
GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Olivier. The recording has started.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the ALAC monthly conference call on Tuesday, 29 April 2014. The time is 14:06 UTC. Let's get on with the roll call, the apologies, and the adoption of the agenda. Gisella, if you could please take over.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Olivier. On today's call on the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Sandra Hoferichter, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Beran Gillen, Ron Sherwood, Roberto Gaetano, Sebastien Bachollet, Judith Hellerstein, Otunte Otuneh, Allan Skuce, Mwendwa Kivuva, Glenn McKnight, Pastor Peters, Garth Graham, Mercy Moyo, Anthony Niigani, Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, Sunil Lal, Roosevelt King, and Ali AlMeshal.

On the Spanish channel, we have Leon Sanchez and Fatima Cambrero. Apologies. Leon may be on the English channel.

On the French channel, we have Hadja Ouattara. Apologies today noted from Christopher Wilkinson, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Alberto Soto, and Gunela Astbrink.

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.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Terri Agnew, and myself, Gisella Gruber. Cheryl Langdon-Orr has also just joined us on the Adobe Connect.

Interpreters today on the French channel are Claire and Aurélie, and on the Spanish channel, Sabrina and David.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, as well as for the interpreters to allow them to identify you on the other channel. If you are both on the audio bridge and on the Adobe connect, if you would please mute your microphone on your computer.

Also, if you could speak at a reasonable speed to allow accurate interpretation. If you do wish to ask a question, please use the raised hand function. If you are not on the Adobe Connect, if you would just speak out and we'll be able to then grant you the floor.

Thank you, and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. My name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Actually, if you're not on the Adobe Connect and you would like to speak, then speak out, but say your name so I know who is speaking out, rather than just saying, "Excuse me. Excuse me," when I wouldn't have a clue who wants to speak.

So adoption of the agenda. It's a fairly large agenda today. I hereby ask for adoption of the agenda and any other business that would need to be added to the end of the agenda. I don't see anyone put their hands

up. I see a green tick from Eduardo Diaz, so let's go ahead. The agenda is adopted as it is.

Let's get moving straight with the second item on our agenda, and that's the roll call. That's done. Third item. Here we go. Review of Singapore meeting action items.

I invite you all to have a look at the wiki page, which is linked to this. That, of course, looks at all of the work that we have done in Singapore and all of the action items that are still yet remaining. There are quite a few of them, looking at it from day to day. What we will do is to just look over the action items that are yet to be marked as being done.

So in the first day, which was the Sunday, the ALAC and Regional Leadership Workshop, we had a discussion with the Communications Team with Duncan Burns and with Chris Gift. There was something there saying staff to follow up with Chris Gift on the ICANN Academy tab on the ICANN.org. I believe it is the ICANN.org website.

Any update on this, please, staff?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi. We will follow up with Chris on that. We're going to be following up with him on several items, and we'll include that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you. Next, a discussion with Maguy Serad, Vice President for Contractual Compliance. Staff is to send a report drafted by Garth on enforcement of UDRP proceedings and UDRP compliance related to

decisions by ICANN Compliance, and Alan's presentation also. That's how it's drafted on the action items. Staff, has there been movement on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I've followed up with Garth twice asking him what the staff actually was complete that action item, but I have yet to hear from him, so I will follow up with him again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Heidi. And I note that Garth Bruen is not on the line at the moment, so it's difficult to ask him a question. But I see Alan Greenberg having put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Could I have clarification from Heidi on what's she's following up with Garth on?

HEIDI ULLRICH: There were some e-mails that Silvia forwarded onto Maguy during the Singapore meeting, and I'm following up with Garth if that completes that action item. To me, it wasn't clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I thought that the first part of that action item was just forwarding a report that Garth had sent to the ALAC, so if that was done, it's complete. If it wasn't done, it isn't complete. I think there was just one

item there in addition to my presentation, and I know I forwarded my presentation to Ariel and presume that she forwarded that on.

ARIEL LIANG: Hello. I have forwarded your presentation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah – no, no, I know that. That’s what I’m saying. I’m saying the only other part is an e-mail that Garth sent which included a report – a relatively exhaustive report – on the UDRP. So the record should show either we forwarded it or not. If we did, then the item’s complete.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I think we’ll just need to obtain some clarification from staff after this call on this, and also on the next action item, which is for Heidi to forward Garth’s e-mail regarding Compliance to the ALAC. Heidi, has this been done?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, and again, this is the same thing. I think I sent him a couple of e-mails saying, “Does this complete the action item?” So I will follow up with him again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. So let’s follow up directly with Garth. If Garth does come on the call, maybe we might come back to this quickly and ask him for this information. I would certainly like to see some movement

on this and some follow-up, since Compliance is one of our main meetings that we have on this Sunday, and we certainly need to advance.

Next, the meeting with the SSAC with Patrick Fälström and Jim Galvin. The ALAC, through the SSAC liaison, is to provide input and support to the new initiative being undertaken by ICANN SSAC staff and ICANN communication staff to better communicate security and stability issues, including relevant SSAC reports, to a broad audience, including end users. I see that Julie Hammer will own this action item, so over to you, Julie Hammer. I'm afraid at the moment I'm unable to hear you. You might be muted. It's *7 to unmute.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, Olivier. She may have come in a little too late to hear the question asked to her.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you, Heidi. So I'll repeat – the meeting with the SSAC. We are looking through the action items at the moment. The ALAC through the SSAC liaison should provide input and support to the new initiatives being undertaken by ICANN SSAC staff and ICANN communications staff to be better communicate security and stability issues, including relevant SSAC reports, to a broad audience, including end users. I wish that action item was a bit shorter, but that's what it says here.

Julie Hammer, is there an update on this, please?

JULIE HAMMER: Good morning. [inaudible] Sorry. [inaudible] been connected to the call. I'm afraid [inaudible] there's not been any progress to my knowledge to date.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Please, let's get this working and moving because it's been a month.

JULIE HAMMER: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the next month? Go ahead, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah, Olivier. I'm afraid that depends on staff availability to work on that, and I think have been [inaudible], especially with all the IANA transition work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. Then that provides some feedback then. Thank you very much, Julie. Let's keep this ongoing then for the time being.

Let's go to the next action items. Scrolling down the page, you will notice that a majority of the action items are marked as having been completed.

If we go all the way down to Wednesday, 26 March, we have one remaining action item where Ariel is to work with Alan Greenberg and Dev Anand Teelucksingh in regards to the mailing list subscriptions and rules of procedure. Come up with some rational rules to be posted on the wiki. I think I know the answer to that. I know it's in progress at the moment, and I believe – is it next week that you will have a conference call, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Maybe. It will likely be next week. It requires a fair amount of work that I have to find a couple of hours to do first to review what's on the current mailing list.

The intent is to find a rational set of rules, but it's not going to be something we implement overnight because if we decide to change the meaning of the mailing list, it's going to take a fair amount of effort to do that. But the intent is to review how people are currently using the mailing list and then try to make some rational decisions about that.

But yes, the work should start in earnest this week or next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you, Alan. So let's move on then further down with Pavan. This is an APRALO monthly meeting, but I think that affects absolutely everyone. Pavan Budhrani is to start collecting local music collections for ALTAS II.

I'd like to ask the RALO leaders here whether **[inaudible]** received that request so far. Anybody that has not received the request, please let us

know. I think that it's been received by most RALO leaderships because I have seen some discussions on some of the mailing lists. Yes, the music is, indeed, for the Fayre of Opportunities, and I think it was a case of providing 10 or 15 tracks.

Let's move on further down. The ATLAS II Organizing Committee Meeting, Part 1. Again, because this is a really core amount of work that the ALAC is working on now, I will go through any ATLAS II-related action items as well. Here, that's funny. We've got Nancy Lupiano to start collecting local music collection for ATLAS II. So let's see, out of Pavan and Nancy, who gets the music faster.

Then we've got Nancy to check into whether the Windsor room can be changed into format on Monday afternoon. I am not quite sure what "format" is, but I believe it's probably getting rid of the tables. I wonder, staff, have we had some feedback on this? Getting rid of the tables in the room?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi. We've been in touch about that, and she's still working on whether her team can do that. So that is in progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Well I think, Heidi, that the removing of the tables is probably something that we can do. It's putting them back together and fixing the microphones and all that which is likely to be the main cause of problems.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Actually, Olivier, we cannot touch any of those tables because all the cords are linked to them, and Nancy gets very unhappy about that. It's actually a safety issue. So I think the question that is being asked here is whether, if there are no more meetings after 14:30, whether then her team can come in and change the format not out of that U-shape. So that's what they're looking for.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right, thank you. Let's go on. Then after this, looking further down, so we're not going to look at the Academy Working Group meeting, but the ATLAS II Thematic Development meeting, there are two remaining action items on there.

Evan Lebovitch is to identify the chairs and rapporteurs for each breakout theme. I think that this has now been identified and is listed on the wiki. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, Olivier. Sorry. As a matter of fact, I'm going to have to drop off the call. I just heard of a death in the family, so forgive me. I just heard this within the last five minutes. Sorry about this. I'll join back as soon as I can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's okay, Evan, and sorry about this. Sorry to hear that, and we hope to speak to you soon.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we're off to Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I don't think that the action item was exactly that. I think it was that we need to identify chairs and rapporteurs, and we already started in Singapore. Then there was a call for volunteers, and we received a lot of, how to say, volunteers.

My concern: I expressed it in Singapore and I repeated it during the call we had after Singapore. When you ask people to volunteer, if you don't take them, they will be unhappy. They will be upset. And the volunteers we have, there are some who are not able to do that. It's very clear. They don't have experience. To be chair, you need some skills. To be rapporteurs, you need other skills. People are volunteering, and some of them don't have the necessary skills.

This is the problem, and Wolf has agreed with me at the end and said, "You are right." We tried to be democratic. We had this situation. So now we have to set a set of criteria for both roles. With those criteria, we will be able to select people and say, "You don't fulfill this criteria. That's why you are not taken." Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. And I think we all need to keep this one ongoing, and we still have some work to do on it.

The next call: Events Group plus Aziz, Alan, Wolf, Sandra, Adam, Tijani, Evan, OCL, Roberto, Siva, JJS week of 7 April. I'm not quite sure what this action item is supposed to be. Has this next call taken place, staff?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, that's for you, if you can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You might be muted, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. I was unmuted during the people joining. Yes, my action items. The events pool, is that correct? That is set to take place by 7 April?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It looks like it because it says on the...

GISELLA GRUBER: Is that the correct action item?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's what it says on the action item, yes. The Events Group, next call.

GISELLA GRUBER: We have had an Events Group. I will check to see if the people that are stated on this action item were on the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I guess it's just a standard thing. Let's move on further down at the bottom of the page, the Friday, 28 March. That's an action item from the ALAC Leadership Team. In fact, the leadership team have had a conference call since, but that page here, which is the ALAC page, it says: staff to check all ATLAS II team leaders to keep track of the number of personnel in their complete team in spending in ATLAS II. Can someone please decrypt this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. That's the reason that it's not really been done. I'm personally not clear in what that means. Is it the personnel in their group? Is it the number of hours being spent on calls? So that's something I need direction from the [inaudible] on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. It's a staff action item. Oh, but I see two people having put their hands up. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am sorry. It is an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe that was an item to keep track of the amount of time spent on ATLAS II to reinforce the fact that this was a major undertaking. That's what I understood from the discussion in Singapore.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, thanks, Alan. Since this is a staff action item, I'll leave it with staff to work out, and we can I guess leave the action items. Just asking if anybody has comments or questions on any of the action items that we have said so far.

Seeing no one put their hands up, let's move on then to the next part of the agenda, and that's the review of the current ALS applications. I believe this is Nathalie Peregrine who will take us through this, but I don't see Nathalie on the call. Would any other staff care to go through the ALS, please? You might be muted. You probably are.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, is Nathalie not on the call, Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, no, Nathalie's not on the call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Is she able to get onto the call? Ariel, are you aware of the number of votes that are currently continuing right now?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Currently we have the ALS Application (197) Open Media being voted on, and the votes will end tonight at 23:59 UTC. We only have – I think only Tijani hasn't cast his vote, so this is ready to go.

The recently certified ALSes includes an Application (193) Fundetic-Bolivia, also, (195) Native Public Media and (196) Visually Impaired and Blind User Group. So these are the three recently-certified ALSes.

The rest on the agenda page from (198), (199), (200), (201), and (170) are pending applications. I'm waiting for Nathalie to tell me which one to launch, and also Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this, Ariel. I'm just concerned that what is written on the agenda page is completely different from what you've just told us. So I think that would have needed to be updated.

I guess the only thing I can think out of this is we have a lot of applications at the moment that are going through the process, and that really is great news. We have, certainly, a growth in the number of At-Large Structures, which is unprecedented.

That said, we will have an agenda item later on in our call regarding the ALS decertification because we have, due to changing circumstances, we have some At-Large Structures which have disappeared or are not operational anymore, so we will have to tighten the list of At-Large Structures that we have.

But it certainly is great to see all of these new ALSes that have been recently joining us. Certainly Fundetic-Bolivia, the Native Public Media,

and the Visually Impaired and Blind User Group – really, really great to see some new communities that are really joining the work that we do here. I’m not sure whether they are on the call. We have a lot of people today on the call, but I welcome them on this. I really hope that we will see a lot more from all of these communities in the forthcoming months.

Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. Ariel, I have a question about the number of ALSes, yes, certified before or by 31 December 2013. Because those ALSes will be attending the summit, and I would like to know how many ALSes will be attending the summit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. I’m not quite sure whether this was the answer you were looking for Tijani, but certainly there are quite a few. I would imagine there are – we have tables for 160 ALSes, but there is likely to be around the 160 mark.

But ever since that time, there have been several new organizations that have applied and have been certified as At-Large Structures, and I think we are now nearing the 170 mark very quickly, indeed. We might even have exceeded this. But at the moment, as I see in fact on the top of the agenda, it says, “Total number of At-Large Structures: 171.”

So that’s what we have, but as you know, the rule was set up last year that At-Large Structures needed to have applied before the end of

December, so before the 1 January 2014. Any At-Large Structure that has applied before that date and that has been certified since will be funded to come to London. Others, unfortunately, we have to apply a cut-off date if only for establishing our budgets, and we have no idea how many At-Large Structures there would be.

Furthermore, all registered At-Large Structures that qualify have now been sent constituency travel documents for them to book their London travel. I think we will be speaking about this shortly, later on in this call.

Let's move on to the next part of our agenda, and that is the reports part of the agenda. In the reports, I invite you to have a look at the RALOs and Liaisons reports page and also the ALAC Monthly Reports. In fact, I think it's pretty much the same sort of page.

The At-Large Reports from Work Groups, RALOs and Liaisons has got the liaison reports for the GNSO, the ccNSO, the SSAC, and then we also have NCSG liaison. There used to be an Internationalized Domain Name liaison. That's completed and we might need to make a change on the page for this to reflect this. Then there is a .mobi liaison that the ALAC has. The bylaw mandated liaisons are the GNSO liaison, the ccNSO, so I will ask first for Alan Greenberg, our GNSO liaison, to provide his report on the GNSO's activities. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think there's anything to report that I haven't already reported on. The only issue that is hot right now is the Cross Community Working Group on Cross Community Working Group rules.

The formal call for volunteers for that will be going out either later on this week or next week. At that point, I think the ALAC, since there are our formal members and observers, the ALAC may well have to ratify who the formal members are. But at this point, they were waiting for the formal call. I'm also checking who's already on the list. I should get an answer. I'm in the processing of discussing with the GNSO staff on that.

So I don't think I have anything else to report. The GNSO is acting, in my mind, in a far more professional manner than they have in recent times, and I think that's a good thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for your report, Alan. That's good to hear. Certainly, I hope there will be much involvement from the ALAC and At-Large community in the Cross Community Working Group on cross community working groups.

As you know, historically – and I'm saying this because we do have a number of newcomers on the call – but historically, the creation of cross community working groups that have participants from all across ICANN have been somehow messy because there were no set rules on how to create a cross community working group, and depending on the political inclination of the working group, things sometimes got stalled at various levels of the process.

So it's great to see that the GNSO is now looking at establishing rules and establishing them in a way which brings other members of the

community so that we have rules that are mutually acceptable for everyone across the community.

When I was in Sao Palo a couple of days ago, I spoke to the chair of the GNSO, Jonathan Robinson, and also the chair of the GAC and the chair of the ccNSO. The chair of the GAC was Heather Dryden and the chair of the ccNSO, Byron Holland. We had a little four-way conversation regarding the things that needed to be done, and certainly pressure for this community working group on cross community working groups was something we've all made quite clear. So I think we'll see some movement on this.

ccNSO liaison reports next, and for this, we have our very own – where is she? Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maureen Hilyard? Go ahead, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I see the ccNSO report is up. As has just been discussed, ccNSO is also involved in the Cross Community Working Group's discussions. The report basically sort of states – I recorded this all on the council meeting in Singapore. They have had a council meeting since then but, of course, it was a local forum because most of the council was actually preparing for NETmundial.

So that was probably the shortest council meeting. It was only 50 minutes, which ALAC, it would be really good if we could ever [decide on] something that short.

But I had actually listed the sorts of discussions that are taking place by the council. It reflects a lot of the discussions that we ourselves are taking [part in]. So it's good to see that across the other organizations, the same discussions are taking place since the input in those discussions is taking place, and that is actually listed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Maureen. Any questions now on the ccNSO report of the GNSO report? I see no one put their hand up, and it doesn't mean that this call will be less than 30 minutes in length, but we have managed to have a quorum here, so we'll continue on the call.

Let's move to the SSAC liaison reports. For this, we have Julie Hammer. Julie, you have the floor.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Olivier. Not a great deal to report here [inaudible] a whole lot of activity in the working group. There has been a huge amount of work on the working party looking at the IANA transition and the security and stability implications of that. [Part of] that report is planned for release by the London meeting.

The SSAC is also working on a comment on the JAS report even though deadlines for that have long gone. The SSAC is still working on the

comment on that. So there has been a great deal of work going on, just nothing publically released as yet. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julie. Do we have any questions or comments for Julie Hammer? I don't see anyone put their hand up.

Finally, I was going to call upon Murray McKercher, our recently-appointed .mobi liaison. I do not see him on the call, unfortunately. Is Murray on the call? Nope? Okay.

Could I just ask staff, please, to take an action item and just to get in touch with Murray McKercher with regards to his .mobi liaison report? I'm looking at the wiki page at the moment and not seeing any update. I know that the recent update that we had was that the first .mobi advisory board meeting conference call had been moved back, and it would be good to have an update on this.

Heidi Ullrich?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, Olivier. Just to clarify as to whom that action item is directed? Is that staff to follow up with Murray McKercher?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. Yes. Staff to follow up with Murray McKercher, asking for his liaison report.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And so with that, we can then move to the next part of our call if there are no questions, and that's new business with Items for Decision.

We have here quite a large chunk of our work, which is the policy developments that the ALAC does. That, of course, is all of these number of statements that the ALAC publishes in response to both public comment requests but also to spontaneous suggestions from the At-Large community.

Looking at the list, you will notice that there is a policy advice development page link on the agenda page. That has got all of the statements which are currently under discussion. It also has the closed statements – the past communication, past closed statements which have been voted on, ratified, and sent to the relevant person.

It's a constant pipeline of work, and for this I have to thank Ariel Liang, who is our staff member in charge of this. She has done extremely well in being able to track all of the different moving parts of this huge, big equilibrium.

And as you will see, I'm not going to read through all of the recently adopted ALAC statements, documents or groups. I just wanted to thank all of the penholders for this. You see that there are a lot of statements that have been published in the past month or month-and-a-half, and

it's great to see such an amount of activity. But as in any pipeline, there are a lot of forthcoming statements, and we have a long list.

At agenda item 6B (for bravo): statements or endorsements currently being developed, reviewed, or voted on by the ALAC. The update at the moment is as follows:

First, the Policy Development Process on Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues. The ALAC has submitted a statement with pending ratification, and the ALAC is currently voting on the statement. Ariel, when is this due?

ARIEL LIANG: The vote will close on May 1, 23:59 UTC, so the day after tomorrow we should have the results.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Ariel. Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a quick comment. This is an initial statement. The Privacy Proxy Working Group, which is a GNSO working group, continues and probably will continue for some time. So I will probably be asking for input over the next probably year as this is just the privacy proxy accreditation, which was put into the RAA 2013 version. So it's probably just the first statement of many, just to alert people that there will be a lot more to come. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much for this update, Holly. As I understand, you are on that working group. Is that correct?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes I am, and in fact, the meeting is going on of that group right now. So I'll just have to catch up with the latest on that working group. [inaudible] to the meeting probably later this morning at some point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for that. Very busy day or night for you, since you are based in Australia.

Going on to the next statement, the ICANN Draft Five-Year Strategic Plan (FY 16-FY20). Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Rafid Fatani have very kindly offered to co-draft a first draft of this statement.

Dev or Raf, is there any update on this? Actually, I don't see Raf on the call, so perhaps Dev?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Dev is not here. He said he'd come back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He's not here either? Oh, that's right. Sorry. Goodness. Of course, Dev had to leave a bit earlier, so we'll be waiting for a first draft. This is a long-term deadline. I think we're looking at the end of May.

But I invite all the people who are interested in this five-year strategic plan to have a good luck at this and type their comments at the bottom of the page. You have to log in to be able to comment because we've had some problems with spam. But please bring in your comments on what you would like to see on this statement of the ALAC regarding this topic.

Next, the Interim Report Internationalized Registration Data Expert Working Group. Again here, Raf Fatani has suggested that he would be holding the pen on this.

This is to do with internationalized domain names (IDNs) and is to do with the registration data itself and the translation and, I guess, the transliteration of the registration data.

There's an interim report that has been drafted, and this is just one of a long number of activities that are taking place in the IDN, Internationalized Domain Names Working Group. If you're interested in this topic, please join the working group. If you don't know how to join it, just drop a note to ICANN At-Large staff: staff@At-Large.ICANN.org, and they will point you in the right direction.

Next, the ICANN Strategy Panels. As you know, ICANN has had four strategy panels which have been implemented and set up and have worked for the past, I think, we are looking at about five to six months. The work of these panels has now been finalized and published.

The first panel was on the identifier technology innovation recommendations. The second one was on the ICANN multi-stakeholder innovation. The third one, on the public responsibility framework. And

the fourth one was on the ICANN role in the Internet governance ecosystem.

Each one of these panels was headed by a world megastar and had some world megastars as their members in there, including someone from At-Large in the ICANN role in the Internet governance ecosystem. So we're now asked to, like for all reports that are published, we are now asked to comment on the reports. Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just to say that I've looked at all of them. I think the most useful from our perspective is the one on the multi-stakeholder governance one because a lot of really good suggestions and information about what the policy should be, particularly if we want to look at what comes out of NETmundial and the IANA transition. Really good stuff on that.

Perhaps most useful is the outreach, except to say, yes, we need to do it. The technical stuff I'm probably not qualified to do, except probably because it's an expert reminder of how much ICANN does other than just IP addresses and domain names.

The other is just communication tools. We had that briefing before. It's probably the least useful of them. But I will be putting some comments on, and I know that Olivier has comments that people can have a quick look at before we actually submit them.

I have noticed that there are very few comments on the panels, particularly for the one on this sort of strategic multi-stakeholder one. That's a shame because it's a very useful paper. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly, and indeed there are very few comments, and the deadline for comments is tomorrow, the 30 April. However, we have asked the staff whether we can have an extension on this of how many more days we might have on that. So let's work on the premise that we have time to submit our comment. If you turn to the wiki page, you will note some initial comments from both Holly Raiche and myself. I note Tijani Ben Jemaa has put his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. Anyway, even if we miss the deadline, as an advisory committee we can send our advice to the Board about those panels. My remark was in this: we need four reports, so it is a huge work I think. I don't know if Holly will do the four reports. Not reports – I mean statements, four statements.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, that's correct, Tijani. So there are four panels/four different e-mail addresses to send the e-mails to, and so we will indeed have four different statements.

The way I believe they will be built will be that there will be a common first part of the statement which will support the work of the panel and then specific points on each one of the panels. So those panels where we might not have specific points to note, we will just be sending a message to support the work of the panel.

Unless, of course, anyone during this call objects to the ALAC sending messages of support to these panels, in which case, we will have to reconsider the statement. If you don't wish to object on the call, then perhaps you might wish to object or put your points across on the wiki page itself.

Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll just note one of the strategy panels on community work suggests crowdsourcing to replace most of the existing organizations or significantly augment existing organizations within ICANN. That would significantly alter the multi-stakeholder model and, in my mind, corrupt it. So I think we ought to be careful about support. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. Perhaps we might wish to say we support recommendations apart from. And if you could find the location for the crowdsourcing, then that would certainly be an interesting point that we should definitely make on this. If you could please identify, that would be great as a follow up. We do need to do this quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would hope the people who are actually reading the reports in detail would do that, but I can try it if no one else [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's okay, Alan. I note that Holly knows where that comment is and will make the comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: She has just put it on the chat, so that's great. Fantastic.

All right, let's move on to the next statement. Goodness, there are so many of them. The next one is the IDN Variant Top-Level Domain, so IDN – Internationalized Domain Name – Variant Top-Level Domain, Label Generation Rules for Procedure Implementation. That's Maximal Starting Repertoire Version 1.

As will you have all guessed, this is a highly technical Internationalized Domain Name working group work that is taking place. Thankfully, we have an IDN working group in At-Large, so we've had a very good first draft, or in fact now final draft, drafted by Rinalia Abdul Rahim, who is the co-chair of that working group. The ALAC is now voting on this statement.

Next, the ICANN Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance's Submission to NETmundial. That's, of course, a topic that is currently very hot indeed. Alan Greenberg was meant to hold the pen on this. And, of course, NETmundial has just finished. Alan, do you have an update on this, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not an update other than I realize that given that the deadline is the end of month, which is soon, and given that the meeting was being held, it was better to draft something without knowing what the outcomes were. We can put a little bit more context in it, and I will have something by the end of the day.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would be great. Thank you very much, Alan. Therefore, as soon as this input, this first text will be online that, staff will mention it on the ALAC-Announce and I invite everyone to comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I note the intent was just to have a sentence or two, and it's not going to grow a lot more than that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Next, the Draft Implementation Plan for the WHOIS Online Accuracy and Reporting System. Now, for this one, the ship has sailed already. The trains has left the station. The ALAC has submitted a statement with pending ratification, so that's where it is at the moment. Pending ratification means that we are currently voting on this.

Thanks to everyone for this work that has taken place. Now, there are two currently open public comment periods which have been – well, they're not open anymore because I note that they closed on the 14th and 15th of April. But they were open and they ended up not yielding an

ALAC response because they were either a very much GNSO internal work.

One of them, of course, is the Use of Mandatory Policy Advisory Boards for Regulated Industry Sector and Consumer-Trust-Sensitive New gTLD Strings. That's, of course, a public comment period that the ALAC has launched, so it would therefore be futile to respond to one's own public comment. We will be having a follow-up about this in a moment later on in this call. Let's move onto the next spot of our agenda if there are no comments on the policy development.

There is a consensus call on the creation of an At-Large Ad-Hoc Taskforce. That is to select two ALAC representatives to the ICANN-wide IANA Stewardship Transition Steering Committee.

Both point number 7 and point number 8 of our agenda today are about this transition of the U.S. government stewardship of the IANA functions. The first step really is that announcement which was made as part of the public comment on the transition of NTIA's stewardship of the IANA function, which mentioned in there the creation of an actual group that will be steering the work of ICANN.

It looks at the moment as though there would be two people coming from each one of the parts of ICANN – component organizations of ICANN, basically – that would be looking at steering the work. It's still very much a question mark. It's going to be probably a high-level committee, a little bit like the Accountability and Transparency Review Team.

This is why I was going to suggest that we create a selection committee for this, very much like the selection committee that selected the people for ATRT-2 and for other review teams in the past. I'd like to open the floor for comments or questions on this suggestion.

I see no one jump up and down to go and speak on this issue. I must admit that, yes, there is very little that we know at the very moment. The only thing that we do know is the overall composition of who will be on that, so not the actual list.

Of course, when I try to look at the paper that I was trying to look for, I can't find it. But there you go. I think it will be two people from each SO and AC.

I see Eduardo Diaz and then Cheryl Langdon-Orr, while I try and look through the mess of a wiki that we sometimes have. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I see this suggestion of doing something similar to ATRT-2. This IANA Stewardship committee that is being put together, I don't think we should go through all the processes we went through with the ATRT-2. We're talking about the IANA stewardship. It encompassed just a section of ICANN. The other one was the whole ICANN. I suggest we have a process that is less, I don't want to say cumbersome, but a long process that we went through for the ATRT-2.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Eduardo. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. It's an interesting voice of tones. I apologize for my lack of voice; I'm actually yelling at you all at the moment.

Eduardo, I respectfully would like to agree to disagree with you on the need for an effective, and I would hope not be cumbersome, but nevertheless effective system. It's going to be incredibly important that your At-Large and ALAC representatives are the right people for this job. This is going to be a particularly time-consuming task.

One of the most important criteria – which is the reason I put up my hand, the reason is twofold. First of all, yes, I think you do need a selection system similar, if not identical – certainly effective and I would like to think not cumbersome – as you had for things like ATRT-2.

But you also need to make sure that whoever you appoint – and it will be probably, as you say, two appointments – you may want to go forward also putting [the chat one] internal to ALAC, as such, the 15-person in ALAC, and one external to ALAC, more generically, therefore from At-Large.

But you also need to make sure that those individuals have a clear and unambiguous understanding of what IANA actually does and what the remit of IANA and the effects of any form of transition will be. I would suggest you, in fact, need to have a higher level of detail in your process than you would for things like the more generic ATRT-2, SSAC, or similar. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I partly agree with Cheryl. I partly think that, yes, probably it should come from within ALAC. But I think there are two issues picking up from Fadi and a lot of other comments that have been made. Yes, it is about what IANA does in a technical sense, but more than that it's also about the Affirmation of Commitments, what that meant, how that could be – and replaced is the wrong word – but the accreditation and the issues surrounding the replacement of the Affirmation of Commitments is the other big unsolved issue.

I'd have to say that if you look back at the strategy panels, the one on transition was particularly useful in that regard. I also think some of the stuff that came up at the NETmundial is also [inaudible] important.

I think it's not just transition because from what [inaudible] said, the process itself of the IANA function has gotten problematic in recent years, although it may have been quite problematic in the past. I would say the breaking of the Affirmation of Commitments and the lack of a U.S. hand on top of IANA is the thing that seems to be causing the most concern, particularly in the American Congress. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. Next, we have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I certainly support Cheryl in that I think the ALAC is going to have to put a rather careful process in place for this. In my mind, it is at least equivalent to ATRT and perhaps something above it in that this is going to be a difficult problem. I think we need to pick people who are going to be able to think innovatively and then convince others to go along with it or to work on evolving whatever the ideas that come out of this are.

I think this is something we need to do very carefully. The only qualm I have with what Cheryl said is the concept of inside and outside ALAC. The lifespan of this group is likely to expand appointments to ALAC, so that may change. I wouldn't agonize over whether the person is in or on ALAC right now. That may change by the end of the term. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. Add on what Cheryl said that the mission would be more technical than other things. In this case, the thing is that you agree with what was said [Steve] in our meeting with the Board last time when he asked, "You are asking to be part of the process, but what do you know about the IANA functions?" He knew the technical parts of the IANA functions.

If it is the case, I think that we don't have a lot of choice inside At-Large. There is not a lot of people who know exactly about the technical parts of the IANA functions. If it is the case, I don't think that we would need

any selection process because we would find perhaps one or two at the maximum.

But I doubt it is not only about technical issues. I think that it is also about the process, about how it should be done, etc. I don't know exactly. I don't have all of the information about that, but I don't think it would be only the technical issues. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Tijani. I sense there is some confusion in both our community and actually with everybody. There was a discussion about this topic back in Sao Paulo with the SO and AC Chairs that were present, and everyone is slightly confused. Let me just take a step back and explain what this is.

I've just put in the chat an announcement which is dated 8 April 2014. That sends you to a call for public input: Draft Proposal Based on Initial Community Feedback of the Principles, Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA Stewardship of the IANA Functions.

That proposes the creation of a steering group: "to form and operate a steering group to steward the process in an open, transparent, inclusive and accountable manner as described below." In there, one of the sub-bullet points says: "The role of the steering group is to coordinate and to ensure that the process proceeds appropriately. The relevant affected parties will lead their community processes to determine any necessary mechanism as appropriate. However, the steering group has

to coordinate such results so that they fit the overall proposed mechanism.”

There are a whole lot of other bullet points in that announcement. These were added after the original statement that we made. We had already made a statement supporting this when this was half-cooked. This was then added to afterwards. This is why the actual draft proposal is a lot longer than it originally was when it was shared with everyone.

There’s even a beautiful little bunch of diagrams at the bottom of the page further down. In fact, the second one, the process diagram is even more complicated than anything I’ve seen so far coming out of ICANN. It looks like it’s filled with happy people. That’s one part.

The second part of the work is separate. It is the Cross Community Working Group that is going to be created by the GNSO and the ccNSO together with the ALAC, the GAC, and the SSAC, to have a Cross Community Working Group look at the IANA functions and look at the transition of stewardship of the IANA functions. That is something that will take place in parallel.

Now, the both the steering group, which we have here, that is staff-lead or board and staff proposed and the Cross Community Working Group that is community proposed will have to both work together, but at the same time will have to work at different levels. The Cross Community Working Group will be where the discussions will take place as to where IANA should go. The steering group will shepherd the process and make sure a processes in place to have something that will smoothly go from today to the end result, whatever that end result is.

I hope that has cleared the way a little bit. As a result, we need to furnish people for both of these working groups. There is going to be a need to have people on the steering group, and there is going to be a need to have people on the Cross Community Working Group. I'm not quite sure today how to select people for this.

I've heard some thoughts from Eduardo that we shouldn't have a top-heavy process to select people. We're dealing here with a real critical piece of work where we need to have people that will not only be on those working groups but know what they are talking about. So I would be very reticent in accepting everybody's application.

I think we might have some outside experts who are very knowledgeable about this who might not be on the ALAC (or even very much active in our community) that we would like to put in the Cross Community Working Group, for example, or that we would like to put in the steering group. It's important that we don't make these decisions too hastily and too fast.

I understand we have over a month to be able to make choices. The Cross Community Working Group on the NTIA has not been created yet, so we'll also have about a month to do that. This is why it's very important that we choose the right people.

I think I'd like to tell you the words of Vinton Cerf, who spoke at Sao Paulo, when he mentioned the transition of shepherding of the IANA function. Basically, his point was, "Don't mess up. Do not make a mess of it." Something that is – that's how that thing is important. "Don't mess it up." There you go. "Don't mess it up" or "don't stuff it up"?

That's translating in Australian. "Don't mess it up," I think, was what Vint Cerf said.

I would certainly feel better if we have a committee that would be able to look at people's credentials, wide-ranging committee. We could have the same type of committee as we had for ATRT-2. Or maybe even a slightly larger committee. Some kind of selection committee. Then a process by which we would have people applying for the positions. Then we'd have the best people on there.

I would also like to see a process by which we could have feedback on the performance of our members in those committees. There are only two spaces on the steering committee. There is likely to be only two spaces on the other committee as well. If we're lucky, in the Cross Community Working Group we might have five spaces, in which case we could look at having some geographical balance.

With regards to the steering committee, it's only two. If one of those two or both of those two don't perform, that's a whole community that is going to lose out on this very, very critical process and trust me, it's not going to be fun. There are several people now looking at the opportunity at reopening the whole process of IANA and of how the Internet is run.

Let's see. Now that I've provided you with a bit more background on this, are there any new comments or more comments or questions on this? Eduardo, I'd like to hear from you again because you were the first person to speak on this and tell us that we should not overburden ourselves.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Once you gave these explanations, I can see what most of the scope of it is. I wasn't aware that we have a month to do this. I thought we had until May 8 or something like that. I was confused. In any case, there is time, then we should take the time to gather the people. I agree with that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Yes, the deadline is within about a month because, of course, the proposal at the moment is on the table. At the moment, we are asked to comment on the proposal for the creation of this steering group. Then, based on the feedback that will have been received by the 8th of May, at that point ICANN will move onto the next process.

I firmly believe that there will be a call for volunteers at that point to be selected to go into that steering group. In parallel, the Cross Community Working Group, again, I've seen some e-mails today on the SO/AC list where Jonathan Robinson has told Byron Holland that the pressure is on them now to create that working group as soon as possible and to make invitations for everyone else on there. Judging from the current composition of Cross Community Working Groups, it looks like five people from each SO or AC will be the standard request. So we have time.

What I wanted to do here was just obtain a consensus, basically, that we're okay with a selection process rather than having someone else select for us. Because it might well be that we send the candidate list to

ICANN and they make the selection at the end of the day, just like what happened in ATRT-2 as well, where the chair of the GAC and the chair of the Board made the final selection.

If I could ask for a consensus call.

I don't know. Someone is playing with the notes at the moment. It's sort of flying around the virtual table.

Does anyone object to having a selection committee for this? I don't see any objections, so I think we can say that there is consensus on having a selection committee created. There will, therefore, be a call for members of the selection committee.

I think that what we do need to is to make sure that this selection committee is geographically balanced and, of course, have the standard rule, which is anyone in the selection committee will not be able to stand as a candidate for both the Cross Community Working Group and for the working group that is discussed here by staff.

Timeline for this, I would say within the next, well, we can have two weeks, 15 days to receive applications for this and we create this working group. That, certainly, will take us to early-May. That means that at that point we will be ready to proceed forward with asking for applications. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I would like to make it clear that the selection committee will be for selecting members of the steering group and not members of the Cross Community Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Tijani. That's a fair point. Does anyone think that they should be for both the steering group and the Cross Community Working Group? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: My first inclination is to say to have one selection group for both, but if we are going to put a rule in place saying that people on the selection committee cannot be a member, then it's really problematic in selecting people for two different groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry, Alan, I didn't hear the last part of your sentence. There was a bit of noise in the background.

ALAN GREENBERG: I said my first inclination would be to have one selection group, but if we were going to have a rule saying members of the selection group cannot apply, then it's really problematic to have the same group selecting both because you're taking the least common denominator, the only people who can be part of the selection group, cannot apply for either of the positions, and that, I think, that is problematic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Let's start with a first step which is what we are assured will happen, which is the selection of people for the steering

committee. In this case, I think we have consensus on having a selection group that will be created within the next two weeks. If I could ask staff to send for a call for members of that selection group, please. That's one.

Then, with regards to the other group, let us first obtain more clarity as to what will happen with regard to the Cross Community Working Group since this hasn't been created yet. But I note here that there is a preference that we would have direct applications to that group rather than having a selection group for this, the Cross Community Working Group on the NTIA. Unless I hear otherwise, but I don't see anyone putting their hands up saying that they would prefer a selection committee for this.

Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Thank you, Oliver. I don't think that we need a similar selection group for the Cross Community Working Group but the members, some of them must be selected by our community. Because if there are five, we would need regional balance, and the applications cannot go directly to the working group. It must be done inside ALAC, inside At-Large, then give those candidates to the group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you, Tijani. That takes us to the next agenda item, which is still on the same topic. That's to do with the creation of an Ad-Hoc working group in At-Large that will lead with regards to the transition of

the U.S. government stewardship of the IANA function issues. So, the question is do we want to create a new working group, or do we wish to assign this work to an already existing ALAC working group? The floor is open for comments and questions. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE:

This really is a question, which is we've now got three groups kind of headed in the same direction. We've got a very high-level group, we've got a lower level group, and now you're saying that we've got something else. What's the difference between the second and third, and why couldn't that membership be overlapping?

Because you're talking, I think, about the same set of expertise and, really, how many of us do we want to put on this taking up people's time and literally not leaving too many people left to do other things? It just worries me that we've got three different groups dealing with much of the same things. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Holly. In fact, there's not three, there are four different groups. That's how big the beast is. Let me recap now then.

There is a steering group, which is an ICANN-wide steering group that is staff and Board-led. That will just deal with the process.

There is a Cross Community Working Group, which is not led but launched at the moment to do the heavy lifting, launched by the ccNSO and the GNSO. I have agreed for that to take place because the ALAC has already done the hard lifting on the Cross Community Working

Group on Internet governance. Trust me, that was an enormous amount of work.

On this case, the basic first draft of the charter will be drafted directly by the ccNSO and the GNSO and will then invite everyone else – the ALAC, the GAC, the SSAC, etc. – to join and be part of that working group and, of course, to agree to that charter together. That is the Cross Community Working Group. That will deal with the actual discussions and the actual negotiating which might take place with regards to this IANA topic.

Then we need, ourselves an At-Large, we need to have a working group or a group of people that will specialize on this as we've done. This is what I'm asking for. Do we want this task to be allocated in an already existing At-Large working group, or do we want to create an ad-hoc working group in At-Large to discuss that topic internally and what are our positions going to be? Because we have to remember, these are not just personal positions; we have to channel in the positions from all of our At-Large Structures into these purposes.

Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. Olivier, you repeated several times, "Shall we create a new group, or shall we give this to an existing group?" Are you thinking about allocating it to a special or one group which is already existing?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Tijani. On the one hand, I was thinking of the Future Challenges Working Group; on the other hand, I was thinking of maybe the New gTLD Working Group because we have much knowledge in there. I'm pretty open to this, and I'm not quite sure what would be preferable. This is why I keep it quite open.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I continue, please? Olivier, I'm sorry to disagree with you because both groups that you mentioned, they don't have the same task. I think that this is a special thing that needs a special group. That's why I don't think that we have to give it neither to the Future Challenges because we will need always the Future Challenges Working Group working on the issues that are not emergent or very hot, if you want. They are important, but we are not under pressure to decide on them. And it cannot be the New gTLD Working Group because that doesn't have anything to do with the New gTLD. Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: My inclination is to say we're over-engineering this. That notwithstanding, the groups you mentioned are not regionally balanced, which you had previously said the groups should be (although I'm not convinced that's correct). And moreover, we're talking about a group that's going to look at handling personnel issues. You cannot take an open-membership working group and give that kind of assignment.

I think we create a new group as we did last time, where Rinalia led us, or we simply say it's the ALT and if there's any overlap between members of the ALT and people who are applying for the positions, then we cover it by finding a regional person to take their place.

I think we're trying to, in the name of transparency and regional balance, we're making this far more complex than it needs to be. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, you're confusing the issues. We've passed the selection working group. We're dealing with At-Large having its own NTIA issues working group to discuss things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. My apologies. I'm sorry. I've lost track with the multiple groups we're trying to create.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: if you're getting confused, I wonder what everyone else thinks on this call. My goodness.

ALAN GREENBERG: In that case, let me make up a new answer. I don't think it should be an existing group. I think it should be a small number of people that have an interest in it and go from there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: On discussing substantive matters, you cannot demand a regional balance, I don't believe.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Next is Leon Sanchez. Leon, you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Oliver. I too think that it would be convenient to establish a new group for this task. This is a very important task, I believe. My question would be: would this working group, and the outcome of that, would lead those appointed to the shepherding group in order to guide their work in there?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon. Thanks for this. The question is: would the members of this At-Large working group also be able to be in the steering group or also be able to be in the Cross Community Working Group? The answer, I think, is yes, indeed. Certainly, the members of this committee will be feeding into the ICANN community-wide processes.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. My question was more, not that the members of the working group could be part of the steering committee or the Cross Community

Working Group but rather how the work that's being done within this working group should be [inaudible] the work of those that actually belong to the steering group or the Cross Community Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon. I believe, my understanding is that it will feed directly into it. That's what a working group does. It will feed into the ICANN-wide process.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Leon. Next is Fatima Cambronero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. As far as I understand, this ad-hoc At-Large group for the NTIA transition somehow needs to provide the contents for any discussion. These discussions need to be fed into the Cross Community Group.

If I am understanding correctly, from my point of view, I agree with Alan in the sense that it should be a different group from the groups that we already have. It should be a new group. Probably, in this case, we will not be able to respect regional diversity because I understand that you require certain skills. I don't think we can all handle these very delicate and sophisticated issue.

So, in this case, I consider it to be a good option for the person who is the chair of the At-Large group could be someone from the Cross Community Group so that they can coordinate activities within the two groups so that the discussions can be fed into the At-Large group. I hope I was clear enough. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Fatima. That's very clear, indeed. Next is Holly Raiche. Then I'll close the queue, and we can move forward. I do realize that we are an hour and a half into this call already. Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks. [inaudible] One last comment: I think it was two ICANN meetings ago, I think it was you, Evan, and myself that put our hands up for the governance stuff. What has happened to that?

I think people are saying there should be a new group, but should the basis of the group that actually put their hand up and said, "Yeah. These are the issues that we should be involved in" transmogrify into the group that was formed? It was pre-the NTIA announcement but not before some of the main issues that we'll be considering have to be dealt with. I guess my question is maybe: what's the state of the old group, and is this going to be the new group?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Holly. Could I just obtain clarification from you? With regards to the old group that you mentioned, are you meaning the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, right. Okay. That one is also running, and I needed to also provide you with an update on this. I'm one of the co-facilitators, along with Rafik Dammak on that. The group produced a statement for the Brazil NETmundial summit, and several members of the working group traveled there.

The charter of this Cross Community Working Group has finally been worked on. Because, as you know, the whole working group was set up at such a fast rate that a charter was not ready by the time it came up with output.

The working group itself has decided that it will not touch on the NTIA issues. That is because there were objections from some of the working group members for the NTIA issues to be dealt with in that working group. They preferred that there would be a separate working group for NTIA. So the current working group on Internet governance issues will just continue with all of the other Internet governance issues that are out there, including the follow-up to the NETmundial meeting and the IGS, etc.

As far as I understand, you are one of the members of that working group. Of course, that will also require some feedback to the ALAC. It was the ALAC and the NCSG that started this working group to start with.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you and I'm going to have to give my apologies now, but thank you very much for that explanation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Holly. I note there has also been on the chat some support to create a new working group. So now then have an action item, which is for a new ad-hoc working group to be created. The topic of this ad-hoc working group will be the transition of – let's get the name exactly right – Transition of U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA Function.

That effectively needs to have a call for members on the ALAC, and that can be done as soon as possible with, of course, a mailing list also that will need to be created for this.

Now, for agenda item 8b, this has taken an enormous amount of time, I do realize. There is also ALAC/NCSG Ad-Hoc Group on the Transition as well.

Tijani, you have put your hand up? Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I'd like to mention that I prefer to have a group dealing not only with the IANA function stewardship transition but dealing also with the ICANN accountability. So it is the whole transition, if you want.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Tijani. Very good point actually. The transition is the first step; ICANN accountability is another step. I think that, in the first instance, let's start with the first step which is to call this the U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA Function.

The launch of the ICANN Accountability, which is really the follow-up to the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, is imminent. I'm told that the Board is likely to launch this before the London meeting. So that's another amount of work that will come on our hands but, certainly, it looks as though it will be our same ad-hoc working group that will be able to work on both issues since the two issues are closely linked together. Are you okay with that plan?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. No, especially because Fadi said in Sao Paulo that before he said the stewardship transition before and then the ICANN accountability then, and now we say, no, they will be together. They will go in parallel together. Do you remember?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. That's correct, Tijani. Yeah, go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Right. That's why I say that is not the first step, second step. it will be one step of work with two aspects. Thank you.

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

Now, just to confuse you even more, there was, during the last ALAC/NCSG work that took place, there was a meeting with some action items that the ALAC and the NCSG should put together an ad-hoc group on the transition of the U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA Function, a little bit like a liaison group between the two. I was going to ask where we go with this basically. How do we proceed forward with that?

I was going to just make a suggestion that there should be a first conference call that will take place. There is a list already of people who have volunteered to be in that small group. I was going to let you know that this is going to take place separately. That's just a little coordination group that will take place between NCSG and the ALAC.

Okay. Let's move on. I don't see anyone putting their hands up. We spent a lot of time on that. The next agenda item is the ALAC Public Comment on the Policy Advisory Boards. As you know, I mentioned this a little bit earlier, the ALAC launched a public consultation on the policy advisory board.

Evan was supposed to lead on this. Unfortunately, Evan has had to leave. I still see Evan on the Adobe Connect, but I think that he is not on the call anymore.

The question was: where do we go next? What is the next step from here onward? I must admit, I haven't had a chance to read through any of the input so far. I note that there is input from some people who have supported the process and some who have not supported the process. What I would suggest is that we ask the New gTLD Working Group to follow up with us.

The ALAC asks the new gTLD Working Group to analyze the input and then make recommendations to the ALAC as to what the next steps should be.

Any comments or questions on this? And thank you, Heidi, for putting the link to the public comments in the Adobe chat. I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

The period ends on 6 May, so there's still some time. If any of you wish to make comments on this topic, please do so. As I mentioned earlier, the ALAC will not be making a comment because it is its own comment period, so it is not able to comment on its own process. But as individuals and as At-Large Structures, you are very much encouraged to make a comment on this, and in fact, some At-Large Structure representatives have made comments in this process.

So hearing nothing to the contrary, the action item is for the New gTLD Working Group to analyze the input on the PAB – not the PBA, the PAB – and suggest the next step. Thank you very much for this.

Let's move on to the next item on our agenda, and now this item for discussion: Review of NETmundial Activities, Outcomes, and Next Steps. We have several people listed here. I note that Fatima Cambroneró could also be listed on there. I'm not quite sure what her point of view is, and Leon as well, that's right. We have a lot of people who went there.

My feedback on it is that this was a consensus document. The original document was, I think, a very good piece of work as a stopping point. The discussions were very interesting indeed, a very interesting format – so much so that it looks as though we might be seeing a new format for the Thursday in London. On that Thursday, we might have a format where we have the four microphones and the discussion taking place openly in the room, specifically about the NTIA topic.

But I think that at the end, whilst a lot of people were annoyed that they didn't quite get exactly what they wanted, that, to me, was proof that there was some consensus that was achieved in the room. Because as we know, consensus is all about being able to find a middle-of-the-road solution, and it looks as though there was a pretty good middle-of-the-road solution there. That's my view on the documents.

You will note in the agenda that there is a link to the At-Large NETmundial Workspace. And on there you will see both the NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement, which is the end document, and you'll see also the contribution from the ICANN Cross Community Working on Internet Governance, and you will see the Consolidated Document, which was the stopping point for NETmundial.

So a lot of reading, but very interesting. Are there any comments or any additional information from those people who went to São Paulo? I see Leon Sanchez, go ahead Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Olivier. One thing that I really liked about the process is that on the public comment period on this website, they set up comments were really taken into account for the final drafting, as far as I can see.

I mean, as you said, not everyone got what they wanted, but one key issue that I pointed out in that comment period and that was properly addressed to my views, is that the [spirit] NETmundial was, in the beginning, could be not binding.

The first draft that was put into public comment seemed to have language that was binding and that was not encouraging but rather having the part facilitating to commit to the outcome document. That seemed, to me, like a really far-fetched thing. So I just pointed out that we should continue with the period of creation of NETmundial to have it as a non-binding document.

You can see that the final outcome document starts by saying that this is a non-binding document, which I believe that they publish that initial period on the [main].

Another thing I liked about the NETmundial meeting is the format, of course.

What I didn't like was that to wait – maybe, not the word – but to take so many time in the opening session and features from all sorts, until

5:00 or 6:00 on the first day. I think we could have done a better work if we used that time instead of having teaching done, focusing on the [inaudible].

That's my point of view on the NETmundial meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this feedback, Leon. Next we have Fatima Cambroner.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. I will be brief because I made quite a lengthy comment on the LACRALO call yesterday.

I agree, in terms of the format. We had a microphone for every stakeholder group. I think that was, indeed, a very good idea so that everybody could make themselves heard on an equal footing among all stakeholders, instead of having the usual stakeholders taking over the microphone. I hope this will be repeated in further meetings on Internet Governance.

As I said yesterday, there will be as many opinions on the outcomes of NETmundial as many participants or attendees. So, of course, there were people with only one item on their agenda, and if that one item was not included, then they are frustrated about the result.

Personally, and on behalf of a group of organizations in Latin America, in our view, we reached a very good result because many of the items in our contribution were included in the outcome document. So there is

no bittersweet taste or us in this case. On the contrary, we are going to continue working on those topics on which consensus was not reached.

Then, the civil society was not aware of negotiation processes. The level of discussion was really high-level in order to reach consensus.

Further, I think that ICANN, in terms of the transition process and in terms of ICANN accountability, well, we were not that much affected. I think it's understood that this is just but one more step. We do understand that this transition process will continue in other fora or ICANN meetings.

So, personally, I think that the outcomes were very good, and it was a very good exercise for all stakeholders to make themselves heard at the same time in one single place. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima, and I absolutely agree with all your comments here. I very much had the same feeling as you did on this.

Next is Leon Sanchez, Alan Greenberg, and Tijani Ben Jemaa. I'll close the queue after Tijani because we do have to move forward on this agenda. Leon, you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Olivier. Just to point out that, as I typed on the chat, I think that the full impact of the NETmundial outcome documents, it could depend on the next IGF, since there were so many paragraphs just trying to strengthen the IGF forum.

I think that we have to be expectant of what happens on the IGF and see if these documents really impact the way things are going out there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon. Absolutely. And I think there was an emphasis made by several people, including the Steering Committee of the NETmundial, that NETmundial was not meant to replace the IGF but, certainly, to provide input.

The IGF is a natural follow up to the NETmundial discussion, especially when there was a call for a lot more local governance work and local IGFs to take place as well.

Alan Greenberg, you are next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I won't go into any great detail. I personally was quite pleased with the outcome. I rarely find myself in complete accord and agreement with Milton Mueller, but he did a blog post, which I'll put a link to if you haven't seen it, which I think captured an awful lot of the substance of the outcome. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. That is very good to know. And, please, put this on the Adobe Connect chat. That would be very helpful indeed.

Next, we have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I have been in this environment since the first [inaudible] first phase of the WSIS in Geneva, 2003. I can tell you that this was the best and the first meeting, which is totally multi-stakeholder, totally participatory, which is totally inclusive. I was really pleased, and I think that the outcome was good.

We will never have a full consensus on everything, that's normal, but we had enough consensus that, in my point of view, is enough for a meeting like this.

Also, during the two days of NETmundial, I didn't really hear anyone contest the multi-stakeholder model, perhaps one or two. I apologize. One or two, who didn't say explicitly, but who said things that means that it is the role of the government to do that and it is because [inaudible].

But generally most of people, I would say 90% of people, agreed with the multi-stakeholder model. It is a great achievement for the civil society, because it was our fight since 2003. And now we have this agreed by everyone, and I don't think that we will have to fight in the future for it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Tijani.

So let's move on with our agenda. I note that the time is ticking, and we have about 15-20 minutes of time with the interpreters.

We've got number 11, the At-Large Social Media Strategy – Review and Next Steps, Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Ariel Liang. Dev, unfortunately, is not able with us, as he had to leave earlier. But, Ariel, would you be able to take us through this in less than seven minutes?

ARIEL LIANG: Hello, everyone.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Olivier. Dev is back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev is back. Welcome back, Dev. I wasn't aware whether you were there not. Okay then, Dev or Ariel, whoever wishes to take us through this, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier. The At-Large Social Media Strategy was first put together by the At-Large Technology Task Force. We presented this strategy at the ICANN Toronto meeting in 2011, I believe – sorry, 2012.

And since then, we recognized that this is an entrance strategy because there were certain things that needed to be done to update the strategy.

The Technology Task Force, and I was there with Ariel Liang from At-Large Staff with her experience in social media, we put together this proposal for the draft At-Large Social Media Strategy.

The full report and the full presentation was done on the At-Large Technology Task Force, so there's a much more detailed presentation with notes and so forth. What we're presenting to you now is an abbreviated summary of this strategy. So I'll turn the floor over to Ariel, who will go through the first few slides.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you very much, Dev.

So to have a strategy, we first should have a clear objective. And the first objective we have for social media is communication. You can see on the slide, it's to raise awareness of the ICANN At-Large community as a diverse, passionate end user volunteer group, whose work affects the future of the global DNS, Internet Governance, and other ICANN-related policy issues.

So to recap, we're going to advertise who we are on social media and what we do on social media and make our messaging very inspirational.

The second objective is the business objective. That means how communications translate into concrete action. So the action we want to see is to use social media to enhance Internet end users' engagement with At-Large.

There are many ways for enhancing engagement. For example, if we encourage input from ALS members to comment on draft ALAC statement, that will be a way of engagement. And if we motivate interested end users to join in ALS or create a new ALS, that will be a type of engagement.

So these are the specific ways that we want to achieve through social media.

Linked to this objective is the measures of success. It's how we evaluate our performance on social media. In terms of the communications objective, our key performance indicators can be tracked through many metrics provided on social media platforms.

For example, on Facebook page, we can see the new page likes, and also the reach of posts (it means that for certain posts, how many people have seen it) and also the engagement rates for each post (that's the sum of the likes, comments, and shares, divided by the number of fans).

Those numbers, we can track them on a weekly basis in order to understand awareness we have raised through social media.

And Twitter can provide similar type of numbers, and we can use many analytics website to track those metrics. These are some examples of the metrics we're going to use for tracking our performance.

And then, a link to the objectives as a business objective, the key performance indicator in terms of end user engagement with At-Large on social media, can be in many ways. It can track the direct traffic from social media to the At-Large wiki. We can track the number of comments on the draft ALAC statement from our target audience. Also, the shared, retweets and mentions by other accounts on social media.

So these are the ways of tracking our performance, in terms of business objectives.

Now, I will talk about the target audience we are trying to reach on social media. The primary ones are the external target audience, who are inactive, new, and potential ALS members.

You can see on the slide, we listed several characteristics they have. They are younger generation. They spread around the world. They interest in Internet consumer protection, safety, and other ICANN policy issue areas, but they have limited knowledge about what ICANN and At-Large does. But they have a desire to learn, to get involved, and to make a difference. So they will follow news, attend meetings and gatherings, and also like to attend ATLAS II, that type of events, and share their viewpoints.

To give you a concrete example of who our target audience is, we can see the participants of NetMission.Asia's NextGeneration Program. These are the people who fit the bill for our primary audience.

Now, I will give the floor to Dev, and he will talk about specific tactics and organizing patterns we are going to have for social media.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Ariel. So on the next slide – which I don't have controls, so Ariel will have to do it – you're looking at the tactics.

There are two types of content here. There's the fluid content, which is sort of like the real-time things as they happen. We have when there's a call for comments, RALO updates, policy updates.

And then there is the static content. The static content is things like Beginners' Information Guide, the acronyms, explaining things like

policy backgrounds on particular issues, and also focusing on the person involved in At-Large, and so on.

The static content allows us to do some more forward planning and an ability to also reuse the content that may be already there. Next slide.

Okay. So these are some of the things we want to do, like to really develop hashtags so that we can start conversations also among these various issues. These aren't set in stone, obviously. These are just suggestions. But the idea is that we have hashtags for the various different types of posts or tweets that we will be using.

So, for example, if we're talking about ALAC statements and you want to do a call for comments, you use that hashtag. We use hashtag [inaudible] the various policy issues, whether it's on WHOIS or IANA, for example, or meeting info, and so forth. Next slide.

Okay. This is one of the examples right now. What we try to do now is also to show that, well, instead of a repeat of what's been posted on the ALAC Announce list and shared on Facebook and so forth, but just more to create different types of content on that. It would be fluid content to say, "Okay. Please comment on the strategy," and to go to the page.

And the ones identify as "S" are more the static content, and that could be done beforehand, before the fluid content. Next slide.

How is this going to work? The intent is for a Curation Working Group to do that. We're thinking that the lead person from the Capacity Building Working Group, Outreach subcommittee, the RALO Chair and

Secretariat, Technology Task Force members, and At-Large staff. These are the proposed members for this Curation Working Group. Next slide.

So the responsibilities of the Curation Working Group: develop templates for the fluid content, which is the most needed information coming from – a lot of information comes from ALAC-Announce – to try to develop the tactics for the new social media and also to draft most of the static content at least sometime in advance. The consensus is two months in advance.

Also, they have to decide fluid content, to have the flexibility ability to create content based on any trending topic. And also, what we're thinking of is also, each of those start posting content, well, we want to start this before the ICANN London meeting. We want to try to get this up and get this going sooner rather than later. Next slide.

What we're thinking, in terms of organizing and planning, is to form this Curation Working Group and, as I said, for this static content looking to develop static content related to Beginner's Guide and policy background and so forth and to then work on the template for the fluid content, the content coming from ALAC-Announce. Next slide.

Just to give an example here, this is what we could do. We have a spreadsheet here showing the how tweets are organized. So, for the static content, the Curation Working Group would work on this static content and have this spreadsheet filled out, ready to be posted on a regular schedule about static content. Next slide.

Okay, so next steps: we'll ratify this strategy within the Technology Task Force. We've had a conference call to deal with this topic. That has been

done. Now, we've also submitted within the past day or two, we submitted it to the Capacity Building Working Group and the Outreach Working Group, and the Secretariat, to get some feedback.

Once we get some more feedback – and from this call as well – we'll evaluate these comments, define this strategy, but then we'll also be looking at developing strategies for the Curation Working Group, working out a time for deliverables, also to study.

For example, what that point means about e-mail trends: do we need more persons to be working on this social media during certain times? For example, I think typically a month before ICANN meetings, there's a lot of fluid content. We may need more persons involved in the Curation Working Group, to be involved in that. That's what this study of the e-mail trends would indicate.

Another help guide, how many allocations are needed at any given time? Also, what we need us to look at is also look at how you can use social media to respond against any inaccurate information being posted about At-Large. In other words, possibly engage in a dialogue with them or setting up a post countering the inaccurate information.

And again, the full slides are on the At-Large Social Media Workspace. That's all the presentation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. Well done for this piece of work.

Two quick questions: the first one is a question which was in the chat from Garth Graham where Garth asks, "Does this mirror or duplicate the

existing ALAC processes and tools, or does it represent a migration of these tools to social media?"

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thanks. To answer Garth's question, it does mirror the existing processes, in the sense that the e-mails to ALAC Announce will continue. That will not stop.

What we are looking at is for social media to target not those, for those persons already heavily involved in the ICANN At-Large policy process, but to try to reach a different audience, members of the public whose new ALSes is now coming into ICANN At-Large and for those members within those At-Large Structures to be able to get some insight into what their members involved in ICANN At-Large are doing.

So it's more mirroring. It's not going to replace the existing ALAC processes. It's more. Was there a second question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The second question.... Yes? Go ahead, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: I want to add to what Dev said. The main purpose is to communicate the information from At-Large to the wider public in the voice of social media. So we will convey the information from ALAC Announce e-mails, but we will write in a more user-friendly manner and provide direct, helpful links to help the user engage with our community.

So that's the main purpose why we want to have this presence on social media, and also it's necessary we speak the language of social media for communication.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Ariel, and thank you, Dev, for this very, very good update. I think that we can have action item, then, based on the suggestions that you make there, which is for the formation of the Curation Working Group, to be put on the agenda of our next ALAC call, which will be the May ALAC call of next month.

At that point, perhaps you might be able to repeat parts of the discussion, parts of the presentation that you have made here, just to summarize to refresh our memory of the time. Really good. Thank you.

Next, we have the ATLAS II update. We only have another five minutes of interpretation time. If we could have a quick update on what's happening, first with Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In fact, we have an organizing community call this Friday at 16:00 UTC. I invite everybody to participate and get this update on ATLAS.

Basically, from Singapore up to now, we have been doing some e-mails. Things are moving along, but they're moving faster. I cannot pinpoint any details about specific details, other than in the Event Groups, there is draft agenda that you can look for the whole week. Please, go there.

I'm not in front of the computer, so if someone can put the link there. I recommend everybody to look at the draft and make any comments.

Also, there is a group within the Event Group. They are working very diligently in setting up the different thematic session groups that are going to happen, five of them. If you are interested in participating one of these as an expert or a facilitator or anything like that, please contact Tijani, Wolf, or Evan, which are the main co-chairs that do that.

Other than that, Olivier, maybe you want to add something. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this very quick summary. Tijani, did you wish to add anything to this? Tijani Ben Jemaa? You might be muted, Tijani.

Okay. I take it that there is no further update from Tijani. And Wolf and Evan are the coordinators for the different thematic groups coordinating.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, Tijani, yes, you're back. Please, do you wish to add anything to the update from Eduardo?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you, Olivier, especially for the Event Working Group. We are now trying to find the right chair, the right rapporteurs, and the right subject matter experts for each session.

I heard yesterday/today, that some of our colleagues are not happy with that because they said it is not open, etc., and most of the experts are from ALAC. Of nine already listed experts, there is only three from ALAC. So I responded to the mail, and I hope it is clear that it is not closed. It is not closed at all; it is open for everyone.

And the mission of the subject matter expert is not to be analyst. He is not to be speaker. He will not speak. He will be there to, if you want, it will be a discussion. It will not be a panel. The [inaudible] groups are not panels; they are groups of discussion, and each group will issue its own statement about the theme they chose.

So there will not be any panel inside them. It is only discussion, and the expert is there to feed them with information if they don't have those information. He is expert, so he had more information than the others, and everyone it is needed, he can feed them with information, with events, with approaches, etc. This is the role of expert.

As for the chair and rapporteurs, as I said before, it is a difficult task because we need to have the right chair for each group, and each chair, the chair must have a certain skill to chair the meeting. The rapporteur has another skill, to write, to do drafts.

Those are two missions that people have to be skilled in, to do it, and we need really people skilled because we need good statements that will, at the end, be compiled in a final document of the summit. The

success of the summit will be this document. If we don't do a good document, we will not have a successful summit.

So, once again, it is not closed. It is not done between ALAC members. It is open for all, and everyone can participate, and everyone is invited to participate in the Working Group and the Event Working Group, to give ideas, to give suggestions, etc. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Tijani. Just a reminder, quickly, when is that Organizing Committee call? Because I think it would be important for anyone who is interested and who currently is still not involved in this process, to be on the call of the Organizing Committee. That will not only deal with just this part of ATLAS II but basically go to every single aspect of ATLAS II. We definitely need more people on this.

Eduardo, could you please remind us when that call is? Oh, I see here. Thank you very much, Gisella. ATLAS II Organizing Committee call on Friday, 2 May, at 16:00 UTC. If you could just send the link to the agenda page for it, that will help, because the agenda page will have all the information on how you can join that meeting.

I realize the interpreters are reaching the end of the call at the moment. I see two minutes from Heidi. Maybe it's the end now.

We still have to discuss the ALS decertification and then an announcement on the new online ALS application document.

I'm not sure. Gisella, are we finished with the interpreters?

GISELLA GRUBER: If you would just bear with me for a second now, we'll just get the confirmation from the [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, they given us about three more minutes now, at this point. Keep in mind that they've been interpreting for almost two and a half hours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Two and a half hours, that's great. Thank you. Let's just quickly go through the ALS decertification. I mentioned earlier that we have a number of At-Large Structures that are candidates for decertification, and they are listed on the document, which is linked from the agenda page.

As you know, we have de-listed At-Large Structures that don't exist anymore. The Internet Users Network in Tokyo, the Internet Society Pakistan, and Alfa-Redi are three such At-Large Structures which were de-listed.

There is a list that is now on the screen that I'm going to read through, from each one of the regions. What I would like to ask you – and I hope that we still have the regional leaders on the call – is for you to follow up by e-mail afterwards to provide either further information on those or to provide whether the list is accurate.

You have Associazione Italiana per la Sicurezza Informatica (CLUSIT), that's under EURALO; you have KEPKA, consumer organization in

Greece, it's under EURALO; Terre des Femmes, Germany, EURALO; Yinternet.org, Switzerland, EURALO; Asociacion Costarricense de Derecho Informatico, LACRALO; National Consumers' League, LACRALO; and then you have Consumer Web Watch in NARALO; and then The Alberta Community Network Association, NARALO.

If you could please – and I'm asking the region leaders – for those of you who are ALAC members and notice that your regional leadership is not present on the call, please relay this. What we need is the type of information that was supplied but is actually given in the ALAC Rules of Procedure. The process is actually defined here. Decertification process, we need the information that is needed there. If we don't have it, we cannot de-list an At-Large Structure.

I'm looking towards having a vote before the June meeting, so before our At-Large Summit, to vote on all of these ALSes so as for them to be officially de-listed from At-Large. That's all, for this agenda item.

Then, we have the New Online ALS Application. That one, Nathalie Peregrine, I think, might take us through this. I think that in order to be able to see this, you need to log in as well, because I've tried it when not logged in, and I did not see that document. Nathalie, over to you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I'm just putting the link in the Adobe Connect chat right now. At the moment, it's not online. It's on my personal wiki sandbox because it is just in draft form. We're hoping to have it online very shortly. I do hope you can follow the link and log in.

Just to give a very quick overview, the main aim here was to have an automated process rather than have it sent as an archaic form of Word document attachment.

While doing that, we also decided that it was a good opportunity to make a few modifications to content. Based largely on the errors of application forms we already received, we tried to improve and clarify the content of the application form.

The aim here is that applicants will fill in this form, and once they submit, a copy will get sent to staff. No record will remain on the wiki until posted, as per procedure by staff then on the At-Large website. The only difference here is that it will be automated.

The application form will be available on mailing lists sent by staff. There will be no [rests] on the initial application form on the wiki.

Regarding clarification of the content, we reworded a few confusing questions – mainly, those that led to widely different responses from the ALS applicants. So there are a few.

Here, for instance, the original: “Is your organization constituted so that individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the geographic region in which your organization is based control your organization?” This was deemed a little lengthy and confusing, so we’ve restricted it and shortened it to a clearer question.

We also clarified a section about funding, which was maybe a tiny bit vague and led to different answers.

We also updated the website's question in the contact details section. So, where a normal was that URL was requested, we noticed that quite a few ALSes were recently presenting a Facebook page, for instance, instead of a traditional website. Whereas before, a Facebook page was purely illustrative or for membership interaction.

Recently, we've seen that many ALSes or applicants are transferring a lot of their contact from traditional websites to Facebook, so we decided that the application form needed to reflect this.

Also, in an aim to speed up the process, we added questions that existed in the due diligence form to the application form. We established that due diligence is there for staff research and staff to delve deeper based on information in the application form.

As we've seen in the due diligence form, it should be reflected as basic information in the application form. This has led to a few extra questions, but simple questions that could be answered by yes/no in the application form.

There are a few things left to do. We need to have this document translated in the same languages as already existing. We need attachments to be possible, since many ALSes like to attach the by-laws for information purposes.

We need to also set this page to an anonymous setting. So, as you've seen today, people will need to log in to access it, because normally ALSes get given the wiki credentials once they have been accredited and not before.

This is all in the draft form, though this is the main gist of it. So I welcome any questions or feedback you may have.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nathalie. When is this supposed to start?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: No timeline for now. First, I wanted to have feedback from this on the forum and from other members to see if we can go ahead and get it translated. So if we're all fairly happy with content and form, then it will be as soon as the various language translations are available.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I was going to suggest, since not everyone is able to access it for some reason – I see people that are logged in that are unable to access this document – I was going to suggest that we follow up by e-mail.

I'm also concerned about the interpreters, I'm not quite sure whether they're still on. I was going to say, we need to end this call pretty soon.

I see people have been putting their hand up. Alan and Tijani, if this is substantial, this is going to pretty much be lost in the call. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll just note, as I was listening, I did not hear anything which bothered me in the following respect. But note that the process for accrediting ALSes is a process approved by the Board. If we're going to

change anything in terms of what they approve, that has to go back for Board approval.

From listening to it, it sounds like it's purely operational and does not affect anything. But that's something that we need to do a sanity check on before implementing anything. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. So it is not accessible for me, for example. I propose to Nathalie to put it on the wiki so that we can visit it and give our feedback as soon as possible. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Tijani. Let's make this as an action item then for Nathalie to put this on the wiki. Put it in an area which doesn't need a log in, so everyone can see it, rather than have it behind a log in, where it looks as though, for some people, this is not reachable.

And with this, that takes us to any other business, ladies and gentlemen. Yes, Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, just a very short one. The draft schedule for ATLAS II says the ALT meeting is scheduled to be from 8:00 to 11:00 on Friday. Is that finalized?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I answer?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Whoever wishes to answer. I'm not sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm currently scheduling it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm currently scheduling it.

OLIVIER: Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan and all. As started in Singapore, we now have ALT meeting at 8:00, starting and running through 11:00, and that includes a breakfast.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm currently scheduling a 3:00 PM departure from Heathrow, so that's good enough if we're really ending at 11:00. I just wanted to verify that before I booked tickets. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. Thanks to our interpreters, who have lasted two and a half hours on this call when, really, this call was supposed to be two hours in length.

Thanks to all of you who have been on the call. I think this has been very, very helpful, indeed, and we have progressed and have a lot of action items from this. A round of applause for everyone.

Oh, I see Pastor Peters has put his hand up. One last comment, Pastor Peters, go ahead. You have the floor.

I cannot hear you at the moment, I'm afraid – unable to hear Pastor Peters. Could you please type your question or comment in the chat?

We'll have to follow up by e-mail because I'm not able to hear you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you all for having been here for two and a half hours. This call is adjourned. Good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]