JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the NARALO Monthly Call on Monday, 11th March, at 19:00 UTC. On the call today we have Garth Bruen, Thomas Löwenhaupt, Darlene Thompson, Joly McFie, Gordon Chillcott may arrive later; Gareth Shearman, Allan Skuce, Avri Doria, Eduardo Diaz, Murray McKercher, Andy Weissberg. We have apologies from Dana Perry, Glenn McKnight and Seth Reiss. And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani and myself, Julia Charvolen.

May I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes? Thank you very much and over to you. |

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much. Welcome to the call. If Darlene, the Secretary, could read the action items, Item #2?

DARLENE THOMPSON: Yes, the first action item is staff will assist with the backend processing of an online application form for ALSes as well as individual NARALO members. Two, request to staff to update NARALO's slideshow template by Glenn; and a note to there saying "updated by Glenn without staff assistance" item. Number three, NARALO call will observe daylight savings time until it ends Sunday, 3rd of November, 2013. And number four, Joly has indicated to the Chair that requested brochures have not arrived; the Chair is requesting a status update.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Darlene, this is Garth. In reference to the action items, in terms of number one, this is an item that's been bouncing around for a while. Is there a staff person that I can connect with directly to start working on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, this is Heidi, Garth. Yeah, Matt would be able to help you with that and he'll work with IT staff.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, I will connect with Matt directly, thank you. And then in terms of Item #2.4, do we know if the brochures were sent to Joly?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, this is Heidi again. Yes, I can confirm that they were sent and a staff colleague is working on checking with FedEx on why they have not arrived yet. So I'll let you know in the chat what's going on with that.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, well maybe Joly can help us because he has his hand up. Please, Joly, you have the floor.

JOLY MCFIE: This was to speak about the time and the fact that it says EST when it should be EDT as I already pointed out (inaudible).

GARTH BRUEN:	Okay, thank you very much. No news on the brochures though?

JOLY MCFIE:	The brochures, I haven't been into the office for two or three days so they might have come if they came in the last week.

GARTH BRUEN:	Okay, thank you. We're all eagerly awaiting news of that. So moving on, I'm going to give a quick overview of today's items and in terms of the agenda, there's a lot going on. So I'm going to ask that people be mindful of the time when they're talking and to try to keep on topic so we can finish on time and make sure we've covered everything that needs to be covered.

We're going to talk about next the preparation for the Beijing meeting and some details there. We're going to go over of course Agenda Item #4, the review of our communication and outreach issues. Number Five we're going to discuss community issues. Now within this community item we're going to have Darlene's spotlight and we're also going to discuss some potential de-accreditation of an ALS; and we're also going to talk about some other important issues. Under #6, some general questions about the Summit – I know this is our next event on the horizon and I want to make sure we have all the information for that.

We have some very pertinent items concerning New gTLDs, specifically the objection to .health and we're going to be covering that in a couple of different ways. Glenn issued a report on the Nominating Committee and I believe he sent that out to the region, so everybody should have a copy of that. He's not going to be on the call today so you will have to

send any questions to him about that. And then #9, we have a long list of ALAC and Regional items to discuss.

Okay, going right into the preparation for the… Now Joly, you still have your hand up. Did you have another question?

JOLY MCFIE: No.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you. Alright, as we discussed previously Item #3.1, the NARALO scheduled meeting in Beijing will be dedicated to outreach, inreach and recruitment and I will be sending out a meeting agenda for an upcoming teleconference directly to that Subcommittee; and we can discuss all that. Maybe we'll bring Matt in with us and we can talk about some of the specifics of getting the applications updated.

Item #3.2, very important: I've heard from a number of people. Is there anybody on the call who is a sponsored NARALO traveler who does not have or is missing some of their travel items? Going once, going twice, going three times… Okay.

Item #3.3, have all of the travelling NARALO members, sponsored or unsponsored, have they all received copies of their visa? And for those who are sponsored, have they sent their visa to Constituency Travel? And part of this question would be for staff also – if staff is aware of any outstanding visas not received from NARALO members?

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Garth, this is Heidi. I'm not aware of anything.
GARTH BRUEN:	Okay. Are there any sponsored travel members who have not received their visa or who is having a problem with their visa?
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	Garth, this is Evan. Sorry, I'm down from Adobe Connect at the moment. I have my visa but I haven't submitted it to Constituency Travel – I didn't realize that was required.
GARTH BRUEN:	Okay. Yeah, that was one of the details within Constituency Travel's request – they wanted to have it I guess by last Saturday which was the 9th. I don't know why they needed it by that specific date. I don't know if that's something that staff currently on the call can educate us about.
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	That may have just been a prodding to make sure that everyone got it by then. I'm wondering what the time gap is going to be. Anyway…
GARTH BRUEN:	That was my assumption, is that they just wanted to make sure everybody was thinking about it and being timely. Okay. This is Garth. If nobody's going to step up to discuss any problems they're having with travel details or visas we're going to move on from this item.

There is going to be a Pre-Beijing Policy Webinar – there's going to be two of them on March 21st…. Sorry? Did somebody have something to say? March 21st at 12:00 UTC and then on the same day at 19:00 UTC, and it should be linked directly from that action item within the agenda.

Item #3.5, there was a discussion about a meeting with the Address Supporting Organization in Beijing, and is anybody on the call aware of the details about that or wishes to speak about that? Going once, going twice, going three times…

And some people have submitted this various, this interesting article about how the great firewall of China works and how we may be impacted by that while we are over there. And we can reserve discussion of that for later in the call in our "Any Other Business" if we need to.

Okay, Agenda Item #4, we have been working on our communication and outreach strategy and as I said earlier the meeting in Beijing will be dedicated to that discussion. And we're continuing to develop an agenda. We've had some positive movements on this, and Louie Houle has jumped on and is interested in helping out. And I'll be, like I said I'll be sending out a meeting poll about that, a Doodle about that this week hopefully and we can discuss over teleconference soon; or I'll have staff do it. Staff has indicated that they're willing to assist with coordinating those meetings of the Subcommittee as well.

Under Agenda Item #4.3, this is something that's come up in the last week very heavily because of our debate about .health and I think it's a good time to review our conduct within NARALO in terms of how we work on the calls, how we work within the email threads and how we

deal with each other on a personal basis as well in terms of NARALO business. The first sub-item there, #4.3.1 – for those who are asking is there actually a rule of conduct? There is. There is a code of conduct, and Code of Conduct Item #22.1 – "The ALAC Discussion Lists and its other collaborative online spaces serve two purposes. They are where we discuss ICANN-related policy issues and attend to administrative tasks related to the management of ALAC." And that is linked there for anybody who wishes to read it.

We had an incident come up last week while we were debating the .health issue and there was some personal, unfortunate personal comments and these personal comments have been expunged from the record because they are not policy related. I know that these debates can get very, very heated but I want to remind everybody to stay focused on policy and that personal comments like that will not be accepted; and that unfortunately they reflect very poorly upon the entire region. So if we can keep all of our discussion policy related it would be appreciated.

Item #4.3.2 – as far as topics on the NARALO list, this is also something that has come up quite a bit recently. As we see in the Code of Conduct section, the online spaces are really for specific ICANN policy issues and administrative tasks for the community. Now, I'm guilty of this too in terms of posting interesting news items on the email lists etc., etc. This has occasionally generated some complaints about the usage of the email thread, and I think that within many people's minds they subscribe to a lot of different threads. I do, also – I subscribe to many email lists, I have a lot of emails to read during the day and I think that people would like to have an expectation that when they see that

something comes on the NARALO list that it is NARALO-specific and it's something that needs their attention. And I think that this would save everybody aggravation in terms of having to read specific emails.

However, if you do come across an item that you feel is critical to the community and that needs to be shared on the NARALO list, it's really up to you to explain why and to be able to justify it and to be able to explain why it is pertinent to our community and requires attention and discussion. If you just post a link, if you just post a news item that does not appear relevant to anybody you're going to get challenged. If you actually do feel it is relevant to NARALO, to ICANN, to any of the policy issues then feel free to comment but make sure you justify it within your submission as to why you think it's related to NARALO business.

Any other items for discussion we have the Skype chat. This has been said over and over again and I've even been reminded of this myself, to put that on the Skype chat. And whatever doesn't apply to policy, doesn't apply to ICANN but is still interesting, is still something you want to discuss, talk about it on the NARALO or on the At-Large Skype chat.

In terms of the actual handling of the .health objection debate and polling, Item #4.3.3, I received a little bit of criticism and I actually am willing to accept it about the way that this particular debate and polling was handled. I feel like it was really, this whole thing has been last minute; I did the best I could. We do want to make this as democratic a process as possible and I will keep this in mind for the next one.

A comment was made to me that last minute votes come in all the time for ALAC and ALAC is able to deal with them. I think that's kind of a different animal because ALAC is a more tightly-knit group that votes on

things regularly. It's part of their normal business and they talk to each other frequently. Getting all of the NARALO ALSes to officially vote on something is a lot more complicated, and I think that if we're going to have a debate and a vote on something that is as complicated as the .health objection the community really needs more time to ramp up to that. And I'm certainly willing to open the floor to discussion or questions on this issue or any of the other conduct issues if anybody has any. And I'll leave this open for a second…

I see that Alan has posted within the chat "The ALAC Code of Conduct – there is an overriding ICANN standard of behavior." Yes, there is and we will add that maybe to the action items for people to review. Darlene has her hand up; please, Darlene, you have the floor.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Darlene Thompson for the record. Yes, I agree that it does take a lot of time to ramp up to a formal vote of the ALSes, but I do think that when we don't have a lot of time like we didn't have a lot of time for the .health that any kind of conversation should be encouraged; and if you need an informal poll that that should be encouraged, too. And I know that that wasn't a formal poll but to get some kind of consensus out of the region, to get some kind of direction… Sometimes we can't give the full amount of time that a subject may deserve so I'd rather see like what happened with .health happen rather than stifle this kind of discussion.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you very much, Darlene. As Darlene said, this wasn't an official vote. I think that the procedure definitely could be better next time but I do feel like we had quite a bit of input from several different ALSes and from all of NARALO's ALAC members. And it was a very intense debate and this will be noted going down the line that we can handle this better and we can have a more official vote. And if nobody…. Oh Evan, you have your hand up. Please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, I'd simply make a point about the way that this was handled, that the end result was that NARALO actually came out of this with no opinion. When it came time to poll the regions of whether or not they accepted or rejected the objections, essentially three regions came in saying they approved the objections. EURALO said that they explicitly abstained, and NARALO effectively for the purposes of this process was silent. So it wasn't even a matter of coming forth and saying "We're split" or coming forth and saying "We reject or accept essentially," there was no NARALO input into the RALO level of advancing the objections. And I think that was probably more significant than anything else.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, this is Garth again. Does anybody have any insight as to why EURALO abstained? I see Alan has his hand up. Please, go ahead Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not to answer that question so I'll let anyone else answer if they can.

GARTH BRUEN: No? Okay, go ahead with your issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think it's important to understand we're not just being pedantic about this. The objection process was hard fought to get it for ALAC and At-Large. The Applicant Guidebook has interesting wording in it: it says that we have a right to object if we create and publish a set of rules as to how we're doing it, and those rules included getting essentially formal positions from the RALOs as to how they felt in the objection process. So we lucked out in that perhaps in the three RALOs that did substantively contribute; if we had contributed the results might have been different on the fifth TLD that the Review Group was looking at.

But by not stepping up to our part of the responsibilities we are essentially potentially calling into question whether the ALAC should be given responsibilities like this if it cannot get all of its organizations to respond reasonably. And yes, there were timing problems and all sorts of other issues that I'm not going to go into but the bottom line is we ended up not participating in the processes as Evan said; and I think that calls into question or could call into question whether we should be given that level of responsibility. Since I think all of us believe yes, we should be, we have to make sure in the future that this kind of thing doesn't happen again. And that might mean calling attention to the fact that there's not enough time and we need an extension of some sort.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth, I mean in terms of the extension basically I don't think that there was any room for that. I mean I even asked for it I think and I was just told "No, this is the deadline, this is the deadline." In terms of not participating, is that how you really see this? Because I would say that there was extremely active participation and we did put the opinions forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can respond to that very quickly; I don't want to go over time.

GARTH BRUEN: Yeah, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: NARALO has quorum rules; I believe that it's a quorum of 50% is required to make a formal decision. I suspect, although I haven't counted, that the number of ALSes or independent members represented by the people who were vocal does not come anywhere near there – I suspect, I haven't counted.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth again. So in terms of that then, you're basically saying that our vote in terms of this was really an abstention or was really not a vote.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I don't think we took a vote. You asked for input from the various people; I think this kind of thing warranted a vote or a consensus call but one that would stand up to scrutiny.

GARTH BRUEN: Right, this is Garth again. I don't want to go to "the dog ate my homework" but unfortunately the Review Group gave us no instructions.

ANNALISA ROGERS: Excuse me Garth, can you hear me? Can I make a comment?

GARTH BRUEN: Who is this?

ANNALISA ROGERS: This is Annalisa.

GARTH BRUEN: Oh Annalisa, I want to let Alan finish and then I'll go to you and then I'll go to Evan who had his hand up.

ANNALISA ROGERS: Yeah, I apologize, I'm on a phone so I didn't know how to put my hand up. Okay.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, that's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just very quickly, this is a post-mortem. We're not trying to point fingers and say who did it wrong but let's try and learn should this kind of thing come up again – and it will – that we have to take better care. That's all.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you. Annalisa and then Evan.

ANNALISA ROGERS: Thank you, Garth. Yeah, I wanted to make a comment. A little while back there was a question if anybody had insights on EURALO, and I don't directly have insight on EURALO but I thought I would just make this comment: I know that the Europeans in terms of the GAC organizations or any kind of objections that go through there, they are heavily influenced by what the European Union or European Commission feels or what viewpoints they're pointing out. And so the European Commission in terms of the GAC, they didn't actually follow the GAC procedures – they just made their own procedure by submitting a letter.

So I don't know if that's valuable insight that maybe some of the individuals that essentially represent either organizations might wear two hats and represent countries or what have you in EURALO may have felt uncomfortable not knowing a position from the European Commission before just making opinions through the ALAC also. So it's just an observation that you know, it didn't really happen in the GAC; maybe that's why it didn't happen in ALAC – just a thought.

And then another thing I wanted to just talk about, what Alan was saying is one idea with participation through ALAC is that a lot of – at least speaking for myself, some ALAC members are also wearing other hats. And while I'm representing individuals through an ISOC chapter in California I'm also an applicant and I play different roles and have different relationships. So it could be somewhat awkward to be getting involved in objection processes on one hand through the ALAC when I'm wearing different hats in different areas, and I think that one thing about ALAC is that it's a lot of the usual members do actually wear different hats.

And ideally we would have a lot of ALAC members that that's all they do; they're just individuals representing associations or organizations outside of the industry but I'm not sure we have a lot of that yet. But it might be something we want to strive for.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, this is Garth. So Annalisa, just quickly are you saying that you think that people in EURALO had a conflict?

ANNALISA ROGER: I think yeah, maybe if it's not an actually filled out conflict it could feel uncomfortable to step forward. Yeah, I guess I am, sort of, maybe.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, alright. Evan, you've put your hand down, are you…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No sorry, it was meant to be up.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, so Evan and then Avri. Please, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, I just want to make it clear that in terms of how the feedback was received, when Dev gave his report to the ALAC about how this was done he received clear direction from three of the RALOs that they wanted to advance. So in other words, LACRALO advanced all five; AFRALO advanced all five; APRALO advanced the four Latin script ones but did not advance the IDN one. EURALO brought back a decision that it was split and abstained because it did not have a definite decision one way or the other. NARALO was the only region that did not put forward any opinion.

We had the option of being able to go and say we supported the objections, we rejected the objections, or we were split and like EURALO abstained. But when it came time for them to send in a report to the ALAC on what had been received there had been nothing received – that's the way it came across. I'm simply stating from what I recall of what Dev had gone through and the reporting to the ALAC; there was no report of either yes, no, or "We're split" received.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth. I don't think that that's actually correct but we're going to have to go back and look at the tape. Avri, please go ahead. Avri, you have the floor.

AVRI DORIA: Sorry, I had to take myself off mute, this is Avri speaking. Just briefly, I'm also a participant in EURALO because I'm a wannabe European who spends a lot of time there and I think part of the problem is that very few of us voiced opinions. There were two strong ones voiced; they were in opposition and EURALO really had no time to get into it between the time when the request went out and the decision had to be made, especially because I believe its Chair is also under the weather at the moment. So a confluence of events kept it from really being discussed. I do not believe that the European Commission or the EU positions came into it at all. There were just two active speakers; they disagreed and at that point it was an abstain because we don't have a clear view. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Alright. If there are no further comments I'm going to close this issue for the moment so we can move on to our spotlight. If Darlene is ready and if staff can give her control or run the presentation we can get started on that. Darlene, are you ready?

DARLENE THOMPSON: I'm ready to go. I just have a quick blurb to say and then we can watch the video if staff can just go ahead and play the video as soon as I stop talking. If you do click on the link there in the NARALO ALSes Spotlight you'll see a little map of where Nunavut is. NCAP's mandate is to provide all people in Nunavut with access to and training on internet for increased adoption and utilization of today's increasingly complex

information and communication technologies, or ICTs. Our mission is to develop and champion sustainable community initiatives and applications using ICTs that enhance economic, educational, social and cultural opportunities throughout Nunavut. NCAP operates a network of tele-centers, and we refer to them as Community Activist Program or CAP sites in Canada and we do this throughout Nunavut.

Nunavut itself is a very large territory that encompasses one-fifth of Canada's land mass with only 25 communities with a total population of around 30,000 people. There are no roads from one community to another nor linking us to the south, and 85% of the people in Nunavut are Inuit so it's very difficult for individuals to have adequately affordable or fast internet into these extreme remote communities or to provide these community members with training or access to ICTs. So that's where NCAP comes in. We seek out federal and territorial funding in order to keep these centers staffed and the equipment well-maintained and additionally we work very hard to bring different training initiatives to the communities both in English and in the Inuit language of Inuktitut.

One of these items that I've just been working on is in the video that Matt I'm sure will be playing now.

GARTH BRUEN: People may have to turn up the volume on their consoles in order to hear it.

DARLENE THOMPSON: And if not there is a link to it on the page that is linked in from our agenda.

[video plays]

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, that was wonderful. This is Garth again. Any further comments, Darlene?

DARLENE THOMPSON: No, that's it – and just to show you how bad our broadband is I didn't even get to see that because it wouldn't stream properly up here. [laughing] So that's just normal for me though, so thanks.

GARTH BRUEN: Darlene, do you have a show up there called *Zero Hour*?

DARLENE THOMPSON: No, never heard of it.

GARTH BRUEN: Because we actually have a show, they went to Nunavut in the first episode but it doesn't matter. Okay.

Now, as far as the ALS Spotlight goes we're going to do this on each call. We're going to solicit a volunteer from each ALS to step up and give a two- to five-minute presentation of what their organization does and

how we contribute to NARALO. And so we'll be looking for a volunteer not for next month, because next month's meeting will be in Beijing. We'd be looking for a volunteer to give a presentation on the May call, so if there's anybody out there who hasn't done one yet think about it and start preparing for it; and let me and let staff know about this. Okay.

Moving on, further down in our community we had a Fellowship Program item also. Darlene sent a brief to me about possibly getting some indigenous people on the Fellowship application. Do you have any quick comments about that, Darlene, just to give everybody an idea of what we're talking about?

DARLENE THOMPSON: Darlene Thompson. Well, the Fellowship Program is specifically for underdeveloped countries, for those that have lower economies. So if you're say a Fellowship applicant or you want to be a Fellowship applicant and you're from Canada or the US they won't even look at you because we are supposedly "developed." However, our point was that our, especially our indigenous populations often live in areas and are under such circumstances that they would not be considered "developed" and they are in lower economies.

If I look at Canada's Reserves, if I look at Nunavut itself we have many, many, many people living well below the poverty line and I wouldn't be surprised if the situation weren't the same in the United States where you have a vast difference between what's available in any of the urban centers compared to the reserves and places like that. So I guess my point was that I think that people coming from these less-advantaged

areas should be given Fellowship opportunities as well and should be looked at rather than just being denied the opportunity because they are in an affluent country.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much, this is Garth. This is going to be a cornerstone of our outreach efforts and we're going to be discussing this within the Subcommittee, absolutely.   And the same may apply to some communities within the United States as well.

Okay, moving on #5.2 – this was a discussion item from the last call that is ongoing concerning a vote for Board Seat #15. Avri brought this up and she has sent out some materials on it. Avri, did you have any kind of a statement or update on this? Do you wish to discuss it at all?

AVRI DORIA: Hi, this is Avri again. I just wanted to basically send that. I'm certainly open to conversations on it. Certainly if and when At-Large really gets a discussion going on it I'd like to get A.) support for there being a discussion at this point – and I don't know what's happening, if anything's happening; and B.) if we have a discussion I'm hoping to be able to convince the folks in NARALO to support at least a little wider notion of voting. But at this point I have nothing further to add but I'm more than willing to answer questions about what I wrote if anybody has any.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you – this is Garth. I do think that this is an important item and we should continue the discussion going. Alan has his hand up. Please, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep, my understanding is ALAC leadership has said there will be a discussion on this in Beijing. I thought that was already on the agenda.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. That's correct. That's going to take place Sunday afternoon, the 7th of April.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth. If that's the case I will add it to this call agenda and we'll make sure we keep an eye on that – thank you very much. Avri, you have your hand up again.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, okay. Okay, so I checked that as a rejection of us starting to talk about it before Beijing which is something I had also been requesting from people, but okay. I guess starting it then… I just hope that starting it in Beijing is not too late and then all of a sudden when we come to vote or select again we go "Ah, well, too bad, we should have started this earlier." But if it starts in Beijing it starts in Beijing, what can I do?

GARTH BRUEN: Avri, this is Garth. I think you're being premature about your objection; this is why I include it on the agenda so we can talk about it and we can find a space to talk about it. Alan has his hand up, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just to be clear, I didn't say the discussion is going to start in Beijing. I said there would be a face-to-face discussion on it in Beijing. I made no statements of anything other than that.

AVRI DORIA: Yes sir.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, I think that we can agree that there is plenty of room for discussion on this issue and there will be an actual meeting on it in Beijing which is fantastic.   Okay, if nobody has any further comments on that we can move on but make a note of it.

In terms of the status of ALS applications we had an application from the University Community Partnership for Social Action Research. There have been some issues with the due diligence. I tried to reach out to them directly and I did not receive a response so this has gone into complete limbo and as far as staff is concerned did we ever resolve the question from Legal about their applicability?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Yes, Legal did respond but again, this application has a lot of issues including that the application may have been sent without the

full support or even awareness of some of the people involved. So given that, Garth, perhaps we can try again to contact our contact person and go over some of these. I can forward you what Legal's response was, and just given that there's a whole complex series of things going on with this application it's not so simple.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth. It will be important for us to see that Legal response for future reference, absolutely, so I'd like to see that and we'd like to post it if it's possible.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I'll [work with that].

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Staff, have we had any applications for unaffiliated members?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi, this is Matt. No, we haven't.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. This is a question which we discussed-

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. We have had one resignation.

GARTH BRUEN:	Oh yes, we did – we had the resignation of Eric Brunner-Williams, thank you. This is Garth again. Under our Operating Principles we have a clause which details the procedure for de-accrediting an ALS. Now, we have a couple of organizations in there; one of them is… I believe I put it in the quote but now I don't see it… It was yes, the Alberta Community Network Association.
	Apparently this organization either no longer exists or it has no active members. So we're going to look into the procedure of removing them from the list. I don't think we should do this lightly so I want to put this item out there for everybody's review and for them to think about. And we can prepare… We can discuss it in Beijing and then prepare an actual process to de-accredit them following the adopted procedure if everybody's comfortable with that. Alan, you have your hand up please.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah, my recollection is Beau Brendler's former organization also no longer exists and yet I believe they're still an ALS.
GARTH BRUEN:	This is Garth. Yeah, I wanted to make sure so we don't take this process lightly that we start with I guess the low-hanging fruit, go through the procedure once; make sure everything is one properly and then we can move to de-accredit Beau's organization if needed. I don't want to go through and just start knocking people off the list en masse; I want to make sure that we do this thoroughly. Darlene, you have your hand up, please.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Yeah, Darlene Thompson. About the Alberta Community Network Association, I actually know personally the guys that applied for that organization and they have confirmed that the organization itself no longer exists period. So it's not like they're inactive – they're gone, they no longer exist. The guys that used to work for them all have different jobs and they don't exist as a society anymore. So that definitely is the lowest hanging fruit to knock off the branch, and it's because of that that I did suggest that that group be [in a]… As for Web Watch I had discussed this with Beau probably a couple years ago and he thought he had done everything he needed to to get them down the accreditation process but apparently not. But yeah, there is no one there apparently with interest so that would be the next one. But I do agree with Garth's approach, like let's start with the easy one first and see how it goes.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you very much. Avri, you have your hand up again, please.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, sorry yes, my hand is up again. I wanted to ask – do we actually have a checklist of what due process in this procedure is? If not I would suggest we draw one up. I think it's very good that you're going to do this weeding but I do think that there should really be a sort of very strict due process checklist that you follow through with ample timings and known process and known procedures, and letters by snail mail and whatever before you actually do it. And I mean I don't know; if you

actually have such a thing please point me at it so I can look at it and say how wonderful but I just don't know. Thanks.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth. We are going to start with the language that is posted within the agenda currently which covers this. And we'll meet in person in Beijing; we'll do this with full transparency and with lots of communication within NARALO and official communication with this former group. Even though Darlene says it's not necessary we will do it and get it documented.

I think Alan had his hand up but he took it down?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, my recollection is there are formal rules in our Rules and it has to do with not participating for N teleconferences and N votes or whatever. So there are formal rules.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, and this is Garth – we'll make sure that we follow those to the letter and that everybody is aware of it. If there are no more comments in observation of the time I want to keep moving. Participation working group watch – I may move this over, completely over into the outreach agenda. We're just trying to keep an eye on areas where we don't have a lot of participation where we can add people.

Moving on to #5.6 under cross-RALO relations, we're working with APRALO to help them out with their agenda; and the Secretariats' Meeting has been added to the schedule which is on the Wednesday

the 10th of April between 12:30 and 14:00 local. I don't know off the top of my head what the time in US time or Canadian time will be for that call, when the remote will be available but we'll make sure we have that up.

This next section #5.7 just covers the details of Daylight Savings Time, and thanks to Joly I corrected the – yeah, I will correct the 3PM EST to say 3PM EDT or the other equivalents to make sure that it's technically correct.

Moving on, #5.8 we have had some people with some technical problems with Adobe on these calls; I happen to be one of those persons. I have an extra session open on my laptop that was crashing and of course, just as you might expect it hasn't crashed yet and it's been fine for this entire call. I did make some updates to Firefox since the last call – maybe that has fixed it, but I wanted to give an opportunity for anybody else who's had particular technical problems with Adobe to step forward and document them on this call.

I know for a fact that some of you have had problems. Does anybody… Yes, Evan, you have your hand up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, I typically use Adobe Connect on a Linux system. It used to be absolutely horrible; it's gotten much better lately. My problems of late have been with the Android version of Adobe Connect. I have on occasion been traveling and have been trying to use the tablet version of Adobe Connect and generally speaking it's not too bad. Again, it has improved. It just has this wonderful habit of when you're in the chat

and you're trying to delete something, when you press the "delete" it just basically puts in the content of whatever was in the clipboard and so essentially you can't delete what you type once you're in the chat...which means you have to either abandon what you were saying or potentially type something very awkward into the chat.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you Evan. Alan, you have your hand up please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I use it on a Windows system. I experienced a number of crashes and just freezes over a period of several weeks but the last few weeks I've had no problems at all. So it may well be that whatever was causing those was fixed.

GARTH BRUEN: Alan, what browser do you use?

ALAN GREENBERG: Firefox.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, you use Firefox, alright. Well, I know there were a lot of complaints within the Firefox community about specific crashes, really bad crashes and I wasn't experiencing them. There was an update released recently and it's possible that that did fix it. But in general I'd like to ask that everybody keep track of their crashes in terms of Adobe Connect, share them with the list or send them to me; and I'll

coordinate with Matt and we'll try to figure out if there's a particular problem that can be corrected on staff's side. And if nobody has any more comments on this we will move on.

Just a quick question, Agenda Item #6: do we know where and when the Summit is going to occur? Has that been decided yet?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes.

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, we do?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes, I mean Heidi can back me up – sorry, this is Evan. It has been confirmed that it will be during the London ICANN meeting which is tentatively to take place June of 2014.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you very much. We'll start making note of that and I believe that we have to start preparing some budget requests for that. Heidi, you have your hand up, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, just a couple of clarifications. Again, the request is going to be made that the Summit, the ATLAS2 take place at the ICANN meeting or along the sidelines of the ICANN meeting in June, 2014. That has not been fully approved yet.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Oh.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And then also, but we're hoping very much for that. And the second point is that it's not actually going to be an AC request – it's going to be an exceptional request. So and Olivier and myself and others are working on that. Olivier, I know you're on the line, if you have additional points to make on that…

GARTH BRUEN: Darlene has her hand up first and then we'll go to Olivier if he does.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Darlene Thompson. Yeah, I just wanted to mention I am on the Finance Subcommittee so I was aware of this, that it is [hoped] for for London although not approved. One thing that we as the RALOs are being asked is that if we are looking to have a General Assembly in the 2014 fiscal year that we do not ask for a General Assembly in that year since we'll be able to have it in London anyway. So when we are thinking about our own finance requests, not to (inaudible) – it only makes sense, really.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Olivier, did you have a comment in response to Heidi? I think Olivier may not be on the phone; he may only be on the Adobe Connect.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I am on there, Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, please Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm right here. No, I have nothing else to add. The Finance and Budget Subcommittee has been briefed with proceeding forward with making requests and of course we've got this At-Large Summit which is our big thing this year and we'll soon have more on this.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Evan, you have your hand up?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes, I just want to note that in terms of the mention of a possible General Assembly, if there is not an approval for the ATLAS taking place at this time I would note also that the ICANN meeting directly after London is designated for North America. So it's my hope that if it's not approved for London that at the very least there would be a General Assembly held at the next meeting wherever it's designated in North America.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you very much. If there are no more comments on the Summit I will close this item and move right into new gTLDs, specifically the .health objection. Now, just in terms of observing the time and keeping it topical, we've already kind of discussed the NARALO polling,

etc. I would really like for this portion of the discussion to be about the ALAC vote coming up which is supposed to happen this week – I believe it closes on Wednesday. So in terms of discussing the .health objection that's what I'd like for this particular section to be for. Evan, you have your hand up, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Oh sorry, that's residual. Sorry.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. So the question now is because ALAC now has the ball I suppose, and just to sum up: three of the regions voted to move at least four of the objections forward – does anyone from ALAC have… And I see Eduardo has his hand up. Eduardo, please.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I think the vote is due today, Monday. This is Eduardo for the record. Maybe somebody else can confirm this.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, the vote of what?

EDUARDO DIAZ: The vote for ALAC is due today, Monday.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth. I thought it was on the 13th.

EDUARDO DIAZ: For going forward with the objections or not – that's my understanding from the last call.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Oh, I thought that was on the 12th. Heidi, can you confirm that? I remember from the call for votes I thought the deadline was on the 12th.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. That's my understanding. Matt, you have the last word on this. When does that vote close?

MATT ASHTIANI: That's my understanding as well. That is correct, actually.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, and that was Matt. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: The 12th, thank you . Thank you for the clarification, this is Eduardo.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, this is Garth. So it will be… What's the actual timeframe Heidi? Is it midnight UTC on the 12th?

MATT ASHTIANI:	This is Matt, correct. It's 23:59 UTC.
GARTH BRUEN:	Okay. And I would assume that everybody in observance of what Olivier requested previously, that there has been some discussion within ALAC about this? Do we have any kind of… I know Evan put out a statement – does anybody else have anything they want to discuss about this?
ALAN GREENBERG:	It's Alan, I've got a couple of comments I can make quickly.
GARTH BRUEN:	Please, Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. I think number one it's important to remember there are four different votes – one doesn't have to vote the same. If you look at the documents in terms of the public interest statements, in terms of the applications, the four applications are very different from each other. And my personal opinion and I know Evan was the one who first voiced this is that some of them, the perception is that these might be managed in a way that is supportive of the public interests and others are business. And that clearly will make a difference.
GARTH BRUEN:	Okay. I mean I know – this is Garth. I know there has been some concern and myself included that this isn't a true community objection. And I know this has been expressed by some other folks but I suppose if

the ALAC members want to keep their votes a secret until the last secret that's certainly their prerogative but the rest of us are going to be hanging on tender hooks until then.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Garth, this is Evan. I thought I made my intentions reasonably clear. I have not voted yet pending the outcome of this call to see if there was any significant feedback. I will be on the record though as saying that this vote is far less important than I think many people are blowing it into. In the realm of all the various things that ICANN is expected to do and that ALAC is expected to comment on, this to me is actually something of a blip. While the process is very important and the development of this objection procedure is an interesting and useful milestone in ALAC's maturity, the vote itself – this very specific vote on objections of four of hundreds of applications to me is far less important than people are blowing it up into and I'll leave it at that.

Frankly I must say as a personal observation I've been amazed by the tone of the comments, by you know, some of the dire "Watch what you do" kind of comments. And in fact it's my understanding that the results of the vote will not be open in terms of knowing who voted how because there's some ALAC members that are seriously concerned of being harassed – such as been the tone surrounding this particular vote. And I must say I'm very concerned about it and to me this has been blown up far out of proportion to its actual value to our role within the workings of ICANN.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, this is Garth. Perhaps, I mean if the procedure maybe next time can be ironed out maybe that can be alleviated a little bit because I think that there were some bumps in the way that the Review Group was able to get information and keeping our things on time and things coming in at the last minute, so yeah.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'll give you my own views of this, is that the problems with this go right to the top of it. And many of the problems within this objection process have much in common with the same problems we encountered with the Applicant Support Process. We were asked and demanded to come up with very, very elaborate procedures that in the end turned out to be horribly underused. I mean if the most that the community can come up with with objecting to was four objections – and even that "community" is essentially a proxy of the World Health Organization as opposed to grassroots groups – you know, having objections for .health but none against .healthcare…. You know, the entire way this has come across has been very, very disappointing.

But Garth, we could have jolted the process with lightning and I don't think it would have mattered a whole lot. There's some very, very high-level reasons for why this hasn't worked out I think as it was intended.

GARTH BRUEN: Well, that's interesting. Olivier, you have your hand up and then Alan, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Garth, it's Olivier for the transcript. I was just going to add to what Evan has said – maybe not the second part of his comments because I'm not going to comment on that until we've basically established where things went wrong and why did the word not get out there, and why did the Review Group not get more requests from the community because clearly when one speaks to the community outside of the bubble of ICANN there are all sorts of issues that people have with ICANN and that people might have with new gTLDs. But it doesn't look as though there have been many more than a handful of objections called and referred to the Review Group.

That said, the Review Group itself was pretty much working in darkness. It's pioneering steps; they're obviously learning a lot from this first experience and I really hope that we will all be able to learn from that first experience and during the next rounds. And I'm adding an "s" after "round" hoping there won't be just another one round or something, I don't know. Hopefully in the next rounds the problems will be ironed out and we will obviously learn from our mistakes.

But I do note that it is the first time that the ALAC has an operational process that it had to design from scratch and it had to ask for tools and work with ICANN staff for the tools. And so far I haven't seen any major blip or break in the system apart from of course the part which is the publicizing it outside of the ICANN walls. But somehow our hands are tied in that. So that's all, thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth. Just before moving on to Alan, as a member of the New gTLD Objection Review Group it was actually, it was kind of difficult

because we started off with several objections to different strings. We had to research those and in the midst of this we came up, we pushed one forward – the objections against .health. And it was really kind of… It was really only at that point did that application or that objection come under the microscope because we had the other objections to consider previously and we couldn't focus enough. And then when I took a really, really close look at it I didn't necessarily like what I saw and this is where my problems with it got started. Alan, you have your hand up again, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to lend a bit of pragmatism to this. There have been glitches, bumps, and blips in every blasted part of the New gTLD Process so let's not claim that the problems we've had with this are unique. The whole thing has been a learning process. The whole thing has been littered with things that we should have done differently if we had been smart enough to do it. So let's accept it as a learning process.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Avri, you have your hand up, please.

AVRI DORIA: Yes thank you, this is Avri speaking. I want to basically take very seriously the things Evan said about outreach and publicity. I think as the Chair of the Working Group that was responsible for creating these processes, I think it'll be very important for us once all is said and done – things are still happening at the moment; but once all is said and done

to actually do take a look at what happened, what should have happened, what could have happened, what should happen in the future. And this somehow dovetails into the work we're doing on the SARP outreach and recommendations or becomes somehow a separate activity, I think it's critical that we take a look at it. And at some point if we do that we'll be inviting everybody to give us their comments on what they think the problems were and how things should be improved in the future. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you Avri. This is Garth again. If there are no objections or further comments I'm going to close this item for the moment and we'll look for the results of that ALAC vote. We're going to skip over-

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Oh, sorry Garth, sorry to interrupt you but just before we move on I just want to make clear that nobody had any comments or whatever about the substance of the objections or any comments on what I had posted? Like I said, I had withheld actually doing my vote until I had got any pending feedback from this call and it sounds like on the substance of the vote there is none.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you Evan, that's noted. This is Garth again. We're going to skip over Agenda Item #8 because Glenn is not on the call and we can certainly direct any questions about NomCom activity to him. He did put in a date of… The date of nominations will be closing on May 1st, so that's something to keep an eye on.

Moving on to Agenda Item #9, the ALAC issues, and I've listed many, many issues that have come up over the month. And I put out a request for people to help me prioritize them; I didn't hear from anybody so the item I put at the top of the list is something that I came across just over the weekend, and that is specifically that the negotiation updates that were published last week are different in some content to the previously disclosed list. And in particular there are changes to registrar responsibility over WHOIS and selling bulk WHOIS which was not in the list previously but has been added recently.

And regardless of how you feel about the specific issue I think this is problematic in terms of the way that our community has not been a part of the negotiations even as an observer that things like this can be slipped in at the end. And before I open the floor to ALAC discussion I'd like to get people's opinions on that. Thank you. None? Okay.

Then I will move on through the list. The next item is Finance and Budget Subcommittee – do we have any comments on that? Going once, going twice… Next item is the WHOIS At-Large Working Group recent call – comments on that? Going once, going twice, going three times… Generic closed applications – there's been a statement posted recently, I believe it is linked there. Any comments or updates on this? Going once, going twice, going three times…

The ALAC Statement on the WHOIS Registrant Identification Study and Draft Report – I don't have a link for that. I believe that I did have one somewhere and I'll dig it up and add it. Proposed Modification of GNSO PDP Manual to Address Suspension of a PDP – going once, going twice, going three times… Before I go through the list does anybody have any,

anybody from ALAC have anything they want to discuss from this list or any other items that they want to bring forward? Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Garth, this is Olivier for the transcript. I've asked staff to ask several people to provide us with details whether there will be a statement or whether they believe there should be a statement in all of these, and you can see the latest update on the At-Large Policy Development Page which will tell you if there is or if there isn't a statement forthcoming. And of course you're all very welcome to take part in the drafting, thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: Olivier, this is Garth – was that in reference to something specific or just in general to the Policy Development Page?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Garth, it's Olivier for the transcript. In general to the whole page. We've got the Modification of GNSO PDP Manual, the FY14 Community Travel; FY14 Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework. We've got the Consultation on Root Zone KFK Rollover, etc., etc. – they're all listed there.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you. And also within – this is Garth. Within that list there is a link to the Policy Advice Development Page which covers all of these items. So if the ALAC members don't have any further comments on anything we can move on and wrap up the call slightly overtime. Going

once, going twice, going three times… Does anybody have any other business that they need to bring up? Going once, going twice, going three times…

One action item that I put at the end, just housekeeping for staff – can we move all of the Toronto meeting pages underneath a specific directory in the navigation and also the same for any of the NARALO teleconference meetings before 2012 if that's possible?

SILVIA VIVNACO: Yes, this is Silvia Vivanco – we will do that. I'm noting the action item.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much. So if there are no other issues, anything anybody wants to bring up please save them for the NARALO list and we will see you in Beijing if you're going. And please stay in touch and bring anything to my attention that's a problem. Alright? Have a great week everybody, bye.

[End of Transcript]