
JULIA CHARVOLEN: Recording is on, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julia. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening at once. This is the ALAC Executive Committee Teleconference or the ALT – At-Large Leadership Team. It's Tuesday 8 October, 2013. The time is 13:05 UTC. If we could have the roll call and apologies, please.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you, Olivier. Welcome, everyone to the ALAC ExCom ALT mid-monthly meeting on Tuesday, 8 October 2013, at 13:00 UTC. On the call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Evan Leibovitch, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Julie Hammer, Alan Greenberg who will be joining us for one hour. We have apologies from Rinalia Abdul Rahim. And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani, Nathalie Peregrine, and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you very much, and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julia. I had to start this conference call with a bit of a question with regards to the link in agenda item number two, which

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.

says: “Review of action items from the 25 September 2013, ExCom meeting.” That links to the 13 September meeting. I did ask staff, and I haven’t had a reply on this. Heidi, could you please enlighten me on this, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible] Just give me one moment, please. Actually, Matt since you’re faster because my computer is very slow this morning, so if you could put the proper link in if yours is any faster. I just keep looking at that haunting little circle.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Well, let me you out of your tight spot here. I don’t think there was a call on the 13th. There was a call on the 25th indeed. So probably that page is misnamed.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, okay, sorry. Sorry, Olivier. Yes, the dating is incorrect. It is 9/25/2013. I’ve noted that as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 13/09/25, okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, it’s just the dating is off.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, let's get going. So it's either the wrong way around. Let's get going. Let's have a look. We've had several closed action items. We've got several open action items still.

The first one is Matt and Alan to work on cleaning up the various meeting lists. That's ongoing.

Alan is to complete the required documents to allow the new rules of procedure to be put in place. And once that is close to complete, the chair will put out a call from members of the Board Member Selection Process Committee (BMSPC). I guess the first part of this action item is done. The second part we will be discussing in a moment during this call.

Matt is to work Dave and Olivier on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of At-Large action items. That's ongoing.

Olivier is to begin speaking with RALO chairs on ALS [recertification]. That's still yet to happen.

Olivier and Alan are to inform the ALAC when ATRT-2 documents are ready for review. And, in fact, there is a lot of work going on at the moment in the ATRT-2. We might touch on this later on in the call shortly.

Then Heidi is to move forward with the appointment of the dot-mobi liaison, as now we have response from the [inaudible]. The call for candidates will be sent and statements of interest are to be requested and have a teleconference on the issue is to be held. Is there any progress on this, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Very slow progress, but progress, and it will be done hopefully by the end of the week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, great. Then there are several action items which have been completed, and I'll leave you all to read them in time. The follow up maybe on the Registrants' Rights and Benefits, the Registrants' Rights and Responsibilities. Well, simple as that, there hasn't been any, so I will follow up with Fadi Chehadé and ask the question again. I must say it is a little bit irritating to be ignored in this way for something that is as important as that, since it is an RAA document that's a legal document.

Let's move on. Finally, Evan, Holly, and Carlton are work together the develop a charter and propose initial chairs for the newly formed Regulatory Issues Working Group. I gather that's also on its way at the moment.

Any comments or questions on any of these action items? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so let's go directly to agenda item number three, I believe, and that's the policy advice development page. We've got several adopted ALAC statements, and of course as usual, I thank everyone who has held the pen on these.

We've got currently some statements being developed, as you all know. The first one is the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in [All] gTLDs. Any update on this? I don't know if it's Alan or Evan that wishes to speak on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's on the to-do list. It has got to be done real soon. It hasn't been.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, goodness, Alan. It sounds like you've been up all night.

ALAN GREENBERG: I haven't been up all night, but it's going to be a rather busy day. I have a deadline of 5:00 today for some ATRT stuff that's going to require some careful thought.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, let's go through this quickly, then. So that's still to-do. Policy and Implementation Working Group. That's another one that's to you and to Evan.

ALAN GREENBERG: That one I think we're going to need a bit of discussion because there's a strong difference of opinion among people in the ALAC that have been having some private discussions, and I think we need to decide which way we're going on that one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you want to do that right now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not quite sure whether we want to discuss this right now. Do you think? I mean, it probably would be better to wait for the full ALAC or to launch the discussion on the mailing list.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we have that, well, there's no formal deadline on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, there is the 31st of this month. The 31st of October is what's written.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. The request said, "Or maybe we can talk in Buenos Aires." I don't remember. Remember, this isn't the formal comment period. This is a request for information. But I really think because of the progress the group is making that we should say something sooner rather than later. My personal opinion is not to say an awful lot but to note a couple of points. But there has been a bit of unrest that – to quote a past movie – "we're sick of it and we're not going to take it anymore" attitude among some people, and the question is, is this the one that we go to the wall on or not?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Do you suggest then that we discuss this here, or can we just fire a discussion on the mailing list first and then take it up in the next few

weeks or so? We've set ourselves a [inaudible] date of the 31st of this month. It's clear that there's going to be discussion about this all the way up to Buenos Aires.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. I'll give my opinion, and Cheryl is very active on the working group and can also chime in. Whether this working group comes out with something that is nefarious for the GNSO or not, I don't know. There is a possibility of that. I haven't yet checked, and I really need to do my homework on it, to see exactly what is it the Board asked and did they direct it at anyone in particular? I know when the GNSO group was chartered, Olivier, we asked you to approach Jonathan and ask, could this be a joint group? I don't know whether you actually got around to doing that or not. My recollection is...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I did, and the answer was one of saying, "I'm very concerned about making it a joint group because of the complexity of the task," and it does appear that there is opposition within the GNSO for any kind of joint working groups. But that we are more than invited. We are invited to take a very active part in the GNSO Working Group discussions. Because the group is absolutely open, Jonathan did not see any problem with us sending several people in that working group.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now, of course, the limitation – and I did voice this to Jonathan – was that any work of the working group would then have to be effectively voted on by the GNSO. But then I also did say that it may well be that the ALAC having taken part in the working group, if the GNSO counsel did not vote on the work or blocked it or whatever might happen with it, the ALAC might be drawing its own conclusions out of it since we have active members on the working group itself.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, the modus operandi of most groups recently – and I'm not going to go into ancient history – is that ALAC people tend to have a significant role to play and are given a fair amount of air time, as it were. That doesn't mean everyone just bows and agrees with us, but nevertheless.

I think this is a working group that is likely to come up with some good statements. We may not agree with everything, but I think the overall direction is probably likely to be positive, and I think we should contribute at this point to try to direct that. You've got a couple of strong people on the working group, but a statement from the ALAC helps. That's my overall position.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Do you believe time is of the essence? We need to get that before the end of the month, or can this be put on the side for the time being and give you and Cheryl a little bit more time on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it should be done well before Buenos Aires, but I don't think there's a very tight deadline.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so let's put this to the side. Maybe what we can do is to then have this as one of the subjects of our next ALAC call, which I believe this month is going to be delayed unfortunately because of the IGF. So that ALAC call is likely to take place on 29th of October, just a day before the deadline that we have set ourselves. What I would like to do, though, is for staff to find out through their channels of an actual deadline for this from whoever has sent this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, just go to the policy page. It has the e-mail that triggered this, and I believe it gives Buenos Aires as one of the options.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, okay. Correct. Yeah. "Set up the next interviews by conference call or possibly in person during the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires." How do you feel about a conference call? Because the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires is going to be so busy. And, of course, if we do discuss this policy implementation, there are some calls that policy versus implementation be discussed in the monthly afternoon session. But I personally think that this is just so many people there, there's not going to be any kind of significant discussion. How do you feel about a conference call prior to Buenos Aires related to this?

ALAN GREENBERG: A conference call with whom?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, it says here if you'd like to prefer to set up an exchange of views by teleconference or possibly in person during the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, the working group would welcome such an approach as well. So I believe it would be a conference call between the working group and the ALAC. That's what it says in the e-mail.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a really large working group. If the ALAC can come to closure on a statement, I would say submit one. That's my recommendation. Cheryl, why don't you speak up?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see Evan in the queue first, so let's just get Evan's point of view, and then after, Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. At very least, I want my name taken off doing any kind of statement based on the GNSO Working Group. So please take my name off any action items to do with that. I thought I made myself perfectly clear a week ago saying that we're in a wrong direction, that while I appreciate everything Alan has said and I understand all the nice words

about the inclusivity of the GNSO Working Group, ICANN is doing this the wrong way. There is no two ways about this.

And, yes, we can do our input and so on, but I'm already seeing out of initial work that even the biases in the questions that are being asked of this so-called survey of the SOs and ACs. So just what I expected has come to pass, that a bias in the GNSO is even affecting the questions in the survey.

So as far as I'm concerned, yes, some of the work that's come out of this might be positive on a micro scale. On a larger scale, ICANN is tackling this issue the wrong way. This has to be totally inclusive of the community. Multi-stakeholder does not just mean the stakeholders in the GNSO. So, I'm sorry. This is an extremely flawed process. We need to say early in this process that it is flawed, and frankly the fact that Jonathan thinks that this is uncomfortable to make into a joint group does not negate the necessity of doing it.

Anyway, I think I've said my piece very clearly on the e-mail. As I've said, if there's interest in me participating in an overarching statement to the Board saying the Board has to take leadership on this issue and not leave it to only one of its supporting organizations to tackle an organization-wide issue, I'm happy to work on that. Please take me off any action item specifically to do with commenting on the GNSO.

I'm absolutely convinced that even though it's inclusive on a micro level that it is an absolute monstrosity as far as ICANN's general community inclusivity. There are no other ACs involved. The GAC should be involved. The SSAC should be involved. This is not just ALAC issue. This is

something that needs to be community-wide, and I think we are abrogating our responsibilities by saying, “Oh, let’s go along with it because they’re inclusive,” rather than looking at the larger picture of saying, “What the hell is ICANN’s multi-stakeholderism all about?” Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I think I’ll just speak to answering specific questions that arose in Alan’s deliberation because my continued and ongoing engagement in not only this but any number of GNSO and ccNSO [inaudible] but nevertheless, they are the support organization and do do policy activities for the record. So I’m clearly somebody who wants to work from the inside.

That said, I think the issue where in particular about who you meant for a conference call on the briefing on this topic, that could have merit. It would need to be close to the BA meeting. The reason I’m saying that in terms of timing is that the work group itself. I also serve in a sub team of this work group which is putting together the project planning and timeline for it.

And for the questions to be tackled, there’s not a closed set of questions by any means at this stage. The purpose of reaching out for AC and SO support was to get exactly that. If we don’t as a work group get very much or anything in from the AC and SO letters sent out, then it’s quite

possible that the work group could organize with [inaudible] direction, and hopefully that would allow everyone's particular concerns to be appropriately brought forward and definitely heard. And certainly that would be a reason why the GAC and the other [inaudible] might wish to get involved.

In terms of timing, it's quite likely that the work plan for the Policy and Implementation Working Group will only be put together by the Buenos Aires meeting. So I think you've got less pressure on your timing than was perhaps first thought. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. So hearing the divergence of views that we have in our community, I certainly think that we need to actually discuss this in a wider scope. I see Tijani has put his hand up so, Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Evan, I heard you. I understand very well what you said, and I fully agree with you that a cross-constituency thing is better than a GNSO that includes ALAC or any other [inaudible] constituency. But if we can have our voice heard, it's better than if we are absent. So I believe that since we have the opportunity to participate, it is better to participate, but we have to continue our fight to have a cross-constituency working group rather than a GNSO one with the participation of ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. So I think that what we can do is as follows. The next ALAC call is on the 29th of this month, 29 October. Then there are two weeks until Buenos Aires, well, a full two weeks until Buenos Aires starts. I wonder whether we could arrange for a conference call with the working group or even a subset of the working group whoever wishes to be part of it on the week of the 4th of November. That's the week before Buenos Aires. That's sufficiently close to the, well, it's a week before. It's a week and a half before Buenos Aires for some and a week just for some others. That's sufficiently close to Buenos Aires.

And then we would be able to speak both of our from Evan's point of view and I believe that Carlton is also of the same point of view as well and also from the point of view of Tijani and of Alan and of Cheryl, although Cheryl I think is somehow between the two points of view. And certainly I would be interested in hearing the point of view of other ALAC members on the issue. I think it's really important. This is a core coalition, and we need to have discussion on that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Holly is on the work group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly is on the work group as well, so it would be good to hear from her as well what her feelings are with regards to the way the work group is moving forward. Alan, you put your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I just wanted to comment that, again, we've got to go look and do the work, and complaining to the Board about what they did when I don't remember and no one else can seem to recall exactly what they asked for, is something we have some homework we need to do, but that's easy enough to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, sorry to cut you off, but I have done that homework. I have spoken to Steve and I've also had feedback from several other Board members and the answer was the Board basically said to the ICANN community you have to look at this issue and work on it. And I guess this was picked up by the GNSO, and the GNSO just started work on it. If we wanted, we could work on it by ourselves as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you for confirming what I thought they said.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, so that pretty much, if we wanted to work on it ourselves separately, I think we would be very welcome to do so. Obviously, the GNSO have said, "Well, we'll allow anyone to work with us." Might we be asked to allow anyone to work with us, the ALAC, on this? I don't know. I've never heard of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I think the gist of the issue is there are people who believe the Board should have been much more explicit and chartered a

community-wide thing to avoid the fragmented review of this with the possibility of multiple answers coming out of it. I have no problem with that statement, and I've said it several times in public.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that's pretty much the understanding.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Olivier, may I finish because we really need to get on to other things. My point is I think we can and should make that statement, but I don't think it should be at the expense of also contributing to the GNSO work that is going on and may yield something useful. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, a two-pronged approach. I think we have an understanding on that. I can see agreement from Tijani and agreement from Cheryl. What we might do is to not actually even have a – if we have a double-pronged approach, then maybe Evan could be working on one specific statement and others could be working on the other statement.

That's one way. The other way is to actually have a conference call with the working group and to voice those two opinions simultaneously but separately. In other words, Evan would speak on behalf of looking at one direction, and others would speak regarding another direction. Is that a possible solution or not? I can see the pros, which is that it saves us from drafting two statements. I can see the cons, which is that it might confuse people on the working groups, and you know how easily people get confused in this world. And they'll say, "But, hang on. What

does the ALAC want?” They don’t seem to be able to deal with two-pronged approaches when they’re delivered at the same time. I’m all ears.

ALAN GREENBERG: I’ll say what I was in the process of typing. The real question is, does responding to the GNSO formally on behalf of the ALAC essentially give aid to the enemy because we’re supporting a process that we feel is not the one that should have started?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Alan. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I don’t think there is a single person in ALAC who doesn’t think that a cross-constituency working group is better than a GNSO. So drafting two statements is a good solution for me, and anyway, it will go through the approval of the ALAC. So the best is to start on writing both statements and propose them to the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Tijani. Let’s do that then, and let’s not have a call. That will save us from having a call. Let’s do the two things. First, statement regarding the fact that the Board should have asked for a cross-community working group. And I already know the answer because that’s exactly the question that I did ask them, but I guess it wasn’t

formal so maybe we need to formalize this. The kind of answer they will provide will be, “Oh, we’ve thrown it to the community. It’s down to the community to organize itself,” but I think we should make a point about this.

So a statement to be drafted that the Board should have asked this question and basically asked for a cross-community working group to look at this. And I guess that is part of the top-down approach that we are sometimes asking from the Board but that the Board has shied away from doing for reasons that are their own.

And the second statement is effectively to be responding to the questions which were asked in the current process. And we would have to have a closing date for both of these statements before the Buenos Aires meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, could you please repeat the second one and give a more specific [deadline]?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The second one, Heidi, is for a response to the questions which were asked on the At-Large Policy and Implementation Working Group Workspace to be drafted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I object to that, so before we cast it in writing, can I speak?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not convinced the questions are what we want to say. I think we need to make a statement. It may partially or completely address those questions, or it may say something at right angles to it. I don't think we should be prescriptive in the AI.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're basically saying let's not answer the questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I'm saying I haven't had time to focus on them, and I'm not sure I simply want to answer questions, that may not be. If Evan is right and the questions are slanted and they don't give an opportunity for us to say what we think is important, then I say the questions be damned. Say what we think is important. I haven't done that analysis. We've got a deadline of Wednesday or Thursday for the ATRT report to be dispatched. I'll have a bit more time at the end of that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we'll just draft a response, and let's take away Evan's name from this because Evan will have his own statement to draft on that. Are we all clear? All okay with this? Thank you, Matt, for removing Evan's name on that. Heidi, are we clear?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier?

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Olivier, thank you. On the first question of mine, yes? On the second question of the deadline, if you can please give a more exact deadline and is that for the actual vote?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Both deadlines would have to be before Buenos Aires, but I'd like to be able to discuss both of these statements during the next ALAC call. And perhaps we might even actually have a vote there and then on the ALAC call if we do have the time. If not, we'll just have an online vote. I'm not quite sure how busy the next ALAC call will be. Okay? And so the other action item, of course, is for that item to be also in the next ALAC call. And we can send both of these before Buenos Aires, and I know that there will be discussion about this in Buenos Aires because it's an issue which is not there for the short run. This is a long run issue. Are we all okay with this? Evan, you okay?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah, that works out. Actually, given the way that Alan is planning to tackle the comment on the working group at a higher level rather than just point by point, actually I'm really happy with that too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Let's move on. The next one is the study on WHOIS Privacy and Proxy Service Abuse. On this one, I believe it is Holly, Carlton, and Evan. We've got a statement there, and people are just commenting. I see absolutely no comment in there yet. There's a comment from Holly, but I guess that came into the first draft. I'm just surprised that we haven't got any feedback on this one. The call for comments closes in two days. Matt, have you sent a reminder of this?

MATT ASHTIANI: No. I can send one, though, if you like.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I know there has been some discussion before, but it's just I'm very surprised since it is something of importance. Then again, the statement does pretty much go in the general direction of the report. So what I do find funny – and this is my personal feeling on it – is that ICANN seems to be surprised by the extent of the NPL report. I don't think it really surprises very much anybody in our community. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. That was an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Next one, the ICANN and SO-AC Leaders Brainstorming Collaboration. This was meant to be a statement to start with, and then we received a note from David Olive that it didn't need to be a statement and it could just be a response on the SO and AC chairs list, so just the correspondence as such.

I have taken it on myself yesterday, and thus far on the SO-AC list I have received a response. There needs to get a copy of that response to also be put on the wiki page. And, in fact, it says that on the whole our community is happy with having the SO and AC general meeting on Monday afternoon, cross-community meeting on Monday afternoon. And on the other hand, there is no support for bringing forward the report and the public forum meeting from Thursday afternoon to Thursday morning, and that would certainly introduce problems for us.

And then there was also a note in there that they're rather unhappy, or some of our members are rather unhappy that the working group, the cross-community working group or expert working group which had been put together which had been cast aside during its brainstorming conference. It's very surprising.

Okay, let's move on to the next one, and the next one is the Revised Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Procedure, another hot topic here. That one looks very likely, by the way, to be a hot topic on the Monday afternoon discussion. There is currently no statement drafted on there. I know that, was it Holly that was going to take? No, it's Rinalia, Evan, and Carlton. Who was supposed to take the lead on

this one? I just can't quite remember off the top of my head. Alan, your hand is still up? Is this an old hand, your hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand is up again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't actually think anyone was named for this one. There has been a lot of discussion on it. I have a question to ask. My personal opinion is, I don't really give a "something" about the DRP. We can certainly make a comment based on whatever the new one says. I haven't read it yet.

The real issue I believe is, is ICANN going to take a position to be able to enforce things without someone filing a dispute? Fadi has said so publicly in our Board and ALAC meetings. I personally have not seen anything in writing backing that up. I think we need to call him on that. I guess that's your job.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Question: does this need to be included in any of our statements? Because ultimately there was a discussion on this, and if I recall correctly, it was mentioned I think that Evan had produced something which pretty much led into a statement. It just hasn't been added to this

wiki page. I certainly agree with you that Fadi does need to be called in on this because he has said that this would be happening, but maybe this is not really that confirmed.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, if indeed whatever he said is not operative and the DRP is the only mechanism that is going to exist to get PICs enforced, then yes, the PIC has to be changed radically. If indeed they're going to follow through on what he said and has committed to – or at least publicly said, whether that's a commitment of ICANN I don't know – then the DRP is relatively moot. I mean, the DRP is for funded people who have materially been hurt, I believe. I think those are still the rules, and that's not what we were talking about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Correct. Next there's Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. I want to sort of dovetail onto what Alan was saying in the fact that, okay, as of right now we have a public process and we have a private told to us but not expanded upon secret process that nobody knows about yet, except we were told about it. We already went into some good detail on the first draft of the PICDRP. There's a statement out. ALAC voted on it. The second draft, as Carlton so aptly dissected, essentially doesn't really address any of what we said the first time.

So essentially, you're absolutely right. This is a statement that is to essentially allow companies to complain about other companies that

have to show material harm, and that really leaves out advocacy. It leaves out whistleblowers. It basically prevents anyone from going on the public interest, and it has language in it that talks about it appears to be specifically targeted at disallowing whistle blowers or organizations that are looking at multiple applicants to see how they meet public interests.

As far as I'm concerned right now, this is a subversion of the original intent. In the absence of Fadi's follow through, this is what we have. And what we have was deemed explicitly not acceptable in the first ALAC statement. I'm not really quite sure how much more there is to say. We said the original one needs a lot of work and is unacceptable. The second draft basically doesn't address any of those things on a substantive level.

And what Fadi promised, as of right now, it's still a conversation between us and Fadi with no follow up. So what we have is what is public, and it is unacceptable. It's difficult for us to talk about something that was hinted at but has never been expanded upon and even, perhaps, what Fadi described is different in his mind than it was in ours when he described it to us.

So this whole thing is a real mess. It really sort of leads back to Carlton who has been consistent all along with saying that the PICs as a concept is absolutely flawed and is going to end up having absolutely no additional value to the TLD process. And although I didn't agree with him at the beginning, the way this is being handled now is really starting to prove that allegation out. Thanks.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. And I'll note I have to leave in 15 minutes. I don't make the claim that PICs are flawed. I think the PICs and new parts that are being added as we speak by new Board actions have an opportunity for fixing some problems that we really messed up in the original New gTLD process. But the DRP as the only mechanism to address the PICs being honored is flawed. So we're not going to change the PICs right now. It's the only vehicle we have to fix some of the really ugly stuff they put into or didn't address at all in the New gTLD program, and we have to come out with gangbusters.

Fadi made comments at two consecutive meeting, certainly very clear ones at the last meeting, and I think we need to call him on it. And I think we need an answer to that prior to writing the statement because the statement is a very different statement if the official position of ICANN is this is the only mechanism we have. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I hear both of you. I think we have already discussed this in the past. I will write to Fadi, so let's put this as an action item. Olivier to write to Fadi regarding PICDRP and Fadi's – is it promise – yeah, promise that...

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, no, statement that there would be another mechanism which he deemed to be crowdsourced because...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Fadi's statement that there would be another mechanism which... exactly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Undertaking?

ALAN GREENBERG: Undertaking. Whatever.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So action item, please. Olivier to draft – I don't see any action items being drafted at the moment. Maybe I'm – okay. Olivier to draft an e-mail to Fadi regarding the PICDRP.

ALAN GREENBERG: PIC enforcement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: PICDRP enforcement.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. PIC enforcement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, PIC enforcement. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Another mechanism in addition to the DRP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: PIC enforcement in addition to the DRP. So just put another mechanism in addition to the DRP.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you know where to find me on Skype if you want help with the wording as you're getting that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. No worries. No worries.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, before you go, this is Evan. Do you have access? Does anyone have access to the actual transcript of what Fadi said?

ALAN GREENBERG: It should be online.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I cannot remember when that was. Was that on the ExCom? Or that wasn't, was it?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. It was the Board ALAC meeting. If you look for the term "crowdsource" in the transcript, you should find it. That was near the end of the transaction.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And staff, if you could please find that piece of text, "crowdsource" in the Board ALAC meeting of Durban.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't guarantee it was transcribed properly, but that is what he said.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Evan, your hand is still up. Okay, thank you, Evan. Right, I think that we have a way forward with this as well. Let's move on further down. Currently no open public comments are listed in the agenda. And then, of course, there's the Early Engagement Workspace, which was updated at some point and seems to have fallen behind again. I'm not quite sure how often staff has to go and ask the SOs and ACs for their advance warnings.

Let's go to ATLAS II number four, and here just a.... Yes, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm just saying if you want me to be present for the discussion on the Board director announcements which still haven't gone out, we need to do that before I leave.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so let's do this before the ATLAS II because ATLAS II was just a quick update. At-Large Selection of Board member next steps. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm not quite sure. I saw Heidi's note, and Cheryl has put some boilerplate in. I can look at it later today and make sure. Hopefully we can come to closure and get that damned thing out. Excuse the language. The revised timeline hasn't been done. Cheryl has a new contribution. I haven't looked at it and won't until very late today at best. But that doesn't need to be included in what we send out, so that shouldn't be on the critical path of getting this announcement out. We've spent another week or two weeks with the RALOs not yet talking about their selection. We need to get this out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't be more adamant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl has sent a proposed new timeline with new proposed key dates with the first meeting of the BCEC to take place before or at the end of October, which means by the 22nd of October, the ALAC should appoint the (BCC) and (BCT) chair and should appoint also the BMSPC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, we need to appoint them at the next meeting no later, which means the ALAC needs these candidates before that. We've already slipped that a week by slipping the meeting by a week because of the IGF.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we need to get the announcement out and get RALOs working on selecting people.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, absolutely. Heidi, do we have an update on this, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. I just wanted to point out that, Heidi, you did send as you've noted some text edits. And I'm a strong supporter of quoting the rules

of procedure rather than just referring to them and talking about them in general terms, especially with something as important as [inaudible] process.

You've called for, I think the [inaudible] said the 16th or something like that, but fairly short order for closing dates. With the new ALAC meeting now being the 29th rather than 22nd, you could actually afford to have another week put on those closing dates for people to get their names into BCEC in particular. And for BCEC that I think is going to take the longest amount of time, what you can do is I think give them another four or five days, up to a week even now.

And, of course, in the timeline I had been assuming the date of the 22nd because that was the standard date for the ALAC meeting. Anywhere that it says 22nd of October, I will be changing that to 29th now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Cheryl, very much for the additional information that you sent through overnight. The call, I'll incorporate that, and then we can get those messages out. And we'll also follow up with the RALOs. Silvia can follow up personally with them to ensure that we get the message out. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. Alan? Your hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I agree the BCEC is going to have a huge amount of work to do, but the BMSPC is the one that must meet and formally decide on some game rules, including the formal timeline. And that's the one. the BCEC is easy to compose because we're telling the RALOs give us two members.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, might I say to go out for calls.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we're not disagreeing on going out for the call. We're not disagreeing on constituting them. The point I'm making is, the ALAC doesn't have a lot of work to do in creating the BCEC other than naming the chair. The ALAC does have work to do because it's a joint ALAC-RALO responsibility to decide on the composition of the BMSPC. And we need, if nothing else, a few people to get together and decide what to recommend. The ExCom could certainly do that – recommend what the process is to do that. Because that's something we need decided on before we go into that ALAC meeting. We can't do it at the ALAC meeting. I'm starting to ramble on it.

My only other comment, and then I'll shut up, is I haven't looked at the words in the rules of procedure for the people we're looking for. I think one of the things we need to stress for the BCEC which is probably not

in the rules of procedure is experience on the last BCEC and/or the NomCom.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which is in Heidi's text.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, it is. Fine. Thank you. I haven't had a chance to look at it. Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. So this is the process and procedure. Hopefully by, did you say tonight or tomorrow, Heidi, you can share that text with us?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I will try to get to it today. I'm in training the next three days. I get one hour break, and I will do it during that one hour break today.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you'll get it back to us today to be sent out tomorrow after it gets any further comments?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Because, Heidi, you have sent to Alan, Cheryl, and myself – you have sent the call for BMSPC and BCEC members as such, but this has got the different dates basically now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

She's going to revise it based on Cheryl's information and others.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Exactly. Okay, now with regard to the selection of the chairs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

The switch to the 29th is important, but Alan raised a point, and all I've done in my timeline is say that the BMSPC will be appointed on the meeting of the 29th now as well. The process, the putting out the call is important, but it's probably wise for the leadership team – and I'm glad the leadership team has already discussed it on list – to put together at least a slight with some if not all of the slots filled, and we can actually have more than the number of slots. We can have more names than

there are number of slots and put that to the ALAC for deliberation and finalization. So you'd need to have that out at least, I would think, four or five days, preferably seven days, which would take you back to the 22nd for your [inaudible] of BMSPC to go to the ALAC. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Cheryl. So question: Matt, I think the Board director workspace probably needs to be updated. Is that up-to-date, or does this need to be done or yet need to be done? We have Matt with us?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We won't be meeting Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: Can you hear me now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead.

MATT ASHTIANI: Off the top of my head, I think [inaudible] was started, but Alan and I needed to complete some additional work on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. If you can just check it and then, based on what we've got here with the call, then we can forward...

ALAN GREENBERG: Is Matt available during the day or is he also in training?

MATT ASHTIANI: I'm available.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I didn't hear what two people said.

MATT ASHTIANI: I'm available, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tomorrow I'll be able to work with you on it.

MATT ASHTIANI: Okay, perfect.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the meantime, the discussion for the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) chair, I have had extensive discussions with Roberto, and he would be happy to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did we just lose Olivier? Olivier is gone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we lost him.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm going to have to get off the call now. Thank you, people. I'll be on the Adobe Connect and I'll try to keep an eye on if there's any messages for me, send private messages so they turn gold so I may notice it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just get clear with deadlines. You'll be fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Heidi, while you're getting Olivier back, this is Cheryl. If you do want to run – if you just want to do it, I can update those dates. If it's a problem, let me know if you don't have enough time for getting all of these calls and everything out. I still remember how to do these things.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Cheryl. If you could add any details that I could just incorporate, that would be greatly, greatly appreciated.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think the calls are pretty much okay. I might now fiddle with the wording on one or two points right from this conversation, but I think we're okay because, as Olivier rightly pointed out, the specific timeline, in fact, is something we can now deal with after the call goes out. But we might just word a few things. What time, UTC, is your break?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Let's take a look. It is approximately 20:00 UTC, it looks like. 21:00 [inaudible]. So what I can do is incorporate your comments, send it overnight again, and then we can get the call out tomorrow. Can we do that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, we can do that. I've got [inaudible] on it. I should be finishing up a call, so Julie or Nathalie or whoever has got control of me at the time will know when I'm finished, and I think it is about 21:00 UTC, if not a little earlier. So we could Skype and put this thing to bed the next day.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, 21:00 UTC. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It will probably not take the full hour. That's all. Okay. I'll stop pressing now. Hopefully Olivier is back on.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just while we're doing that, I've noticed that, in fact, the transcript to the board ALAC meeting in Durban has not been posted which is rather unbelievable, given that I was given a transcript later that day. So I think it's just a technical issue. I'm writing, right now, an urgent note to everybody who could possibly be involved in this just to get that posted immediately.

Julie, how are we doing with getting Olivier back on?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're back. Okay, excellent. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's perfectly sound.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. Thanks. So before I was rudely interrupted by the call being dropped, I was saying that I had spoken to Roberto Gaetano to chair the BCEC, and he would be more than happy to do so, and has also checked with the current position that he has on the PIR board or whether this was compatible or whether there was any conflict. Several people, including PIR legal, have spoken to him and said that this is absolutely fine on their side, so it would be down to the ALAC to decide.

I personally think he would be a fantastic chair. He has all the knowledge of what a board member has to do. He definitely is one of these people that has a lot of wisdom, and I think that we do need someone with a lot of wisdom for a process that is as important as this.

He also has the advantage of being entirely out of ALAC and At-Large politics, which therefore makes him a perfect candidate for being able to conduct and maintain his neutrality, I guess, in any debate of the BCEC. He's very good with procedures as well, so I was going to suggest that the ALAC suggests him to be the chair of the BCEC. And, of course, the ALAC will have to ratify this.

With regard to the BMSPC, there was discussion with several candidates. Looking at the ALAC and with how so many people are busy, one of the things is that I would have preferred someone from the first ABSdt who is well knowledgeable of procedures. I was going to suggest Tijani, and I think that he's got what it takes.

The only concern I have with Tijani – and, Tijani, you may wish to reply to this – is that Tijani's already so busy with so many other things and extremely busy, specifically, with the capacity building and all of the work that we're doing with our RALOs at the moment. That was a concern that I had at the moment on this.

Any comments or thoughts? Tijani, please, you're very welcome to respond to this – encouraged. Tijani Ben Jemaa, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. Tijani speaking. Yes, I am too busy with a lot of things, and especially the Capacity Building that I took it very lately, or very new – but there is a lot of work especially for the summit. I don't know if the BM etc. will need a lot of work out of the work that you do with the group. I mean that there will be a committee, and the committee will work together.

There will not be any work to be for preparation, if you want. We don't have material to prepare for this group. If it is like this, and I think it is like this, there is no problem. If there are things to prepare for the meetings, for the calls, etc., yes, perhaps it will be conflicted with my work on the Capacity Building and others – a lot of other things that I am doing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tijani. I see Cheryl's got her hand up. No doubt she has an answer. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. I respect that Alan keeps saying that the BMSPC has to get started, get its work going, and prove and do timelines and all sorts of other things. Yes, on just the rule of procedure, that is, in fact... I guess you could draw along there inside that sort of thing to do. It's an oversight committee. Its role is to look at what has happened before, suggest any improvements, or charter any changes for the BCEC to consider – not to have to do; to consider – and then act as an oversight body.

Yes, it was a bigger job the first time around. You've got a report from the first time around, which has already been incorporated into your rules of procedure as an annex. So I actually think if Tijani is in a situation to run this oversight committee, it wouldn't be as onerous as it might be seen, comparing it to the first time around.

What it does have to do is meet with the BCEC no later than, preferably, the very beginning of November or the end of October so they mutually can establish the ground rules. And because you've actually got a full report from the last time, you can go yay/nay, accept or not – and that can really be done in a 90-minute meeting. By then, your timeline should already be tick and flick accept because you won't have any latitude because things are running so late. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Cheryl. What I'll do, I'll give both of – well, everyone here – another 48 hours to think about this. We need to move on that. The moment the call comes out, I will be making the suggestion for Roberto, definitely, for the BCEC. I think that time is of the essence on this process. So, Tijani, you don't need to give us an answer right now, but within the next 24 to 48 hours will be good.

I have really looked and looked at maybe having other on this. The problem, of course, is that many of the members of the ABSdt are not that active anymore, and so it does make it a little bit difficult. And also, I do think that there will need be maybe some, as you said, some close oversights. So you need someone who is still very active with At-Large and is keeping a very close eye on this.

Alright, let's get moving on this. Thanks very much for remaining on the call, Alan. I guess you can pretty much go now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Already gone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He's already gone? Okay, excellent – well, not excellent – but good that he's moved on to the next call.

ATLAS II, next steps. The survey is ready. The survey, I believe – was it just sent out just now? I'm not in ALS as such, not an ALS delegate – a main delegate – so I haven't received anything. Has the survey been sent out?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi, if I could?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So just to update everyone where we are. Staff has sent out the interest or request for updated information. The deadline was Sunday. We are still getting just a few in, but for the most part, we have I think most of them. So we have an updated database now. Matt is working on getting the survey in the three languages into Big Pulse, and the survey is due to

go out tomorrow, on the 9th. It will be open, I believe, for two weeks. Any questions on the survey? Thanks to everyone who was working on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see Tijani has his put hand up. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. The survey has been finalized and then updated again because Dev gave a late comment. The translation was done on the old – not the very last version. When we got the translation from my side, I updated the French translation copy and I reviewed it as well and it is now ready. The Spanish version – I don't know if Eduardo or Sylvia did that. I sent the very last version of the survey in English so that they tried to make the review according to this version.

A second thing, Heidi asked me if I can write the companion letter, if you want, of the survey to the ALSes and I agreed. I said yes, but I asked her to ask you, Olivier, because you are the chair of the ATLAS II Working Group. If you agree, I can do that. This is the situation now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Tijani. I'm okay with this. I mean we really have to get this out as well. It's one of these other time critical things, and I'm a bit concerned that the rest of the ATLAS II Working Groups are kept static at the moment until this thing moves forward. So the faster we get it out, the earlier.

Certainly, on the subject of translation, etc., that should be fine. We'll just have to send it out. The concern I have is that we have now a database that is not completely full of all of the addresses of all of our ALSes. I do hope that we will stick to the point that anyone not submitting a response to the survey will not take part in the ATLAS II. I think we have to be quite strict on that. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, Olivier. Now I am thinking that perhaps you are the best person who can write the note to send with the survey. It will be very short, just to introduce the survey. I think it is better that you do it since you are the chair of the ATLAS II Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, then I will do so. Let's put this down over on my slate. I can certainly do that. All I will need is the latest version of the survey and I guess the text, and then I can send that out. The alternative, of course, would be to get staff to send it out from the staff accounts. That might be something which is likely to land in the right part of the mailbox since they already do send announcements, etc.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

But I need it to be done very soon because it needs to be translated already.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

The request needs to be translated? Yeah, yeah, yeah.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, the note that you will write.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The note needs to be translated, yeah. This is why I thought staff was just going to be able to just have the notes from them. I could translate it in French, although my time at the moment is quite limited.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You should be [inaudible] French and English.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, I think we're going a little bit in circles if I'm following correctly – which, at this hour in my day, it may not be.

Tijani, just asking your permission – can you draft a statement on behalf of the ATLAS organizing committee for it to go out with the survey? And once you approve, he'll draft one and then staff will translate it into French and Spanish.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine by me.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So what did you say? I didn't understand very well.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'll Skype you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. It's okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So we can move on this. Let's move on. That's the next step for the ATLAS II.

Next is the Buenos Aires meeting, number 6 – Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CCT). The next steps on this one. As you all know, there was a call for a review team and that was then changed to a call for a working group to review – sort of an implementation group. Evan and I had a call with staff, and I think maybe Evan can provide us with his feedback on this.

Tijani, your hand is still up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, Olivier. You skipped the B of the ATLAS II next step. The B is the...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Review of the ATLAS timeline.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. The meeting rooms.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, update on the meeting rooms. Sorry about that, Tijani. Yes, you are quite correct. I didn't see that. I must be getting a bit blind.

Meeting rooms in London, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, so this is Heidi. Sorry if it's a little loud here. Very quickly, we had a meeting with the [inaudible], Olivier about two weeks ago now with Nancy. She was able to get the five breakout rooms at the summit on the Saturday, so we will be able to have five simultaneous meetings on that first Saturday. Only two rooms will have interpretation possibilities, so those will be going to AFRALO and APRALO. I think that was the main point that I meant for that item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you, Heidi. And then, review of the ATLAS II timeline. I guess this is slipping a little bit more as well. The survey was going to be distributed on the 10th. That's in two day's time – no, not the 10th. The 3rd, sorry. We are slipping back a little bit. Hopefully, if we can get this survey out by the end of the week, then we're not slipping up by too much.

The survey response was supposed to be received by the 17th. This might have to slip back as well, but Eduardo will probably be adjusting the timeline slightly on this. Comments or shall we just move on?

I guess we can move on. Let's go to number 6 – Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice. Evan and I had a call the other day with

staff to find out what was the rationale behind have an RT, and then the review team that will then transform into an implementation team.

My take from the conference call was that we are able to send as many people as we wish on this working group, and certainly we have voiced our concern that this working group might be another way to water down the set of metrics which were finally recommended.

As a result, if we are able to send as many people as we wish in that working group, we certainly can hold our ground on that. There will be, like any working group, a chair will be designed that will be decided by the working group. It will be down to the working group to administrate itself, but it looks as though we need to continue holding a strong position on this.

Have you taken anything else out of that meeting, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

No. The way you've described it seems quite there. I'm a little disheartened by the lack of transparency in it all, but this is what it is. I mean I'm simply happy at this point that the ALAC metrics are being considered on an equal par with the GNSO ones. It's going to be up to us to make sure they don't get whittled down in subsequent processes. So far, I'm happy with what I've heard, but we need to keep going.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Evan. Of course, there was a call for candidates sent out to our list maybe. I don't know how many of the At-Large community have decided to be on that working group. We need some

active people. I know that both Carlton and you are very active and would be great – what do you call it – flag bearers.

But I think we also need a few more people, especially if it does come down to a very active working group for other parts of the community that might disagree with the point that we have pushed forward.

Certainly, if it comes down to being shouted down, the numbers will matter, and the number of active members.

So perhaps if you do know of other members in the ALAC or in your community that are interested and that have the time to devote to this – because this is likely to be quite a compressed timeline and sure to be quite onerous on the number of conference calls – please suggest that they join and make sure that they remain in that working group.

I know that Carlton has had to run for the EWG calls, so let's move on to the next agenda item. That's number 7 – Buenos Aires meeting. I'll ask Heidi to take us through that please.

Heidi, you might be muted because we cannot hear you at the moment.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry. Can you please repeat the question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's not a question; it's an agenda item – Buenos Aires meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh okay. Sorry. Matt, can you please put the general ICANN At-Large pages in for Buenos Aires? I believe right now we have 21, perhaps 22 meetings that include the latest ALAC and ccNSO meetings. There's going to be one more added, and that is a cocktail with the board. It's going to be likely Sunday or Monday evening – that event we're working on that, but for the most part, we're set with that.

We do still need some agendas and we'll be following up with those groups that have not sent agendas yet. If you don't see your agenda in there yet but have sent it, don't fear. We will get to it shortly. Cheryl, that was to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So basically, we're set for that. If we could skip to the update on the Leadership Training Course. We are still working on the wiki pages for those two sessions – the facilitation training and the ACSO training. We're going to be adding an additional wiki page to include those meetings to the normal At-Large pages so everyone can see what is going on.

We have approximately 22 – let's see, 24 now, because the GAC sent in two additional people. So I think there will be a good number of people. Any extra slots will be taken by GSE senior staff. That will be a good group.

I am currently going through the Facilitation Skills training so I can feedback to you on how that is. This is a three-day course that we're going through, and then it will be compressed, that two-day session. For those of you that are going on the course, you'll be going through in Buenos Aires.

The senior staff will ensure that there are links between those two meetings in Buenos Aires. I would like to get a call with everyone who's working on these two groups, or at least the AC/SO leaderships ones to ensure that their documentation that will be used in that course is similar to the one that is being used the Facilitation Skills training. I'm just getting sure that they're both at an equal level in terms of documentation, etc. So that's on that.

Olivier, did you want to mention the AC/SO-led session, or I think you mentioned that above already? Item C.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have touched on this. That's the AC/SO afternoon session on Monday, isn't it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: On Monday, correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we're all on the SO and AC mailing list, so the brainstorming session that took place had suggested that there would be an SO/AC session cross-community discussion on several subjects – the two

subjects which were pushed forward or suggested were the PICDRP on one side and the policy versus implementation on the other side. We've already had the discussion on this. Now we'll see what comes out of this.

On the SO and AC mailing list, there's been some support for both of these topics. We'll just have to see how they pan out, really. I think that both subjects are worth of discussion. Whether anything will come out with such a big, big group is really dependent on the moderator of the session and on the format of the session itself. I'm not sure whether that will include the red, white, and green sheets of paper. It might be interesting if that's the case.

Cheryl, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Olivier. This is Cheryl for the transcript record. I just wanted to give a quick update on the ALAC ccNSO meeting that's planned throughout, I believe, it's the Tuesday lunchtime. We had our ccNSO council meeting earlier this evening, and I just wanted to make sure that we were clear.

They have appointed now two members – one who's chair of their meetings [inaudible], Katrina – unpronounceable second name that I can't remember at the moment, but I will get it to you. Actually, (Bart) going to get the contact details to you – me and Ron, Heidi. So we have two bright-eyed and bushy-tailed women to help us with the agenda and organizing and all of that.

I did raise the issue that the costs of catering are prohibitive, but we would be seeing if we could at least rustle up a boxed lunch. And with your permission, Olivier and the rest of the leadership team, I'd like to liaise with Heidi on that just sort of out-of-session when she finishes her training.

Then a final point on training – oh, sorry, no. Stay with the ccNSO meeting. It will, in fact, only be their executive committee and liaisons, though I would expect probably no more than six or seven of them now. So it will be, pretty much, if you bring your ALT and four liaisons, they'll have their main liaison teams and staff, etc., but it won't be a full counsel at all, which is a good thing.

And the final thing is – Heidi, I am sorry to say to you, my dear, that I will have to send you the MP3 of yet another report to the ccNSO council on the – sure packed with exciting intricacies of the ICANN Academy. Please note my tone.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Cheryl. Cheryl, thank you very much for that. Can you just clarify – did you say that this ccNSO will send just the leaders, i.e., the full council?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, not the full council – the executive committee and liaisons.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That has changed. That's what I needed to tell you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have you finished the discussion? Heidi, I'm waiting for you. Next item.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just before I begin on the questions, just to confirm, Olivier, that you would only now like your ALT and the liaisons going to this and not the full ALAC, given that it's only...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Definitely, yes. If it's just the executive committee, then yes. It would just be our ALT and liaisons.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I would think that a boxed lunch could be had, I hope.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Probably be easier, yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, much easier. I think we can do that. Then you'll see on the agenda that we have all the work spaces that Matt has prepared, all the questions to the various meetings. They remain unfilled at this point, and time is now getting to be important in this. It's not urgent yet, but if we can start filling these with various questions and we'll go ahead and send these out to the various mailing lists with a deadline, maybe, of mid to late October so we can then start filling our work spaces and forward them to the relevant staff members.

I think that's it for that item, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Heidi. Any questions or comments on the agendas? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Tijani speaking. Heidi, you said the deadline is 15th of October?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Tijani, there really isn't a deadline, but just know that I'm aware of when these various groups will start needing them. I would say mid to late October will be fine. But we'll send them out this week to the various mailing lists and maybe put a date of around mid October just to allow for a little bit of leeway there.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tijani. Questions? Comments? I'm a little concerned at the moment, having looked at the different subjects to be treated with our meetings with the board and meetings with various people and constituencies that we're meeting with. There hasn't been very much movement on this, very much input on this.

Please start raking your mind as to what we wish to discuss with the board, what we wish to discuss with the GAC. These are really the two most important of our meetings, and I got a note that there is a lot of word going on at the moment with regards to the GAC possibly appointing reverse liaisons with different parts of the community that will update from the ATRT-2. But until then, we have to work with the GAC as we always have, which is the chairs have to liaise with each other and find discussion points.

I would very much appreciate that you forward me the discussion points we would like to touch on. It was quite clear what we needed to touch on with the GAC and the board in Durban, and I think it's thanks to those interactions that it was a real success. Obviously, we need to choose our subjects very carefully again this time and prepare for these in advance of the actual meetings as well so as to know that we have already some terrain for comprehension.

Let's move on to the next item for discussion, and that's going to be number 8 – Topics for the 22nd of October ALAC meeting. I therefore open the floor if you have any specific topics that you would like

included. One, of course, was going to be a discussion on policy versus implementation, I believe. Am I getting this right or correct?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: We pretty well covered that off.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have covered it, sorry. Thanks for paying attention, Evan. Alright, any specifics? I don't see anyone putting their hand up at the moment, so we'll just have a general standard agenda for the time being, and I'm sure, closer to the time, we will have some subjects that will come up at some point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Heidi. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just one quick point I wish to highlight. Cheryl, maybe I can work with you and Olivier on that. We need to get the schedule set for the ExCom and liaisons schedule – selection/election schedule. I'll try to work on that next week and have that ready, the draft schedules available by that meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's fine, correct. And then of course, the other thing that needs to be in the agenda is a follow up on the call for candidates for BCE and the other one, [ECBN]. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier. Under the “any other business,” and in thinking about possible engagements with the board, there is a slightly over-arching point that I would like to raise that I think would be something worth raising. I just wanted to bounce it off of the executive committee before making it more formal.

That is, what I have seen in regulations coming from compliance, as well as the documentation on the PICDRP indicates what I consider to be a very, very troubling approach of ICANN, philosophically, towards whistle blowers, public advocates, and the like – that there is a concept of repeat offenders; there's a concept of denigrating the complaints of organizations that have complained about others.

It just seems to be a very public interest-hostile attitude in general. It's not just a specific issue now. It seems to be a cultural matter that I really think we need to bring to the board's attention. This has a very, very public interest effect because if you have a corporate interest, if you have a monied interest, they have the means to be able to bring people to ICANN or to put them into the complaints process. And in the case of the public interest, you have possibly advocacy bodies, you have third party advocacy agencies and whistle blower organizations that are involved in watching out for things in the public interest and launching

things in the public interest such as law firms that do class action suits and that kind of thing.

The people that are directly affected can't always be at the table, so there are often organizations that try to speak on their behalf. There seems to be a very conscious bias against that within just about everything that I've seen come out of ICANN to do with compliance, to do with just the ability to take complaints. It seems to be very heavily biased in favor of those who bring money to the table and against those that have to depend on third parties to do that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Evan. I'm not quite sure how to tackle this one. I mean...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I mean as a topic for the board, for our engagement with the board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. As a topic, fine. It's just that one of the concerns is that the very board members that are guilty of what you've just said will say, "Oh, why is the ALAC whining? We are listening and we are not being biased." It's just a matter of appreciation, I guess, of one bias that's sometimes very difficult to find.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, it's in paper now. When you look at the regulations on the PICDRP and you look at some of the [No] Procedures in place from compliance, it's actually on the record of some of this hostility to whistle blowers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Certainly, what you mention there and actually touching on the PICDRP – and I didn't actually manage to explain this earlier. When I read the new PICDRP, I thought there were 101 ways to block anyone from making a complaint and from the complaint going through. There were only less than a handful of ways for the complaint to go through and for the response of the registrar or the registry to yield some kind of response against them and some kind of rejection against them.

I've noticed there's enforcement into stopping someone from being able to file further complaints on one side, but there's absolutely nothing touching on the serial...I guess the serial offender on the other side. So, certainly, there's something very imbalanced.

That said, this is something which – we can ask the board, but I'm not quite sure it would yield any positive dialogue out of it. What you have to do is to perhaps take some examples maybe and at that point just say “Can you explain that?”

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I guess I'm simply thinking on an issue – and this is high level and thus requiring board attention – is the issue of how it treats “customer service” and who it sees as its customers. Why do we keep saying that

the customer of ICANN is the end user? Certainly the actions that we've seen come out of these recent things indicate otherwise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well maybe we need to call the shots on that. I do agree with you. Okay. Let's keep this one in mind, and if you can just drop a couple of notes on the ALAC Board wiki so that we remember it and it doesn't fall through the cracks.

Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, it is not on this subject. It is “any other business” but another subject.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, go ahead. We've finished on that one.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I would like to address the participation of ICANN and the IGF Bali. I have been contacted by the IGF telling me that our workshop, the AFRALO workshop, is chosen as one of the Capacity Building workshops, and there will be an orientation session every day from day one to day four from 8:00 to 9:00, and especially in day two, I will speak in this orientation session. There is also a roundtable that will be organized on the fourth day about the Capacity Building and I will be there, too.

There is another very important thing that they told me. They wanted to promote the booths that are dealing with Capacity Building, and they asked me if we have a booth. I gave them the booth of ICANN, but I want to express my sadness and my disappointment that we wouldn't be able to coordinate our common participation in the IGF because I noticed that, for example, in Baku, the European Union got three or four booths under different names – [inaudible] Loan, the Commission and Loan, the Union and Loan, etc.

So they had more than one booth. ICANN could do the same. Because we are more than one contingency, we can ask for a booth for AFRALO, a booth for APRALO, etc. Why do I say that? Since our booth will be considered as a Capacity Building 1, I would like to have a space to show all ICANN is doing for Capacity Building, and now we have a lot of things to show – a lot.

We have the online platform – very, very, very important thing and a very good tool. We have the ICANN Labs, something I find ingenious, and I think that is something to show and it will give ICANN more visibility and more credibility. We have more than that. We have the ICANN Academy that was started in Buenos Aires, and we now have programs for that and we can show that.

So if we had more than one booth, we would be able to show that very easily. With only one booth, as we saw in Baku, it will be very crowded, it will be for everything, and I don't think we will have an opportunity to show everything we want to show in this very small space. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Tijani. That's really something for Heidi to check. I don't know what the size of the ICANN booth is going to be. I suggest that there is a cost associated with the number of booths and the size of the booth, and that we really need to depend on the overall–

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's very cheap.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very cheap. Yeah, well, I haven't looked into the exact cost. It could be very cheap. I don't know whether there is time to change the size of the booth or perhaps to divide the booths so that there is a Capacity Building corner specific on this. Can I just ask you to liaise with Heidi on this – and she liaises with meeting staff or whoever is in charge of that process, whether there is the ability to either split the booth into two or to have auxiliary booths added? That will probably help.

The concern, of course, with having many booths is that you might end up with some booths being absolutely being unmanned and empty, and that's never looking too good.

I see several hands up at the moment. Heidi and Evan. So first we'll start with Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. I'm just going to comment now on the IGF issue. I understand that things may be coming a little bit slowly, but I can assure you that there are so many messages internally now in preparation for

Bali. We're reaching out to community members. At-Large has set up its working page, it's wiki page, to collect the names and times when people will be there. That's in order to help ICANN staff coordinating the IGF to know who's going to be there when so they can incorporate you into their events

They've also reached out to me to ask for volunteers for the ICANN Information booth. Tijani, excellent idea to add an element of Capacity Building to that booth, and I'll take that right away to the main staff organizers about that. I think that likely can be done. If you would like particular documents or your banners, if your RALO has that, sent to Bali, please let me know ASAP. I can coordinate that with our communications team. I think that's really all I have to say on IGF right now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Heidi. You've actually mentioned that things are actually moving quite along. There's a lot of e-mail at the moment with regards to IGF. I can announce that I was contacted by Sally Costerton and asked to go as well to Bali.

Now, since Bali was only two weeks away and I had made some alternative arrangements with regards to work that was going on in the UK, I drafted the message yesterday that unfortunately it looked quite unlikely that I would be able to make it. But earlier today, I had a long conference call with the people I was supposed to see in the UK, and I can say that I will be able to go to Bali now. I haven't drafted the note yet, so the next thing I need to do is to quickly draft a note to Sally to

say that, thanks to a two-hour conference call before this one, I'll be able to make it.

Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's perfect, thank you. I'm going to add you right now to the volunteer table for long stretches.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, super stuff.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, and part of this is ATLAS II promotions, so we're going to see what we can do in order to start promoting that. We're not going to have any promotional material with exact details, but we hopefully can have a postcard or something mentioning the summits and making sure everyone's aware of that. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Heidi, this is also something that we should discuss really earlier than now – the promotional material. Every detail of our common participation should be discussed very, very early because everything is done early.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so, Tijani – this is Heidi again – I'm aware of that. Olivier and I did discuss that, but Olivier's point – which I think is a valid point – is that we need to wait for the results of the survey in order to be able to identify what kind of promotional materials, what kind of information on those promotional materials, would make the most sense. So I think that maybe by Buenos Aires or a little bit after, then the promotional subcommittee can start developing those types of items. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Heidi. Any other comments or questions? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I read it now. Thank you. Heidi, I am sorry to disagree with you, because the promotional material for the summit shouldn't compulsory include the detail of the program or the subject that we will discuss. We could prepare something without that to promote the summit. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. I'm in agreement with you. I think we can prepare just a general postcard that just mentions the date and what it is in time for the IGF. I'll see if I can get that working with Lynn on that today or this week.

Olivier, if I could just mention another big detail, a big news event, I think. [inaudible] this idea.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Very quickly, last week during the policy workshop we were able to hear from lots of various departments within ICANN. One was the Board Support Group which is expanding with some fantastic new staff. They made the announcement that they are now developing a tracking system for statements to the board from ALAC and the SSAC – just those two groups.

A beta will be in place by Buenos Aires. I will be working with Karine. She's the new director of Board Support. I'll be meeting with her on Thursday to discuss the initial look of the tracking system. I've already asked her, if they are available, that they be invited to the ALT meeting on Friday in Buenos Aires along with Steve Crocker just to go over this and show that to you. But, again, she has yet to confirm her availability on that date. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Heidi. Question? Comments? Any other “other business”?

I don't see anyone's hand up. I thank all of you for taking part in this call. It's been very productive. Just a little bit long, but very productive indeed.

We'll have the next call after the IGF. The ALAC call will be after the IGF. I believe that the ALAC Ex-Com will take place after the ALAC call, so yet even closer to the Buenos Aires meeting.

In the meantime, let's follow up on e-mail, then follow up with the action items that we have, and certainly follow up with the call for candidates for the BCEC and for the other groups which shall remain nameless as it always is and so I keep on forgetting it.

Thanks to all of you for being on the call. This call is now adjourned.
Bye-bye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]