OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the ALAC January conference call on Tuesday, 28 January 2014. The time is 15:02 UTC. I'll ask Gisella for the roll call, please.
GISELLA GRUBER:	Thank you, Olivier. On today's call, on the English channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Holly Raiche, Evan Leibovitch, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro, Oksana Prykhodko, Peter Knight, Ron Sherwood, Garth Bruen, Roberto Gaetano, Siranush Vardanyan.
	On the Spanish channel, we have Leon Felipe Sanchez Ambia, Fatima Cambronero, Aida Noblia, Alberto Soto, Maritza Aui.
	On the French channel, we have Hadja Ouattara, Pierre Dovonou Lokossou.
	We also have Julie Hammer and Murray McKercher with us.
	From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	And Heidi Ullrich.

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

GISELLA GRUBER:	And Heidi Ullrich. Sorry, Heidi. Welcome. Our interpreters today on the French channel are Camila, and on the Spanish channel we have David and Veronica. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. I see Garth Graham has joined as well. I'll add his name. Have I left anyone else off?
	If I could also please then remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes but also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel. And please also do speak at a reasonable speed for the interpreters.
	And Antonio Medina Gomez has just joined the Spanish channel.
	Thank you. Over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Gisella. And welcome, everyone, to this first call of the ALAC in 2014. I hope you've all had a good New Year's break, and best wishes to everyone on the call.
	Let's start with the adoption of the agenda and a call for any other business or any other amendments on the agenda. I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so the agenda is therefore adopted.
	Let's go to the review of the agenda items from our last call last year on 17 December 2013. In there, we have just one open action item that is ongoing with Matt working with Dev Anand Teelucksingh and myself on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of At-Large action items. We still haven't found the best solution for this. Let's try and select something, and we'll try and put for something for the next call.

Going swiftly at the bottom of the page, the newly assigned action items, the first one is for Olivier to follow up with Sally Costerton on the need to expedite visa issuance for London. I have e-mailed Sally Costerton, who is well aware now. I mean, I have spoken to her in December already but then also e-mailed her as [inaudible], and she has followed up with the Meetings Team and with the people who deal with the visa issuance.

There is one thing that one needs to know that there is in general any letters – invitation letters – are drafted by the host of the meeting, so that's one thing which will need to be done by a third party. But there's this understanding that it might be worth the if the ICANN themselves also send a note, a letter of support on ICANN letterhead.

So it is in hand. I, unfortunately, have nothing to relate back to you on this because I believe that Sally has not had any feedback yet. But on the earlier call today – or yesterday for some of you – in the APRALO region, an action item was asked of me to follow up and put more pressure and try and get an answer sooner rather than later.

Next, 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. There is actually a follow up on this. In fact, Maureen has put a follow up at the bottom of the page. Maureen, do you wish to touch on this now, or do you wish to include this in the ccNSO report?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. I don't mind leaving it until later or now. Whatever you want.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, let's leave it until later then so that it's all clean and so on. We know that this is ongoing. I think that we can say that the action item assigned to Heidi has been completed since the matter is in hand with the joint working group from the ccNSO and the liaisons. So we'll get the update in a moment from you.

Next, Silvia is to check the accuracy of the ATLAS II Organizing Committee list. Silvia Vivanco has come back to me and provided me with some details, and I think that the mailing list is all in order. Silvia, is that correct?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Olivier. It is completed. I checked with Carlos Reyes, and he has completed the accuracy of the mailing list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much, Silvia. So that's done as well.

Next, Olivier is to send a letter to the chair of the Board with the copy of the minority statement on the Draft Final Report on Protection of International Government Organizations and International Non-Government Organizations Identifiers in All gTLDs. There was a statement that the ALAC made, and then after that the ALAC also submitted a minority statement in the overall report that was submitted. And then Alan Greenberg made a copy of this and suggested some text as well, which was suggested on the mailing list.

Now just to let you know, the process has gone on. The correspondence has been sent to the public comment process, and I have also followed up with the chair of the Board with a copy of the minority statement. I don't think that the Board has looked at it yet, but I understand that the Board will soon be going into one of their intersessionary meetings somewhere. I don't know whether they will be looking specifically at this or not, but at least it's in hand as well, ongoing.

Next, Heidi is to send a call for members for the Non-PDP Cross-Community Working Group Design Team, and Matt is to add all members to the mailing list once the call for members is completed. Heidi, could you please provide us with an update on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Olivier. That is still in progress, and I will do that ASAP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Any questions/comments on the action items? I see Alan Greenberg. You have the floor, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. On that last item, the group was officially formed at the last meeting, and there is a call out for membership. I'm sorry. It's not official. It will be meeting very soon. The charter was approved. So it really is urgent that we get people involved with that.

That's the one that we complained violently last time but never actually submitted a comment to the GNSO. And the process is going forward,

so we need to make sure we're participating. We can't complain afterwards if we don't. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. So, Heidi, if you could…

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, sorry to interrupt.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: May I just confirm that's there's French interpretation on [inaudible]. Sorry. Just asking Camila if there is French interpretation as Hadja Quattara is telling me that she does not hear anything.

CAMILA (INTERPRETER):   Yes, I'm still here. I'm checking with the operator to see if they can hear me.

GISELLA GRUBER: Lovely. Olivier, if we can just clear this before we continue. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella, for this alert. What I can do is to go slowly to ask for any more questions or comments regarding the newly assigned action items and at the same time ask you, Gisella, if there is feedback from Hadja on the interpretation if she is able to hear. Technical issues are sometimes something that happens.

There's also a question from Sandra if there is an audio bridge today in the Adobe Connect room. I was under the impression that there was.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was working before.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier? I'm sorry, Olivier. I'm only using the Adobe Connect, and I can confirm there is audio.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is audio? Okay, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, absolutely. I am too. Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl.

GISELLA GRUBER: Let me please just confirm from Hadja.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 2014 sounds like the fun year for technical issues if we start like this. We're currently awaiting for Gisella. Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Hadja can still not hear us. We're going to disconnect her line and call her back straight away. It will probably take a couple of minutes. Apologies for the inconvenience.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Gisella. In the meantime, I think we're going to have to move forward. I realize we do have a quorum, so we can continue forward. Apologies to Hadja, but we do have a lot of people on the call today and some have not very much time here.

Let's move to the next part of our call since we have gone through the action items, which is the review of the current ALS applications. For this, I will ask is it Julia or Nathalie or who? I think Nathalie is not on the call, so I'm not quite sure who is going to deal with those applications. Someone from staff.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, Olivier. Normally, Matt does that or Nathalie, but neither of them are on the call. So I'm going to review them as they are on the agenda. So the recently certified ones are the Fédération Comorienne des Consommateurs and the Hispanic Educational Technology Services. And those that are – I'm sorry. Just a moment, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perhaps I should take them then?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, sorry. I'm just checking something out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's go for this. Recently certified At-Large Structures: first, we have the Internet Society Bangladesh Dhaka Chapter who has integrated in APRALO. Then we have the Internet Society Pakistan Islamabad Chapter, also in APRALO. Then we have the Internet Society Japan Chapter, also for APRALO and the Capital Area Globetrotters in the NARALO region.

Just to let you know, the Dhaka Chapter and the Pakistan Islamabad Chapter and the Japan Chapter were people whom several of us have met at the IGF in Bali last year. So that really is a direct follow up from our activities in Bali, and I'm glad that they have joined and that we've managed to grow the region, grow one of our regions significantly.

Next, we have organizations that are currently undergoing the accreditation processes: the Internet Society Kenya Chapter. As you might know, the ALAC vote is still currently open. It's actually somehow open and suspended until we have more information on the website which currently is not running. I think several of us are feeling a little uneasy about accrediting an organization that doesn't have a website that is currently running. So I think the suspension is indefinite until we

actually have more information and until we have confirmation the website is running.

Then there is an organization called Age Numerique in AFRALO. Regional advice is currently being sought. And then a very recent application, Fundetic Bolivia, where due diligence is currently being carried out. That's in the LACRALO region.

Are there any questions or comments? Oh, I see two people. So let's see first Tijani Ben Jemaa. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Do you hear me, Olivier? Do you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well, Tijani. Please, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. I would like to say something about ISOC Kenya. I saw a lot of comments on the list saying that there is not [inaudible]. We cannot [inaudible] this kind of [inaudible], etc. I would like to remind you that [inaudible] experienced exactly the same problem in the past. Why, Olivier, you came to Tunisia and participated in one of my events in Tunis. My ALS was very active. Our work website was down, and it was down exactly for the same reasons.

So this is a problem that the [inaudible] may face because people are coming and going and, unfortunately, they don't do the required things

before they come or they go. In this particular case, the administrative and technical contact was someone who went out and they couldn't have anything from him. And they couldn't do anything for the site since they are not allowed even to pay for the next period.

So they didn't [inaudible]. It was partly because they didn't pay, and they didn't pay because they weren't contacted. The contact was absent, wasn't there. And the contact didn't [inaudible], didn't help any, didn't feel a responsibility to transmit the information.

So now they have this problem, and my problem with them is that they don't want, [inaudible] didn't want to give me all the details, but I have feedback from ISOC [inaudible] from [Christine] who is in charge of the development of chapters in the whole ISOC. And here [mail] was very clear. ISOC Kenya is in good standing and is active. [inaudible] with the African bureau chief, if you want, of ISOC, he said exactly the same thing.

So I cannot accept that we refuse this ALS because they have a problem today with their website. We can defer the accreditation for some time, but we cannot reject it. In my point of view, it will be a real – I think it will be a pity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. So let's go through the list first, and then I'll try and summarize. Alan Greenberg is next.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have no problem with the website being down. Problems happen. What I do have is their lack of any interaction with us. I personally volunteered when it was still possible – and now it probably isn't anymore – to intervene if the problem was the contact had disappeared. And the contact – which thanks to Garth I verified – was a Web design company. I said I could probably intervene and get the name transferred to someone who was a principal in ISOC Kenya, and we got nothing back.

My concern is if we send things to them and Tijani who knows them personally sent things to them and didn't respond, that's the part of the problem I find troubling. Not the fact the website per se is down but the fact that it was down for a long time, we offered help, nothing came back. That kind of silence I find problematic. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Next, we have Evan Leibovitch. Evan, is it specifically on this or something else?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes, actually, I have a comment on this but something else to add. So if there is more to – anyway, I was one of the people that raised the issue about this and asked for originally the suspension, but the vote has simply been extended. I had asked the questions about the responsiveness. I'm satisfied with the answers which Tijani gave which have been given previously either in e-mail and elsewhere.

EN

Tijani, if you could relay back to the folks that we know that we're all dealing in good faith. I think as Alan suggested that this was simply a matter of hoping that they would be proactive in answering us on their own. You provided basically all the answers to the questions I could ask, and they're all satisfactory to me.

I guess my own take on Alan's comment is that we would hope that if this is going to be an ongoing ALS, it's going to be an active participant in AFRALO and in At-Large, that we not have to prod them so hard for questions, that they're capable of coming to us and being proactive of letting us know what's going on.

Anyway, I'll just leave it at that. I voted in the vote. I'm happy with the questions that have been answered and so on. And so yes, Olivier, I had another question. If you want me to wait on that until later, I'm happy to do so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, please, go ahead, Evan. Please, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I know that the ATLAS II issue is coming later on the agenda, but there's something related to this issue. And I just wanted to ask about the status of what the cutoff was for ALS applications that were eligible to participate in the summit and to find out what the status of their inclusion is.

I've heard from a couple of newly-minted ALSes that, in fact, have gone through approval and have been voted on by ALAC. But they said that in

some cases they've had difficulty either receiving the survey or participating in any of the prerequisites, and they're concerned that they may be denied from going on a technicality.

So I don't know who would be the best people to talk to about this. I just want to ensure that people that some of the ALSes that have been approved to go and that everybody that is eligible to go that we've confirmed with them that they've received the survey. I don't want anyone to be denied because of a technicality on we think they received the survey and they didn't answer, and they never got it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. I note from the chat that Heidi has asked you to send [inaudible] a note to list which ones of the ALSes you're speaking about.

I know of at least one ALS that has e-mailed me and has asked about the status of whether they were going to go to London or not. They had received the link to the survey as sent by staff, but they weren't quite sure whether they were included in this or not. And then I told them as long as they reply to the survey and fill it in, then of course that will get them on the listing of the ALSes that will travel over to London.

I still see three hands up. I'm not quite sure whether these are old hands. I have a feeling that they are. But Tijani has his hand up still. So, Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Two things: first, about ISOC Kenya, it's right that [inaudible] didn't give me the information of the WHOIS that should be on the WHOIS for the new contact, but [inaudible] interacted with me and he sent an e-mail saying they are working on it. He thinks that it could be fixed very soon, but it is not fixed.

The ISOC [inaudible] sent me a very recent e-mail saying that ISOC is working with the chapter to fix this problem, so it is something which is in hand with ISOC. It's not only with the chapter of Kenya; it is the whole ISOC who is trying to fix the problem. This is one information.

The second point regarding the ALSes for the summit, the decision was made that the last date for accreditation of the ALSes to be in the summit was 31 December. So any ALS who was certified before 31 December will be accepted to be in the summit. The others wouldn't because it is an endless process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Actually, I think I need to correct you on the last point you made. Any ALSes that have applied before the 31st, not that were certified, that was my understanding. The application needed to be in before the 31st because, as we know, for some it might take a little longer time for them to get accredited and others might be accredited a little faster. So the application time is the deadline. Any ALS that applies now in January will not be going to London, will not be included in London.

With regards to the ISOC Kenya application, I guess it's a touchy thing. The point which I think Alan was trying to make – and I know how Alan

doesn't say those things – but Alan was the chair of the post-expiry domain name resolution policy development process. I guess no one knows the policy better than he does, and I think his help would have made a real difference, especially since he also knows all of the parties involved properly. It's a bit of a pity that ISOC [inaudible] they can fix this more easily than making use of Alan's help, but such is life.

I'm inclined to say we will leave it suspended until we have more concrete information on this. As you know, the application was filed in December, so it doesn't actually hinder on any chance of ISOC Kenya to make it to London. The only thing that it hinders is for them to provide their input in the At-Large survey for the ATLAS II survey.

But I do have a question if that community is going to integrate our community, if that ALS is going to integrate our community, it really needs to know that it's going to need to interact with this community, and I'm a bit concerned that we have them join and then we don't hear anything from them. So it would be helpful, Tijani, if you could please put the people from that organization in touch with Alan and follow up a little bit more on this.

Let's not spend more time on that. Is there any question or comment on anything else regarding the ALSes? I don't see anyone put their hand up, so let's go on then and let's move on to the next agenda item, and that's the reports. Now, the different reports we have are all linked to the agenda page. We've got the working group reports, and we've got the RALO and liaison report, and we've also got the monthly reports from all of what's going on basically here.

We've got the three links that are there. Usually I guess we just look through the liaison reports for the GNSO, the ccNSO, and the SSAC. Let's start with the GNSO liaison report with Alan Greenberg. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The last meeting was held last Thursday. The report is online. The only two items I'm specifically focusing on are the one we already mentioned, the cross constituency drafting team looking at rules for cross constituency working group [inaudible].

And the working group on what is being called GNSO metrics and reporting has been chartered, and there will be a solicitation for membership as soon as the name is changed to something more meaningful. That's a request I made.

This is a group looking at what registrars/registries can report to highlight abuse issues. And this is not a PDP at this point, just a working group looking for best practices, although it could become a PDP type consensus policy later. I think it's a critical issue because it focuses on the types of abuse many of them that we have been concerned with.

So the working group is being formed, and the announcement will be made soon. Once it is, I'll highlight it to the ALAC and hopefully we can get some people participating in it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Any questions for Alan Greenberg on his report? I don't see anyone having put their hand up, so let's go to the

ccNSO liaison report with Maureen Hilyard. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan, thank you. Thank you, Olivier. I would like to report that Cheryl and I had a very amicable discussion with the ccNSO [inaudible]. And I think we really tried to address the issues that were raised at our last meeting so that we have a meeting planned in Singapore for Monday lunchtime and the [inaudible] of course in my report that's online.

But I think their [inaudible] concern is that their meeting does prioritize the role of the ccTLDs and the ALSes so that each group can actually understand. We've got a lot of new people onboard, so it's going to help everyone understand what each group does. And also there was a request for some discussion about common Internet governance issues which we will [inaudible].

Secondly, I attended the freedom of interpretation meeting, and because there was a lack of a quorum we were unable to discuss the ALAC's response to the public consultation, the revocation paper. So that will come up in our next meeting. [inaudible] for his liaison report as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. I think someone is not muted. We do have some interference. Any questions for Maureen Hilyard on her ccNSO report? Maureen, did you let us know a little bit about the

progress on the working group at the moment to prepare for our face-to-face meeting with the ccNSO?

MAUREEN HILYARD: There is the meeting that I just discussed about the Monday lunchtime meeting with the ccNSO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please. Yes. That's for Singapore.

MAUREEN HILYARD: You mean there's a [conflict]? I think I just mentioned that the topics that we will be covering include the role of the ccTLDs and the ALSes so that we get an understanding of what they each do and Internet governance issues. Are there any questions about that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There could be. Really, it's down to seeing if we will have an agenda ready by the time, and I guess you could probably give us an update at that time.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry. Yes, there will be updated – we have another meeting just before Singapore, and a proper agenda will be issued.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Maureen. We have a question or a comment from Tijani Ben Jemaa, and then we've got Cheryl Langdon-Orr afterwards. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Last time, I spoke about the work which was done by [inaudible] and Ron about the ALSes and the ccNSO [inaudible] ICANN, etc. So I tried to find it. Unfortunately as we know, last year my hard disk crashed, so I didn't have the whole data. I asked [inaudible], and he's on travel now but he promised to give me the link when he is back. When I get the link, I will send it to Maureen so that perhaps they try to plan on what was done already. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Tijani. Next, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. I'll just speak to Tijani's point beforehand and then get back to the other item. Thanks for that, Tijani. That's very important that that is shared. As we all know, that was a very useful snapshot, and there have been a number of new ALSes and ccTLD members to the ccNSO since then.

But that dataset is a victim to being on social text and, yes, it is a page that undoubtedly also will exist somewhere in an archive in an old form. And indeed, Ron's on the call. Ron may also have a copy of any of the presentations and final data.

But it does definitely need to be repositioned in a new wiki page because not only is there a desire for mutual work between both Maureen and Ron on behalf of the ALAC and the ccNSO to continue on that but a number of the regions – APRALO, for example has done additional work now specifically in [their] Asiana sub-regional team. So we need to build on that, and it is very annoying that it's one of the important pieces of work that is lost in the bizarreness of social text pages disappearing.

What I wanted to say, Olivier, is to assure you about the agenda. We actually have fleshed out, I think, quite a very good agenda, and it was in fact to go to Heidi and should be passed on to you and the rest of the ALAC executive if not the ALAC as a whole for approval. I'm surprised that hasn't already been done. That was a staff-to-staff action item out of our meeting.

But rest assured. We have enough of an agenda to go up on the site already, and indeed it's a medium- and long-term plan because what the aim is is to build over a couple of meeting opportunities. And certainly there's even work we've looked at specifically for London.

So Tijani's point is important, but I'd also want to go back to your question on the ALAC and the ccNSO meeting on Monday lunchtime. Trust us. Maureen and Ron have got it very well in hand. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. We certainly are feeling better that the agenda is being built. We have Tijani Ben Jemaa. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Old hand, old hand. It was an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, it was an old hand. Okay, thank you. Okay, let's move on then with our liaison reports. As you can see, the next one is the SSAC liaison report. Then we have Julie Hammer who is on the call. Julie, you have the floor. Julie? Unfortunately, at the moment we are not able to hear you. I can't hear anything from Julie. Julie, I'm afraid we may have to…. We're getting some….

JULIE HAMMER: Are you able to hear me now, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you clearly, yes, but it's very, very noisy.

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, okay. It's clear. I'm hearing okay at my end. I'm getting a [inaudible] in some way. Okay, there's very little to report from SSAC. Two of the working groups are very close to producing reports. I think one [inaudible], possibly two will be ready for publication before Singapore. And that's probably all that I have to report. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Julie. I'm getting feedback as well now, so [inaudible]. Okay, that's fine. Thank you very much. So we do have one more just quick liaison report. I was going to ask Murray McKercher, our new .mobi liaison who is on the call, whether he could provide us with a very quick update as to what the progress has been with .mobi. Murray?

MURRAY McKERCHER: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. There is little to report at this point. The .mobi policy advisory group is meeting in mid-February. We haven't set a date. And as soon as I have more information, I will pass that along. And apologies for not getting that earlier [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Murray. Is there any date at which you will have the first meeting? What date did you say that was going to be?

MURRAY McKERCHER: The dates are being debated amongst the group. It's around 14 February. As soon as I have a fixed date, I'll let everyone know. And then, I can report back on our next call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, you can report on the next call. Thank you very much, Murray. That's absolutely great. Okay. Super. Let's then move on, and let's go on to the next part, which I believe we've got all of the [inaudible] RALO reports. I just want to thank all of the RALO leaders for providing us with

an update on what they've been up to. It's very helpful for all of the new ALSes joining for them to be able to catch up with what is going on.

Let's move now to the next agenda item if I can find my agenda altogether. Yes. There we are. We're now moving on to the new business items for decision. That's agenda item number 6, the policy development activities. I invite you all to look at the policy development calendar, which is linked, and the policy advice development page.

There are several adopted ALAC statements since our last meeting. The Study on WHOIS Misuse, the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Cross Community Working Group report, the request for written community feedback on the Geographic Regions Working Group recommendations have all been adopted.

There has also been correspondence on the protection of IGO and INGO identifiers that I've mentioned earlier to you. And we have also submitted another correspondence on the ALAC and LACRALO correspondence as a follow up about the Brazil conference and 1net.

There has been a reply on the ALAC and LACRALO correspondence as a follow up about the Brazil conference, and that response has basically been Fadi sending this on over to [inaudible] who is the person in charge of the 1net discussions. Sadly, no one from At-Large has been directly selected to be on any of these committees. I'm saying directly. We do have indirectly some people who are At-Large [friends] that are on the committee that have been chosen by the Brazil conference people as announced on the mailing list by Hartmut Glaser.

Statements or endorsements currently being developed, there are quite a few as usual. The first one is the draft criteria and process for selection of the multi-stakeholder Ethos award pilot program.

This is a program that ICANN has designed to answer some of the criticism that has been received that mostly the Board and chairs of supporting organizations, advisory committees, people high up in the ICANN structure often get all the thanks but do the least work. The real heavy lifting is done by people in working groups – in GNSO working groups and At-Large working groups and ccNSO working groups – and these people that do the heavy lifting are seldom recognized.

So this Ethos award will be awarded to someone who has effectively been very busy in working groups, some say at the bottom of the pyramid. I guess, in the bottom-up model that's really great.

What this consultation asks for is for you to have a look at the kind of qualities that people have to be able to receive that award. [inaudible] if you have any other suggestions as to what these people should have as qualities, then please bring them forward on this page.

Next, the draft vision, mission, and focus areas for a five-year strategic plan, the ALAC is currently voting on the statement which has been drafted by Tijani Ben Jemaa. So if you're interested in this, I guess the finance and budget subcommittee has been directly involved with the drafting of this as well and has provided its feedback.

The next one is the review of trusted community representation in the root zone DNSSEC key signing ceremonies. The whole dynamic naming system is now assigned using these digital electronic keys using DNSSEC.

At the top of the pyramid, you have these electronic keys that are effectively just a very complex set of numbers on a [USB] stick. And these are given to some trusted members of the community. So there is a review at the moment on how to select those trusted members of the community who meet – I don't know how many times – a few times a year face-to-face to update the key.

So Sala has volunteered a few hours ago to draft a statement on this. I'm not sure whether it is already on the wiki at the moment, but she has sent it over to staff so I hope that staff has been able to put it on the wiki. And, no, it's not on the wiki yet. Okay. Well, it will be on the wiki I guess after the end of this call, and I'll invite you all to comment on it. If more people want to be involved in the drafting process, then of course please bring your comments forward.

Alan, you have the floor. Your hand is up. Go ahead, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A few minutes before this meeting, there was another statement on the policy statements about one on the Spec 13, which disappeared it must have been moments before the meeting started. That was one that Evan and I were charged with saying whether a statement was necessary or not. My position was that a statement is not necessary because we weren't really going to comment on the Spec 13.

One of the things they asked was should they have a category for dot-brands, and we have talked about making a statement similar to ones we've made before saying that we want to go on record as saying that

we object to a new category being created for dot-brand when similar categories have been rejected for other types of domains such as the geographic ones, community ones.

I just put in the chat statement that we're suggesting I think it's reasonable that this be adopted without any large amount of public consultation or At-Large because it's simply a repeat of what we said before at a timely point. So I think both Evan and I would not object strongly if the ALAC does nothing. On the other hand, it is an opportunity to say something that we've said before and make a pointed comment.

We're talking about a one-sentence statement, and I'll read it. It's in the chat: "The ALAC has no input on the details of Specification 13 but wishes to go on record as objecting to the creation of a new category of gTLD at this point when earlier decisions were made to not have categories of TLDs supporting community, geographic, and other similar classes of gTLDs."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible] ALAC [inaudible] now, but it's up to the [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And maybe I'll do a quick consensus call in a moment. So if that's okay, you can see the statement. It's pretty short,

and it is actually in the comments on that policy page. If you cannot access that policy page since it appears to have disappeared from the ALAC agenda, then the link to it is over in the chat. I've just put it on just now. Have a quick read. It's at the bottom of that page in the comments section.

Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks a lot, Olivier. I got in the queue after Alan having talked to him about this at the beginning before the call started. And you mentioned you wanted a consensus call. If you would like this to be put forward in the form of a motion, I'm happy to make it at this time. I have something else to say, but first I just wanted to get through that. Did you want to do this as a consensus thing, or did you want to have a mover, a seconder, and a vote?

ALAN GREENBERG: A consensus call is an alternative to doing a vote. In either case, we need a motion.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. So if that's the case then, I would like to formally move the acceptance of the statement that Alan wrote in as a comment and has just now read into the record in this call as a statement on Spec 13 for us to approve and to forward to both the Board and those requesting the feedback. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I have another comment, but first I wanted to make the motion to approve this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. And we need a seconder for this, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have one. It's Alan in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Since this is going to be a statement that we send out if you want to change this into actually giving the green light for this statement to be sent out, so we're not going to conduct a vote online. I believe we have quorum, and so we could conduct a vote there and then right now on that. This is ICANN's for decision at the end of the day. Evan, your hand is still up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, I just wanted to know how you wanted to proceed with this before I mention my other thing.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I was going to suggest then that we have a formal vote with the hands up with the green ticks basically. Any of the ALAC members being in favor could vote with a green tick. For those people that are not on the Adobe Connect – those ALAC members that are not on the Adobe Connect – could they please make their vote known as well? And then staff will record the votes, and we'll read the votes to the record.

I think we can do that in a minute or so. I don't think that this is a particularly long statement, and I see already a lot of green ticks on the screen. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I simply said I have another unrelated issue to raise when this is done, so I just wanted to get an okay from you to move on. Okay, that's fine. So let's start. Staff, are you ready? And I'm not sure who will deal with the votes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, Silvia and I are going to take the votes. So if you wanted to again for the record state which PC this is for, that Evan motioned it and Alan seconded it, then we can take the vote.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Heidi. So the public comment is the At-Large proposal for a Specification 13 to the ICANN registry agreement to contractually reflect certain limited aspects of dot-brand new gTLDs.

EN

Now there is a link to this in the Adobe chat, which I believe – oh, where is it now? I put it in the Adobe chat; now it's not. Okay. There's a link to it. I believe that, Dev, did you put the link to it?

ALAN GREENBERG: The statement itself is in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The statement itself is in the chat. Thank you very much, Alan. So the suggested statement is: "The ALAC has no input on the details of Specification 13 but wishes to go on record as objecting to the creation of a new category of gTLD at this point when earlier decisions were made to not have categories of TLDs supporting community, geographic, and other similar classes of gTLDs." End of statement. Dev Anand Teelucksingh has also put a link to the page as well on the chat.

For those members who are ALAC members only who are in favor, could you please now put your green tick on the Adobe chat or vote in person.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have green ticks from everyone, all ALAC members who are on the call, nine of them.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, Olivier, we've just had Leon join as well, so I just wanted to make sure the Leon is aware of the vote.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Leon, are you aware of the vote?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, is he on the…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: He has put a tick on.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, he has ticked. Okay. And again, this is only for ALAC members. So those of you who are not ALAC members, can you please remove your green tick? Okay, Olivier, are you ready for staff to take the vote?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Maureen, you'll have to take your tick off, and I guess everyone else is an ALAC member so let's [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen is an ALAC member.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's Murray that had the green tick.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, Murray. Sorry. Yeah, sorry. My eyes are going wrong.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, are you ready, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm very ready. Go ahead, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So on the votes, those in favor, we have green ticks from Olivier, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Eduardo Diaz, Evan Leibovitch, Fatima Cambronero, Holly Raiche, Leon Sanchez, Maureen Hilyard, Sandra Hoferichter, and Tijani Ben Jemaa. So we're putting those names in the AC room, and I think that's…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is there anyone who is not in the AC room?

HEIDI ULLRICH: If you could, please, keep your green ticks up as we're just finishing noting the names.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so let's take your ticks off, please. And those who vote against this, could you please put a big red cross on this. Going once. Going twice. I don't see anyone putting a big red cross. Okay, and anyone who is abstaining, could you please now put your hand up. And that's, of

course, apart from Evan. As we know, Evan has voted in favor already. And I don't see any abstentions on there, so it is carried. Thank you. Alright.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, sorry. I just saw Hadja in the chat also said okay for me as well, and she said that during the vote. So I would suspect it may be that she doesn't know how to put a green tick up, but I would have assumed that her vote should go for the record. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And on the action item, I see the list at the moment in favor: Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Eduardo Diaz, Evan Leibovitch, Fatima Cambronero, Holly Raiche, Leon Sanchez, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond – please don't put Leon again a second time; I believe we've only go tone Leon Sanchez – and then Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sandra Hoferichter, and Hadja Ouattara. And that provides us with 12 people in favor. No, less than that – 9, 10, 11 people in favor. Is that correct, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, we're just taking the record, so we'll get back to you in just a moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, Silvia, did you finish?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes. I counted 11.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Silvia. So 11 in favor, and then no one voted against and no abstentions.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Olivier. Tijani also said yes, and he's not on there. So it's Tijani, so we have 12 in favor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 12 in favor. Okay, thank you. 12 in favor. 12 in favor, no abstentions, no one voting against. So this is carried, and therefore it will be sent over to the public comment process. Thank you very much. I'm sorry for the little slowness in going ahead with this.

                               Evan Leibovitch, your hand is up. You can now move forward.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. Actually, Olivier, what I wanted to do was to bring forward an issue that was an action item coming out of the executive committee to do with compliance. I wanted to sort of hand the floor over to Garth. There was some discussion about Garth and myself and Alan coming up

with something to bring forward to ALAC regarding ongoing compliance issues, and so while that hasn't happened, Garth has constructed a memo that he would like to propose for us to consider for moving forward. So with your indulgence, Olivier, I'd like to give the floor to Garth to explain this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. I've corresponded with Garth just now in the chat and suggested that we have this – let's see, looking at the agenda – as agenda item number 11 before the "any other business." So just after the working group updates.

Hopefully, we can fly through the rest of this agenda. The reason being that it's not an item that we will be able to make a decision on right now, so it really is an item for discussion. I think that – I'm not even sure if the agenda has been updated. I know that I have asked Heidi to update the agenda. No, the agenda has not been updated yet.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. We're getting to that right now. We're short staffed today. Apologies for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is that okay with you, Garth? Are you okay with having it as agenda item number 10?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan. It's fine with me, and I think I got a message from Garth saying it's okay with him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So let's move forward then swiftly. I realize we have been on the call for an hour already, so time is passing by. Let's go on now with the rules of procedure revision. That's the next part where we need to make a decision.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier? Sorry to interrupt.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes? Yes, go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Antonio Medina Gomez on the Spanish channel has a question, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, then. Please, Antonio, you have the floor. Antonio Medina, go ahead.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: This is Antonio speaking.

GISELLA GRUBER:	Olivier, sorry to interrupt, but Antonio's line has just dropped. We will try and reach him [inaudible] take the call then. I'll let you continue with the meeting. Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Gisella. It's just one of these days. Let's go to number 7 in our agenda, the ALAC rules of procedure revision with Alan who is going to provide us with a quick update and follow up. And he's probably going to be a lot more efficient at doing this than me. So, Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. In Buenos Aires, we decided to fill some gaps in the rules regarding the electorate for the Board seat election. Unfortunately, it fell through the cracks. That is, a motion was proposed – a motion which, incidentally, had a typo in it. Evan made the motion. It was seconded by Carlton who was not an ALAC member at the time therefore not valid. And then we forgot to do anything about it. I guess over the Christmas holidays it just fell through the cracks.
	So my recommendation is assuming the ALAC still intends to do this – and we did decide in Buenos Aires to do it – that we should do this with a vote at this meeting. And I believe it is pointed to by the agenda somewhere. Essentially, the substance is it gives…
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Olivier, Alan, sorry to interrupt. The link to the motion has been saved in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. The substance is it gives RALOs the ability to replace people who are not eligible to vote for one reason or another to make sure that all RALOs have their full complement of votes in the process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan, for this. And so the rule of procedure revision motion is linked over to the chat as we have at the moment. And so I guess we have to read through it first, and then we will need a proposer, a seconder, and we'll conduct a vote again on this.

So Motion for ALAC Revision, and the reason of course for the vote is in order to be able to move forward with this. The process is moving forward for the voting and also the fact that we have discussed this during the ALAC meeting in Buenos Aires. So this is really a follow up now.

Motion for ALAC Revision:

Whereas the ALAC approved revised Rules of Procedure on 03 April 2013 which came into effect on 03 October 2013;

Whereas the selection of the At-Large Board member occupying Seat 15 of the ICANN Board is in the process of being initiated;

Whereas the selection procedures were written with the intent of having four voters per ICANN region;

Whereas two Rules of Procedure omissions have been identified which could reduce the number of voters per region;

Whereas section 10.1.3 of the Rules of Procedure allow the ALAC to approve additional rules to two address these omissions; (and I think that there needs to be an amendment on this: "to two address" probably not, so "additional rules to address these omissions")

Whereas at its meeting in Buenos Aires, the ALAC discussed the proposed changes and decided to put them into effect by an vote after the close of the Buenos Aires meeting; ("by a vote" – please amend that error as well)

It is resolved that the ALAC approves the following two rules to the ALAC Rules of Procedure:

* If a RALO Chair position is not currently filled, or if a RALO Chair is not available to participate as an elector, or if a RALO Chair also holds a vote as an ALAC member, the RALO for his/her region will name a replacement for the purposes of the vote. This replacement must be approved by vote of the RALO according to its rules.

* If an ALAC member is unavailable to participate as an elector, the RALO for his/her region will name a replacement for the purposes of the vote. This replacement must be approved by vote of the RALO according to its rules.

And Alan added a rationale underneath which is that: "When first published there was a typo in it which is now corrected (a missing NOT

in the first resolved). The original form was moved by Evan but not seconded by any sitting ALAC member."

So we have a change in this. I would like a proposal, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan. I'm happy to re-move the motion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. And a seconder?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I'll second.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And finally, also I did ask that were there any last minute questions before we vote on this so that we're all aware of how we're voting. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, please. You might be muted, Dev. We cannot hear you.

VERONICA (INTERPRETER):   Sorry for interrupting you. Antonio Medina Gomez is back on the Spanish channel, and he has a question to ask you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Is this related to the rule of procedure revision?

VERONICA (INTERPRETER):   Yes. The question is related to the rules of procedure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So we'll first have Dev ask his question, and then afterward Antonio Medina Gomez. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. I hope everybody is hearing me. My question is regarding the – not that I don't disagree with the substance of the two rules – but shouldn't this be given a proper line number or say exactly where in the rules of procedure this is going to be?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Dev. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: We certainly can identify them. Since we were inserting them, I didn't think it was necessary in this text. But I could come up with the numbers quickly if we feel that's appropriate. It won't take but a minute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Let's go over to Antonio Medina Gomez. Antonio, you have the floor.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier. I think it is important to identify the point to be modified or the changes not only the position that was mentioned because it is usual to delegate these type of procedures within the RALOs. Olivier is to see if it is convenient and what problems may appear so that we can analyze this as an exceptional case.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Antonio. I believe you have finished your comment. Indeed, one of the reasons why this has appeared now is because of the fact that there has been much thought regarding the unavailability of some members in the voting in the electorate. And especially one of the conditions might be that there might be some RALO members that have some RALO that might be in the run for the election process. So the replacement of the voting members is something that is important.

I see Alan Greenberg has his hand up. Maybe you can add to what I've just said. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. That was an old hand. You can go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. So this really is the reason why there is this amendment now. For some reason, we have not addressed the unavailability of someone in the electorate to be able to vote. In the previous round of elections, there was a big question mark over this and one person got a proxy to vote on their behalf and the other person did

not get a proxy. Another member did not get a proxy to vote on their behalf.

It's all about trying to make this as clean as possible, and so this is a procedure that would actually make it quite clear and straightforward for any of the RALOs to be able to proceed forward with changing the person who actually holds the vote.

I have to remind you that as far as ALAC members are concerned, their vote is really up to them whether they wish to do a directed vote, if they wish to actually listen to the region that appointed them and perform the vote from the region or whether they want to vote on their own choice. But as far as the RALO leaderships are concerned, it is expected that they would be relaying the region's vote.

Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Several things. First of all, the case of a member of the [inaudible] of the electorate [inaudible] already addressed by the rules of procedure, so it will not be under those changes. Second point, the only possible case is a member of the electorate who is unavailable. Unavailable means ill or anything. But since the vote is generally electronic, I don't think that this is a barrier. Anyone can vote, even if he is not available physically.

So my concern as I stated very well in Buenos Aires is that we are changing the rules in the course of election. We are already in the process. This is what bothers me. I don't think that, first, we don't have

people who are at the same time a RALO chair and an ALAC members. We [inaudible], thank you very much. You served it in Buenos Aires. This is not the case now.

For the electorate being a candidate, it is already addressed in the rules of procedure. What is remaining? It is remaining that one electorate member is unavailable. And I think unless he is dead, he is killed, he can vote in any case, in anywhere he is, and in any condition he is. So if we can avoid changing the rules during the game, I think it's better for us. It's better for our credibility. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Alan, do you have any supporting, any thoughts on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I would question whether indeed anyone can vote as long as they're not dead. I would suggest that there are situations where that might not be the case. I don't feel very strongly about this.

Tijani is right that we know of no cases right now where this rule would kick in. We did solve the problem of someone holding two votes. Someone raised the issue of what happens if some BCEC member is suddenly made a chair between now and the vote. This rule would cover that, but we're not planning for that to happen.

We decided in Buenos Aires to go ahead with it, so I'm doing my part of the job of drafting it. Chances are it will not kick in for this election, which is why I don't feel particularly bad doing it. It is conceivable that

someone could be unavailable and the RALO would have a chance to replace them but could not if this rule is not approved. The chances are moderately small. I don't feel particularly strong about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. I think that the only way we can find out then, really, because I'm starting to sense we're going back into the discussion that we had in December and moving on. Why don't we just submit this over to a vote and everyone votes on whether they wish to have this or not have it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, you may want to read into the chat before you go. Just read into the record what [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I will, yes. This is not one of these things where it is a statement that requires a very, very strong vote as such to push something forward. And I guess that if we do have this vote that is a split vote, we will also be able to refer to this transcript record showing that it's not that people are against having this but it is that they don't feel that it is required as such.

Just on the transcript at the moment, Alan has provided some details as to possible numbers. Two new rules would be inserted in 19.10, but then they would shift all of the numbering forwards. And so Alan suggests that we shouldn't put the actual numbers in the motion itself. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I'm sorry. I just realized that we would approve this – if we do – not as an amendment to the rules, therefore there are no numbers. I erred on that one. This is being approved as the ALAC adding a rule not a change to the rules of procedure as such.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Aha.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a technicality.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that's an additional rule, basically?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, but they're not numbered. This would have to be done formally to change the rules of procedure in another time. This is simply putting additional rules the ALAC has the discretion to make. It's not a formal amendment to the rules, so sorry about that. They do not get numbers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. So we have this motion that is brought forward by Evan Leibovitch, seconded by Alan Greenberg, and I now ask for the vote to take place. For those who are in favor, could we please put a green tick on the Adobe Connect. And those people who are

EN

unable to do that, please, put it in the Adobe Connect chat or say it on the call. And of course, I'm speaking about the ALAC members only, please.

Maureen, you have your hand up. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry, Olivier. I just ticked the wrong one. I'm putting my hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So are we ready for the vote?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, Silvia is going to read your names out loud, and I will note them. So, Silvia, please?

SILVIA VIVANCO: We have Eduardo Diaz, Evan Leibovitch, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Fatima Cambronero, Holly Raiche.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Slow down, please. So Fatima. Okay.

SILVIA VIVANCO:	Okay. Shall I start again?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	No. Go ahead. Fatima…
SILVIA VIVANCO:	Holly Raiche, Leon Sanchez, Sandra Hoferichter. That's all.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Now, I have Alan.
SILVIA VIVANCO:	Ah, okay. Alan Greenberg, sorry, and Maureen Hilyard.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	And Olivier. So let's just go over that again. Sorry. Read again, please.
SILVIA VIVANCO:	Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Eduardo Diaz, Evan Leibovitch, Fatima Cambronero, Holly Raiche, Leon Sanchez, and Sandra Hoferichter.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	So we have ten in favor. The motion has passed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. Anyone voting against? I see at the moment Tijani Ben Jemaa voting against. And I note that Hadja at the moment is abstaining. So we have an abstention from Hadja Ouattara.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anyone voting against? Anyone else voting against the motion, please put a red tick, a red mark, a red cross on the Adobe Connect. I don't see any other red marks. No. So we have the abstention from Hadja. Anyone else abstaining? No one. Okay, thank you. So we have ten in favor, one against, and one abstention. And so I thank you all for this vote. This motion is carried, and so this revision is added to the rules of procedure. Thank you.

Let's move on. Number 8, establishment of an At-Large ad hoc ICANN accessibility working group. That's actually a very interesting, very good initiative. The ALAC is basically asked to make a consensus call on whether we should establish an ad hoc At-Large accessibility working group. We have Christopher Mondini who is with us on this call. Christopher, can you hear us?

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: Yes, hello. Can you hear me?

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you Christopher. You are regional vice president for North America, I believe.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I also note that Garth Bruen has also got his hand up in the chat on the Adobe Connect. Shall I just let you sort of go through a quick rundown on what the initiative is about, please, Christopher? And then I'll hand off over to Garth Bruen immediately after that.

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: Certainly. Thank you. I'll just give a little bit of background. I think you and the staff have summarized the gist very well in the notes that were circulated. But since taking on the role of vice president for global stakeholder engagement for North America, I've engaged with a number of At-Large leaders from this region but also from other regions during the ICANN meetings.

And specifically on three Internet user populations that include those that have a physical disability or physical challenge. Also some discussions on Aboriginal or Native American or First National groups. And also some conversations with one of your members about disadvantaged populations, vulnerable populations I think is the WSIS term. That includes refugees, displaced or trafficked people, abused people, and so forth.

And there is a great deal of knowledge and also passion about what I think could be two things worthy of exploration. One I think is the more challenging one, which is how ICANN's core role of coordinating addressing and identifiers in Internet resources might be deployed in some ways to improve accessibility for groups like these. And a second, more broadly and perhaps easier, would be ways to include the participation of these groups in ICANN policymaking, in accessibility to ICANN information resources, meetings, and so forth.

Working with some of the staff and some of these leaders, we came up with the idea of an ad hoc working group within At-Large with work streams or committees on each of these groups to really sit down and be a best practice clearinghouse and sounding board for what we can do in this area and see what we can learn in the coming weeks.

So that was the origin and background of the proposal that's before the group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Christopher. Next, Garth Bruen, please. You have the floor. Garth, you might be muted for the time being.

GARTH BRUEN: Alright. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So we've had a push in NARALO to recruit disabled user groups, and we have several prospects already. In general, in terms of dealing with the ad hoc group that has come up within At-Large, I would like to recommend that we have a teleconference as soon as possible before Singapore so we can help

EN

develop our agenda. So the quicker we get this group established and the quicker we get a teleconference going, the better we'll be able to work. And thanks for your help, Christopher.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth. And so I open the floor for questions or comments on this. I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl, you might be muted or dropped.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We dropped? Gisella, is she still on?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, you're back now. You're back. You must have broken up a little bit. I don't think we can hear Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I dropped for a moment. Sorry, I dropped for a moment. Are you hearing me now?

EN

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. Thank you. Thanks, Chris. That was an excellent background on a very important piece of work. And this way forward has my absolute support and I wanted to recommend it for the ALAC to approve at today's meeting.

Just to Garth's point, as he knows very well from the work on our unofficial little mailing list, there is every intention of having a meeting as soon as possible. And I believe there are already plans for a Doodle to go out for all of us to do that.

But I just wanted to point out that a number of regions, of course, already do have At-Large Structures who are specifically dedicated to interests of representing various classes of people who may find the accessibility issues we're discussing important. These are not, of course, just limited to physical disabilities, as Chris has outlined.

And I think this move by At-Large is sure to go ahead, and I trust it will. It's very much a watershed of turning point, one for ICANN, and just wanted to recommend it absolutely to all of you. Thank you.

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

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Hi, Olivier. I have a comment.

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

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you very much. I was actually looking forward to this part of the agenda and congratulate Chris and everybody who has been working hard to get to this point and just wanted to acknowledge the categories that have been listed so far. It's really, really awesome as to the [inaudible] persons, including indigenous [inaudible] sort of thing. Pending adoption by the ALAC, I'd like to also have it on record to have my name as one of the volunteers for the working group once it's adopted. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Thank you, Sala. This is noted. So I don't see anyone else in the queue to comment or ask questions. Oh, I see Eduardo Diaz. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to – I heard what has been proposed to have this as an ad hoc working group, and I'm wondering if it should be a standing group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eduardo. I'll take the question from Murray McKercher and then respond. Murray, you have the floor.

MURRAY McKERCHER: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to also congratulate everyone on this enterprise as it seems that it would bring the Internet community together not based on a geographical distribution but on one that we could all [inaudible]. I'll take that comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great, Murray. Thank you very much. Then next, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and then I'll answer the question which was asked by Eduardo Diaz. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Olivier, and in fact I wanted to respond to Eduardo. I think the ad hoc status is probably worthy at this time because in an ideal world this is something that is far beyond just the confines of At-Large interests but goes ICANN-wide.

So with Chris' support and assistance, this is something that we're going to into areas – and that's where the clearinghouse model is so useful in the design of this – this will go into areas that will probably be far more appropriately housed under a bona fide cross community nomenclature.

So don't get too tied up about standing versus ad hoc. I certainly believe all the work that needs to be done now can be done – from an At-Large perspective at least – as an ad hoc one and one that, of course, is as open as we always are but aggressively and very proactively open to all of the ICANN community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Yes, there was a discussion as to whether it was going to be ad hoc or whether it was a standing working group. There is a precedent in the At-Large ICANN Academy ad hoc working group which then became a cross community working group that benefited all of ICANN. And hence, the idea of also calling this group an ad hoc working group so as to move on and evolve into a large ICANN-wide working group as soon as we can. But of course, in many of these cases, At-Large is showing the way forward.

Okay. So I see no one else in the queue. I think that what we can do in order to move swiftly is to have a consensus call on this. Now, a consensus call is basically just me asking whether there's anyone who is opposed to this ad hoc working group being created. We've had time to discuss it, and we've heard from everyone here, and you've had time to ask questions.

So I effectively now do a consensus call and ask if there's anyone who is against the creation of this ad hoc working group. If you are, then please state your reasons or your concerns. I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so that means we have consensus here present that this working group should be created, and therefore, the working group will be created.

And we need to instruct staff, I guess. This is an action item to create the wiki page, etc., all of the things that work around with a working group with a link to our working group page. Heidi, could you please confirm that this will be created as soon as possible.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, yes, I confirm that all of the workspaces and mailings lists, etc., will be created shortly, and I believe a conference call is going to be scheduled as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe a first call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: First call, yes. So several things. So first call will need to be [inaudible] very shortly. I would suggest that we could have an interim chair as Cheryl who is well aware of how to create those working groups and the first steps forward into getting the wheels in motion for this. Are you okay with that, Cheryl? I see a green tick from Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Okay. That's fine, and she can launch this and move it forward. Thank you very much for joining us, Christopher Mondini, on this initiative.

I really am thrilled to see this moving forward. I know that there will be a lot of members. Definitely Sala, but we also have several At-Large Structures already involved who have people that are very interested in those issues, and I wish this working group real success and a big expansion to cover all of ICANN [inaudible] important.

EN

CHRISTOPHER MONDINI: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So let's move on then. I'm trying to look at my various screens and think, well, should we move forward? Let's move forward then with the next thing, the items for discussion. I realize we are already eight minutes beyond the original idea for the end of this call. I think half past was the time when we're supposed to finish. Are we okay with the interpretation? Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, we are fine with interpretation until 17:00 UTC, for another 22 minutes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. So let's move forward. The items for discussion, we have three of them. First is the Singapore meetings and agendas. The next one is the working group update. And then we have the item on ICANN compliance.

So first the Singapore meeting and agendas. For this, we've got a review of the meetings and agendas. I guess I'll have to ask staff for this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Olivier. Gisella and I are going to be sharing this item. Just for the speed of going through this, we have the ALAC meetings as regular on Sunday, on Tuesday. The wrap-up on Thursday this time again for three

EN

hours as that has worked well. An ALT call for three hours on Friday. I'm going to hand it over to Gisella for the working group and the RALO meetings. Gisella? If you're able to.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. We have the working group meeting on Monday. We have the RALO meetings will be the NARALO, the APRALO. And with regards to the working group meeting, we have – sorry – I seem not to have them in front of me. Sorry about this.

We will have the Registration Issues Working Group meeting on Tuesday and the Academy Working Group session on Wednesday. There will be a couple of ATLAS II meetings. The AFRALO-AfrICANN meeting on Wednesday afternoon and the At-Large IDN Working Group meeting on Wednesday afternoon. Thursday we will have the Future Challenges Working Group meeting. And that concludes on the working group meetings.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, if I could have the floor just for a moment?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, at the moment, you and Gisella have the floor, so you can hand the baton back and forth. Back to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: On the showcase, it is very likely that the gala will be on Monday just for the Singapore meeting. So that means that the showcase will likely be moved to Wednesday. So at the same time, it's just a shifting of days, so we wanted to let you know about that.

And there's also the next agenda item, as it was an action item, it was for Holly or someone from APRALO to talk about the At-Large Roundtable on Privacy and Proxy Services. That has been scheduled currently for Monday, 16:00-18:00. So, Olivier, I'm not sure if you want to give that over to someone from APRALO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. I had trouble understanding you I think. There's some background noise there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, there's some very odd background noise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It sounds like a whale at the moment that we have somewhere, but we accept all sorts of members, including whales and dolphins.

But the concern, you've just mentioned that's the first I hear about this, the shifting of the agenda. It seems to be the usual thing that we have. I don't think we should spend any more time on this. I think we have the next ALAC call next month where we will be able to discuss the agenda in further detail.

EN

I'm just a little concerned that things are just being moved around now and something as significant as a gala, which is, well, business as usual, I guess, move things. Work on a schedule, and then shake it upside down at the end.

HEIDI ULLRICH: From what I've heard, I think it's a one-off. I have had confirmation that the gala in London will be back at its regular time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Heidi. Let's move on to the second part of this discussion, and that's the discussion on the At-Large Roundtable on Privacy and Proxy Services, which is being organized by APRALO. Holly Raiche will be speaking to us about this, then I will open the floor for questions on any aspects of the Singapore meetings. Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. There are a couple of things that have been organized and thank you, Gisella, for doing it. On the Monday from 4:00-6:00 – that's 16:00-18:00 UTC – we're going to have the multi-stakeholder forum. The topic is going to be really two-fold. One is going to be the privacy/proxy servers, and maybe Carlton will do an update as well. But [inaudible] chats with Don Blumenthal who's the chair of the working group, Carlton [inaudible] Chris could stand up to talk. I'm hoping you do too.

What I've talked to the APRALO about and talked to the [inaudible] about, there is a very clear kind of connection between the discussions on privacy/proxy servers and the Expert Working Group. So we'll have one session on privacy – one hour will be on privacy/proxy; one will be on the Expert Working Group. And now it's just to finalize [inaudible] time.

The other session that we're having is on TOR, and I think Garth can probably tell everybody about TOR better than I can. But I think it's, what, The Onion Router I think is what it's called? Anyway, it's going to be a session with Patrick who is the chair of the SSAC, the co-chair. Garth is going to be the other co-chair. Evan is going to moderate. I think [inaudible] moderation meeting.

That will be held the hour before the multi-stakeholder meeting. So that's going to be three solid hours on Monday of what I hope will some really interesting discussion. That's all the details so far. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:　　Thank you very much, Holly. Do you have the exact timings for these sessions? Because at the same time on the Monday there will also be very likely a public meeting of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, and the group is currently looking at the Monday schedule and trying to think whereabouts on the Monday schedule they will be able to hold that meeting. I'm trying to make it that we're not going to have a clash between this and both of the meetings you've just mentioned.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE:	Gisella has already found a slot for that TOR meeting. That would be 3:00-4:00. So really, from 3:00-6:00 we've got those meetings. If you [inaudible] another time, that would be terrific. Otherwise, there's going to be a clash.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	So the CCWG, the Cross-Community Working Group meeting would have to finish before 3:00 PM?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Yes, please.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	That's great. Thank you. Heidi Ullrich, you have the floor. Your hand is up.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you, Olivier. We were aware of the possibility of the CCWG on Internet Governance being scheduled on Monday, so we did leave a large slot immediately after the welcome ceremony. I'm aware that there is Doodle out for the CCWG on Internet Governance currently. If that Doodle results in a later in the day, then we can look into shifting the At-Large meetings because we're aware that this is really going to be a really key meeting for everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I don't think we can go any further than this now. Holly, you have the last word, and then we'll have to move on.

HOLLY RAICHE: Heidi, could you please as soon as possible confirm times because I want to be talking to people to confirm speakers when, and I don't want to do that if there's any chance that times are going to be changed. So really in the next day or so, the next few days, make sure that the time slots that Gisella has allocated in fact won't be switched so that we can start planning people. Otherwise, if we plan people and the timeslots change, it's not going to work at all. Okay?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, may I respond very quickly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi, absolutely. Please, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you. Yes, the meeting confirmation forms have just opened. Gisella and I will be submitting them. I'm not sure when the Doodle for that CCWG on Internet Governance closes, but we should get back to you I would say in the next week or so, but it won't be in the next few days. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's move on. I was going to open the floor for more questions or comments on all of the Singapore meetings and agendas. I suppose that we are somehow running out of time. We've got another 15 minutes maximum of interpretation.

So let's plow forward with our working group update. First, the At-Large summit, ATLAS II organizing committee. For this, we have Eduardo Diaz. Eduardo, please provide us with a quick update.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to let everyone know that things are moving along with the different activities for the ATLAS II. We finished and have already [public relations] messages and strategic goals already accepted by consensus. We are talking with the [PR] staff and communications staff to get those fine-tuned if necessary.

I understand the staff is working with the final [inaudible] list to get all the ALSes ready. By 31 January, the [inaudible] will be sent to constituency travel, and then they will start doing the actual logistics for all the ALSes' travel.

Event agenda, I understand Tijani and his group have been able to come up with a very specific draft for the activities that are going to happen during the summit.

Fatima Cambronero has opened a page for their mentoring. There is going to be a mentoring program, and the first draft has been put in the wiki for comments.

Glenn McKnight is in charge of the showcase [inaudible] activity. I don't have much to say there.

And we're trying to push for having a newsletter sometime February/March timeframe to start communicating to the ALSes what's happening and what is coming just to get to the momentum going.

I know Olivier has been working with some companies about sponsoring some of the activities like a cocktail, a Saturday dinner, and so forth.

So as far as I can tell, we're on time with most of these things and things are moving along. So far, that's everything I have to say. Anybody that is in any [of the other] communities are welcome to comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eduardo. You've said everything, including what I wanted to say as well, so that's very efficient. Any questions or comments on the ATLAS II organization? I note that Fatima Cambronero has put a link also for the ATLAS II mentoring program, and there is an organizing committee that has been put together for this as well.

Very, very happy to see that all of the different committees are now picking up quite well. So hopefully, we're going to get good involvement. I urge people from our ALSes who might be listening to this call or who might be on the call at the moment to please consider joining one of those sub-committees. We are in need of involvement.

And of course, this is a summit that is organized by the community for the community. So the earlier you get engaged in this, the more you'll be able to take out of it. And we really look forward to working, and I'm

just so thrilled to see that this will come up into an event that is likely to be as time-defining, as epic as one could say, as the ATLAS I.

Thank you, Eduardo, for leading this. I've given you a lot of freeway to move forward just because I haven't had so much time to spend on this, and you've held the steering column very well so far. So great.

Next, the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee, we have Roberto Gaetano who has been steering this ship as well. Roberto, are you on the call?

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you very well, Captain. Please, proceed forward.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay, I'll keep it very short for the sake of economy of time. There is a monthly report that has been put down for the details, and we are going to present other communication in due time. For the time being, today was the deadline for producing the slate of candidates that go to the next step, which is the ALAC voting. And we have communicated this a couple of days ago to the ALAC chair.

For the record, the slate is composed of five candidates that have successfully passed our filter, so to say. Those are in alphabetical order

of the last name: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Sébastien Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, and Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

So the working group has worked on pretty tight deadlines. What we are going to work on now is a sort of item list, bullet point list of considerations for improving the process, sort of lessons learned from this.

I would also in particular point out that staff has supported the group very well and has worked over the Christmas and New Year's holidays because the deadlines had some significant milestones happening over that time. And the last voting has been done on a long weekend in the U.S. So everybody has shown exceptional dedication.

So in thanking everybody, I think that the bulk of the work of the BCEC is now over, and the ball is on the ALAC camp. I think that probably Tijani will speak about the next steps. We will be only marginally involved in the next month, but in any case we are available in Singapore for having a complete report for transparency and for better communication. That's all. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Roberto Gaetano. And I'd like to extend my thanks to the whole Board Candidate Evaluation Committee for the exceptional work that they have done. It's not easy to choose between all of the candidates, and it's sometimes just a case of basically being very psychologically inclined and asking more questions and being very inquisitive, etc.

C CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Olivier. I truly appreciate this opportunity. As someone who knows very well, as many of you do, but perhaps a little more poignantly having chaired both the original BCEC and its design team for the process, I really wanted to just congratulate the BCEC now and Roberto particularly for what I think has been an amazing job and a group that has assisted us not only in producing an excellent slate of candidates.

And obviously the opportunity to exists for regions to add additional people who of course have already put in a statement of interest. But I think what you've done with the five you've got is an excellent slate of candidates for our consideration.

However, I also wanted to point out that the ability now and the keenness I see of this excellent BCEC to improve the process, which of course goes to the work that Tijani's group is in charge of and so I won't speak to that. But I really wanted to say how delighted I am from my Queen of Process point of view with the way everything has been managed – its efficiency, its professionalism, and of course its outcome. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Absolutely in agreement with you. And in fact, I'll hand the floor over to Tijani Ben Jemaa who is the chair of our

Board Member Selection Process Committee who is going to be able to let us know what the next steps are in our process and, obviously, comment on the current process. Tijani, you have the floor. You might be muted, Tijani. We can't hear you at the moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, now you're on. Go ahead, Tijani. You have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Sorry. I was talking to myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He's breaking up again. Sorry, Tijani. We cannot hear you. Did he mute it again? Well, staff, what's going on with Tijani? Have we lost him?

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, we are dialing out to Tijani as we speak.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So effectively, we have a small technical problem as expected from today after a few other problems that we've had.

The next steps I believe are for this list of selectees to now be made public and published on the wiki space and turned over to the ALAC. So

staff will follow up on this. I believe that all of the people who have sent in their statement of interest or their application will be published as well.

And then the next stage is for the RALOs to be able to suggest candidates to be added to the current short list that we have. Although I do note that we have five candidates here, so that's quite a large short list or a larger short list than we had in the first instance.

Tijani, are you back?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I am back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, welcome back. Go ahead, Tijani. I'm sorry. I tried to fill in in the meantime.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, and thank you very much. First, I have a question to Roberto. Where in which wiki page we can find the list of the members of this slate? I think that it must be on a public page. Is it on a public page now? Roberto? Okay, if he's not here…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He might be muted. Ah, yes. Go ahead, Roberto. You have the floor.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah. I'm sorry. I was trying to unmute unsuccessfully. For the time
                          being, it is not. With staff, we are working on publishing the document
                          and the reports and everything. That is, for the time being it is only a
                          communication that has been given to you, Tijani, and to Olivier. If you
                          want us to speed up and to bring to everybody's knowledge this, I can
                          forward the e-mail that I have sent to Olivier to the whole group. Or
                          maybe it's more appropriate that Olivier does it himself or whatever.
                          I'm open to suggestion.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Roberto. No. My point is that today, 28th, is the date of the
                          publication of this slate. And I think that Olivier, perhaps you should ask
                          the staff to do the communication with the conventional means of
                          communication of this slate plus all the candidates that are in good
                          standing but that are not selected by the BCEC because the RALOs will
                          choose among those people if they want to add candidates.

                          So today, we have to have the five candidates on the slate chosen by
                          the BCEC plus the list of candidates that fill the conditions, the criteria,
                          but who weren't chosen by the BCEC. I think that the first step now is
                          for the staff to publish it very widely so that everyone can know who are
                          the candidates and who can be added.

                          The next step for us, we will have a meeting tomorrow – the BMSPC will
                          have a meeting tomorrow – and we will if you want decide on what we
                          have to do practically. It is more or less clear, but we have to do it in the
                          committee and not a person do it. We have to do it together.

It is clear that we have some days for the RALOs to think if they want to add people on the slate among people who already have had an SOI and who weren't chosen by the BCEC. And when we decide if we will add or not people on the slate, if there is an additional people who have to go back to the BCEC so that they will issue their last final slate. And then we will proceed for the vote, for the election.

This is the procedure in the future, and I am open for any question. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. In essence whilst you were between calls I alluded to what you mentioned there. Just to make it clear, the RALOs can add members from the slate of people that have already submitted their statements of interest. So you cannot just bring new people or it's not like reopening the application process for anyone.

The second thing is that three RALOs or more, but at least three RALOs, need to support a candidate for them to be added to the overall slate. And then the process will start.

Staff will follow up with all of the explanation, all of the timetables and timings so that the RALOs know how much time they have to proceed forward with this. Staff will also send out to the mailing lists the list of candidates.

In addition to this, some of you might have noticed that the Board Member Selection Process Committee wiki pages needed to have a login. That's an error, and we are working at the moment with staff to

keep that open so as to keep the process as transparent as possible. Things have gone a little south and there's been a little bit of overwork on all sides recently. So, please, bear with us and we'll have all of that information in time on there. But certainly today is the day when the list of candidates is published, 28 January 2014.

Evan, you still have your hand up?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, that's a new one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a new one. Yes, go ahead then.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier. Tijani, there's one part of the way that you described the procedure that I wasn't quite sure is quite right. It's my understanding right now that the BCEC having accomplished what it did in creating the slate of five candidates has essentially done its job, created its report, and its role is finished. If the RALOs between them decide to add more people to the slate, that doesn't require the BCEC's further involvement.

It's my understanding that if the RALOs follow the procedure if they wish to add other people onto the slate, then that becomes part of the ongoing process of other groups. But the BCEC, they've been charged to do one task. They've done it. And as far as I understood and from what I recall from the last process, having created the initial slate, the BCEC's

EN

job is done. It no longer needs to reconvene. It can disband. And that further additions to the slate done through RALO process actually go through a different channel. That's my understanding of it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Tijani, can you confirm, please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, please. Evan, we will have two days after the deadline for adding people on the slate to have the final slate. And in my timeline here, I have the BCEC have to complete it. So it is not a problem. Even if it is not, I will come back to the original rules and I will confirm. But I think it is also the job of the BCEC. It's not a problem. It's something very formal. It's not a problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. So now we know where we are going. So thanks again, Roberto and your team, for all the great work you've done here. And I hope you will continue being able to chair some of our most challenging groups at very short notice like you have on this occasion.

Next, 10 C, the At-Large New gTLD Review Group where Seth Reiss and Dev Anand Teelucksingh lead in that. That's the working group that reviews the follow up to the application.

Tijani, your hand is still up?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I just raised it because I didn't hear the action item for the staff to publish the list of the five candidates plus the list of the candidates who were not selected.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was done.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It was done? Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was done. It was done, Tijani. I'm afraid the action item list is not up-to-date for some reason, but whilst you were being redialed I actually gave the action items for all of that to happen. And if staff haven't listened, then they'll have to listen to the recording.

We're really running out of time. We've got one more minute left for the French interpreter, and I'm really sorry for those people on the French channel. But the At-Large New gTLD Review Group, that's a really important update. Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Seth Reiss. Who wishes to provide the update? Is it Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I don't think Seth is on the call, so I guess I'll do the update.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Before March 13, the ALAC had filed community objections against three applicants: DotHealth LLC; Goose Fest, LLC; and dot Health Limited for the .HEALTH string. That was the culmination of the process by which ALAC could file objections to new gTLD applications.

The review group facilitated the objection process within At-Large. I can post the links that [went to the entire] comments, and there's also the dashboard that has the archive of the comments received by the review group, statements drafted, and so forth.

So the ALAC Objections Follow Up Group was chaired by Seth Reiss and was created by the ALAC to follow up with the objection process as it was being [inaudible] by the ICC, the organization that is hearing the community objections and the limited public interest objections.

To date what happened since March 2013, one of the applicants – dot Health Limited – withdrew their application. The applicants filed a response to our objection statements within 21 days, which was in April 2013. The hearing of the remaining two objections were consolidated, meaning that it will be heard by one panelist. This was approved by the ALAC Objections Follow Up Group and the applicants.

The panelist chosen was professor John [Poulson] who was also approved by both the follow up group and the applicants. The panelist didn't really ask the applicants or the ALAC follow up group for any questions or submissions and in fact rendered its decision within just over a month, but it's only been published just this month on January

16. And the panelist dismissed the ALAC objections against the two applications.

There was an e-mail that went out by Seth Reiss. Maybe I don't need to repeat the entire content, but in essence if I were to try to summarize it, it was a very interesting meeting from the panelist. He went into the GNSO principles from 2008 that approved the New gTLD Program and looked at that. There were no concerns regarding public interest.

And in fact, he makes a statement that this new gTLD process clearly allows any private interest entity to apply for these type of strings that may have raised public interest concerns. And ICANN – I'm trying to find the exact text – but I'll move ahead with that.

The statement also called into question – I should mention for community objection grounds, there were four grounds for community objections. There was what they called community, substantial opposition, targeting, and detriment. What the panelist found was that we did not meet the threshold for these four conditions.

The follow up action that has been suggested on the list is that there's probably a need to have a discussion of the outcomes. The ICC also includes a form regarding getting to give feedback to the ICC regarding how they handled the objection process.

In terms of next steps, [theoretically] the ALAC could file a motion with the ICANN Board, but I note that most of the other the ICANN Board has not acted on previous objections that were forwarded to them for reconsideration have not been approved. So I really doubt it would succeed.

I know that time is of the essence, so maybe I should stop there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, for this very complete follow up. Of course, quite a disappointment that our objections have not been sustained. But I guess this is all part of the way that things are since things are just rolling out.

I note actually that a lot of the objections which were filed including the ones by the independent objector have been refused by the examiners. So at this point in time I guess it is a little early to draw any conclusions from the whole process, but I'm sure that the work that we will have done will hopefully be part of a wider review.

Certainly a view of the actual applicant guidebook itself since it looks as though the person that looked at the application or looked at the objection [inaudible] as you called it spent a lot of time basing their answers and their work on the applicant guidebook, which I guess is what they were supposed to do. So that's all as was intended, I guess.

Let's move on. Unfortunately, the French interpreter has left. So people who were on the French channel, I hope you are able to join us on the English channel or the Spanish channel if your second language is Spanish. And I'm not even sure how long the Spanish interpreters will be able to stay with us.

But let's move quickly to the next regional outreach pilot for the CROPP, Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program. Dev, it's back to you again.

EN

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, can I add a sentence at the end of the last issue about the objection process?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, yes. Okay. Please, go ahead then just before we move on to the next thing. Go ahead, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I simply want to call everybody's attention to a link that I just put into the Adobe Connect room chat. That is a link that will take you to the e-mail archive of a very, very lively discussion that has been going on within the ALAC list. I invite anybody who is interested in the issue of the objections – why the objections happen, what they mean to At-Large's role in the entire objection process.

                           There have been a lot of people participating including other that are not normal ALAC mailing list participants. I really encourage everyone to have a look at that. The e-mail exchange started six days ago. There are a couple of unfortunate personal things back and forth in there, but if you get past that there are some phenomenal contributions that deal with ALAC's entire role in the objection procedure and I think can really help guide us forward as we consider how to respond and what we do next. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: One quick follow up?

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

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I know time is of the essence, but just to mention that one of the other concerns that has been certainly mentioned is the difference, the variance in which the panelists for hearing the community objections treated the applicant guidebook and interpreted it in different ways.

For example, in our case with .HEALTH, even though we mentioned that there was GAC advice, our panelist – I shouldn't say our panelist – the panelist basically disregarded it whereas in another objection against .INSURANCE, the panelist there took the GAC advice very seriously, which affected his ruling. This is something that we probably need to really observe and to study the various community objection decisions.

Just one final thing is that the threshold for these community objections was also high. Ones that did not meet any one of the four grounds, the objection had to be dismissed. And in fact, even the independent objector, some of his community objections were dismissed as well because it did not meet the threshold. So these are all something to consider.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. I think that at this moment in time, it's a bit hard to [inaudible] some conclusions as to whether we went wrong somewhere, whether the process was doomed to fail, whether the

ALAC was set up, whether there are any procedural issues with regards to the rulings, with regards to any of this.

I know that the objections follow up team is looking at this, and I invite you and Seth and others on the team to perhaps have a look at what the different points are that the ALAC might be interested in raising. But frankly, I don't see any ability to have a reconsideration request succeed apart from us wasting a lot of time on something that has very, very little chance of being taken.

As you very well said, so far any consideration requests that were asked from the Board have been refused, so maybe we should concentrate a lot more on the things that we have coming up in our community – the At-Large summit and the Brazil meeting and all of these other things.

Certainly the defense of the public interest in the wider context is something that we might wish to spend more time on and put this on the side and learn from our conclusions and perhaps participate in the post round one debriefing, which I think this community will want to push for.

Because certainly we've noted throughout time that there are a lot of inadequate things in the process not only just on the objections but in other things, and it would be helpful to be part of that review so as for the second round to be able to draw from those conclusions and learn from those mistakes or potential mistakes.

Alan Greenberg, and then we'll have to move on.

ALAN GREENBERG:
Yeah, thank you, Olivier. I think what you're proposing – and I think you're proposing it is a rational way forward – the chances of us succeeding in any further activity at this and actually influencing/impacting the public good in how any TLD is deployed I think is exceedingly small. But I think we've learned a bunch of lessons, and I think it will put us in good stead as we go forward in making recommendations on what to do next time should there be a next time.

So I would support not putting a lot of effort into this now but focusing on other things which will have real impact but learning from the lessons. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:
Thank you very much, Alan. Absolutely. And I do have to thank, by the way, the team that put together those objections and the whole process of collecting the objections from the community as well. It was the first time, as we said, where the ALAC has had an active involvement in something that is operational.

And having had to design all of its processes from scratch, in my opinion, it has done extremely well in a very short amount of time. So that's something really to recognize, and I'd like to thank all of the working group members. And you know who you are, and they're publicly listed on the wiki. Thank you for this really, really incredible work. A round of applause, a virtual applause for you.

Of course, it's not the end. We've got further rounds in the future. And I guess, we learn from our mistakes. ICANN will learn from its mistakes, and we will continue to improve our process during the next round.

Let's move on to the next thing, and that's the CROPP. Dev, back to you, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much. So the CROPP, there have been three travel proposals submitted by NARALO. So far, I put the link to those three proposals. The current status of those right now is that they have passed. Two of them passed initial review by the Review Team and have also been approved by the BT.

The only thing now is the actual filling of these proposals onto the ICANN's CROPP wiki, and hopefully the two members from North America who are in charge of this will be doing this very, very soon.

I have sent out a notice again, but again the background behind the CROPP program is that outreach travel is available for at least up to five trips, but the conditions are that the travel must take place before June 30, 2014, and it must conclude by June 30, 2014. And that one of the conditions that given that ICANN requires six weeks' notice, we need eight weeks for the travel request to be submitted to the CROPP Review Team in order to give us two weeks to really look at it and to make suggestions, comments on it.

So, please, time is ticking on it. So, please, submit your travel proposals very soon. I think that's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. Here, here, absolutely. Only a handful of the regions have actually taken this forward into the next stage, and I hope

that we're not going to miss that opportunity and hopefully there will be some good follow up. Of course, this is a pilot program. Hopefully, we can continue this next year.

Moving swiftly on, finally in 10 E, the ICANN Community Preparation for the Multi-stakeholder Meeting in Brazil. That's, of course, the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance which Rafik Dammak and I are coordinating. We're not chairing. We're coordinating at this very moment.

Just a quick update: the working group has worked on the one side to put together a charter which will work across all of the supporting organizations and advisory committees. There has been some questioning as to how many people from each one of the communities should be in this working group and whether we are speaking about supporting organizations, advisory committees, and stakeholder groups.

The GNSO has many stakeholder groups. It has a lot more members on that cross community working group than other parts of ICANN, such as the ccNSO or the SSAC or the ALAC for that matter. But discussions are underway on that side.

On the other side, there are discussions underway as to what the purpose of this working group is and what the deliverables will be. It hasn't defined the deliverables exactly, but it is clear that – and this has been confirmed by a visit by Fadi Chehadé during one of our recent calls – that the output of this working group will actually serve as the principal input that ICANN will be bringing to the Brazil conference.

Now this was said by Fadi Chehadé. There has been a call on the working group for this to be confirmed in writing and a commitment from ICANN to then make use of the input from this working group as its principal output, or the output from this working group as its principal input – whichever – input and output.

The process is there and progress is being made, although I must admit a little slow but this is always what happens with cross-community working groups. They just need to be oiled a little bit in the beginning to get moving.

Questions or comments on any of these working group updates are very welcome. Ah, there is a question about Vint Cerf's panel in this report from Peter Knight. Very good point, indeed, actually. As you know, there are some strategic panels which were created a few months ago – quite a few strategic panels. They are also making input into various processes in ICANN.

Actually, you must have seen in the At-Large announce that there have been some webinars that were done by those strategic panels. There are more webinars. I believe there is one at the end of the week as well from one of the strategic panels.

If you missed the strategic panel webinar, since it was a webinar it's all recorded and it's all available for download. Please ask staff or check on the At-Large mailing list. There have been some announcements on the ALAC announce, and you can actually even see for some of them the video archive and chat record as well.

So thank you for pointing this out, Peter Knight. The input from these will also go into the input that ICANN will be sending in Brazil. But there is a follow up after that, and I will continue to update you on the process. Just remembering we have quite a few people from At-Large, so people from At-Large who are in that working group and they're also bringing their input to the process.

Now number 11, the update on compliance issue. For any of you that have not reloaded your agenda, if you're on the Confluence website and you've got the agenda in front of you, please reload your agenda and you'll see one additional point which we did not include in there.

The At-Large Leadership Team had an extensive discussion with Garth Bruen regarding an issue on compliance following up on the e-mail that Garth had sent over to the ALAC mailing list and which was effectively pointing out some issues with compliance, several serious issues with compliance.

Garth has updated his report and sent an update to this. There was an action item in the At-Large Leadership Team for him, Evan Leibovitch, and Alan Greenberg to put together maybe just a wiki page and develop a draft statement and present it over to the ALAC on this present call. Unfortunately, that hasn't happened, but we're giving him an ability now to discuss this.

Garth is, unfortunately, not on the call anymore. He had to step out, but he is listening to it and he has put the Washington Post article into the chat. The question really now for this community is what we do next. How do we move forward? I guess as a first step really checking out of

the action item whether this can become an action item for the ALAC rather than an ALAC Leadership Team action item.

But I see Alan Greenberg has got his hand up, so maybe we can follow up. Oh, and [Frank's] also got, yes, originally [Frank] in the NARALO – was that the NARALO monthly reports? Okay. In the NARALO monthly report there is a link over to that article as well. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. My recollection is what we decided to do – and I'm sorry we didn't get to it – but my recollection is that we decided to reformulate the specific complaint as a compliance report that would be submitted by you or by someone on behalf of the ALAC. That is, targeting the specific infraction that we believe is there today, essentially challenging Compliance to either act on it or tell us they're not going to act on it.

And the second part was to put together a proposal to Compliance to build a submission process by which reports of essentially multiple infractions, that is a problem which affects large numbers of complaints, be handled.

The original discussion was lifting the limit on the bulk submission tool, and my belief is that's not a practical thing to do. Yes, someone may be able to develop 1,000 or 10,000 or 20,000 complaints, but since that process has them handled one-by-one, there's not a lot of merit in doing that.

If Compliance were to lift that limit to that level, they would then get six months' worth of work to do, completely destroying the complaint process for any future complaints for a significant amount of time and would not be relying on the fact that if someone could generate 10,000 requests at once, they're likely linked. And that method of handling one-by-one is not the appropriate way to address that kind of problem.

So the proposal, which I think I had made originally, is to develop a new process or propose they develop a new process but in parallel handle the specific complaint that Garth has identified as a formal complaint into the compliance process. Essentially as challenging Compliance to either reject it, and then we take whatever action we choose at that point, or to actually see it through.

For those who haven't read the documents, the issue is that there are privacy/proxy registrations, a relatively large number of them, where the proxy provider lists a nonexistent e-mail address – nonexistent because the domain that the e-mail address is in does not exist – a purportedly nonexistent street address, and so forth.

So I think that's how we went forward, and I would still propose doing that and perhaps prodding Evan, me, and Garth to actually get to the point of doing it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, for this explanation. And there's also some more explanation on the chat, which Garth has provided us with. So regarding the case of [inaudible] and several false WHOIS.

The question is: where do we go from here? The action item was for the ALAC to develop a statement. And as for a statement on this, first to touch on the raising of the number of complaints that can be filed bulk and also a change in the actual process itself by which those complaints are being dealt with so that they could be batched in one go rather than being treated on an individual basis.

Alan, your hand is still up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, no. A new hand. I don't believe we decided to charge the group, the three of us, with developing a statement. I think we were charged with developing a plan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Developing a plan.

ALAN GREENBERG: A proposal, not a statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, Alan, you've touched on the proposal here. I think that we really need to move forward on this, and I would urge the three of you to put together that proposal. Put it on the wiki. Get the ALAC – all of the ALAC – to be able to read through that proposal and let's get something out within the next two to three weeks directly and send it over to Compliance, vote on it, have it as a formal set of documents.

And then we will be able to engage in an ongoing dialogue with Compliance based on all of what we have here.

The concern I have at the moment is if I take this and engage in a dialogue, then it has the potential to make things personal. I'd like to have this all formalized with a vote, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. I would suggest that the two issues not be linked because one of them we should be able to do in a matter of a day or two and the other one is going to take a little bit longer to think through.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Do you have a timetable for us, please, then as to being able to – for a first step.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm suggesting that the specifics of the case in point we can address very quickly, and I think we can do that within a matter of days. I hesitate to say by the end of the week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Can you tell me what the action item is that you're – what is the action item that you're putting yourself to, that you're linking yourself to then? So staff can record an action item right here.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is the same action item: to develop a plan, a proposal, to address the issues Garth raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the outline of that is it will have two parts. One is a complaint to Compliance. Number two, a proposal to how to go forward with the generic type of problem that has been identified as problematic, that is not being able to submit large numbers for [quest] due to limitation on the bulk submission tool.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Staff, do we have this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, we do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much. Right. So thank you for this. And when this is developed, please, could staff then forward this to the ALAC on the ALAC mailing list but also forward it over to the At-Large – the wider mailing list – so that everyone can comment on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we really want to broadcast the details of the complaint before we issue it that way? I would suggest we might not want to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, this is quite a transparent process. Are you saying that we should not?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not saying hide it. I'm just not –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's the eternal problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Garth and I will discuss that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, discuss it with Garth, but it's the eternal problem of being as transparent as possible whilst keeping our punch at the same time and being able to develop things properly. This is something that we have to struggle with all the time, and I'd rather keep it open rather than [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll make a recommendation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thanks for this. So we're reaching the end of this call. We are now going into finally any other business. And in fact, since the beginning of this call, there have been two additional other business that have come up. But first, I'll let others take the floor. So I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr first. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. It's a very brief little piece of any other business which hopefully will lead to an action item to do with a page of monthly report from working groups that presented for the record for each At-Large advisory committee meeting.

                          I have updated the one relating to the rules of procedure working group with the events and resolution from today's meeting for you. And at this stage, I would like staff to more that link to the archive section of the page because that will go into torpor for now noting that we will [inaudible] it as needs be in the future. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Staff, has this been recorded?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, I will be in contact with you afterwards to clarify that AI.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So two more pieces of any other business if I don't see anyone else with their hand up. First, the fact that during this call we have received – well, actually, less than 24 hours ago – I had received a note from Avri Doria who has resigned from the position of the New gTLD Working Group chair, and she has announced it over to the working group just a few minutes ago.

I find it quite sad that she has resigned because she did a fantastic amount of work to lead this working group to do its work and be very active in the number of statements that it has produced, and certainly anything related to the new gTLD program. But she explains her resignation from the amount of work she is now faced with in the real world. And this, I guess, is something that we all have to struggle with – the struggle between our volunteer activities and doing things that bring bread onto the table.

So I'd like to ask for a real round of thanks and applause – virtual applause again – for Avri for all that great work that she has done during the several years that she has been chairing this working group. I note for the record applause throughout the Adobe Connect room.

And of course, we have a co-chair of this working group, and that's Evan Leibovitch. I gather that the recommendation will be for us to then have someone to take Avri's chair as well. Evan, do you have a few words on this? Is the working group going to select another chair as well or another co-chair?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier. I think part of the interest and part of the strength that Avri brought was her connections to other communities such as NCSG. Now that I believe she's GNSO council, that sort of makes that really difficult.

It's hard to say that the group needs to share the load considering that it has done really not a whole lot in the last little while. In fact, in some important ways it has been stuck with its wheels spinning on things such as the applicant support survey.

I guess I agree with you. It's a matter, let's take it back to the group, see how the working group responds. If there's a need for more co-chairs, fine. If not, I'm prepared to go it alone. But really we need a little bit more life, a little bit new mandate to keep going because so many of the components of the new gTLD program – we've seen the objection process, we're seeing the categorization issue.

So many of these things are either coming and going really quickly and don't work with the kind of deliberative leadership that the working group has traditionally been doing. So we're in a bit of a difficult situation in terms of mandate and what it is we can do. This is something we need to take back to the working group, and I'm happy to do that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. And perhaps it would be worth the working group setting up a call very soon so as to be able to discuss what happens next and what it wants to do. Certainly, there's a lot of work

still on the table and, as you mentioned, the follow up to the new gTLD process will be a sizable chunk of work that will continue.

In the meantime, I have not answered to Avri specifically because I wanted to announce her resignation first to you all here. But I will, having seen the applause that was the virtual applause on this call. I will convey this vote of thanks over to her, thanks on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee and of At-Large community for the stellar, sterling, fantastic work that she has done.

When she started, I told her there's at least one thing I don't have to worry about and that's the new gTLD process because I know that you and your team have got it well in hand, and certainly that has proven to be the case. So great, and thanks.

Finally, one more piece of any other business, and that's going to be quite quick. You might have noticed that there is someone – a human. Would you believe it? It's not even a [inaudible] machine thing, a human who keeps on spamming the wiki pages anonymously. So they just write some kind of advertising for clothing labels and websites and so on.

Staff, myself, and a few others have been playing deleting those as quickly as they could. But it's not something that is only constrained to At-Large. It's actually spamming all of the wikis. And just as we were having this call today, there's been another huge wave of spamming again. Clearly, that person has plenty of time to waste.

So it has been discussed been discussed with IT and in fact effective during this call that the anonymous comment thing is suspended until

further notice hoping that person will go away soon or these people will go away soon because it might be more than one person.

I realize it is a bit of a problem and an issue when not everyone in our community has a login to be able to leave comments. If you have a login, then you can login and then the comment box will appear. If you don't, especially on our policy development, just please send your comments to staff at staff@atlarge.icann.org and they will be forwarding this comment and putting this comment on the wiki on your behalf.

I think that's the best way to be able to stop our community from being spammed. And we will of course evaluate in the future if this wave of spamming stops and if we can change this again and reopen our wiki for people to comment on.

These are the two. Any other business for the time being? I ask if there is any other business on the call? And I don't see anyone put their hand up, so I believe that is the end of this call. I thank all of you for having lasted that long. It's been 2 hours and 45 minutes since we have started.

Thank you to the interpreters, and thanks to staff for having been able to support us. They've been under a bit of strain today with being a bit short of staff ii [inaudible].

It has been very helpful to have all of you here, and I'm very impressed that you've all managed to last. So thanks, and this call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]