OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC Leadership Team bi-monthly conference call on the 19th of December 2013. The time is 17:04 UTC. Let's have a roll call and apologies please, Julia?
JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Thank you Olivier. On today's call we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Evan Leibovitch, Maureen Hilyard and Alan Greenberg. We have no apologies so far. Dev will be joining us in a few minutes. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Julia Charvolen. May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you.
OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Julia. We immediately can open our Action Items. First the monthly conference call Action Items. These are the Action Items from the 17th of December, the last ALAC call a couple of days ago. If you scroll to the bottom of the page you will have open Action Items and newly assigned Action Items.

In the open Action Items you'll notice some that have been around for a little while. I guess we'll probably have to punch some of these until 2014. The first one is Matt and Alan to work on cleaning up the various mailing lists. I think that's somehow in the way. I know Matt's been working on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan has been MIA but Matt's done most of the work already I think.

MATT ASHTIANI: I went through the list in the ALAC email guide for the Rules of Procedure and I cleaned up all the lists that were on there. I think we can actually mark it complete.

ALAN GREENBERG: Given that, Matt, I'll do one of my audits of the mailing lists and then see what else I can find at this point. Hopefully nothing.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. We then have Alan Greenberg to complete required documents to allow the new Rules of Procedure to be put in place. Once that is close to completion, I will put out a call to Members of the Board Member Selection Process Committee.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's obsolete.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, it'd done. Matt is to work with Dev and Olivier on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of At-Large AIs. We have worked on this. Still ongoing. We have not got the unanimous solution on this. Evan, Holly and Carlton are to work together to develop a

Charter in coordination with Chairs for the newly formed Regulatory Issues Working Group. This is an old one as well, but this is all okay.

The newly formed registrant issues. Holly, would you please let us know whether… I know you were speaking both to Carlton and to Evan on… Primarily you and Carlton, the two Co-Chairs of this. Have you developed a Charter now for the registrant issues?

HOLLY RAICHE: In fact, we had a draft one at Buenos Aires. What's missing is the introductory paragraph. Evan, can you have a look at it? Basically we've got the text as to what we want to do. That's already posted. Matt's already put that up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I don't have it at hand, Holly, but I seem to remember that I thought we did nail this down in the Buenos Aires meeting.

HOLLY RAICHE: We did.

ALAN GREENBERG: Out of curiosity, could we have what the right name is? I've heard three different names in this meeting so far.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's Registration Issues, plural. Matt has already… it's a combination of the WHOIS and the Registrant Rights, both of those have been archived. There is a new workspace, which Matt has done, and put the Charter up. I'm going to add some sentences, Matt, when I had a look, but that much has been done already and the Charter is there. I think this is already done.

Evan, if you want to have a look at the Charter, the introductory sentences probably mean completion, only I'm not sure what you had in mind, so we can work on that part of the Charter. The rest of it's done really.

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry to interrupt, can somebody let me into the Adobe Connect room please? I've been waiting to come in for ten years.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's better than being rejected.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Very sorry Julie. We're not seeing you with your request to come in.

JULIE HAMMER: I'll try to log on again. No worries. You continue.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Registration Issues, yes. I can see on the Wiki that the Charter is there, or the proposed Charter is there. Moving forward… Evan, Carlton and Holly, if you could close that loop and have it all sorted out, and make sure the Wiki page is all friendly enough, etc., etc. I can see there's a huge number of people on that group. I'm so glad to see a massive number of people.

HOLLY RAICHE: Don't go there.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's good. Let's move on then. I think we can mark this as being done. Let's move onto the next one, which is Heidi to move forward with the appointment of the .mobi liaison, and that we're going to follow up with in a moment. That's also done. Alan Greenberg is to provide an explanation on membership requirements and any other additional details as necessary for members of the BMSPC. That's done as well. All of these are open AIs which we just had to tick off.

Recently closed, we're all fine. Newly assigned AIs. Olivier is to follow up with Sally Costerton on the need to extradite these visa issues for London. I'm afraid I haven't done any AIs yet since our last call, because I haven't stopped travelling, unfortunately. Heidi is to ensure that the ccNSO and the ALAC meetings in Singapore are scheduled properly so that the meeting with the ccNSO can take place. That's in progress as well.

Maureen is to start the ALAC /ccNSO Coordination Working Group. that's also in progress. Silvia is to check the accuracy of the ATLAS II Organizing Committee list. Have you had a chance to have a look at it, Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Actually, I haven't done that. Sorry. I will.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, ongoing. Olivier is to send a letter to the Chair of the Board with the copy of the Minority Statement and the Draft Final Report on protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLDs, and is also going to the suggested text, noted by Alan Greenberg on the mailing list... I'm going to need some help on this one. I need to find the suggested text, Alan. This AI says to include the suggested text noted by Alan Greenberg on the mailing list. I thought you were going to draft a small intro note or something?

ALAN GREENBERG: I did, I sent it and emailed it just before the ALAC meeting, with the exact first sentence and a pointer to where to find the text.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's the one that I have not read and is still in my mailbox.

ALAN GREENBERG: We discussed it on the Wiki. The intent was to take the one sentence, add to it the two-page Minority Statement, minus the title that is the Minority Statement.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Okay. It's in the pipeline. Thank you. Olivier is to send .mobi a note that Murray McKercher will be the ALAC liaison to .mobi, and also to inform Murray McKercher that he has been selected as the ALAC liaison to .mobi. I've done neither of those yet. This is something I will do today.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, just so you're aware, informally I've already had conversations with Murray since then where I've let him know the approval, but obviously it's not an official notice.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, cool. Thank you. We can move forward on that. That's good. Heidi is to send a call for members of the Non-PDP Cross-Community Working Group.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That is on my list of things to do today, but we already have some of the members from some of the RALOs and I've sent those to Glenn.

EN

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you tell me what the Non-PDP CCWG is please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That was the call that Glenn sent to you for the gNSO Group that's working on this framework discussion. I'll put the link in the chat in just a moment.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know what it means, but why is it called the 'Non-PDP'? I've never heard that before.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Because… Alan, can you expand on that? I expect it's because it's not going through the normal PDP process because it's a cross-community working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we're talking about the one that's the Rules for Cross-Community Working Groups?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's more like it, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then it should be a Cross-Community Working Group Design Team. The 'Non-PDP' is I suppose to convince other gNSO members that this is not a PDP.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's call it Cross-Community Working Group Design Team.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe that's what it is being called, although I vaguely remember somebody suggesting not using CCWG because that now has another meaning within ICANN, but I can't remember what that is.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, right now I don't think the term CCWG actually has solid meaning because it's taking different forms now. I don't know if it's been entrenched.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but someone pointed out that the CCWG, which we were using as an acronym for Cross-Community Working Group, in fact has been taken on my something else. I remember someone saying that. It may be irrelevant. Ignore it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's a type of group, not actually a title of a group.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know, but I believe that term has now taken on another meaning unrelated to cross-community working groups, but let's not worry about this. I may be wrong.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, let's move on. We've got the last one – Matt is to add all members to the mailing list once the call for members is completed. I'm just letting Matt know the name is the Non-PDP CCWG Design Team, for our records, so that we know what we're talking about on this. Any questions or comments on any of these?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: One more delicious acronym.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a comment on the item that isn't there. I was assigned the responsibility, under public comments, to look at whether Specification 13 needed an ALAC comment, and I'm asking at this point, Evan, if you could… It's a long, messy document. The public comment description is no sufficient. Could you very briefly glance over that stuff so we can talk about it later?

EN

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Alan, if you could pump me the URL so I don't have to go digging, that would be great.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll do that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So will I.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much gentlemen. I see no one putting their hand up for other comments, so let's move to the ALT comments from our 6th December meeting. There's only one listed here, and that's for staff to send a call for comments on ICANN's draft vision, mission and focus areas for a five-year strategic plan to the FBSC. I believe that's been done. Is that correct?

MATT ASHTIANI: Yes, I believe it's been done but I'll double-check and make sure.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Matt. We've gone through the AIs. Anything we might have missed on this? You'll notice the ALT AIs are quite slim. They did not appear a few hours earlier so we've salvaged… But I don't think there was anything else on there. All right, let's move on then through our

Agenda and go to items for discussion, which is effectively the policy development activities.

You were all very well aware of what's going on. Is there anything in there that we need to pick on, specifically? The floor is open. I'll give you two seconds to read through. With regards to the current statements of the ccNSO Framework of Interpretation Interim Report on Revocation, we're voting on this.

A few problems with some of the newcomers with regards to their voting. They're not too used to the Big Pulse system yet. Matt has been chasing them around, so hopefully we're getting some response now. Some are getting used to it and don't quite know how to use the system. Tijani Ben Jemaa? I saw your hand go up and then go back down. Let's start with Tijani and then Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. For the second bullet point of (b), proposed bylaw change regarding the Technical Liaison Group, I think we already voted on it, so I think its base is not here, it's in (a).

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, you're absolutely right. Thank you. This is slightly out of date, but never mind. Protection of IGO and INGO identifiers in all gTLD recommendations… There was a lot of discussion that took place during the call. I believe we now have a basis for something? Yes, we do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Regarding the members who are not voting yet, do we know who those are? We informally decided a while ago that new people should have mentors. We never did anything about it formally. I know I spent a lot of time talking to Rafid in Buenos Aires, and I'd be glad to take on that role with him. If anyone else… I think the other new members should have similar support.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I've already been in contact on a couple of things with Leon, and I'm happy to work with him.

ALAN GREENBERG: In particular, if someone is helping out, they should be notified if the people aren't voting or are expressing having problems or something like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. Now, I have concerns primarily with Hadja, and also with Beran. I wonder whether someone could mentor them? Do you have any ideas, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. As for Hadja, I'm following her very closely, but the problem is that she got a new job exactly at the time she was appointed as an ALAC member, so she's a little bit busy. But she made a lot of effort regarding the English. She's now following English courses to make her English

better, and she asks me every time she doesn't understand anything. So I'm following her very well.

For the Gambian lady, I never saw her. I Skyped with her and sent her emails, but we never talked together, so I don't know.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Bit of a concern, but we'll continue working on that and try and provide her with as much support as she can get. She has missed the BA meeting, which is always a bad start, unfortunately. So we need to make sure we can provide her with as much help as possible. I know Matt has been helping her out with the vote. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sometimes I don't actually get the emails with the facility to vote, and therefore what I do is just email Matt and say, "Please put in my vote." Using Big Pulse, sometimes for some reason I don't seem to get that email, or I've already gotten the email to say, "Vote," and I don't see the Pulse so I send Matt... If staff could just have a look at making sure that everybody gets sent the Pulse facility to vote, that would really help. Thank you.

MATT ASHTIANI: Olivier, just for one clarification, in case this does come up again – there are always two emails that are sent out. The first one is the vote announcement, which will not contain the links, and then there is the vote credentials. If you just want to email me, even when you see the

vote announcement, that's fine, I have no problem doing that. if you're looking for the Big Pulse credentials, it should always be the email titled 'vote credentials'.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sometimes I don't seem to see it. I don't know why. If I don't see it straightaway then I just email you. It's not a problem for me.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly. I think it does depend on some anti-spam programs if somebody has difficulties. Let's continue to our Agenda. We've got the At-Large Study on WHOIS Misuse. That's well in hand I believe. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I haven't seen what Carlton's done. We've exchanged a few emails on that. The reason I wasn't at the ALAC meeting was I was actually at the webinar, and then I sent the notes on that to Carlton. He's holding the pen but I haven't yet seen what he's going to do about the Study. I think I sent you some notes as well. If something doesn't appear very soon then I'll actually develop the comment.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. Thank you very much Holly. We do need to move on that. Time is ticking. We have until the 27th of this month, but bear in mind that we probably will not be able to make it by then. I don't understand

why staff, in charge of the public comments, come up with a deadline date, which is right in the middle of the ICANN holiday week. It's baffling. We will probably submit in the reply date, reply close.

Next, the new gTLD action rules. Now, these ones… This is a new one. I've asked Matt to ask Avri Doria, Chair of our New gTLD Working Group, on whether a comment was necessary. Have you heard from Avri, Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI: No, I've not yet heard back from Avri.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, any thoughts on this? Or Evan? I know you've been following this as well.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I've been following it. My gut instinct is that right now this is auction, this is between registries, and it does not have a whole lot of immediate end-user ramification. This is a battle between registries that get past a certain point. It establishes that there are no community applications, so this is essentially a fight between various non-community players, in which case, personally, this is between applicants and there's not a lot of end-user stake in the ground on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's certainly an end-user implication in that our position has been that some of these things shouldn't have ended up in auction, because of community issues, but that's not what we're discussing now.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Right, the issue here is the mechanics of the auction. Having already settled that this is a process, and how they do an auction is, to me, a moot point. We've had an opinion on the circumstances for having auctions, but they've already agreed on it, so the mechanics have had to do the auction, I think, are beyond our caring.

ALAN GREENBERG: As are what to do with the proceeds, at this point. Not beyond our caring, but not the subject of today's discussion.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much gentlemen. Just a question – would it be worth sending a statement there saying that the ALAC is not positively happy with the auction process due to the fact that it cuts out community applications, that will not have as deep a pocket as commercial applicants?

ALAN GREENBERG: We could certainly say that, and add in that we believe the issue of where the proceeds go should have been discussed long ago. It's not a comment on any of the things relevant, I believe, to the exact public

comment period, but we could go on record if it makes people feel comfortable.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The reason why I ask this – and I'm entirely aware we would be answering completely outside the realm of this public comment –, it's like, "Would you like to have some ice cream?" and the answer is, "I love driving very much when it's a sunny day." Is there a way…? Would you think it's worth going that length and voicing out concern?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: At very most I'd suggest perhaps a letter to the Chair of the Committee doing this, as well as a cc to Steve, saying that the ALAC concerns about the nature of auctions as a method of deciding gTLDs, as well as issues such as proceeds from auctions, have been stated before. Having said that, we have no comment in the actual mechanics of the auction.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since we're not asking for action or responses at this point, I'd just do it as a public comment.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Then it will be ignored because they say, "Okay, it's out of scope, next."

ALAN GREENBERG: I started off saying I don't think we need to reply.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Oh, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier asked, "Should we say something?"   We could certainly go on record as saying that…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: We can refer to earlier statements where we've made our positions known on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure we have said that in statements.   It's certainly been a theme, but whether it's been a formal statement or not, I don't know. Does someone feel strongly that we should put our stake in the ground on issues related to auctions, even if not the question they're asking? If anyone feels strongly then we could draft something.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Especially in terms of proceeds from auctions and whether or not there should be so many, I think that's justified.   It's out of scope for this particular comment, but certainly we've got a stake in regarding the auctions in general, especially when it comes to proceeds.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you gentlemen. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: The question is, are we going to put something together right now that either the ALAC's going to vote on, or you say, "Does anyone object to us sending this in?" I have no problem with it. I don't think it's really necessary at this point, and I don't think it's going to be effective or have any real impact. I don't think either of those things are going to change.

The Board Members made clear at BA that they're looking at all these things of what to do with the proceeds. It's an in-process thing. Us saying it should have been done three years ago doesn't really alter the fact or speed up what they're doing right now. Nor does reiterating that we think the whole process of how to decide who gets a competed-for TLD was done properly.

I don't think there's any impact of us saying any of those things, and I don't really see the merit of us doing it. But I wouldn't object if we chose to. By the way, someone mentioned Avri. I don't know for sure if [.gay? 00:29:01] is in a contention set with auctions, but if it is then she's not the appropriate person to do anything regarding that.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're right, yes. We haven't received an answer from her and it was sent to her, since she was the Chair of the New gTLD Working Group.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought hers was a community one, and I don't think therefore it goes to auction, but I don't remember for sure.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The reason why I asked the question is that under normal circumstances I would say yes. It's not worth the ALAC spending time on something that is going to primarily only affect the people applying for new gTLDs, and therefore future registries. On the other hand, there's certainly a user element in that its domains end up reaching the millions of dollars worth in those auctions. The price of the domain names at the end that will be sold is likely to be a bit more expensive, or be somehow affected by the price of the auction. Topically, of course.

I'm not sure whether we should think about that. But more so, perhaps more for going on the record, in the same way as the ALAC is on record in December 2010, before the San Francisco meeting where the new gTLD program was officially launched, the ALAC at the time did point out a number of things that still were not right in the program. They said things were unacceptable, and in the current state we said this program should not move forward as-is, until a number of things are fixed.

It's interesting to see a few years later that even some Board Members, who voted at the time, have said quite publicly, "Had I known, I'm not sure I would have voted the same way at the time then. The pressure and… There was something contextual about it." So in a certain way there are maybe some things to say about this.

Yes, it will be completely out of the context of this public comment period, because we'll not answer within the subject matter that we're asked, but it is a time where we can repeat – maybe the cranky wheel syndrome again – the two facts in there.

Number one: community applicants are likely to be negatively impacted by this system of auctions, and the ALAC does not support this auction system. Two: the ALAC has real concerns about where the funds from those auctions would go. It would suggest that since community applicants would be impacted by this, it would suggest that this money would have to go to the communities. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The more I hear this conversation the less happy I am with this particular tactic. I'm going to suggest something a little different and float it by the rest of the ALT and see what you think. We have all sorts of concerns. We have all sorts of hindsight about the program.

I'm going to suggest that perhaps we may want to consider creating an [ominous? 00:32:53] statement about the current state of gTLDs that covers off a whole bunch of things, and then is written, created, voted on ALAC and presented as ALAC advice to the Board in advice of Singapore. These little public comment things get into a pile and get ignored.

I really think that hearing what I've heard we've got really big concerns. We need to update our previous stance on the gTLD program and we've got to reiterate – very publicly and right to the Board – about our concerns on how things have turned out with what the promise was and what the realization has been. I think we need to create a proper statement that is not just a reaction to this auction mechanism or that PDP or whatever.

We need to be an AC. We need to provide advice. I'm suggesting a document that's an update to the ALAC opinion on the gTLD program, on everything from auction proceeds, to categorization, to community, to brands, and to update that as a single statement about the status of the program and our opinion of how that's affecting end-users. We do that as a single document. We bring that to ALAC and we approve it for presentation in Singapore.

That's my proposal as an alternative to just doing one more comment to a public comment period that's going to likely get ignored. Thank you. Obviously I'd not propose this without offering to help do it.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two things. With regards to the statement you proposed, I'd be very careful about saying things like, "Auctions disadvantage community applications." The rules for how to decide on what's a community application disadvantage community applications, but by the definition of what is a community application and what is deemed to be a community application, they don't go through to auctions.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, I'm not…

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm commenting on Olivier's statement, not on what you said. On the assumption that you may lose, he may win, I'm commenting on that statement. We have an uppercase C, lowercase C community issue, so I'd be very careful if we worded the statement like that.   On Evan's proposal, I strongly support the idea of a unified statement at this point, assessing what's going on or what has gone on.

I'm not 100% sure it's advice, because although there might be some aspects of advice, in much of the case we're expressing regret about how things have been handled. It's not necessarily things that can be fixed.   I like the idea of coming out with a statement on the ALAC assessment, and possibly advice, depending on what the contents are, in time for Singapore.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Evan, just a thought – we, being APRALO, are talking about having a Multistakeholder Forum. We've already got two hours. It was originally going to be on consumer metrics, but that would be an opportunity to have the kind of discussion, two hours open to everybody, to go through some of these issues and broaden out the consumer metrics part of that new gTLD to other parts of it? Just a thought. Thanks.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. Was that a question to Evan specifically?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, it was, but it's probably to everybody really. If people think it's worth exploring, taking up what Evan is suggesting, having that broader look at new gTLDs, it may be a very useful way to spend two hours, when you actually have a lot of different people in the room.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, we'll bank this question. I'll go to Tijani and then we can discuss that proposal as well. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier. First of all, I think that what Evan proposed is something we can do together with the public comment participation. I agree with you, Evan, to draft comprehensive advice about the new gTLD program, but why before Singapore?

I don't think it needs to be before Singapore, because the whole thing is not yet done, and I'd like to wait until the new gTLDs are on the root and are working, so that we know everything about what the mechanics were, and all the issues about the program. Then we can write really comprehensive advice to the Board about the new gTLD program. I agree with you, but I don't think we can do it before Singapore.

As for the public comments, I think we can do something. I didn't read it, so I have to read it before, but I think there are some concerns. Alan, you said that the auction didn't concern the community applications. That's right. If the community applications are competing with the other

applications, but if there is a problem between two community applications I think they have to go through auctions too. The point of Olivier is relevant perhaps. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not 100% sure that's correct. It may well be, but I don't know if there are any situation that's competing community applications; the ones that have passed the community threshold in the evaluation process. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Back to you Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks for the opportunity, Olivier, to address some of the comments and questions. First I want to address Tijani and what you said about why before Singapore. The reason why I want to do it before Singapore, and the reason why I want to do it as advice is because I think this is more than just doing it just after the fact. I really would like, actually, to have at least a handful of recommendations going forward that could be implemented.

I'll give an example. Alan jarred my mind with it at the beginning of the call when he referred to Specification 13, which has to do with introducing new ways that allow registries to handle .brands. This is an after the fact issue to do with the gTLD program because .brands are a new phenomenon to do with gTLDs. This is an active thing. We now

have the registries that are saying, "We want you to create a new specification. We want you to create a new and [joint? 00:40:28] category for .brands."

Well, if this is indeed an issue then I want to reopen the whole thing of categorization, because the optics of having the registries being able to create new categories, when previous attempts by At-Large and the non-commercial groups to create categories that broaden the definition of community, is just absolutely horrible public optics, in that registries can ask for a new category, but the public interest cannot. This is something that I think we have the ability to visit now.

The reason why I'm advocating for doing something at Singapore is because I don't want to wait until totally after delegation. The registry proposal for Specification 13 is on the table now, and what I'm suggesting will include a number of things. It could include specific recommendations to do with categorization. Certainly an enhancement of the PIC system is on the table.

Tijani, I'm suggesting we do something sooner rather than later because I don't just want to do this as a post-mortem. I want to do this as a mid-way report card where there's still some course corrections that can be done before things get totally bad. That's the approach I want to take. Not simply a review of how it's gone, but a report card on where things are now and there are corrections that can be done at this time that will still inject some of the public interest into the TLD program.

As for your question, Holly, about whether or not your own meeting can be expanded to cover this, frankly, I don't know whether a meeting for

two hours on consumer metrics would actually be useful at this point, especially given the early nature of the Working Group on that, but certainly.

I think it's within the realm of At-Large to basically be able to sit back, look at the state of things, look at the state of how [jazz? 00:43:14] went, look at the public interest comments, commitments, have a look at the things that we're seeing now about the request for Specification 13 and so on. I think we have an obligation to the community to do that.

Tijani, rather than just do it after the fact, I think we still have an opportunity to propose some change that will benefit the public interest before it all rolls out. If the registries can ask for a Spec 13 then we have the opportunity to ask for something else. That's my take; that if this long into the process the registries can ask for something retroactively to be done, because of the gTLD program, then as far as I'm concerned this is on the table.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't, for one, think that this is on our critical path for today, and I for one have to leave in not too many minutes from now. Can we make sure we're addressing the issues that have to be addressed? I don't disagree with Evan that this is important, but I don't think it's on the critical path for today's meeting.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm happy to take it offline, to the Skype chat or elsewhere.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Evan, and thanks for this Alan. I see there are more people putting their hands up. I don't know if you've also got a hand up, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I called out instead of waiting for my hand to be called on.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, did you want to say something?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. I agree with you 100%, but this is something we can do now, and after all the process is done, I'm sure we need to write advice to the Board about the whole program, because we have a lot of things to say. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. What I hear is that there is support for a wider statement to be drafted ahead of the Singapore meeting, that will take a snapshot and look at the new gTLD program in a critical manner, and that Evan will be leading this, perhaps with the New gTLD Working Group, perhaps with the Future Challenges Working Group. I'll tell you what, we haven't got the time now to exactly work out the details, but I also support this.

I think it's a good thing. I see that Tijani is putting that we should be writing something in response to this auction process, but I do hear from most on this call that we could somehow stay out of it, because it's just one of the things that will primarily affect the applicants for new gTLDs. If we're going to draft that larger statement then really we're repeating the same thing in a small statement that's out of context and not going to help much.

So I'd be inclined to say no statement on these At-Large new gTLD auction rules, unless, Tijani, you really wish to have something on that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I didn't read it. I'm sorry.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have a look and come back to us.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I proposed a specific AI in the Adobe chat, if everybody could have a look? Perhaps that could actually be what's in the minutes of this meeting, or at least something like it, as an actual AI?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'll read it for the record: "Proposed AI: the new gTLD Working Group be charged with creating a statement on the state of the gTLD expansion, analyzing and proposing possible new measures for consideration by ALAC, and presentation at the Singapore meeting." Any comments on

EN

this? I see a green tick from Tijani, and Holly as well. A hand up from Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Olivier. I would go with the first AI, but just as a suggestion here, I'm thinking this could possibly be a good opportunity for the ATLAS II Summit, to really…   The use of perspective on all this new gTLD expansion to be channeled into something at the Summit? I support the AI as-is, in order to get the ball rolling on it.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. You've opened a new door with the Summit and I fear we might be going into another half-hour discussion on this; whether the Summit is the right location for it or not. Let's move on. I think we can take that AI. Dev, if you could follow up with your suggestion on the mailing list as well, for the Summit, then we can continue the discussion. AS Alan said, this is not on today's critical path.

Let's go forward. ICANN's draft, vision, mission and focus areas and a five-year strategic plan. Tijani, how is that coming along? I know you're working on it at the moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It will be done. The deadline is the 21st of January.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It has to be presented before.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sure. I hope so.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Can we do that before Christmas please, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. Before Christmas I will work on the geographic region…

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, then you can do it during Christmas. Sorry. No-no, take a break please. Next year we do need to have full batteries. Let's move on. Review of the ALAC meeting of the 17th of December 2013. Agenda Item #4. There were three particular sections of that meeting that I remember, and staff remembers, as being something we said, "Let's continue the discussion on the ALT call."

The first one is the acknowledgement of the DSSA Cross-Community Working Group Report. We appear to have had the response… I thought we would have a consensus call or something, but people haven't really been totally… Well, they haven't read it basically, so we couldn't have a consensus call at the time. Let's see what Alan Greenberg…?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe I was assigned the task of drawing up a resolution based on the gNSO, with consideration for what the ccNSO said as well. That's on my action list of things to do before Christmas.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure it was on the formal action list, but I wrote it on my action list, so…

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well, we have an organizational home for this. It's a Wiki page that's linked from this. When you've got that proposed statement you can put it on that page as well. I'll follow up then and send this over to the mailing list. Perfect. The other one was to do with the selection of the ALAC liaison for .mobi. Just to let you know that on this I will be emailing Murray McKercher on this and following up on this today.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Murray's just been in touch with me on Skype and I've informally communicated to him that he was appointed the .mobi liaison from ALAC and he awaits your emails.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. I'll do that shortly. I'm not sure whether there was much to discuss on this. Just to say that I think he's an excellent candidate, seeing his background. I'm really looking forward, having discussed this with Philip [Gravely? 00:51:44]…   As you know, .mobi has been purchased over by affiliates. This creates a lot of interest in developing the brand, and Ken Stubbs is the person who's on the Policy Advisory Board of .mobi. He's the Chair of the Policy Advisory Board.

Some of you might have met him in BA. He was there and he went to many different meetings. I think several of you might have met him. It's really a new beginning with .mobi. I'm just hoping that some of the new gTLDs will have Policy Advisory Boards that might ask for someone from the ALAC to sit on their Policy Advisory Boards, the reason being that it seems to be a good way to get input from at least part of the community.

Of course, there's always the danger that this is used just as a showcase; as a window-dressing, but if .mobi really means what they mean then I'd be interested in seeing maybe more gTLDs do this sort of thing. This is just a personal comment by the way, not on behalf of anyone else. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.   Two things.   Number one, regarding Murray, without presuming he's not going to do it, I think it's important that he understands that this is a position that we appoint for communication in both directions.   We did not have that from the previous incumbents, who were completely silent.   I think you'll want to reinforce that.

Number two, I have a little bit of concern with what you said – although I don't disagree it's going to happen – on a lot of the new gTLDs.   In many cases, such as .mobi, these are likely to be paid positions and I think we need to be very careful that we're not going to start to be viewed as an organization whose allegiance can be bought on these new gTLDs.   Just a concern.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a very good point and I certainly had not [inaudible 00:54:03] the fact that yes, these positions are actually paid.   It's not paid as such…

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no guarantee, but in many cases there will be remuneration in one form or another.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan.   Next we have Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I just want the ALT know that I've already had a conversation with Murray that outlines the need for communications and that indicates

that he's still got to have a certain… I've spoken to him about the idea of having independence; of being vocal within the group, of speaking his mind, trying to promote the end-user interest within the group in serving that role, and doing the communications.

While, of course, any time that somebody has remuneration or even in some cases paid travel, one could be seen to be in a conflict. I've already had this conversation with Murray. He's aware of it and I think we're okay.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Evan. Now we'll move onto the next AI, 4.c, the confidentiality issue related to the BCEC. As you know, we've had some concerns from Roberto. There has been some discussion as to how far should the information… Let's not call it a 360' review, but the review by Board Members, in whatever form it takes, of the performance of the current Board Member, as selected by the At-Large community or the selected ALAC and regionally selected Board Member.

Originally, Steve Crocker did say that this was going to be shared with the ALAC through me, effectively, in saying, "Once you've got that information you can share it with whomever you want." I asked, "Well, is this a permission for [credential? 00:56:07]?" "Oh yes, of course it is." But with 'whomever you want' meaning whomever you want, the voters. So there's this [secondly? 00:56:16] big group of voters [inaudible 00:56:18] 15 members of ALAC, plus the regional Chairs of Vice-Chairs for each of the regions. That makes a total of 25 people.

There's also the BCEC, which has ten people, and the first step is for the BCEC members to have signed a confidentiality agreement, and therefore they're 99% sure that they will be having access to that information. Now, the big question lies in whether the ALAC and the voters should have that information. I've seen on the list a big discussion on this. Some say yes, some say no.

I'd like to try and move a little bit forward on this and get a bit more clarity on this; whether we should or not. My suggestion would be that if we do, then we need to ask for a confidentiality agreement. We've heard from Cheryl how the ALAC has not been stellar in keeping information in-house, sometimes, so we do need to make sure people realize that when they receive that information it's something they shouldn't share, or at least shouldn't copy and send to a public mailing list, etc., etc.

Three people are on the queue at the moment: Alan Greenberg, Evan and Tijani. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, that was an old hand. As somebody who has said I will be a candidate, I believe I have a vested interest in the outcome of this discussion, and I don't believe I want to participate in it. I have made my position clear in the past however.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. Next we have Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Mine was an old hand too. But if you're trying to poll everybody, I think I would agree with the position Carlton took in the mailing list, which was basically saying that the voters need to have the maximum amount of information, and if that requires a confidentiality agreement, so be it. Yes, there have been risks in the past, but we have people who are voting on this very important thing. They have to have the maximum amount of information that they can, if that information exists.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this point of view, Evan. I must say, I'm very glad that Roberto has not only posted this to the ALAC list but has also posted it to the At-Large mailing list, the wider At-Large mailing list, thus generating much discussion there as well. Maybe sometimes we do have to remember that non-ALAC cannot post to the ALAC list. It's good to copy things over to the At-Large list and get some discussion going on with people who are closer to the edges.

ALAN GREENBERG: Quickly, in relation to what you just said, it's true, but we need to make sure that when we post things suddenly to the At-Large list we frame the context, because out of the blue people didn't know what we were talking about.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you Olivier. I will start where Alan just ended. I think the problem was that the mail was sent to people who weren't aware of the issue. That's why they had this kind of reaction. I believe that there is a big misunderstanding, because people thought that this is for Sebastian to say or report on what he did for At-Large. This is something very legitimate, and we can ask him – people can ask him, RALOs can ask him, ALAC can ask him – and I'm sure that he'll do it because it's part of his contain.

If he wants to be re-elected he has to highlight what he did for ALAC. So this is not the issue. The issue is about this Board review, which is something completely different to that, and it's written by Board Members, and it's an evaluation of his work on the Board; not related to the At-Large or ALAC interest or concern.

Lastly, I think that if this review has to be shared with the voters, all references given by the candidate also have to be shared. I don't think that we need to… We can give the voters the maximum amount of information. What we are doing now, now the voters have the public information about the candidate, but there are some kinds of information that are not public.

This review is one of these kinds of information. That's why I strongly advise that we don't share it with the voters. The voters can ask Sebastian, Sebastian can tell them, and they can touch on what they had from Sebastian's work, but with regards to this review, I think it must be restricted at the maximum. I will not see it. I am a voter.

I would be glad to see it, but I will not see it if we decide so, and that's better for the confidentiality. If you share it with those 20 people… I think last time I said it would be public. I mean it will have more risk of having the information on the root.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Of course this is a double-edged thing though. If the report is absolutely ecstatic about how well Sebastian did on the Board, then that would go to his advantage. If on the other hand it shows criticism of his performance on the Board, that's obviously a concern. I'll hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg. Sorry Alan, there was Dev before you. I apologize Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'll be brief, because I think Tijani echoed exactly what I wanted to say and I fully support what he said. So I think… I don't think I need to add any more to that.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you just be clear as to what you support, so as to make clear for the record?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That any candidate references should also be shared. I agree, regarding the 360' review, that to me the review really focuses on his performance within the Board, and not necessarily so much of what he represented of

the At-Large interests on the Board, for lack of better wording. If it's shared with the 20 regional voters – the ALAC and the five Chairs – I don't think that will be held privately within that. It's going to leak out to the wider public. It's going to be shared within the RALO.

Just bear that in mind, if you do decide to share it with the voters. I'm not convinced that… The more and more I hear this discussion, the 360' review, I think, is super critical, in making our decision as a voter, because there will be opportunity, as Tijani said, that Sebastian will be on a conference call, questions can be asked: "What about this and that?" regarding his performance and so forth.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev, there is a difference though, because the 360' or whatever it's called, is going to be an in-depth evaluation of the effectiveness of the Board Member on the Board, and a whole lot of other things. Sebastian may be putting the points across very well, and any Board Member may be putting the points across and relaying our [inaudible 01:05:15] over to the Board, but how effective is that Board Member in the various committees that they're in?

A lot of the stuff that we don't know about, as to the Board relationships, etc., is something that will be provided in that information. There is a difference between providing a reference on one side, and providing this kind of information. Obviously, when you're going to choose a referee, you're going to find someone who theoretically should be quite sympathetic to you.

I'm not sure whether a performance review like that is as sympathetic. There are still questions as to how the people who will review your case will be chosen. We're not going to dig into this, because I've now heard a conflicting explanation from Steve Crocker himself, and from other Board Members, and I don't even know whether they know.

The question is, do we share this among a wider list of not? I note that a couple of people here are for it and a couple are against it; are concerned about the leaks. I must say, it's a real problem to find whether this should be… Between, do you provide most information to a voter, or do you make sure that whatever information is given is not going to be leaked around? That's a big question.

There was a suggestion made that some members of the BCEC could go and speak back with their communities, therefore not sharing the content of the review in detail, but basically just providing vague ideas about how that person did. I think that Roberto has actually replied that this would actually break the confidentiality agreement, which the BCEC members have entered.

I would also feel very concerned that each BCEC member would have to try and gauge exactly to what extent they could share the information, and how much of it they could share. That's a recipe for failure and for a lot of trouble. Alan Greenberg, and then we have to move on. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: My first point is that some people keep referring to this as a 360' review. It's nothing resembling a 360' review.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, I'm sorry to interrupt you. I've said, "Whatever its name is." We need to keep away from this. It's not a 360' and I'm not even sure if the Board knows what it is, but it's a review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I don't care. I do have two other comments to make and I'm not making a statement on whether this information should be released or not, but I'm astounded at some of the things I've heard in the last few minutes. Number one: we don't have the ground-rules for whatever this review is and who it gets released to. That's what's being discussed.

We have ground-rules that reference input from references from the BCEC are to be considered private, and I do not believe we have the discretion to change those rules in mid-flight. That's number one. As much as people think this is the thin-edge of the sword and if we do one thing we have to do the other, the other one is not something we can consider, in my understanding, as a settled manner.

People have presumably asked for references already, based on the fact the references would be confidential. So I don't believe we have the discretion to change that, and I think it's a very important issue. Number two: I've heard the statement saying, "Whether the incumbent has represented us well." The incumbent is not there to represent us.

The incumbent is there to be a good Board Member. It is the Board Member selected by At-Large. They are a Board Member and the whole issue at stake is whether, in 2010, we selected a good Board Member,

and whether that person should be back or not. Regardless of whether the answer is yes or no, the whole question at issue is, "Are we putting someone on the Board in 2013/2014 who will be a good Board Member?"

Not who represents At-Large. Legal counsel would have a fit if we said words like that to them. So the whole issue that we should be evaluating is finding a good Board Member; someone who's a good, competent, capable, effective Board Member. This evaluation is the crux of the question that the voters should be considering. It's not an internal Board issue. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Very good points. Next we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Alan, I fully agree with your first point, that the references can never been disclosed. That's why I said, "If we do that, we have to do this." Since 'this' is not doable, we cannot do 'this'. This is the first point. The second point is I respected very much, and loved very much, your mention at the beginning that since you're a candidate you will not enter into this discussion.

Regarding the requirements of the Board Member, I want to remind you that our requirement was in three parts. The first part was the requirements of the bylaw. The second was the requirements of the NomCom, and the third one was specific requirements of At-Large. For

sure, we know that the bylaws said that the Board Members have to act for the benefit of ALAC, and not for any other constituency interest.

ALAN GREENBERG: You mean ICANN?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: ICANN I mean, yes. [laughter] I said bylaw. If we have put those specific requirements in then really, why did we fight for so long to have this voting Board Member? It's because we want someone who's aware of our concerns, aware of our problems, and someone who can bring us something, who can improve the position of ALAC inside ICANN. I think that yes, we need to know if our candidate will be a good ALAC, and also we want to know if the incumbent ALAC member did something for ALAC.

This is what people asked on the mailing list, I'll remind you. That's why I made the comment. So this is very important. I think people are aware of what the Board Member will bring to the ALAC and to the At-Large community, and this is something that can be shared and explained by Sebastian. We know if we had something from Sebastian, we know it. So it's something that we can explain. No, not we, Sebastian can explain. This is something different, but this review is different and I think this review has the same importance of confidentiality as the references. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. That doesn't bring us any closer to a successful outcome on this question, because I see we're quite divided on which way this should go. Go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'd like to say that Carlton's comment was not 100% for the disclosure, or for sharing the review with the voters. He brought two things forward; confidentiality, and you know what the second point was. It was more posing the problem and saying that there are two things – we have to think about it. The support of Evan… I don't know if it's for the full disclosure of the review to the voters, or if it's in support of Carlton's comment.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: If that's a request of me, Tijani, I'm okay with the hybrid.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Several people have called to Carlton's note, and I'm a little concerned about one thing. It says here, one of the paragraphs says, "The [inaudible 01:15:10] collectives from equity. Is it fair under all circumstances to release unfavorable, specific information about a candidate to be elected, when such information cannot be developed or accessed for all candidates?" One could turn the table over and say, "Is

it fair under all circumstances to release favorable specific information about a candidate to be elected?"

The only thing that I would say though, in response to that, is that in general, when a president of a country, for example, stands for re-election, there is an extensive amount of work that goes into the performance of that president. Of course, all of the other candidates who've never been president don't have the ability to show any track record. This, in effect, would be the sharing of some track record – be it good or bad.

That's the way I see there is indeed an unbalance between the person that's already occupied the post and the people who've not occupied the post. It's very difficult at that point to evaluate how anyone else would be able to hold that position. I see Tijani still has his hand up. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This is also one of my concerns. Suppose Sebastian has performed very well on the Board? The review that will be shared with the voters will be in his favor, and this will be an advantage over the other candidates. So this review is something that I think has to be given to the BCEC, so they can see if this name has to be put on the slate. For the voters, I'm not sure it has to be seen.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It seems, Tijani, the problem I have with what you just said is that if the report is all very positive, then I would for sure want to re-elect that

person to the position. If the report was very negative then for sure I wouldn't want to put that person in that position. So I don't see where the fairness goes with the other candidates, because none of them can show a track record that's the same as the track records of the incumbents. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm going to have to leave as soon as I finish speaking. Thank you for the interesting discussion. All I'll say is what I said in the chat – we're describing life. If the report is superb then yes, indeed, the incumbent has a strong lead, and as Olivier said, maybe that's how it should be.

If the report is rotten then so be it, that's life, you live by your record. It happens in real life. I'm not quite sure why this should be different, but in any case, interesting discussion. I wish you luck. I've got to go. Bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Bye.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Bye Alan.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Take care Alan.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan for this. Tijani, and then we'll close the debate.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. What Alan said… yes, I think that we may have a very good Board Member with a very good review from the Board, for the benefit of ICANN, and it's very good for ICANN, but perhaps this Member didn't do anything for ALAC, he didn't do anything for At-Large, he didn't even try to help for the At-Large projects? I don't think it's the one that I will elect.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we're starting to go into the philosophy of voters' minds, and everyone would probably choose a different point of view for the different weight on all of these different things. That's how you end up with different votes, at the end of the day. If everyone thought the same way then we would not need a vote because people would all, unanimously, choose the same person. So it's a bit more complicated than… Evan, you've got the last word and then we've got to move on.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, Olivier, I got the impression that you raised this issue with the intention of getting some closure. I don't know if what we've done around the table here is doing that.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think we've got any closure on this…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Right now, if I had my preference right now, and it's a matter of either it's available to voters with non-disclosure, or if it's not available, I really would have to go in the direction of making it available. If you have a situation where one person has a voting record and the rest are all unknown, well, that's every election that we've ever had that involves an incumbent.

So I think we have 20 voters who are sufficiently capable of dealing with that. The whole thing of the devil you know versus the devil you don't, or whatever, as Alan said, that is life. That is what elections are. You have one person that has a known voting record, and a bunch of contenders that don't. Every election with an incumbent has that situation and the world hasn't fallen apart because of it.

So I really want to, at this point, emphatically speak in favor of if it's a [blanary? 01:21:10] decision between disclosure with an NDA, or a non-disclosure, I hardly go in favor of having the disclosure. The voters are going to be limited as it is with the information at hand, so if we've got stuff that's going to make their job easier, let's do it. Thanks.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Evan. What about asking the current Board Member and asking whether they mind if that information is shared, prior to the information being published?   At the end of the day, it is personal information that's being shared.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Then that ends up being totally personal determination of whether or not he thinks it's going to be useful or not useful to him. I'm not quite sure that's an appropriate question.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If, asking it before the 360' or whatever you call it, the review is done…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Let's go with 'the third degree' instead of 360',

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, the third degree. If asking before the third degree gets done, would that…?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: If he anticipates the result will be negative, he will not want it released, even before it comes out, if he anticipates the results will be negative. I'm just saying, I don't know if that's the most appropriate thing. I don't know if the person being evaluated is the best judge of whether or not the information should be made public.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I could certainly ask the question, and then if I get the answer saying, "I don't mind if people want to have access to it," then that's fine. I guess that would probably pay in their favor for transparency. If, on the other

hand, they say, "Well, I really wouldn't want it to be there," I think that's understandable as well.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The only other thing I wanted to mention, Olivier, and I'm sorry, I know you want to close this off, but the only last thing was the criteria are pretty clear – not whether or not somebody represented At-Large, not whether or not they represented ALAC, but whether or not the last set of 20 that voted, whether or not what they thought they were getting was what they got.

That was somebody on the Board to represent the interests of end-users, not any constituency. I think that's the important thing and we have to always be cognoscente of that. The fiduciary duty of every Board Member is to ICANN, not to any constituency, so our question right now is, "Did that person bring the perspective of end-users to the Board in a way that the 20 voters last time were hoping to get?"

I think that's the main question, as opposed to whether or not they represented anyone. Thanks.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If the review would be about whether the incumbent has brought the concerns of end-users to the Board, I agree to disclose it, to make it

available to all voters. If it's about how some Members of the Board think about this Member, I don't agree, because as I said it will be something personal that doesn't have to be disclosed. I think that we have to be very careful about that.

It's right that the Member is representing himself. He's speaking about the interest of ICANN, but also about the interests of the end-users. Thank you. Last point, if you want to ask Sebastian whether he wants the review to be public, or not, if he answers yes then I don't have any problem with that.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I think that's one thing I can take as an AI. I'll write to Sebastian and ask what his point of view would be with regards to sharing that information. We'll come back to you on that. With regards to making a choice as to whether to publish or not publish, I know there are still some deep disagreements.

I know that it's not a clear black and white situation. I don't think we need to know right away. We'll probably need to make a decision by January, and I ask you all to mull on this still. Evan, is that a new hand?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, that's an old hand. You asked for closure. I'm not going to dwell more.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to give you an idea on what a 360' is – and I know that some are calling it a 360' or not a 360', and I'm not sure whether it's the same system that will be used – there has been a 360' conducted in the past on some people in ICANN. I have a copy of the questionnaire, which I think comes from the 360online.net. I'm not sure whether that works. No, that gives you a password. Okay.

The questions that are asked, effectively, here, in the 360' that I filled out, there were 79 questions. The questions were of the type, "The individual has a compelling and clear picture for the future of the business and organization." "The individual develops results-oriented strategies to achieve and maintain competitive advantage." "The individual articulates a compelling strategy for integrating technology into the strategic plan," etc., etc.

There are tons and tons of questions; 79 altogether. I wonder if I could actually try and do a cut and paste, or find a way to send you the list of the sort of questions so you know what kind of questions are probably going to be asked. I'm sure it would be modified for Board Members, but this was for some staff in the past. Let's move on with just that one AI, for Olivier to ask Sebastian what his thought is with regards to the sharing of that peer review.

Now, back to the Agenda. We're now on Agenda Item #5 – ALAC meeting schedules during the ATLAS II. As you know, we've got the ATLAS Summit and Tijani has been working with the events group to build a schedule of all of the events that will take place, basically. One of

the things is that we also have our At-Large and ALAC schedule that we need to think about.

As you may see – and I wished we had a link somewhere – can someone put a link to Tijani's suggested schedule for ATLAS II please? We've got the ALSes that will all be there. The reason I'm bringing this up right now is because we need that schedule ready by January. We've got the ALSes that will all be there – 160 of them. The Saturday and the Sunday will be primarily devoted to the At-Large structures.

First question is, do we want to go and have a normal – normal as in our usual ALAC Sunday meeting with all of the discussions and staff updates, etc., etc. – meeting? Bearing in mind there might be the impossibility of doing this, because in the list of rooms that we're using, I believe that the ALAC room is one of rooms that will be used by the ALS meeting.

So, we've got Saturday with a whole number of parallel sessions – thank you for the link, Tijani, in the chat – and we've got the Sunday with the parallel sessions, which means, what happens to the ALAC sessions? Firs question. Second question, we've then got the Monday. We could move the Sunday working sessions over to the ALAC working sessions on the Monday, but we also have to remember that we'll probably – the ALAC – be asked to take part in a number of cross-community events.

If you remember in BA there was a cross-community discussion that took place in the main hall, immediately after the opening ceremony. This is likely to continue, especially since there will be a huge emphasis on ICANN as a community. We might not have as much time as we thought we might have on Monday. Then on Tuesday, it's usually

constituency day. This is the day when all of the constituencies focus on themselves and on meeting with other constituencies.

That's likely to remain for the time being, and therefore the ALAC would be meeting with the GAC, would be meeting with the Board, would maybe be meeting with the ccNSO, with whoever it is. Again, that would probably clash with some of the RALO and At-Large Working Groups. If you look at the current schedule, you've got RALO and At-Large Working Groups on this. We haven't got the ALAC and regional leadership working sessions, which Tijani suggested to move to Wednesday.

I thought we could keep it on Tuesday, but of course this is all moving all over the place at the moment. I guess I've confused you all enough and I can open the floor. Tijani, you can follow up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier, for that. I would like to say that we have, now, almost a confirmation of Saturday and Sunday having five rooms for the breakout session. The breakout sessions will be the core work of the Summit, because we'll discuss the themes and we'll have reports from those themes that will constitute, at the end. A compilation of those reports will constitute the statement of the At-Large from the Summit.

So this is the main issue, the main work of the Summit. Saturday and Sunday I think that no other work of the ALAC can be done. It's not only because of the unavailability of the room. It's also because the ALAC

Members have to be deeply involved in those Working Groups so that we can have a good output from those groups.

For the other days I'm okay with any suggestion, and I'm asking Heidi, I'm even insisting on asking about what she thinks the structure can be. It is more a problem of the logistics than anything else. I'm waiting for her feedback. The most important thing is to have Saturday and Sunday for the groups and to have Thursday morning for the plenary for the Summit, to agree on the Final Report that will be the statement of the Summit. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I saw Evan earlier had put his hand up. I'm not sure whether it was to do with this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm just going to defer, and also given the fact that I have really not had a lot to do with the Summit, so I feel myself at a bit of a disadvantage offering advice on it. I'm just going to have a look at the schedule and see if there's any input I can give. I'm pretty satisfied with what the group's been doing.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. I note that Holly has put in the chat a question, which is: "Can we each have time to look at the schedule and get back to Tijani?" This is not getting back to Tijani, this is getting back to us on the ALT list, which is to really see… let's do the AI then. We have to work

with Heidi and with the Meetings Team, to let them know whether we're going to keep the constituency day and all of these other days.

It will also depend on room availability, etc., but I understand and hear from Tijani that Saturday and Sunday look as though they will be entirely for the ALSes. So we'll be losing our Sunday. I'm going to ask a simple question. Should we lose our Sunday altogether, or should we move it to somewhere else in the week?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: At the threat of possibly being redundant or in conflict with something I'm unaware of, perhaps if there's something that we've traditionally done on Sundays that might be extended to the Summit, and that is at the end of every Sunday ALAC Members and the regional leaderships are sort of assigned – these people go to the GAC, these people go to the NCSG, these people go to various things; we have assignments.

Perhaps that might be extended to some of the ALS reps, which would help deal with having everybody and everything going on on Tuesday, and perhaps having sign-up sheets where people can express particular interest in particular things, and then we can keep track of who's doing what. Then perhaps later in the week, as we often do Thursday, we could get a bit of a debrief. It's simply doing things almost exactly the same way, just on a much bigger scale. I'm wondering if either that's being considered, or it's a dumb thing to do. If it is then I apologize.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I don't think that we will be able to have our Sunday in the same format, because we will not have a full day from 9:00 until 19:00. I think that we can split it into two or three parts to be organized on the various days. It depends a lot on what we need, what we want. I think that since we have the Summit, we have to be aware that we have to not organize the kinds of meetings that we normally organize, because we will not have time or the place to do it. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The question was whether we were going to be removing our ALAC session altogether, or whether we were going to replace it elsewhere in the week. What I understand at the moment is that we might be able to slice it up and keep maybe a sub-set of those sections to keep our ALSes involved as well. Then we'd have to remove some other parts. I also hear that they might also have to be moved to other parts of the week, they wouldn't be removed altogether. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Before I comment, instead of talking about moving bits and pieces, we need to be clear about what we mean about what we mean about which bits we think are critical to saving or not, and I'm concerned about moving them into the rest of the week, because for some of us the rest of the week is attending a lot of other meetings just to get across the issues across ICANN.

I'd hate to think that we're going to lose the ability to do that, just because suddenly our days have gone and we wind up having three or four days where we're talking to each other and the other day or two is all we've got left to talk to the rest of ICANN. I'm not sure which bits and pieces of Sunday people think have to be saved, and I just don't think we can solve this in the next three minutes either.

I think we need a discussion offline to see what elements we think, individually, are important; what needs to be saved, and to preserve our ability to also go to attend a lot of other meetings. Thanks.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Holly. I think we've gone around the globe in one turn now, and that's a good one because we've actually managed to see all angles of this problem, so I'm glad that we are. Let's follow up until January. I'll leave your holiday period to ponder about this one. Maybe after your turkey, or maybe on New Year's Day, if you want to come up with some good resolutions, think of this. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Tomorrow at 16:00 we will have a call of the Events Sub-Group of the Summit, so please come there for the discussion if you want to discuss this more. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. This takes us to the last Item on our Agenda, and that's Any Other Business. Seeing no one put their hand up I'm glad to

say thank you to all of you for this long-ish call. It's been a couple of hours and 45 minutes. I think we've moved along quite well. It's not a couple of hours, is it? Anyway, it's been long. Thanks to all of you. Have a great holiday break. I think we all need some of that. We've got an enormous amount of work next year for all of us.

I really appreciate those of you who are in the early hours of the morning in the Antipodes; Julie, Maureen, Holly… Goodness, that's a lot of people. We now have critical mass over there. We might have to rotate these calls at some point. Seeing the amount of feedback for the rotation of the Internet Cross-Community Working Group, that's going to be fun. Having tasted some of this rotation, by being on the APRALO call the other day at 5:00 am, I feel your pain.

Thanks to all of you and thanks very much to staff for having supported us this full year. Knowing so well that we've got an even busier year next year, if you weren't there, this whole community would collapse.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Not so fast! There's going to be a couple of us still coming around another 12 hours from now.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's true, but this is the last ALT call of this year.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The CCWG thing.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, there's the CCWG, there's all sorts of things. There are a number of calls still on my Agenda as well. Thanks to all of you. This call is now adjourned, so have a great holiday time. Goodbye everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]