
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...and good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC ExCom call on Tuesday or Wednesday, I don't know. On Wednesday, 26th of June, 2013. The time is 13:05 UTC. And we're going to start immediately with a roll call. Gisella please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. Gisella here for the transcript. Welcome to everyone. On today's call, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Julie Hammer, Evan Leibovitch, Sebastien Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, and shortly to join, Carlton Samuels.

Apologies noted from Rinalia Abdul Rahim. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco, and myself Gisella Gruber. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Gisella. Have we missed anyone by any chance? Is anyone on the call whose name we have not called? Possibly not. Okay. In which case, let's go immediately into the ALAC ExCom action items from the 31st of May, which was our last call. And I'll invite you over to look at the open action items that we have at the moment, and there is only one and that's for Olivier to check how the decision was made, and if the Board charted the GNSO to work on policy and

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

implementation in the ICANN context, with a possible statement to the Board to be drafted as needed.

The Board actually asked for the community to work on policy versus implementation in the ICANN context, but the GNSO took it upon themselves to move forward and to charter a GNSO working group on policy and implementation. The working group is open to everyone to participate, and I understand of course that some in our community are pushing for a cross-community working groups, but it's not happening, unfortunately, in this case.

Any comments or questions on this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Alan Greenberg and then Evan. First Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to point out that Holly is sharing the drafting team. For those...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, sharing the drafting team, okay. Excellent news. Okay. Thank you very much Alan, that's excellent news. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, I'll see... I still think that the group is going, already has some of its outcomes pre-determined, and so I guess we'll wait to see how it turns out. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Evan. And that's the only action item we have on the open action items. The newly assigned action items, we have one in there which is for Heidi to include a ten minute agenda item on the next ExCom call so Cheryl Langdon-Orr can discuss nom com selections, nominations, and appointments. Well, seeing that as our... Yes Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. This is Heidi. Olivier that was, I believe, for the last call, on the 31st of May agenda. There is going to be an item on the nom com issue on today's agenda as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Right, let's move on then and let's go to the items for discussion, the policy advice development page. And I invite you all to open it. As usual, before an ICANN meeting, we churned through a number of statements and suddenly we were assailed by a wave of new statements, which is the usual thing.

The currently recently adopted ALAC statements, there are three of them that were adopted. The first was the proposed final 2013 registrar accreditation agreement. That was adopted with 12 votes in favor, and there was a lot of discussion on this. I'm quite happy about it. The FY

14 draft operating upgrading plan and budget was adopted with 14 votes in favor. Thank you Tijani for this.

There was very little discussion about this, so I was a little disappointed that operating plans are particularly important for us, yet there wasn't very much interest. And then the new gTLD Board committee consideration of GAC safeguard advice. As you know, initially we thought that we would not comment, and then we did, and we did have a statement, and that was good. It was adopted with 13 votes in favor.

Now the statements currently being developed are somehow a question where a number of people do need to provide us with an answer, and it's good that we have Alan here because I think a number of them asked for his point of view. First, the implementation of IDN variant top level domains, that's being done, well drafted and commented on. And the ALAC is currently voting on it.

GNSO structures charter amendment process, Alan Greenberg was to confirm if a statement was necessary. In the meantime, I think I had a feeling there was no statement necessary, but let's hear it from Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have not looked at it, and I'm not likely to in the next little while. Just to serve notice for the other things that you're going to ask for, I'm really past my limit of being able to deliver things right now. The number of things on my plate for ICANN, and occasional other things I try to do in my life, are past the limit I think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I have not looked at this one and I'm going to accept your analysis.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I mean this is really down to the internal GNSO structures and quite complicated, internal GNSO...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Leave it alone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I thought, yeah, not touching it would probably be best. Then the next, the draft final report and universal acceptance of IDN gTLDs. Edmund is currently super busy on something and has punted this over to Rinalia, and Rinalia is currently away. So I'm not quite sure whether we will have something on this. I might have a look at it and see if we can just follow up.

As you know, we have produced statements about this in the past already. The next one, the proposed renewal of dot org gTLD registry agreement. And in fact, there are two more. There is number eight, dot info gTLD registry agreement, and there is number nine, dot biz gTLD registry agreement. As you know, we have commented on the dot com agreement, but I'm not quite sure we have commented in the past on dot org, dot info, and dot biz.

And I wonder whether, although, I mean, Alan, would you have any point of view on this?

ALAN GREENBERG:

If I remember correctly, the comment on the dot com was largely related to, I think, WHOIS. That clearly does not apply on either of these. One should I get quickly look at the red line and see what else they have changed. I suspect some of it is just incorporation of stuff from the new gTLD agreement.

We may want to put in a token yes if it includes some of the stronger statements of amendment and things like that. Other than that, and I'm presuming they're not lifting price caps and I'm assuming they're not doing other naughty things, so someone should glance through it quickly but I don't think it's not likely that we're to a result in anything. But we should take a quick look at it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Just trying to see... I'll have a look at it later on after this call and see... The three of them come up for renewal at the same time, I have the same memory of the type of comment that we submitted for the dot com agreement. So that's obviously not...

And thank you very much Heidi for getting us the ALAC statement on dot com. Let's move on. The [? 0:09:28] report on protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs. Now that's of course something which

we have been very active in tasks. Evan, you've had a chat with Alan about this.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes. We're basically going to work on it and come out with a statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, did you want to add anything?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think so. We're talking about IGO and INGO I think?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. [CROSSTALK 0:10:02]... I'm trying to time share even now. No, the interim report has a long laundry list of options, and they are asking the community to pass judgment on them. Our answers are not likely to be of particularly controversial compared to our previous ones. My personal point is that we not take very hard lines, if we – that we pretend we're trying to find a middle ground that is still acceptable to At-Large.

My personal point of view is I think this is going to end up failing because I think we're not going to get enough commonality among the groups. So, but I think we have to go through the process of restating our past positions, and in some cases because of the options on the table, we may agree to something that otherwise we would have not volunteered before.

But it's not particularly onerous to users. My presumption is that we should really look at user perspective this time and not just take the philosophical line of, don't give the buggers anything that they don't need. But we'll see with Evan, he'll keep me on it. That was it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Right, let's just leave it then for the time being. Evan, if you could just push on it and see how we can drive something that is...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: ...table is, that Alan and I hope to have something done by the end of the weekend.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, super, thank you. The next, the consultation on the source of policies and user instructions on internet member resource requests. Requests were sent to the technical issues working group and Luke [? 0:12:00] has actually responded and volunteered to hold the pen on this. So we should be seeing a first draft in the next couple of days.

Next, the thick WHOIS initial report, and that the GNSO policy development process. We sent a request over to the WHOIS working group. But Alan, you're also solicited to confirm whether a statement would be necessary on this. I'm not even sure, has Carlton also made it on the call yet?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I'm on the call Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Super. So I'm going to actually send the question over to you on this.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I absolutely responded. I'm going to give Alan a chance to get in on here. As you know, Alan and I were on the working group essentially to endorse what we, the ALAC position that we have been carrying for a couple of years. There is maybe one or two small little things that we might wish to add to that.

I'm not so sure there is very much value in saying, "Yes we told you so." But I stand to be corrected.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Carlton. I mean, would you think that the situation as it stands currently in the working group would benefit from an ALAC statement? Or since we do have limited bandwidth, this is one that we can just drop?

ALAN GREENBERG: Someone keeps putting my hand down, either someone or something.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can see your hand up Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Someone is granting me microphone rights, I don't know who is doing that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes I can see that. I don't know, I'm not touching your hand [laughs].

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think you are. The microphone pixies are doing it then. I think that this is one of those that if we don't put a statement in, we are absolutely out of our mind. We have been saying that we want [tickets 0:14:09] for God knows how long, this PDP is recommending it.

If we don't put in a simple yes please, because there will be people who say no I think, then we're crazy. Why we would not comment and say that we support this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, it's really down to whether, how far the politics of the working group have gone Alan. If the question... The actual fundamental question of [thick 0:14:43] WHOIS or [non-thick 0:14:44] WHOIS is not

resolved now, and it's still hanging in the balance, and of course we do need to stick to our guns and to push it to the end.

If on the other hand, the system is already rolling down and we're just dealing with tweaking of things, then at that point it might not be work [CROSSTALK 0:15:01]...

ALAN GREENBERG: ...there will be comments. I know there will be comments on a number... Some of them have already put them on our mailing list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: That they think this is the stupidest thing ICANN could ever do. I think we need something balancing that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's a good point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since those comments are coming from At-Large people, I don't think we want them stand as the only comments form At-Large.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you Alan. Carlton...

CARLTON SAMUELS: Let me ask you to... Let's do the only one that [? 0:15:36] ...that is against, that position has been known before any of the statements. So I mean, I am not opposed to writing a statement that says, "We told you so." This is what I'm saying.

I mean, it bounces the rubble, that's about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. Number one, this is not the only one. And number two, it's not an I told you so. It's we support your recommendations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. That sounds good. [CROSSTALK 0:16:13]...

ALAN GREENBERG: ...push for the DBP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do you wish to hold the pen on this Carlton? Or being [CROSSTALK 0:16:22] working group, would you prefer that someone else hold the pen on it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can write it during this call.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I... Well, this is not a question of writing it Alan. I could write the damn thing in my sleep. What I want... The point I want to make out is, I'm sorry to sound so irritated. But the point I'm making is that we are on record as proposing this working group, we are on record as promoting the working group.

I wrote the first statement in [? 0:16:52] while on it. All I'm saying is that if we wish to double down on it, that's fine. But it's not a big deal to write something that says, "We support it." That's all I'm saying. I'm not saying that it's another thing, it's not a big deal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Thank you. Yes, but first we have Sebastien with his hand up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah thank you. Sebastien Bachollet. Yeah just to take that issue, don't you think that it could be a good idea to ask the RALO to make a comment here? And to keep your weapon for sending advice to Board if needed? Because if you take all of your weapons outside before you will get...

It will be more difficult to send something afterwards. And I think that if any time you need adding to very important topics for end user, it will be good to keep that for possible next stage if needed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sebastien. And next we have Evan and then Alan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. I just wanted to support what Alan and Carlton are saying, or more over a combination of the two. I agree with Alan that we need to say something, but I agree with Carlton that we don't have much to say in that we've already said it.

So essentially, literally, an one paragraph statement saying, "We appreciate what the group has done. We've supported it, in fact we have been one of the catalysts behind it. Okay. Now let's actually get on and do it." I mean, both Alan and Carlton have said that they could do it in a matter of minutes or in their sleep or whatever.

It's a very, very simple statement. Say, "They've done what we asked. We think it's in the public interest." Or whatever specific wording, let's get moving on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you. Next is Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. My statement is I'm typing it right now, my draft, and it's much shorter than even what Evan says. We don't need history, we simply need to say we support it. And for the record, what's best is that I

wasn't talking – I never mentioned anything about advice to the Board. This is an answer to a public comment period.

That will be analyzed by the working group, and certainly I don't think there is anything else that we need to do at this point. If life unfolds, as it is expected at this point, then the working group will make a recommendation of [thick 0:19:42] WHOIS, with some caveats saying, "Someday ICANN has got to look at the privacy issue, but they are not nearly related to this GDP."

And it will go forward, and presumably the Board will approve it. So I don't see this as a statement to the Board issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much Alan. And thank you Sebastien also for your suggestion. I tend to lean with Alan and agree that we will... One thing doesn't stop another. This is just a public comment period that we are answering to. And I'm a little concerned at the moment about getting the RALOs to do any serious policy work whilst they are dealing their internal politics at the moment, going through selections of their, next year's leadership.

Until Beijing, it's going to be a little bit difficult for them to actually bring some independent RALO input. Okay. [CROSSTALK 0:20:46]... Yeah. If you can just drop this over to the chat, maybe your text of the chat while the rest of this call takes place, this taken up by Matt who will be able to put it on the public comment page and can start the process.

Any comments on any of the public comments and statements endorsed by the ALAC at the moment? The last one in there is still the statement on WCIT outcomes, that's one which I still have on my plate. And with the current moving goal posts, I'm not quite sure how this one will progress. My original intent was to have one that will really push for the multi-stakeholder process to be supported in ICANN, and for the ALAC and At-Large to be able to funded to send people to non-ICANN meetings.

But as the date of the budget approval, and I'm not even quite sure whether it's today, or tomorrow, or sometime this week, I figured it might have been good to just wait and see for the time being, because it might be that the message has already gone through by other channels rather than an actual official statement of the ALAC. Any comments or questions?

None for the time being. Okay, thank you. Just a follow up on one of our latest statements, the one on the stability of the internet with regards to dot less domain and the ISOC advice. This was finally actually confirmed as being received both by the Chair of the Board, Steve Crocker, but also Chair of the new gTLD committee [? 0:22:51]. And [Shareen 0:22:53], by the way, will be meeting with him tomorrow, so there might be a further follow up based on this.

I have also received letters of – emails of support from several of the other constituencies in ICANN, although I don't wish to go into details at this moment in time. It is something that we might wish to speak about with various constituencies such as the NTSG for example, and also others if they decide to put this on the agenda.

Okay. Currently open public comments, they are all listed in B. And then finally, the new At-Large policy development early engagement workspace, that's something a little bit different. I'm going to ask Matt to take us through this please.

MATT ASHTIANI:

Hi everyone. This is Matt for the record. So the At-Large policy development early engagement workspace was created out of the conversation with David Olive in Beijing, trying to get [? 0:25:05] ... At-Large [Board GC 0:24:10]. So if you look on the page, or actually on the workspace, it's very simple. It lists the months in which future issues are, the release, the community group which released it and the issue.

If you click on any one of them, the facts are just a way, way basic review of it, including the issue and the upcoming [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 0:24:37] ...summary of the issue, the ALAC engagement [? 0:24:42] status. So where it actually is within the CNSO or the GNSO, any additional information and at the very bottom ALAC statements that have been issued on this.

It's just a very quick way to see what's coming up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Matt. The floor is open for comments or questions. And I actually noticed that Alan had put his hand up just prior to you speaking Matt. So Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Actually a long time before that. I was just going to comment... At that point, I was just going to comment that recently an ALAC statement had a full item to discuss at a Board meeting. That is, the Board is going to be discussing an ALAC statement as a sole item on their agenda. That gave us more visibility than I think we've ever had in a certain context.

So it's a... Something to note. That's all. I note there are other things that are not public comments that are out for comment, and the expert working group draft report, or whatever it's called, is one of those. That's something that we may actually want to think about talking about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you elaborate please Alan? A couple of words on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: The WHOIS expert working group, directory service expert, have come up with a report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have they not come out with a public comment yet?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's not a public comment, they're asking for comments to be solicited, to be sent directly to them. For some reason, it is not a public comment. There is also the ICANN region one which actually is a public comment, not quite sure what status that is in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton for the record. Yes, I just wanted to say that, Alan already said it. It is not a public comment per se, the initial report has been produced. It's ready to garner feedback at Durban. We're going to have a webinar on the 8th of July to talk about the report, and we are soliciting feedback on this report. But that's all it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Carlton. I mean, at this stage, do you believe that we need to file a comment on this? Or is it – it's more of an informal, early commenting and then there will be a formal commenting process later on? The reason why I'm asking the question is, will there be an opportunity later on to comment?

First question. Second question, is it the right time to comment now? Or should we just wait a little more until more of it gets gelled?

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton. My advice would be for us not to make a formal comment now. Individuals may comment as they wish, but let's wait until the time comes before we make the formal comment. This is not intended to capture formal comments from groups, but simply to get a kind of early warning.

It's the canary [? 0:28:27] kind of thing. [CROSSTALK 0:28:31]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] Thank you. I see agreement from [CROSSTALK 0:28:40] and from Tijani on this. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the answer on whether we submit anything at this point is based just on what Carlton just said. If we read this and have a significant disagreement, this is the time to say something. If we say, "Yeah, things are going along as they should," then it may well be [CROSSTALK 0:29:06] say nothing.

I mean, I've glanced through the report and I can see comments coming from some groups. Perhaps not us, because there is the recommendation, as I read it, is problematic from some points of view. And I think we have to go through at least the process of people scanning it or listening to the webinars, or whatever. I'm not saying we write a comment today, but I think it needs to be on our radar and a decision made.

Is there something we need to say because we think the direction it's going is not appropriate? Or no?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. I think that we do have the sense of from the input that Carlton has told us just now, and I gather that both Sebastien and Tijani have also read it. But let's keep it on our radar and let's be

vigilant. Let's move on, back to the part which Matt has taken us through, the policy development early engagement workspace.

Are there any questions about this? I don't see anyone putting their hands up. I have a question about it. How are we to integrate this with the rest of our policy development process Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI:

Hi. This is Matt for the record. Well, it would really depend on what the group wanted to do. Perhaps on the ALAC monthly calls, we can go over the early engagement, most recent early engagement that has been completed. They'll just have a quick moment to [intercept it 0:30:55] who are thinking about it. But again it's up to the group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Matt. So what I propose is that we present this over to the ALAC, and ask the ALAC about their use of this. I see some potential in being able to interface this both with our policy development process, but with the work of our working groups. So that they know and they can put, they can forecast on their future work when they might need some time for a specific topics.

But obviously it is something that we would need to formalize when we are... Any comments on this? Are you all okay with asking the ALAC? I see no one putting their hand up so I gather silent is – or silence is approval. So let's do that then, and we'll have it in our next ALAC call. Matt, you'll be able to present it and we'll see if this is of help for the policy development process.

What I don't want to hear later on is people to say, "Well, we were not aware that things were coming up." Because that's exactly what this is meant to be, giving us a heads up about things that are coming up. Let's go to the ALS decertification and certification issues.

We've recently received At-Large structure applications. There were a couple of them. Would you be able to take us through this Matt please?

MATT ASHTIANI: Sure. This is Matt for the record. There are two recently received ALS applications. One for the EURO Individuals Association, this is undergoing due diligence. And the other one is the Australian Communications Consumer Action Network, which is also undergoing due diligence.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So one is EURALO I gather, and one is APRALO.

MATT ASHTIANI: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Any forecast as to when due diligence will be finished on these?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier this is Heidi.

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. So on the issue of the EURALO one, Roberto which [is kind of 0:33:26] leading that one, and he and Natalie will be discussing the details in Durban. There are some issues with that one. They don't have a website, not yet, but that's coming up.

So that one will be slightly delayed. And I think the other one that we've just received from ICANN should be going quite quickly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Now the next one is the decertification. And as you know, we've got at least two At-Large structures that are currently in the pipeline for decertification. Oh, first I see Sebastien having put his hand up. Sebastien, was this to do with the first recently received ALS applications? And you might be muted Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay now? Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you. Yes, go ahead please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Now it's okay? Sorry, sorry. Yeah, it's a bit strange to say that they don't have a website and maybe we don't want them to have a website. The goal was for EURALO to setup an organization to allow the end users to gather and to work together. And I really don't think... Even I was present that we, the Chair of EURALO setup by-laws, and that would have been an association with no bylaws.

And it would have been okay also. And I am not sure about this, how we want to run on that because we know the people, we know what they are doing, we know why they are doing it. They are pushed by a lot of members of EURALO today then I don't see why we spend a lot of time on that, and why we understand to run a website because they don't have a budget, they don't have money, they don't have anything.

They are a shadow organization. Then don't, please try to get as light as possible, this organization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sebastien.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. If I may? Yes. You know a compulsory society for the record. It's not compulsory that they have a website, that's not really the main barrier. It's just I think Roberto just asked to have a discussion with Natalie on various issues. So I think that given Durban is a couple of weeks away, once that goes through, then we can expedite the due diligence.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. Sebastien, you still have your hand up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. Tried to have my hand down, but I agree with Heidi. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you. And for the record, this indeed is EURALO's way forward into having an individual... Well, to being able to accept individuals into EURALO instead of going through an At-Large structure, so individual membership of EURALO.

It will be interesting to see this as a case study perhaps for those regions that have not, so far, embraced or looked at possibilities for having individual membership. Now decertification. We've got two that are listed here. There was an extensive amount of discussion in the past few months.

I'm actually quite embarrassed that we haven't moved forward on this and we're wasting so much time on it. Matt and I have worked on just a simple text for the vote to start shortly. So Matt, first, could you just provide us with details of what you've done with regards to the database of those ALSs, and the information that will be stored and publically accessible?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi. This is Matt for the record. So what we have right now is we have a workspace where former ALSs, let me find that and I will put that into

the chat right now. I think there was some talk on what was to be included and what wasn't.

But we did try to put all the information surrounding the decertification on the website, it's there right now. But we'll try to put all of the information on there. And then [second 0:38:02] I'll be able to text the proposed decertification text for the group review. [? 0:38:09]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

And whilst you do this Matt, just to respond to some suggestions which were made in the past, I do recall that Cheryl had just suggested we would keep to the original information that was on the ALAC website. So the overall ALAC website, and just say that this was decertified and put whatever reason for it to be decertified on that page.

The problem with it is at the moment, this website is so out of date, and providing such information and getting it updated sounds more difficult than getting blood out of a stone at the moment, which is the reason why we've move forward in actually putting together our own Wiki pages for this.

Because it's more responsive, at least in matters of direct control of it. Back to you Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI:

Thanks Olivier. The text has been placed into the AC room, so at this point, part of the voting that I would need to know is, if everybody approve that text, should the vote be anonymous or not anonymous.

And then the other issues about the [? 0:38:26] during the decertification process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Matt. So I'll let everyone read this text, I believe you all are on the Adobe Connect so you can read the text. This would be the text of the question regarding whether should the vote be anonymous or not anonymous. I have to remind you that the vote for accreditation of an ALS is not anonymous, and so with this in mind, I would have said that with due regards to full transparency, we're not voting on a person, this is just accreditation, de-accreditation.

It would need to be... This vote would probably better if it was transparent. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can imagine some ALS decertification votes where it's a political hot topic for whatever reason, and some people, perhaps nationals of some country, would not want to have their vote made public and we can certainly consider that. These two are not among those.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan.

MATT ASHTIANI: This is Matt for the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: Just one note, the ALS certification is in fact anonymous.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ALS certification is anonymous.

MATT ASHTIANI: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh I was not aware, I thought it was not anonymous.

MATT ASHTIANI: It is anonymous.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay that changes things. I was for keeping the system one way or another, certification and decertification to follow the same path effectively. So that kind pulls a coffin in my point of view [laughs]. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. Can I ask for a clarification? My recollection is that they didn't used to be anonymous. I remember getting in hot water with some people saying, "Why did you reject someone?" And I had to personally

explain, which was fine, I'm not sure when they became anonymous, I don't think they were originally but maybe I'm having a senior moment.

MATT ASHTIANI: This is Matt for the record. Since I've been setting them up, they actually were anonymous. I've been involved with individuals.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan says right now almost all votes are anonymous. I'm not quite sure how that happened. [CROSSTALK 0:41:59]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oops. Misspoke. Okay [laughs]. [CROSSTALK 0:42:07]

UNIDENTIFIED: ...no not all votes are [? 0:42:09]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's... If accreditation is anonymous, let's make de-accreditation anonymous. But I could maybe task Heidi to have a look at the past and in the days... I mean Cheryl maybe might know. Cheryl, were the votes for accreditation of ALSs anonymous in your days?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [? 0:42:33] very originally it was, Alan, did not. And there was a couple of challenges and paperwork confronted. And I think it was a result of that they were made anonymous.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Cheryl for this piece of history. So let's then do them as anonymous if that's the case. If our delegates risk being lobbied or pressured when we're operating, this is a political issue, then let's make it – let's make those votes anonymous. I understand that the current two votes will be totally non-controversial.

But then, although they would be non-controversial, we can't just choose on whether we want to make it anonymous or non-anonymous depending upon our assertion on whether something is controversial or not. We need something that is clear. So we'll make it anonymous.

Now back to the text. I'm just asking if anyone has a point of view on the text, whether you have any amendments you want to make to it. I see Carlton, you have put your hand up.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, thank you. This is Carlton for the record. The... It would be important to, I think at least, in this case, whether or not the requests came from the ALSs themselves to be certified. For example, National Consumers League would actually ask to be certified. I perhaps... We should vary the text based on the origination of the request.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So should we say, based on the information we received by the ALAC, and on the request by ALS XYZ to be decertified, according to section 2.7 of the At-Large framework information, blah, blah, blah? As ICANN by-laws, blah, blah, blah of the ICANN by-laws. Yes or no?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, is the text somewhere we can look at? Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's on the chat.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's on the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Matt just put it on the chat.

UNIDENTIFIED: Matt Ashtiani, me. Look for Matt right behind my, in the middle of the screen.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I thought I already posted motions for both of these?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Months ago, or many weeks ago. I put on the ALAC list hard text and asked for a seconder.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for reminding us, but I don't know where those are. Matt, help.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Evan, this is Heidi. Where did you post them? I sort of....

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The ALAC mailing list I believe.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I vaguely remember that as well.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I will try to find them.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, let's look for those. [CROSSTALK 0:45:42]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fine. We have an answer to the question. Thank you, let's move on then. Matt and Heidi, please find those and we'll start the vote.

MATT ASHTIANI: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They have been proposed, they have been seconded, so we can move forward with it. Okay? Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just for the record, they may need tweaking because when [? 0:46:15] came out is we have to document somewhere, not necessarily in the resolution, the reasons for doing it, which is what you and Matt went off to do for a while.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yeah.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So they made need a slight tweaking just to point to the right place.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We will point to the right place. We'll just point it over to the general area. I think we're over engineering this at the moment. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. I just want to be on the record as saying that I think it's, I did not realize that the votes were anonymous to certify and decertify. And I really would ask that the ExCom put forward to ALAC changing that and making it open.

Here we are, trying to hold ICANN open and transparent to its community, and the fact that occasionally some votes that will come about that are going to be perhaps a bit either embarrassing or difficult for some elected or appointed representatives to make out in the open, their discomfort is not on itself a reason to make that vote anonymous.

I guess I should have said something earlier, but now that it is sort of really brought out to the open. I really have a problem with something like this being anonymous simply because some of the ALAC voters might have a little bit of political discomfort in actually voting in a certain way.

We really need to be as open as possible in who we accept and we need to be as stringent as possible in who we kick out. And I really think that a transparent process is called for here. Every time that we make a decision to close something rather than open it, we compromise our own credibility when we call for ICANN's general transparency. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Evan. That's noted. Okay. Let's move to the next part of our agenda, and that's number five, the nom com update on the schedule of selectee appointments. As you know, there are quite a few... In fact, I

don't understand, quite understand the schedule here, it says five, six, seven, eight, I guess this is just a small section of the schedule.

Currently we have AFRALO that has provided us with preferred candidate, being [? 0:49:03]. EURALO with a preference for Veronica [? 0:49:08]. LACRALO who will be, requesting that the ALAC accepts the LACRALO names. Sorry, we will be requesting that the LACRALO names will be received by the 20th of June, there is a delay.

NARALO has put forward Louie [? 0:49:31]. And APRALO has put forward two people I believe, and I haven't got the [CROSSTALK 0:49:38] ...and the other person [CROSSTALK 0:49:44] [? 0:49:46], yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah. Please refresh your agenda page. They've been added.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you. Now of course, these are not necessarily the people that the ALAC are going to appoint to the nominating committee, and we need to quickly think out how we are going to be making our choices. Last year, it was a bit of a quick discussion among several people.

And I guess for the most that the advice from the RALOs, the suggestions from the RALOs, or the preference from the RALOs, was taken into account, except in a few cases where the ALAC decided otherwise. How do you wish to proceed forward? Any suggestions here? Even you have your hand up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry it wasn't taken down from the last time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Any thoughts? What we could do is the ALAC could issue a call for candidates and for people to... We could issue a call right away and have more people added to the list, and then have a vote, an ALAC vote on the candidate themselves.

In the cases of course, where more than one candidates end up on the short list. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Question and then a comment. When is this vote?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No later than the 12th of July do we have to notify the appointees to the nomination committee. So we're dealing with a very short timeline here. A good 15 to 20 days.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And here...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Have we not already sent out something to the either ALAC announce or At-Large that this process is going on?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have, but I'll ask staff to let us know what was the last announcement that was sent on this.

[AUDIO BLANK 0:52:01 – 0:52:18]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay [CROSSTALK 0:52:19]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...for a while...

ALAN GREENBERG: It almost... It almost doesn't matter. At this point, I think we should have done a heads-up to the community that this process was going on. I suspect that we did. We can check, but nevertheless, at this point, we are on a short line, it's an ALAC decision, the ALAC, if anyone on the ALAC wants to add anyone to the list provided by the RALOs, they are fine to.

But let's go ahead with the list that is provided by the RALOs. In cases where there is just one, we can accept or reject. In cases where there are multiple, we have to select.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So [CROSSTALK 0:53:02]

ALAN GREENBERG: ...at this point. I think is counter to what we've done in the past, and it is a poor use of our time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Well, the notification, the last of the candidates will be confirmed to the ALAC by LACRALO on the 20th of June. Then the ALAC has between the 25th of June, which is really yesterday, and the 2nd of July to review the RALO recommendations, but also to suggest additional nominations.

I believe that there should be maybe a note to the ALAC for any suggestions of nominations. [CROSSTALK 0:53:44] ...nominations to be sent today, as soon as possible. And then we can do the selection and endorsement vote between the 2nd and 8th of July. I'm against one vote which basically says, "Here is a short list. Do you accept it? Do you not accept it?"

I think it would be... If we only ended up with just one candidate, so no additional suggestions for RALO, then we can say that this candidate is therefore carried. If on the other hand, there is more than one candidate, then we can stage a vote on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier [CROSSTALK 0:54:20], if there are any candidates that anyone on the ALAC feels that would be detrimental to the point to the nom com, then the ominous is on them to identify another candidate, I think. If the RALO hasn't done it for us, then I think we need to go, we may pick one of the alternatives the ALAC, the RALO rejected, but I think we need to go forward on this.

I don't think we want another open competition.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And do you believe... I mean, should we have a discussion on the ALAC call about candidates?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that should be in an in-camera discussion, it's about people.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, we can have that, it just makes it a bit more difficult. But I wondered there was an interest in actually having a discussion on this, or whether it just is going to be discussion on ALAC internal mailing list.

ALAN GREENBERG: The ALAC internal mailing list is not necessarily completely confidential I'll point out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, we need confidential. You're correct, yes. Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would ask the ALAC, is there anybody who feels we need a formal conversation on this? Because they have some concerns. If anyone says, yes, we have the conversation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Staff, please take note then. Let's send this call out to the ALAC as soon as possible, and ask if there is anyone that wishes to discuss this during the next ALAC call. At the least, we need to have a face to face or not face to face, but a voice discussion on this, that would be conducted under in camera rules.

Is this understood?

MATT ASHTIANI: Noted Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Matt. Let's move on. The next is the At-Large meeting schedule for the 47th ICANN meeting in Durban. We have, well, quite extensive Durban agendas. I'll hand it over to Heidi to take us through this and through the different questions that we need to work on. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. This is Heidi. I put the At-Large meeting page, with all the various work teams for the days, Sunday through Friday. The [?

0:56:48] into the staff. And just to go through them. So I think we're basically all set.

So Sunday, just Olivier, did you want to go through the actual agendas?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think this, probably not because I have a feeling that you're going to go through the agendas with the ALAC next week. So...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. [CROSSTALK 0:57:10]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...a little bit too much. Except if I could ask the ExCom to, between now and next week, have a look in their own time at the agendas. If they could flag anything that we missed, or anything that we're doing too much of. As you know, I'm always concerned that we got too much on our agendas.

We're going to be absolutely slaughtered again as far as time is concerned. Back to you Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If I could add to that... This is Heidi. If I could add to that, we're hearing... We heard, Olivier and I heard in Beijing, from the [PPC 0:57:41] and I've been hearing here internally is that staff as well as other groups in the Board would like to see more members of the At-Large community at ICANN meetings, participating in other meetings.

Not just staying within the At-Large meetings. And I'm also hearing from some of the key staff that normally they do speak with the ALAC, and they are continuing to do so. They are also suggesting that we make sure that members of the At-Large community are in their public meetings.

So we have public meetings from compliance, from the new gTLDs, etcetera, and they're really asking that we have members in those sessions as well. So perhaps that's something... And I know that we've had them in the past, but maybe more numbers, and to have them speak out during those meetings.

That is the comment that I've been hearing. So the next point on the agenda under this item are the various questions for the meetings. Now we've sent out a notice of please add them, and we are getting them slowly in. The deadline is past, it was the 21st. So you can see, if we go to the At-Large SO Leadership meeting question, there are several there.

Not sure how you want to actually take those. There is one for the GAC. I'm just going to walk through those and you can do that on your own time as well. So there is only one question for the GAC. Nothing yet for the Durban Board meeting. And I have had Board staff, or staff follow up with me on that so we can get that, we can get those questions in as soon as possible.

That would be helpful. The one for the At-Large Durban global stakeholder engagement questions, nothing there yet. Again, that session is going to take place on Sunday morning with Sally, the new VP

for global communications who is Duncan – let me just take a look at her name. I'll get that to you shortly.

So nothing there yet. And then also during that same session on Sunday morning, it's also the communications team, and there are no questions for that yet either. So those are some of the areas that we really do need questions. Olivier, over to you. How do you want to take that forward?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Heidi. I think we just need to continue filling this up, and I know that you've sent a general question to all, to the ALAC announce list and also to the RALO lists to fill those. It's particularly important that we fill those in and that we shape somehow the discussions that we would like to see happen in Durban.

Just today, I was given... I was sent... Sorry, I received another email with regards to the public forum and what subject the ALAC would like to hear, would like to speak about in the public forum. I know that they... I mean in the past, we have made some suggestions and they have been followed actually. So the subject did come up for the public forum.

Although I know that some of us don't quite like the public forum too much because it's the same old questions, same old discussions. [CROSSTALK 1:01:15]...

HEIDI ULLRICH: ...public forum, I did forget to put that one on the agenda, but there is one question on that one. It has to do with [? 1:01:23] ... in Africa.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yeah. I mean, ultimately when is the deadline for us to submit anything on the... Is it end of this week? Or end of next week? Because what I was going to suggest was that the ALAC has one last look at it and by Thursday next week, we just make a quick reply with – collation with the whole, all of the matters which are developed in there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I think the deadline for the public forum and for the Board, it looks like it has passed but it will take them again. So I think next Thursday would be okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I'd be surprised if they were pass because I received an email yesterday regarding the public forum at the SCOC list.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh you did? Oh okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. No I have not received those. So okay, that's good news. Normally, it's always much earlier than this, but maybe because of the short time between meetings...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. And this one for the record is run by Brad White. I see that Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The ATRT received our list of when our meetings are yesterday, so I assume Heidi has that list also. If not, one of us can get it to you. We should try to make sure... Now, there is no guarantee that both Olivier and I are at all ATRT meetings, but I think we should work with that presumption and make sure that we are prepared to cover our absences for the, during the ALAC schedule.

And to the extent possible, not schedule one of us to be speakers at a session where we are not likely going to be there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Yeah, thank you Alan. And Gisella has been tasked with this. I was going to touch on this afterwards, but Gisella has been tasked. I have forwarded all of the meetings over to Gisella. And she is going to produce a calendar which will show our availability and any clash with any of the ALAC's meetings.

At the moment, it is not produced yet so I can't tell you whether there is any clash. But as we know, we've got two wonderful vice-chairs who

would be ever so happy to run meetings during that week. I have noticed one clash perhaps, the ALAC meeting with the Board on the, I think it's Tuesday morning. And the ATRT... I think on this occasion, the ATRT meeting with the NCSG or with one of the GNSO...

So I think it's just for a half an hour and it will probably either remaining for the ALAC with this. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I guess I'm just sort of perplexed by the public forum in the sense that in the past, we've used the public forum to be able to discuss topics that in fact have been the subject of conversation during the proceeding week. And in fact, sometimes the statements have been crafted the night before in reaction to things that are both timely and relevant during that week.

Being asked to come up with public forum issues right now, so long in advanced, frankly I guess I'm just increasingly [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:04:52] by the stage management to the public forum. It's becoming less and less valuable. It's becoming more and more just a stage show, the way the Board meeting used to be.

And it serves absolutely zero purpose considering that we already have channels to the Board and to other constituencies. The issue of having to come up with public forum issues so far in advance, not knowing what's going to happen during the week of Durban, so tying our hands to be able to do something ad hoc right at the Durban meeting, at the public forum.

This is, I'm sorry, this is absolutely a joke. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, thank you very much Evan. There is going to be some more movement as far as the ICANN week schedule is concerned. As you know, the meeting strategy working group has also started working and I have been interviewed by it, so this might change in the future.

And some of the sessions might be amended, etcetera. But I see that Alan has his hand up and then Sebastien. So first Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm going to disagree with Evan. We may well want to say that the public forum is a sham and don't bother having it, that's a different issue. If we are going to have it, there is always a catch-all at the end which says for issues that we don't, we haven't already identified as devoting for specific time to.

I think I'm encouraged by the fact that they're asking us what the main session should be, as opposed to finding out by looking at the screen when we walk into the session, which is how it used to be done. They're asking us what the important hot topics are likely to be. And that's better than someone deciding that in a dark room with no one being involved.

So I don't think we're being asked to identify everything we want to talk about, but I think we're being asked, what are the hot topics that we think should be on the table. And we may want to say policy and implementation, or we may want to say something which might not be

on the quote stage manager's agenda. So I'm encouraged by this, not discouraged. That's presuming the public forum goes on at all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I think that the [? 1:07:18] of Alan is the right one. And the [? 1:07:23] that we change a little bit of the posture of the Board meeting itself, there is no more. It must not be of any more discussion of hot topics discussed the week. It will not be taken by the Board, they made that clear.

Because it was a decision of the Board not to have this type of rush decision or taking. I am not absolutely agree with that, as you know I was, and you agreed with me, that the Friday, the end of the meeting on Friday was not a good idea. But the reasoning was, we have no need to take decisions on something who were a hot topic during the week.

If it's not coming from previous work done, and all the stuff we feel. And I think it's important to have the explanations given one of the topics they would like to discuss during the public forum. Public forum need to evolve, I agree. We are open.

And I am particularly as a chair of the PSCC open to any input on any of that subject, when you want. The meeting participation working group is also working, and it will be one of the issue. But please, don't throw the baby with the water, you... There is reason for that here to have

this request, and that is a good request. Now how we can improve this, input are welcome. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sebastien. And would you care to enlighten us what the PSCC is please?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah sorry. As you follow all the [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:09:23]... I was thinking that you know. But we changed the public participation committee to the public stakeholder engagement [? 1:09:37] committee. The reason was supposed to be in the content, but no change for the content, except that we [? 1:09:49] ...and we change the name.

The reason really was because a change of the organization of the staff, I thought that the both committee must, either be in line with the organization of the current community or with the staff. That's why, just a committee like that we know, we don't know to whom staff will help us or to whom part of the community will report to.

Then the decision by the Board was just to change the name. That's a strange way of doing it, but we will review all the committee ideas in September, the content, both the content and the name. And it's a public stakeholder engagement committee. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sebastien. Carlton Samuels?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Olivier. This is Carlton for the record. I would say, following up on what Evan was saying, that what he is talking about is always a concern that it is going to be, the public forum is going to be stage managed and we need to be vigilant that it is not totally overcome, but I can understand why they might need to have questions ahead of time.

Because as you recall last year, when in the public forum, there were quite a few questions that came up and they kept on apologizing that they could not answer, they could not answer. So I think given them an opportunity to answer some questions, yes. I don't suspect some of the issues that that would be at the moment would arise in the public forum itself, or in the week of the meeting.

Some of them would be overflows from previous times. So I think we need to be vigilant that it does not become too stage managed, but I can see why it is useful. So I would urge that we look at the public forum and the way they want to frame it in this context. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Carlton. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I do have one thought for Sebastien though, who may want to pass this on to the powers that be. With regard to the term stage managing, last time Brad White chastised some volunteers for not speaking on target, or what he thought was not on target. I make no claim that everyone is on target, but the reaction to he being the one to

chastise volunteers was exceedingly inappropriate, or at least as it was taken by many people.

So someone may want to think about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. And I see agreement from Sebastien on the Adobe Chat. Right. So let's just have all of us, have a collective look at these questions and these hot topics until the ALAC meeting next week. And hopefully we'll have a little bit more than the current material is in there.

Bearing in mind this is where we make the choices of our discussions with the Board, etcetera. In addition to all of this, something that is not listed there, and I will be soliciting your input in, I am also going to have an early morning breakfast on the Friday morning before the ICANN meeting with the ICANN president. And sorry, not president. Chair. Board Chair, Steve Crocker.

So as usual, we discuss things informally at that time. Steve is able to gauge an idea of where the ALAC and At-Large stands on many different issues, and he is able to informally gauge the temperature of the ALAC. So if you have any suggestions as to what I should touch on, then email to the ExCom list or welcome. Right. Let's move on to the next thing.

Heidi do you still have anything else you would like to add on this section?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. This is Heidi. So we have several formal meetings with other [AVs 1:14:41] and SOs, one being the ASO. But we've just noticed that Robin asked Olivier on Monday, this past Monday, for a meeting with the NCSG. Now a concern we have is that the schedule for meetings for formal rooms ended weeks ago, and the formal public schedule has now been posted, I think Monday.

Meaning no changes can be made at this point, so for that meeting, it might just be informal meeting room that we get when we sign up, when we get to Durban. I just don't think we can get any more formal, I can try obviously. But again, the deadlines for formal meetings passed weeks ago.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Gisella. Do you mean that we're effectively not able to pursue a new room bookings at this very moment?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I can try. If you could just give me a possible date and time for that, then I can follow up with meeting staff immediately this morning on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The email that I received from Robin was I think a suggestion for it to happen on Monday. I did forward this over.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Monday is probably the most difficult days, because there are a series of public meetings that are taking place that we're trying to keep as un-conflicted as possible. And if you look at Monday's schedule for At-Large, we're even working during lunch. So we have 11 to 12:30, and that's going to be actually – that slot is the only meeting that is going to be conflicting with a meeting that they wanted as un-conflicted as possible.

That's the five year strategy meeting, but there is nothing we can do about that. So that meeting remains at 11 to 12:30. Then following immediately is 12:30 to 14:00 is the Academy, followed immediately by the At-Large multi-stakeholder process, sorry...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah...

HEIDI ULLRICH: So...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi? Heidi? Heidi, that's understood. What we've done in the past is get Gisella to deal with this with Robin to find a suitable time. And I know that there was always a flurry of emails going back and forth to find a suitable time. What I would like to just ask here is whether we're okay with an informal meeting with the NCSG, perhaps not the full ALAC, perhaps just select members of the ALAC who wish to meet with the NCSG.

And I was going to ask Evan about this. I have also spoken to Bill Drake a couple of days ago, and he suggested that one, again, a single subject be touched on. And on this one, the subject that he was suggesting was the shortening of the ICANN week. Apparently NCSG is faced with a lot of problems in being able to schedule their meetings because the Friday has been lost.

And so the suggestion was for the ALAC and the NCSG to draft a joint statement on this. Comments, questions, suggestions.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, this is Heidi. If you wanted to have an informal meeting, perhaps a working lunch is a possibility. But again, that would conflict with the Academy working group session, 12:30 to 14:00. But if you wanted to keep it on Monday, there is really are not a whole lot of options.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah. I don't think we're going to find the time today. As I said, maybe if Gisella can give us a number of options, and also options on Tuesday and we can then get them back over to Robin. I'm just concerned that we will just waste time on this. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If the subject is [? 1:18:42] the ICANN week, I don't think we need a meeting. We'll agree. We've already done it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. Then it would be just drafting, a time to just draft a joint statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that needs two people, not a meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So maybe that's one of the topics. Any other topics in mind? Policy versus implementation was another possible discussion. I'm not quite sure whether we feel we need to discuss this with the NCSG or not. Another one was to do with the possible, the dot less domain, the SSAC, although this is probably....

Now I think we made our point strongly enough that this has been, has effectively been noticed by a number of, well by the Board. And we might yield some results on this prior to Durban. False questions, Evan you are the liaison. Any thoughts on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought Evan resigned?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan resigned.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, I think I may I have done that informally, but I mean I'm still keeping contact, I'm still subscribed to the list and I've been in contact

with Phil about this. So basically everything you're saying, Olivier is accurate. You've essentially listed the issues, I think in the priority that they were dealing with.

When it comes to the Friday meeting, I think I agree with you also that it doesn't necessarily take every one meeting with every one, and that perhaps we can do a little bit of ground work in advance, and maybe this is just three or four people sitting down and actually word-smithing [sic] something everyone can agree on.

So... And that actually doesn't even need to wait for Durban to happen. Some of the ground work for that can happen in advance because I don't think the issue of the Friday meetings is going to significantly change between now and Durban, so we can probably even start working on that in advance. So I can keep contact with Phil and see maybe if there is interest in doing it that way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Has there been any follow up on the [? 1:21:06] plus 50, or is this also something to touch on?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: When I mentioned the issue of policy versus implementation, TM trademarks plus 50 is still at the top of the NCSG list as the manifestation of the problems with policy versus implementation. That that is something the NCSG feels strongly is a policy that is being hoisted upon the community as implementation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, since we've run out of time during the last Beijing meeting, maybe that could be the second subject to discuss. One that has a pretty clear conclusion, the other one that might need a little more time to see if we can have some focus. Alan Greenberg, and then we're going to have to move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm just going to state that I really don't want any discussion further. I want to make sure that everyone in this group is aware of it. I've seen statements in a number of forums, I'm not sure which ones now, on this policy and implementation issue. I believe the whole discussion we are having is a red herring.

The culture of ICANN, and certainly if you look at the process of the new gTLD implementation is the community has been involved. The Board reconsideration and response from the Board governance committee implied that if it's implementation, there is no bylaw mandate to consult with the community and use the multi-stakeholder model.

I believe strongly that as long as decisions are being made which effect stakeholders, there must be consultation and discussion, regardless of whether it's under the rubric of policy or implementation. Eventually you come to an implementation phase where it's just mechanical, but we are using the term implementation to be everything after the PDP, some of which does involve substantive decisions and must involve the multi-stakeholder model.

I think we need to shift the discussion to that and the, it looks like the GNSO working group is in fact, may well go in that direction. And I think

that's crucial, and we need to stop using the term, policy versus implementation as if that's the line of demarcation that should matter. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. And whilst you were explaining this, Heidi has suggested an informal lunch on Tuesday. I think that's probably the best way forward, and we will be able to discuss then face to face, come up with a statement if need be, or come up with no statement if need be, but certainly the other clear cut shortening of the ICANN week will yield a statement on this.

I thank you all for this input, and we need to move on. Back to you Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. Okay. I think that's it. There are several informal meetings, but now we've just added that to this one, so the NCSG. Besides that, we're having an informal meeting with [? 1:24:16] and the technology taskforce. There is going to be an informal meeting with Nora [? 1:24:22], the advice person for public, I'll get her title on that.

She's going to be handling the online distribution platform, so it's going to be an informal meeting in Durban with her as well. And I think that's it for that item.

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, I think you have everything under control for the social event? There is going to be an ExCom dinner on Saturday. And then an At-Large dinner, I believe on Tuesday, Gisella?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Is that ExCom or ExCom plus?

HEIDI ULLRICH: ExCom plus.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, ExCom plus liaisons to be clear. Gisella, is that correct? If you're speaking, please know you are on mute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not sure we have Gisella with us. Is Gisella here? Yes? I'm not sure who we can hear [CROSSTALK 1:25:30]... Gisella is one...

GISELLA GRUBER: That was me, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...the UK.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Everyone stop talking until Gisella talks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We cannot hear you very well. Yes, go ahead Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. The audio cut out then.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, that's happening. Can you just... Gisella, can you just write into the chat in terms of what the social events are?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. In the meantime, let's move on. The audio cuts out. Yeah, that thing... Because Gisella is not using a headset so her computer is basically cutting out the sound. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm having an awful lot of problems both with audio and with the Adobe Connect really as well, so Gisella is not the only one. Just on Tuesday, you need to remember that the 10 year anniversary of the [CTNSO 1:26:52] is on the Tuesday evening, and one would assume that the Executive Committee of the ALAC should be there [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:27:01]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. That's a very good point, and we need to have this on our calendars. So make sure that our schedules do not double book when this anniversary is taken place. I think it's particularly important for us to attend this on force, and not just send one person along.

Thank you. Okay. Just one more thing with regards to those schedules. And my computer has now managed to freeze. Here we go, now it works. One more question with regards to these meeting agendas, the scheduling of the... So we've got the ExCom dinner, we've got the At-Large dinner, when would that take place? Is that on Thursday?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think it's Tuesday [? 1:28:04]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's Sunday on the chat.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Well there you go. Gisella is the [? 1:28:12] secretary for the [? 1:28:13]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. [Laughter] I'm mindful of the time, let's move on. Is that it from you Heidi on the meeting schedule?

HEIDI ULLRICH: On that, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. And of course, we'll always have some more updates when we have the next ALAC call. And in fact, talking about the next ALAC call, topics for this call, at the moment suggested topics, Durban meeting, questions and activities, which is what we've had earlier.

Any other topics that you would like to bring up to the call in addition to our usual topics of public policy, public comment period, etcetera? Policy development. And someone has there... Here we go. Thank you. Gisella, your computer is bringing some echo into the system.

Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. Actually since we have two members of the ATRT on this call, perhaps this is appropriate. As you know, there are a number of At-Large people that signed a letter to the ATRT, is there value at the appointed time, putting on your ATRT hat, is there value to actually considering that ALAC endorsement?

Because if it is so, then I'll put it forward. The [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:29:42] ...RALO to put to events that forward, and so I'm happy to do so. But if, putting on your ATRT hat, you're going to tell me that there is not too much value in pushing that, then I'll defer. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. I'll defer to Alan to respond to this since he is one of the vice-chairs of the ATRT, and he is much more aware on the follow up of the public comments than I am. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I answered that question in another venue and I for the life of me, I don't remember whether it was NARALO or ALAC, and Olivier supported me and my answer at that point was, I don't think there is great... That this is going to have greater value coming from the ALAC than as it is right now.

And I suggest we put our efforts and time into the other interactions that are needed with the ATRT. That's my position. I don't think it's going to get less or more focused by the ATRT based on the extra endorsement. And I believe that's what I answered, although for the life of me, I don't remember where I was when I answered that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I believe you were probably sitting at your computer when you said that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In what session, I don't know [laughs].

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you want me to tell you a bad joke right now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Laughs] Please tell us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Guy is hovering in a helicopter in the fog, and finally he comes up to a little building and he notices there is a window open. He gets very close and yells out, "Where am I?" And someone from inside says, "You're in a helicopter." And the guy immediately knows where to go to get to the airport. How? That answer was completely accurate and completely useless, that was the Microsoft building. [Laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And with this, I think we need to move on. We're starting to lose the plot on this call. So the next one is the update on the next beginner's guide on ALAC policy. Actually, just before this, to answer Evan's question, absolutely agree with Alan.

And in fact, at the time when Alan did mention this once, and I don't remember why I was at the time, it was the same, my same follow up as well. I think it was on the ATRT 2 call that we popped the questions and that we asked. At the moment, the committee itself, the ATRT 2, and you're very much welcome to listen to the recordings of its calls, is very

much in one mind, which is let's go to the depths of it, and let's look at all of the avenues that are there.

So there is no... No one is basically saying that the avenues which you have mentioned, which several people have mentioned in the public comment, are avenues which the ATRT 2 is unwilling to look into. It might come later, when we... There might be a time crunch, and there will need to be a focus.

But at the moment, every single issue raised is very important. And certainly, you are not the only person, the individuals who have raised these issues are not the only people who have raised them. We do see a pattern on many issues being raised by many people. That's what I can add on this.

And let's move on. I see Evan and Sebastien with their hand up. So Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Nope sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Sebastien? Evan, yes, go ahead. It was an old hand, yeah? Okay. Sebastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. Just to confer that both of you, I really think that you need to consider to have an ALAC endorsement. My rationale is because

you ask that voice from ALAC must be taken carefully and was more important than individual people.

And my second reasoning here is that if we do like that, we don't need At-Large anymore. We will have individual users who gather to talk about one topic and send to every working group that comments. And why we need to stay with a structure gathering the votes of end users?

And I really think that... I understand your rationale, but please keep in mind this one too. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Sebastien. And of course, it is understood that the ALAC will also speak with one voice, but the strategy that was pursued is that the ALAC will be meeting with the ATRT 2 in Durban, and rather draft text for the ATRT 2, the issues will be taken up with the ATRT 2 in Durban.

And in fact, touching on this, there needs to be an agenda that also needs to be drafted for this. The ATRT 2, it was discussed yesterday, will come to the meeting with very open ears and keep the discussion very open. So I would very much appreciate if you could put your collective minds together and make a few suggestions as to what topics you would specifically like to touch on when discussing things with the ATRT 2.

It's a good follow up. Thank you Sebastien. And let's move on now. Well, just in response to what you said Sebastien, I think it would be double duty to have both a statement plus the discussion taking place afterwards. As I said, it's not a case at the moment, pushing something

across because some people in the ATRT 2 are unwilling to listen to them.

Quite the contrary, all members of the team want to hear from everyone. We're not in a pitting competition at the moment. Let's move on. The next one, the update on the next beginner's guide on the ALAC policy. Matt, you have three minutes or even less maybe.

MATT ASHTIANI:

I'll do my best. This is Matt for the record. So I put up the first draft, we have some notes going back and forth. I think the only responses back that I heard, tried to, there were some pictures and things, it's the same people over and over.

And of course, the biggest issue on the public interest, but that seems to be moving. So once we hear back from Holly, I'll incorporate that into the text and send it off to Lynn. Are there any other general comments about the layout, the content or anything?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, if I could just basically, this guide is going to be in PDF form by the Durban only, and then MS only, and then everybody will be able to take

a look at it at that point, and make – if there are any significant changes, then we'll go ahead and make those changes before it's [? 1:37:34] and made into printed copies.

There are... You'll see on the agenda, there are two choices for cover, you can choose those. You can let us know which one you would like. One change is that At-Large will be on one line, the dash, that's incorrect. But other than that, congratulations Matt, you did a great job on this.

MATT ASHTIANI: Thank you Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It will be another great addition to the material.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much Matt for this. Regarding the two choices of cover, I was just discovering them at the moment as we speak. Frankly [laughs] I really don't care about the cover. I think what's important is what's inside. Both of them look great.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Originally, the purple color was completely wrong and right away thought of Cheryl. So we changed that color to the RALO, the ALAC colors. And then for some reason the designer gave us two choices of the cover so we posted them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. The only thing that I can say, Heidi, is that the logo on the second one, on the version – which version was that? It doesn't say which version it is. Whichever, the one which has got the little lines on it as well, the logo looks a bit rough. It doesn't look as high quality as the other one.

Surely you can figure this one out. On the content side of things, certainly important to have, now that I see it from the discussion, to have definition or some kind of introduction to the public interest. Not a definition, I think it's impossible to define it, but some kind of introduction. I look forward to seeing Holly's text on this.

She certainly hit the nail on the head. What's the process for approval with everyone afterwards? Because at the moment, it has been sent to a smaller group. Then will it be sent to the ALAC for comments before Durban?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Yeah, I think that was the plan. That [? 1:39:49] will present it during the Durban meeting, and then we can send it to ALAC announce for a couple of weeks of review. But again, I'm hoping that there is not going to be significant changes at this point. Or at that point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. So time table, did you say next week?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Matt, yeah. This is Heidi again. Comments from that select group, yes I believe that was it. I don't have the schedule in front of me. But I think that sounds about right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What I was going to suggest Heidi, so that you hear what I was going to suggest, is that this gets presented during the ALAC call and that you then collect comments for three or four days after the ALAC call, and then finalize it, finished. Because the week afterwards, everyone is travelling and will be very busy anyway.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. And now we are moving on to the last part of our agenda, that's any other business. The floor is open. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm already discussing this with Heidi but just so we keep everyone in the loop, several deadlines have passed and we still haven't gotten an answer on whether that US Internal Revenue Forum is necessary or not for people to collect per diems.

And we have had no tutorial or any indication for people in far off lands but exactly how to fill out that form. We're going to be coming down to a crunch real soon, where if we don't get an answer for that, and we don't tell people how to fill them out with a little bit more advice than, "Please consult your tax accountant." We're going to have people not pay per diems.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Olivier, I followed up a couple of times with the finance department, and I will follow up again. And I have informed them of ALAC concerns, asked them specific questions. So I think they're having an internal meeting and they're hoping to get back.

ALAN GREENBERG: But understand if the answer is yes, we're going to have to probably handhold some people in filling out these forms. Someone should be aware of that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: They are. This is Heidi. They are aware of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can I just, for the record, find out is it true that if it does mean that these forms need to be filled, if they are not, the per diem will not be paid?

ALAN GREENBERG: That was threat in the letter we all got.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Including me, and I don't even get a per diem anymore.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well they won't repay expenses either by the way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right. I wouldn't get any expenses.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Okay. Any other, other business?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I just say something here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: We really need to push back on this issue, because why I don't like it, it is tending to suggest we are getting paid for services rendered. And that is not the case. And I really am beside myself with this attitude, that we are being compensated. It really bothers me, because I keep on telling ICANN, I spend more money from my pocket for ICANN meetings, than they paid me in per diems, every striking time.

On the list, we have a full and frank discussion about this, and I'm fine to have a full and frank discussion. And I want to... The term, full and frank discussion, to be interpreted in the diplomatic sense. We're looking to get over from all of this. That's what I have to say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Carlton. But as you know, anything that is dealing with accounting and so on might just be a general rule without any determination as to whether this is compensation or this is just to deal with expenses and so on. I do hear that from Cheryl that her expenses will not be paid, if the form was not filled in or if the form was required.

But I do hope that the finance department will shed some light over this as soon as possible. And as we know, it is vital that some of our, some people in our community get their per diem before they arrive in Durban, because that's how they manage to survive during the time that they are at an ICANN meeting.

So it's not a matter to be taken up lightly. Alan and then Sebastien.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you very much. I've said in a number of forums that this sounds like a cover your ass. ICANN only needs these forms if they're actually compensating someone for work performed in the US. Certainly in the Durban meeting, since we're not being compensated, although I volunteered to put an expense – to put an invoice in if someone would like to pay it at my regular daily rate.

I would be delighted to have them pay, and I'll fill out the form immediately.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Won't we all?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Now it sounds like a cover your ass, which I object to on a whole bunch of grounds, but I really think before this goes forward, someone needs to tell Fadi about this, because I'm sure he's not in the loop. And what this does to his attempt to make this look like ICANN is not an US corporation.

It is just unbelievable to take all of these foreign nationals who have never even set foot in the US in some cases, and tell them they have to fill out an Internal Revenue Form because ICANN is resident in California. It just destroys everything he is trying to do. Thank you for letting me... Thank you for letting me vent.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you...

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you Alan, you're speaking for me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Here, here Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastien is next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I would like to ask you to send me a short summary of the situation, because I find some of the same trouble, a little bit more money of course, but I had to tell how they organized the question of the tax between France and US, and to do the work myself.

And I agree with you that all of that is a crazy situation. Then if you can give me some input, I will push that... If I had that yesterday, I would have talked to Fadi, but as soon as possible, I will talk also with [? 1:47:12] and maybe the new CO. And she will be coming the 1st of July.

I think we need to have, as soon as possible, [? 1:47:27] as to our volunteer people, it's just crazy. You are doing much more than the dollars you get for the time you spend, and it's a bad, bad way to do things in this organization. And I want to support you as much as possible. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will certainly send a note, anyone else might also want to send one or an official one. But I was the one who started this, and I would be glad to send you something Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much everyone. Yes, Cheryl, you were about to say something and then we'll have to move on. We are half an hour beyond the limit.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The particular form we are referring to is highly complex. It's a huge impediment for many people, particularly if English isn't your first language and you don't feel particularly connected to the US. And you have little understanding of what the IRS is. Just based on movies or television, I can imagine where this would be a great put off for volunteers. I think it's certainly something that Sebastien should follow up aggressively.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll also point out that the instruction form, which ICANN didn't send to anyone, is something like seven or 12 pages long.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much everyone. Of course, the alternative would be that each one of you gets a tax attorney based in California, that would be able to help you out. But then good luck on the... Well, that's what I was going to say.

Good luck on the monthly amounts that you would need to pay that tax attorney [laughter]. And that will probably vastly exceed your per diem. I really wish to move forward. We are now over, well we're nearly half an hour over the official ending time of this call, and I do note that some people have to move on to other calls after this one.

I ask for any other, other business? I think that's it. Okay. Well, I have to thank all of you for lasting this long. It's been a very productive meeting. I just wanted to end this call with a round of applause for Matt for the beginner's guide, which I was very impressed with.

And that's a significant amount of work in addition to everything else that he has been doing for us. So Matt, thank you. [CROSSTALK 1:49:59]...

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Matt.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I've just put my hand up instead of putting the thing... Okay. Great. Thanks to each one of you, and we will speak only in a few days' time, next week during the ALAC monthly call. Until then, have a very good weekend and keep on making those suggestions for those SOAC and all of those meetings that we're going to have in Durban.

Thanks very much. This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

[Various good-byes]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]