

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, we will now start the recording. I'd like to welcome everyone on today's NARALO Monthly Call on Monday, the 14th of January, 2013, and wish everyone a Happy New Year 2013.

On today's call we have Garth Bruen, Darlene Thompson, Oliver Crépin-Leblond, Murray McKercher, Evan Leibovitch, Gareth Shearman, Glenn McKnight, Alan Greenberg, Gordon Chillcott, and Thomas Lowenhaupt. We have Seth Reiss who has just joined us as well. Apologies noted from Eduardo Diaz.

And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. If I have, if they can just speak up now... And also to remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Also if you are on the audio bridge and the Adobe Connect room, please remember to mute your microphone as well as your speakers. Thank you, over to you, Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you and this is Garth Bruen, and I want to hand it over to Darlene for a review of the action items. Thank you.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Right. Just to apologize to everybody first of all – I can't get my Adobe bridge up because the internet's gone down on that computer of mine, so I don't have that. However, I do have the action items in front of me. Action item 1: staff to create agenda page for next NARALO monthly

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.

meeting immediately following each monthly call. I believe that's being done. Staff?

GARTH BRUEN: Darlene, this is Garth. I think that might be an old version.

DARLENE THOMPSON: No, that is from our December 10th meeting.

GARTH BRUEN: Oh, from December 10th. Okay, alright, please go ahead.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Staff to follow up on the remaining NARALO ALS applications. Heidi to work with staff that is working with RAA to make sure that the documents are translated into French and Spanish. So those are the action items from the last meeting.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, this is Garth. Darlene, it also listed updated action items and some of the ones you mentioned, in agenda 2 on the current agenda. But since you don't have it I'll just go through them quickly. Olivier and I have discussed thank you letters to the NARALO Toronto sponsors and we'll be sending those letters out this week; two, staff should review and update the working group lists. I believe we discussed that last week, and they may be current – we'll have to check with staff on that.

Staff will assist in the backend processing of an online application form for ALSes, and I think that last time Heidi had said that Matt would be our contact for that and I'll reach out to him if that's correct. Staff should report on the payment to performers from Toronto with an apology – this has been done I believe. Heidi advised us earlier today that there was a technical glitch that prevented the payment from going out but this is being taken care of.

And Glenn requested an update to the NARALO slideshow template. Glenn, are you on the call?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, I am.

GARTH BRUEN: And do you have any comments or status on that?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, I asked Matt – Glenn for the record. I asked Matt if there was another template. The template he gave us originally was the one that was used for the ICANN Toronto meeting so it had the ICANN Toronto logo in the template itself. Since we're updating the slideshow it didn't make any sense to use that as a template so that's why I requested a more neutral NARALO slideshow template.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, and do you have that?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, I haven't received anything yet.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you, I will make a note of that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Garth, this is Heidi.

GARTH BRUEN: Please, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, just for clarity's sake, Glenn, can you just send staff an email of exactly what you're looking for? And then we'll follow up.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah, I did... I'm sorry, who do you mean by staff? Matt and yourself?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, just send it to staff@atlarge.icann.org. Well, I'll put that into the Skype chat, into the Adobe Connect chat. It goes to all At-Large staff that way. Okay? Hello?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Last item is request for registrar and ICANN RAA amendments, and I had made this request to staff after a notice was sent out that the amendments were proceeding and it listed several sources of requests for amendments. And we've all been privy to what are called the "law enforcement amendments" – those have been published publicly and debated widely. But we have not seen any as far as I know, any copies of ICANN-requested amendments or registrar-requested amendments. So staff, do we have any of those documents available?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm still following up. This is Heidi, Garth. I'm still following up on that. I'll do so today.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, alright. So closing off that we'll go into the general call. This is Garth Bruen again and welcome everybody to our first call of 2013. We're happy to have everybody here, and right off the top – preparation for the Beijing meeting. And this is specifically for NARALO agenda. The travel issues can be discussed later in the call.

The first question that we had before us is should we have our monthly NARALO meeting in Beijing itself and if so how long should the meeting be? And I'm just going to put this to a quick informal vote. I think we should have a face-to-face meeting in Beijing and I'm going to put my "agree" checkbox there, checkmark there. And if everybody else can either vote for or against that, that would be great. Gordon likes it; Murray likes it. Nobody else seems to like it, okay.

I know that Evan is not available, and Alan has his hand up. Please, go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, given the time zone difference having a meeting there almost guarantees there's no remote participation, or at least not at a particularly convenient time. Is that really what we want to do? I'm not disagreeing with having a face-to-face meeting but making it the monthly meeting, you know, I think skews things unless we can arrange a time which is reasonable at both ends.

GARTH BRUEN:

Okay, this is Garth. I think that that is a reasonable point to make. I was just noting that in terms of the calendar our next call, our next NARALO call would be immediately after the Beijing meeting, the Monday afterwards. And I think everybody will be significantly burned out and significantly jet lagged. So I think that we have the option one of having an in-person face-to-face meeting which I think is generally a good idea anyway, and then maybe rescheduling the monthly call for a week later. And I'll put up a check mark to reschedule the call for a week later if people think that's a good idea, and then we can have a separate meeting.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Garth, this is Evan?

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, please Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: One possibility to go along with the time zone issue that Alan brought up quite correctly: if we were to have something in Beijing and we had it really early in the morning, so for instance it's almost I believe an exact 12-hour difference. So if we had a meeting say at 8:00 AM on the Tuesday morning that would also equate to 8:00 PM Monday Eastern Time; similarly, 7:00 PM Central, 6:00 PM Mountain, 5:00 PM Pacific, and I think that would work out to 3:00 PM Hawaii. So we could conceivably have something early on the Tuesday morning that would equate to a late Monday teleconference. So we could pull it off if the desire was there.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth. I think that's a great idea.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan – yeah, that could work. I hadn't looked at exactly what the time zone difference is. I was just raising it as an issue we need to be concerned about.

DARLENE THOMPSON: This is Darlene; I'd like to make a comment.

GARTH BRUEN: Please, Darlene.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Darlene Thompson for the record. I just think with all the scheduling difficulties that I question the need. I mean I'll go along with it, I don't actually care all that much but I question the need for a face-to-face meeting in Beijing. But I do agree with pushing the next telephone conference a full week ahead so that it's still on Monday at our regularly scheduled time just because that's what people are used to. Also there are going to be people taking time off after the Beijing meetings and who may not even be back by the Monday when we have our telephone conference. But it's completely up to the group and I'll go along with anything. That's it, thanks.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, this is Garth. I'll put these two items out consecutively for just a quick vote. The first one is shall we have a Tuesday morning 8:00 AM meeting in Beijing that coincides with a reasonable time in the Western Hemisphere? And I'm going to put my checkmark on that. And Evan, you can vote by voice but you've already voted by voice because it was your idea.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah, that's about right.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Alright, seeing a good number of checks-

HEIDI ULLRICH: Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. We just need to confirm when the Board meeting with the ALAC is on Tuesday. That's Constituency Day and it might be 8:30 to 9:30. So if so that is going to interfere with your 8:00 AM meeting.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, unless we schedule our meeting from 7:30 to 8:30.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's a possibility, exactly. So basically you just want it early morning.

GARTH BRUEN: Exactly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Okay, thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Alright. This is Garth again. Second item for a quick vote on would be to have a postponed NARALO monthly call the week immediately following the normal time, which would be two weeks after the Beijing meeting, and assuming that that slot is open and staff will confirm that for us. And I'll give my checkmark to that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Garth, this is Heidi again if I may?

GARTH BRUEN: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So I've looked on the calendar and it's just confirming that it will be Monday the 22nd of April – is that correct?

GARTH BRUEN: I believe so, yes. It'll be the third week in April.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Checkmark from Darlene.

GARTH BRUEN: Yeah, it'll be the 22nd of April.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

GARTH BRUEN: Alright, if there are no objections we can move on to our second item, and this is a general question for discussion within the group: what should our agenda as NARALO be in Beijing, and how is our time best used? Aside from any kind of monthly or face-to-face meeting that we have amongst ourselves what should we be preparing for, what should we be doing? And I'll just put that out there if anybody has any thoughts or ideas off the top of their head, or maybe somebody already thought of something. Anybody?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Garth, it's Evan.

GARTH BRUEN: Evan, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, most of the things policy-wise personally I would think are global in nature. There's not, I mean there's been a number of different policy initiatives that have been going on within NARALO but most of them to me merit discussion on a global level. And if we've got face-to-face with everybody else in ALAC and the other regional executives then we should consider engaging that way, which basically means having the NARALO meetings specifically to issues that are of unique interest to the region. And right now the only one that comes to my mind this moment are issues of outreach and inreach. I'm drawing a blank right now in thinking of ICANN policy issues that are unique to the region but at very least trying to increase outreach activities is probably top of the list.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, this is Garth again. That is an excellent suggestion and I think we can continue on with some of the momentum we made in Toronto. Now if I'm not mistaken there is some sort of official I guess At-Large Outreach agenda, and I think Glenn had mentioned something about the... Maybe I'm being too vague, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: You're so vague you're going over my head. I'm not sure what you're talking about.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, I'm sorry. But Murray had actually mentioned to me about the possibility of having additional funded members for any one of these meetings for the specific purpose of outreach.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah, to actually do some outreach actually, and I think Murray's the most appropriate person to speak on that. I believe he's on the call.

GARTH BRUEN: Yes. So and I believe that Murray has prepared some thoughts about outreach agenda? If you're prepared to speak on that just quickly, Murray, it might help us move this along. Maybe Murray isn't on the call or he has his mute on?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah, he's typing, Garth, in the chat box.

GARTH BRUEN: Oh, alright.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: He doesn't look like he has a mic, that's what he's typing.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, that's fine. Alright. We'll try and solidify what that would actually mean and this will actually feed into our next agenda item, unless anybody has anything specific they want to discuss in terms of Beijing... I want to put this out there for a minute before I close this item off. Does anybody have any issues, something burning they want to bring up that's not necessarily travel-related in terms of Beijing? No? Okay.

So no objections and I'll move forward to Item #4 which is a review of the ongoing review of communication outreach strategy. I hope everybody has been reviewing the Communications Strategy document that was drawn out of our meetings in Toronto, and one of the things that we've done is we've created a subcommittee and we need to kind of reboot what that subcommittee is doing and reorganize what it's doing. And what I would like to do is after this call schedule some time with the folks on that committee so we can just have a call amongst ourselves. And if anybody else wants to join the committee we're always looking for some more volunteers to do some work.

And if nobody has any comments on that we will move on to Agenda Item #5, and there's a little more information about the recruitment

efforts, specifically about the introduction letter which is something that we're still crafting. And anyone is welcome to visit that link and see if they want to add any comments or if there's something that we're missing in that letter – feel free to do so.

In terms of our ALS applications, last time we had Thomas tell us all about his ALS. This time we were going to have Dana talk about the Nova Scotia Community Access Program. He had to cancel at the last minute so we're going to reschedule him for the next call, and I will just skip over this for now rather than pull anybody up on the spot.

The last item is something that I think is still in limbo and maybe staff can give us an update – do we have an update on the University Community Partnership Social Action Research application?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Garth, this is Heidi. I'm working with Legal just to clarify some issues but I think it's ready to go to a vote very shortly.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, that's good news! Thank you very much. And if nobody has any further issues with that we can move on to the next Item #5.3 – unaffiliated applications. Staff, are there any new applications-

ALAN GREENBERG: Garth, it's Alan. I did have a question on the previous one.

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm just wondering if Heidi can give us any insight as to what the rationale is that allows them to participate because there was a strong feeling that although they were a good organization they just didn't fit the model.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. Well, I think the major concern is that they're a global outreach and they're based in Arizona in the US, in NARALO. That's your question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, that they were not controlled, whatever the wording is, to a large extent by North American individuals.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, let me look into the details on that and I'll get back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Alan, for raising that point and before we move on I also see that Glenn has his hand up. Please, Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, Glenn for the record. Back a little bit as well – you were mentioning about the introduction letter, and I’m just curious from other RALOs whether they have actually produced something that’s a warm and fuzzy action letter or prompt to action letter as well so that we can compare our letter to EURALO or other locations.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth and that’s an excellent question. I’m not aware of it; perhaps somebody else is. I had had a very brief discussion with Pavan, I hope I’m not mispronouncing his name, from APRALO in Toronto. And he really liked a lot of the things that we were doing in our meeting in Toronto and he wanted to I guess copy some of the things that we were doing in terms of his recruitment efforts. So maybe I can reach out to him and some of the other... If anybody has a suggestion of various Secretaries or Chairs or other members to contact about that they’d be welcome. Alan, you still have your hand up – do you have another comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: No sorry, it’s down.

GARTH BRUEN: No problem, okay. So staff, were there any other unaffiliated applications this month?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi – no, I have not received any.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you. Alright, in terms of our working groups and general participation we're continuing to keep an eye on this. Now last time it was announced that there was an immediate need for two members for the Budget and Finance Subcommittee. I believe that we got two volunteers right off the bat. Is that true? Am I remembering that correctly?

I'm hoping somebody who had volunteered is on the call. I believe one of them is Darlene and then there was a second person who wanted to be on that working group.

DARLENE THOMPSON: I'm sorry, I just spoke and my microphone was off – Darlene Thompson. Yes, I'm on the Budget and Finance Subcommittee.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, and then we had a second volunteer – is that correct, staff?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: It looks like Allan.

GARTH BRUEN: Allan Skuce?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yep, it looks like it.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, alright. Yes, Allan is putting up exclamation points: “I am one!! I am one!! I am one!!” Alright, so are those, have you gotten your whatever notice that you’re in the working group and you’re in the working group mailing list and whatnot? I suppose Darlene already was.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Yeah, we just got a vote as to when to get our first meeting happening. So I got it; Allan, did you?

GARTH BRUEN: Allan is probably typing; he has no mic. I just want to confirm that Allan has received communications from that working group... Yes, he has. Okay, great. And Murray McKercher has his hand up. Please, Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, I’m just testing my mic, I guess I’m still not...

GARTH BRUEN: It’s great. Well, we can hear you alright. So that was just a mic test? No actual comments? Okay.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Sorry, you can hear us, sorry. Yes, I was trying to reach Olivier and I had documents which didn’t get posted to the list in time for the call. So I will post that to the list and we can have a discussion about that later. It

regards a draft outreach project for NARALO and has some relevancy I think to all RALOs.

GARTH BRUEN:

Great, looking forward to it. I believe you sent me a draft of that too and I was reviewing it. Okay, the next item: Cross-RALO... Yes, is somebody else talking? No? Okay.

Cross-RALO Relations – one item that I had posted is about the ICANN Academy Survey that Sandra from EURALO has created. And I submitted one survey and everyone else is welcome to submit one on behalf of their RALO, I mean on behalf of their ALS. It would help her information collecting and you can go to that link and fill out the brief survey.

We are also offering support for the APRALO Showcase event at the request of Holly Raiche, and we've given them some advice and we're just going to make ourselves available to discuss it with them. And I've also as I mentioned earlier, I'm going to be offering my help to the APRALO Secretariat during the meeting and other volunteers are welcome. I mean it's just good that we support each other as a community.

And Glenn, who are you talking about when you say "the volume is low?" Are you talking about me or somebody else?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

I apologize – it was Murray. It was very hard to hear Murray when he was speaking.

GARTH BRUEN: Alright, okay. Next item, a question for staff: before the last meeting they were requesting that people submit statements of interest. Staff, has everyone who is required to submit an SOI, have they submitted a completed SOI?

HEIDI ULLICH: Garth, this is Heidi. Not all ALAC members have but I think that all NARALO ALAC members have and NARALO leaders. I'm going to follow up with Matt and I'll get back to you on this call.

GARTH BRUEN: Well, that's fantastic. We're on the ball, that's good to know. Alright, moving on to Beijing and in terms of specifics and travel and whatnot – now, I have created a sub-report on travel issues dealing with a number of items, and I have posted this sort of ongoing examination of getting the visa and some of the things that were not quite right in the document in terms of instructions. And I encourage everybody else to share their experiences so maybe the rest of us don't fall into the same mistakes or pitfalls in terms of that. Does anybody have any kind of visa-related issues, complaints, problems, suggestions or maybe tips for other people?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Garth, this is Evan.

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, please go ahead, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, one is a question, and this is a bit of an oddity that was kind of strange. Like everybody else who's being funded to go I received my information packet from Constituency Travel, and I was given a deadline to book travel. And we appeared to have agreed upon flights and they sent me an itinerary, but I haven't been issued with a ticket yet which is highly unusual for something like this. So I'm not sure if this has to do with visa issues or if this has to do with something else.

We did have an approved itinerary but that was never, as far as I know, converted into an actual ticket which is usually something I receive from Constituency Travel. Does anyone else have the same situation? Did you get actual tickets? I'm just trying to find out if I'm alone in this oddity.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a comment – it's Alan.

GARTH BRUEN: Please, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know in my case they responded relatively quickly, well relatively quickly given that it was over the Christmas/New Year's break. Unfortunately they didn't bother responding to me; they only responded to Constituency Travel and it was almost only by accident

that I found out that there was indeed some itineraries and they were making other suggestions that I had never heard about. So I would think the first thing is follow up with other emails. Everyone may think that they've done everything and they're waiting for you at this point if my example is representative in any case.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, I'll follow up. One other thing, for anybody that's applying make a point of getting two different invitation letters. There's one that comes from ICANN but that is not sufficient. There is also a specific way on the travel page to request a letter of invitation from CNNIC which is the local host based in China. Some embassies might require that as part of the visa application, and so I would suggest just being fully armed with all that information in advance before doing that – get both invitation letters.

They're very specific about the information that they want to have. You send in a form to them and then they send you a letter, and I would highly recommend getting that in advance. I've also been told "Don't even bother applying before the 1st of February" because you're not supposed to apply for a visa apparently too soon before you're actually supposed to go.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Evan. These are all very, very important points and especially in terms of what I've been experiencing. In my particular case when I went to CNNIC to get that invitation letter there seems to be a discrepancy about whether or not the Chinese government requires an

actual paper copy or if a scanned/faxed copy is acceptable. And when I went to ask the embassy that's where I ran into the problem of the information in the instruction document being incorrect in terms of the phone numbers and the email addresses; and then I found the actual correct phone numbers and correct email addresses.

When I was able to contact the embassy they told me basically that you can send in a photocopied or faxed invitation letter but they may look at it and require you then to get a paper letter. Now, if you have to get a paper letter that's going to take two weeks according to CNNIC, and the question that I had is okay, if you go through this rigmarole and then you all of a sudden have to get a letter, will you miss the deadline? It seems like it's almost like a setup for you to not be able to get a visa on time.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Oh, it was my [information] that they can currier it. They're just trying to avoid getting the paper copy because of the expense of doing that. So that's why they're trying to talk people out of getting paper copies and being able to deal with printing your own PDF version of that because I do believe they're capable of currier-ing paper copies of it; they're just trying to avoid the expense if they can.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Garth, I have a number of comments.

GARTH BRUEN:

Please, go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, several things. On the paper one, the Canadian Embassy rules say “Generally a fax is sufficient but we may ask for the original or ask for other documentation or ask for an interview.” I sent those exact words to CNNIC and they said “Well, we’ll start with a copy and then courier...” Because courier costs are expensive and they are definitely not relying on regular mail. So but if you start at the three-month point then there shouldn’t be any problem – even if they request it there should be time to get the document in and go forward with that. The only potential problem is that you may be without your passport for several weeks at that point and that could be a problem if you have other travel going on.

I’ll point out the three-month rule in general is for single entry visas. If for some reason you need a multiple entry visa I think those are good for six months. So all sorts of complexities. The rules for Canada for instance, or rather there’s a Consulate in Montreal but they don’t issue visas. You have to go to the one in Ottawa; they will not accept it via courier. You either have to deal with a travel agent who’s their agent and trust them to not lose your passport or you have to physically go. So like many countries the rules are obscure and they vary from country to country. Each of the countries make their own rules; so you can learn some lessons from other people; other ones you’re going to have to define yourself.

GARTH BRUEN:

Right, so that’s a question that I actually have for staff, is that in reading the instructions for obtaining a visa it mentions over and over again this

concept of the carrier, of the official carrier. There's no description of what that actually is. Now Alan, you also mentioned that yourself – what does that really mean for somebody who's never gotten this kind of visa before?

ALAN GREENBERG:

If you go to the embassy site for your country, or the one that's applicable for you, they will generally tell you who they will accept as an agent if you're not going to do it yourself. In terms of the Canadian one, they list the group which they call a travel agency – exactly what they are I'm not sure – who will for a fee take it on. One of the questions I haven't resolved yet is to what extent will ICANN pay for these fees because they start adding up when you start having other services in applying for your visa. And it looks like in my case it's going to take two to three per diems to pay for the visa alone.

GARTH BRUEN:

That's a good question, Alan. So a question for staff specifically: do you know what they mean by these carrier businesses?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Garth, this is Heidi and no, At-Large staff can't give you proper advice on visas. So if you have any visa questions please follow up with Constituency Travel. And I'll put their email again into the chat.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Garth, if this is any help – it's Evan?

GARTH BRUEN: Please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I just recently went through an experience not with China but with India that's gone essentially the same route. The embassy doesn't even accept applications directly; they take it only through their authorized agents. And so while it might be a travel agent it's usually essentially a third party, a commercial party that essentially does their frontend forwarding for them. So Alan, if it's the officially designated ones they should be trustworthy but I think it's only very specific companies that are entrusted with doing sort of the frontend processing. They do charge a fee but that fee is unavoidable, and as far as I'm concerned is pretty well part and parcel of the total visa fee.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Question?

GARTH BRUEN: Please, Darlene.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Darlene Thompson – I actually did the request to CNNIC back when they first kicked off the process, back in November, and I haven't even heard

back from them. Has anybody got a faxed, scanned, or paper copy of this yet?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, this is Alan. I have mine; on the other hand, I haven't gotten my ICANN letter. They've ignored me.

DARLENE THOMPSON: I got my ICANN letter just [signed].

GARTH BRUEN: Darlene, this is Garth. I got mine within 24 hours so you may want to try again.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: This is Evan. I have both. CNNIC was a little finicky in the way that the form was filled out but once I had one or two back-and-forths with them they did send it. So I've got both.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Okay, they've totally ignored me. So yep, I will re-email them. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. So are there any further comments about this? On a different call, on an ALAC call it was Tijani from AFRALO brought up the issue that there doesn't seem to be much in terms of a travel buffer – in terms of the time of arrival and the time of departure. So there isn't really much

of an opportunity for people who are travelling a far distance to I guess recuperate and get ready for the meeting, or get back to their home location in time. Maybe this is common. I mean I don't know if this was the case for people who were travelling from Asia to go to Toronto. Does anybody have any insight on this? Is that common in terms of the days?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can comment in a general case.

GARTH BRUEN: Please, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, in general ICANN has said you have to arrive that day, and typically they've taken a pretty hard line that if the only flight arrives at 10:00 at night that's tough – you're going to have to work on a few hours' sleep. Occasionally they'll be more flexible. They're being adamant that if there's an afternoon flight you leave on the Friday, even if you have Friday afternoon meetings, or that you leave early in the morning if you finish on Thursday. They are being very adamant.

Olivier has written a letter to the person responsible for stakeholder relations complaining. I don't believe there's been an answer to it yet. They're being pretty rigid and from my perspective they're... They're imposing rules on us which I don't think they would impose on their own staff. That's my perception anyway.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, that's an interesting perspective. Alright, what I would encourage everybody to do and I guess you could say that this is an official request of mine, is that if you are having some sort of problem, delay, any sort of confusion please let me know because I want to collect all this information so we can keep track of it, especially if somebody is experiencing a problem which is completely irregular and we can work together to fix it. If somebody is experiencing a problem which somebody else has experienced and they've found a solution, well, we can fix that too.

So send the travel-related items to me or post the comments directly into the Chair Report on Travel Assistance which is linked from the agenda here. And if there are no further comments on...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Garth, this is Heidi?

GARTH BRUEN: Please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just if I could again urge, if anyone does have issues with travel-related points please write Constituency Travel. They are pretty responsive and if you have any concerns with them not following up then you can write At-Large staff. But your first-

ALAN GREENBERG: Who do you write if you don't like their answer? [laughter]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, you can let us know, how is that? You can let At-Large staff know but we don't make the policy on that. I know that the ExCom is going to be discussing some travel-related issues this week.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, this is Garth. Just in general I want to make sure that I have a list of everybody's problems so I can be kept aware of it, and if they've been resolved quickly I'd like to know that, too. So maybe we can help somebody else out who's had a similar problem. And Alan, you still have your hand up – do you have...

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I'm doing multiple things here, so thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Okay, I've also noted as many other people have noted that the air pollution is reaching really serious levels in Beijing. I don't know if there's much that ICANN can do about that so we'll just leave that as it is.

New gTLDs – Agenda Item #7: there's a deadline for comments which is this week and actually Dev sent out a new alert about that. And the At-Large Dashboard is linked here; I would encourage anybody who is interested in this or wants to submit a comment to please follow along. There are some comments already posted – one of them is on .book, I believe some new comments were posted recently. And then the further down objection deadline is March 13.

Before I move on does anybody have anything they need to mention specifically about New gTLDs? No? Alright, seeing no hands I will move on.

The Nominating Committee – I had put into this agenda item that there were no updates but Glenn has said in the chat he does have something to say. Glenn, are you available and do you have something to say?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Garth, I do not have anything to say.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. I thought I saw a note in the chat about you about NomCom, but maybe I'm wrong. That's fine.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Oh, I sent a report on NomCom but there's not much to say because we've only had one meeting on NomCom since October, and it was very generic. Our Outreach Committee has not even had a meeting yet so we haven't really done that much, but the notes are in the report. Every time we do a meeting I'm supplying a report for people to read.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you so much, Glenn, we really appreciate your efforts on that. Okay, moving on to ALAC issues, and I've tried to list everything that has been coming across recently but if I have missed anything please, please let me know. The first item, and I specifically checked with Olivier that he would be on the call so he could just give us a brief on the Dubai

meeting. If you're ready, Olivier, we'd all love to hear about your experience in Dubai, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth, and it's Olivier for the transcript record. Can you hear me?

GARTH BRUEN: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. Well, what an interesting two weeks we had over in Dubai. I was on the UK Delegation as a full delegate and there were a few other people from At-Large who were on the US Delegation and there were a few people from ALSes who were present in the room as well, but not as government members but as sector members. So they're organizations and some companies who have paid a serious amount of money to be able to sit at the complete back of the room and never to be able to open their mouths during the whole length of the two weeks – which is interesting because they were told afterwards that they could have made comments if the Chair had let them speak and if they had put their hands up.

But the very tension that was in the room made it that no sector members even tried to take the floor because really the floor was a battle. After a few days only of trying to basically update the international telecommunication regulations, which for the last time were drafted in 1988 so that's 24 years ago, just before the internet

became what it became, and those regulations are totally out of date. So the idea was to update those and update some of the regulations which don't mean anything today because back in 1988 the majority of countries were still running under nationalized telcos whilst now of course in many countries the market is totally deregulated.

Very quickly it looked as though the room decided to cut itself into two halves: the part of the room that wanted to just update the regulations so as to reflect the whole open market regime that is now, and the part of the room that wanted to make some much more serious changes and actually include the internet in the regulations themselves. Now these are regulations which are basically looking at security matters, looking at charging matters, looking at matters of control – who is in control at the end of the day; and those who were just in favor of changing a few things, a few small items in the regulations to bring them up to date, were really trying to keep the internet out of it and the content regulation out of it, because the proposals which were received for example from Russia, from China, from some of the Arabic states basically took out the management of the internet including its numbering system that ICANN is currently dealing with – take all of that away and put it directly under government control.

And that was totally unacceptable to most of, well to all of the Europeans I should say and to North America, and a few other countries such as Japan and India as well. So effectively from the very beginning it became very, very difficult to actually find consensus. When you have one side that says “Yes” and another side that says “No,” well nobody is going to be happy with a “Maybe” and in fact the internet is either

controlled by governments or it is open as we know it today. You cannot have something that goes in between the two.

The way that the work happened was through a large plenary conference looking at each one of the articles one-by-one, and each time there was one which raised a problem where there was no consensus – and believe me, I think 95% of the articles had no consensus at some point – those were sent over to a working group and then discussed in the working group. Now, if the same thing happened again and no consensus was found in the working group then sometimes just one line would be sent over to a working group to try and hammer out a sentence within an hour or even a couple of hours. And sometimes after a couple of hours the sentence did not come out; it went back to the working group and still no sentence was found.

Then it all ended up really in the second week at the plenary where there was no agreement on many different points. The deal breaker was something which actually had very little to do with telecommunications to start with, and that was that all of the regulations – and this was actually a proposal made by Tunisia – that all of the regulations would take place with respect to human rights; so effectively none of the regulations would contravene human rights. And strangely enough, although all of the countries agreed to the inclusion of human rights – and initially that was not the case – later on in the week some countries also wanted to have states to have the rights to telecommunications. That's in response to some states having their telecommunications services cut due to sanctions, sanction regimes, etc. I'm talking about countries like Cuba, Iran, Somalia, Sudan – the countries that are currently under embargo.

And so the deal breaker was one where the right of states to telecommunications was equated to human rights, and the room really went up in fire when this happened. And I could say nearly literally went up in fire, it wasn't so bad but I did say some pretty interesting should we say "breakout" sessions during the breaks when the representatives of Europe and the US faces representatives of Russia, China and mostly the Arab states since the United Arab Emirates was the host. And very tense words were exchanged at the time.

But to cut a long story short, and I'm not going to keep you any longer, the end of the conference – which was supposed to take place as a consensus – actually abruptly stopped when Iran called for a vote and basically in words which, and I'm paraphrasing here, which basically said "We have wasted enough time now, let's just vote on the darn thing," and he might not have been so far... Well, not so far from what I've just said now.

The vote took place. Over 90 countries voted to sign the regulations with all of the amendments, or many of the amendments that were proposed. Fifty-five countries decided not to sign. It might be that the numbers change. Some of the countries that have decided to sign, I've seen that a number of them have actually signed the regulations and then put a statement after that which basically said "Although we have signed we reserve the right not to follow any of these regulations," which is pretty much the same thing as those countries not signing as well. And in fact some countries having not signed also reserved the right to sign later.

The regulations are due to come in force in 2015 so I believe that for the next two years we're going to see an ongoing battle between those who wish the internet to be run by governments and controlled by governments and those who wish to keep the internet as open and as user-centric as possible. I'm open to questions.

GARTH BRUEN: Does anyone have any questions for Olivier on the conference in Dubai?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: This is Evan; I've got one question in general.

GARTH BRUEN: Please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, one of the things that you pointed out while this was going on was that originally the Chair of the ITU had said that this was all going to be done by consensus and that the internet was off the table. And then as the meeting went on exactly the opposite was proven to be the case – they took a straw poll that was magically converted into a formal vote and the internet was definitely on the agenda.

To what extent has the ITU itself been damaged in its ability to broker a deal on this? It seems like that at the very least the Chair of the ITU lost a lot of credibility in promising one thing and the conference having delivered almost exactly the opposite? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan, it's Olivier for the transcript. Yes, very interesting question. There are questions with regards to Chairman Touré's lack of resolve I guess. Initially yes, as you said he said there was not going to be a vote and if the conference ended up in a vote it would be a failure. But as you might have read there was a vote at the end. Of course it was called by one of the members, one of the member countries but at the end of the day that was to be expected. And yet the ITU has released a press release that "The conference has been an absolute success!" which doesn't quite make sense.

But Chairman Touré has on a couple of occasions during those two weeks actually managed to do U-turns rather well, and once at ten-minute intervals. And he has not hidden from that. On the issue of human rights, for example, and this was immediately touched on as a second session on the second day, Tunisia announced their proposal. Chairman Touré completely agreed with it and then there was a barrage of negative replies from several countries. And barely ten minutes later Chairman Touré turned around and said "Actually you're all right – human rights have nothing to do with telecommunications." And everyone looked at each other and thought "Did he just say that??"

The ITU itself is a very strange animal. It operates partly in the way the United Nations operate but it also has its own rule and regulations. The concern now, and I think that a number of countries in Europe and also the United States are looking at the ITU and thinking "Well, the chairing of the conference itself was done by the host, and that was the United Arab Emirates. And of course the Emirates had their own delegation that was there so it was particularly difficult for the neutrality of the conference Chair. But it also looked as though there was certainly some

lack of balance from the ITU itself in treating the demands of one side over the demands of another side. And I'm sure that we are going to see an inquiry about this, maybe not a formal inquiry but certainly several countries are now looking at the situation and thinking "Should we reduce our funding to the ITU? Should we complain to the ITU? Should we start playing very strongly to get our own person as the next chair of the ITU?"

I just remind you that Chairman Touré is actually going to move on, I'm not sure if it's this year or in a couple of years' time. So there's bound to be a leadership struggle as well. So far it looks as though the whole balance of the ITU was affected and they have certainly lost a lot of credibility in this exercise.

GARTH BRUEN: Alright, thank you. And seeing as how we are running low on time I'm just going to move very quickly on the remaining items within the ALAC list. And if people have a comment on any one of them please speak up or put your hand up and I'll give a brief pause before moving on. The next item, the Trademark Clearinghouse Statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Yes please, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, thank you Garth, it's Olivier. I just wanted to, for those people who are not on the Adobe Connect, remind everyone there will be a Post-WCIT Webinar on Thursday, the 17th of January. If you don't know about it, I think it has been announced on the At-Large list but I just wanted to remind you. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Okay, this is Garth again. Any comments on Trademark Clearinghouse Statements? Going once... Any comments on the IGO/INGO statements? Going once... Thick WHOIS? Yes, I think it was Olivier first and then Alan, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth, it's Olivier for the transcript. On the IGO/INGO I just wanted to thank [Ivan] from DiploFoundation for having also helped on this, [Ivan Korolija]. He is based in Geneva and he's helped quite a lot. But I also wanted to thank Alan – I think he'll be speaking next – for having held a lot of the statements in his hand; and also Evan. Alan and Evan have both been really keeping the record going for this [one]. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, my only comment is on thick WHOIS and actually it was a question for Olivier on what are we going to be doing on that. The statement has been out there for a while; there has been very little

comment and certainly to my knowledge no negative comments. If nothing else I plan to distribute the statement un-ratified at this point to the Thick WHOIS Group tomorrow but are you planning on having a vote or should we just ask for a hands-raised consensus, what?

GARTH BRUEN: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Alan, it's Olivier for the transcript. I see that the deadline for submission was supposed to be the 9th of January. What is your deadline for having this ratified and in your hand, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the group is working and the input would be useful to the group, so I was planning on distributing it. It's not likely to change substantially prior to ratification and the ratification not likely to be refused, so I think there's nothing lost in giving the working group access to the statement. I mean they already have it if they know where to look. But the question is what are your plans in terms of ratification? I think we're talking about process here; as you point out the date's already passed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, well as soon as I have a green light from you that there's been no further comments from-

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll double check but I believe there were no substantive comments other than notes of support. But I'll double check on that and get back to you directly then.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then just for the record we'll then just start a vote. We'll start a five-day vote on it. For it to be ratified formally we need to have a vote on these things; either that or we can wait until the ALAC call but that will be up to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I'll follow up with you directly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Okay, the next item: Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone. Any comments? Going once... Policy versus Implementation Draft Framework – this is a document that was an attachment. I don't have a link for it – does anybody know of an actual link for this document? No? Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is Alan. It's probably been posted somewhere if only as an attachment to an email.

of folks, or maybe I sent it out to the whole list, but I think that any kind of voluntary compliance effort is not a real compliance effort. And I think that if we're going to be offered a volunteer solution to any kind of policy problem it's not going to work and we need to reject it out of hand.

But I see Alan has his hand up; Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I guess I would caution about the wording of this statement. VeriSign's a public company and I don't know many public companies that would agree to an audit which may incur real liabilities for them when they're not contractually bound. There may be some that are so honorable they'd do that but not many, and I'm not sure their stockholders would appreciate it. So I think the wording here is perhaps a bit harsh.

GARTH BRUEN:

This is Garth. I honestly, I think that what they did is within their own interests and I'm not surprised by it at all. And if I was in the reverse position I would probably do the same thing. I think my point is that in terms of expectations of what ICANN is presenting to the community and what ICANN says it's expecting from contracted parties, it should only be what is contracted. And if they want the contracted parties to do something it needs to be in the contract. I see your hand is up again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Garth, to make it clear to the people who haven't been following this in extreme detail, the contract that ICANN just signed with VeriSign for .com last December includes a very extensive clause saying ICANN can audit anything related to contractual compliance. The .net agreement which was signed a year and a half before that does not have such a clause and that's the basis for VeriSign saying they're not agreeing to this voluntary audit, this audit which is therefore voluntary with .net.

So along the way over the last year and a half, two years, ICANN has decided to include that clause in contracts. The .net was signed prior to that and doesn't include such a contract; presumably the next one in three and a half years will. But that's a different world. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN:

Yeah, this is Garth. And this situation just called to mind the earlier plan to have self-assessments for Compliance for the contracted parties, which to me self-policing has failed over and over again in this realm and I don't think that that kind of suggestion can be taken seriously. I mean everything needs to be clearly documented and transparent and what's required needs to be in the contract. And they need to be held to that first before any kind of voluntary items.

Okay, and if nobody has any further comments in this area we'll move on very quickly to Language and Translation. These are some standing items which were forwarded to staff but what I posted recently was a link to the Preliminary Issue Report on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information. This is an official ICANN document and I put this out there for folks in our Spanish- and French-speaking communities to review and comment on.

And I think that these are issues that impact folks in other regions slightly more but I'm not going to say that they don't impact our region – they certainly do. So any folks on this call who are within those language speaking communities please take the time to review this and comment on it. The comment period is open until February 8th.

Moving on to Travel, we have discussed travel-related issues extensively, and as I said, please let the community or me know and of course Constituency Travel know about any difficulties you may be having. This includes anything that you have done successfully, anything that you've figured out; any way you've figured out how to navigate the process and share it with everyone else so everyone else can make that happen.

Under Any Other Business I have listed a number of news items which folks have forwarded to the list or to me in the past month, but before we open any discussion on those I want to give the opportunity to the floor, to the group to bring up any other business. And I will open the floor up to any other business... No? Okay.

Does anybody have any comments or issues concerning the news items which are listed there, anything anybody wants to mention? Okay, seeing... Yes, somebody has a comment? No? Okay.

Seeing as how there are no hands and no comments I will consider this meeting to be at a close and I'll remind the folks on the Recruitment Subcommittee that I'll be reaching out to you in the next week so we can schedule a meeting for ourselves and further our discussions. And I the meantime please send me anything, any issues, anything you want to discuss and have a great week! Thank you all.

[End of Transcript]