
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC Leadership Team, ALT monthly conference call, on Wednesday the 28th of May, 2014. The time is 20:06 UTC. And we will start with the roll call and apologies. Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Olivier, Gisella here. On today's call we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Evan Leibovitch, Maureen Hilyard, Julie Hammer, Alan Greenberg will be joining us in the next 30 minutes, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh should be on his way in.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Lang, Teri Agnew, and myself Gisella Gruber. And if I could also to please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And welcome everybody for this wonderful evening in Europe, and morning in Australia, and [?] eastern part of the world, and daytime in the western part of the world. It's a short call, I hope. We've got a number of things going that we need to discuss, and certainly a follow up to our very long, marathon call that we had yesterday I believe.

Let's immediately start with a review of the action items from our last ALT meeting and then the ALAC call that we had. So first the ALT meeting on the 14th of May, earlier this month. And we'll just have a

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.

look, scrolling down, over to the open action items. And I'm glad to note that there are more and more action items that are complete.

The open action items are very much like the ones we were reviewing yesterday. So for Ariel to work with Dev and Olivier on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of At Large ALS. That's ongoing. For Cheryl, Evan, and Rudi to, sorry, to liaise with Rudi in regards to the implementation of consumer metrics and follow up further details. So then there was an additional action item that was brought yesterday, which we'll probably be touching on in a moment, where staff had to find out what that action item actually meant.

I'm not actually even sure whether staff has found out what this action means yet. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

No, okay. So that answers the question. Next, staff to monitor the use of additional languages over the course of a few months. And as you know, everything started yesterday, or the ALAC call which started with having Russian interpretation. So that would be monitored, and it's also a short that shortly we will also have Chinese interpretation that will be made available.

Ariel Liang to work with Alan Greenberg on updating the former At Large structures workspace and ensure that its information is accurate

and up-to-date. Also, I think that's still ongoing. Ariel, can you confirm please?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes, this is the Ariel for the record. This AI is still ongoing. Alan and I will set up a time to talk on Friday next week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Fantastic. Thank you. And then finally, staff to publicize the ALAC/GAC meeting question space and ALAC/Board meeting question space on the ALAC list and request topics for these meetings. Now as you know, there is not going to be a meeting, a formal meeting between the GAC and the ALAC. I suspect that this is not because the GAC doesn't like us, or submit that because the GAC has got a very full agenda with a high level meeting on the Monday, and then this point of this debate about this alcoholic or sometimes non-alcoholic grape-based drink, which actually is always alcoholic, grape-based drink that seems to be poisoning things at the moment, and so they need a lot more time to discuss things.

With regards to the ALAC Board meeting questions, we will be touching on this later on in this call. That's the open action items. Looking further down at the newly assigned action items, they have all been completed. The floor is open for questions, comments, or anything else really, if you wish to add any thought to this.

I see no one, so let's move on then. Let's go to the other set of action items, and that's the last, well that's yesterday's call then. So the ALAC

monthly conference call on the 27th of May. And here again, we will be scrolling down, and we still have a number of open action items, and let's have a look at them.

The first one, the new gTLD working group to analyze the input on the PAB and to suggest the next step by contacting At Large staff. The comment closes on the 7/5/2014. This actually, I think, can be put as done because we did have an action item yesterday for the new gTLD working group to start the analysis. It's just that this one at the moment has got an absolute date. In fact, Evan, you were not at that time on the call, when we mentioned, but then later on we touched on it at the end of the call. So I don't know, has there been any development since yesterday?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

No. I only missed the first 20 minutes. I remember that when this was under discussion, there was a mention that there was going to be the usual activity of staff summarizing the comments, and that was going to be brought forward to the committee. I mean, we can start to move forward without that, but that was what was mentioned yesterday in accordance to previous public comments, was that there is a staff activity in summarizing the comments received and then that ends up driving the rest of the working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That's correct.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Because there weren't a whole lot of comments, we could probably start going on what we have now, but that's what I recall from yesterday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Evan. I'll leave this in your hands, and I guess this really is up to the working group to look at. It might be worth sending a note to the working group to let people know in the working group spend time to read through some of the comments that were made. But that be a good first step to get people to work with it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I have one question at this point Olivier, and I just want to get the feel for the rest of the group. As you know, there has been a couple of people from outside ALAC that were also involved with us in initiating all of this. Would it be appropriate to invite them to participate in the working group at this point, since they were active in working with us to put this forward? I'm thinking Ron, Marilyn, and so on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. I see agreement from Holly, a green tick next to her name. What do others think on this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I mean, these are open meetings. I'm just wondering if there is any objection to me having a formal invitation to them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Evan. I note that there are some green ticks from Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, and I guess you probably agree with it, since you bring this forward. I agree with you that all of the discussions are open. With regards to a formal invitation, I have never invited anyone to formally join a group, because I'm not quite sure if they would be interested in joining the group, or would they be interested in the part of the discussions.

I don't see any barriers to them attending the discussion and bringing their input in, it really is down to the chair of the working group.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, what I meant by formal, Olivier, is simply indicating to them that the meeting is taking place. They wouldn't normally be participating in it at a working group level thing in ALAC, so this is more a matter of bringing it to their attention then, you know, an absolutely formal thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks Evan. It's Olivier speaking. I certainly don't see a barrier to that either. As I said, the chair of the working group is able to do whatever they want, as long as you don't plan to do something that will go against ALAC rules. But I don't see any rules, as far as I know, that stops you from inviting people to the call.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Cool. Okay, thanks, done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Let's continue here. So, the next one, the RALO leaders to follow up on the ALSs to be decertified, listed on the, up on that page. And I think that is done as well. Correct me if I'm wrong, I think that's pretty much on the card as well. Now next, Nathalie Petegrine to post the new online ALS application info on the wiki page, viewable to the public and to publicize the wiki page.

We know that's on its way as well. So let's keep this, for the time being, an un-check. Ariel Liang to work with Dev and Olivier on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of At Large ALS, that's ongoing. Cheryl, Evan, and Rudi to speak to each other, we know about. That's the consumer metrics question we just touched on about three minutes again.

And staff to monitor the use of additional languages we also dealt with a few minutes ago. That is essentially a copy of the ALAC call, ALS [?] call action items. The newly assigned action items. Now these are these are [?] important one. We've got... Did I just hear Evan? Yes, Evan please, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. I just to put to bed that one action item that keeps cropping up about Cheryl, Rudi, and myself. The consumer choice group is still meeting and active. When there is a report to be presented, they will. I mean, Cheryl, Rudi and myself are all three members of the committee. I'm not sure why this keeps cropping up as a recurring item. I'm more

than happy to liaise with the ALAC and the ALT and present news when it comes.

I don't know why it needs to be an explicit... Actually, Cheryl and I were in conversation yesterday, not understanding why this was an explicit action item, where this came from. So, this is ongoing work. When there is a milestone, and there may be one soon, there will be something to report, but until then, I'm not quite sure why this crops up as an explicit action item. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Evan. Does anyone have an idea how this came up?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I suspect this is something from Singapore. That came up during meetings. So it sounds like we can just sort of check two boxes today.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I would suggest doing that Heidi. This is Evan. In just saying that, when news comes up from that committee, you've got Cheryl and myself and

Rudi, they're all part of it, including as well as Christopher Wilkinson. So there is good representation there, and when there is news to come out of it, we'll bring it. I don't think it needs explicit comment as action items. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. And just as a reminder that this was a discussion that we had in Singapore. There was a potential problem at some point, when the – some of the consumer metrics were being under danger of being struck out through lack of participation, and so on. And there was a tension at the time. We discussed this in Singapore when face to face, and this is how the action item came to be for the three main participants: Cheryl, Evan, and Rudi, in that working group to speak to each other and constantly liaise and be able to come back to us.

And I think that might be the part that's not in the action item. Come back to the ALAC and let us know on ALAC calls how progress is going on. This is, I think, quite a key issue for At Large and for end users, and therefore we need to keep a very close watch and close eye over it. So I'm thrilled to actually say yes, as a person who loves ticking boxes. Please, please, please, let's tick it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: They've been ticked. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you for this Evan. You've just made our day, and certainly made Heidi's day by having two boxes ticked. A good step forward, and these are the newly assigned action items. Let's see if we can tick more boxes. Olivier to take up the issue of volunteer recognition and consideration with other SO and AC chairs as an ICANN wide issue.

And unfortunately, I've not done that yet. I'm trying to push on a few other things at the moment, namely to try and invite them to our SO and AC mornings, early morning discussions with the ATLAS II. And the response rate has been a little bit slow at the moment, due to other discussion taking place, namely some discussions on the IANA transition issue and also the recent threat of the GAC high level meeting, where there has been a question by people in asking, you know, are we all allowed to go into the high level meeting discussions.

Would we be able to take the floor in front of the GAC, or speak, or etc.? So there has been a bit of a discussion on that. The Curation working group to discuss...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Olivier, I've got my hand up on that...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan, please go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, just trying to connect the dots with something we were talking about yesterday. So here is an issue about volunteer recognition, and

yesterday the ALAC had on its plate of director remuneration. During that call, that issue was linked. I'm wondering if these two things have some relation to each other and that allows us to connect the dots.

Because the concept of volunteer recognition definitely came up as a whole during yesterday's discussion on director compensation. Just tossing it out, I think there is a linkage.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Evan. It's just that this is quite a different discussion from the other discussions that are going on. And it seems at the moment, from what I see on the SO/AC chair's list, which is strange because, by the way, this appears to be a list that is not openly consulted outside SO and AC chairs, that the discussion seems to just be between three people, and very few others actually saying anything.

But there certainly have been a bit of a question with regards to scheduling of meetings, and things moving around, and it's been a bit of... I'm not quite sure. We've got all of our meetings setup, and they haven't. So their mind is currently occupied by this, but I will ask in the next few days to follow up on this. And certainly, yes I know it's an important topic to address. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. Yesterday, this action item came while we were talking about Alan's statement about the Board member's compensation or remuneration. I think, I see links to the other point, the point that Evan just made, and this action item was

made. Also there is another action item. I think that Alan take the pen and hold the pen and draft a statement, not his own statement but a statement for ALAC, but he put on the wiki and that we can comment on.

And if there is consensus, [?] an ALAC statement about this issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much Tijani. And that's been understood. And I know there has been a thread on the ALAC mailing list, which I've just replied to, and so I think what Alan has drafted as a first draft needs to be slightly modified, it will be put on the wiki, and then our comments included will be given prior to having a second draft, including if we have consensus on this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So my point is, there is another action item which is not on the action item page.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It was not on the action item page Tijani, because it was part of the policy development page. And so the only action item which was on there, I think, was for... In fact, I can see this correctly, and I don't know why it's missing actually. There was a note which was saying that Ariel Liang should move that statement from being a no statement to a neutral statement with the first draft, etc.

But I gather that because it is part of policy development, it didn't come into the action item, as an action. It was just taken onboard by Ariel. Can staff confirm this please?

ARIEL LIANG:

Ariel speaking. I actually moved that action item to the recently closed action items, because I thought Alan already posted his draft wiki, but I can uncheck that box and make sure this draft is transformed into ALAC statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Ariel. So one blinks one's eyes and one sees that Ariel Liang to move the Board member compensation up to the open PC section of the PD page, and Alan to post the first draft on the wiki. There you go Tijani, the action item has just gone so fast, it's already done before it has even been opened. That's what I call efficiency, thank you Ariel. Great.

So let's move on to, we're spending too much time on that. Curation working group, to discuss the change of its name in the next call, and that's going to happen tomorrow. Staff to perform the initial analysis of the PAB public forum contributions and the new gTLD working group, to kick up the follow up work on this. And of course, we just discussed this a moment ago, and that's also in progress.

Nathalie Peregrine to send an email to the ALAC list about decertification emails that were sent to the ALSs, minus the ALS from

Costa Rica. Nathalie, is there a follow up on this? Is Nathalie even on the call?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, this is Heidi. Nathalie is not on the call. As far as I've seen, there's not, we're still waiting for legal. It's past one hurdle in legal that we are just waiting for another person and we'll be able to post it. And then it goes to IT, who thinks that they will be able to post it very quickly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I'm sorry. It's Olivier speaking. Can you just let us know what the process is? Because I'm not quite sure what has gone to legal.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Basically we've shown the new application to legal, because it had some additional questions. And there is one aspect, an element in the bylaw that says that if the ALS certification needs to be approved by the Board's process. So we wanted to make sure that that, the new changes did not surpass any kind of hurdle, that meant that it needed to go to the Board. And so far we've heard back from one person, legal saying note, you know, the changes are not significant to warrant that.

So we're just waiting for another colleague to say the same thing, and then we'll be able to post it, and it will be ready to go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Heidi. You just taught us how to make a cake whilst I was asking you how to make a starter. What I mean by that, is that we're speaking about decertification emails at the moment, we're not speaking about that automatic, online...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine, we've got an answer that we can bank for later when we will ask you the question. We'll say just refer to the earlier part in the transcript, thank you very much. It must be page three or four. So coming, back to this one, the email list to the ALAC list about decertification emails that were sent to the ALSs, on the formal At Large structure workspace, minus the ALS from Costa Rica...

What I understood from the discussion yesterday was that Alan was going to send out the proposed decertification motion, and we already have seconders for each one of these. And once these are sent out to the list, then we can start with those. That's what I thought.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I will need to check, follow up on that and, with Nathalie and see where we are. I know that we're eager to start the vote ASAP. I'll make a note of that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, thank you Heidi. So, next, staff to explain... Did somebody just start speaking? Staff to explain the open action items. This is the one, the explanation, you can tick this one, excellent. And then staff to form the thematic groups so they can be proceeded forward. In other words, a question from staff on this. That really is basically gathering the thematic group poll results from Carlos Reyes, and then creating those thematic groups.

That was the action item itself. Could we have an update on that please Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, this is Heidi for the record. We talked, Carlos and I spoke about that today. I'm hoping he'll be able to start populating the thematic groups later today and have them finish by the end of the work day today. And I'm suspecting that is the best way to basically add a table on each of those thematic groups workspaces with the name of the person, as long as their RALO... How do you wish thematic groups to be listed?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Heidi. I know that, having read the email thread, Tijani Ben Jemaa has a few views on this, so I hand the floor over to Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I think that staff has already to proceed to form the groups, according to the survey results with people who already took the survey. Those who didn't take it, will have to make a call with the

staff and groups with the, the whole event group, including the thematic groups subgroup. And we have to see how to balance the groups, and how to make use of the rooms according to their capacities.

And this must be done between the staff and the group, because there is two considerations. There is the logistic consideration, which are the rooms, etc., and the language translation, etc. because there is translation only in two rooms. And on the other hand, we have the balance for the teams, for the groups, etc. So this work must be done between all of us.

First we have to already [?] the groups with people who already took the survey, and then a call to complete this work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Tijani. Does this answer your question Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Somewhat. So what I'm hearing from Carlos is that there has been 91 respondents. So that is a decent number, better than we had the first time around. So how would you like these listed on the thematic group pages? Would you like a table that lists the name and the RALO? Or how would you like them listed?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, tables, for sure. Tables for each team, you have a table with people who will be in this group with their affiliation, with their RALO, for sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And Carlos is also saying that it was a preference survey, so people noted their preference. So for example, we don't want to give everyone their first preference is the room has been allocated as a small room, or do we want to note that? Do we want to list their preferences? How do you wish to publicize the results?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: First, since we don't have everyone who have taken the survey, we will use the first preference for people who already took the survey, and put them in the right groups. And then to complete the groups, we will use the other choices for people if the groups will not be... No. We will use the other people to complete the groups because, except if we have one group for more than available number as a first choice.

So it is a work which is not automatic. First of all, try to put the first choice for each one in the group, and then – that's why we need a call to complete the work.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I think I have it. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Tijani for explaining this and thank you Heidi for raising the question. One thing you did say, to say it, well how do we have too many people that want to be going into a group that will be allocated a small room, and really, the rooms will be allocated after we know the

size of the groups. Part of the thing is, the only concern though is that if we have a very wide spread of people who do not speak English, wide spread...

So if we have like say, a small group of people that don't speak English, that are in a small group, and yet we can only have interpretation facilities in a large room, and I really hope that we don't end up in such a situation. So we'll have to see. Until we get the results from Carlos and we have those tabulated, then we'll be able to find out. It would be good to have a table and find out the sheer numbers, and then we will have to maybe manually have to balance things out.

Question though, whose job is it to balance this out? Will it be Tijani and who else? What working group will work on that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. It will be the event working group with the staff, together.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: As you said Olivier, there is a problem of logistics of translation, of interpretation. And we need to balance the groups according to the language spoken, according to the capacity of the rooms, and according to of the [?].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And then we were able to play with the spare number of people who have not responded, and put them in a room which will fit their language, maybe fit some of their background. That's the other thing. I mean, are you just going to allocate people randomly? Or will you think, "Ah, I know that person. I know they would be more likely to be interested in this thing or that thing."

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: First of all, we will try to make the, we will use the issue of language before, people who don't speak English, for example, must be in an interpreted session. People who can speak one language or the other, we, in this case, we will try to find, to see, if some of us know what is his preference, his logic preference.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'll ask one more thing. I know it's not easy, that's why we're spending a bit of time on this just to make sure we're clear on that. It's Olivier speaking again. Last thing, Heidi do we have an exact capacity details of each of those rooms? Because if we allocate 30 people to a room and there are only 25 chairs, on the day it's going to introduce real problems.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I have to look at, we have a scheduler that we have internally, see the absolute numbers, and we can get that before the events call that would be scheduled to allocate the final numbers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Heidi. And I'm discussing this here because I know the events call is coming and I don't want this events call to be wasted. We're only three weeks away. And that's really the discussion on putting people in what group and so on, should be something that shouldn't take three calls. It should be just dealt with in 20 minutes, and done, and dusted, and other things should be dealt with.

There are so many other issues that need to be tightened now, and we really are at a position now where we have to start tightening screws, not open new nuts and bolts and things. Tijani, and then we'll move on. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, thank you Olivier. Heidi, I apologize. It is better to have the whole preference of people who took the survey, together with the allocation that Carlos will do. So that when have the call, we all have the other preference of people. If we need to balance the groups, there is a real necessity to make change from the first choice to the second choice. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you. I'm noting this to Carlos now, so okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. And that closes our action items for the time being. Are there any other questions or comments on the action items? And I note that Alan has a comment in the room, and wanted to discuss the

first action item. We can discuss this during the next part of, the agenda on the policy discussion, this is a policy matter.

So without any further ado, let's go over to number three on our agenda, that's the policy development activities. And let's start exactly as Alan wanted to touch on this, with the Board member compensation, where the ALAC is considering drafting a statement. I invite you all to that public comment page, or the wiki space, which has already got now some text in there. And Alan you have the floor to explain, or ask your question, or start the discussion. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. My understand, incorrect apparently, is that I was supposed to post what I said, and then others would join in and say whether the ALAC needed an unique statement or there would simply be a statement of support or neither. Apparently, Olivier, that was not what you intended, but the intention was to draft a statement based on mine, but perhaps deviating from it. So I guess I want some clarity to make sure we're all on the same, the same chart.

If the statement simply is going to say the same thing, I see no reason to redraft it. A statement can simply say we support. If there is a need to deviate, then I guess it says a statement is warranted, and the powers that be will have to hold them up to the light to see what the differences are. So I just want some clarity so I know if I'm supposed to be doing something or not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier and thank you Alan for drafting the statement. My understanding, I said it on the email list, my understanding was that you hold the pen to prepare a first draft, not on your behalf, on the behalf of ALAC. And if there is a consensus it will be the statement of ALAC that will be sent. This was the decision of yesterday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Tijani. The facts are, intimately speaking, the facts are that Alan has now posted the statement to the public comment on his own behalf, in a purely individual capacity. And he has sent a copy of it over to the comments box on the wiki page. And so we have a number of avenues open to us here. The first avenue is for the ALAC to draft a statement and to say that it fully supports the statement that Alan has posted in his private capacity to the public comment page.

The second submission is for the ALAC to draft its own statement and move it there for the pen holder, and it probably makes sense to maybe have Alan hold the pen on this. The third option is for this statement to be put as a first draft to the ALAC statement, and then everyone in At Large to comment on it and to amend the statement according to the comments. These are the three, well the fourth option is for the ALAC to do nothing, but that we'll stick it aside because we heard yesterday that it was of interest in the ALAC releasing a statement.

I see Evan Leibovitch and then Tijani Ben Jemaa. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. I've got a question, and I guess the answer in which will determine which of the various options you've just described. And that question is to Olivier, going back to something that we talked about earlier on this call, before Alan came on, when you were talking about the discussion within the SO and AC's chairs about volunteer recognition and that kind of thing.

Is there anything out of any of the discussions that you have had along those lines that would add any contribution of substance to talk about the issue of volunteer recognition and in the context of Board compensation? If there is something to add, then there might be value to our doing our own statement. If there isn't anything to add, I would recommend simply having ALAC formally endorse what Alan has already submitted. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Evan. And I'll answer your question right away. So, the discussion that belonged on the SO and AC chair's list, is not dealing with this topic. We have had some discussions in the past about this very topic of volunteer recognition. We have made our concerns known to ICANN staff that SO/AC chairs, chairs of working groups are often thanked, etc. and recognized, Board members are thanked and recognized, but people in working groups and volunteers themselves have very seldom any kind of formal recognition.

And so this gave rise to the concept of the multistakeholder [?] award, which is something which is now under development, and in fact there have been some requests for nominations and the committee dealing with it. I'm part of that committee. They're having weekly conference calls now to evaluate the different nominations which were received. Aside from that, there was no discussion, and I'm just working from memory here, I don't think that there was any discussion about volunteer recognition as far as monetary compensation.

And therefore, the request that I was asked, the action item that I was asked to perform, which is to ask the SO and AC chairs and open the discussion about this topic of compensation, compensation of volunteers, is something which would open a new chapter. As I said, I'm sorry I haven't started it yet. Now that said, the concern I have specifically on this topic, is that we are dealing here with Board compensation. We're not dealing with compensation of volunteers.

This is not a PC about compensation of volunteers. And the gist of Alan's statement was to say that if the Board ups, so raises its compensation, that raises the, that widens, sorry, the gaps between the volunteer, uncompensated volunteers, and Board members. But that's how I understood Alan's point in there. And I don't know whether we should focus specifically on volunteer compensation.

You know, this is just all about Board compensation here. Now, of course, we can extend, expand on this, but I'm still not sure about how to do that. And opening something about volunteer compensation with the SO and AC chairs is definitely something that I could do. Does that answer your question Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. Olivier, it's not a question of compensation for volunteers. It is a question of recognition and consideration. And yesterday when we spoke about the statement of Alan, we spoke about that and we said that we are not asking to compensate or to pay volunteers, we are asking for recognition of consideration of volunteers who are working hard.

So this is something that we can add to the statement. And this is, I think, this would be the difference between Alan's statement and the ALAC statement. We will perhaps emphasize on this point at the end of the statement, but you mentioned three options. I think two and three are the same, more or less. So my inclination is for a statement of ALAC, a detailed statement of ALAC. Not to support Alan's statement, but an own statement for ALAC, which is inspired from Alan's statement, since it was more or less a consensus among the ALAC members. Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Let's be clear. If ICANN offers to give me \$35,000 a year in recognition of all of the work I'm doing, I will accept it. [Laughter]

ERIC LEIBOVITCH: I'm really happy to know that, Alan, I was wavering.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do not believe that it's likely to happen in this particular term. And this current statement, in recognition of the various comments, and people misinterpreting what I was trying to say, is the current statement does not ask for compensation.

It says, "Increasing Board compensation without some recognition," and I can try to read verbatim if you give me a moment, "it denigrates the contributions." The previous version that I had posted to the ALAC list implied, but didn't quite say that yes, we think compensation for chairs is reasonable, but that's not necessarily what we're talking about for others.

I even removed that, because I wanted to take the focus away from compensation to other issues, and do what I think Tijani is saying and other people have been saying. That is, we have to make sure that people get some tangible benefit from all of the work that they put in, and we're talking about those who are putting, what I call in this message, [?] efforts. So I don't think the current message, and if it does, tell me where and I'll try to correct it, focuses on compensation.

I know that the discussion has focused on financial compensation, but it says, "Board and now liaison compensation, with any consideration for

the contributions of others denigrates the others.” There are a host of other benefits that Board members get, that other volunteers and chairs really appreciate. And I think that is the, what was the tone.

So if there is something separate, if there is something different to be said, then it is surely the right of the ALAC to say that. I’m not sure I’m the right one to draft something different. On the other hand, if what you’re really saying is, yes, you support it, then a simple statement of support is cleaner because it means that the people who are evaluating it don’t have to, you know, try to look at the common denominators between the differences, and it’s a lot easier to draft the one statement then to get closure on a page.

So I haven’t heard anything different here that anyone wants in a statement than I think I already put in there. I’m not trying to defend what I wrote. I wrote on a personal behalf, and didn’t write it from the point of view of getting acceptance from the ALAC. But I’m not looking to add extra work with no real benefit out of it either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. And come on, come on, you have to admit, you do like to have acceptance of the ALAC as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course I would. [Laughter] But I wrote it knowing that I didn’t think it was going to come to this. The fact that the ALAC, everyone yesterday said, yes let’s do something, it was a pleasant happening. But I didn’t write this on the assumption that it would be seconded by the

ALAC, I was assuming a half a dozen ALAC members to contribute something saying, “Yes, me too.” So far there has been nothing from anyone, so be it.

UNIDENTIFIED: Do we have to write that again?

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have to write what again? I was expecting several ALAC members that I have supported, so I was expecting one line contributions to the public comment saying that. So far they’re not there. Maybe people are waiting to see if the ALAC does something in general.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe people have changed their mind. They don’t like you anymore.

[CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: ...say something and then not get around to it. They don’t like me anymore, that’s tough. I’m going to cry. I would be happy if people would want me to write an one line statement saying the ALAC supports it. I would also be willing to redraft my statement saying we instead of I, or the ALAC instead of I, if that’s what you want. Any further refinement on that, I don’t think should be mine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan on this. And I see that there are more hands up at the moment. I don't know whether these are old hands or new hands. Evan and Tijani. Evan? No? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I think that Alan, you're right but I think another statement would be an enforcement to this effort, and I don't think that it is [?]. Yes, your statement is good, but it needs more perhaps refinement, and the refinement has come from the comment of people about this statement. And I think this is way we work before and we have to work now.

So, if you change we or ALAC instead of I on my own behalf, it would be good, and people will add what needs to be added. And perhaps to propose other things. We have to see what is the direction of the others. From my side, I would emphasize the notion of recognition for the volunteers. I will make it perhaps more visible in the statement, that's all. But I am okay with all you wrote, but perhaps others have others to add. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Any other thoughts on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well there is not a lot of time left.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, I say there is very little time left. The reply [?], including reply period. And it closes on the 12th of June. Alan, what I would suggest is that you take that statement, replace the I's with we and put it as first draft submitted. Ariel can publicize this. We can have a three or four day comment period, in fact we can have a week of At Large comments, and then we will be proceeding forward with the final version and then the vote afterwards.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two questions. The first question is do you want the statement to refer to mine, to make reference to it, and then state what it wants to state? Or just do it blank? That's question number one. Number two, who is going to draft the refined one based on the comments? Who is going to redraft or change?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So in regards, it's Olivier speaking. In regards to your first question, I think that referring to your statement would effectively have the ALAC statement endorsing everything that is in your statement. And it might well be that some of our colleagues might wish to amend some parts that you put in there, either strengthening them or taking them out. So we would be precluded from pointing to your statement specifically.

We could say, post refining, that if it is pretty much your statement, we could then say, "Well, you know, this is based on Alan Greenberg's statement."

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I mean, I guess I have a philosophical problem about saying we're going to say what we use essentially what I have verbatim, change the I's to we's, but then somebody is going to go ahead and say, "Can we leave out sentence number four?" Because that essentially detracts from mine. So I, you know, starting off with the exact same words and then tweaking them, I'm not sure that's what you want to do. [CROSSTALK] ...want me to do, then I'll do it, but...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are you saying this will induce confusion in Board member's minds, because they'll say, "How come the statement starts in the same way and then ends differently?" I can totally understand that some Board members, some, might get very confused about it. So, yeah, that's a very good point. Then we would need to start something new, and someone has to hold the pen on this one quickly.

So I don't know if Alan, you'd be happy to do a slightly different version of this, or whether someone else on the call would like to hold the pen to do a slightly different version of this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, there's a conflict. If we ended up saying something directly opposite to what I'm saying, I have trouble being the pen holder. That's going to send mixed messages. We post with these documents exactly who wrote it, and that's a rather mixed message. I will be glad to repost what I said with the we's, and then someone else will have to take over, if indeed, there are strong changes that are recommended.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, there is no one who said the opposite ideas. So there will not be anything opposite to your statement, but there will be a refinement and this is good. And perhaps you are right, perhaps I propose, even if you don't mind, I would propose that Evan hold the pen for it, and redraft the statement in another way so that it will not be exactly the same. And with the comments, it will be refined so that it would be the ALAC statement. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani for the suggestion. I was going to suggest that it would be translated from Canadian to English, but of course we're dealing with two Canadians, so that's going to be hard. [Laughter]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan. And Tijani, I appreciate, I thank you for your trust in me. My only problem right now is I am severely swamped with non-ICANN stuff leading into the summit. And I'm happy to participate, I'm happy to work with Alan or somebody, taking it may be beyond my ability right now, especially if I'm going to be taking up the issue with the public advisory Board stuff and the new gTLD stuff.

It's going to be very hard for me to take the lead on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Evan. I notice three people from the [?] who sound very far away at the moment, who are hiding on the other side of the planet, and that's Holly, Julie, and Maureen. Holly, you've put your hand up. I can see the tip of it, please. You have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Finally, finally. Look, I'm sorry but I really like Alan's statement. I'm sorry I didn't get out of bed at about 2:00 and say I did. I have now. I don't like the idea of anybody else drafting it, and I would support Alan putting the we's for the I's, and I absolutely appreciate his position, which is if it starts to look like something he isn't saying, then we drop it. Because I think that there was plenty of people who supported what he said.

If that's, in essence, what he says, and we support it, we don't have a lot of time to start redrafting the stuff. There are, to my mind, too many other important things to say. So, I support Alan doing what he said he was going to do, which is substitute the we's for the I's, in essence say what he said. If there is a bit of tweaking, and I mean just tweaking, just possible little changes to accommodate the fact that it's all of us instead of some of us, fine.

But Alan, I guess Olivier, I don't think we need to spend a lot more time on this one. And I support Alan's holding the pen. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much Holly. And so there is ticks for Alan saying let's make so. So therefore, Alan, if you could just cut, paste, change the I's with we's, and we'll go from there. If there are significant changes, then we'll have to adapt on whether you want to remain as the drafter or whether you don't, but we can do that dynamically.

And of course, if there are changes, then it might be you won't be able to do those changes, and so we're less likely to have consensus, on any major changes that we going there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, there have been multiple times where Alan and I have worked together, where he has crafted something and bounced it off me, which I think will be just fine in this instance. I'm more than happy to help in that regard, and you know, I don't disagree with what Alan said in the first place, so I don't think we're going to talk about anything major here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much Evan. So now we have all of those statements in front of us. The ICANN draft five year strategic plan, the FY 15 operation plan, operation plan and budget, the preliminary determination to grant registrar date retention waiver request, the WHOIS requirement and national law conflict, and the ICANN, enhancing ICANN accountability. Are there any comments or questions or would you like to discuss anything during this call? Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. Simply on the issue of the accountability issue. I need to put something into the wiki, but it's really hard for us to do anything that talks about increasing ICANN's accountability without making reference to accountability and transparency review teams that have already been doing work, have not been totally listened to. And I'm really concerned we're reinventing wheels once more, when we haven't even implemented the old ones. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. It's Olivier speaking. Perhaps that suggests that we draft a statement saying, "Start implementing all of these ATRT I and ATRT II recommendations and then we'll talk." And in fact, I see Holly is saying the same thing. Maybe we just say that. So we'll say just that. That should help you in your search for this.

Okay, any other comments on the statement? Just to let you know, the pipelines for these statement is ongoing, so Ariel and I will be following through. I think the next one that falls through is the five years, is it the five year strategic plan? Or it is the Board member compensation one. But we'll follow up by email on this.

So if there are no further comment, then we can move to the next part of our call, and that's the review of the full conference call. And just to remind you of the page of the ALAC conference call. First, as I said earlier, I was very pleased to see that there was interpretation in Russian.

I felt a bit sorry for the Russian interpreter was by themselves for the full two and a half hours. Great to see so many new ALSs arriving and

being accepted into the At Large. And I was particularly pleased that appears to be a wish for an At Large wide discussion on the accreditation of new ALS, because some of the confusion that there is...

And I think that the RALOs are going to be dealing with this, and I hope, and staff correct me if I'm wrong, but I hope that you will be able to find some time for the RALOs to discuss this, either independently during their GAs, or during the secretariat discussions, face to face discussions in London.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, currently the GA agendas are coming in and I don't see that item on any of them. And secondly, there will not be a face to face secretariat meeting during the London meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, thanks for telling me that. It's Olivier speaking. So maybe it's a good idea to suggest it to the RALOs. And in fact, I haven't seen a follow up on this. I know that yesterday we discussed this quite a lot. Not all RALO leaders were on the call, it would be good for Silvia to follow up

with the RALOs in letting them know about this wish from the people who were on the call.

And I think it was something that will benefit everyone.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Olivier, this is Silvia. I will do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thanks Silvia. So that was one thing, and then of course, we had the creation of the curation of working group. And we'll know what the new name is tomorrow or if it remains curation working group. The policy advisory boards, we spoke about yesterday. And that's well in the hands of Evan now, and of course the hands of staff, to perform the summarizing of the input.

ALS decertification, I'm glad we've got this also working out. There is one quick follow up on that. Alan, you have to have that drafted email that needed to do the decertification... Actually, I know that we tasked you with drafting this email, since you've already had three ALSs being decertified, you have already drafted that email. So we can just do a cut and paste and take it from there, can't we? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: In fact, no if we follow the pattern. The other decertification, the motion was very specific to the situation, and I looked at those, and that's why you haven't already seen the output. So at this point, my inclination is to make the motion very generic, and simply point to the

workspace as the rationales, instead of trying to build into the motion, the specifics of a case.

So I would like to make it into something which you've just described in the future, as opposed to what we did the first times. The first times, we said things like the group hasn't existed, or we were approached by the, you know, the head of the ALS to say, "Decertify us." And we tried calling the, you know, the president three times and they didn't answer their phone. I would propose that we do a very generic one, pointing to the workspace, and leave it at that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Then having the workspace itself provide the details of the circumstances...

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. And if indeed they don't, we may have to tweak the workspace, but then in the future it becomes a mechanical process, instead of inventing text each time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Alan. And apologies, I was under the impression that we had done that, with that automatic way pointing to the workspace. So if we haven't, then I look forward to the more generic email...

ALAN GREENBERG: You will recall that the first time around, we did it with great trepidation, and wanted to cover ourselves six ways to Sunday, and we did that by tailoring the motion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much Alan. So do you have an idea of when you'll have that more generic motion ready?

ALAN GREENBERG: I will have that and some comments as to whatever workspace needs tweaking, but I don't plan to do that myself, and I'll have that tomorrow.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Alan. Yeah, the workspaces themselves need to be tweaked by the respected RALOs, I think. And really, some tweaking might be needed in the discussion that then takes place. It's funny how one tries to launch a discussion on the list, on the mailing list, regarding a topic, and no one takes any interest in it. And then when the vote actually comes up, so many people wake up and start reading and say, "Well, I'm not sure I want to vote this because I don't see enough evidence here."

So if there is a request from ALAC members for more evidence, then we'll probably have to be willing to suspend the vote on a specific ALS decertification process, and ask the RALO to provide further input than what they have provided so far. And neither you nor I could predict the response from our ALS, sorry, from our ALAC members. They might ask

any type of question, but certainly the ones that we've got listed so far all have a reason for being on the decertification list. So Alan, your hand is still up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Only because I didn't drop it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So if we can have that in the next few days. The moment staff has this, well send it over to the ALAC list, see if we get feedback from the ALAC members, and of course explain, and I will fully support you that it's better to have something a bit more generic because otherwise we're not going to have Alan Greenberg writing these motions forever, for decertifying ALSs.

And we need something that's going to be more generic for this. And then staff can start launching the process. We've got the list of the [?] already, and I think that if the motion is in line with what we said in the discussion yesterday, the seconders will stand as such. And then launch the vote on each one of these. I'd like that vote and the whole process to be finished by London.

So there is only three weeks left until we are in London. That would be a good way forwarded. And I'm glad to have noted, actually, that in one of the ALSs, the Costa Rican ALS, this process has actually, due to the due diligence of the chair of that RALO, has actually come back and said, "Hang on. You're about to be delisted, but delisted from what? And we're actually interested in taking part."

So that could have brought back that ALS into being active, that's a good point forward. Okay. Next we have the ATLAS II update. I know that we flew a great speed through the whole update. Do we have any updates that we would like to make here on the ATLAS II? Is there anything that you thought we hadn't touched on yesterday that you need to share with regards to ATLAS II?

And I was hoping, by the way, to have... I was thinking, well maybe shouldn't we have Eduardo on the call today? But then we had so many other things on the call, so maybe it's just... I know that Tijani is fully into ATLAS II, and Evan too, and Dev of course. So we're all involved in this. Is there anything else that we need to discuss on the ATLAS II update?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So, I gather that's it for the review of the ALAC call. Any comments or any other thoughts on the ALAC call? Maureen Hilyard, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you Olivier. Maureen for the record. I just wanted to raise the ATLAS II mentors program. We had assumed that, well we're not quite sure whether we, as RALOs, are supposed to put names down, but we understand that there is, that the mentors working group, and Fatima, was going to put the length in there, so that's quite soon. But that hasn't happened yet, and we'd like to make contact, because I'm assuming that the mentors are going to get mentees, ALS mentees, from across the region.

So I'm not quite sure what they're thinking is with regards to that group. That was only concern we had from APRALO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Maureen. So, just as a quick recap, we've got these two things. We've got the mentor, the three mentors of the overall mentorship program, which works with the fellowship program. And we've just had, before this call, we've had a call, a number of us had a call with the mentees, the three mentees, that include was it, Mercy, and Anthony, and – the names just evade me now because I'm thinking of something else.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [?]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [?], that's it, yes and [?]. And so those three are mentees, but I guess they all start, they're becoming mentors very quickly, as they've been through one ICANN meeting. Now the ATLAS II mentorship program is the one that's run by Fatima Cambronero. I asked a question of Fatima, a short one, yesterday I asked a question. She has answered me today that she's been in discussion with Silvia Vivanco about this.

And so I wondered, and that's a good point that you raised it Maureen, I wonder, Silvia, would you be able to share with us your discussions with Fatima Cambronero, because Fatima is currently at the Stockholm IGF, and then she's also involved in the MAG, the IGF MAG afterwards. So

she is unable to spend a significant amount of time this week working on this.

But apparently she's been working with you, and I have a few emails which are in Spanish, which I need to translate before I understand them. Perhaps you could explain things without me needing to read those emails in Spanish.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Yes, of course Olivier. This is Silvia. Yes, Fatima talked to me two days ago to request our assistance, because she's first in Paris and then in Stockholm working, attending conferences. So I have been working with her to put together an email for [?] to find new people to help new mentors from, especially from the NARALO region, that still needed... She needed some people to help out, and some other tasks.

So I have been helping her to get email reminders, and other tasks related to this. So she's in contact with me, almost every day through Skype.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Where are we now though? Because the list which we have at the moment, on the wiki, is empty. And we're three weeks away. There is a concern, I guess, and a genuine wish for people to be involved in this, but, you know. Where are we? What's the next step? What needs to be done? Because with Fatima being away for the week, we need to continue moving forward.

So it doesn't rest on Fatima, I guess it rests on the whole working group. What's the next step of the working group?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Right. Okay. Well, one of the concerns that Fatima had is that, she mentioned that there is not much support from other members. She shared that with me. But let's see if I can just pull out the emails that I have communicated with her. Just one moment.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Silvia, while you're doing that, I'm just wondering, perhaps, that you suggest that she does hold a call, because I don't think there has been one call of the At Large mentoring program yet. And I think that's why the confusion is coming about.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, okay. So she's in... The next step would be that she will ask all mentors and mentees to review the mentorship guidelines, to identify their responsibilities, and they're working from now until London. Regarding the teleconference, yes I can suggest that, Heidi, for sure. Because I think that all instructions she is planning are in writing, so it would be good to have a real live conversation.

That's the next step. That she will send an email reminding everyone of what they need to do, and then they will meet in London. That was the plan that she had.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi for the record. I'm just wondering if the ALT might wish to make that an action item, perhaps suggesting that there is a call to coordinate this program. It's up to you, Silvia, or the ALT to make that.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. Another thing that she's coordinating with Carlos Reyes on the certificates, then the timing of the certificates, the agenda of the meetings of the 13 and the 14. So all of that, all of those activities, she's coordinating with me. The agenda, the certificates, and then the next step, which would be if we recommend a conference call, it will be a conference call otherwise, they just need to read the instructions and be prepared to work in London.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So Silvia, it's Olivier speaking. I'll let Alan Greenberg speak and then come back to me. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we have some clarity as to who is going to do the pairings of mentor/mentee and when is this going to be done?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. This is Silvia. I have a document here which Fatima sent to me, which is the pairing of mentors and mentees. I believe she has done it. She has done the pairing of people. It looks like it.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's really important to get that out before London, so the mentors can start making contact with their mentees or whatever.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yeah, that's one of the documents that she sent me, and she's planning to send an email between today and tomorrow. She Skype me today on this one, on this activity, the pairing of mentors and mentees.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you everyone. It's Olivier speaking. So Fatima has shared those emails with me, so I can let you know that the... I'm not quite sure what she meant by agenda per your request. Is that the agenda of the next call that she wants to have? If that's the case, then we need to have that call started.

SILVIA VIVANCO: No. It's the agenda of the meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi for the record. It's the orientation meeting on Saturday in London.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, but you know, we're putting the carrot before the horses here. We need to have a call before that. So as you said, Heidi, as you suggested, let's have an action item. And I'm really sorry to be bringing some top down thing here, but I'm concerned that this is a significant

part of At Large, of the ATLAS II, and at the moment kind of stalling, or a little bit aimless and wondering about it, so on. We need to heighten this nut that we can tighten, and stage a call for the mentoring program working group.

And get them to basically make up the two main things, which I think is the pairing of the mentors and mentees, and the, you know, saying, suggesting on the agenda, and basically staking to the agenda. I can see here that she's done the pairing of the NARALO mentor and mentee, that's just one, and I've got the list here in front of me.

That's just one thing, and already there are five, six, seven groups, and it seems to be an incomplete list, as far as I'm concerned, when I look at it. So, I don't know where, is she going to be dealing with the pairing of everyone in every single RALO? I mean, that doesn't sound like a working group thing. This needs to be done by the working group. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Aside for everything else, I mean it's nice for you to have that list, but some of us also have other commitments outside of ATLAS at the meeting. And I'd like to at least look at who it is that I'm mentoring, and how many they are, before it's made...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Three. You've got three people Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much for telling me that, and some day someone should tell me who they are. Sorry [CROSSTALK]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...or not, I will, but at the moment...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, we can have a private call on that afterwards. I've already said what my price was. So you decide what yours is. All I'm saying is, you know, someone has to do it, but it has to be vetted by the mentors. If you pick someone who has a feud with me, that I'm mentoring, it's not going to work optimally, or whatever. So I'm just saying, time is running out. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Alan. I'm really not sure what to do with this one. I guess we have to wait for this to move forward with Fatima. In the meantime I would ask for staff, let's get this forward. Send a Doodle out to the mentoring group, working group, and get them to say it would be best for them to have a call, and let's have a call early next week.

We need to force the issue on this one. Any other... Yeah, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If we advise them to make a call, we have to tell them why. So a call to fix or complete the pairing between mentors and mentees, to finalize the agenda for the orientation session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly, yeah. Thank you Tijani, thanks for this. Yeah, these will be the two topics. And I think the majority of the time on that call will be made by looking at the full list of the people, and the suggestions that Fatima makes as to who is going to be paired with who, and the mentors to provide feedback and basically say, “Okay, I’m okay with these three people or not,” or whatever. That might mean that part of the call will have to be done in camera, in case, because we are dealing with people here.

That’s what one understood, and I would suggest that mentors, or whoever is on that call, and I probably will be on that call as well, will need to mention that this is in camera, so if they want to say, “Sorry, I can’t mentor that person, he’s an idiot.” I’ll give it to someone else. So excellent.

Who is then the committee or the mentors? No the committee and the mentors. I think that it would be good for the mentors and the committee to [CROSSTALK]... coordination things. Alan, please, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry for speaking up without my hand up, but we’ve had 30, or I don’t know how many other people volunteer, to be mentors. We asked for volunteers, are we accepting them? Are we using them? At this point, I don’t know who the mentors are? I don’t, maybe somebody knows. But also to people who put up their hand, it’s not clear whether we’re using them, you know, sorry. It’s just a little bit confusing for me, maybe I haven’t focused on the details enough.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, there is a wiki page where you have all of the mentors.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that, but it's not clear that we're using all of those people who volunteer.

[CROSSTALK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They will, the table just needs to be filled, basically. And I don't know why the NARALO part of it is not filled. But yeah, the table needs to be filled. The mentors are primarily the ALAC members and also a few additional volunteers from the different regions. But this is work that needs to be done quickly, because the other thing I was hoping was that this mentoring, the mentors would immediately start contacting the mentees before we arrive in London, and that they would be able to help them and point them, sharing their load.

You know, point them over to the webinars, for those who have not been in the webinars, and already getting to know them. So when the mentees arrive in London, they already know who their mentor is, and they've already emailed, have emails going back and forth and so on. I don't know, this is a little bit late but we need to push forward on that.

Okay. Let's get moving then. Anything else on this topic? No? Okay, so let's go back to our leadership team call, and I note that it is half past, 21:30 UTC actually, so we are actually reaching the end of this call, but we still have a few more things to discuss. The PAB public comment next steps, that's dealt with already I think. But prior to that, we still have some discussions on the forthcoming meetings, and we've got questions which are the At Large London ICANN Board questions workspace, the At large London global stakeholder engagement questions workspace, and the ICANN London meeting PowerPoint template workspace.

Well, the PowerPoint template is not a question I guess, I don't know how that fell into this. Someone thinks this is a question, I think it's just a PowerPoint. So...

UNIDENTIFIED: ...public meetings.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right. So the question is as follows, we've got the Board questions, the stakeholder engagement. Board questions, I know that we discussed some of it last time, but the page is still desperately blank at the moment. And I wonder whether we could spend five minutes to think about this. I know that Evan had made some suggestions, and I'll ask Evan to expand. So Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks a lot Olivier. And so I just coincidentally had my hand up. My point is that given the nature this special meeting, giving the nature of the fact that we're going to have all of the ALSs there, given the fact that we are going to have the attention of the Board, I want the Board to do most of the talking, I want it to do most of the questioning. This is not, I think we need to do a slightly different meeting.

This is not somewhere were, you know, we have the form where we come up with these questions and they come up with those questions. I want the Board to actually put forth questions that it has of us. I want it to, as it has now, this form of all the ALSs there, I would like to do things a little differently. The big topics are already well known. The Board has already done its standard stuff of IANA transition, new gTLDs, blah, blah, blah.

This is all going to be said elsewhere. I would like the Board to take advantage of the fact that it has all of these ALSs in the room, that it has this summit there. And I would like the Board to give us its questions. I would like the Board to have a look at the ways things have progressed since the first summit, and going back even further, since the creation of the RALO system and the creation of At Large. I would like to get some comments from the Board on this, and from various Board members including those that have been around long enough to see the history.

So that's my comment on this. I would like this, since it's not an ordinary ICANN meeting for At Large, I don't think it should be an ordinary Board/ALAC discussion time. We will have our usual... I'm hoping that we will have our usual moments on the Friday with either Steve or somebody else, to talk informally about some of the hot issues,

but for the meeting that is between At Large and the Board, I would really like it to take a different direction, especially given that I did not like the way things went at the last meeting, and I want to avoid something like that. Thanks.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think it's a secret that I have somewhat of a bad taste in my mouth with regards to these meetings. I think they have been singularly unproductive, if anything lead to misunderstandings instead of better understanding. That being said, the only issue that I can think to bring up as an issue with the Board, is in fact the compensation one. And not focusing on the Board compensation, but focusing on acknowledging, and rewarding, and whatever, you know, some of the more hard working volunteers in our community.

That I think is worthy of some discussion. I'm sure we'll get lectured on by someone regardless, but nevertheless. I do not know how productive, what Evan is suggesting, is going to be. Certainly it would have to be orchestrated well ahead of time, not just asking Board members to ad lib what they want from At Large. In the past, the Board said they don't want to use this as their platform, so I don't even know to what extent this would be acceptable to them. Or, let me be blunt.

Just like we didn't need comments at the meetings from Board members telling us that maybe we should have a teleconference in

between ICANN meetings, I'm not sure how well, what might be uninformed comments would be in front of all of the ALSs. That's a rather pessimistic view of the world, I'm sorry.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That's my job Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, well I just took it over.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. It sounds like Evan, you're out of the job. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I think that the compensation issue, how to say, controversial subject, if we raise it with the Board members. Because you'll raise a point that touch their pocket. So it is something that will not be easy to handle, especially we have 160 ALSs present in the room. So my inclination is to avoid such a subject. The idea of Evan is not bad, it's good, but is it enough for a meeting with the Board? This is my concern.

I think that, yes, they can talk about that, but to be, I would like to perhaps push our showing the report or the progress done by the At Large during this time, during, since the creation of the At Large, until

the election of the first Board member from At Large until now. And perhaps show that we need perhaps more presentation to the Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. Just commenting on the Board compensation. Something that you might not be aware of, there has been some discussion behind, in more private surroundings, sort of a meeting, speaking with Steve Crocker, and various Board members on Friday, you might be unaware that not all Board members actually even accept compensation from the Board.

In fact, some Board members are paid a salary in their real world job outside of ICANN, which is way higher than the 30,000 which is [?] of them. And so some Board members have actually renegaded on the compensations. And that said, there are they are doing this work pro bono, whilst other Board members have relied on the so-called salary that has been provided in order to be able to sustain themselves.

Bringing this topic up, in anything new thing of the ALAC with the Board is likely to bring it, to raise a number of points, which might on the one hand, might not put the At Large community in a good light, but on the other hand, might embarrass some Board members, these are the other Board members. And I don't think it's a good idea to discuss this topic publically, in front of a 160 At Large structures.

That's just my personal point of view, and take it as strongly that I have on this. Evan Leibovitch and then Alan Greenberg. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. I think I would tend to agree with you, with using the topic. Again, the time that we're going to have with the Board and the ALSs is going to be very, very valuable. I would like to make a best use of it as possible. There is policy issues to deal with. There is all sorts of things that we need to get out of this. In fact, the Board compensation thing, I would, personally I believe to be a relatively small implementation issue, that's part of a larger issue of how ICANN treats its volunteer community.

And frankly to have all of that at a meeting like that, may come across as a bit self-serving on both parts, that is At Large talking on its behalf, and the Board talking on its. And so I would tend to agree with your point of view on that, Olivier. Having said that, I want to go back to what Alan was saying, with his somewhat pessimistic point of view of what I was suggesting, and frankly, I don't mind having the rule of crank in chief taken over by someone else.

But having said that, I think we need to... I'd like to sort of take my original idea, and perhaps nuisance it a bit, and tailor it a bit, and make it a little bit more useful, in the sense that Alan was talking about. That is, tell the Board ahead of time, "This is what we're expecting of you." And frankly, maybe it's about time for the Board to start giving us some pointed questions. Most of the questioning can go from the Board to ALAC, in that we can basically do the kind of education that prevent the kind of comments that we heard before that sort of bely the Board isn't even aware of what ALAC does.

Maybe it should be asking some of the questions, maybe some of the questions, the answers that we can come up with them, are going to

help educate everyone. So I still think the idea of having most of the questions go in the opposite from the usual direction, that being the Board to us, is a good idea. But I'm absolutely amendable to the idea of number one, making sure that the Board is aware and prepares in advance, so this is not all off the cuff. And at the same time, coming up with other possible ways to make this better. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Evan. It's worth noting, it's Olivier speaking. It's worth noting that in each instance of preparing for this meeting, this face to face meeting, the ALAC has been asked to supply questions to the Board, and at the same time, the Board has been asked to supply questions to the ALAC. The Board, until the more recent meeting, the Board always had a couple of questions that it wanted to ask of the ALAC.

If you recall in past cases, when we had a successful meeting with the Board, they had questions which they wanted to ask us. In the last meeting, and perhaps even the one previous to the last meeting, they appeared not to have any questions for us, and that's certainly a concern. Whilst I understand your point of view of saying, "Well, it's the time asked questions of us, investigates what they would like to know."

What is unclear to them about the ALAC and about At Large and the At Large community, we should be prepared of having, of receiving silly questions such as the one that Alan mentioned earlier, which is, does the ALAC have calls between ICANN meetings? And this sort of stuff.

That would make the Board member asking that question particularly silly, and that would not be that productive for us.

I don't have an exact answer on this one. I'll ask Alan and then I've got another suggestion, maybe on this that we could think about. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. First of all, on the compensation issue, if it were to be brought up, it wouldn't be a discussion of Board compensation, but in light of the Board compensation, the issue of volunteer benefits, or whatever, has been brought up, and that's the tone that I would suggest, you know. So the statement that I submitted starts off saying, "I support Board compensation." I think the levels talking about are reasonable.

And by the way, the current level is currently 35 or 40,000 per director, and 75 for the chair, not 25. And currently the only director who does not accept that money is Bruce Tonkin. Every other Board member accepts it, according to the ICANN website. If are to have the Board ask questions of us, then I believe, again, like they have wanted in the reverse, we need to have those ahead of time, so we can orchestrate how they get answered.

Otherwise we'll just have, you know, one person doing all the talking, and other people perhaps disagreeing with them. There were no questions this last time or two because the Board explicitly said, "We're not here to ask questions, we're here to hear what you think." So it's not an accident that they didn't have any questions, it was a deliberate policy. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. In light of the fact that the Board has this ability to answer questions that we don't ask, and not answer the questions that we ask, I would be very concerned about asking a question with regards to the treatment of volunteers, in light of the Board compensation. [CROSSTALK] ...they'll then launch into a Board compensation thing, by telling us how they don't, yeah go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I accepted the decision not to bring that one up. I was just clarifying what I had suggested, but it's dead. Let's not waste any more time talking about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to suggest the following. We've got five thematic working groups: the future of multistakeholderism, the globalization of ICANN, the global Internet from the user perspective, ICANN transparency and accountability, and At Large community engagement in ICANN. I wonder whether we could ask the Board about their view on these themes. And because this is really is... That is something that is an ATLAS II activity, and our working groups are core to the At Large summit.

So having the point of view from the Board on this before the working groups drafting their final statement on these things, might be interesting because it might well be that our ALSs raise some questions

as to what the Board thinks when they discuss these topics on Saturday and on Sunday. Any thoughts on that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Tijani. Okay thanks. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, for the theme of ICANN accountability, you will ask the Board about their point of view, but they were talking about that since now three months. So what they can say more than they said before? I am afraid it will be, I don't know. If we have a specific theme, but all of those themes are for the whole ICANN, and I don't know. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. Heidi has suggested some text. What are the views of the Board on the topics of the five thematic groups of the ATLAS II? I'm left wanting more than that. I think, I mean, that doesn't go deeply enough into asking specific questions on it. Maybe we could concentrate on one or the other thematic groups?

The future of multistakeholderism is a very open thing, and I'm not sure, we really wish, are interested in the ICANN view on this, or the Board member's point of view. The globalization of ICANN is obviously a hot topic. The global Internet, the user perspective. ICANN transparency

and accountability, well that's another topic which is being treated elsewhere. What we've got here, the global, and I'm just, by the way, for the record and for your thought, I'm reading through these and thinking as I go along, brainstorming at the moment.

So tell me if I'm completely off the track. What about the global Internet, the user perspective, what do they think is the user perspective is the global Internet, and specifically in ICANN? What are the user's place in ICANN? And then At Large community engagement in ICANN, what does the Board recommend for At Large community engagement in ICANN? And that's how it works with what Evan was mentioning earlier in finding, you know, let the Board specifically ask what questions they would want to know about At Large community engagement.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, sorry. Could you repeat that then?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I'm putting on the table at the moment, Heidi, you want to discuss. So prior to repeating this, accepting that nobody heard me.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, we heard you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we note here, Heidi says TG1 and TG3 are the clear favorites, but I just mentioned, TG1 and, well the future of multistakeholderism, I don't think we have any interest in discussing this with the Board. I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think we have. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. I think that you raised a good point. Perhaps you can ask the Board about their views about the contribution of the At Large community in the globalization effort, and the globalization operation that is taken place now of ICANN in general, and IANA in particular. So since we know that they think we don't have a lot of [?] in this operation, I think it is good to raise the point so that they give us their point of view explicitly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Tijani. The only concern I have with the topic of the globalization of ICANN, is that at the moment, it says yet undefined, and we've heard that the IANA transition is one thing on the one hand, and the accountability and transparency is something which is also being folded into this, and so it's a bit of a mess at the moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, when I speak about globalization, I'm speaking about the sum of IANA position, and the accountability of ICANN. This is at the end, this is the globalization effort. This is the whole globalization operation. And if you want to phrase it, it's good, but try to make ICANN people, Board

people to tell us clearly how do they think the At Large community can contribute in this operation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Tijani. What do others think about this? I know people saying, I see Alan saying, “We’ll give them enough rope to hang themselves or to hang up.” I’m not sure, that’s more on the involvement of users in At Large in ICANN. Okay. What lessons can ICANN learn? Here is one from Evan. Evan, you may speak please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Simply that, you know, maybe what we have to do is perhaps just go back to the original model, and here’s some questions for them, and so on. And if we’re going to do that, and this is the one that I come up with, and that is asking what lessons can ICANN learn from the NetMundial meeting, which it was a big participant. NetMundial had some very interesting outcomes, but even more interesting where the processes which it did.

Which was a very different approach to multistakeholderism from the traditional one used by ICANN. So the way that business, governments, civil society, and so on, participated in NetMundial, it’s a very different model. And I’m wondering if there is any lessons that ICANN can learn from this, and if they’re even thinking about it, in terms of different ways to engage in governments, different ways to head off multilateralism and that kind of thing.

So that was just, you know, if this brainstorming doesn't work out and we're still back to having to give them questions, this was my suggestion for one. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Evan. That's a good point. Any other thoughts on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Olivier, this is Heidi. What about Evan's suggestion? Should we use that one?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I'm just wondering at the moment, and it looks like... Does anyone have any objection on this, this one? Evan, I think I like that. I mean, definitely focuses a lot more on what we're doing in our thematic groups, that is a specific topic, topical question on this, and perhaps that could be one possible question. I think that's a good one.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's one that could go into a broader discussion, but it's sufficiently specific, so it's not totally mushy that can be answered with some kind of canned answer that they give to everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, yeah, definitely, and yeah. So okay, unless anybody objects to this, I think we can have this question. I see Tijani Ben Jemaa having put his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Tijani speaking. I am not objecting, but I'd like to say that we don't have to tie ourselves in speaking about the process of multistakeholder and the NetMundial versus the one in ICANN, because NetMundial, it is very different because it wasn't about policy development, it was about discussion. It was more a forum, more a discussion forum.

So the multistakeholder model, used there, it is not the same. We are not doing the same things, so it is normal that is not the same. So if we tie ourselves in this issue of process, perhaps we will be mistaken. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Tijani. And I think we are already coming into the discussion of what discussion could take place when we meet with the Board. Because that's a very valid point that you've made, and these are two different levels. I'm starting to like this very much. I think we can move forward with this one, because I can certainly see there would be much discussion on this, and of course, it's a hot topic at ICANN at the moment with the testing out of the Thursday sessions, where we're going to be seeing this testing of things, topical based discussions.

And I hear that they also want to have some local hubs around the world, etc. And I, you know, one of the discussions that I've recently had with David Olive was expressing my concerns about the fact that we're dealing with this topic forum type thing, which is more discussing issues locally like that, and we're doing away with this deep working groups, the people that actually draft documents.

We're not getting enough support to those people who draft the documents, and it seems to be just skimming the issues and saying, they're making public declarations at a microphone and putting more emphasis on that. So, certainly that comes really into the same sort of questions that Evan has raised on this. Heidi, you wanted to say something.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, I have, this is Heidi for the record. I have a suggestion and a question. My suggestion is, rather than what can ICANN, what lesson can ICANN learn, did you want that to be, what lessons... Or has the ICANN Board? Because I mean, the At Large community is part of ICANN. And then the question is, what, in the second sentence, falls into the result as the process one that applied, what does one refer to?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, the process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

The process, yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Heidi, no I disagree. I want to keep it open to ICANN, because ICANN is not the Board. ICANN does not equal the Board, it equals the community. And if this is a matter of the Board saying we need to engage the community, there is a different way to look at things, or whatever direction this goes in, know this is a question to the ICANN Board, suggesting that it may have a leadership role to play, in – because ICANN Board members attended a greater proportion of the ICANN Board, attended the NetMundial, then a proportion of At Large, or the proportion of the business community, etc. etc.

So, the Board was there, it was participating, it was learning. And so this is not a question just of the ICANN Board. This is a question of, have any lessons been learned that can be used by ICANN?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I just want to make clear, this is Heidi. I just wanted to make clear that that was the intent. So I'm just putting this slightly different... What about that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, just what lessons can ICANN learn from the NetMundial meeting, the results as well as the process? One that applied a very different model to MSM?

ALAN GREENBERG: So it's just making it one sentence.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What a big change Heidi, I'm not sure I can agree with that.

[CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: I like that comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I like having a question mark there, and I'm not sure I can agree with this. But okay, in the interest of time, I'll agree with it. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, it is an old hand. Excuse me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Okay, well that's taken us half an hour to come up with one question. And we're now into the two hour mark for this call.

I think this is a good one. The other one, Evan, I understand you'd like the Board to say more or to ask questions to us.

I'll tell you one thing that we can do, because we need, I think, two topics for a meeting with the Board is plenty, rather than shifting to a number of sterile politics. This one should be, I think, a good topic because we would be able to not only hear from the Board on this, and the Board members on this, but also certainly make the point that Tijani has made earlier, with regards to the difference, to the difference in the way things work, to the fact that the working group model that we had at ICANN is something which is better suited in the long term and in making policy, this sort of stuff.

So that is definitely one thing. The second part, the second topic I think that we might wish to do is to think of a way to bring the Board to say, look, we have 160 At Large structures in front of me here, what question would you like to ask those 160 At Large structures? And we could prepare, and that could just be a small thing, prepare an answer to you during, on that, during our meeting with the Board. It's not every day that the Board has those 160 At Large structures that are going to be sitting in front of them.

And it's not every day that we'll be able to spend maybe 10 minutes, brainstorming with At Large structures, and perhaps we can ask each one of the working groups, to brainstorm for 10 minutes, to bring their input into the answer of At Large, to the Board when we meet them on Tuesday. I see agreement from Evan. Tijani, is this still an old hand or a new one?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I cannot lower my hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. All right. Heidi, you have your hand up. And you might be muted.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I am indeed. Thank you. This is Heidi for the record. Could you please repeat that last open-ended question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Heidi, it's Olivier speaking. The last open ended question was, what.... How should we word this? Having 160 At Large structures in front of you, what question would you like to ask At Large structures?

HEIDI ULLRICH: About what in particular?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: About anything.

HEIDI ULLRICH: About what questions then?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. What questions would you like to ask At Large structures? And they should give us their questions and we can give the At Large structures to work on them for 10 minutes in their thematic groups, so they'll be in smaller [?], come up with, you know, a few lines of what they would think the answer, and then we can have those answers presented and have a little dialogue taking place in the meeting with the Board on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. This is Heidi. So just to clarify, you would like the Board to ask them the questions prior to the actual meeting on Tuesday?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh yes, so we can prepare for them. We need that now. How does that sound to everyone?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Clear green ticks from Evan, clear grants from everyone else on the call. So I take this as a [laughs]... Fair enough. Well, we've gone through this. Anything else that we need to look at now? I think we're all getting a bit tired on this one. The global stakeholder engagement questions. I think that one big question that we had for Sally Costerton, was the concept of crowd sourcing. We made a very strong statement

regarding this crowd sourcing, and we've actually responded to this stakeholder engagement panel, which had been formed.

And yet, the concept of crowd sourcing still came out, and I think it would be important to be discussing this with Sally, and to make the difference, really explain the difference between having a website where anybody and everybody can comment on anything happening at ICANN, and having a working group that is being put into the GNSO, that basically prepares a document that will end up as being policy that will affect 2.6 billion Internet users worldwide.

I have a concern there a lack of understanding with this, still a lack of understanding of this at a certain level. And this is why crowd sourcing comes out, and this is why suddenly there is an enormous excitement about the NetMundial meeting, and the format of the NetMundial meeting, and yet I'm not sure this is a sustainable, long-term solution. And here was a question from Evan Leibovitch, which I believe by shouted by Evan in the room since it's [?]. But maybe we'll refrain from this, and I'm sure we can work this one out, this one before the summit takes place.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Actually, I'm really, really, really upset about this. The ICANN webpage is talking about the fellowship round for LA, and it doesn't have space for the bloody summit. I'm sorry...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Evan? Sorry. Just so you know that it is in process and just stay tuned. There is going to be a blog post by Olivier with the welcome message. It's just literally being cleared right now.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually the blog post just showed up, it's now there on the page. But this should be in the headline at the top. I'm sorry Heidi, this really...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, let me just take a look. That's where I thought it was going to be.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's under blog post, it's in the middle of the right hand column.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Let me just take a look at that. Yeah, I'm going to try and get it up on there in the headline. Not particularly good, but definitely there should be something up there, I agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you just replace the whole front page with a big picture of me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's what I wanted.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

But Heidi, I got tell you, and this is the reason why I would frame it as a question to Sally. This shouldn't have to be our initiative, it shouldn't have to be that ICANN, as an organization, has spent a lot of money, a lot of person hours on a lot of effort. It has clearly gone through the entire range of the organization to get approval to have this happen.

And it really, I'm really upset that you have to drive that within your superiors to actually make this happen, why it wasn't considered to be something that should just organically happen.

I think I'm more disappointed in that then at these remedial steps that are being taken. I mean, yeah it's going to be there, and yes it's going to happen. I guess I'm really disappointed as a matter of corporate culture, that we actually have to remind ICANN that it should be doing this, as opposed... And even so, it's in the form of a blog post.

This is something that the organization should be shouting to the world, that this is an outreach issue, this is a global engagement issue. This isn't something from At Large yelling from the bottom, "Hey, look at us." This is something that ICANN should be saying as a source of pride. And I guess I'm really upset that Sally and the senior staff haven't taken this as their own initiative.

And to me, it says more about the upper staff than it does about us, and I guess I'm just, you know, my yelling, I think, is just an expression of that frustration more than anything. Thanks.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I think we can make it happen. I don't know if it will be an issue by the time we're all in London.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Thank you for this Evan. So, I think we've got our two topics. And for the record, the second topic is not asking about the ICANN website, but it's to do with the global stakeholder engagement and the question of crowd sourcing versus the question of working groups.

I think that will be a topic that we would want to discuss with [?]. Do you need any further information on this Heidi, or are you...?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. This is Heidi for the record. Just, no not for the time being. Sally normally brings her entire team there, so maybe it will be good to listen to Jean-Jacques a little bit, as he's new. The summit and ICANN 50 is in London, that's his territory. Maybe a little bit about the plans are for the IGF, for Nigel. He's in his new position. So I think it will be a good chance just to let them have an open discussion as well, since it normally is a very tight discussion, limited on time.

And this time we're going to have a full hour, so I think it will be good to have some open discussions with everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent. Thanks very much. So, we're now two hours and 10 minutes into this call. I realize we're all getting a bit tired and so, oh I

see another last question. What is the future of One Net? That's a good point also. Maybe we could ask.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I'm happy to put that in there. I think Theresa is leading that, but that team should be able to answer that as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is Theresa going to be meeting us or not?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Not unless you want her to, but no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. I don't think we have enough time for...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well the only, this is Heidi. The only time, as we discussed earlier today Olivier, was that hot topic ICANN accountability and transparency, because she's leading that, and you had said you didn't want outside speakers to come to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. We have a hot topic on accountability and transparency, I thought that we would be discussing with each other. And the concern I have with having someone coming from staff or from the Board to talk to us about accountability and transparency is that we're going to spend, it's only a half an hour hot topic, and we're going to spend 20

minutes with the presentation or with the, you know, the point of view of, what is ICANN doing about accountability and transparency?

And we will not have enough time to discuss the matter with ourselves. There is going to be plenty of time to interact with the Board, interact with staff, interact with everyone. On the, in the public day on accountability and transparency on the Thursday. I wanted to use the full half an hour, when we meet with each other face to face, to design a response or a line that we're going to hold regarding this, regarding this topic.

And so therefore, not need to [?]. Okay. I see no one else put their hand up, apart from Tijani who has got now both his hand up, stuck up in the air, and the green tick also start. Dev Anand Teelucksingh has the floor and then we'll probably close the call off after that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. Just wanted to raise something under any other business regarding the CROPP RT meeting. I think we should have the call sometime next week. I know Tijani has said that he will be unavailable until June 7th, however, I'm just looking at the number of changes, and also looking at if you want to get events filed for CROPP in July, I am thinking, I don't think we should meet beyond June 7th.

But I just wanted to throw this out there, if you have any thoughts or comments on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Dev. Thank you for digging this up, very good point indeed. And for those of you who are not aware, so the CROPP has been extended, with some significant changes and amendments, so that the team would need to meet up if it was going to start processing CROPP requests for July, and as you note, eight weeks I think to approve those requests from a [?].

So Tijani, it's good you're on the call. Would you mind if we had actually that call? And perhaps you can listen to the recording of the call upon the return from your travels, because I think a lot of the discussion will take place in explaining what will happen. Okay, that's appreciated then. Okay, thanks Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sure. But Olivier, I would like to say there is not a lot of change. There is a change of the procedure, perhaps of the documents are all on the wiki, but there is not a big change in the process and the conditions also. Only the visa will be paid and that's all, and perhaps sometime you can have an event not exactly in your region. It is to be discussed afterwards. So this is the only change in the program. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Tijani. Dev, your hand is up. And you might be muted.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: You're right. Thank you. This is Dev speaking, I was muted. The other question, of course, is do we also, well, does the CROPP RT have to ask

again where the members have to stand for the FY 15? Or anything like that? I mean, in terms of it now being FY 15.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, you sounded very mumbled the last few words you said.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'm sorry. So the question is, do we have to go into asking members whether they wish to stand, continue to stand for the CROPP RFT?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For another year, I would say yes, absolutely you would need to ask if they wish to continue. The other thing I would ask of you is to find out those members who might have not done anything at all during that year, and perhaps you can suggest the RALO of the member that has done nothing to suggest another member to replace that person.

Although, I think just from memory, that all of the members of the CROPP RT were active, but maybe they weren't. I don't know. I have checked that currently. Let's have a quick go through the list, and then I'm really concerned about the moment. Evan Leibovitch and then Tijani Ben Jemaa. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just a quick question about the timing. One of the problems with the timing about the previous year's CROPP thing was that things that happened in January and February could not be done because the

timing of when things are approved. Is the fact that things are now approved this early mean that we've got enough lead time to be able to do things in early 2015?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes, absolutely. And the reason why we're pushing for a call to take place right away is for the ability to process requests for early July, eight weeks is the barest minimum and so we're talking a matter of weeks. We might be able to squeeze things in for the 9th or 10th of July, and that's of course, for our region in the northern hemisphere, it's not that significant because there are very few events taking place in July and August.

But certainly for the southern hemisphere and for parts of Asia, it is a particularly busy time of year. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Olivier. I forgot what I wanted to say, it's important. So I skip, I will come back if I remember. Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani. Right. So the action item on this is to get the next CROPP up, and to also send a note to the CROPP mailing list, to ask for if any CROPP members would like to remain or to be swapped out or changed. Tijani, you have now remembered so you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, yes. It is about this action item. The mail shouldn't be sent to the actual CROPP review team members, but to the RALOs, since those review team members were appointed by their RALOs. So we have to ask the RALOs about the new composition of the review team. There are two members. Each RALO has to provide two members.

Also, I understood from Rob [?] that also the coordinators should be confirmed. So this is another point. This is something between the staff of the CROPP and the RALO, but for our review team, we need to ask the RALO to confirm or to change the representatives. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Tijani. So this action item needs to be amended to say, staff to setup the next CROPP call and send a note to the RALOs, for the RALO chairs and secretariats, to ask if any CROPP member would like to remain, or would need to, or could remain or be swapped out or changed.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, confirm their membership is the term that we normally use.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Okay. Let's get finished. I see Alan is getting tired and we are all getting tired. Any other other business? Seeing no other other business, I thank you all for having remained two hours and 20 minutes on this call. And we have an enormous number of calls tomorrow and for the rest of the week. Thanks to all of you for this. Thanks to staff. And this call is now adjourned. Good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]