JULIA CHARVOLEN: The recording is on, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julia. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. We are Friday, the 6th of December and it's 14:04 UTC. The 6th of December 2013. This the ALAC Leadership Team call, if we could have the roll call please, Juila.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Thank you, Olivier. Welcome, everyone. On today's call, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Holly Raiche, and Julie Hammer. We have a tentative apology from Evan Leibovitch, and we have apologies from Nathalie Peregrine and Matt Ashtiani. And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Julia Charvolen. I see that Sebastien Bachollet has just joined.

May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julia. We have an agenda that's going to look at mainly the action items of the Buenos Aires meeting to see if there is anything we need to add or follow up on or amend, and then we'll look quickly at the statements, the current statements, that we're working

on. Finally we'll have a discussion on the dot-mobi liaison, which some of you have been following as well.

Is there any other business that anyone would like to add to this call? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so let's go directly with the Buenos Aires ALAC and At-Large action items. As you can see on the Wiki page there are quite a few that are now proceeding forward. On the ALAC and Regional Leadership working session, Heidi has ensured that Chris Mondini liaises with Garth Bruen on how to ensure that ICANN is working, to ensure that the blind, deaf, and disabled are able to take part in ICANN activity. This is in progress. I've spoken to Garth about this. Things are moving on it.

Julia is to schedule a Capacity Building Working Group call for the week of the [inaudible] December. I believe that has been done, indeed. And Heidi was to work with the ALAC on travel related concerns. Heidi, I gather that's in hand at the moment in progress?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. We're still working on some post-BA issues, but yes, we are working on some of those issues, particularly for the summit. The Singapore travel base has been sent already in BA, so that should be coming along. But then we're also working on some issues related to the summit. We'll let you know as we know more.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Heidi. Any questions? Actually, you know what? Let's move the questions and comments totally at the end, and I'll just call

upon the people whose action item there is, if there's anything in addition to be asked. Then we can discuss all of the action items at the end of this call.

On the joint [BC] and BMSPC meeting, I guess that's not for us to look at. The Future Challenges Working Group, again not for us to look at. The NARALO meeting, not for us to look at.

The ALAC policy discussion, part one. Matt is to send Cheryl Langon-Orr a copy of the transcript of the ALAC policy discussion part one from the Buenos Aires meeting, especially noting Evan's presentation. I've inquired with staff on our transcripts for the ALAC session, because I've looked at the website, and at the moment, we don't seem to have many transcripts from Buenos Aires at all. Any update on this, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. No. Again, as was mentioned during our call earlier this week with Olivier, the reason that some meetings get transcripts earlier is because they use a different system. They use [inaudible] while we use Adigo. I'll follow up again with them. But again, normally because of the vast number of meetings using Adigo, the transcripts take a little longer to get posted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. Yes. That's something which I learned. I was not aware that the transcript during the face-to-face meetings were actually undertaken by the company dealing with the transcripts on the call. I guess that makes it [inaudible]. I wasn't aware of that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a very small correction. It's Language Services that does the transcripts. So Adigo sends the recording to Language Services, and they – so it's basically in-house does the transcripts. It's just the volume that causes the delay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Then that totally confuses me at that point, because I thought the transcript was being done by Adigo.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. The recording is sent from Adigo. The recording goes from Adigo to Language Services, and then Language Services does the transcripts.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. So you just said the opposite of what you said earlier, I'm afraid, because earlier you said that because it's a different system.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, sorry. There are two different systems. For example, the GNSO meeting uses [inaudible]. So they use a completely different. They do their own and they do have I think even 24-hour turnover. ALAC and most of the other meetings within ICANN uses Adigo, and Adigo sends the recording of the meeting to Language Services in-house and they do the transcripts. It's basically only the GNSO that is the exception to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. The transcript is done externally, and we're having those done internally. Okay, understood. Now it's clear. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Let's move on then. LACRALO monthly meeting, nothing for us to work on. The ALAC ccNSO meeting, Maureen is to ensure that the ALAC and ccNSO are to consider the following areas for future collaboration. Joint statements, shared calendar space, joint meetings at ICANN meetings, coordination of activities and the Internet ecosystem. Why am I getting another call? Maureen? Is Maureen on the call? Yes? Maureen, could you let us know please. Sorry, I meant to call upon you, but I had another call on the other line as well at the same time. Very bizarre. Go ahead, Maureen, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I haven't had a meeting since Buenos Aires with ccNSO, so I haven't had an opportunity to progress any of those issues, but I will do so next meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Maureen. I note there's a second action item there, which is to ensure that the coordination group should start as soon as possible so as to have a good set of subjects. So I guess this is

firmly in your hands and you've got the full green light to push forward on this.

Tijani, I noticed you put your hand up. I'll wait until the end of the whole list, and then we can discuss.

So the APRALO monthly meeting is nothing for us to work on directly. The joint ATLAS-2 Capacity Building Working Group and regional secretariat's meeting, that's also in progress and there's nothing for us to look at directly either. Or actually is there? Maybe there is, because we do need to… Yeah, this is really an ALAC core matter. Let's have a quick look at those. Matt is to – mostly, Matt and staff work to work on. Let's just pass this, and if anybody wants to discuss those, then we can come back to those afterwards. I'm mindful of the time.

The ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap-Up Session. As you can see, we've got the statement votes. I can just let you know that all of the statements have been submitted. Some of them were submitted directly to the public comment period, some of them were submitted to the internal process that the GNSO had asked about.

Then the ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap-Up Session Working Group Consensus call, these were also I think all affected. Establishment of the At-Large Registration Issue Working Group, I believe that's – is it registration issue, by the way, or registration issues? I wasn't quite sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think it's issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe Holly can help us on this. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. I think it's registration issues, but because we were trying to combine the WHOIS, the [RAA], the new stuff on EWG, the privacy proxy and the sorts of things that all have come under the same heading and they're all related. So probably "s" at the end makes sense.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Can you confirm or do you wish to first concert with Carlton and then come back to us?

HOLLY RAICHE: I've made an executive decision.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Heidi, please amend this correctly. And also, Amanda, I understand the Wiki page has been created, etc. So this all needs to be amended accordingly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Actually, it has not yet been created, so perfect timing. But I will double check on that, because Matt may have started on the mailing list. I'll check that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have received some confirmation of something. You know that I keep a tab over at whatever Matt does. So whenever he logs in, it tells me wherever I am in the world. I think he touched on this already.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, I normally [inaudible]. Let's take a look.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'll let you deal with it after this call. I don't think we need to keep people awake over this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's move on. The closing and archiving of the At-Large WHOIS Working Group and the closing and archiving of the At-Large Registration Rights and Responsibilities Working Group is all going and proceeding forward.

Then we have the ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap-Up Session with the different chairs announcement, and I believe we had all of the different liaisons apart from the dot-mobi, and we are going to be discussing this shortly afterwards on this call.

Then, finally, we have the At-Large and NCSG meeting. So Heidi was to oversee the creation of a steering group composed of three people each from NCSG and ALAC. Olivier and Rafik Dammak as chairs, we're supposed to start this up and write a correspondence to Fadi Chehade.

As you know and as I've mentioned on the list, Evan basically provided a description of the fact that this joint working group had been created between ALAC and the NCSG, and as a result, David Olive met with us on Friday morning and also took it to then announce this to the supporting organization and advisory committee mailing list, which is a sort of cross-ICANN thing. Immediately others volunteered to join the group.

I know that now I can confirm that the mailing list is ready, the Wiki page is ready, there are two mailing lists are ready – one for the members of the Working Group, one for a future steering committee of this Working Group. I know that some people have already started work on a charter on one side. I guess this probably needs a little bit more of a push still, steering into what we're going to do, and I'm hoping that some of you who are on the mailing list are able to basically make suggestions as to "this needs to be goal-oriented."

I'm a little concerned about the discussions that are taking place regarding the One Net initiative that is taking place on another mailing list, the One Net Initiative being all of the iStar organizations. It's now been several weeks that all they've been speaking about is who is going to be sitting at the table, but absolutely no discussion whatsoever about what they're going to say at the table, which unfortunately is a bit disappointing.

So I'd like us to work on what we're going to say at the table irrespective of who's going to be there. I did announce and say, ultimately, if it makes sense to have a subject expert or a civil society expert – whatever expert it is at the table – I'm not [fighting] to be there

myself. It doesn't need to be the chairs of X, Y, Z. It has to be the right people being there.

That's the whole thing on the action items. Tijani, I note that you had your hand up a little bit earlier. So I'll first ask for Tijani to speak, and then I see that Evan Leibovitch has joined us as well, so then it will be Evan after Tijani. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I wanted to speak about the ALAC and ccNSO meeting. It was really disappointing that we had the meeting without meeting, more or less, because it was for a very short time with lunch. I do hope that in the future we have [inaudible] meeting with the ccNSO because we have a lot in common and we can do a lot of work together. Please try to program a slot of time where we can speak, where we can discuss, with a good agenda. I am ready to participate in the establishment of the agenda. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. I was actually going to add also with regards to the ccNSO something which I mentioned yesterday. The ccNSO organizers, what they call a tech day at every ICANN meeting. It's a day where they discuss technical issues. It started out a few years ago as a purely ccNSO thing, and then started expanding having more and more people being involved.

One of the main organizers of the tech day is a gentleman called Eberhard Lisse from dot-na [inaudible], and he has joined our technical

issues mailing list and for the past several meetings has asked me whether our community would like to take more part in tech day than there are at the moment.

Now, I realize it is on a Monday. It does clash with a lot of the things that we also do and everybody else's activities, but one suggestion that was made in Buenos Aires was perhaps if we had any technical issues, we would like the tech day to have a presentation about and they could find subject experts to do that presentation for anything that would be relevant for us.

Also, if we do have any technical experts in our ranks that would like to speak about a technical issue the tech day, we're very welcome to ask for session and they would be very happy to have us as the members of the At-Large community conduct a session during the tech day. That could be one of the things I think that we need to discuss certainly with the ccNSO during our next meeting and I hoped that Maureen Hilyard has taken notes on this, or at least if you have any questions on this, Maureen, I could follow up with you afterwards.

But I agree with you, Tijani. I was equally disappointed with regards to the way the meeting was conducted. There's just not enough time and a bit of a mess regarding the schedules on the part of the ccNSO. Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there, and good morning everybody. Good afternoon, whatever. Sorry that I joined a little late. A couple of things. Number one, I agree with Tijani that the meeting with the ccNSO was, shall we say,

unsatisfying. I was very, very distressed given the way everything went that there was not a meeting with the GAC in this session, and I really, really want to stress, impress, going forward that we try and have this at every future meeting.

The GAC and ALAC have probably more income than any two other constituencies within ICANN, and not having a session actually had tangible problems associated with it this time. So, Heidi and staff, please, you made a point that we're only three months from Singapore. I really want to make this almost an obligatory at every session between us and the GAC, especially going forward. We really, really ought to have our act together as two advisory council committees going into ICANN.

Anyway, I don't know if you wanted me to offer any comments about the Cross Community Working Group that was made. Olivier, you've shared some of my frustrations with the way this thing has been building. It started off a bit as Noah's Ark where we had three from NCSG and three from ALAC that were starting to build it, and then two people were put forward from the GAC, two people came forward from ASO, two people came forward from SSAC and so on. ccNSO had been assigning people. Then Mikey came along from the ISP group, and in fact, you know he's been working really hard at the charter.

And so we have all this with everybody bringing in a couple of people, and lo and behold, the Business Constituency is insisting on having eleven people there, as much everyone put together. This is a real, real problem. In the very group that is supposed to demonstrate the strength of the multi-stakeholder model, it is about to demonstrate its

susceptibility to capture. I don't know what to do about it. I don't know if it's a flaw in the system that we are a victim of our own openness, but I've got real concerns about this going forward if something doesn't change soon. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. I hear what you've said, and you will have noticed on the SO and AC discussion that I have asked the BC to kindly consider reducing the number of people it has on there. In fact, others such as Bill Drake have been more insistent. The response has been quite flat, actually, in that if they needed to reduce to any less people than what they had, they would need to conduct elections, etc.

I agree with you. It's a bit of a concern that some communities seem to not be able to integrate themselves very well with the concept of consensus, I guess, which is often brought in by having to compromise on something. But I don't think it's something that any of the chairs can try and face on this – sorry, the coordinators want to face on this. We don't want to be accused of closing this group off and not being open.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, as a matter of follow up, could I perhaps suggest that you take offline with the leadership of the Business Community, the absolute horrible optics of this? I know that they've stated online that they had eleven people coming forward and they don't want to go through the process of having whole elections and all that, but if possible, maybe this is a matter of doing this in private conversation. Obviously, the

public messages have not been heated either in their subtlety or not being quite clear in what they were trying to say.

This is a real, real serious problem that does have the potential as a matter of optics to sabotage this effort before it even starts. So I really would ask you and [inaudible] to try and perhaps talk to the leadership of the BC. They're conscious of image, they're conscious of optics. Please give them an idea of what's going on, and ask them maybe a little bit more personally in a way so that they don't lose public face to exercise a little restraint. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. I take note of your suggestion and I will proceed forward and send a private e-mail to the BC leadership and I'll carbon copy my co-coordinator, Rafik Dammak, on this so that he's well aware of the discussion as well. But I guess you're absolutely right on this. The optics are not that great. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I'd like to support the proposal of Evan regarding the meeting with the GAC. I don't want it to be like the previous meetings. It wasn't productive. It wasn't [inaudible] productive. I do prefer that we define the subjects [inaudible] and we prepare our contribution and we are clear about the output of the meeting, what we need from this meeting. Is it only presentation of what we have, etc.? No, we don't need it. Is it their presentation of their things? We don't need it. It is something that we have to do together, and we have to

define it succinctly ahead of the meeting and we have to define the output. What do we need from the meeting? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. I'm a bit confused with regards to the output from the meeting with the GAC, because the last one which we had where the GAC was in Durban – and I thought that went very well. in fact, the GAC released some input from our meeting that went straight into the GAC advice with regards to dotless domains, in regards to clashing certificates, etc. Did you mean specifically about this or…?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, excuse me. I am sorry I missed the meeting of Durban because I had a conflicting session. But I remember the previous meeting where we go in a big room, we speak about our groups, etc., [inaudible], etc., and they have some things to say to us and that's all.

We had a very good work with them about the JAS Working Group, and it was very productive. Now we need to do the same for everything we need to do with them. Our meeting with them shouldn't be only to greet each other or to present things to each other. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I think that starting from Durban, the work with the GAC has started to be sometimes also inter-sessionally between us and the GAC. In other words, I have often sent Heather updates of what we are doing and Heather has sent us updates, which I then forward over

to the mailing list and some of the vice chairs have also been in touch as well.

With regards to the preparation of the meeting, I totally agree with you. That's, in effect, what was done for Durban and I hope that this will be what will be done for Singapore.

Certainly focusing on two issues which are strong for us, which we can then have some kind of goal to achieve with the GAC is the way forward. Not just share of what we've been up to and what the GAC has been up to, but actually push some specific issue forward for the GAC to address with us. Evan Leibovitch, you're next.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah. Olivier, I just wanted to back up what you said. We seem to be now in a bit of a groove, shall we say, when it comes to doing our meetings with the board and with the GAC. We've come up with very specific issues. And just like the board has noticed that when we come in, we don't dance around things – we get direct to the point – Steve has actually made the point that he appreciates our directness and our impatience with the usual pleasantries that we get right to it.

I think the same thing is starting to happen with the GAC. As you say, in the meeting in Durban, there were some things that were concrete and that the idea of they supported what we were doing. It was reflected in what the GAC was doing.

So Tijani, I would just suggest to have a little bit more confidence in the way things are going. I was very happy with the way things have gone

with our last two meetings with the GAC. I was very disappointed, as I just said, that we did not have one in Buenos Aires because the previous two were so successful.

So as long as we have our act together, that we have questions on specific issues as you say that we go in and it's not just talking about generalities, we go in with a specific agenda, the GAC comes back with things they specifically want to ask with us, I think this relationship is only improving and that's why I don't want to spoil the momentum by having ICANN meetings that don't have this session either formally or informally. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Evan. That's helpful. As a result, I think that we'll just be starting work on the next discussion [for] Singapore very soon. I note that there's been a lot of discussion between the chairs of SOs and ACs, Heather Dryden included, with regards to the current issues on One Net, on the Brazil meeting, etc. There is going to be this month a call of the SO and AC chairs, which is one of these calls that takes place without staff, without anyone.

There is also likely to be some members of the government meeting that I will be attending next week to work on the preparation for the ICANN 50th meeting in London in June 2014. So I will also circulate – well, basically try and [inaudible] and find out what is on the GAC's mind at the moment, and I would really appreciate from you all to e-mail me what is on our mind at the moment, what is on the ALAC's mind at the

moment. I can relay this in an informal way so as to start preparing the terrain. Evan, your hand is still up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, apologies. It's there inadvertently.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Evan. Let's move on. Any other questions or comments on the action items? Seeing no one put their hand up, I think that we can move to the next part of our call. Great news. We're not doing too badly today.

It's the policy development activities. As you know, we've had several recently adopted ALAC statements and documents and so on that have been sent over and correspondence. There is going to be hopefully some more feedback on all of the statements that we sent out to a new system that Steve Crocker is implementing with help from staff and members of the board and having all of our advice put into a table. Then the advice to be discussed afterwards, with responses basically being put on the table. So some kind of tracking system. It will be good to see if this is going to come to quickly, and hopefully by Singapore, it will all be fully in place and we will be able to see if it actually works.

On the statements and endorsement currently being developed, we've got two where the comment is open for At-Large to comment on. There is the ccNSO framework of Interpretation Working Group, interim report on revocation. I note that there's been a lot of discussion going on in some of the regions about this, and you will see also in the Wiki

that there is a lot of going back and forth. I'm quite pleased to see the healthy discussion that is taking place there. Does anyone wish to comment at the moment on how this is progressing and whether we will have consensus on this? I see no one is ready to put their hand up on this subject. Sorry? Yes, Maureen. Please, go ahead. I didn't see your hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry I was a little bit slow on doing that. I just wanted to say I, too, have been very interested in the conversation that's been going on about the [revocation] issue. I think officially as [Keith], who's the head of the SOI group, he's already stated that he doesn't think that [inaudible] governments – if there's any differentiation of government as being a different stakeholder.

And I think that the discussion actually really does indicate that perhaps there needs to be some statement that actually does clearly outline the issue about local laws and how they need to be included into the framework, how local laws should apply to the [revocation] process. But someone [inaudible] would have to make that statement. I don't have that expertise. I think, as you say, it's a really healthy debate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen, on this. That's the first one. I ask you if you could have a [inaudible], and I know many of you have, since many of you have commented on this. And Rinalia is holding the pen on this. She's going to be having to finalize this sometime early next week.

The other one that's actually finishing today with regards to comments from At-Large is the proposed bylaw changes regarding the Technical Liaison Group, and the suggestion is to basically remove the technical liaison from the board as such and make some changes on this. There's been, again, a very healthy discussion with, in fact, LACRALO having an internal discussion – a very healthy internal discussion – on this as well and coming up with a statement. So they found consensus at a regional level and I'm hoping that this can be somehow intertwined with the overall ALAC statement there. But that of course will rest in Rinalia's hands as well and I'll try and see if I can help her over the weekend as well. Any thoughts or comments on this from anyone who is here on the call? I see no one put their hand up. Sorry, Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Olivier. It's an interesting topic because we had some long discussion within the board, within the structural implement committee about this. I follow the discussion at the ALAC, At-Large level. It seems that there are some maybe discomfort with what it's done, but at the same time, I am thinking that as a proposal, it's really to go in the direction that people are pushing for.

One of the reasons I am saying that is we, as At-Large or ALAC, we don't have any more [inaudible] onto the board. One of the results here was the difficulty to communicate between ALAC and the board, even if I [inaudible] with that. And the fact that the board now is setting up [inaudible] and the advice of ALAC, it's to ensure that for other purposes, the same type of action will happen. It will [inaudible], but that maybe of our chair, then it's an important topic.

But I think the TLDs would be the same. The TLD will finish [inaudible] sit on the board as a liaison, but the TLD will still exist as a liaison of the [inaudible] and with the help of the rest of the ICANN SO and ACs.

The fact that the first meeting of the launch meeting was in Buenos Aires on Sunday was open to ALAC and to other SO and ACs, it's to ensure that this TLD will meet sometime, I guess once a year. We will, as a board, follow all the requests from the board to a list that will be public, then everybody will be able to follow that and to add requests or add information and participate in some discussion.

I just wanted to tell you don't spend too much time [inaudible] onto the board, because it's not the only way the board needs to interact with the technical community. We already have the liaison from the SSAC, from the RSAC, and from IETF and that's [inaudible] plenty enough. All your comments are interesting and useful to [tune] the best solution and I think we are going in the right direction. Thank you very much, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. In fact, as you were mentioning this proposal, you did mention though there will still be a liaison to the board from the Technical Liaison Group. Is that correct?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: There would be liaison from the SSAC, from the RSAC and from IETF.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But there will not be a liaison from the Technical Liaison Group.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No. But [inaudible] bylaws, there were two items. One was the liaison. The other was to have a group of two people from each organization. [inaudible] IETF, it's almost the same. [ITUT], [inaudible]. It was not really organized, and now it will be organized as the Technical Liaison Group, and the first meeting was in Buenos Aires. It's to say that they need to have a liaison to the board is not for this type of interaction. It's not really a must. The question is are we organized the way we have advice from the TLD to the board and to the community more generally speaking?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was the gist of my question. How will the Technical Liaison Group advice reach the board if there is no liaison of the Technical Liaison Group on the board? I think you basically said this is one thing that we need to work on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETT: No. My answer is, of course, yes it needs to be worked on and how it will be done realistically in the future. But the fact that we will have a roster of all the questions and the answers from both sides will be something that both the board and the community will be able to follow as it will be done or it's done for the SSAC and will be done for the ALAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. I see Dev Aanand Teelucksingh has patiently been waiting with his hand up. So Dev, you have the floor.

DEV AANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier. Sebastien, one of the things that is puzzling to me was that the final report from the [inaudible] made a recommendation that the Nominating Committee – this is regarding the delegate from the TLD to the Nominating Committee – and it said that ICANN should maintain this connection and should continue the TLD's role in filling [inaudible]. But the bylaws recommendations basically removes this.

So was there some sort of feedback or discussion that, well, basically led to this recommendation being dropped or being ignored? That's what's puzzling to me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Dev. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETT: Thank you, Dev. I follow your point. And yes, between the time we received – or the board received – the report and what it's done now, I am not sure that they're so much linked. The question was, how are you – you set up the interaction. At the time, if we [inaudible] onto the board, there is no specific need to have [inaudible] in the NomCom.

But you are right. The NomCom could have been taken as another topic, but it was done at the same time. I must tell you I don't know if – I guess it's public now. I don't know [inaudible], but I have [inaudible] to this

motion when it came to the board because I was feeling that the way it was under – and your question raised not the point I was raising, but one of the issues of the process was not the best one.

Now it's a decision of the board and I try to work within that decision of the board. It was not the best process I would imagine. And today, for example, we don't [inaudible] the bylaw change, and at the same time, you may have seen we even follow the [inaudible] bylaws. We don't have anymore [inaudible] board. If we want to [inaudible] process, we can spend a long time and we disagree for a long time.

I hope that we will pass that and have a bylaw change and then we will be safe again. But I get your point, Dev. On the process, as a result I don't think that there is [inaudible]. Already enough people with technical background within the board and within the NomCom to be safe on that issue. And if we think that it's not the case, maybe At-Large as we have five representatives within the NomCom, we may send them some message saying that they may [inaudible] future board member with such knowledge and not just with what [inaudible] by the BGC, the Board Governance Committee to the NomCom. Sorry for the long answer to a short question. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. Certainly on the issue of the TLD person to be sitting on the NomCom, I am also quite concerned about this because it shows the misunderstanding of what the NomCom actually does. The NomCom does two things. Of course it selects people, but it also does outreach and I would've thought that reaching out using that technical

liaison person who is on the NomCom who is from a totally different organization than the main organization – than ICANN – is opening the door to then being able to do outreach within their own communities and I would've thought this was going to be quite welcome rather than closing up the NomCom to more insiders. So it's a concern.

I think that seeing the comments which have been made on the Wiki, I think there's so much material there at the moment, I hope that Rinalia will be able to put together a consensus statement on this. I would perhaps ask any of you who have taken part in the discussion to help her out over the weekend. She has the weekend to work on that. Dev, I know that you've put a lot of points there, including pushing many of the points that were given in the LACRALO statement. So it's important that we find something of a consensus.

I would tend to agree with – personally, my personal feeling – agree with Sebastien with regards to having a technical liaison person on the board. If you look at the history of it, I'm not sure that technical liaison as it stands at the moment has done much work – has had much utility to fulfill their mandate or fulfill what they have to fulfill. So we'll just have to comment on this [inaudible] on that.

Anyway, this is ongoing. There's the weekend to look at that. I note that time is ticking, so let's get moving with the next three statements currently considered for being developed and so on.

The first one is the protection of IGO and INGO identifiers, inter-governmental organization and international non-governmental organization identifiers and all PDP recommendations for forward

consideration. Sorry, in all gTLD PDP recommendations for board consideration.

Alan and Evan. I see Evan has been fast on the trigger and put his hand up. Oh, he's put his hand down again. No, he's back up. Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. Actually, Olivier, the reason that it was up so quickly is that I had been previously wanting to speak on the last issue, but you want to move on. I put on my point about the technical liaison committee. I think that that's actually going about it the completely wrong way. My comments are on the record on the mailing list, so I won't dwell on them here and we'll move on to the other thing.

Regarding the IGO/INGO, essentially what's happened in Alan put together a really, really good comment based on the original final report of that working group. It provides very, very contradictory things. The entire set of recommendations – the ones that had consensus – amongst themselves are actually contradictory.

Sebastien, you're on the call. The board is really going to have a quandary about this. If the board actually approves all the recommendations, it will actually find that some of the recommendations are contradictory against each other. This is a real, real ugly soup of recommendations that is just an amalgam of things, and the result of very, very intense pressure tactics. I don't think I envy the role of the board in doing this, but just keep in mind. Have a good read of those recommendations because you'll see that they are

contradictory and simply approving the bunch of them as a whole is an invitation for at least pain, and at worst disaster. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. You mentioned comments that Alan has made, but I don't see anything on the Wiki itself.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: What had happened was there was a response that was made immediately after. So there was a single document that constituted both a minority position on the original draft document, and it also essentially formed our own position on the entire issue as a whole. There hasn't been anything new created since then because there really hasn't been anything new to [inaudible]. But the original document, the one that Alan wrote and I contributed to, that was essentially the minority position that was attached alongside that also was passed by the ALAC, and essentially as far as I'm concerned, constitutes our advice on that and there really hasn't been anything new to come up to modify that or change either the tone or the content. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. So in this respect, for this specific comment period which closes on the 18th of December, at the moment, there's nothing. So are we not submitting a statement?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's my take – and I know Alan isn't here. I have a difficulty speaking for him. But I think as far as we're concerned, everything that has to be said that we've needed to say has already been said in the statements to date. There's not much to add to it simply because there's a public comment period. We had the ability to respond to it as a minority statement, as a participant in the working group. We did a very complete job of it at that point. I don't think there's much to add, simply because there's a public comment period. What we've had to say has been said. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Maybe [point] to that minority statement.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'll try and come up with that. Heidi, if you could help out. This was an endorsed ALAC statement, so it should be easy enough to find.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Sebastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Following your discussion, maybe advice to the board from the ALAC just saying what you say, Evan, at the beginning – that it's in better English and more politely. It's a soup of contradictory proposal. You need to, as a board, to send it back to the GNSO to work on that again to [inaudible] who are acceptable and working together. It will be

enough and a way to advise the board on the work you have done. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. Evan, I think we've got something for you to do here. Are you clear with what to come up with? Just a very short statement, I would hope maybe, just to remind the board of our previous statement and of the fact that this is the end result that we have before our eyes is a contradictory set of recommendations. That probably would be just a few lines I guess, and that would certainly wake the board up to our previous statement just in case it goes unnoticed. And of course to the minority statement. You okay with this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just for everyone's awareness, the original statement – the last one that I can find from Alan – is from an e-mail that he sent to the entire ALAC list dated 13 of November. I've pasted it again in the ALT Skype chat. I will continue to dig for it further, but essentially that's what I can tell. So there's a statement that Alan and I worked on. It's an e-mail to the ALAC list dated November 14, and the subject title is "Minority Statement for the IGO/INGO Final Report." So it's there. If anyone has problems finding it, please tell me. Like I say, I pasted the draft of this in the ALT Skype chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Evan. If you could please also work something out for the Wiki, then we can launch the thing for the wider ALAC to be able to read. Just a quick reminder.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I'll go back. This is already a statement ALAC has approved, so it should be easy to find.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you. So next is the At-Large study on the WHOIS misuse. Here Holly and Carlton are to confirm the statement on this public comment is required. I note that Holly Raiche is on this call. Could I call upon you, please, Holly to let us know?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. I think that I've already done a very brief statement to say we looked at the study, the study came up with the not unsurprising conclusion that in fact sometimes WHOIS is misused. Now we've got evidence of it. Very nice, thank you very much. [inaudible] on e-mail queries [inaudible] of a WHOIS misuse study. I'm not sure if that is the same thing, so I've got to check and see if there's another WHOIS misuse study. But if that's the one I'm thinking of, I've actually done a brief statement. The only comment I got from Alan was to say isn't it a little bit long? Why could we just say I told you so? So I'll have another look and see [inaudible] three days. I'll see if it's the same thing. Otherwise I've done really brief statement already.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Holly. If you could put whatever statement you've done on the Wiki, that would be great, and then we'll be able to launch the clock on this. I do note that in typical ICANN fashion, the comment closing date – initial comment closing date – is the 27th of December 2013 which is of course the time when ICANN is closed. But those people that do these timings obviously don't know what 27th of December is. But there you go.

So we'll probably submit it I think either just before the Christmas holiday or we will submit it when ICANN reopens afterwards during the reply date. So that gives you a little time, but certainly the earlier we get something on the Wiki, the better to get our feedback.

The next one on our list is the ICANN draft vision mission and focus area for a 5-year strategic plan. I was going to call upon Tijani Ben Jemaa for this. Have you had any chance to look at this yet, Tijani? I can't hear you at the moment. Tijani? He might be muted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, do you hear me now?

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

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Olivier, can you please repeat the question? I am sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. We're looking at the ICANN's draft vision mission and focus areas for a 5-year strategic plan which has just arrived in the public comment period with a comment closing date of the 31st of January. So that's a long – it just opened the 29th of October. It's a long date for this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. No, I didn't work on it. First, because we have time; and second, because the strategic panels in ICANN are working and I am curious to see if there is something which will perhaps [inaudible] if we can see something from them. So perhaps this will give us some indicators. So I will work on it, but we have time. There is no problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Tijani. What I was going to suggest was that a copy of this comment period is sent over to the Finance & Budget sub-committee so that not only you have to read this, but also the whole Finance & Budget sub-committee has a good read at this. And I guess you can then follow up immediately after the staff e-mail and let everyone know on the FDSC. The strategic panel's work of course is moving forward as well. Does that sound like a plan?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So action item for staff, please. Staff to send the call for comments on the ICANN draft vision mission and focus areas for a 5-

year strategic plan to the Finance & Budget sub-committee. Perfect. Thank you. Let's move on.

The currently open public comments and suggestions of the ALAC meeting of the 17th of December. I'm not quite sure what that is supposed to be. I guess any questions really as to what parts you'd like to discuss on the 17th. I think it's still a little bit early and we're already working on all of the forthcoming statements. That's fine with that.

Let's go on to Number 4 in our agenda if there are no questions about our policy development activities. I see no one putting their hand up.

Number 4: dot-mobi liaison next steps. So as you know, we have not managed to select a dot-mobi liaison when we were in Buenos Aires because things were a little late, so this just came in at the very last moment. We had three people that have asked to basically go for the position of dot-mobi and all three basically have sent their – they've been nominated and they've actually sent their acceptance. The only thing that we're missing at the moment is their CV or their – well, any details from them, effective.

One of the suggestions that was made was that we could actually have this liaison position appointed, and the way that it could work would be that this leadership team could discuss the participants – the candidates – once we have all of the information from the candidates. We could discuss it, make a recommendation to the ALAC and ask the ALAC to ratify that recommendation. I don't wish to discuss the candidates themselves at this very moment because we haven't got any of their details. If you do wish to discuss any of the candidates, then I would

suggest that we go in camera since this involves people. And as I can remind you all, this call is recorded and transcribed and it's usually quite good to discuss things like that in camera.

First, I see Holly Raiche, and then Evan Leibovitch. So Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a note for everybody who hasn't been checking their e-mails. [inaudible]. I don't see any other information from any of the other [inaudible], but just note that there's apparently some information which may assist the in-camera discussion is in people's e-mail box. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. Yes, I've just noted that has appeared whilst we were speaking on the call. And I must admit, I haven't read the information yet. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, Olivier. In full disclosure, I actually encouraged [Murray] to put his name forward knowing what he's done within the mobile world, so I need to disclose that up front. Having said that, we have now gone from one executive meeting to the next executive meeting. We've given the month. I really don't know if there's really a need to put this off any further. We've had three people that have put themselves forward, and I believe that we had actually put out a call for them to submit

information about themselves. So I really don't believe that there's a need to try and put this off any longer, personally. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Evan. I do have concerns that the call for further information was only sent I think yesterday or the day before yesterday. Heidi, was it more than 24 hours ago that this was [inaudible]?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It was. It was 24 hours ago, yeah.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That last panicky call went out 24 hours ago in anticipation of this meeting, but the nominations themselves have been in place for more than a month. So if there's been interest, then it's not as if people haven't had an opportunity to put themselves forward in their best possible light.

So like I say, we've had a month of this. We've had the three names. The three names were actually in place in Buenos Aires, and so I really see no need to drag this out further.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Evan. Tijani Ben Jemma?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, Evan, you are right. We don't have to put it for later, but we really need the information about people. I propose that those information would be given as soon as possible and we can discuss by e-mail among the members of the TLD [inaudible] I don't know the name.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ALT, ALAC Leadership Team.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So discuss it by mail and perhaps prepare the advice to the ALAC by e-mail. And we can decide on it for the next meeting of ALAC, which is on the 17th of December. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Tijani. That's a good point. Yes, the 17th of December is where the ALAC call is taking place. I see agreement from Evan. I was going to ask that we go in camera just for five minutes to have a preliminary quick discussion on the candidates themselves. I guess we know the candidates to start with. Is there support here for going in camera for 5-10 minutes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Fine with me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see agreement from Dev as well on the line, and there was a yes from Tijani and a yes from Evan. So I think that we can – and yes from Maureen as well. Is there anyone that is not? This is the leadership team and I include in the leadership team here both our liaisons and I think – are we okay with having Sebastien in the leadership team? I see green ticks all around, so that's fine. So let's go in camera please, which means that we will stop the recording for a few minutes, just to make sure that we do not have any non-ALT or the people that I've listed just now on the call.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: The recording is off, Olivier.

The recording is back on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julia. Following on the ALAC leadership team call on the 6th of December 2013. The Leadership Team has spent about 10 minutes discussing the three different candidates that were listed on the Wiki for having applied for the position of dot-mobi. No firm decision has been taken. There was a request for additional information sent to all three candidates, and so the information will be displayed – [weighted] by the committee before a definite position is decided on. That recommendation from the ALT will then go to the ALAC for its monthly ALAC call, which will be I believe on the 17th of this month, the 17th of December the ALAC monthly call. What we will ask is for a

consensus call or a vote, whichever of the two. What would you prefer? A consensus call or a vote on this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think a consensus call will be better. And if you fail to have it, we can go to the vote.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's do that then. Consensus call on whatever candidate will be brought forward. That will then allow us to appoint someone to the position of dot-mobi liaison.

I think we've finished on this agenda item. We now have any other business. I realize we have six minutes left, and there are three minutes allocated to any other business. Anyone with any other business? I'm always concerned when I see Evan put his hand up, because that's when we end up being late. It might be the first call ever that I finish early. Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor. I'm only kidding.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, you're not. This is probably then not to be discussed on this call, because I think we need to deal with it. I saw recently the report back from Denise Michel on the ATRT. I'm very, very distressed about this and I was thinking at this point that we may want to consider assigning some people to have a look at the ALAC response to this, because having all the strategic panels and all the review teams and everything if we're trying to defend the multi-stakeholder model, this is essentially all

for naught if it ends up getting to senior staff and gets pushed back from there.

I'm mindful of the movie Monte Python and the Holy Grail where they get as far as they can and then they get to that one castle with the French knights and they're absolutely [forded] after the entire trek, and it almost is that kind of sad comedy. But in this case, it's a bit more serious. I think we're going to have to look at this very hard. I would like to if possible, Olivier, for you to collect some people to do a response to this. It is not the role of senior staff to comment on what things of the ATRT are doable and which are not. This is the community speaking. This is critical of importance to ICANN and this just sends out the exact wrong message to the world that the [MSM] can be [forded] by internal culture. It's absolutely horrible and I think we're going to need to move on that.

So in the interest of still allowing you to end early, just please consider about assembling a team to create a statement on this so that we can move fairly quickly on it. I'm very, very deeply concerned about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Evan. Any other thoughts on this? I gather I've only pointed this out to you just a moment ago. I see agreement from Tijani on this.

I think there is definitely going to be much discussion going on in the ATRT itself about this. I certainly have inquired about this response already with some of my colleagues. I've inquired about it in our

confidential list, because I wasn't quite sure what to make of the response that we've received so far and I wanted to first test the temperature of my colleagues and find out what their thought was. So it will be interesting to see what comes on the record and the follow up on this.

Maybe two things need to be done. One, for the executive committee sorry, the leadership team – to monitor the ATRT-2 mailing list and see what kind of response is going on in the ATRT-2 mailing list at the moment. I can send you all an e-mail with the location of the archive and you can read this, or I could forward the e-mails from the ATRT-2 mailing list over to the ALT mailing list.

Second thing, with regards to drafting a statement on this, the comment period is still open. The public comment period is still open until – I don't even know until when.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, just one thing. The comment period is to the ATRT report itself, not to the staff response.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, but there is a reply period which can be used to reply to any responses that have been filed. I'm surprised that – well, not surprised, but you will have noticed. Actually, you will have not noticed. But if you do look at the ATRT-2 mailing list, the staff response on implementation was sent to the ATRT-2 list was not sent to the public comment.

I think that it might be possible to respond to a comment like this on the public comment, but maybe you think differently. Maybe that's a different way forward. I just find it, at the end of the day, the ATRT-2 mailing list is a public mailing list, so it is a bit like a comment. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I wonder if the staff has the right to make such a comment for the ATRT-2. I don't think they have this right, because it's not for them. Even the public comment is not for them. So if we use the reply period, we will be using the normal public comment process. This is not in the normal public comment process. That's why I think that perhaps we need to draft a statement from the ALAC against this kind of behavior of the staff.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Tijani, you're exactly right. But we're now starting to talk about did the content of our statement as opposed to the mechanics, and I would just remind everyone that ALAC is not b][ound by the limits of public comment period. This is a very unusual circumstance and I think we have the ability to act and comment about it in any way, shape, or form that we deem appropriate under our bylaw mandate. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And for those who don't know what we're speaking about, I'm putting in the chat.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Evan, I would like to understand if you agree with me or not. I didn't understand. You say it is not about the mechanics. I didn't speak about the mechanics. I said that this is not a normal public comment, so we need a statement from the ALAC. This kind of behavior [inaudible]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I agree. Tijani, what I meant to say is when you talk about the fact that staff should not even be doing this in the first place, that's actually getting into the content of our statement as opposed to how or when we should be doing it. And this is a conversation we need to have, but not right now, especially since it is at the half-hour. My comment simply was to note we are ALAC. We are not bound by public comment periods. This is a very serious allegation. This is a comment that needs to be made to the board and the CEO that need to take leadership of this situation, and ALAC has the tools and the bylaw mandate to do this any way, shape or form we please, and I don't think we need to – and in this case, we probably shouldn't – be bound by the limits of the public comment period. I'll leave it at that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, because it is not advice of the public comment. It's out of the public comment. It doesn't have anything to do with the public comment. It is something against – the behavior of the staff for this kind of things. That's all.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes, I agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. I don't know what's going on with my – can any of you actually see what I've sent onto the chat, onto the Adobe Connect chat, or not? Because I've sent the actual link. It doesn't appear on my screen, so I apologize for everyone else who might have not received a copy of this. I don't know why it doesn't appear on my screen. But anyway…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You sent it twice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I sent it twice now, yes. It still doesn't appear on my screen, which is bizarre, but anyway. I'm glad you've all got it, that you've got that link and you can have a read through it. It's only been sent yesterday evening a few hours ago, so we will have more information on this.

Evan, I hear what you're saying. Can I just ask then as a follow-up that we would just work on this by e-mail over the weekend and perhaps put together by Monday sort of Wiki page for us to build a response.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That's fine with me. Sorry, I didn't mean to take you over. I just wanted to raise the issue with the knowledge that we would have to do follow-up work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Well, I was going to celebrate with a bottle of champagne the fact that it was the first ALT meeting or ExCom call that was going to run under time. Of course now we're forming this over time, so that bottle will have to remain closed. Thank you very much, Evan.

Thanks to all of you for having survived this long call, which has run over time. Any other other business? Yes, Heidi. Please, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Really quickly. I'm sorry, but you may have noticed that there were two items on the agenda that were sort of compressed together. One of those was the item for any ideas for the [inaudible] December ALAC meeting. So is there anything that stands out at this point or should we discuss that further, closer to the 17th?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think I kind of touched on this, because it was indeed compressed with [inaudible] and didn't make sense. It was currently open public comment suggestions for the ALAC meeting on the 17th of December. I don't think we had any feedback on this. I might've not made the question clear. Anyone has anything that needs to be touched on on the 17th of December meeting? Are we just having an update from working groups? We'll obviously have the dot-mobi. With regards to the working groups, I think we need an update from the At-Large Summit, because that's something that is moving forward and we need to make this a core activity. And apart from this, I'm not sure. I see Dev and Tijani have put their hand up. So Dev Aanand Teelucksingh?

DEV AANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well regarding the CROP do you think – I know one of the action items is possibly a single conference call to introduce the CROP. Do you still want to do that or do you just want to present it at the ALAC for the 17th?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Dev. The problem with CROP is it's not primarily an ALAC-led thing. It's really a RALO thing. So I don't think the ALAC call is the right location to speak about the CROP because [inaudible] does not have the full local leadership.

DEV AANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Point taken.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Dev. Next, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Regarding the CROP, I think that the review team can make a call to explain to the RALOs how to use the document elaborated by Dev, for example. And we need to make them aware that it is a little bit late now to start the process. We need them to start the process immediately, so we need a call dedicated to that.

Second point for the 17th of December, the Capacity Building Working Group will present to the ALAC a program of Capacity Building for the

ALSes for the Summit for approval. So this point has to be put on the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Tijani, thank you. So as I understand you, Capacity Building Working Group to update and to ask for ratification at that point from the ALAC. Yes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. And then I also heard from Heidi, maybe a quick update from the BCEC Board Candidate Evaluation Committee to see how things are progressing with them. That sounds good. I don't see anyone responding and saying no, so I'll take that silence as being approval. That's it for the time being. We might think of more things to add to the ALAC call. Let's try and keep it a bit more compact than we usually have it. I know that it is the last one before the holiday period and the last one of the year, so we might have quite a few things that will still come up. And of course, we might need a placeholder for the discussion that we just had a moment ago with regards to the ATRT-2.

That's it for the time being. Any other suggestions? Seeing no other suggestions, I thank you all for having lasted this one-and-a-half hours. I think it's been very productive and I look forward to speaking to you all over the week in various conference calls, etc. Good morning, good

EN

afternoon, and good night everybody. This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

JULIE CHARVOLEN: Thank you, everyone. I will now disconnect the audio.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]