of

implementation. That one, I think, is worthy of a comment if people feel strongly about it. Thank you. Personally, remember, this is only sunrise and 90 days at this point. I don't know how much energy we want to put into it.

But on a matter of principle, the 50 times X is something we could comment on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. So let's just transform this action item, since this was for the Beijing meeting, let's transform this into… I will follow up with the complete drafting team, so that's Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, David Cake, [? 0:13:15], and Robin Gross.

To basically kick this back into play and see if we could reach a consensus. I think that suddenly the trademark clearing house plus 50 is something that we have been very interested in drafting something about. And the very Board reconsideration request being rejected, and the fact that there hasn't been any movement yet, or doesn't appear to have been any movement yet on the actual new gTLD Board group, means that there is still an opportunity there for us to make a difference and to put our point of view forward.

Let's move on. Scrolling further down the page. The next action item, if I can find them, there we go. APRALO monthly meeting was full of action items, but that is not for us to look at. The last one was on the page are from the ALAC Executive Committee meeting, and that's I guess for information.

The ALAC is to send a letter of thank you for the extraordinary work of the ICANN's constituency travel to Fadi [? 0:14:31]. I'm going to have to check on this one. I'm not even sure whether this has been [rung 0:14:36] or not, I have to cross check this, if you bear with me.

And then preparation for Durban to review the ExCom agenda and review the agenda items that are not essential. And Tijani Ben Jemaa is to send a note to the Executive Committee regarding how to reformat the Thursday AFLAC meeting. And that's because there is a concern with regards to timing, and how we can do things without being in an absolute rush when we have so many votes going on and people running around.

Thursday is always a very busy day. Any comments on these action items? I don't see anyone putting their hands up. Now you will have noticed that we did not have a link to the prior action items from our prior online conference call. If I can put them in the Adobe Connect, you'll see the action items from the 26th of March, 2013.

There were a few that were there in the open action items. There were two of them to do with the World Conference on International Telecommunications. There has been no movement on this yet due to lack of time, and also the fact that the World Telecommunications Policy Forum, the WTPF has taken place four weeks ago in Geneva.

So there is a kind of follow up to the WCIT. There hasn't been very much movement, although there has been a follow up. There was still, in two separate camps, that things are progressing slowly. Although there is much work now going on as far as capacity building is concerned.

That statement is forthcoming. Once the rules of procedure working group provides it work to the ALAC, the ALAC members will have two weeks to read through the work. That's to do with rules of procedures, and of course that has moved forward. And I believe that this is actually a closed action item, this is done, because the ALAC has voted on the new rules of procedure.

The newly assigned action item, there are two active GNSO working groups, IRSVP, and IGO, NGO. I thought it was IMGO, but At-Large members are to be invited to join these working groups. Is there still time Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: What do you mean by current? Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are these working groups still accepting new members? Or are we really setting people up, the train has sailed on these two now? Bearing in mind that it has been two months since…

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the latter is the case probably.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Let's mark this as done as well, because the call was made. And then revised ALAC rules of procedure are to be translated into the five UN languages plus Portuguese. Staff, has this been done yet?

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Hi everyone, this is Heidi Ullrich. That's still in progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thank you. Right. That's the action items done. Any questions or comments on any of the action items that we've gone through? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so let's move on to the next part of our call. This is the review of the current ALS applications. And I'll had the floor to Matt Ashtiani for this. Matt? Please go ahead.

MATT ASHTIANI:	Hi Olivier. This is Matt for the record. I actually think Natalie was supposed to update on this. Natalie?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Oh okay. I wasn't sure, so thank you Matt. It's Olivier here. Natalie? Natalie Fairgreen, would you please go through these. Okay. The question of course is whether we have Natalie on there and it appears that we don't have Natalie. I don't see Natalie on the call.

So it's either you Matt, or it's going to be me again. |

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Sorry. Matt, can we bring that back to you, and also there was a [? 0:19:06] yesterday, so we have two announcements. Matt, do you want to go ahead and take them?

EN

MATT ASHTIANI:	Sure. I just need one second. Would you just come back to me in just a second?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	So Olivier, this is Heidi again. Apologies. We have the recently sort of the At-Large structure, Internet Society Canada. And we're just checking on the votes for [? 0:19:35] which closed yesterday.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you. In the meantime, can anyone mention the application 170, University Community Partnership for social action research. That's been NARALO, I understand. Additional questions are being asked about the applicant at the moment.
	So whilst we try to find out about the details on [? 0:20:01], I just wanted to virtually applaud and welcome the Internet Society Canada chapter, who have been recently certified. Welcome. You will probably know some of the representatives that ALS. They have been in the community for quite a while, and very active indeed in the community for quite a while.
	Great to see the NARALO continuing to grow. Now do we have any updates on [? 0:20:33]?
MATT ASHTIANI:	This is Matt for the record. I just got the vote results. The application did pass, with seven votes for yes, two abstentions, and no votes against.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So seven yes…

MATT ASHTIANI: No nine yes, two abstentions, no votes against.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. You just gave me a heart attack, Matt, thank you. Because seven was not enough for it to pass. So nine yeses, two abstentions, so that effectively means that [? 0:21:07] is accredited, is an At-Large structure as well. To [? 0:21:12] technology adaptation development research telecommunication organization. Great to say that LACRALO keeps on growing as well.

Any comments or questions on this session? I see one, yes, Yaovi Atohoun, go ahead. You have the floor.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you Olivier, Yaovi here. I hope you can hear me. My comment is to [? 0:21:43]… process for the [? 0:21:50], but maybe we need to think about, because there are some questions [? 0:21:56] many times. Right, some type of migration.

We are talking about At-Large, and then there are many questions, and somehow wonder if there is enough technicians. We have to be cautious so, I just wanted for this [? 0:22:11] to be meeting at some point focusing or thinking on this opportunity for [? 0:22:21], that's very, very important.

EN

[? 0:22:23]… some organization, not paying too much attention to the questions. Sometimes they replied, or replied completely. So [? 0:22:34] comment I want to make. So I know we are [? 0:22:38]… it is important to [? 0:22:41] maybe some people to think about the process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Yaovi. That is certainly something, I see some agreement from Rinalia Abdul Rahim. And certainly something in my head as well with regards to the way that we accredit ALSs and how much work is done to do all of the due diligence, etcetera.

It might be something that we have to set up a working group for, or that we have to move forward with, in the next few months or so. But it's something… I mean at the moment, we deal also with ALS accreditation as well. There are number of movements on this to get our regions and our RALOs to have better ALSs.

So Alan, you have the floor. Maybe you have a suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have a suggestion. The issue of moving on reaccreditation or verifying that ALSs are still viable, I think is something that we must do. If we don't, someone else is going to and it's going to be embarrassing if they do. And I worry that we're still approving ALSs that would not make meet whatever test we are going to use for ensuring they're still viable. So I think we have a real problem on our hands. I think it's not something we can keep on putting on the back shelf.

I think we have pushed ALS numbers so much that we're in a potentially very embarrassing and awkward position, ensuring that what we have are really viable. And I think part of our perceived outreach problem is that we're trying to outreach to groups to that a large extent don't exist much more than the one or two people who communicate with us.

And I think we have to move on it quickly. I think it's serious. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Do you think… I mean this is an open question for everyone on the call. Do you think we should move into this by immediately forming a taskforce as soon as we can? Or can this wait until Durban to start the discussion about the – over in Durban?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're asking me, I don't think there is much difference. I see no reason not to start discussions going, but…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Yeah but Alan, there is a difference between actually have an actual taskforce, and putting a Chair in charge, and doing some deep work, and then presenting some results to the ALAC in a month and a half, or two months. And just launching a quick discussion online, where the ALAC could just discuss things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if you're asking me, I would say do it quick sooner rather than later, and put a target on completion. So yes, I would start quicker rather than later. But people have to be willing to do it. That's just…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. I see Tijani Ben Jemma has put his hand up. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Hello? Do you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you Tijani. Please go ahead. You have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you. So I do think that it is a very important point. It has always been a question that some of us have, in the AFRALO. I think that we need to start discussing about it now, we can do it by mail now, prepare Durban via a discussion in Durban. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Note that Rinalia also mentions in the chat, start now. She agrees with Alan's point of view. It's going to be difficult to of course start a working group, or a taskforce today, because it's not in the agenda as such. But I will follow Tijani's wisdom and your…

I think that if we can start a discussion right away on the ALAC mailing list, and with a view to be able to forming such a group, perhaps we can

EN

even form such a group at the next ALAC call in one month's time. I notice already that Yaovi volunteers for such a group.

It would probably be just a taskforce that would look at this. I don't think it's a standing working group as such. And the taskforce will probably be have a limited mandate as far as time is concerned. And especially bearing in mind that we do need to also finish all of the adjunct documents with our new rules of procedures.

And Alan will be able to speak to us a little bit about this later on in this call. Let's move on. So thank you for this information on the ALS certification and decertification. We definitely have an action item here. Do you have… Staff, do you have the action item that is recorded, or do I need to say it again?

MATT ASHTIANI: Please repeat it one more time Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. The action item is for the conversation, or the discussion about ALS accreditation to be started on ALAC list, with a view to – with a possible view to form a taskforce. I think that leaves it open and we can set the timeline, etcetera, when we discuss things on the mailing list.

Next. Now the next part of this is the public comments part of this. No, sorry, I just jumped a bit too far ahead of myself. The next thing is the reports, and I'm not going to go through the full list of reports from both RALOS, liaisons, and also the – well, the RALOs and the liaisons.

We have an ALAC monthly reports Wiki page, and I invite you also to look at these very interesting report on the RALOs. I think all of the RALOs is for this. We will go through a couple of dates for working groups later on. But as is customary, I usually ask for our two main liaisons with the other supporting organizations, the GNSO and the [? 0:29:44] NSO to give us a short report.

So first the GNSO liaison, Alan Greenberg. You have a couple of minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm sorry to highlight in my report in red, the things that are require, that I think require an action ALAC action. There are two of them in my report from the last meeting. One is that a new drafting team in preparation for a PDP working group being formed.

The title is a rather uninformative one of uniformity of reporting, I was just – people look at the description there and if there is any interest that people volunteer, the drafting team is to create the charter, and usually the drafting team morphs into the working group with possibly other people added afterwards. So I would call your attention to that.

And the second item is, at the last council meeting there was a really interesting presentation IDN variance. And I would suggest that people number one look at the presentation, and there was a number of questions that was solicited. Questions that were asked, information that was being solicited by ICANN, I would suggest, number one, look at the presentation and I don't think that presentation was made to us in Beijing.

EN

I'm pretty sure it wasn't. If I'm correct on that, I would suggest that we may want to consider either circulating the presentation or perhaps having it made with some discussion maybe in a special purpose meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. On this second point, I note that this came up for a public comment and there was no comment from the ALAC. That they might have a chance this time around maybe to comment on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. In fact, I would suggest people look at the presentation. It was more informative than many of these often are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Since these are highlighted in red for the ALAC to act on, perhaps – would you say we could copy those other to the ALAC action items? So these are followed up after this call.

ALAN GREENBERG: You certainly could. I realize I didn't put into the report the minute point within the transcript or mp3 where the discussion was held. I will add that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. And let's therefore take those points in red and make them action items. And please, staff, when you do put

the action items together, do say in what environment these – and what they actually relate to.

Just a call for committee members will be issued is a tough one. Carlton Samuels has his hand up. Carlton you have the floor.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Olivier. This is Carlton Samuels for the record. I have a question to Alan. I have been sort of peak my interest in following these ideas there inside. I submit, as I always do, I am no expert at this, I have not been following in detail. But ever since it seems that the trademark plus 50 was converging with the idea, and given my interest in local trademarks, I've been following.

And I'm looking at the red indicators in the thing, and I'm asking some of these issues, I mean is it that they were not asked or they were not raised before? Because I'm looking at what is written here, and I can distinctly remember some of these issues as being burning issues for the IDN people.

I wonder if the point is that they were not raised anywhere in ICANN before now? Thank you. [CROSSTALK 0:33:53].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Alan. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. First of all, I don't see any connection whatsoever between the trademark plus 50 and IDN variance. Other than both of them both of

EN

them may cause more things to go into the clearing house through some path, I just don't see the connection at all.

So I'll put that on the table. In regard to have these questions been asked, I think the questions that are being asked are a direct – not a result of, but directly linked to our last statement on IDN variance. That is IDN variance are complex, there are things that can be done in different order.

Some things are higher priority to be done, we shouldn't wait for everything to be done to allow variance to exist either in the root or anywhere else. And the presentation and the questions are one of the first from ICANN that they understand this. They are asking for the relevant questions of given that we don't have to do everything at the same time, given that there are things – some are easier, some are higher priority.

Some were closer, we're almost ready for. Some are far away. There are actually the relevant questions. And the questions are prompted by our last statement. So no, I don't think these questions have been asked by ICANN before. I think they're new. I think they're the state of art in terms of deciding how to go forward in the next six months to a year.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. And I note that there is a note in the chat at the moment from Evan Leibovitch, and of course that will come in later on the discussion on the GNSO work on policy and implementation in the ICANN context. Let's move on.

EN

CARLTON SAMUELS: Just before you move on. I thank Alan for that answer. If the statement is that ICANN has not been asking the question, I quite understand. But the point I was making was that the idea folks that we have, have been asking those questions and making publications on those questions.

And they've been doing it for over a year to my recollection of it. As I said, I only became interested in it when I saw the connections between – and for me there was a connection, and Hung and others were more and more informed about this than me, seems to think so as well.

It seems to me that there is some kind of a nexus there. But again, we [agree on some things 0:36:29].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Carlton. [CROSSTALK 0:36:38] Yes go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've been discussing variance for a long time now. I think we are at a different place than we were even in Beijing, and I'm not going to keep praising ICANN, or heap praise on us for having talked about it. I think we're at a decision point right now, we being the community in ICANN, and we have to make some decisions.

And ICANN is asking the questions. so the extent that you care, to the extent that we have people who want to answer, I think we should pay attention. And as I said, I thought the overall presentation was informative, and as I said, I will put the timing in it and I would suggest people look at it, even if we don't do it explicitly for us. The presentation has merits, just to have been exposed to it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Very helpful. Let's move on in our agenda. Let's go to the next public liaison and that's ccNSO liaison in the persona of Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl, you have the floor.

And unfortunately Cheryl at the moment we cannot hear you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier she… This is Heidi. She's not on audio.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: She's not on audio, okay. And any – I see that Heidi has very kindly put the ccNSO report, so I invite you all, in your own time, to read through this ccNSO liaison report. And that gives us a few more minutes than to let Julie Hammer, our ISOC liaison, sorry I was reading at the same time I was thinking, and that's not easy to do, reading something else at the same time I was thinking.

Julie you have the floor please for a few minutes about your report from ISOC.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. It's Julie Hammer. First, I'm going to backtrack a little bit to the action item on the AP IOS. I'm just going back over the transcript of that session, and I'm embarrassed that you are absolutely correct, Olivier, and I apologize. That was a topic that was discussed at that session, and it had completely missed my attention.

And so I'll need to go back over that and just that get my mind around what was intended by the action and what might be possible be with

EN

each of the groups commitments. So much apologies for having missed that, my memory for not having recall of that as well. Again, you are correct, your memory.

So having said that, moving on to the report. The main item of interest this month is the fact that the ICANN Board in the 18th of May meeting, further considered that – is that report number 058, which was the advisory on internal name certificates and we talked about that at some length in Beijing, and not just the issue of internal name certificates that may have conflicts with new gTLD.

But just the naming of servers in internal networks that could have conflict. And so the Board has come out with some decisions to follow up on, those ISOC concerns. Firstly, they've commissioned a study on the use of TLDs that maybe in conflict with what is used at the root level of public DNS within Enterprises.

This is the name certificate issue that we're talking about. And Langdon [? 0:41:08] is going to be leading a body, this is not an ISOC study, it's a study commissioned by the ICANN Board to look at that issue. But the ISOC has been requested to liaise with [Lie-man 0:41:26] and his group, and offer advice and then offer some views after the study delivers its report.

The ISOC has been asked to cooperate regarding whatever data is required of that study. So there is a lot of work going on at the moment issues in a very short time, because they are being asked to deliver something before Durban.

In addition, ICANN staff reaching out, or continuing to reach out to the certificate authorities in browser forum to continue to work with them on minimizing the risks of the internal name certificate conflict. So there is a lot happening in that space as everyone has hoped there would be after Beijing.

And that completes my report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Of course I have to unmute myself. Thank you very much, much appreciated Julie for the comprehensive report. I've noted here that there has been. – that there will be a study that we are very close to the release of new gTLDs. Isn't this a little let?

JULIE HAMMER: It is a bit late. And this probably should have happened a year or more ago. Some of these things of course weren't realized. Of course, if you would recall when Patrick came and spoke to us in Beijing, a couple of these potential conflicts, depending on when they dropped to some one of the AFLAC members, really not recently but this could result in a problem, and that could then generate both the ISOC advisory and more recently the concern about the naming of service within internal Enterprises network.

Cheryl, I guess the study is now time to look at what each other potential conflicts might be there, that's nobody had [talked at all 0:43:59].

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The unknown unknowns, is that what it is?

JULIE HAMMER: Exactly, exactly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's rather frightening that close to the launch of new gTLDs. It's one of the points where I think that the ALAC will need to monitor this very, very closely and we will have to be very vocal if ICANN is about, or risks releasing domains that will actually break the internet for some of our end users.

It's just terrible, terrible to think it's at this point today. Thank you very much for this Julie. Any comments or thoughts on this? I note that in the meantime, Cheryl has also managed to let us know regarding the ccNSO liaison report that Paraguay dot DY has joined a ccNSO. So welcome to Paraguay.

Any thoughts? No comments? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so that probably leads us to go to the next part of our work. And that is, of our agenda sorry, that – if I can find the right window, is going to be the… Well, first thanking you, sorry, for all of your reports.

The regional reports, RALO reports, you can read online. And please, those of you who have not sent your regional report, your RALO report, please send it. Staff will be following up with you and asking you for. The next is the items for decision, and we have the ALAC policy development activities.

EN

We are going to go through the different statements that are currently up for discussion. There is a recently adopted statement that the trademark clearing house and IDN variance, and I have to thank Holly in particular for having worked on this, but also Rinalia for having worked with Holly on this statement.

And that was adopted with 13 votes in favor. The statement that are currently being put up, there are a few that are currently being drafted. The FY 14 draft operating plan and budget. Tijani is currently drafting statement too. Tijani would you like to say a few words about this please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Olivier. The statement is almost drafted. I am finishing it now, and it will be posted on the Wiki page this evening. I noted that there was a lot of comments, but there are all – especially those of the registry stakeholder group who was trying to see where was going, their money where it was going.

Why they are not [0:47:18]… enough, etcetera, etcetera. So I don't think it was interesting comment from them, but there was other comments that are more questions than comments, because some people find that there is not enough clarity in the budget.

Our statement will not be long. We said the most important thing for us, which is first the activity that the community wasn't enough this time because we know why, but it not – we know the reason. The reason doesn't justify that we cannot give the point of view of the

community sequentially in time we have enough time to discuss and to comment.

We are behind what we had before. Before we had the framework on which we comment, and then we take those comments into consideration and they drop the budget. This time that is only in the budget. And it is because of the change in the management vision. So this is very important when there is two or three other specific points with [eagles 0:48:50], etcetera.

You will see it this afternoon or this evening on the Wiki page. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani.   Are there any other questions or comments on this? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I ask everyone to check on this page tomorrow because of the fact that we have a very, very short amount of time until the comment period closes on this.

It's one of these things where everything is in a rush again, because things have moved. Equally, I was also on the call with you, Tijani, on the budget call and I guess the way that they are working on this is obviously to improve the system and give more transparency and more clarity to things.

But the very fact that they have changed it and they changed… It's also linked to the internal changes that ICANN is going through at the moment, the internal organizational changes. It certainly makes things

a little more complicated for us to be able to take in, in such a short amount of time.

It's interesting to note that there are the early budget process special requests, some of which were approved, and then there is the later one. It is a two stage special request approval. And of course, they are bound yet again to the fact that the fiscal year finishes at the end of June.

There is less than a month for the Board to approve this. And there is certainly some concerns that was ousted some of the other SOs and ACs, that this leaves so little time to make any amendments to the framework and into the proposed budget. How much would the current budget be frozen? And if we are to make some serious comments on this, to make some serious amendments to it, how likely are they likely to be followed at least in this fiscal year?

Please everyone check this tomorrow. There will be an announcement of the financial budget subcommittee mailing list. Just a reminder, and if I can ask staff to take an action item on this, please to check for this, for Tijani's statement, first draft.

And then immediately send a reminder to the SPSC on this. Let's move on… Yes Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You mentioned the special request of the SO and AC. I think that, and this skill there is a big improvement, very important improvement. Since we have the [? 0:51:40], which will allow ask to apply for activities that will happen just after the budget improvement.

So we, if we wait until the budget approve, perhaps will not reach our goal and we will not be able to implement the activities. So this is a very important improvement, and in the statement I thank the [? 0:52:05] department about the process improvement.

They are always approve the process. But this time, unfortunately we couldn't take benefit of this improvement because of the changes in ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. That's certainly very helpful. Right. The next one that we have here is, I'm looking back through quickly, the At-Large statement on the – to the Board. So the ALAC statement to the Board regarding the security and stability implications of new gTLDs.

Julie Hammer has drafted a statement on this. And the ALAC is currently voting on this, as far as I understand. If I can check, yes we're still voting and the vote closes on the 30th. I don't think we'll need any run through of this, where at a voting stage, let's move onto the next one.

The new detailed Board committee consideration of GAC safeguard advice. Alan and myself are actually going to draft a statement of this. originally a month ago, the consensus was that it might be wise to keep out of any potential conflict between the GAC and the Board.

Thankfully Alan and I who were at the ATRT in Los Angeles, we met with both the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC. Alan do you want to say a few words on this please?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes I do. I don't know to what extent people have read the section on safeguards, it's the last half of the annex and the GAC communique. If I were to summarize, what it was saying is there are a whole bunch of constraints that ICANN needs to put on the registries for various different things, ranging from to protecting children, to protecting religion, all sorts of other things.

From my point of view, there are a number of components to the statements. Number one, and I think the largest single part is I think we need to say that it is unfortunate that this level of detail on how we are going to manage these TLDs when they come into existence.

It's coming out now instead of seven years ago when we spent years talking about the details. And I think that message has to be made because it's exceedingly difficult to do this kind of thing now. The bulk of the recommendations are in fact putting requirements on registries to do audits, to do self-control, to initiate all sorts of inspections.

Not bad things in their own right, but a little bit more interesting to be proposing to people after they already made their business models and made their business decisions. And offloading a fair amount of work of ICANN compliance onto the registry itself.

Again not a bad concept, but the timing is rather interesting. And then I think we need to also comment on the scope of some of them, because I think some of them are interesting but I don't believe we understand the issue well enough to simply say that anyone running dot something, that's a generic term, has to consider the public interest and run it from a point of view of public interest, that's just punting it to another group because we haven't found those terms.

So we have to make a short statement and largely identify the potential problems with it, and to laminate the timing. Conceptually, everything that they are saying is honorable and good, perhaps a little overstepping in a few cases. So that's the kind of thing that I envision saying. If people disagree that we shouldn't be saying that kind of thing, I shouldn't be one of the ones drafting it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. That's very helpful. Let's move on with our next public comment. So Alan and I will be working on this together the next couple of days and then be drafting something. Any comments or questions on this? I see Jean-Jacques Subrenat put his hand up. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. Yes I wanted to put a preliminary question following on Alan's remark. I've noticed now for some time, like many other people, that as far as I know this is the first time in the [? 0:57:15] that the Board has discharged itself of a large part of its duties.

And has entrusted one of its constituencies with quote, unquote full powers to deal with the new gTLD program. I have not followed this point from the legal standpoint [CROSSTALK 0:57:40]… sorry? And I was wondering if anyone on the ALAC would have knowledge of the legal implications, to tell me if this is quite normal or not.

Because frankly, it seems to be discharging the [? 0:58:07[of its duties. I know this was done, this was done because now there is an unusual

number of Board members who are conflicted, and potentially conflicted. But isn't this the right time for the ALAC to be pointing out the last contradiction between the two sides.

There is a majority, a high number of Board members who are conflicted [? 0:58:33], and because of that, almost as a repair procedure, the Board has decided to [dis-cul-pate 0:58:44] themselves by nominating a full committee with full powers.

There is something fundamentally wrong with it so what I'm saying [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 0:58:56]… I'd like to have a view from someone on the ALAC on this. If it's legally healthy or not. And if it's not well than perhaps we should also use this opportunity to make a strong remark on this aspect as well. Thank you.

MAN: Do we still have Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry about this, I was muted [laughs], it's always a bit of a problem. Thank you very much for this Jean-Jacques. Any comments on Jean-Jacques… I see that Alan has put his hand up, so Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah thank you. I don't see this as being the same issue as the one, what is up. It may well be something that we want to talk about. I'll give a very brief answer. As far as I can see, if it wasn't legal either ICANN's lawyers or someone would have already said so.

And I don't think anyone has raised the question of legality. Essentially what they've done is have a standing subset of the Board minus people who would be recusing themselves if the discussion were held by the same Board.

So I believe it is a logistic expedient and nothing more than that, but I'm not a legal person I'm not going to quality on it. Whether it's good or not, that's a different issue and a very substantive issue. It's clear that under the current structure, we will have ICANN members who have conflicts on any given issue.

The fact that we have this many, and including some specific ones is distressing. I tend to agree. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Any comments from anyone else? Okay. So I think we can just take this and move on basically on this. Let's look at the next thing which is the proposed final 2013 RAA. That's of course the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. The ALAC is currently voting on the drafted statement.

I must give you just a quick points, things to point out. There were a couple of words that were used in that statement that will be probably modified or amended – well, being mindful of the fact that the vote is taking place. And that's just, I would imagine just be a more cosmetic than actually changing the meaning of the statement all together.

I'm working currently with Alan Greenberg but also with the drafters of this statement, Holly Raiche and Carlton Samuels, to try and to see what amendments, small amendments we can make so that it's a more

polished statements. The vote is going on at the moment, I think it will finish a couple of days.

So we can move on to the next one. That's the compost final 2000 and…   Sorry, wrong one.   The next one is the questions to the committee on the accountability and transparency within ICANN. The ALAC was considering drafting a statement. Actually, there is several things that took place. First thing that took place was that we had a webinar that took place with regional leaders.   And really on this occasion it was a case to try to get the RALOs to take the lead in the region and stimulate their ALSs to go and submit some input.

Perhaps having a common input at RALO level, but also individual ALSs submitting input into the ATRT, the accountability and transparency review team. Now this team is there to go and review the work… Well, review effectively the work of the first ATRT, which looked at the way the Board was running, looked at the way the GAC was running the stability and the, SSR Stability and Security and Security Review team.

And we also had the WHOIS review team that is reviewed by the first ATRT, we are looking now at that. But there is also some additional work that is to come on the table. Alan Greenberg is actually one of the vice chairs of the ATRT 2. Perhaps Alan you want to add a few more things.

Sorry, I know that Carlton had his hand up before Alan. Carlton was that on the previous point?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes Olivier, it was on the previous point.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh dear. I really apologize. I have to look at five or six different windows at the same time and this one, I think it got behind it. Let me just finish on the ATRT and then I'll come back to you Carlton, if that's okay with you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's fine, no problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. I'm going to take off my hat as an ATRT vice chair. I'm very much saying this as an ALAC member who cares about this. the ATRT asked a whole bunch of questions. I'm sure the ALAC and At-Large can come up with answers to all of them.

Time is short, and I really strongly suggest that the ALAC focus on areas where the ALAC has traditionally cared, and I will identify several of them. They're issues that the ATRT 1 did not look at in any great detail. And specifically there are, is the policy development process working? Is ICANN, and I'm paraphrasing, does ICANN have the ability of mobilizing volunteers so that we have real community bottom up things?

And this comes back to the kinds of discussions that have been had. Do we really have a say in the policy development process? Do contracted parties or others capture the process? Are our volunteers given enough incentive? We talk continually about travel policy, and that's one of the

EN

issues that our volunteers reasonably expect to continue to put lots of effort into it.

So I would strongly suggest we focus on the two or three issues that we really care about, and put some strong comments in those. If we don't do that, and other people don't do that, this ATRT is going to ignore those issues again. So I would be glad to give a subset that I think the ALAC should be commenting on.

They're my personal opinion, I can't draft it as an ATRT member, but I think we need some strong, short statements of issues that we think are problematic in ICANN that we care about. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. And I totally agree with you and your point of view on this. It's also important to note that some of the RALOs, as I've said, some of the ALSs have already sent some input. There is a concern with regards to the fact that we are already in the response period for the call for comments.

I understand that the ATRT is in listening mode all the way up to the Durban meeting, and perhaps even beyond that. So the input is very gratefully acknowledged. And I think we really have a duty to work out what we want to send. What points are we particularly feeling strong about at the moment?

There was a recent email that was sent out by, I think, was it Evan? There was some discussion about the public interest and also ICANN meeting perhaps looking at the regulator aspect of things. There are a

number of points which this community is interested in making. And I'm a bit concerned about not having much feedback or response so far.

So I hope that after this call there will be some response and some feedback. Carlton, I guess you're the only person in line, you may comment on this or you can comment on the prior note as well, if you wish to.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Olivier. This is Carlton for the record. Let me comment on the ATRT 2 first. To Alan's questions, I'm making the response but you see [Ali 1:08:05] has made the response. Wasn't it remarkable that we read the same thing and came up with pretty much the same idea of what was being said?

Specific to the specifications for privacy proxy service. The comment was based on two things. One, we agreed, the ALAC agreed that, from as early as the review team that we support a privacy proxy service that was well defined and moderated by ICANN. And what that meant was that we wish to see privacy proxy service providers that is accredited by ICANN.

And two, privacy proxy service providers must maintain strict liability for the domain name that they are providing the service. That's what we said. If you look at the specification, it actually delegates the accreditation until 2017 to the registrar. And it also acknowledges that the registrar maybe a proxy provider. That is what we mean when we say limbo to our views.

And limbo means here ambiguity. So I will release a statement that will go into it in detail on top of what Alan has said.   But that one established why that is. With regard to the changing of the wording, I don't have any problems changing that to something that people would – even the word ambiguity is what it means, but it is a personal things.

Sometimes you must stretch people a little bit. That's how you learn. Look it up. And I don't mean to be talking down to anybody, but I say this to my children all the time, "If you see something you don't quite understand what it means, look it up. That's how you learn."

I mean, I don't think we should continue to dumb-dumb in what we say. I really have a problem with dumbing down all the time. Let's give them something that we say what we say what we mean, and people can look it up. We don't have to dumb-dumb the language all the time. It is really a bother to me. That's the first thing.

With regards to the ATRT, I totally agree with Alan. It would make sense because of the short attention span that we're dealing with to go down and enumerate a few issues that we're particularly strong for. And say exactly what we think.

I quite agree with them the value that is placed on the time and resources provided by volunteers. It is not what it should be. Second of all, I quite agree with the [a shore 1:11:08] policy. The problem, as far as I'm concerned, is that we are seeing to be outside of, on the outside an advisory of the policy because of the way it is structured right now.

And the problem that we have with it, if it's going to be multi-stakeholder, is that you can have this instance where one part of the

EN

structure, the contracted part, has the right to decide what is policy, and no they are not saying they have the right to decide what this policy, they're saying that they have the right towards determine how we implement it.

I think that bothers some of us, and maybe we follow Alan's note on this, maybe those two things we should put out strong statements about those things. And those two things, I quite agree. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Carlton. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm just going to make one very brief comment, I'm not going to talk about the specifics of the RAA, because the emails that went out were private ones. The rest of the ALAC has the, and we need to expose it.

I note that the ALAC and other groups in ICANN have been sending out very mixed messages, that we say we want bottom up, we want involvement in policy development. And then we say things like, in the private negotiations, the privacy proxies rules should be fleshed out in detail, without any community involvement.

And I think we have to be careful about sending mixed messages that is advocating top down when it suits our purposes, and bottom up when we want to give input into it. So just caution that, I've seen it a lot in the last couple of weeks.

And on a completely different subject, that we pick our top down, bottom up, depending on where it suits our purposes. And that's the exact kind of thing that's getting ICANN into trouble. Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Let me respond to that. The statement also pointed out that we believe we should have been there in the negotiations, why we said that. We should have been there up front in the negotiation, we should have been there… If you read the statement, it says we should at least even a watching brief, that was tongue and cheek to say, even if you didn't take us as full participants in the discussion.

That is one of the things that we really, really, really see that we should be involved in. The contract. That contract is the singular piece of detail that comes out of this work, that affects everybody. And if you notice this curdled, what is consensus policy and how the consensus policy portions [? 1:13:57] right, and so on.

What we've been saying is the idea of consensus policy does not involve enough of us, and we think that is one of the things we should have been involved with.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Carlton. And gentlemen, I know that this is a very interesting point. I'm going to let this discussion go on for a couple of more minutes. I also see Holly Raiche in the queue. Before you answer Alan, I thought I would let Holly say a few words and then back to you Carlton – back to you Alan. Holly, Holly Raiche.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I just like to support what Carlton said. Having sat on the original telephone conversation, starting in 2009, we are starting there, would be involved in even contract negotiations, and it was [? 1:14:50], then please could we at least see [Reece didn't have a watching brace 1:14:53], but we've been pushing, or I've been pushing.

I know that everybody in APRALO, and everybody I've talked to, have really been pushing to be involved in these negotiations and it's always been, no this is a contract negotiation, it's got no place in it. And so it's a sense of enormous frustration that this was, there has been no consensus. It's always been what it is.

By the way, what do you think now? And it's just very discouraging. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly. And just to remind everyone, since I received a note that people are on the call getting a little lost. This is the At-Large proposed final 2013 RAA workspace. That's where the statement is at the moment.

And that's what you're voting on, what the ALAC members are voting on. Alan, back to you. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a very brief comment to both Carlton and Holly. I understand completely that we're dissatisfied that this was done as private negotiation in the statement. That's good.

But the discussion that started this, was among other things, on the dissatisfaction that the privacy proxy specification is not far more complete, and far more inclusive of all of the protections that users deserve, and a number of things like that, which is destined to come out to be developed in full in a PDP.

So at the same time, you shouldn't have done this in private, but you should have done the privacy part in excruciating detail and not let anything out. And I think that's sending two different messages. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. I note that Holly has typed that she is happy to word this statement that way. I'm a little concerned about the fact that we are currently voting. And I'm reminding everyone, the ALAC is currently reporting on this. Let's see where the vote goes with this, follow up after this call.

Holly, Carlton, Alan, and myself and anyone else who wishes to join, just drop me an email and we'll discuss this quickly by email, or even on the At-Large list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, as Chair, I think you should give the ALAC members the right to change their vote if when they see the changes they don't like them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah absolutely. And what we might do then is extend the vote. If I see that there really is… I mean, there is three ways. One, keep the vote as

EN

it is. Two, extend the vote and let people change their vote. And three, cancel this vote and start a new one.

The concern that I have about cancelling this vote and starting a new one, is that we're going to be really out of time on this. So I'd be inclined to, since this is an open vote, I'd be inclined to keep the vote open and extend it for a few more days and make the changes, announce it to the ALAC, and then move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think anyone is going to have a problem with them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Wow that's been an interesting thought here. I'm glad that there is much discussion going on, and I hope that everyone has been able to follow on this. It is a lot of documentation, but it's certainly a very core, very important agreement, and very important contract that we really needed to have a look at.

Finally on this statement on WCIT outcomes, as I mentioned earlier, I'm still working on putting out a statement on this. The currently open public comments, there are four of them, and no statement is decided, no statement would be drafted.

The first one, the proposed modification of GNSO policy development process manual to address the suspension of a PDP, internal GNSO matter, not something that we want to comment on. Locking of domain

name subject to uniform dispute resolution provider proceedings, UDRP proceedings.

It's an initial report, very on… Giving the amount of time at the moment, or lack of bandwidth that we all have at the moment, it's seen as being something we didn't need to comment on. The consultation on the root zone, KSK rollover, that's the key – I'm asking follow up on this one.

I know that one the earlier call today, I didn't know what KSK was, the key supply, key or something. Anyway. No statement on that one. So even if we can't understand the KSK, the statement could have actually been called something else with that.

The revised proposal on the ACDAR to serve as an UDRP dispute resolution dispute, resolution service provider. That's the Arab Conflict and Dispute Resolution, I think it's called that. The Arab [? 1:20:29] for Domain Name Dispute Resolution. And that's effectively just putting together… Well, the hiring of this organization, or the contracting of this organization, for IDM that are in Arabic.

That would be for the Arab world. I see that Alan has put his hand up. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah thank you. I don't know what happened to it. There was a question of whether we were going to do a statement on the registry agreement. It seems to have disappeared. In any case, my recommendation was no we don't need to do a statement.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. You're absolutely right. For some reason this has that. No statement on this. Any reason why? Because there was a serious question as to, we did comment on the registrar, so maybe the registry will also be important to comment on.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are a lot of changes. There is nothing there that I see as being earth shattering for us. One of the ability to, for the Board with an elaborate long term process, change the agreement without the approval of the registrar, registries.

That was what was approved in the RAA, and we supported the concept. So there is also some little things there, to be honest, I don't think we're a large player in this, and I don't think we need to comment on it. That's… Could we come up with a 12 page comment on some of the details? Sure.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: …strong are…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Let's just open the floor for one last time for any of the public comment process, any policy development activities.   Does anyone has any comments to make? I'm seeing that no one has put

their hands up. I just have one last bit of information courtesy of Julie Hammer.

KSK is Key Signing Key. I wonder why I didn't think about using key twice, but there you go. Key Signing Key, great stuff. Right. So let's move on. Oh yes, well I do note that yes, okay. Sorry, I'm reading the chat at the moment that is quite well attended.

Thank you for all of this. Let's move on to the ICANN for decision that is the ALS decertification. So effectively, we've received two requests for decertification of an ALS. First one, was sent by [? 1:23:20] on behalf of the Internet User's Network Tokyo, who asked – that is the current organization, that this organization be delisted or de-accredited, or decertified, whatever the name is for this.

Decertified I guess. And because we haven't performed any such thing before, we looked at the current procedures. There is nothing in the actual bylaws as such, they are some adjunct – they're not really called adjunct documents, there is a procedure that is documented on the At-Large web page.

That effectively says that for the decertification, we need to have a vote. So there needs to be a request, if I can – here we go. So decertification should be subject to review as provided by the ICANN bylaws, but then in order to be able to decertify, you need to have – there needs to be a reason for decertification.

And then there needs to be a last attempt to get in touch with the ALS that might be decertify, which often is the case for ALSs that are persistently not confined with significant ALS requirements. So the ALS

will have a last opportunity to be heard and respond to the ALAC prior to decision on decertification.

Of course, in this case, because this was a request from the ALS representative, [? 1:25:04], really there is an agreement that the ALS should be decertified. So that's one. The second one, is the one about Internet Society Pakistan chapter, and there we received an email from the – that that one was from ISOC Global, advising us that this ALS, or rather they call it chapter.

So this chapter was not in existence anymore, was undergoing regional [? 1:25:39] that the current members, the membership etcetera, the leaders of the chapter are not around, or cannot be adjoined, or have basically stood down. And there is like a rebirth process basically to start a new chapter, and that could take several years.

In accordance with our specifications on the At-Large website, I have contacted the Internet Society Pakistan chapter, people that are listed as being the ALS contact, the website has disappeared. So there is no website. The domain name itself is not around anymore either, and I have contacted the people, their Gmail account I think, and one of them on another account, that domain bounced.

And I have not received any reply at all from the other two people that I've contacted. I think I could pretty much say that this one is gone. But before we go forward with a vote, of course, there needs to be a discussion on these two. I'm proposing that we have two votes on this. One for each.

And I see now three people already put their hand up. So first we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Cheryl you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. This is Cheryl for the transcript record. I just wanted to be particular about the process and the record. Because of course I'm not an ALAC member, I just wanted to [? 1:27:09]… You have in fact had the situation with an accredited At-Large structure, have written to previous ALAC chairs with a staff, with a letter of recognition.

A desire to no longer be an accredited At-Large structure underneath the ICANN classification, and indeed at that time, the ALAC needs to [AUDIO BREAKUP 1:27:48]… accept that as a resignation, and then has in the record, that that At-Large structure should be listed as decertified, or resigned. We didn't care which way it should be held on a record [AUDIO BREAKUP 1:28:10]… and that's very simple [? 1:28:14] to what is proposed for [? 1:28:17] here. People who still run the thing as this, will need to block the change.

That's the [? 1:28:24]… I want to commend you however, on the particular [? 1:28:30] through with the second, the chapter on rejuvenation with ISOC. It's a lot different situation, the rules – you follow the rules and the recommendations I think to the nth degree, and my compliments to you doing that.

We want to ensure that a few people who were out of contact for a little while, could not end up having an At-Large structure. This is an acknowledge [AUDIO BREAKUP 1:29:04]… and it's typically is that this is

a nonexistent. But you have got a situation whereby you need to be very clear on what your result with your [? 1:29:23].

Because if after rejuvenation in [AUDIO BREAKUP 1:29:27] ISOC happens, you then have a modify and active ISOC chapter who wishes to have been reaccredited At-Large structure, you probably need to think about that process now. Because if you decertify, it means that no mechanism for recertification and they made the argument that if you decertified, should they have to go through [AUDIO BREAKUP 1:29:59] or what's the risk, etcetera, etcetera.

So just need to be cautious doing that Olivier. The one way you could do that if you wanted to, is to, as we have done before, satisfy requests where an At-Large structure has decided that it is not in a position to be involved with ICANN for a period of time, until certain administration has changed.

We keep deactivated, decertified, deactivated. In other words, stop them off list, etcetera, etcetera. That they would be parked in a parking or hold position. Until they reorganize, and on that reorganization, the ALAC reactive it again by a majority vote. But just be really cautious the one that's going under rejuvenation, just in case you've read the problem with your [AUDIO BREAKUP 1:30:59], in the same name back on later.

Just be really clear on the record. And then if I may, because I couldn't speak earlier on this matter but not at this time, I would like to bring up something as business latter. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Cheryl for this very extensive explanation. Just in response to your concerns, suddenly the Internet Users Network is I believe a very straightforward decision here. There is nothing contentious about it.

As to the second one, the Pakistan chapter of the Internet Society, I have to make it clear, this is a specific request, by the Internet Society to have that ALS decertified, because any organization in Pakistan today using the name Internet Society would be in breach of the Internet Society and would not have anything to do with the Internet Society itself.

And so the request, and bearing in mind, we are dealing here with an organization that is effectively been dissolved in Pakistan, the new team that would be, if this is rejuvenated, the new team would have to go through the same certification process in ISOC as a new chapter.

It would have to restart from scratch, and satisfy all of the conditions that need to be satisfied by a new chapter applying. And therefore, I see a very dangerous to give this special status. So as for any new chapter to be able to reuse an old name, including all of the loopholes that might be used by this.

If you reuse the name of an organization that seems to have been suspended, and you basically take on their identity, it opens a whole new kettle of fish. Is that the right thing? Kettle of fish? Yeah. It opens a whole new world, and therefore I would really recommend that this organization gets decertified all together.

And if, in the future, the new Pakistan chapter is created, it would have to go through the full ALS certification process again. Whether it is the same people or different people. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Cheryl here. This is [AUDIO BREAKUP 1:33:35]… I fully agree with the decertification about getting dropped, if indeed a chapter cannot be rejuvenated, and you use the same name in the ISOC rules, which is not at all what I'm saying in this, there is no problem.

If however, a rejuvenated chapter would be possible to have the same name, I just want you to make sure that what you are resolving is clear that a recertification – sorry, a new ALS would have no impediment because it's using a decertified ALS's name from the ICANN point of view.

So I just wanted to really [? 1:34:25], just make sure when you decertify, you really are clear that there will be no impediment for a future chapter of the Internet Society reapplying. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you. Thank you very much Cheryl. I full understand your meaning, and I think we are in agreement on this. I see that there is a queue here. Alan Greenberg and then Holly Raiche. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Based on my earlier intervention, you will already have the concept that I strongly support getting rid of ALSs that don't exist, or are

not active, or a variety of other things. I think we should have no fear in doing this in these particular cases. There as close to no-brainers.

The concept of deactivation does not exist in our current formal rules, and I think we need to be careful about using a process like that, which works against trying to get a lean, mean set of ALSs that are really active. And I agree completely with Cheryl that whatever we do has to be without prejudice to some organization in the future.

I serve notice that I will offer some carefully crafted draft resolutions to decertify both of these ALSs on the list very soon. I suggest that if anyone has a problem with them, speak up quickly. And if not, we can proceed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Thank you very much Alan. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: I just say look, the request actually came from [? 1:36:07], Pakistan who was a member of the Society who was advised personally that the chapter doesn't exist, that he doesn't want the name used.

So if you…   My suggestion to you Olivier, if you want to check on anything about the name or whatever, get ahold of [? 1:36:27], as you know he is with ISOC now. But that's the advice I have. He just said please get rid of that, that that is an ALS.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much Holly. And in fact, Holly, I have spoken to Ann Lord previously, that's how far back it goes. Ann Lord has been away for years from ISOC. And I'm actually going to meet with Ann Lord next week, she's coming from the South of France.

So I'll meet with, but I've spoken to her a year ago about this, and I spoke to [? 1:37:07] about this, over in Beijing. So it was… [? 1:37:12] is now part of ISOC, this is one of the reasons why this is really on the card now and moving forward.

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: Olivier, may I please intervene?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sala, yes please, go ahead Sala.

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: Thank you very much. I think following this is… Sala Tamanikaiwimaro for the transcript. I've been following this as an interest personally, I shouldn't say personally.   There is an ICANN, in a sense as ALAC members, we hold a peculiar position in terms of offices. Our first duty, first of all, is to At-Large.

Our second duty, in a sense, is to ICANN. And particularly, the addressing particularly on a global public interest perspective on this particularly too. As I'm hearing the debate and the discussions, I know that there is not much debate really, but I would say that we should exercise caution.

First of all, whilst we do have a strong affiliation with the Global Internet Society. I would exercise caution in, particularly in terms of how we are going to vote on the matter, to decertify and that sort of thing. And the reason is this, I do not think it should be or it's within our mandate to determine whether our community within Pakistan and Japan, in this instance it is Pakistan, that the Internet Society.

As far as the community in Pakistan is concerned, if they feel that they are a community, they can call themselves whatever they wish to. On the one hand, the conflict that surfaces here is the conflict between ISOC and ISOC Pakistan. With ISOC having a problem with the manner in which ISOC Pakistan is holding, is turning out its duties.

My view is, ISOC has already be willing to decertify them from this process, for the ALAC to step in, we enter a dangerous territory, whereby we open up potential retaliation from an ALS, even… Particularly in terms of ICANN's protection, they can potentially sue ICANN for, in terms of the decertification process where the procedures are not too clear.

The other thing is, I'm not too sure whether it was good to ISOC Pakistan that they have, that [? 1:40:41] should not be aligned to the Global ISOC, that sort of thing. And as for charges where ISOC Pakistan has been suggested to run with the ISOC members, that ISOC Pakistan is a community, and is a city.

I'm not sure what the extent of the investigation have been, and whether they've been impartial, where they have not involved ISOC offices or holders of ISOC positions, so to speak. So with that, we are

very, very cautious and yes, and I thought that I would just mention that for the record. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sala. And that's noted. I just wanted to make sure that we are aware. ISOC Pakistan has not asked to change name, it has disappeared. There is no way to get hold of any of the members of ISOC Pakistan, and the website has gone, basically is an ALS that has disappeared.

The organization that was certified as an At-Large structure was ISOC Pakistan. And the mother ship of that organization, I gather that we're not going to go into the depths of the chapter, mother ship relationship. But I believe that once that ISOC has decertified a chapter officially, we are bound to also, because that chapter does not exist anymore.

The contract is with this chapter, we're bound to also decertify it. I don't think that there is anything we can do. And certainly, not – in fact, we would probably be exposed if we were to continue having an ALS that does not exist. It would just make a farce of the whole process.

That's my personal point of view, but looking at it on a level, having spoken to various people about this. Holly, then Alan, and then I think we'll proceed with the vote, and of course we're all ALAC members on the call are very open, very – they wish to vote, abstain or vote against, that's all fine as well.

But it's a democracy here. Well, kind of [laughs]. Alan you have the floor. That was a joke by the way. Go ahead Alan.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two points. Number one, I'll point out that in this case, abstentions count as no's, so people shouldn't abstain without understanding what they are doing. This is unlike most of our votes because the rules are very specific.

That's number one. Number two, I can assure Sala and anyone else who cares, the resolution I will be posting will make no reference whatsoever to the Internet Society. I will point out that the Internet Society China, is not an Internet Society chapter, and yet ICANN has very strong ties with them based on our meetings in Beijing.

So we can't be sending out mixed messages. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Next is Yaovi Atohoun.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: [INAUDIBLE 1:44:07]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Yaovi. We can hear you well. Go ahead.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yeah. I have two comments. The first one is about a ISOC chapter. We are an ISOC chapter, and I used to attend ISOC meetings that positions that ISOC chapter are at [certificate 1:44:28], this is very important, and once one of us can, there is no more in ISOC chapter [INAUDIBLE 1:44:37]… that's one.

My second point is, I would like to note a request of the request from [INAUDIBLE 1:44:52]… decertified the Tokyo chapter. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Yaovi. I believe that this is explained in the letter by [? 1:45:09], with regards to the Tokyo chapters. In fact, I don't have the pen. [? 1:45:18] basically asked for it to be decertified, and I understand that he wants to windup the structure itself, the Internet Users Network.

So he wants the organization to cease functioning. With regards to the nomenclature to the ISOC Pakistan chapter, yes indeed. In fact, I also take the point of Alan saying that the Internet Society of China has nothing to do with the Internet Society. But it has never purported to be part of the Internet Society.

And I gather that it's well understood that this organization is totally independent of the Internet Society. And I'm talking about the Internet Society of China. With the regards to the Internet Society Pakistan chapter, and let me say it again, I have attempted to contact all of the people who are listed in the application.

I've received no reply. And various inquiries with people who are in Pakistan, that includes [? 1:46:21], that also includes [? 1:46:24], that includes people who, well the Internet Society, the people who are in charge of chapters. This chapter does not exist anymore, and they want it out as an ALS.

Because if they do create a new one, then there would be a potential conflict since we'll probably get an ALS application from the new

Internet Society Pakistan chapter. And then what happens, when we've already got an Internet Society Pakistan chapter, I would like you to think about this as well.

We're spending much time on this. Just one more thing. We have 14 members on the call, we need a two-third in favor. And the interpreters are going to go soon as well. So time is going by. So just a couple of more comments, and then we'll go forward. Who can I hear?

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: It's Sala.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sala, please, go ahead Sala.

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And then Alan after you, and then we have to go forward with the vote please. Go ahead Sala.

SALA TAMAIKAIWIMARO: Thank you Olivier.   And thank you everyone for the comments, especially Alan. I just have a quick question Olivier, just for the record. As this is the case of most ALSs before they become certified, we usually ask for the ITM regional office assistance in terms of the due diligence.

Was there a report published by them on this matter?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sala. Heidi? Would you care to share your words on this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Heidi [CROSSTALK 1:48:23]… sorry, yes, go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl wanted to speak, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Cheryl please go ahead. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Put my hand up before, now I'm [INAUDIBLE 1:48:37]. I just say, just to be very clear [INAUDIBLE 1:48:41]… is the fact that there is no requirement or indeed [INAUDIBLE 1:48:45] for regional [INAUDIBLE 1:48:47] discussion. To be a requirement [INAUDIBLE 1:48:52]… ALAC is in control of certification, and any other decertification, etcetera.

What ALAC does do is it consults with the regions for their opinions on accreditation. There is no equal requirements for them to consult in any other matter, only during the accreditation process, then it's absolutely all up to the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Finally Alan, and then I'll say a couple of words. Alan Greenberg please go ahead.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I would caution that this should be done formally, and the wording of the resolution should be carefully worded. I was just not having a vote on this call, but doing it as soon as possible afterwards. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I thought that the vote would be, does the ALAC wish to decertify the Internet Users Network Tokyo? I think we needed to have a huge paragraph on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, the rules call for us to have the equivalent of what the Board now calls a rationale, and I would suggest that that be crafted either including in the resolution, or not, but that we have that on the record.

And as Cheryl pointed out, we do need to have something that says without prejudice to any future organization with the same name, or a rebirth of this organization. So I would strongly suggest, that since we want this to be the model of how we're going to do others in the future, should ALSs are no longer viable, and I think we need to be doing this as I already said, I think we should do this as the model and not do it in an ad-hoc way.

You're the Chair and you can do it as you wish, but I would really say we need to do this carefully and formally.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier. I'm unaware which ask the ALAC to explain its votes. Was that a Board thing? Because I understand…

ALAN GREENBERG: That is in the section seven that Heidi pointed to, if you want to go back to the URL, we can find it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see, well…

ALAN GREENBERG: Reasons for the ALAC to pursue the decertification access, must include… So it says we have to have specific reasons, it is subject to reconsideration, to a review. And therefore, I think we have to do this carefully.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Provide information requesting review of the decision. Okay, fine, yes. I understood. Staff will work with me on this, and we will have text this. If Alan you want to suggest the text on this, then you're very welcome to.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will be glad to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Perfect. So let's not have the vote here, so if that's the case. Sorry? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I think you are taking a wise move in this [PHONE RINGING 1:52:17]… The reason why I'm [INAUDIBLE 1:52:21]… is because these

things do get put into concrete, but it is the one time that the At-Large Advisory Committee has fallen under the less than friendly gaze, and indeed fall for one review, and it takes and report made, was the ICANN ombudsman, was to do with ALS certification and decertification.

And all of the rules you currently operate by now, were put together as a result of improvement in the process, as a result of the ombudsman scathing report on how ALSs were to be decertified and how that was processed, and how that [INAUDIBLE 1:53:16] was not. So please see what you're doing [INAUDIBLE 1:53:20], in other words, [INAUDIBLE 1:53:21]… this is the one thing that ALAC has stumbled badly on in the past. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl, that's helpful. Let's then move on. I note this will take a lot more than 15 minutes on this, but I think this discussion needed to be had on the record, and I'm very grateful for all of the input from those people who are knowledgeable about the matter on this.

I gather that the ALAC, when the ALAC would vote, would be in full knowledge of the fact now. Next we have the consensus call on the naming of members of the At-Large Objections follow up group. Let me just quickly explain where this is going at the moment.

As you know there was an At-Large… There was a review group that was for the new gTLD review group, look at the actual objections that the ALAC was tasked to be able to file with regards to the new gTLD process. This review group came up with a number of

recommendations for objections, specifically for the dot health applications.

There was a vote of the ALAC then which took place, which agreed that three of these applications would be objected to. The objections letter and file was prepared by the review group, and was then sent by myself on behalf of the ALAC to ICANN. Sorry, to the dispute resolution provider that is in charge of the objections process.

This was then responded to by this organization, the International Chamber of Commerce based in France. They acknowledged the three objections. They then proposed that the… And of course, the applicants were advised of this. They then proposed that these three objections be consolidated into one case. It appears that two out of the three applicants agreed.

But then for some reason, the cases have been kept apart from each other at the moment. And the thing, of course, is that we are currently going into uncharted territory. It is the first time that the ALAC goes through this process. And it's something that we are effectively…

Because we are in uncharted territory, we're currently charting the territory, which is good, but we need to proceed carefully. But we don't really know what the follow up will be. There was a follow up from the objectors side that took place in Beijing, where several of us, including myself, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, also Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and also Julie Hammer, met up with someone from the World Health Organizaiton.

The objectors, the original objectors, were somehow related to the World Health Organization, and we needed to find out from the World

Health Organization where there was a new follow up on their side, having been told through other channels that the applicants where in discussions with the World Health Organization.

It appears that this was not the case, and that the wishes of the World Health Organization for the domain name not to be allocated at this point in time. But irrespective of what the wishes of the objector are, at the moment the ALAC has objected…

Sorry, the original organization requested are, the ALAC has objected to these three applications. And so now there comes a case of, should I continue the acting chair for this follow up? Or should someone else be the chair for this? The discussion really is, whether there might be a face to face discussion at the International Chamber of Commerce, whether there might be some kind of brokering between the two parties, maybe some kind of mediation that would take place.

No one knows. There hasn't been any requests so far from any of the applicants. But in order to be prepared for this, it would be good and judicial for us to have someone who can act on this in person. And so the proposal that I make is that for Seth Reece, who is a lawyer, who was in the review group so he has the knowledge all of the work of the new gTLD review group.

That it is also, as I said, because he is a lawyer, he knows all of the legalize, etcetera. The proposal is for Seth to be basically the front person, in case there is some kind of mediation, face to face, or even mediation that needs to take place.

But of course, with full knowledge an full report from the ALAC itself. There is also a second proposal that Rianlia Abdul Rahim be a member of the objections follow up group. At the moment, the objections follow up group is just made up of Heidi Ullrich, as selector for At Large, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, who is the current – well who was leading the objections review group, and myself who filed the objection.

So it's a very small group, it's probably unlikely to have much work to do. And it's just a case of being able to be ready in case we are requested to do something. So that's where we stand at the moment. As a result, I thought because it looked not controversial as such, we just need a consensus call on this, a consensus call on each of these two items.

So first one for Seth Reece, and then one for Rinalia. But prior to the consensus call, of course, are there any questions or comments from anyone on the call here?

WOMAN: Uh..

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I heard an "uh" from someone, but that will show up on the transcript as being female voice, "uh."

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: Sala Tamanikaiwimaro.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Sala, please go ahead. Sala Tamanikaiwimaro.

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: Thank you very much Olivier. Just in terms of the propositions that were put forward by the ICC International Chamber of Commerce. I would recommend that the ALAC chair put [AUDIO BREAKUP 2:00:52] … whether it was done in the past.

That is to ask for internal legal costs from ICANN legal on the letter, particularly in English, to any during this and that sort of things. To look at particularly, just for us to know what ICANN's official position on the matter would be, and that sort of thing.

Just [AUDIO BREAKUP 2:01:24] ICANN, and also just, as I say [? 2:01:28]. The second comment I would like to make is that I have full confidence in Reece, and I really warmly welcome him as chairing this, it's an excellent proposal. Thanks Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sala. And that's appreciated. And yes, the ICANN legal team is not directly implied, sorry directly implicated with the objections process. Obviously we are objecting as part of one of ICANN's organizations. And the fact that the individuals who are part of the team are protected as are any other objections that are working on behalf, or doing things, on behalf of ICANN.

That's the feedback that I have received. I have met with legal when I was in Los Angeles a couple of months ago. So that's one thing. Now

whether ICANN legal themselves are a part of the of our objections process, no they're not.

Of course we have the ability to ask for legal help from ICANN legal on some of these, but we have not because I think it might be seen as somehow conflict of interest in some way. So yes, asking for advice; no, for directly being involved with the process.

Okay. So seeing no further hands, I therefore ask for a consensus call. If anyone is against Seth Reece acting as the Chair of the ALAC Objections follow up group. That's… And I see, it's a consensus call so it's not a vote, you don't need to put a tick. If you're unhappy you should just either shout out or put a red cross.

I don't see anyone speaking against this, so that's by consensus. That is going, will be designated as the Chair of the follow up group. And then the second one being, is there an objection to Rinalia Abdul Rahim being a member of the objections follow up group itself.

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: No objections.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see only green ticks everywhere, and thank you very much Sala for your comments just now. So no objections there either, so that's great. Fantastic. So by consensus, through the consensus call, Rinalia will also be a member of the objections follow up group.

There is just one thing that I wanted to mention still with regards to transparency. The input, sorry the address that the objections were

sent from is actually a small mailing list that will group all of those people in the follow up group. So this currently does not have archives that are open to everyone.

They're private archives and I think you need to be aware of that. The reason for it being, that I have no clue what type of information might be sent by any of the applicants, or the ITC on that address. And so there is a concern that if they do decide to send confidential information, or something that might be – that needs to be confidential, of course they will do that unwittingly and they will go out into the world and by indexed by Google before we know it.

So it's better to keep it confidential for the time being. If there is anything, of course, that goes in there and that is not marked as confidential, I usually send it over to the new gTLD working group, and I could send it out over the ALAC as well.

That's no problem. Right. Thank you very much for this. I realize we still have so much to do, and we have so little time left. The next one is, a quick discussion please on the GNSO work on policy and implementation of the ICANN context. I'll just give you a quick update of what's happened there.

There was a request by the GNSO chair, and in fact a public request was sent across ICANN for volunteers to be part of the drafting theme for the charter of this GNSO working group. The response that we've had was that Holly Raiche has put her hand up for being called to the drafting.

We also had Eduardo Diaz who volunteered to be part of that drafting team as well. Holly's name was forwarded officially to [? 2:06:52] GNSO Secretariat, and in fact I discussed Holly's future involvement in this when I met with Glen last week in person. So that was good.

Eduardo sent his candidate directly, and I understand he was also accepted in this drafting team. And we don't need 100 people in there, but obviously we need people who are active as in any GNSO working groups. The response that I did provide to the Chair of the GNSO was that these were volunteers, but we would be happier with a cross-community working group, a CCWG.

And unfortunately, I have not had any positive response on that. The GNSO has been bitten in the past with cross-community working groups, and it appears that there is absolutely no interest whatsoever at the moment, for cross-community working group.

And I don't think, personally I don't think we should make a case about this specially until the GNSO actually works out how they work with cross-community working groups. Bearing in mind that we will have people that will work in that working group, and the ALAC has the ability to comment on everything and anything.

And so it can very easily have that fine report and so we'll have members in that working group, have that final report and decide ourselves to push it to the board, if there is any way that the report might be blocked off or stopped somewhere along the way by the GNSO themselves.

Of course the voting for the final report and so on will go through the GNSO only, and will not be something that will involve the ALAC. That's the nature of the game at the moment. Alan Greenberg might wish to add a few more things. So Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I agree with Evan, that it's unfortunate that the Board did not, in its wisdom, do something on a little wider scale than ask the GNSO. I point out there is nothing to stop us from doing something in parallel. We can certainly participate in any working group, and in general we will not necessarily win an argument if we put it forward, but we will be listened to.

The GNSO rarely votes down a report out of a working group. So we do have some ability to interact with that, but all of that notwithstanding, if the ALAC has something to say on the issue, and again I'll remind the group that I sent out a note which died within a couple of hours on the whole concept of policy and implementation.

If we have plenty to say, then we should be saying it. And a working group notwithstanding, and if we have something to say to the working group formally, we should be saying that. So it would have been nice if something different would have happened. In the absence of the Board chartering something on a wider scale, it would have taken something like the DSAA, where the Chairs of various groups go there ahead of time and decided it would be a joint group.

That didn't happen for whatever reason. So I think we need to go forward, but to the extent that we care about this issue, and I think we

do, we need to both be involved in the GNSO activity, and do things independently if we feel it's appropriate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. And I realize that we are running out of time on this. So I suggest that we just continue moving through our agenda, we might need to drop one or two agenda items, we have taken a bit too much time on this.

The next item on the agenda is item number ten, the revised ALAC rules of procedures. The schedule for additional documents… And Alan shall have the floor for this. Please could we make it five minutes?

ALAN GREENBERG: I could certainly do that. Okay. There are four documents, three of them adjunct documents and another one on email, that must be approved by the ALAC prior to the new rules of procedure taking effect. I have submitted two of them, specifically the one on the ALS certification, decertification framework that we've been discussing.

That is an item in an earlier subject, and the position description for ALAC members, and liaisons and appointees. In both cases, both documents are not, I think, what we want to see in the future. The position description I think is going to need significant overall, and the ALS framework, I believe, is going to require some overhaul in the future, which requires Board approval if we change it.

The intent of the rules of procedure working group was that we take the existing documents, modify them in the least amount possible, and

approve them so our new rules of procedure kick in. We can then go about changing them. So although in both cases, a number of suggestions were made, I believe we want to go forward and approve them as soon as possible.

In one case in the framework, a suggestion was made I think by Rinalia, that we take out the decertification and put it under another heading. Heidi, I did ask for whether legal has any problems with that, and will that trigger a Board review, and we do that with impunity.

I don't believe I got an answer. Do you know if we did Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Alan, I would need to check. I believe there was a response, but I need to check.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I may have missed it. But baring that one little change, I would suggest that we go forward and approve these documents, and you'll be seeing the other ones from me in the very near future so that we can take the vast amount of work that we've done in the rules of procedure and get them to kick in. And we can start running under them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's really great. Thank you very much Alan. Let's move on and have a look at the RALO selections 2013. Earlier results requested, Cheryl could you please explain why we need earlier results? Because I know

EN

you're Chair of the nom com and there might be something associated with this. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Cheryl for the transcript record. Yes, it's probably a moot point here. I'll certainly make a pitch to make sure that we get our act together a little bit earlier for next year. It is a central fact that by the time some of the regions have announced their appointment for people, who they would be putting into the At-Large advisory committee for the 2013 thought to 2015 period.

That the nominating committee will have already made its deliberations have done short listing and who they will and will not be interviewing probably their approach to appointment. In other words, the nom com will be operating in a vacuum of knowledge of how the regions are going to be appointing.

So all efforts for any diversity issues, or balances [INAUDIBLE 2:15:20], will simply not happen. So the earlier we get the results from the regions include who they are putting into the ALAC for the next few years, the more quality will be in our considerations when we are using the nom com's time to sort those applicants who have indicated they would be interested in these positions.

And it's particularly important, of course, when we do look to criticism somewhere in the past for gender [INAUDIBLE 2:15:59], or say the issue now is we won't be able to have the information. So the earlier you get it more public, from the nom com standpoint. Some regions used to have the rule that said the appointments for the ALAC should be settled

EN

during June, and that of course any nom com committee plenty of time to look to those results, and take those into consideration.

I would strongly encourage for the ALAC to go back and encourage their regions to go back to the June, or by end of June deadline. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Any comments or questions on this?

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: This is Sala for the record.

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

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: I just wanted to say what Cheryl said makes absolute sense. The quicker the region makes a decision on it, the nom com is able to fill in the gaps. That is all for the transcripts. Thanks Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes thank you very much. Thank you very much Sala. So let's move on. Let's go with the next part. So this is well understood by everyone that we have to move forward on the RALO selections early. The next part is the update for the At-Large working groups.

I'm really mindful of the time, I think we've got the… Do we have the interpreters for another five minutes or something? Or how long do we have?

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Olivier, this is Heidi. We have them for another approximately ten minutes.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Ten minutes.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Can I just ask, are you going to discuss the nominations, the process of appointing regional representatives from the ALAC into the nom com nominating committee as well? You should take that into consideration, not to discuss it now, but you should do it soon.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	We can, yes. Yes. I mean, yes, this is on our agenda. I guess we could touch on this. What I was going to suggest, in the interest of time, because we've got three agenda items left. We've got the update from the selected At-Large working groups, the review from the At-Large meeting schedule and agenda for the next meeting in Durban, and then any other business. I know that Cheryl has an important matter of any other business that she touched on earlier, or mentioned earlier. No?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I believe that's [INAUDIBLE 2:18:51]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I wonder if we can also drop the update from the selected At-Large working groups for the time being. If you could send those by email to the ALAC list, Sala, and are you okay with this? Or maybe I should ask Sala first, are you okay with sending a quick note, an update about what's happening with the At-Large capacity building working group?

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: Yes. Happy to just send an update to online.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much Sala. Next, Dev are you okay with just sending just a quick update of the technology taskforce to the ALAC…

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev Anand for the record. Yes I'm okay with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much Dev. So with regards, going back to agenda item number 11 quickly, on the RALO selections. Not only do we have that, but we… So we also have the selection of the nom com, the people who will be on the nominating committee.

The way that this works, is that there is a call for candidates and the regions themselves are able to endorse specific candidates, and make recommendations about which of the candidates preferred, the preference if you want. But the appointment to the nominating committee is made by the ALAC.

So the ALAC will consider not only the candidates from each region that are pushed by the region, or that are accredited, or that are whichever way that are promoted by the region, if you want. But they will also look at anyone who has, or who is based in the region, and has – goodness, I'm losing my words now.

Has applied – ah, that's such a hard word isn't it? Application. Effectively, I know that last year there was a bit of a confusion because some of the RALOs have a voting process that took place, and they thought that whoever they voted for was going to be that nom com representative.

And in fact, that's not the case. The ALAC that votes for a lineup of candidates. Some regions, some RALOs had a preference in candidates which they got through discussion through consensus, some of them had a vote, some of them just had a propriety discussion.

Some of the people who are currently in the nom com are term limited, so there needs to be someone new, and some of them are not term limited because they've only done the one year out of two, so they could be proposed for another year.

But the fact that someone has been in the nom com for one year, it doesn't mean that they have any preference for being there another year afterwards. I will be receiving feedback about the people that have been in the nom com this year, and finding out what their performance has been, etcetera, taken good part in all of the calls, whether they were active members.

Bearing in mind that the nominating committee member's work is two-fold. One, there is this outreach part, you really need to outreach and try to get good candidates out there, and especially good candidates in the region that you are from. That's why it's so regionally diversified and particularly important because the ALAC is really the most diversified, regionally speaking, of all the SOs and ACs out there.

Maybe with the GAC as well, but the GAC doesn't have anyone on the nom com that is able to make any vote. And so, having five representatives on there is really important. The second part, of course, is the selection process and that differs of course from year to year.

I see Cheryl has put her hand up. You have about 30 seconds to add to what I've said.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. What I would suggest is if you it is your wish, and if the regions are interested, I would be happy to put out a – and I'll do it for all the ACs and the SOs, a [INAUDIBLE 2:23:21] endorsement on the problem, the criteria. So I would suggest questions to ask yourselves when you're looking at the candidates you want to send to us.

Things like you might want to assess how effective their [INAUDIBLE 2:23:42] and key decision making networks are, that kind of thing. If that is going to be useful, let me know, and I'll do it.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Cheryl. Are there any questions of the process? Now if there aren't we'll just move forward and that's fine. I think we all have a pretty good idea what is there. And I will be following up on you, Cheryl, on this.

Fantastic. Let's move on. I can see people are starting to fall asleep because I don't see anyone's hands up anymore [laughs]. Time goes. Quickly, the review of the At-Large meeting schedule and agendas. Heidi, you have 15 seconds, or maybe more than 15 seconds. But please let us know of the main points.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Main points. This is Heidi for the record. Main points, is that there are currently 18 At-Large formal meetings schedule. People are handling some of the informal ones are… Cheryl, I did speak with Bart regarding the meeting with the gTLD NSOs, so I'm aware that there will not be a meeting of ALAC GNSOs in Durban.

If I could ask those chairs, working group chairs, RALO chairs, etcetera, who are having meetings in Durban, could you please send us At-Large staff your agenda at the end of this week please. They just need to be the absolute tentative ones, because meeting confirmation forms are due at the end of this week, and agendas need to be posted. And I think that's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much Heidi. And I heard, was that Sala?

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: Yes Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please go ahead Sala.

SALA TAMANIKAIWIMARO: Sorry, I was just responding by saying thanks Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Sala. Right. Well thanks for being short and very brief on this Heidi. Of course, the pages are up, you can see the links that are there. I would urge everyone to immediately start looking at the Durban topics for the public forum workspace, and all of the other travelling circus requests that are requested of us before the circus starts playing in Durban.

It's only a month and a half away, so let's get moving on that. I now open the floor for any other business. Item number 14 on the agenda. And I don't see anyone putting their hands up. And it's half past the hour, which means we've had two and a half conference calls. I really thank all of you for this extraordinary way of being able to stay awake.

Hopefully you're still all awake. Thank you very much to all of the interpreters…

WOMAN: Rinalia has a question.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is a question. Okay. Rinalia please, you have the floor. I note that Rinalia has asked the question on the chat. Is that correct? The WAEN forum for the US... Heidi please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, sorry, this is Heidi. Very quickly Rinalia and everyone, we have contacted constituency travel about this issue, they are going to give us a concrete response by this Friday. I have heard from Joseph though that you do not need to submit those in order to complete your booking for Durban. So we could hear over the weekend that only four of you have so far completed your bookings.

So please go ahead and submit your information and work with GTCD on that, that would be fantastic. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. And I see that today is Yaovi's birthday, so I think we should let him go and enjoy himself rather than suffer another few minutes here. Thanks to all of you. Thanks to everyone on the call, and thank you to the interpreters.

I see Tijani is still put his hand up. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes thank you, yes thank you. Heidi I sent my forms to Joseph, and he ask me to fill the forms that you said which is not needed to do. So please present him that it is not necessary. If it is necessary than yeah. Okay?

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Tijani. For the time being, just hold on, don't send the form in. And finally, there was a note also from Ron Sherwood with whom I had a slight discussion in the chat with regards to the numbering of ISOC chapters…

Well the numbering of the ALSs and so on, it was just a question onto the numbering issue through ALSs that have been decertified. If they want to recertify themselves, have a new number. I believe that there is a new application, and the number doesn't really mean anything. So there is no concern on that.

Thanks to everyone. And this call is now adjourned, you'll be happy to hear. Have a good week. Bye-bye.

[Various goodbyes]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]