
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC leadership team monthly conference call on the Thursday, the 27th of February, 2014. Let's start with the roll call and apologies. Gisella, please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Olivier. Gisella here. On today's call, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Julie Hammer. No apologies noted today.

And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani, Ariel Liang, and myself, Gisella Gruber. I haven't left anyone off the roll call, and if I could please remind you to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Gisella. Let's go immediately to agenda item number two, we've got our action items from the ALAC call a couple of days ago, and also from the ALT call a couple of weeks ago, or last week. First, the ALAC call, and we'll just look at the action items. There is one open action from there, and that is for Matt to work with Dev and Olivier on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of At Large action items.

That's something I think in which Matt is going to hand over to Ariel at some point. This question of having one overall workspace for the

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.

collection of At Large action items is something which we need to try and find, although there are some ways for each person to find out all actions items that were allocated to them, irrespective of what page there were on. And perhaps we'll have a quick demo of this in Singapore when we meet face to face.

On newly assigned action items, there is quite a few. Nathalie Petigreen, Matt Ashtiani, and Ariel Liang, to start the vote on DNS applicants on one, eight, nine [?]. Is this on its way?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Matt, if you're speaking...

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi this is Matt for the record. Yes, we're still working on it Olivier, it's just [?].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Ongoing therefore. Ariel Liang is to follow with the ITN working group regarding the status of the translation and transliteration of contact information working group, SO AC input requests. Ariel, do we have an update on this please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ariel, if you're speaking, you're on mute. It's star seven to unmute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We can't hear Ariel at the moment. I note that Alan has got his hand up. Alan Greenberg please, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know what the formal status of this one is. I know there was a spirited email discussion, and I think we came to semi-closure on it, but I remember Rinalia turning it over to someone who is actually writing – I don't know if it is someone [?] or someone else. And it officially closes tomorrow.

I was in a discussion with one of the co-chairs today, and he said that's not a hard deadline. They would certainly extend it and consider things that come in later, so we don't have an absolute deadline, but there was a feeling that we needed to say something, and I don't know if Edmund is planning something or if we want to reassign it to someone else or what.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So I have followed up this morning on this, and have gotten some answers back. Indeed, the co-chairs of the working group had asked me yesterday to try and clarify whether we are going to have something or not on this. The deadline for submitting input is actually the 11th of March, so we still have time. The reason why the ALAC public input was the 28th, which is tomorrow, was because of the vote, but what we could always do would be to have until the 11th of March open, and effectively hold the ratification vote after we send the input over to...

ALAN GREENBERG: Chris said it would be closed tomorrow. I didn't check any of the documents. I was just believing that he knew what he was talking about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. What happened was, Ariel has actually cut pasted the letter which was received, onto the actually right location for the public policy development page. In fact, you can see it over here at the moment. And that – so that location effectively showing that the letter does say Tuesday the 11th of March at the latest. So I think we'll take it to Tuesday the 11th of March.

Now, I've also had an email back from Rinalia, because I followed up with both Edmund and Rinalia on this. And Rinalia's feedback on it was that she would be ready to... Well, Edmund is on the working group itself, that no one in the IDN working group has step forward with [?], and Rinalia has some views in there but they are her views. She did raise the issue with the ALAC, and a couple of people indicated, waiting for the expert working group deliberation outcomes may be beneficial before providing input.

And I think that's where we left it. And so Rinalia asked the ALAC to make the decision on whether it needs the input to be made now or later, and then she [?] supported the decision and she is ready to abide by the decision. If there is a need for a response immediately, then she's happy to draft a response based on her views, which others can then tweak. Alan, you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

With all due respect, the expert working group is a red herring. The expert working group, and I presume we're talking – there are so many expert working groups. There is an expert working group on translation and transliteration, but I believe the expert working group that was being discussed on the email, rather I know, was the registration services expert working group, the one Carlton is on.

And that, I believe, is a complete red herring. They're looking at a future new system, which presumably will not be limited to seven byte ASCII, and therefore, the question there, I presume we're looking at is, if WHOIS can be displayed in Mandarin, do we need to translate it to English or transliterate it to English? And I think that's a completely different question from, do we need to do something from a registration that is done in Arabic, or Chinese, and present it in a seven byte ASCII WHOIS?

So I believe they are looking a completely different question. We can defer to them, but they are not answering the question that the current PDP and the specialized expert working group is looking at.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you very much Alan. It's my understanding exactly as you just mentioned it. So I think we should forget about the expert working group for the time being and now it really is down to you all, to say, "Should we proceed forward then with a statement on this?" Noting that one of the co-chairs of the working group is Rudi Vansnick, and he

asked me and said, “Well, the ALAC shouldn’t be saying things,” because we have been so involved in the past.

There are some questions there. Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language. What exactly are the benefits to the community for translating, etc. The answers could just be provided to these questions. And Rinalia has said she is not able to work on it until this Sunday, if she is tasked to go forward with it and...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, may I make a suggestion? Rinalia was very focused on who is going to pay for the translation. And ultimately, registrants pay. There is no other source of money in this whole ecosystem. So, the only question is, do they pay with an explicit fee for translation or is it buried in some other fee? Even if ICANN were to pay, ICANN gets its money from registrants. We’ve made that case over and over again.

So I really don’t think the costing issue is relevant other than perhaps to say that that registrar should not be requested to explicitly pay for it, but you cannot analyze someone’s business model to say how the costs are buried. That’s way beyond our scope. In my mind, the important thing is there must be access to valid, useable, WHOIS information. From my point view, I don’t care if that WHOIS information takes the form of an URL pointing to a site which displays the WHOIS information in Mandarin.

That is perfectly usable from my point of view. I can’t read it but presumably somebody can. The real question is, do we feel strongly

that there should be usable WHOIS information or not? And I think the answer to that is obvious, we've made that case over and over again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. The question that are raised here are exactly the points which are being asked in the input requests, so even in there, there is also, question number eight, who does your committee believe should bear the cost? Bearing in mind, however, the limits of scope in the initial report on this issue. What do we do? Green light for Rinalia to put a first draft? Then we leave it open for the whole week?

Because we've got until the 11th of March for the ALAC to bring – for everyone in At Large to bring their input, and then we can have the ratification after we have sent that statement over. Or, we can ask for a five day extension from the working group in order to send the actual statement with ratification at that time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Chris Dillon made it clear that they weren't – they were flexible, they wanted input.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I would say then, keep it open until the 11th of March. On the 11th, start a five day working vote, sorry, five working day vote. What am I saying? [Laughter] A working vote, what is that? I see agreement from Holly on this, and I don't see anyone being against it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: This is Evan. I don't know if anyone can hear me.

VARIOUS PEOPLE: We can.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I'm walking in [?] weather, so forgive me if I sound a little weird here. Yeah, I fully agree with everything Alan has said.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Evan. So we'll proceed forward then. I'll give the green light to Rinalia to draft a first draft during the weekend. On Monday, Ariel will be sending the call for comments from At Large, which will close, let's say, on the 10th of March. So then it gives another 24 hours in order to be able to, the 10th of March is going to be a Monday, I believe. Yeah.

That gives another 24 hours for a latest version incorporating all the comments, and then a vote will start on the 11th of March. That will be a five day vote. So staff can also let the people in charge of this vote, know that our statement will be sent to them on the 17th of March. Understood? Okay. Hearing no one say anything against that, that's fine. Thank you very much, we've made progress on that.

Let's move back to the action items. Tijani Ben Jemaa is to share the concerns of the ALAC regarding asking questions to seat 15 candidates,

and to report back to the ALAC. Tijani, can you please provide us with an update?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you Olivier. As I promised last time, I invited the BMSPC to meet very soon, and we met less than an hour ago. I would like to thank all of the members that came, in spite of the very short notice. I tried to share the concern of the ALAC members about the interaction between the candidates and the At Large members.

The BMSPC finally accepted to hold the call on the 6th of March, between the candidates and the At Large members. This is not the only one thing we discussed. We discussed also... I also brought the concern of Evan, I think, about members of the NomCom not to be voting, and I explained that there is not a directly relationship between the members of the NomCom and this kind of competition.

And finally the BMSPC decided that the NomCom members can vote. So this is also another point that is... Is it okay with you? Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Tijani, this is Evan. Thank you very much for doing this. I appreciate what you have done, and I'm just happy to move on with that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Evan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And Alan indicates...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Alan is applauding in the Adobe Connect for the record. Well, thank you very much Tijani for this. I'm glad this is proceeding forward. Just one last question. I was also on the call. There was also a discussion as to the form of voting for the first round and the second round. Has that worked out?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. There was a discussion, a long discussion about the vote, the first round voting and the second round voting. The final decision is to make an instant run off vote for the first round, so that we try to minimize the chance to have a tie. And then for the second round, we will vote for one candidate as required by the rules of procedure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Tijani.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

What style of voting is that? Just for the record.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. The first round will happen on 16th and 17th of March, because we said that 16th is a Sunday, but it is good because people are not working, but perhaps it is not good for people who do not have Internet at all. So to make it Sunday and Monday, 16th and 17th. This is for the first round.

I hope we will not be obliged to run a second vote for that if we have tie, but perhaps we will not have it. For the second round, we will vote on Sunday, and if no one can get more than 50%, we will run again, a second round, phase two, on Wednesday. And on Monday, we will continue a second tie voting, and we will still have time to do the tie breaking, which will be a draw. A face to face draw.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one comment. My recollection is, I assume you're using Big Pulse. Big Pulse has a whole slew of options for independent run off voting, and I think, but I think, I'm not 100% sure, that one of them is out of a result tie. I think they have, one of their options is for them to use randomness to resolve the tie, and you will never see a tie. So you need to make sure that whoever configures it, does not allow them to do random.

So if there is a tie you see it. Just a thought.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan for this. It is very important that we do it through Big Pulse. And it is very important that we have Matt doing it, but since Matt is very familiar with Big Pulse, and we will ask Matt if there is a way to avoid ties, please try to configure the Big Pulse so we don't have ties.

ALAN GREENBERG: I suspect, but I'm not sure, that the last time we did a vote of this sort, it was before Matt, but I'm not sure about that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. That is correct. It was [Matias?] at that time. But since then, Matt has stepped fully into those shoes, and is an expert on [laughter].

ALAN GREENBERG: Is Matt on the call?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much everyone.

MATT ASHTIANI: I don't think I can defend myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Don't tell Matt about instant run off voting. It's Olivier speaking. And no doubt by the time we have the next elections for these third round of elections for the Board Director, Ariel will be the expert in the voting at that time, and she'll be having a laugh too.

This voting thing with Big Pulse is a real tough one, but no doubt, we'll be able to do it. So just for the record, the first round will be instant run off. Round two, assuming the first round does need to be repeated, but

round two then is a majority voting. And by majority voting, one means that the person getting more than 50% will be taking the position. Of course, assuming that there is quorum on each one of those rounds.

That's another one of these [?]. Just one last thing quickly, Tijani, you mentioned that the electronic vote will be just two days in length. Is that correct? The Sunday and a Monday?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. I think it is standard practice for the At Large, for the ALAC, to have either a five day vote, or if something is to be done fast, then a three day vote. The reason being that if you do this on a Sunday and a Monday, there might be someone who is actually on a flight for the whole length of that time, because of the very fact that the earth is round, a Sunday starts at a different time for each of us.

That would be a little bit difficult maybe. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. Olivier, Tijani speaking. We have 20 voters, 20 electorates, 20 people, 20 members of the electorate. We will try to make sure that all of them will be available on Sunday and Monday. And if someone says, "I will be traveling," or anything, in this case,

perhaps we will extend – because we don't have time, Olivier. You know that we are more and more....

Since we decided to do the election face to face in Singapore, we don't have to be very – to take our time and don't worry about that. So I expect to extend the vote for another day if there is a problem, but if there is not a problem, it will be two days. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [CROSSTALK]...members.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. Thank you. Now, Alan Greenberg has his hand up, and there is also a note from Maureen Hilyard in the chat. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two things. Regarding the... You or someone said 50% required to win. Just for clarity, it's 50% of the votes cast, not more than 50% of the number of voters. In case everyone doesn't vote. The denominator is the number of votes cast. With regard to the period of time, I won't get into whether it should be two or three days, but I'll note, the process allows for mixed mode voting, and that is if someone cannot, for instance, access the Internet because they don't have access for those two days or something, the process does allow, and I'm presuming

BMSPC is explicitly allowing, telephone voting to a trusted staff member.

I think I've suggested before, I would suggest staff members reach out to all of the voters ahead of time, and make sure they have a mobile phone number so they can reach out to them if someone hasn't voted, or something like that. Whether it's two or three days, I'll leave out. I'm not going to comment on. But, we should make sure that we have provisions that everyone can vote even if the situation is less than optimal. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Any other questions or comments on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, you're on...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The noise in the background, well that's my God Child, Walter who is going, yah, yah, yah. Another future member of At Large. So let's move on then. Thank you very much for this update Tijani, very helpful, very good. Let's go to the next action item, and that's for Heidi to find out whether the community wiki can be set open for the BMSPC Q&A session between candidates and electorates. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. So my question to Olivier and to Tijani on today's call, do we need to do that still? Do we need to open the wiki to everyone? Because I thought on the call it was agreed that people will send their questions to staff and then we'll post them on there.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I answer the question Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. Heidi, I don't think, because perhaps we will have, as Olivier said, we will have people who will be sending a response on the wiki. So, the best is to have the At Large members who doesn't have a login, sending their questions to you, the staff, and then the staff will put them on the wiki. All the candidates have a login, and they can go to the wiki and answer the questions there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Let me write that action item, and if you could please correct me if I'm not right on that. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Heidi. I'll let you write the action item whilst reading through the next action item in the meantime. The next action item, if I can find it, is for Heidi to provide information on the expected duration to translate the policy advisory board's gTLD proposal for public comment, as well as a target date by which the public commenting process could start. Any progress on this Heidi? I'm sorry if you've been typing something else and having to listen to this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I can do that. Yes, Christina Rodriguez responded, no more than a week. So as soon as I have the final English version, I will send it immediately to be translated. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you very much. So just looking at the calendar, are we looking at a starting time of let's say the 10th of March? Would that be a time that we could achieve.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. This is Heidi for the record. Yes I think that we can achieve that. Again, it depends on when that final version in English is sent, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Heidi. Any comments or questions on this? So 10th of March is the opening time for ALAC public comment on the subject of policy advisory board. Is that okay with everyone? I see that

no one is saying no, so that is fine. Let's move on then to the next thing in our agenda, that's going to be the actions of the last ALC meeting that we had.

We've got several action items, the first one being the same regarding the workspace for the action items. After that, Heidi is to put in a call for the members of the non PDP CTWG design team, and Matt was to add the members to the list once the call for members is completed. That's been done, hasn't it? That's complete.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I'm sorry. Could you please repeat that? And Gisella, could you please pause the – you've already done that, thank you. Sorry, Olivier, could you please repeat that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, sure, absolutely. Heidi is to send a call for members of the non PDP CTWG design team. Matt is to add all members to the mailing list once the call for members is completed. [Crosstalk] discussion on this already.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Sorry, that should have been updated. That's been taken care of, and the second action of Matt adding to them to the mailing list should be removed because the GNSO Secretariat did that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Then Gisella is to create a workspace and a mailing list for the At Large ICANN accessibility working group. Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can still hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Gisella, you might be muted. You probably are. You are muted. Your mic is muted. I'll imagine that this is done. In fact, yeah, there is a link on there. So I would think that this is done. Heidi, do you know if this has been done?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just one moment. Sorry, I'm just trying to look at where we are. Gisella, could somebody put the ALT action items up on the AC room? I think we still have the ALAC ones. So, are we... I'm sorry. Which one are we on of the ALT.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Okay, we'll start again. After the blue screen, control, alt, del, and reboot. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. I'm focusing now, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Have another cup of coffee Heidi, there you go.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm having my third.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we have yet, open action items, thank you. Gisella is to create a workspace, let me just use the little green arrows you point you to this as well. There you go. Gisella...

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, I'm here. I'm unmuted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Gisella. Hooray. Please help us.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, sorry. I put the right action items on. Gisella here for the transcript. Yes, that's been completed. Sorry, I don't know why it's not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, I think where the problem is, is that this action item page has not been updated, because these were updated on the ALAC page, so these have all been completed. [CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...of course goes... Thank you Heidi. It's Olivier speaking. This of course goes full circle on the development of the global workspace for the

collection of At Large AIs, so there you go. So the next one is the submission of the compliance investigation. That's done. The message outline the procedure on CROPP requests, that's done as well.

On the newly assigned action items, Heidi to check with ICANN legal and constituency travel on gathering passport information for the ATLAS II travelers to send to the relevant UK ministry. How is that coming along Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Still in progress. Yeah, still in progress. They are really focused on Singapore at the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi to contact the chairs of EURALO and NARALO to confirm who are the Board Director selection electorates.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. So we are in progress on that. Matt, I'll add EURALO. I was just going to text with Wolf, and he expects to have the electorates, the proxy for Olivier, Jean-Jacques, tomorrow evening. And Matt, if I can have an update from you please one the NARALO? And Matt, if you're speaking, you're muted. Matt are you speaking?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Bearing in mind we only have 20% of Matt, we might not have his voice today.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Actually, we do have more of Matt today than next week [CROSSTALK]. There's Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: Sorry. I'm waiting to speak to Alan, but again, with all of these votes coming up, You may want to start to turn to Ariel and not to me.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Matt, this one, you've been involved in the NARALO one, so if you could please finish that one.

MATT ASHTIANI: The NARALO one, I'm waiting to speak to Alan. [?] Alan, I'm sorry, a meeting invite. I think what's better is after this call, Alan [?] to speak with us, that would be great.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. I think that's what we need to do. Okay. Let's move on please. Next, Heidi is to schedule a call between Evan, Holly, Garth, Dave Piscitello, to discuss the Singapore meeting TOR session. How is that going?

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly for the record. We had an email conversation. It turns out Dave simply isn't going to be in Singapore, and also there is a bit of sensitivity

because I was really... The email I got back from Patrik sounded a bit miffed. So I thought, "Uh-oh. We've upset the chair of the SSAC," which is one thing we obviously didn't want to do. It turns out, Patrik now is still happy to talk, which is good.

Garth is still happy to talk. Evan is still happy to be chair. And Dave, I think, is still happy to participate, but it's... Evan, do you still want to talk to Dave offline? Because he is not going to be in Singapore, it will be 3:00 in the morning for him. So I doubt he will be participating.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

What I had actually suggested, and I still want to keep this option open, should we wish to do it, is that if Dave has any prepared comments, I'm prepared to present it and his slides on his behalf so he can get a good night's sleep. So, if he would like to participate, he's welcome to call in. If he doesn't but he has something to add, I'd be delighted to present it on his behalf.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, may I speak without raising my hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes if I can know who it was, but I think it was Heidi. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you. This is Heidi for the record. Both Evan and Holly, I think they would still need to call then to get clarity on what exactly you're

trying to accomplish in this meeting in Singapore. So, perhaps a short call would be the best.

HOLLY RAICHE:

This is Holly. Without my hand up. Look, I'd be happy for that, as long as we can find a time that is not two or three in the morning for me, and is reasonable for everybody, that's fine. Evan, that would give you a chance to have a chat with him and see if you can present stuff that he would like to talk to, but at three in the morning for him, it's not going to be easy.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Is Dave on the west coast?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

This is Heidi. No, he is on the east coast. [CROSSTALK]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

So, I'm okay. I can accommodate whether it's 3 PM Australian time or 3 PM US time, it doesn't matter with me.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. This is Heidi for the record. We will follow up on that action item. Just the two of you, or should we include Garth as well?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Might as well have Garth just in case what he wants to do might be informed by what Dave may want to provide.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So we'll make that an action item and follow up on that action item. Thank you. We'll be in touch with you probably next week about the timing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. So next, Heidi to reconfirm the date and time of the meeting with the GAC in Singapore. Heidi please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Actually that has been done by Gisella, thank you, and that is now Monday evening, 18:00 to 19:00, right before the shuttle leaves for the Gala. And that is actually a leadership call, that is the ALT and the GAC leadership, that is not a full ALAC or GAC meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Heidi. Can you please confirm that we will have recording, microphone, and things over there? So that it goes on the record. Or, is it the wish of the GAC that this stays off the record?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi for the record. I'm quite sure, I'm 99 ½% sure that it is always being recorded.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. So next, staff to check if all candidates running for the ALAC selected Board seat, will be present at the Sunday session in Singapore. Do we have an answer on that please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi for the record. So, Tijani, we spoke about this yesterday, and you said that after today's BMSPC call you would confirm that. So I would think that that needs to be done, correct Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'm sorry Heidi. Can you please repeat the question?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. This is Heidi. The AI is staff to check if all candidates running for the ALAC selected Board seat would be present at the Sunday session in Singapore. We had talked about that yesterday, and you had said that we should be on that for today's call, the BMSPC call. But I think that we should go ahead with that now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, exactly. We will go ahead with that now. It is a [liaison?].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And then staff is to liaise to members of the ALC on filling the ALAC work part two 90 minutes. That is something which I think we might be speaking about shortly, although there is one point that the 90 minutes, are likely to be filled with some of the follow up that we had on the Board on the same day.

So we'll have to see how that pans out. Does anybody have any suggestions for the ALAC work part two 90 minutes for some subject that needs to have on there?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So if I could just comment. This is Heidi. I thought that we had agreed that part two would now, a part from the 30 minutes of the RSAC meeting, which has been confirmed, the rest has been taken up by hot topics. So, Olivier, I thought that we had mentioned that those will be determined following the meeting with the Board that morning, as well perhaps some of the other – the ALAC top three hot policy topics which were the multi-stakeholder model, what ICANN was doing to bolster that prior to the meeting in Brazil in April.

The issue of, let's see, the new gTLDs, and then there is one that I keep forgetting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Heidi. Tijani Ben Jemaa you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I am sorry to come back to the last point. The Sunday session will be a voting session, isn't it Heidi? That's what you mean? For the candidate and the electorate.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Well, I think originally it was because there was going to be a session with the candidates earlier in the day and then the voting. But now what is going to happen is that there is only going to be the voting in the afternoon. I would assume that you would want them there, or do you not want any of the candidates in the room?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The room will be only for the voters, the electorate, and the candidate. The candidates will be quiet in the corner, and the electorate will do the election. It is for transparency purposes. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. So we now have the last thing there. Olivier to contact Marie-Laure Lemineur, Chair of NPOC, to liaise regarding the memorial for Alain Berranger. And Marie-Laure has come back to me and said they will organize something, they have not yet organized

something, but they will keep us in the loop when they organize it, likely to be in Singapore. Any comments on any of these action items?

I realize they have taken quite a while to go through these. I notice one comment from Maureen Hilyard in the chat, regarding the visa arrangements and the concern there that the longer they leave the travel arrangements to be organized makes it more difficult for some ALSs to get their visas to the UK meeting. Perhaps I'm worried, APRALO [?] ALSs wondering when this information will become available.

Two things. I think on the first side, visas are usually only for three months, so they... Applying for a visa right now is actually premature, since the visa would run out, in case of a three month visa, would run out before the ICANN meeting in June. So that's one thing. But on the other hand, we do have the form for requesting a letter, an invitation letter, which is being translated, which I was told was going to be available, I think, today, it was supposed to be available. Isn't it?

And that form will be translated in Spanish and in French as well, so that all of our ALSs will then be able to start asking for an invitation letter. And that's really the first step forward. The next question that Maureen posted in the chat is whether the candidates... We'll have a face to face session with the candidates in Singapore.

I think that was said by some people, if by Singapore you haven't chosen what candidate you want to vote for, the majority of people would have already received – either made up their mind or received their instructions as to who they're voting for. I don't know. Tijani, do you wish to respond to this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you Olivier. As I just said, in Singapore there will be only the voting session, there will not be an interaction with the candidates. The interaction will be done in two phases. Maureen, you are a member of the BMSPC, and this was decided on there. Two interaction phases. The first phase would be by wiki, and the second phase would be a last question and answer session with the candidates call, it will be [?].

So it will be a call. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much Tijani. I don't see anyone else's hand up, and I must say that the 45 minutes on these action items has been a bit laborious, but we've already discussed a lot of the points we needed to discuss on this call. Let's move to the items for discussion, as if we haven't been discussing anything so far.

Two things regarding the recently adopted ALAC documents or groups. First, the At Large policy advisory board for gTLD proposal. As you've heard, the process is now moving ahead for this public comment process to be open, but I have been asked by staff to clean up a little bit of the language which was used.

Apparently, there are a few errors in the text and so on. So I'll be looking at this sometime in the next 24 hours or so, hopefully if I can find the time. I'm cleaning up for us to be able to launch this process. Staff has already started all the work that needed to be done in the background for this.

Regarding the related issue, compliance submission process. I have sent this to ICANN compliance today, as a statement of the ALAC, with a copy to the Board Chair, to the Board Secretariat, and to the ICANN CEO since the compliance function comes directly under the ICANN CEO for their records, of course. So that's the process moved forward on this.

Now, on the statements or endorsements currently being developed, there is the second accountability and transparency review team final report and recommendations. I believe that's on its way. The call for comments closed at the end of this week. We've got a statement on there, I don't think there needs to be any changes on it. I don't know. I haven't seen any – certainly I'm not seeing any comments on the staff.

I don't know if anybody has a comment or if you do have a comment, please submit on the wiki. Then the next thing is the [?] and why we've got this Fayre of Opportunities that's on there, that's a bit bizarre. That's much further down. The translation and transliteration of contact information working group SO-AC, we've already discussed this.

So we can skip to the next one. Proposed review mechanism to address perceived inconsistent expert determinations on string confusion objections. Alan, I know that we asked you to produce something a little bit more robust than what we had on the wiki. Have you had some time to think about it? And add a little bit more spice to it?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I recall we decided to add something, but honestly, I cannot – I haven't done anything and I cannot recall what it is we decided to add. Does anyone remember? And I would be glad to do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Yes, in that very short statement, you mentioned the ALAC deeply regrets that it has taken ICANN so long to react to the overall situation and must now choose to accept many of the other seemingly illogical results. The consensus on the last call was that you might wish to point to our previous statement on the matter. Explicitly make a link to the previous statement, and explicitly say that this advice, that is because this advice appears to have been totally overlooked or ignored, that we're now in the situation that we're in today. In better words, I guess, than what I'm telling you here. But that's what I remember from the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give it a go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. Any thoughts, or questions, or comments on this? If I'm incorrect, by the way, please feel free to contradict me and tell me I'm wrong, and say what you remember from the call. That was a three hour call, so [laugh] it was tough. Right. Let's move on. Next one, ICANN Board resolutions from its meetings on 7th of January 2014. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, that's the removal of the Board TLG, technical liaison group.

Any update on this Dev? Are we to expect a first draft?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. Yes, I'm in the middle of it, so yes. Expect the first draft very soon.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Time and date?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Time and date. I'm going to try and post it this evening, but if not, first thing tomorrow morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Dev. Next one on this long list that we have, the ICANN future meeting strategy. Now there is three that we did not have during our ALAC call, which has just come out just now. So we've got the ICANN future meeting strategy, which I've read, which is very interesting. Certainly a little bit different. And then there is the ICANN strategy panel, and mitigating the risk of the DNS name space collisions. Three things. What I have asked is... The future meetings strategy, we're probably going to have to ask some members of the group whether something is needed.

And I know that Tijani is one of the members. Maybe let's start with that. Any thoughts about this? Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. I think that we are five people from the five regions represented in this working group. And we worked hard for the

last time to get this report for the public comment. I advise you to read it, it's very interesting, and if you have any concern or any remark, we can write something. But I think we tried to make it as available for the At Large as possible. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I did scam it, scam it, skim it [laughter]. Without going into too much depth, I certainly didn't find anything offensive there, and it seemed to recognize that we really do need meetings that would work, which the previous discussions have always skirted around. I do think we're going to require an expert system, automated system to explain this to people because it may make sense, but I'm not sure it's going to be crystal clear to people what the patterns are and what the rules are.

But it looks like an interesting piece of work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Anyone else on this? Tijani, your hand is still up. Is that a new hand? No. Okay. Evan Leibovitch is next.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. I just wanted to ask, Heidi or staff, is there any awareness that there is going to be some kind of workshop to try and explain this to people? Because I agree with Alan that it is not going to

be, it's not superficially obvious why this is good, and some kind of briefing is going to be helpful. Thanks.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi for the record. Yes, there is – I believe it is Monday. Tijani, let me know...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, it's a two-part question. One, is there going to be anything out to the community? And will any of the sessions where people come and do their dog and pony show with us touch on this subject?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi for the record. I see on Monday between 13:30 and 14:30 there is a meeting strategy working group. I suspect that that is going to be the presentation of that. But we have no one right now coming to this ALAC meeting, so it would mean that the ALAC and the At Large members going to that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Next we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Olivier. Dev Anand speaking. I have to say, it's a very interesting report. Part of my concern is, of course, the time taking by face to face meetings and thinking in the sense of how volunteers have to be willing to give up literally a month away from the page, to actually attend a face to face meetings. And nothing is [?] volunteer with working groups and so forth.

To me, I think that's – finding volunteers willing to do that, especially for volunteers, that don't get funded as non-profit organizations, I think is a huge challenge. So I was kind of hoping there could be more emphasis on more virtual presentations, conferences. But given that the idea of having the second meeting as a small meeting is a very intriguing idea. I'll leave it at that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa and Holly Raiche afterwards and then I'll close the queue out.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: To confirm that the session of Monday will be a public session, and the aim is to interact with the community about his support. So if you have questions, you can attend there. And you will see, it is a new way to see it, but it is a good thing, I suppose. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question. That sounds as the best one to conflict with the tour sessions, which is a shame. Am I wrong?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I thought we were in the main room.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, and the tour takes place at 15 to 16:00. So it is a conflict of 30 minutes with the ALAC ccNSO meeting. Evan, to answer your question, the tour workshop is in the ALAC room, which is the VIP room.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: My understanding, it is still a large room.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. It's a largish room, sorry, not large, medium size room. It has got the advantage of having a view to the outside world, while most of the other rooms are just not having a view. So let's move on and go to the next one on the list.

Just before that, so Tijani, do you then think that we need to have an ALAC statement supporting this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that we will have time, it's still after Singapore. So first, try to read it and attend the session at Singapore, and if there is any concern, we can address it. And then at the end, we can perhaps write something to support it, yes?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. Go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm looking at the comment close date, and I see that it is March 20th, so it appears that the actual comment period closes before that date. Let me just check the date. Yes, it's March 20th is actually before the start of the meeting, the Singapore meeting. So any response post that will need to be taken as a reply.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's unfortunate timing. Usually, if one gets input from the community, you should really open during the actual meeting. Look, let's just leave it at that. I don't see that we're going to write anything against it, and we can always draft a notice of support if we're all okay with it. If we could just ask staff, I mean, Ariel, send a general email over to the list asking for comments from people.

And if we don't have any comments, we'll just draft a note of support. I don't see anyone who so far hasn't found anything negative to the proposals being made.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel for the record. Olivier, you are talking about the future meetings one? Or the, hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes. ICANN future meeting strategy, please send a call for comments to the mailing list.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next, the ICANN strategy panels. My suggestion is to punt this over to the finance and budget subcommittee. I know that there is going to be a presentation of the strategy, sorry, that's a different thing. Sorry. No, strategy panels is the result, sorry, of all of the panels that have come out, and that's actually quite an interesting set of results that have been received.

I haven't read any of the reports yet I'm afraid, but what I have done is to attend all of the presentations and some of the input that was brought there was quite interesting. The one with [?] innovation was interesting, it certainly spoke, at some point, of crowd sourcing on there, but... How do you think that we should deal with this? Just send a note out to the ALAC for input on this? Or does somebody wish to hold the pen on that and do the work of reading through it and seeing all of the input? I see Alan Greenberg has got his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There was an interesting session this morning on the GNSO that, if you go to my GNSO liaison report, you'll see I point to. There was also proceeded by that was a 45 minute session with Sally Costerton talking about Internet governance issues, and trying to put into simple terms the relationship between all of the various activities. And she did a superb job I should add, of making what is foggy to a lot of people, a lot clearer.

But there was also discussion on the strategy panels, with a particular focus on the multi stakeholder one, and some rather pointed comments, and how the GNSO will proceed. I strongly suggest that people go and listen to the MP3, it will be worth your time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. And these MP3s are linked from your GNSO liaison report. Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right. It's linked, although it currently says not there yet, although it is there as of a little while ago. And I will be verifying that the time I estimated when I wrote it, of how far into it as far, that they're close enough that if you want to do it immediately after this meeting, they're close enough to start working with. If you wait a little while, there will be more of that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you very much Alan. Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. I guess I have a real problem strategically with the direction that this is going. In the context of the way that ICANN has been taking advice from panels, I'm starting to see the strategy panels as something as a bunch of groups that are going to have a number of very smart people getting together and doing very, very good conversations, and dialogue, and consultation, and producing extremely good results, which will then get shoved away.

I have a real problem with the fact that ICANN is pushing back on its own ATRT report, from its own community, from its own internal experts, from its own stakeholders. If it won't listen to that, what confidence is there that these panels, no matter what value, what quality they produce, is going to actually have an effect on ICANN? There is a real concern that I've heard from other people, that in the context of what ICANN has actually done in the real world, that this is either window dressing or diversionary tactics, depending on who you talk to.

And that when ICANN actually goes and solicits advice, if the advice that comes back is not to its liking, it doesn't get listened to. And there is a sense amongst some in the community, that these panels, and these committees, and these other groups, are all being tossed out there in the hope that one will come back with a proposal that is actually palatable to the status quo.

And until then, these things are going to get ignored. Tactically, I think we need to push for acceptance of the ATRT II review. Until ICANN accepts that feedback from its own stakeholders, there is a real lack of confidence that any of the work of these strategy groups, no matter how high the quality, is actually going to come to anything in the real world. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. There is one other point of view that I have heard, from some people, and ICANN is that they're totally dead against those strategic working groups, because this is top down rather than bottom up. And they are adamantly against those, and are basically saying we need – while the inputs from these might be interesting, but we certainly need to make sure that this gets adopted by the community, which, of course, we might be – if we do support the input from the meeting strategy – sorry, not meeting strategy.

The strategic working groups, we think that yes, this should be implemented, but then it would have to go through the whole process of one another. I'll hand the floor to Alan Greenberg.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Can I just make one comment in return? Because it seems like what you said is in response to what I said, because it really isn't inconsistent. If there is a belief that ICANN is going to keep creating these panels until something convenient comes out of them, then it makes sense that this is going to be something that is top down.

Because the community bottom up process has already, through the ATRT II, been presented and been ignored. Thanks. Well, push backed on, thanks. Sorry. Sorry Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was going to comment closer to what Olivier said than what Evan said. The comments that I heard back was the fear that ICANN will take what the strategy panels say and do something about it, without incorporating it with community feedback. And there is a far more fear that a group that has met, no matter how intelligent these people are, with an absence of people who really understand what's going on, and understand the environment and the end goals.

There is a far more worrisome problem of we destroy ourselves in the process of trying to fix it, and certainly with the multi stakeholder panel, is a fear that the people who came up with these marvelous ideas, don't really understand what business we're in. Thus, let's ignore the real stakeholders and let's do crowd sourcing, which doesn't necessarily make sure that you meet the needs of the various communities.

So I tend to see almost the opposite fear than what Evan is talking about. And I'm a little bit confused on the ATRT, I don't know what push back Evan is talking about. Certainly as one of the ATRT members, I have not heard any pushback from the community since that report was presented. All I've heard, especially from the GNSO, is a

wholehearted endorsement of it, and strong statement saying they plan to go and implement it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm talking about the staff report.

ALAN GREENBERG: There has been no comments from staff. I mean, there were comments from the process where staff made some comments, which were generally ignored by the ATRT, and that's fine.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, I mean staff comments to the Board in response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I have not seen those comments, maybe you have.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I'll try to dish them up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much gentlemen. And so, for this, what I think for this is that you would be having a strategy panel. Are we going to have a statement on this or not? I think the first thing we should really be reading those, and let's come back to this a week from now, having read those and having formed a better idea of those. I don't know, have they already been sent to the ALAC? I think that they have. Everyone should

be on the ALAC announce, so these are usually presented on the ALAC announce, and let's see if we have any feedback on that.

But certainly I've heard the two points of view, which were shared here, what Alan mentioned and what Evan mentioned. And it's funny because where one's freedom warrior is another person's terrorist. It's likely to be more than that. Alan Greenberg, your hand is still up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So again, this one is just an open call for comments on the strategy panels. I don't know if we're pointing one way or another so far. Mitigating the risk of DNS name space collision, now that's another very important one. That's a follow up to the work that the SSAC had done, and if you recall, over in Durban, the ALAC pushed very hard to lobby the GAC, to get the GAC very hard on this, and finally, the advice from the SSAC was acted on. This is advice which originally was a few years old.

Now what happened is, there is a company called JAS Advisors, and I don't know why they use that acronym because it has a star note in the ALAC world. Joint Applicant Support, was never really taken up much outside. But anyway, the JAS Advisors contains also some recommendations that follow up on this. Julie Hammer is on the call? Is she or...?

JULIE HAMMER: I am on the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you are on the call. Fantastic. Julie, would you please just give us the one, a couple of minutes on this please?

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. This is newly posted and I haven't, because of other commitments, I haven't had the chance to look at it yet. It did fall out, it was one of the results of the mitigation, the report that staff produced. I'm planning to have a look at it in the next few days, and I'll get back to you with the recommendation as to whether we need to comment or not. I'm sorry, I just haven't got to it yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Julie. I mean, from what I read, the report basically says that dot home, dot corp, and dot something else, I can't remember what the third something else was, would not be allocated. And then there is the period of quick takedown for a gTLD, for a newly created gTLD, that is possible as well in case that causes problems.

And there is also a recommendation that asks for a 24/7 365 day a year hotline to be setup at ICANN, in case there is a matter of life threatening circumstances. That would be particularly interesting with regards to domain name. Never heard of that, but that's the, in effect, the gist of the report.

Holly Raiche, you've been very patient. You have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. holly Raiche for the record. The shame is that this comment may close before Singapore because the thing that started off the whole tour discussion was the comment that Patrik made while we were having breakfast in wherever it was last time. And he was talking about name solutions and the new gTLDs, and tour any just sort of all of these three issues together, so I think all three issues... And I don't know if it's possible to actually wait until after Singapore and the tour sessions where a lot of these issues will be aired or not.

But it is part of that larger issue, and I've had a quick scan of it. It's not made clear in that report, so maybe we just – maybe we have to comment anyway. But we may make further comments when we have a real discussion about the report but also in a larger context. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly. There is a note actually. Looking at this, I think it's closing on the 31st of March if I understand correctly.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie here. Yes Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that would be after Singapore. And what I was going to suggest is that we wait for the SSAC, so instead of plowing forward with this, of course, we send a call for comments out on the list, on our mailing list, and we all read this and prepare for the meeting in Singapore, and then

discuss it with the SSAC in Singapore. Because they would, no doubt, have analyzed the input that this report produced. So, it's always good to get a point of view from the experts.

JULIE HAMMER:

Olivier, Julie here. The problem with the 31st of March is that it is so soon after Singapore that it makes it difficult. I suppose some of those meetings are happening earlier in the week, and the 31st is the following...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Julie, the SSAC is meeting with the ALAC on the Sunday of the Singapore meeting. [CROSSTALK] ...Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, three days to prep a statement if one is required, and that could be ratified during our wrap up on the Thursday. [CROSSTALK] So that means we're going to have some work in Singapore. There you go.

For the record, we're not going there on holiday.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Why didn't anyone tell us that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Well, there you go Alan. And then of course, there is two PCs which we decided not to have a comment, the qualified launch program for the new gTLDs, and the proposed modifications for GNSO procedures. Let's just put this on the side. That's fine.

I think we can move on to agenda item number four. And number four is review of the ALAC meeting of 25 February 2014. You've got the agenda and the motions that are linked to this. Does anyone have any points that they would like to raise here, based on the ALAC monthly call meeting?

Wow. That's going to be a section that goes very quickly then. I guess most of the discussion, or a lot of the discussion was also, of course, on the policy development activities with regards to any of the other – whether the ALAC should post a public comment, and the decision of the compliance issue, of course, as know, this all moved forward.

On the Singapore meeting agenda, I still have the concern that at the moment, we have not really – in fact, we have not at all filled in the wiki pages that we usually fill in for the questions for the Board, the questions for the GAC, these things. So it would be good that we spend some time on it, in our own time so I do realize time has been ticking on this call.

But we have a look, you know... I guess you all know how to access the Singapore meeting agendas, and the Singapore meeting pages. I'll ask staff to put this in the chat if you don't, and please just bookmark this. On the working group updates, I'm extremely pleased to see such amazing progress with the ATLAS II organizing committee. It's really great to see how things are moving.

On the finance and budget subcommittee, I think that the extra requests are coming in, so there is certainly understanding in the community and thankfully, I think the people filing the requests have

already done this last year, so they're getting more used to doing this. There is less concern on it from the community.

On the CROPP, I'm glad to see that this also appears to be moving quite well, and I'm very glad to see the sort of requests that are being made. It's really fantastic and exciting requests on there. And finally, on the community preparation for the multi stakeholder meeting in Brazil, just to let you know that since yesterday, Leon Sanchez and I have produced a good will doc page with the text that is being built up for Brazil.

What I would like to ask is for more At Large input on this. Holly, I don't have time to spend on this, but to be honest, it's done some good work, and I'm a bit concerned that some of the other communities, they don't really do that much heavy lifting, and we're kind of used to putting point across on there. So if you could just please take a browse on this and try to see what we can fill, or maybe even just polish over, on that group of docs that have been shared.

I note Alan Greenberg and Holly Raiche both have their hands up, so let's start with Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just to note, a reminder, that tomorrow is the deadline for registering for the Sao Paulo meeting. If anyone is planning to attend, you need to get your name in on the list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. And even if you're not planning to attend, just in case you are going to be asked to attend, one never knows...

ALAN GREENBERG: That...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just in case, although I have no idea whether I'll be attending or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's sort of the issue. If your name isn't there, you may not be able to attend if they are at their limit. Apparently the venue has a limit of about 900 people. The registrations are only in the 400s right now, but if there is a big spurt at the end, they may have to cut people out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very good point Alan. Just in case ICANN decides to send that they're going to send all of the ALAC, or [laughter] or the ALAC leadership team to Brazil for a few days, you never know, at that point, you know, it's better that we're all going to sit on that. And I'm not laughing, I just have a big smile on my face. Holly Raiche, you have your hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Riache for the transcript record. I was just noting the email for the new Google space, so that's a really good place to place it and thanks for doing the work, Olivier. And also to point out apparently the

Australian government has been asked to co-host the meeting, and we are all kind of sitting here going, “Why?” And I suppose it is because we are considered a Western country, but not very terrible or something.

So there is going to be a really strange contingent there, which means there is going to be a lot of interest in this country and probably a lot of discussion within sort of Australian organizations. So it will be a really good opportunity to reflect some of that in the Google document. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That’s great. Thank you very much Holly. Have you registered for the meeting? I think it would be wise for all of those people who are listed in the working group, just in case, to register. I’m not saying that I know anything about it, but I’m just saying... One of the things I’m wondering, if there is only 400 people and there are 900 people – there might be at that point, a wish from some of the organizations that are there to fill that room a little bit more.

And they might even open their eyes and say, “Hey, maybe we can get the cross community working group to go there.” I have no pointing out in one direction or another, and I have no idea that would be [?] either. But it’s just [CROSSTALK] silly if we didn’t...

HOLLY RAICHE:

It would be difficult for me if it was granted because I’m supposed to be teaching two days a week, and I’m already taking time off for Singapore,

so I'm not sure that people will be thrilled if I start taking time off in April and then again in June.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine Holly. It's not a problem. I'm sure we can arrange for an Adobe Connect room for your students to be taught remotely [laughs].

HOLLY RAICHE: All right. My students will love it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. That wraps up the discussion on the ALAC monthly call. Any other point that anybody wishes to add on the ALAC monthly call? No, okay. So let's move on with the next part of our agenda, and that's the implementation of the consumer metrics. Now, I've received a note, a recent note, from someone – one of our representatives on the consumer metrics working group, that was rather alarming in that the note itself said that some of the metrics about to be struck out, in the absence of Evan, that day, because Evan was travelling.

In the absence of Cheryl because they decided to use a new system that was dialing out directly and Cheryl being in Malaysia, the direct dial system didn't work out well. So Rudi effectively smelled that there was something coming up there, and decided to stop and wait for the ALAC to come back to mention something about the concerns for – which one was it? Maybe – I'm just looking through it.

There is a link to the document here, the baseline document, which is there. And I think we are speaking about, here we go, consumer trust, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. So 5.2 is a metric on the growth in use of hosted pages for organizations such as Facebook or Google +, etc. 5.3 is the growth in use of QR codes. And 5.4 is the growth in use of URL shortening services.

The rationale of the consumer metrics working group, for these three metrics, is that if you're going to measure the success of the new gTLDs and the growth, you have to measure them against something else. And so the measuring against the three types of metrics would have provided some kind of control experiment, and then seeing, well, it's good to see growth on one side, but what if you QR grows faster than the new gTLDs?

At that point, how successful are the new gTLDs? But it appears in the absence of our delegates on the call, the majority point of view on the group was that these appear to be completely out of context and not interesting or not important at all. So what do we do about this? Go ahead Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry. But this has been the point all along. The GNSO considers these out of scope, the ALAC considers them to be in scope. This is not anything new. So does the group want to say, "Okay, because the ALAC people aren't here, that we now have the ability to wipe out their recommendations?" I mean, there is something fundamental about

this, and frankly I'm really, really disappointed with the Chair of the committee for having not considered that.

And frankly, Olivier, is there a chance you can talk to Jonathan, and state the case that, you know, he saw people were not there. He saw that the champions of this issue were not there, it is absolutely unfair dealing to take that as an opportunity to wipe things out in a way that they can't be brought back. Would you disagree with that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Well, I would say Evan, in all fairness, it looks as though Jonathan's group did not push for that, because when Rudi was on the line, and Rudi said, "I'd rather wait for an input from the ALAC on this," and Jonathan responded, "Okay. That's fine. We'll wait for an input from the ALAC on that before making a decision on it."

So he was, I think, very fair on his chairing of the call. Like I said, I have not listened to the transcript, so I don't exactly – sorry. I have not listened to the recording. I would suggest that you and Cheryl who are also on the call, listen to the transcript and find out exactly how it was. But Rudi seems to say that he just stalled it for us to be able to catch up on this one, and maybe that would be in the next call, the discussion would come back in the next call on this.

But I don't think we can fault the Chair of the working group for this. There might have been people on the call that asked for this, obviously those are the people we have an issue with.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: But why...? I don't understand why this particular fight needs to be kept re-fighting. The Board was explicit in putting through both the ALAC recommendations and the GNSO recommendations. It would be totally out of line for the Board then to retroactively take out a set of the Board mandated recommendations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I think you meant for the working group to take out Board mandated recommendations.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Right. This is meant to be an implementation group, you don't, you know, the Board has basically said as a matter of policy, we agree that all of these things are good ideas, now go out and set the implementation for it. That's not the space where you fight the fight that was already fought during the policy discussions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. And that's why I thought I would bring this up during this call, because you've been on the working group and I haven't. And I don't know if anybody else has been on the working group here, but I'm not quite sure how the working group has worked on this so far. Has it worked as an implementation working group? Or has it worked as a working group that is basically going to tone down whatever the other design working group had worked on?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'll answer that and sorry, I don't mean to take this up from Alan. The answer specifically is that it's designed to be a matter of implementation. Staff has come back to the group with a point by point listing of those are the line items that would be difficult to do, that would be expensive to do, that would be time consuming to do. Not this meeting, but the one immediately preceding, went into a debate on doing a global end user survey about the Internet, that was asking questions about choice, competition, and trust.

And doing a global survey is going to be a fairly expensive undertaking, and it's not necessarily in ICANN's budget, but the working group as a whole, at least during the meeting I attended, seemed to be vastly in favor of doing that kind of thing. I would be very surprised to see if those particular things were taking out. In regards to some of the specific items that you mentioned, one of the things that we had done in the original approach when we debated the metrics, was that things like market research about how much people use Facebook or non-memorable domain names to gather their information, this is easily purchasable information from market research firms.

So while it's a non-zero cost, it's not difficult to get. Anyway, thank you and sorry to take up this speech for so long.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Evan. That's exactly what I recall as well. I'll hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And I have no benefit of hearing what was said in any of the meetings. My understanding of the Board resolution was it passed the whole set, the union of the two sets of ideas, as it were, to the working group. Implementation, it's fair game for them to reject them because they are too expensive, because they are impossible to collect that information, but also for practical reasons.

They may have well wanted to cut down the number of things they do from a simple pragmatic point of view of having a reasonable amount of work going into this, an estimate. But to reject all of the ALAC ones, without doing that evaluation on a one by one basis, which I understand staff has already at least started in any case, I think is completely out of their scope.

And I think if that indeed is what there is some attempt of some working group members to do, then a strong letter from the ALAC chair would be appropriate, copying the Board. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Alan, this is Evan, my response to that is let's see what happens in the next meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, no, no.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I hope this... I mean, it sounds like a bit of an attempt at a side step when the proponents of this, and the defenders of this, happen to be

away from the meeting. It seems like a bit of a low blow to try and use that as an opportunity to gain a political advantage. Thankfully, thanks to Rudi and Jonathan, that didn't happen. So, let's just see what happens going forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much gentlemen. Can I ask that both of you liaise with Rudy, at least Evan...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I will talk to Rudi, and then I'll get a bit of a debrief.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Talk to Rudi and to Cheryl as well. I mean, there are three of you, I think if you're a team on there, and Rudi has played the team very well on that, so you all need to really work together to make sure that these get implemented. The issues that Alan has just described are absolutely real, yes, but as far as the cost issue is of concern on these metrics, this data is available for a few hundred bucks.

It's not speaking about millions of dollars of data here to look at. There is only reason for these two to go out is that it might make the new gTLD program look bad. It might not make it look as much of a success as it could have been. And that's definitely an issue of consumer trust. I mean, I think these are needed, and I'll leave it over in your capable hands to push on that.

But please come back to us with further details as to what's happened, the impact.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Will do. This is Evan. This is to Ariel who is typing in the notes right now, so it would be myself, Rudi, and Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rudi Vansnick is Rudi's full name. I think it's just the three of you on that working group. Is that correct?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, there is a number of other people. The working group... The CCNT working group is very interesting in that there is an awful lot of not the usual suspects there. So there is a lot of names that I've never heard of before. There is a lot of people that I was not aware of before. When they first came in I thought they would be interested in the public interest issues, but apparently not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's move on and time is the king. So, we now have language services, additional languages for At Large calls. Oh, what is that all about? Are we going to have Australian and Canadian on the call as well? [Laughter]

HOLLY RAICHE: No comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And whatever language you wish to speak, Heidi could you please let us know?

HEIDI ULLRICH: [Laughing]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That was on mute, that's another...

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry, I was – I kept getting the details wrong on my login on my phone. But anyway, yes. So I'm very happy to announce some very exciting news. So, [?] Rodriguez from language services, she has announced that there are going to be more languages for interpretation available. Let me just read you through the options, or what's going to be offered.

For the ALAC, we can now have simplified Chinese, which I believe Ariel is Mandarin, or that's what going to be the interpreted language. As well as Portuguese. For APRALO, we will now have the option of offering Mandarin. For the LACRALO calls we will now be offering the option of Portuguese. And Tijani, this is very good news for the ATLAS II, the interpretation being offered during the planetary sessions that being Saturday, Sunday, and Thursday, will be the UN five plus Portuguese.

So a full array of languages there. Being offered, will be available beginning in about one month. So the question is, does the ALAC wish to have Mandarin and Portuguese? And how would you like us to move forward with the offer of the APRALO and LACRALO languages? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Heidi. Alan Greenberg you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: In that intro, At Large and ALAC were used interchangeably, is there an intention of having more translation on the ALAC call?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I didn't quite get that. Olivier or Alan, could you repeat that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'll repeat it. When you were talking, you used the term both At Large and ALAC, is there an intention of having additional interpretation on the ALAC calls? I thought that was to go down, not up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, no. I meant ALAC. So the ALAC calls, in addition to the current Spanish and French, they will now have Mandarin and Portuguese. For the ATLAS II in London, then we'll offer UN five plus Portuguese.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we're talking about adding two languages to the monthly ALAC calls?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Has there been a demand for that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's what I wished to know. I mean, I think it would be [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: The rules of procedure say people should be able to speak English. So are we doing this purely so other people can listen in? Or are we doing this for the ALAC? I'm a little bit confused.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So we've been offering Spanish and French for the ALAC. This is the ALAC monthly call. So we've been offering French and Spanish for years now.

ALAN GREENBERG: But that has been historic because people have not been able to speak English.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And it's not just for the reason of participating in English. I think people in other languages could listen to the recording, etc., and follow along.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Evan Leibovitch, you have your hand up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. I guess this is relevant for something that is going on right now, for the public comment going on for the PAB. I was aware that that was going to be translated into French and Spanish. Will any of these other languages be used for that particular translation?

HEIDI ULLRICH: For which?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: For the public comment on the PAB. This is not interpretation, this is translation written document.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That I don't know. If you request it, I can have that – we can do that, yes. In fact, Portuguese, which was not [?] in terms of being offered for translation, is now offered again. So yeah, whatever language you would like, you can have the PABCC translate it into that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, you're involved with the PAB, what would you suggest?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Or Alan too, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's the amount of time that it takes for the translation, and if it's going to lengthen the amount of translating time required, then I would be against it. On the other hand, it's always good to have more languages, because it demonstrates more openness.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. My understanding was for public comments, if they were translated, they're translated into the UN languages. I thought that...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In any case, so it would be UN languages plus Portuguese at that point. I'm not pushing in one direction or another. I think more languages are a nice show, or openness, but I'm saying nice. I'm not saying they're absolutely mandatory, because both Chinese and Portuguese are not the languages which are currently most in demand in At Large.

I would certainly say that some dose of Arabic, and some dose of Russian, are the two languages which are...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, sorry. This is Heidi. I'm so sorry. There is Russian as well. Sorry. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: ...not an At Large comment, so it's an ICANN wide issue, not what is needed in At Large.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, so I say five, five UN languages then. With regards to our own work, I think there is a real significance with regards to Russian being there since we do have a lot of people that speak Russian in our community now.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So just as a matter of clarification. For the PAB public comment, because that is a real here and now thing, so it's my understanding, and I just want to confirm from this call, that the fact that translations are being done is not going to slow down the positing of the public comment in English, but that the five UN languages will eventually show up as translations of the printed document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi, could you confirm that please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think yes, Evan. What I'm hearing, you're saying that you want the PAB to be in all five languages. Is that what you're saying?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That's what I would like, and I hope Alan and Olivier are agreeing with me here because all three of us are involved with this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: When we ask for translation, I presume this is the standard ICANN translation, and whatever the normal languages are done, and I think it's the five UN languages, that's what I was expecting to have.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's fine. I was just thinking English and Spanish, but we can have all five. I had my hand raised, sorry, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, you're the one speaking at the moment, so you don't need to raise your hand, you can just continue talking.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I just wanted to point out in the Russian language, that on the EURALO call this past week there was a request for the establishment of an EURALO and APRALO joint working group, or joint group, in the Russian language. So I don't know, Olivier, how you would like that to proceed. Would you like that to be something just done between those two RALOs? Or would you like that to be discussed in the ALAC since it is going to be a working group?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Heidi for bringing this up, that's what I was hoping the discussion would move towards. That's sort of an interesting development, what we have to think about here, and that's why I wanted it to be brought up on this call is, do we wish to let RALOs work with each other by themselves? Or do we wish to conduct a formal process that would ratify this and make it official that these RALOs are working together on these language issues, and therefore provide them with a bit more of a green light on what they're doing. The floor is open. Evan and then Alan. Evan Leibovitch you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, it's an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't even think we should be asking that question. If the RALOs want to work together on something, let them. If it gets to the stage where it needs formal blessing, and/or some formality, then so be it. I think we ought to encourage people to actually speak to each other and work with each other. If it starts, and it has a life of its own, we may want to formalize it or do something else, but I strongly applaud that kind of idea. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. The only reason why I bring it up here, or what it is brought up here, is that it would require resources, obviously the translation and the work of interpreters and so on, would require resources. So that does affect the ALAC because it will come under the overall ALAC resources. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, given that, I think it's a reasonable thing to bring up at an ALAC meeting, say if anybody has any trouble with this, knowing that it may well draw a bit of resources. A good consensus based decision, and then let them see what they can do. I certainly wouldn't start saying you have to write a chart and things like that, and do things with formality when they're just trying something out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Heidi, do you know whether this has the potential to impact the ALAC with regards to funding for other resources?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Olivier, no. My understanding is that interpretation and translation comes out of the Language Services budget, not the policy or ALAC budget, to be exact.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. So what I think I'm hearing here is we should... This is very welcome to see these RALOs work together, and perhaps what I can do is to just draft an email to the chairs of those two RALOs concerned and say that I've heard about their interest of doing it, and that the matter has been discussed on the leadership team call, and there is certainly good support and they should just keep on doing what they wish to do on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I'll point out that if a bunch of people want to get together and talk about Russian things, they don't need interpretation. The only need interpretation if they want you to participate in the call or the rest of us [laughs].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you. It's Olivier speaking. They want to do this as an official thing. They would obviously like to discuss ICANN policy in Russian and create the Russian language, but it would obviously correspond with the rest of the world. So whatever output and input comes into them, might need to be translated in both directions. We're not just going to put a bunch of Russian people, Russian speaking people in a virtual

room, in an Adobe Connect room, and let them talk to each other and nothing will come out of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of them might speak English also.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Heidi, I think it's quite clear. So I'll draft a quick note just to let them know that this is an excellent idea and they should just proceed forward.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay Olivier. So this is for the Russian issue. But in terms of the, for example, offering Chinese on APRALO and for Portuguese on LACRALO, we have not informed them yet except for the ALT members. So we should just go ahead and let them know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I should say yes to both, and I'll tell you my rationale, having heard all of the points of view here. With regards to Chinese on the APRALO call, obviously it's important we have a number of ALSs that have come from Chinese speaking countries and that might raise the number of people on the call from those countries. And the very fact that we're going off to Singapore in a few weeks' time, which is Chinese speaking, Malay and Chinese, and of course... So that would be important.

With regards the Latin American and Caribbean region, we've got English and Spanish for the moment. For a long time, the Brazilians have been complaining they are not being – they're being discriminated against, being a very large country in Latin America, and I think that would be a good welcome compact to Latin America. Then what we all have to do is to also provide French support as well for that region, and then we'll have a full continent, and of course [?] later on.

Hello? Heidi, you're here?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, I'm hearing this. Thank you. So Ariel, could you take those action items related to that please? And we can follow up with Olivier after that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I'll tell you what we can do Heidi, let's offer them and let's monitor how many people make use of those channels. And ultimately that's what's going to show if we offer them, and we actually put them there, then we will find out how much demand there is. There is an unknown, unknown. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, is this only for the ALAC calls? Or also for the LACRALO and APRALO calls?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's start with the ALAC calls.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I guess, sorry, Heidi, this is really up to you. We can have a full round with each one. Let's do the whole [?]... ALAC calls, APRALO calls, LACRALO calls, and monitor what is the use of those channels, and if it's not taken up, then we might decide to stop it a few months from now in case we are effectively wasting... But then in the run up to the At Large summit, I think it's important that we have a very good set of languages there.

So if we get more active, as Silvia mentioned in the chat, they might become more active if we offer Portuguese. Okay. Let's move on. Singapore meeting and agendas. Let's have a look at the final review of meetings and agendas, any changes, anything that's changed since the last time we spoke. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: For Singapore, yeah, I think we're nearly there. Let me just go and look for the Singapore meeting. Sorry I'm just getting the Singapore meeting up. So for Sunday, I just wanted to clarify, let me just put Sunday in there, as Tijani and I agreed yesterday, we are now going to have the voting – where is Sunday?

So the face to face voting for Directors selected by At Large will now take place on Sunday 17:45 to 18:15. What we've done is we've moved Theresa Swinehart to 11 to 12, so that would be one hour.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Heidi, what's on the screen on the moment doesn't have the column that it should have. So that Sunday dot PDF needs to be... Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So yeah, so you can see there. Item 14 is the face to face vote, that is 17:45 to 18:15, just to confirm that. And what we've done now, this is now speaking with Tijani, if we do need to go on to a phase two of the second round, that is now going to be Wednesday, and here is a link to Wednesday. So you'll see that it's going to be a very tight schedule for Wednesday. So, the round two, if it is needed, will now be 15:30 to 16:30, which is through a coffee break, but it is really the only time that was available. It's one hour that is needed for that.

And then the ATLAS II organizing committee meeting part two, is going to be down from 90 minutes to 60 minutes, 16 to 17:00. Okay, so that's a change for that. In terms of agendas, we still do need a few, and we really would like to have them in by tomorrow, because we're going to be sending them to translation as soon as we can, this next week, and we're actually going to be freezing the agendas by mid-week, next week, so if we don't have the agendas, we're just going to put a three part, very simple, agenda in there and then chairs will be responsible for updating those agendas.

So I do need one from you Evan for new gTLDs. I need one from the IDN working group. Holly, do you have some ideas that you and Carlton have set for the agenda for the registration issues? So I'll send that to you, what I in the reading.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Heidi, right now for the new gTLD group, the policy advisory issue, and the picks, and this whole thing. Technically the standout in the gTLD committee working group. So that's already been indicated that this would be a major thing. Sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So that's the main issue right there?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And then for the future challenges working group, that other one Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Jean-Jacques told me he was going to be in touch with you about that part of it. I mean, I can if he doesn't, but he said he was going to take care of it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you. I mean, really, that's it Olivier. I think we're all under control here, besides [CROSSTALK]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much Heidi for this. That's great to hear. And now we have any other business, which is the last point. Just reminding you, please have a look at this in the [?] and write in those questions and topics for the meeting with the Board and so on. We've got a date that [?] speak about, but maybe might not agree with it. And so, please add your comments on it.

Any other business. I note there is one thing at the moment, I wanted to bring another on there. Let's first discuss the ALT rotating times. As you know, the time that we have at the moment is in the evening for some of us, in the morning for others, and for no one is it in the middle of the night, thankfully. Who shall... Shall I ask Gisella to explain to us the proposal then for these times, or Heidi...?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes please, Gisella is the queen of that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Gisella you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, Gisella here for the transcripts. With regards to the [CROSSTALK]... Sorry, excuse me here. With regards to the rotating for

the monthly meeting, I think what's – a suggestion from my part would be set the monthly time, so like today's meeting, and then like on Wednesday or a Thursday at 19 or 21:00 UTC to be decided by a Doodle poll, and have that as a set date and time for the monthly call.

And then schedule the mid-monthly with the Doodle as in when. Which will allow for this week to have a late call for Europe, which would make it a reasonable time following the ALAC call that we had on Tuesday, and then the mid-month one will be really just to suit everyone's needs there and then. Does that make sense?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Any thoughts on this? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I think that does make sense. Although, Maureen says, for the ALAC meeting, Tuesday 9 AM or 11 AM which is the middle of her work day. Okay.

GISELLA GRUBER: Put it this way, we'll send out the Doodle... Sorry, Gisella again. For the monthly call, so for the Wednesday or the Thursday UTC time, following the ALAC call, which we do now, we usually have the ALAC monthly, ALT monthly call on the Wednesday or the Thursday following the ALAC call, we'll send out a Doodle and we'll see when it suits everyone, aka for Maureen, 7 AM. We'll keep it at a reasonable time for Sidney bearing in mind that Holly does do a 2 AM for the ALAC call.

And I think that the pain should be shared. So, Maureen I'll definitely at worst bring up the world's clock. I'll make sure that [?] to get your time,

and – sorry, that’s... I’ll make sure that your time is on there and taking into account that your working day starts at 9 AM. And I’ll send it around to everyone and I’ll see what the best time is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Well Gisella, I don’t see anyone going against that at the moment, so let’s proceed forward with this and see how it goes. Anyway, we’re not going to be able to test that before the Singapore meeting, I believe, so we’ll have to test that after the Singapore meeting, but let’s go forward with it and see if it improves the rotation. Okay? Thank you.

Now the second bit of any other business is following on an email that I received, a reminder request for input. And unfortunately this is one where I have to do a mea culpa in my millions of emails that I receive, there was one email from Glenda [?] on the 23rd of January, asking me, and all SO AT chairs actually, for the policy development process, PDP, on privacy and proxy services accreditation issues.

I have no idea why they didn’t carbon copy staff, the staff account, they just carbon copied Heidi and I believe that Heidi email, mailboxes equally [?], which means that it totally fell through the ground and through the net on both of us, and so we now received a reminder email just a few moments ago, asking – the request was sent on the 23rd of January, the working group had hoped to receive input from our group by Friday the 28th of February.

Do we have anyone on that working group actually? I should have guessed, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was going to ask, do we have anyone on that working group? Given the amounts that we belly ache about WHOIS, and belly ache about not being able to get information, if we don't have someone on that group, then we're giving up our right to complain about a whole bunch of issues. So I really think, if we don't have anyone on that group, we should fix it, and the same goes for general comments also.

It's just not fair game to say that we don't like the way things are and then not participate in fixing it. And I'm late for another call, so I'm going to drop off of this one now, and I wish you luck with this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I mean, there is a whole number of questions which are there. There is six, 12, about 20 questions that are being asked here, and I wish we had gone through the full process to answer them and put this on the policy development page, it's just way too much. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Carlton and I are on there, and that's my 3:00 call on Tuesday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't know why you weren't carbon copied on this. I see...

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't either. [CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...and Heidi. Are these the co-chairs, or the vice-chairs? [CROSSTALK]

HOLLY RAICHE: I do not understand that frankly, because Carlton and I are both members of that, and we've been contributing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And were you aware that... It's Olivier speaking. Were you aware that they were sending their request for us?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, no. Should we chit chat offline? Because I've been feeding in comments and staff – as Alan rightly said, WHOIS has been such a big issue for us for so long, that there are two ALAC members on this group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Holly, thank you for this. What I'm going to do then is to respond to [?] with a carbon copying the ALAC leadership team and staff of course, and let them know that we do need more time. This seems to be consensus here. What we're told here is that the working group had hoped to receive input from the ALAC by Friday the 27th of February.

The feedback would be very useful to the working group deliberations. If your group wishes to provide input, but would need more time, please let Mary [?] the policy staff member handling this matter now. And also let Mary know if you would like her to resend for which

feedback is being sought. I'm going to pen a list of questions in my mailbox, [?] not answered.

And I can forward that to staff to open a public wiki page. And I don't think that either of the working group that those would be the first one can hold the pen on this one, but I'm sure we can put Alan as a placeholder just in case. So if you can feed your knowledge, so Carlton and you can feed your knowledge about this to the ALAC that would be very helpful and very welcomed.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Not a problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Fantastic. Thank you very much. And I don't know how much time we will be able to get, how much additional time we will be able to get from them, but I shall make the ask now and come and come back to the leadership team on this. Right. Any other, other business? I see no hands up.

I would like to thank all of you to be on this call. Tijani Ben Jemaa, the very last word. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. I have two points. The first one, as you all know, our ALSs are all over the world, and for the call that we will organize with the candidates, the time will not be convenient for everyone. So there

was a proposal to hold two different calls on the same day, so that everyone can attend. What do you think about that?

This means that the candidates will be obliged to be on both calls. So what do you think about that? This is the first point. And the second point would be, as you all know, our meeting, our ALAC meeting lasted three hours last time. And I think that is not productive to have a very long call like this. The specialist said, that over one hour and a half, the meeting is not productive.

But let's say that we need to find a solution to make it shorter. I can propose to split it into two parts during the month. One part about policy only, and the other part for all the other things. Or we can split it only in two parts. For example, we can decide not to speak about policy development for this call, and that we'll speak about it for the next one.

So it is a way to split the call into two parts. Also, for the ALAC call, two of our ALAC members said that on Tuesday, they have a hard commitment in their work. Those are [?] and [?]. So if it is possible, we can change the date, change the day so that we have most of the ALAC members able to attend the call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Tijani. Any thoughts on this? The last thoughts we can say on this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So we can do two parts.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [CROSSTALK] ...that three hour call into two parts and so on. What I was going to suggest, Tijani, since the next time that everyone is meeting is going to be over in Singapore, maybe we can have this as a topic for like a lunch discussion or something, and asking – because everybody will be there, for splitting the call in two.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And then, I mean, because I think some people would rather have one long call, some people would like to have two calls a month. I've heard several people mentioning possibly having more than one call, but then – yeah, there is just so much more going on. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Very quickly. This is Heidi. A possible suggestion for a time is that currently we have both Theresa and Xavier and Susanna Bennett speaking to us for one hour each. If we put that down to 45 minutes each, then we would have 30 minutes that's on Sunday. Would you like to do that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I'm fine with this. I just don't want to spend too much time again on process issues. We're going to get those people who would like

more, but shorter, and those who would just want to give it over with once a month. They can just turn their computer on, be on the call, and then do their – in the meantime. Okay.

Anyone, I don't see anyone saying against that. So yes, just reduce a little bit the time that we have face to face over there. I'm in two minds about this because I'm just concerned we're going to spend so much time on procedural issues, as we are at the moment again, on things which really does warrant us to have face to face time to discuss. But, let's do that. Let's put it up in Singapore, and let's not spend more than 30 minutes on it.

Okay. Thank you very much Tijani for bringing this up, and I leave it to Singapore. And I note that we've been now two hours and 10 minutes on this call, it was supposed to be an one hour and 30 minute call. So we have 35 minutes, 40 minutes actually, over the end of this call. I thank you all for being on this call, and with this, it's good morning, good afternoon, and good night. Have a good weekend, more than that, have a safe trip over to Singapore in a couple of weeks' time. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]