

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Gisella. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the ALAC monthly conference call on Tuesday, the 22<sup>nd</sup> of July, 2014. The time is 15:04 UTC. And we'll start immediately, and I can see here on the agenda, first the adoption of the agenda and for any other business or amendments. We've got the link to the agenda that has been put, scroll back up on the Adobe Connect.

If there is any other business to add... It's long. It looks like two hour agenda. No one putting their hand up. The agenda is adopted. And we can now go over to the roll call and apologies. Gisella, you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very Olivier. This is Gisella. On today's call, on the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Sandra Hoferichter, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Beran Gillen, Leon Sanchez, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Otunte Otuneh, Allan Skuce, Yubelkys Montalvo, Garth Graham, Satish Babu, Loris Taylor, and Sebastien Bachollet.

On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambroner, Alberto Soto, Antonio Medina Gomez. Hadja Ouattara will be joining us in 15 minutes on the French channel. We also have Julie Hammer on today's call. Apologies noted from Ali AlMeshal.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Gisella Gruber. Our interpreters today on the French channel are Claire. On

---

*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.*

---

the Spanish channel we have Veronica and David. And on the Russian channel we have Galina and Ekaterina.

Could I please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels. And also to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

I hope I haven't left anyone off of the roll call. If I have, would you kindly say your name now. If not, back over to you Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Gisella. My name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and I would like to do two things. First, to welcome the new names that we've got on list of participants today. This is the ALAC monthly call where we conduct our monthly business and discussions in between all of our emails on the mailing list. And I hope that you will enjoy these two hours, it looks like it's going to be at least two hours long, so that's the first thing.

The second thing is to recognize that we now have Russian interpretation. And this is absolutely great to know because that just makes our conference calls more accessible to more parts of the world. I was also going to ask Gisella, is this the right time to announce perhaps the next call and the languages on the next call as well?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Olivier, yes, Gisella here. On the next call, we will be adding Chinese interpretation as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Gisella. So more parts of the world covered. I note that Tijani Ben Jemaa has put his hand up, so Tijani you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. It's just a point of order. I do wish and hope that this call will not last more than two hours. Two hours is already very long for the [inaudible] for the follow up for people following the [conference]. And if we want to be efficient and effective, we need to make our calls shorter. So today we have a two hour program. Please don't exceed two hours. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I think a lot of people will agree with you along this call. And we might have, in the future, to think about splitting this call, perhaps making a bi-monthly ALAC call, but we're not at this level yet. And let's find out how long this call lasts by going immediately into agenda item number three, the review of the ATLAS II action items, and that includes the ALT action items from Friday, the 27<sup>th</sup> of June, 2014, for the last call, the last face to face meeting.

That took place in London. I invite you all to click on the action items and you will see a whole page of them. We will just go through the ALAC related action items. And I'll be asking staff to follow up directly with each one of the RALOs, as far as the RALO action items are concerned.

---

So first on Monday the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June, there was an ALAC and Leadership Working Session. Two action items out of that. The first one is for At Large staff to follow up with ICANN security staff on the possibility of preparing a Beginner's Guide on Domain Name Security. Could I have an update from staff on this please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi everyone. Hi Olivier. This is Heidi for the record. That is being followed up with, in progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Then the next one is for SSAC to be given more than 30 minutes at the next ICANN meeting. That is, of course, in progress we have [bank on the side]. Can I just suggest that we mark this as being done, and for Heidi when building the next ICANN meeting agendas, to make sure that this is remembered? Otherwise we will have be having three months of repeating that action item. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, it has been marked as complete. This is Heidi for the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Now next, the discussion with the communications team. I'm going to look to the action items that were completed as well, just so that we have a record of them. And there, staff was to ensure that Christ Gift has all of the previous At Large community survey work on

---

the At Large website. Indeed, Ariel Liang has been in touch with Chris Gift, and the recordings have been found.

So now we've got a lot of recordings and inputs for the At Large website. Could I just ask from staff a quick update? Is the work starting now on the At Large website? What's the progress on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, this is Heidi for the record. Staff, At Large staff have been touch with the web admin and IT staff on this. So it's going to have happening a little bit internally at first, and then we'll, as soon as possible, start moving forward with this and getting the appropriate working groups involved on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much for this Heidi. Next is the, so on Tuesday there was a General Assembly with NARALO and EURALO. ALAC staff to deal directly with the RALOs on these. Then we had ALAC work part one, hot topic #2, ICANN accountability and globalization. Alan? Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, on the NARALO, one of the ExCom, that item was unchecked because it had not, in fact, been done. It would be nice if it would continue to be unchecked.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       Okay. Thank you Alan for this. I don't know how that was checked. Could you just follow up directly with staff on that?

ALAN GREENBERG:                I have, I'm just pointing out that it was rechecked again for some reason.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       Okay. All right. Thanks. Let's move on then. ALAC work part one, ICANN accountability and globalization. And so the first one was for Holly Raiche, Alan Greenberg, and Chester Soong, and the ATLAS II thematic group #4 to draft an ALAC statement on enhancing ICANN accountability public comment. That is marked as done.

At Large staff to work with global stakeholder engagement staff to ensure collaboration and information exchange on At Large and global stakeholder engagement activity. That's done as well. The global engagement team with web admin staff to look into the page which seems to have a redirect loop and cannot resolve. The link of the page is there.

The feedback on that is that this is an old page, the global partnerships, those [inaudible] anymore, so that can be ticked as being done. At large to make a request to relevant GSE staff that the NextGen program should be expanded to other regions. Now, it doesn't actually specify who in At Large should make the request, and I was just going to ask whether it was the thought that I would need to email global stakeholder engagement staff, or should we get At Large staff to pass

---

this request on via their own channels regarding the NextGen program.  
Heidi, you've raised your hand, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Olivier. This is Heidi. I have been in contact with Mandy about this, who knows most things about GSE, all things about GSE. And this program is actually continuing and the way it's set up right now, that it's a rotating program. So for example, in the LA meeting coming up in October, they're already in touch with local universities to have that program here.

So again, if the request is for this program to be geographically diverse for every meeting, i.e. meaning that it would be AFRALO, African, European, etc. for each group, for each meeting, that would add significant cost. So I'm not quite clear on what expansion means. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thank you for this extension. Olivier speaking. Extension effectively means that the NextGen program would also take place in the other region. So I think you pretty much answered the question here by saying that in Los Angeles, the NextGen program will continue with local universities around Los Angeles. I think that was the jist of the comments here.

The other thought, of course, is to do with the Fellowship program and ask that the Fellowship program has expanded to all of the regions. The ALAC has made a statement in the past to include communities, or

---

indigenous communities, not necessarily in developing countries. But I think that somehow a parallel process, and I don't know what the status with regards to that as well. Although that we have shown, through our mentoring program, that indigenous communities were represented and also developed communities as well.

So I think that there, this could also probably be marked as being done. Any comments from anyone on this AI? No. Okay. Let's move then. Finally, ask that the Speaker's Bureau list of potential speakers be expanded to include a database of well-known and vetted community experts, that would be able to address communities in their local language, or local cultures, or by topics, rather than having it restricted currently to only staff and Board speakers.

I've heard mixed answers to this. I think Tijani has advised me that the Speaker's Bureau has actually included him as a potential speaker for some activities that took place in Africa. Tijani, could you expand on this please? Hello?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. Yes, Olivier. At the request of the organizers of some events, the Speaker's Bureau appointed me, I have handed my travel to those places where I was there to represent... [Inaudible] ...about when [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much Tijani.



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, we can hear you. Perhaps we can, could staff just please clarify this and make sure that this was just not just an one-off, but is actually a standing thing now where local communities could ask for a speaker from their immediate vicinity, or from their area, or someone that speaks their language. [Inaudible] with that Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, this is Heidi. Are you speaking again, this is for the Speaker's Bureau?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Correct.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, no, I would need to look into that. I'm not managing that, so I'm happy to send an email to the relevant staff person on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you. Now is the ALAC work part two. And we have a proposal to make the Academy Working Group, motion passed, no opposition. This has ended up on the action items. I think that because there is a follow up to this, and I was going to ask Sandra Hoferichter, who is on the call, to let us know about the follow that is required. Now, after this motion was passed, when we met in London, Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfectly well Sandra. You have the floor.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hello? Okay. Thank you very much. I would very much report the transition from an ad hoc working group to a standing working group. We should ensure that it is a cross-community working group because I think the strength of this working group came because it was not only from the At Large, but also from the community. So any development in this regard will have my full support.

There has not been other follow up on this issue, because I know Heidi, who was assisting in this matter, was on vacation, and I was swamped with other work as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this update Sandra. Now, perhaps can we then modify this action item and clarify it by basically making the request this working group should be changed from an ad hoc working group to a standing, At Large working group. So you mentioned also the community aspect, since we have other people that have joined, that are [inaudible] or not immediately with our community.

---

Could I ask you to follow up with Heidi and then make a proposal for the next ALAC call for the ALAC to be able to change that working group into a standing working group? And not only that, bearing in mind that the community aspect to it.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sandra Hoferichter speaking. Yes I will be happy to do so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent. So let's put this on the side now. Let's move on. The At Large Capacity Building Working Group. At Large staff to collect the data regarding the pre-ATLAS II capacity building webinars. And At Large staff to also ask IT to check the number of downloads of the pre-ATLAS II capacity building webinars. Certainly these webinars have been a real success by these contents and their helpfulness, but we need to be able to follow up and make sure that they're stored somewhere, that they can be easily found by newcomers and by our community, to be able to bank on those effectively. Heidi, could I have an update on this please?

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Gisella?

---

GISELLA GRUBER: I got [CROSSTALK] sorry. Sorry, I just had a moment where the audio [inaudible]. But I think it's with regards to the capacity building webinars, the download of the MP3s, I'm just waiting for the IT or web admin to get back to me with regards to the number of clicks that the audio received post webinar. And I will send an email around with the attendance. And I know Tijani is waiting for that.

I'm just desperately looking for it in my Inbox. And I will get back out to everyone after I've consulted with Tijani, just to put the data together. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this update Gisella. And over to Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: ...for the previous items [inaudible]... ALAC will change the notion of the...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, I'm sorry to interrupt you. We can't hear you very well at all. Could you speak closer to the mic perhaps?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry, you're right. Now you will hear me well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well, yes. Go ahead please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So, I said that I went into the ICANN Academy. You said that ALAC wants to change the nature of this working group. I don't think ALAC has the ability to do so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we might have lost Tijani. So, in his absence, I can't hear Tijani at the moment. I don't know whether anybody else can, but the Academy working group, the start of it, was an At Large, ad hoc working group. We're just dealing with the At Large part of the working group. Of course, the wider working group is where there is a bit of a complicated story since it's not a cross-community working group as such, and this is why I asked Sandra to follow up directly with staff on this.

And then they'll be able to make a proposal for the next call, bearing in mind the various facets to this working group. Okay. Next, I see, can't hear Tijani, so next is Fatima Cambronerero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can indeed, go ahead please.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much. This is Fatima speaking for the record. I just wanted to ask a question that perhaps we can take to the capacity

---

---

building group, but I raise this question so that we can have it open. Seeing that the previous webinars before the ATLAS meeting in London, these work properly, and there were a lot of people involved in and participating in it, my question is, if we can organize, if we can have one webinar a month considering the issues that we saw in ATLAS, that we saw there were a lot more interesting for our community, or we believe we had to [deepen] more on these issues.

So I think we would have a very large audience attending those webinars because they are very much needed. And it is a time when all of the ALSs and all of the RALOs can interact and build community with these initiatives. So, I open this [facility]. I am also a member of the capacity building group, so perhaps we can discuss it there as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Fatima. And yes, the follow up work will have to be the work of the capacity building working group. I've heard many people in London saying that they would like to see more capacity building webinars taking place between ICANN meetings and certainly on a monthly basis, if not even on a weekly basis for some of them.

And I think the discussion will need to take place in the capacity building working group, and there certainly was support for having these regular webinars taking place. Perhaps a meeting, very soon, of the capacity building working group would be a good first step forward to be able to discuss this, and propose a schedule of capacity building webinars for

---

the community. Especially following up on our thematic working groups, etc.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you [CROSSTALK]... Do you hear me now? Okay. I have a problem with my Adobe Connect so I am speaking from the telephone. Regarding the capacity building program for the future, as I told you recently, since we finished the preparation of the ALS for the summit, now we will come back to our regular work. And one of the items, or one of the projects of the capacity building working group, is to do webinars, especially for the [measuring] issue for, especially for the transition, for the accountability, etc. etc.

Anything which is in discussion in ICANN, we will try to organize webinars for it so that people, our ALSs, will be aware and will be informed and it will be perhaps even more educated about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. And so will you take on the task to organize a call of the capacity working group very soon please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, sure. I can do that, Olivier. It will be very soon, very soon. Now, you know that if it is summer now... You know that it is summer now. It is Ramadan in our region, so it will be done most likely at the second half of August.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Tijani. You mean the meeting of the capacity building working groups will be in the second half of August?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'm not so sure that we can wait that long. The concern I have is that, of course, the lull in activity, which we have in the northern hemisphere is not such a lull of activity in the southern hemisphere. I'm a bit concerned that we will lose the interest of some of our members if capacity building webinars don't start as soon as possible. I thought perhaps capacity building webinars could start in September, but certainly the preparation work and the preparation of the actual schedule of webinars, could take place over the month of August.

I think you can start in the beginning of the month of August.



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Olivier, as I told you, the beginning of August will be the end of Ramadan, and the first, and the first in our region in general. My fear is that I am not able to work, my fear is that people will not be following our work. So I prefer that we finish this phase, and we start, it will be the first week will be what I said now, the end of Ramadan and the [inaudible].

And the second week we can start working along the second week. That's why I said the second half of August. And you said that it's a long time of inactivity, Olivier, I'm sorry but we were very active all the period before the summit, and from the summit until now, it's only how, from London to [inaudible], how long it is. It is not very long period of inactivity. Anyway.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for your feedback Tijani. I thought that because we had so much activity before the summit, we were now really ready to step up and have more activity. Okay, maybe I'm asking a bit too much. All right. Thanks for this update Tijani. Let's move on through our list of action items. So the next action is incorporation of the ATLAS II thematic working groups into the existing At Large working groups.

Three action items there which have actually changed a little bit, but I'll read through three and then add a little bit more information to them. The first one is for staff to send a reminder to all ATLAS II thematic groups to join an existing At Large working groups. The second one is for ATLAS II participants to have a discussion with the 2014 NomCom leadership.

---

And the third one is for At Large standing groups, based on the results of their analysis, with a message personalization needed for best results. A bit cryptic. There are actually two distinct action items. The first one is for the ATLAS II participants to have a discussion with the 2014 NomCom leadership. And I understand that this, as soon as the 2014 NomCom leadership, sorry. That's the current leadership. Was that not done already?

I thought that that was something that was done on that, though I will be happy to have the NomCom leadership on the call. But I ask Cheryl Langdon-Orr to please explain this one to us please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl for the record here. As far as I'm concerned, this has been done, perhaps there was more. But [inaudible] specifically report that [inaudible]... current [2014] NomCom as well. I thought it was...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. It's Olivier speaking. I recall that you were in the room and there was a discussion with the current leadership, and perhaps this should be the next leadership, the 2015 NomCom. Let's have this changed to 2015. So as soon as we know the next leadership, then there will be a call that will be set up.

Now with regards to the thematic working groups, and the standing At Large working groups, I have sent an email to all of the chairs of the thematic working groups, with a carbon copy to the rest of the leaders that have arranged for the working groups, and ask for them to fill a

---

matrix, an online matrix on a Google Doc to identify what, how relevant the work of their working group was to the At Large working groups, so as to then be able to send a more personalized invitations to participants, so we don't actually ask participants and say, well, now you can join At Large working groups.

You actually hold their hands and say the working groups which relate to the thematic working group that you have attended are primarily these ones, and you are encouraged to join them. So far, I haven't had any feedback, I've sent a follow up. So hopefully by the next call, we will have had all of the action items, actions ticked. And we would have sent out the invitation to participants to join the At Large working groups.

I've also asked for the At Large working group front pages to follow a specific format so as to make them more easily understandable by newcomers, and also I literally asked the chairs of the current At Large working groups to provide updates for those who haven't got an update on what their working group has been up to.

To provide an update on their working group's activity, or any newcomer to be able to find out what are the current hot topics in the working group. And hopefully, by the holding the hand of the participants and accompanying to the At Large working groups, we will have the growth in the working group participation, and therefore a growth in At Large activities.

Let's move to the Wednesday, the 25<sup>th</sup> of June. And there were several General Assemblies on that day. Staff will follow up directly with the

---

RALO leaderships on those. On the Thursday, the ALAC and regional leadership wrap-up meeting had one action item, and that was staff to incorporate the text from Thomas Lowenhaupt's submission to thematic group five, regarding end user organization involvement in city TLD applications, in a wiki page for At Large recommendations for the second round of new gTLDs.

Now, such a page already exists. And I'm putting the reference of this page onto the Adobe Connect chat. And Fatima, I will follow up with you regarding the document that I sent, we'll check afterwards. Now, the Adobe Connect chat has got the state of the gTLD expansion program. And on there, it says on the 19<sup>th</sup> of December 2013, the ALAC leadership team charged the ALAC new gTLD working group with creating a statement on the current status of the expansion program, including analysis of the program, and possibly recommending immediate measure to improve the program from the end user perspective.

That was a small thing that, it wasn't follow up as such, because I think this is more of a long term thing. We first need to find out how the gTLD expansion program has been rolled out, and until the announcement of a new round, or a future round, is effected, we don't really know what our timescale. It seems to me, with the new gTLD working group being in charge of that, looks like the natural home for any follow up ideas and topics that we need to start listing for the working group to be able to work on as soon as the process starts.

I know Alan Greenberg has got his hand up, so Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll just note that when I get to my GNSO liaison report, there is an item there that's relevant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Alan. Any other comments on this process forward? Seeing no one put their hand up, so I'll ask staff to remember that page and to make sure that whenever we have suggestions and follow ups on this topic, to fill it all up, fill that page up as time goes.

So when we finally get to moving on the next round of new gTLD preparations, new gTLD, yes, preparations, then we will at least have some material that we can work on. And I note that Dev has put that list as ramping up, because there is a call for volunteers for new gTLD group, and that what might be Alan will be speaking to us in a moment.

Now, back to the action items on Friday the 27<sup>th</sup> of June. An ATLAS II organizing committee call is to be organized in order to hold a de-brief on the organization of the ATLAS II and to develop best practices for future summits. As you've all heard, the ATLAS II was very well received across all of ICANN.

We had a lot of very positive feedback, and Fadi Chehadé in his meeting with the ALAC, thinks that this is something that should take place again, perhaps even in three years' time, which means we need to get working now, but it also means that in three years' time there might be a lot of new people involved in the organization of the ATLAS III, at that point.

---

So it will really helpful to have these [inaudible]... This call is moving forward and is going ahead. And Gisella has already made the Doodles, etc. to organize this. Gisella is to work with the ATLAS II return on investment working group in creating a survey on the ATLAS II to get feedback from summit participants on the various ATLAS II activities.

Feedback on the thematic groups, the mentoring program, the plenary, etc. etc. Gisella, how are we doing on this?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Olivier, Gisella here. This is in progress, working on it with Cheryl. I'll catch up with her this week because we need to now get the information from our meeting team. So we will keep you posted. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Gisella. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you Mr. Chair. This is Eduardo. I wanted to add to this action item, the recommendation that to have the ATLAS II ROI to open an action item, to be standing in the ALAC monthly meeting. So we can keep track of that work on our monthly meetings of ALAC. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Absolutely.

---

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm finished.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. I'm in agreement on that. Have we lost Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, I muted myself. Sorry. Okay. Yes, it happens in [inaudible], but there you go. Now next, At Large staff, in consultation with the ALT and ATLAS II organizing committee leaders, will organize a post-ATLAS II debrief community webinar. That's pretty much like the follow up. That's also in progress.

The next ALT At Large leadership team agenda is to include an item on ATLAS II feedback and debrief. Indeed, that took place, and this is where we are now pushing forward with this. I note that Leon has put his hand up. Leon, I'll hand the floor over to you. Leon Sanchez.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. I'm wondering, will there be some kind of mechanism for us to consider what Fadi told us about not waiting another five years to have another ATLAS? What do you think could be done to analyze whether we should wait another five years or maybe have an in between ATLAS like on the next two years or three years? That would be my question.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Leon. It's Olivier speaking. What I would suggest is that the follow up organizing committee call that follows up on this... I can't think of just something right now and then, but that's one of the things that the organizing committee will need to decide and work on. Perhaps contacting Fadi. Perhaps follow up, I wouldn't say a statement, but certainly a correspondence from the organizing committee, providing further details.

And I also think that the return on investment working group would, when it publishes its survey, would also be something that we need to follow to ICANN leadership, so as to show the, well hopefully, show the positive responses we've had so far. Let's have hope. Okay. Let's move.

The ALT is to discuss the issue of an ALAC liaison to the GAC. Yes, ALAC liaison to the GAC prior to the ICANN 51 meeting in Los Angeles. This is an action item. The ALT discussed it, and there is an item later on in this agenda, in the current call's agenda, very short item that is going to be discussed later on today.

And staff to send a call for membership of the IDN working group. That's still going to take place. It hasn't been affected yet, but I think that there will be a call for membership for all of the working groups, but in particular for the IDN working groups since we, if I could remind you all, we saw a lot of activity taking place in the various script, whether they were Cyrillic scripts, or Arabic scripts, or Chinese, or Korean.



---

And the many different scripts that are currently being worked on as far as internationalized domain name variance are concerned. And by the size of our community and the diversity of our community, we found that there were a lot of, we can't say that there were experts, but we had a lot of people using those scripts that could certainly provide the end user input and experience into the current process that the IDN working group is working on.

And that's all of the action items that we have. There were quite a few of them so they took a little more time than originally anticipated. And so we'll move directly now to the review of the current At Large structure applications. I'm not sure who deals with this now. There was a time when Nathalie was dealing with the applications, then Ariel as well, but neither are on the call.

So I'm not sure who, is it Gisella who will take us through those?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Olivier this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, hello Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, yes. Hi. So yes both of the staff that are doing the At Large structure are not on the call. There are, I've seen emails from Nathalie about following up with outstanding regional advice, so those are in progress.

---

And I know that the other ones that she is doing due diligence on, she is continuing to work with.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this update Heidi. What I was going to do then, just for the record, is to read through the current, well first welcome the recently certified ALSs. From ISOC Yemen, ISOC Portugal, ISOC Venezuela, and the Mantiboa E-Association. Great to see many new members and new structures joining At Large, and certainly reaching new places around the world.

Applications awaiting regional advice: The Open Source Foundation for Nigeria, the Internet Society Chad Chapter, the Internet Society Maruitius Chapter, the Online News Association. And then there applications that were pending at the moment. The Instiuto Panameño de Derecho y Nuevas Tecnologías, Our Rights, University Community Partnership for Social Action Research.

And if you are interested in seeing the application and certification process, there is a link on the agenda that will take you there. So we will have an update on the next call on all of these applications. Next, reports. And these are the At Large reports from the working groups, the reports from our RALOs, and liaisons, and also the ALAC monthly reports that we have.

We'll just through the RALO, sorry the RALO secretariat reports are all linked to the page which is shown on the agenda. And I must thank all of the RALOs for having a debated their secretariat report. It's so

---

helpful for newcomers to be able to find out what is taking place in their regional At Large organization and in their region.

Now with regards to the liaison reports, we don't go through all of the liaisons, we usually go through three bylaw mandated, actually the four bylaw mandated reports, liaison reports. And we'll start this time around with the GNSO liaison report, and our GNSO liaison in Alan Greenberg. So Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. But first my hand was up for item number four.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Go ahead then...

ALAN GREENBERG: We had some ALS de-certifications in process. Some of them were put on hold. Can we try to make sure that we have action items to follow up on those? Because they seem to otherwise disappear off of our radar completely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. And I think the ball is firmly in the staff's hands at the moment to follow up on that. And it's a very good point that you made because otherwise we will forget about them. I think they're primarily the NARALO applications...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: And I believe there was one other one, I can't remember if it was Europe or LACRALO, but there was one other one we put on hold.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know there was a Costa Rican one, but...

ALAN GREENBERG: That may have been the one. I don't remember.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So the Costa Rican one, as far as I understand, LACRALO leadership has gotten in touch with that Costa Rican organization, and has managed to find a new person to deal with in that organization. So it looks as though that is still an At Large structure and is not being delisted. Alberto Soto, you have the floor to comment on this please.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. That's right Olivier. The ALS from Costa Rica was removed. I don't know whether it was before London. It was not decertified, we have a new representative. We did have a minute problem with emails, but I am still in contact with that and this ALS is active.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much for this Alberto. It's Olivier speaking. And it's appreciated that you went the extra mile to contact this

---

organization as a last, last issue before proceeding forward. And I really appreciate the care in which the RALOs have gone out of their way to try and find out what has taken place with the missing ALSs as such.

So, staff could you please just take an action item, or make note of all the persons dealing with those certifications and decertification to follow up on the two or three, I think they were the NARALO decertification, which need to also be affected one way or the other. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I forgot to take myself off of mute. Just looking at this page here, is there a second page [inaudible]... report working group RALOs liaison? Because unless there is, [inaudible] this particular page is not the one that is copied from where the [inaudible] working groups have been putting their actual monthly report, for example the [inaudible] page, which I know is retired, still has its subsection of metrics [inaudible], and that's now what you're seeing here, unless my eyes are [inaudible]... Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Cheryl. I'm unable to answer you, so I'll have to resort to staff to let us know, because they are the ones who have organized this whole thing...

HEIDI ULLRICH: And hi. This is Heidi. I think we need to get back to you as well. Thank you Cheryl for pointing this out. We will investigate that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for that. Now...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to help.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. So going back on, well we're already back in our agenda item number four, number five, sorry, the report. Over to Alan Greenberg for the GNSO liaison.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We're a bit early this month, there is a meeting on Thursday. But the meeting last month did have a number of items that I've highlighted for ALAC attention. And for those who don't look at my GNSO reports regularly, if you go to them, they're at the top is highlighted in red, and often bold, items that need review.

So if you look at that, you don't even have to read the whole thing. If you want to look for the issues that are really important and urgent for ALAC's consideration, ALAC At Large. There are four items this time, unusually. The first that the GNSO has started a discussion group on, and note the word, it's not a PDP, it's a discussion group, on trying to identify what the issues are that will need focus on any future review and probably a PDP of the gTLD program through a second round.

---

So this is the first go around in trying to identify issues, while things are still fresh in people's minds. I would strongly suggest that At Large people who have an interest in this subject get involved. The second is the one on the, which Olivier already mentioned, that the GAC has approved on a year basis, on a liaison from the GNSO. This is to try to address the lack of information flow between the two, and to try to get the GAC more involved in PDP and policy development processes, as we go forward.

There is currently a call out for the liaison and that one is expected to be filled prior to the Los Angeles meeting. We can talk further about the implications for that in ALAC when it comes up in our agenda later on. Based on the letter from the gTLD policy committee, the GNSO is looking at specific issues related to Red Cross and IGO name protection.

There has been a lot of discussion, and controversy, over exactly what the GAC, what the Board committee asked for, because the interpretation of some people on the GNSO has been quite different from what, in my mind, the wording clearly asks for. That will be discussed at this week's meeting, and Chris [inaudible] has been asked to participate to try to ensure that we are addressing the correct issue, and not complete red herrings.

It is not at all clear that there is a rule in place that allows the GNSO to reopen a PDP for measures that have not yet been approved by the Board, and that is being considered because it is not clear that this will be done, because there is some disagreement on Counsel. And of course, if it is done, it's not clear what the reconvened committee will decide. That notwithstanding in the communique out of the London

---

meeting, the GAC very, very clearly, and quite concisely said, the Red Cross decision should not be subjected to or conditioned upon a policy development process, which basically says GNSO, you're not allowed to follow the request of the Board committee.

So that too has some interesting implications. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Alan. Are there any questions or comments on Alan's report? Seeing no one put their hands up, I'll just remind everyone then to be making sure we look very closely at the GNSO working groups that require At Large involvement, and we will resort to Alan to let us know, with time, if there is any requirement for having more people from our community on the working groups. There are quite difficult working groups sometimes, as you can see from Alan's report, lots of acronyms, lots of long historical discussions that have taken place, lots of follow ups.

It's good to be able to cover for each other. And I hereby also recognize many, sorry not many, but some of our members being on GNSO working groups, spending their days and their nights on [inaudible]. Now, the next report from our ccNSO liaison. And I will therefore ask for Maureen Hilyard if she is on the call? Is she there? Yes she is. Maureen Hilyard, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Olivier. Maureen for the record. Okay, briefly, firstly the ccNSO, like the ALAC, were quite preoccupied during most of the



---

[inaudible] information of the coordination group, coordinating group for the IANA issues. And during this, after the last meeting, Keith Davidson, who was one of the representatives on that group, said that, you know, some information about that meeting.

And he attended remotely, he couldn't get to the meeting himself. But important, I think, to the ALAC was the first meeting of our London week, which was the ALAC ccNSO meeting. The leadership meeting. And out of that meeting came an action item, which will have this [inaudible] and I working on a database linking our ALSs for their ccTLDs. And we're working on a select program where we can encourage our ALSs to liaise and learn a little bit more about what their ccTLDs are doing in their countries, if they don't already know.

Yes, so that's about it. If there are any questions. I didn't have the ccNSO Council meeting. Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Maureen. Are there any questions or comments regarding the country code name supporting organization activities? Now is the time to ask. There isn't hand up, so let's then move on to the SSAC liaison report, the security and stability advisory committee. And for this report we have Julie Hammer.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Olivier. Julie Hammer speaking. Just a couple of things to mention. One of the working groups that the SSAC had, which I was a member, called the identifier [inaudible] metrics work party, has

---

actually determined that the work that it has been looking at is not going to resolve in a SSAC report. And that work party has been deactivated.

The original scope which envisioned making a [inaudible] statement from abuse metrics has in fact been somewhat too difficult to achieve, and so that work part has now, I'm saying deactivated because it has something useful to find in the future, then it may well be reactivated.

The primary focus of the SSAC, like everybody else, has been on the IANA transition. And effective working on three reports that it is trying to publish as soon as possible. Two of them are trying to put in place background information that will assist the work parties or the coordination group and the cross-community working groups working on IANA transition.

One thing, a description of IANA transition, my apologies. A description of IANA functions and the discussion of the technical functions from a contractual perspective, and the third document is aiming to make statements about principles for transition and highlight from the [inaudible] considerations. I'm not on that work party, but there has been an enormous amount of work going on for many weeks now.

And hopefully that will be, those documents will be published in good time for them to be useful for the process. The IANA coordination group as it's now called, had its meeting in London last week, as you are well aware. And we in fact have representatives on that, Patrik Fältström and [inaudible].

---

I know there were both there, but whether they were there in person or not, or attending remotely, I'm not really sure. And finally, as you're also aware, the SSAC rep on the charter drafting team for the cross-community working group for the IANA transition that is being facilitated by the GNSO and the ccNSO currently with representation from ALAC and SSAC. And I will leave it to the ALAC reps to give an update on that, that's Tijani and Leon.

So that concludes my report. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this Julie. Are there any questions or comment from anyone on the call regarding the SSAC liaison report? Seeing no one put their hand up, then our last bylaw mandated liaison is the dot Mobi liaison, that's Murray McKercher. I spoke to Murray before this call, there hasn't been any additional activity with regards to dot Mobi.

Dot Mobi has a policy board that includes Murray on this, sort of, dot Mobi liaison on this board. They had one meeting that took place a few months ago, nothing since. Murray, although having tried to find, to meet with the people from dot Mobi in London, they have not found anyone specifically to dot Mobi itself.

So there is nothing new to report on that. Since time is of the essence and we are already late due to the mount of activity and number of action items we've had, let's move to the new business and the items for decision. And we will review the recently adopted ALAC statements,

---

and then look at the current statements or endorsements developed by the ALAC.

There were three recently adopted statements. There was one on Board member compensation, which was in support of Alan Greenberg's earlier statement in that public comment process, that effectively ask for volunteers to be treated well, I think that's [if in a jiffy] just one way to say it. There has been no feedback on this. This is a public comment process, so we don't expect a lot of feedback on that.

There was one statement on the ICANN draft five year strategic plan. That was drafted by Tijani, sorry, by Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Rafid Fatani. And this spoke about various points including the lack of translated version of the document. And certain focus areas which needed to be reinforced or clarified.

And then there was on the FY 15, the fiscal year 15 operating plan and budget. This was one was drafted by Tijani and that was passed as well. And that touched on several points with regards to ICANN finances. And that, of course, has gone with the help of the At Large finance and budget subcommittee.

Now the four statements that are currently developed are as follows. There is the universal acceptance of top level domains draft roadmap. The ALAC is currently voting on this statement. It was drafted by Satish Babu. It's great to see more people now starting to pick up the pen and take on the responsibility of collecting input from the At Large community, putting it down on paper, supporting that second version of it after having put it in the public comments from the community.

---

There is a report, a statement on the report supporting the domain name industry in underserved regions. And here, Tijani Ben Jemaa and Alan Greenberg have drafted a statement. And this is currently under comment from At Large. The closing date for this comment period is very short because we cannot lift the vote on this one, unfortunately, by some technical error.

ICANN moved from one website to another website, and Ariel was monitoring the older website page and the comment did not appear on the older website page, or the other public comments periods appeared on this. This one did not and was only updated on the new one, so we missed the boat on it. However, after speaking to the staff member in charge of this process, we were told we still have time to bring in our comments and so this is drafted and closing tomorrow.

So if you have any comments on this, please have a look at it immediately after this call and make your comment on the draft that was submitted there. Two statements that deal with introduction of two character... Yes? Alan, yes, you have the floor. Sorry I didn't see your hand up. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay. Just to note, it doesn't close tomorrow, it closes today in nine hours. So far there have been no comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. Yes, sorry. It's going to be sent tomorrow, but of course, it closes today at 23:59 UTC. I stand corrected Alan,

---

thank you for reminding us. So that makes it ever more urgent to review immediately after this call. Now, introduction of two character domain names. There have been a number of requests made by various applicants.

There are two types, well two public comments processes that are opened there, and Dev is drafting a statement. Dev Anand Teelucksingh is drafting a statement that should cover both of these. There has been a lot of discussion on the ALAC mailing list, and on the At Large mailing list as well, regarding this point because we don't reach a consensus on something that goes in one way or another. But Dev, could you just take a minute to take us through this please?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry. Thank you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. So the two public comments deal with the introduction of two character labels at the second level, within new gTLDs. So there is [inaudible] exceptions to this rule. Now, the concern I was raising was that, the reason why they're prohibited is that they are, these two character, ASCII labels are considered that in order for these to be introduced that have to be, relevant government or country code TLD operator has to be consulted before they are delegated.

So various registries are [inaudible] to this rule. For example, by saying that they will not use the two characters that exist, the ISO3166 offer to list, which is the list by which ccTLDs are derived from. My concern was that even if [inaudible] allow that to happen, what happens when a

---

future country or territory is created and they are new additions to the ISO tree 166 rule?

And what [inaudible], what many people feel is that, they, this restriction of two character ASCII labels at the second level, there should not be any restriction. And is there really a compelling user interest in preventing two character labels from being prohibitive at the second level.

I think I've tried to summarize the gist of the discussion there. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Dev. Any comments or questions on this? When do you expect to have a first draft out there Dev? I note the closing period is very soon for the initial comment period. So it's probably likely that we might have to file something, if we file something during the reply period.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. I'll do my best to try to do something by the end of today or first thing tomorrow.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Dev. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just wanted to note, this is one of the very few issues where there has been very diverse opinion and contradictory opinion within the ALAC and At Large. And that's something I consider to be healthy, rather than all of us just agreeing with everyone all of the time. And I think this is a good sign. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. Let's move on to the currently open public comments, which the ALAC has so far decided that there would be no statements, but which could be changed. Funnily enough, one of the points which appears there was actually moved from currently open with no statement over to Dev Anand Teelucksingh drafting a statement. That's the first line under currently open public comments, introduction of two character domain names in the new gTLD namespace.

I would ask staff to remove it from there. Same, now the same thing underneath. These are no statements necessary. At the moment, if anyone thinks otherwise, could they please notify At Large staff or notify me or the ALAC mailing list, or the At Large mailing list. The dot Paris introduction of approved launch program, dot WED registry agreement amendment – introduction of third level domain sales, dot NGO and dot ONG registry services evaluation process request – introduction of technical bundling.

These are all amendments that new gTLD applicants are asking of the Board and which the Board has now put out for public comment. And finally, a study to evaluate solutions for the submission and display of



---

internationalized contact data. [Inaudible]... domain name, the IGN working group, and we also asked the registrant issues working group, and neither decided that there was a need for a statement on this.

So that's the current state of our policy development activities and policy discussion activities. You are all very much encouraged to look at this. There is a link to the policy advice development page. This is a page, just under agenda item six, policy advice development page. This is where the action happens.

This is a constant pipeline with staff updating this page on a daily basis, and from there you will be able to see not only today's activity, but all of the past statements that have been built by the ALAC. And my goodness, is it a very, very long page indeed now. Moving on to agenda item #7. And that's an item for decision, the establishment of an At Large working group on accountability.

The question is simple, should the ALAC create a new At Large working group on accountability or charge the future challenges working group with this issue? Now, first thing to note is that there is an ICANN... As you know, there is the IANA stewardship transition working group, which deals with the IANA stewardship transition process. But this process runs in parallel with the ICANN accountability.

ICANN has told everyone, in fact has announced, that there will be an ICANN wide working group that would be created in London, and it would meet in London and start its work in parallel with the IANA stewardship transition. This has not happened. And the latest feedback that I have received from Theresa Swineheart who is in charge of both

---

processes, is that they have connected the input that they have received in the first public comment process, which closed just before London or during London.

There are still digesting this, and our going to make an announcement within the next 10 days. In fact, that was a few days ago. So within the next eight days, they will make an announcement, on the creation of such an ICANN wide working group. But in order to follow this working group, we usually have our own working group taking place and running in our own community so as to be able to formulate our input into these wider ranging ICANN working groups.

And the question here is whether we want to create the new working group on accountability for At Large? Or do we want to make use of an already existing working group? And one of these working groups is the future challenges working group that has traditionally dealt with issues of accountability and ICANN accountability as a whole.

There is the question on the table. I hope that I framed the topic well. I'll hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg who might wish to add to this. Alan you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, two items. I guess my gut feeling is that I have no problem with the future challenges working group doing this, obviously with amended membership for people who are interested in this particular subject. I'm getting the feeling though that we need to change the name, you know, to ICANN strategic issues working group, or something like that. I'm not wedded to the name.

---

But future challenges just doesn't seem to be applicable to something which is right in the middle of our plate right now. And everyone is talking about. That's #1. #2, on the assumption that ICANN will form some sort of coordination group, call it what you will, we are going to have to, again, find members for it, presumably, to recommend or identify members, depending on what rules they come up with.

And maybe this time we want to have that group ready to pounce before it's announced so that it can start working immediately. You know, maybe with the modification of the group used for the IANA group, or maybe it's something different, but I think the ALAC needs to make a decision quickly, so we're ready to go immediately. There is likely to be very short lead time from the announcement of the structure of the group until expecting people to be named. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan. I note green ticks from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, noting her agreement to this. Next is Holly Raiche. Holly, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: She may have been dropped.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You might be muted Holly.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: There was a note from Gisella saying they're calling her back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Would you like us to call you back? Okay. Excellent...

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, this is Gisella.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Just to say that Holly said, Holly's back on. She should be back on, we're dialing Holly back now and she'll be dropping in 10 minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Before dropping, she needs to be back. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Hopefully I'm back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now you're back. Go ahead Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. I am leaving in about 10 minutes. Okay, I'm leaving in about 10 minutes but just to repeat what, a conversation we had in the executive on accountability. There are a whole bunch of specific questions the Board has asked for feedback on. So, even though I agree with what Carlton is saying, we are accountability, there has to be somebody, some group, that formulates a response to what the Board is asking.

And the Board is given a list of documents to read, some of which would be stuff that we have already ready or at least thematic group four has already read. The discussion that happened at the executive was, what is the best place to put this or is it a separate working group? And we thought, well, future challenges already in its statement talked about accountability. It's not doing anything at the moment, so that would be a logical place to put this kind of group to say, this particular task is now part of the future challenges charter, and I've drawn up a document that I've circulated anyway to describe what it is that we do, but largely, working group to respond specifically to the work that is being done, more broadly within ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this Holly. It's Olivier speaking. So does anyone want to make a [fight] with regards to having a separate working group created for this? Yes, go ahead Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Thank you very much. Tijani speaking. The future challenge working group is done, to held reflection without [inaudible], without [inaudible] about subjects that are for the future. The accountability, I

---

am afraid that it will be something that will be under high pressure at the time, because as Alan said, it will be, we will be obliged to follow the base [operatives] what's going on, and we need to have the [inaudible] so it will be very high pressure site.

So I want to emphasize this point. It will not be something we can [inaudible] with no pressure, it will be something under pressure, and I agree that the future challenge will be dealing with, but with the spirit that it is something that is very urgent and we need to work with another spirit. Not with the spirit of the future challenges [inaudible] future challenge [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Tijani. Any other comments on this? Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Probably just to say in the discussion to the actual chair of the future challenges with Evan, and he was the one that suggested that this was exactly the sort of thing that the future challenges working group should take on. And he would very much like to take on the task. So I frankly don't care if we have a new working group, it's simply that there is a working group that's not doing anything at the moment, that does encapsulates the idea of accountability.

If we want to create a new working group, fine. I really don't care. I'm just saying the chair of the working group that it was a good thing. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Holly. Evan, would you like to say a couple of words please? Since you are the current chair along with Jean-Jacques Subrenat of the future challenges working group. There has been a mention of changing the name of the working group, plus also have a subset of that working group work on this topic of ICANN accountability. Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

Is Evan able to speak? I know that he was over at the ITF in Toronto, I'm not sure whether he is able to speak actually, and he has been having patchy Internet connectivity as well, which is a shock for an ITF meeting. But there you go.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, Gisella here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Gisella, go ahead, you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Just to say that Evan is only on the Adobe Connect now. So if he is at the ITF, oh sorry. He is trying to use the Adobe, he'll be dialing in now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. He is dialing in now. I'm mindful of the clock that is ticking with all of these technical problems that we are having. I was going to, since

---

we need to move quickly, and I understand we need to have an action right away, I was going to do a consensus call immediately after Evan speaking, and I was going to have the consensus call as being that the future challenges working group, whatever name it will have to acquire, and that's a separate issue.

The future challenges working group will be the home for the At Large discussions as far as ICANN accountability is concerned. Whether it decides to have a subsection of its membership dealing with this, and whatever that is something for the future challenges working group to work out, what Evan needs to be aware of is that there will be a number of people that will join that working group, that will come in from the thematic working group four.

There will also be likely a number of additional people from the At Large community, who are interested in this. And this working group is going to have to act quickly as well and immediately, and effectively, really get down to work. And as soon as the accountability process discussion starts ICANN wide, it is expected that we will need to furnish results quickly.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan. Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can hear you now, that's great. Just in time. So now you have...



---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I apologize for the background noise. I'm actually on the floor of the conference.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead. You're also on the floor of the At Large call, the ALAC monthly call. So if you can speak to the right floor, that's correct. Go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. So thanks Olivier. And so essentially where I'm at, I'm perfectly okay with having, either way, of having a separate working group or having it done through future challenges, repurposed, renamed, or whatever. I have a concern with both working groups that are too numerous in number, but spread, the same people around the working groups.

Accountability is a natural fit for future challenges because of the two papers that were put out. One was endorsed by ALAC, the R3 report. The other one was the document written by a number of people from the future challenges working group, the [inaudible] ICANN regulator that was submitted to the ATRT. So the group has been very active on accountability issues.

As a co-chair, I would be delighted to take it on. In consideration of what Tijani has said, accountability is not just a working group. It's an ongoing thing that has been basically into what ALAC does and to what ICANN does. So while being cognizant and active, and the working group is going to be one of the important functions.

---

I think there is a benefit to having a future challenges, because it's still does require onward, forward thinking, reaction to the short term activity in the working group, but also consideration of other things. Things that go beyond the scope of the particular working group. So my, Tijani's concern is, yes there is a short-term need, and there will be deadlines and pressure to be done in regard to the working group, but there is also an ongoing long-term need.

And I think future challenges can help with those. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Evan. All right. Let's get moving. So I'm going to ask At Large staff to please make sure that we have enough ALAC members on the call to be able to perform a consensus call that will actually hold, due to quorum issues. I know that Leon has had to drop off, and there are a couple of people who have mentioned that they were not able to make it to this call for various issues.

If I can check with staff. You have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, could you check this? Because I'm looking at the participants in the Adobe Connect, on the agenda pod. And I know a few people that are listed there are not actually on the call. So I can't [inaudible].

[CROSSTALK]

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here. All the names that are involved are listed on the call. Apologies [inaudible] and Jean-Jacques, so...

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Leon is...

GISELLA GRUBER: ...that. Olivier, Evan, Tijani, Maureen, Sandra, Eduardo, Alan, Holly unfortunately has dropped, Beran...

HOLLY RAICHE: No, no. I'm still here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly is still here.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry.

[CROSSTALK]

GISELLA GRUBER: Eduardo, Alan, Holly, thank you Holly, Beran, that's nine, Dev, 10. One, two... I count 10.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And Fatima and Hadja?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Fatima is 11 and Hadja... Let me just confirm that Fatima and Hadja are still on....

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So we have quorum. Thank you. So Olivier, we do have quorum, but we're just checking on the overall numbers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We don't have Leon, and I think that Gisella has said we have Leon and we don't.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No.

GISELLA GRUBER: Apologies. Just bear with me for a second. Gisella here, just checking on Hadja and Fatima. Hadja is on and muted, and Fatima is on as well. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. As long as we got more than eight people, that's fine. And so let's do a consensus call on this. For everyone, the idea... Here we go. The proposal is to have the discussions on accountability taking place within the future challenges working group, or whatever name that working group will take once it starts working on this.

And so, [inaudible] is going to be a consensus call. Is anyone opposed to having the accountability discussions that feed into the overall accountability discussions? Or the overall ICANN accountability working group? Anyone opposed to having those discussions taking place in the

---

future challenges working group? Going once, going twice. So by consensus, there has been a decision of the ALAC to have the discussions of ICANN accountability taking place within the future challenges working group, and I will therefore ask Evan and Jean-Jacques Subrenat to please follow up pretty quickly on this.

What I will do is to link you up with the discussions that are taking place. The discussions with Theresa Swineheart on the creation of the ICANN wide accountability working group. And then also I will urge that you will have a, perhaps a leadership meeting with staff, or even a meeting of the working group itself, to set your work plan and also to consider the suggestion of changing your name. So that comes as a separate work group issue.

And then thirdly, if you could please update your front page. And once the front page is updated, you will also have to issue a call for participation in those accountability issues, and to specifically invite the members of the thematic working group four to join in the discussions. What you do beyond that, within the working group, is your business. All right. Let's get moving.

And now we have items for discussions, a few more items before we reach the end of this call. First, the ATLAS II de-brief with myself and the ATLAS II working group chairs. I was going to ask for a reporting of each one of the components of the ATLAS II, so these are the ATLAS II organizing committee chairs, and unfortunately... Do we have a link over to the different ATLAS II organizing committee?

---

Hopefully we've got a link to the ATLAS II organizing committee, so I know whom to call upon to ask. Here we go. We have, no, we have a link that is [inaudible] to me, so I'll have to ask staff to let me know who the working groups organizing committee chairs are. And I ask for the first one to let us know how that activity went in London?

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Do you want me to start Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you're identifying yourself as a working group chair, then yes, Tijani, you may... I understand you are a working group chair for several of the activities. So you have the floor. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I was in charge of the events, so I was the events working group chair. And I think that things went very well during the summit regarding rooms, organization. There were some small problems in timing because some sessions were shortened because of external constraints.

But in general, there wasn't trouble in the organization of the meeting. And the meetings room, etc. Part of the events working group was given to Evan and Wolf, which is thematic groups. So I will let Wolf speak about this or Evan.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Tijani. And let's then go over to Wolf actually, who can probably cover on two things. First the event that you mentioned there, but also the working group on the survey. Let's go through the whole events thing. So Wolf Ludwig or Evan Leibovitch. Wolf is only on the Adobe Connect. Are you able to speak on the AC or not?

If not, then I'll ask Evan Leibovitch if he's able to provide us with some feedback on ATLAS II? No? Okay. Seeing lack of organization in this, unfortunately, we're going to have to look... Well, let's move through and see if staff can work out how you're going to present your activities. The next one is the sponsors working group. ATLAS II sponsors and I was chairing on this.

As you know, we had several sponsors, Afilias, PIR, and Google. They were absolutely great. They really made the difference in order to have, At Large have some great events. Certainly the Fayre was really great, the, well the whole program was really exciting. And I think they were very well received. What I would suggest is that we continue to keeping in touch with our sponsors, and we'll be able to perhaps make use of them in the future, At Large summit events, or to even ask for them to support the more future events that we have in the meeting in Los Angeles, and the meeting that will take place afterwards next year.

On the logistics group, I'm not sure that there was very much that was done as far as logistics were concerned. Eduardo and I were the two co-chairs. And I know that certainly people in the events group work very hard to organize some of the logistics, and we had a lot of help from staff regarding hotel, travel, etc.

---

As you know, there were some issues with visas. Staff is following up with all of the people that had visa issues and that were not able to come. Unfortunately, even though staff worked enormous amounts, and that went all the way up to Nigel Hickson, who used to be with the UK government and therefore had good links in the British government, our efforts didn't yield very many positive results.

And as a result, we had 15 people that were unfortunately unable to come to London due to visa issues. I understand that Fadi Chehadé is likely to follow up directly with each one of these people. And I might also do directly and apologize, although I have been in touch already with all of the [inaudible], I think with all of the people that were concerned on this.

Next, the public relations group. The PR group was chaired by Murray McKercher. I don't know if we have Murray on the call.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I can hear you. I'm not sure if you can hear me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, Murray. Yes we can hear you. Fantastic. Welcome. Please, you have the floor then to let us know about what happened and how things should be improved. And I note also that Cheryl Langdon-Orr has put her hand up, so I'll hand the floor to Cheryl immediately after your feedback.



---

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you very much Olivier. It's Murray McKercher for the record. The public relations working group, that frequently, prior to the ATLAS II summit. We were successful from a... There was a bit of a pivot towards more social media work that we were involved with, as it is a component of public relations or public engagement.

So we were successful in the respect of that I had a number of connections with the global stakeholder engagement group, and the communications group of ICANN under Jim [inaudible], sorry, Jim [Trentgrove]. Also Chris [Mundini] and I were able to connect and more recently, for North America, the global stakeholder engagement person, Joe [Capatano] and I actually met at the IETF meeting here in Toronto yesterday.

So from my perspective, it was successful. We are still putting together the metrics to give everyone a report on our social media metrics. I understand Ariel is not on the call today, so I don't, I won't speak on her behalf. But we'll certainly put a report on metrics out shortly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Murray. And so now with apologies to Cheryl for having missed her putting her hand up, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's all right. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Olivier, I was actually, I'm in line, but I'm actually next in line, so that's fine. What I wanted to

---

do on this action item, because in fact, the work of the return on investments, as you all know [inaudible] now [inaudible]. We have a number of data points in metrics that [inaudible] threw out during the London meeting, but we've yet to get to that data and do any analysis of it.

But that's obviously is [inaudible] pending. What I wanted to do particularly though while we're asking for feedback from all of the chairs from all of the working groups out of ATLAS II, it will be greatly appreciated, and [inaudible] because obviously your group will be doing it, if we could formalize a request here, Olivier, for a minimum of three to 500 word reporting. But no particular maximum, but I don't mean tone. A piece of written feedback from each of the component working groups.

In other words, everything but mine, that we can incorporate. It seems like what [inaudible] was just mentioning was specific metrics on social media, etc. etc. So the pluses and minuses of what was happening. It will be a number of metrics, even [inaudible] survey groups. How many people, you know, did what would be surveyed, does need to be reported on.

So I'd like to be able to aggregate, as they say, a minimum of three to 500 words from each of those working groups in a post-London event focus. So where we're meeting regularly and reporting on how they were going as we led up to London, in a post-London [inaudible].

I'd like to have a snippet and however much information can be shared, which is probably going to be reporting and recorded for their own

---

purposes anyway. But I would particularly would like something from each of them to integrate into our ROI metric report. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Cheryl. So that was the return on investment group. That certainly has a lot of work ahead of it...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, that should be an action item, Olivier. If I may, I would like to make that a formalized action item on each of the other chairs.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Can you dictate it please for the record then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly. That a specific [inaudible] reporting which should be a minimum of three to 500 words, with no particular maximum, in a looking back on London ATLAS II focus, be provided from each of the working groups in ATLAS II, to the return on investment working group for the purposes of integrating into their report, or their main report, and a focus on metrics, and [inaudible], and numbers would be appreciated as relevant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Cheryl, thank you. This is recorded well. I see with a focus on metrics, yes. Okay. So that's on the action items. Thanks very much for this. And I'll let staff follow up with each one of the working group

---

chairs on this including some of the co-chairs. Now, the next one is the ATLAS II Fayre of Opportunities working group.

And for this, Glenn McKnight was the chair of this. And I don't see Glenn on the Adobe Connect. Is he on the call?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Hello. This is Murray speaking for the record. If I could speak to Glenn's point?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes go ahead Murray. Murray McKercher, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thank you Olivier. Glenn, at the moment, is also involved with IETF, so I think that's probably why he's not on the call at the moment. We have had some internal discussions amongst the folks, so I think we'll just add that we will put a report into Cheryl.

My sense was that it was very successful. A little negative feedback was that we felt, more time for social connecting and less speeches, or at least shorter speeches, was one of the comments that we had. But there was a lot of positive stuff that came out of that and some excellent video and social media that we can either reuse or repurpose. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Murray. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I wanted to add that the most important achievement we had in the events working group, was to have the Fayre of Opportunities organized and [inaudible]. If we have it in the ALAC room, imagine what it could be. So I am so happy that we managed at the end to have this room to organize the Fayre of Opportunities, which was from my point of view, a great success, given, as Murray said, it was perhaps longer speeches than it was planned. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Tijani. And indeed, imagine with that many people having attended the Fayre, how that would have been in the ALAC room, which is about a third of the size of the room that we ended up having. So I think we have to be very thankful to meeting staff who finally managed to move things around and get us to have that large room.

That of course was also made possible due to the moving from the Monday to the Tuesday, which, and again that was also thankfully possible because the Internet Society also moved their meeting from the Tuesday to the Monday. I know that they got a few people to really question why this was happening, but altogether, I think it made for a better program and certainly a lot more success, if you want, to prepare all of the activities that took place there.

---

This is the ATLAS II communications working group. And the three co-chairs of this are Carlos Aguirre, Maricarmen [Sequera], and Natalia [Enciso]. Do we have any of them on the call? Would anyone be able to speak to this please?

I don't see anyone. There is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Dev, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I am just a member of the working group, not a chair. But what the communication working group did before this summit was to release newsletter. Four were released before the ATLAS II meeting. And they also then worked on the website. And Heidi has put the link in the chat to this website. And which collated a lot of the material related to the ATLAS II summit.

Also what was also done was to highlight, well, and this is also [inaudible] on the social media working group, social media was used extensively throughout the ATLAS II summit. And there was a lot of, I would say, a lot of content shared over social media, that was also re-shared throughout the summit.

So, I think those are the key outcomes from the communications working group. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Dev. Yes indeed, it's Olivier speaking. Yes indeed the ATLAS II website was a core component to the, to our communications. And certainly the newsletters and all of the work that

---

went into this [inaudible] really helped in our At Large participants being able to participate more and understand more of what happened during the week. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to mention something about the ATLAS website. That website is currently running on one of the servers that I use in my company, and I would like to, from staff, to see if there is a possibility that we can move this to a more permanent place for future records. And if we can open an action item for that so I can pull off and make sure that something like that happens. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Eduardo. And that they relate directly back to you on this as well please, would be helpful. Next is the ATLAS II mentoring program working group. And if I can find the right screen, there we go. The person who was the chair of that working group was Fatima Cambronerero, and again, that was a very helpful group. Let's see if we have Fatima on the phone. Fatima, you have the floor.

Fatima Cambronerero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERERO:

This is Fatima speaking. I was chair of this working group. Actually the mentoring group has work, it has worked especially for a group of people who have understood what were the objectives of this program, and who collaborated in the program from the different instances that the program had. Then there was something that didn't really work for

---

a group of people who didn't really understand the objective, and who did not want to collaborate with the program.

And who felt that this was contradictory because some people think about building community, and when they are invited to do this in practice, they are not really interested in building that community and giving their input into that community especially the new people who are being involved in the meeting for the first time.

Then something I would also like to mention is that this group had a very large number of members, but unfortunately it was not a very active group. There were very few people who effectively worked on the group, and in some instances, I had to work on my own because I received no feedback from the group, which confirms what we had discussed before, in the sense that the smaller groups are the ones that work more properly and the ones that yield more results.

I would also like to thank especially the support we had from staff on this program. In the beginning we had some communication issues, but then we overcame those issues and we had been able to work successfully in this program with a very good result. Then this program also needs to create a report that those mentees can prepare. We have not received these so far, and we have also opened webpage to receive feedback from the program to improve it from the following edition.

So we have decided to do this to see what has and what has not worked. We have not received comments on this. I need to excuse myself because after the London meeting, I had no vacation. I went



---

directly to work on the IGF meeting, and I could not really follow up these issues. I will try to follow them from this week on.

And also, well, that's all for now. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Fatima. And yes, we're certainly not a [inaudible], and I think the program itself works very well. Certainly the return on investment working group is going to issue this survey and hopefully, we will be able to get more feedback from the participants of ATLAS II. And I therefore hope that there will be a significant section that will be relating to the mentoring program and how to improve it.

I note that earlier Wolf Ludwig could not on, could not speak. I wonder if Wolf, you are able to speak now, on the survey group? Wolf probably unable to do so. I can't hear him. So Eduardo Diaz, I guess the overall chair of all chairs in ATLAS II you have your hand up, and obviously we have to defer over to you for the closing words on the ATLAS II working groups. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much Mr. Chair. Yes, I want to share some of my thoughts about the organizing of the overall meeting. Basically the way I architect the organization, I think it works very well. Maybe we can do that for future ATLAS meetings, you know, how we interact. You know, when we set up these groups, we created many groups due to the specific parts that needed to be done for the event, and one of the things that I learned from this is that maybe a more effective way of

---

doing that in the future is instead of looking to creating new groups, is to use some of the already in place groups as much as possible.

And maybe invite people to participate on those. That is because there is already a structure there that can be used more [inaudible]. The issue about co-chairs and chairs, and this doesn't have to do with the ATLAS II specifically, but one of the things that I found is that if anyone has a chair, and you have several chairs managing a working group, really there is not a specific focus as to who is managing this. And going forward in any of the groups, we should have a chair assigned to the group and then co-chairs to support the chair on those things that the chair cannot do.

This is something that I found very interesting when I was dealing with groups that had more than one, you know, we have multiple co-chairs and no chairs. The issue that Fatima mentioned about having lots of volunteers, you know, slightly not for groups... Part of the thing I wanted to do was exactly that, to bring new people into helping putting together the event. Mostly because, you know, to give these new people a feeling on how, you know, we work in ICANN. And also to bring them on after the ATLAS II.

Unfortunately, you know, [inaudible] in many groups I have seen, you know, that the work is performed only by a few of the people in the overall working groups. And maybe we have to rethink how we find things, people, maybe we want to assign specific small action items to people, and make them responsible, just to make sure that they're engaged.

---

And I also just to finalize, the thing about the newsletter, I think, you know, you should continue to put a newsletter, an ALAC newsletter or an At Large newsletter, at least every three months. And the reason behind that is we can, I think it's a good way of keeping engaged and in communicating with the At Large out there of the things that, you know, we are doing, that if people don't get involved with these calls, or they don't read the emails, at least they will be able to read this concise newsletter that will tell them some important things that is happening at At Large.

With that, I want to thank everyone in ALAC and everyone on the call and everyone who made this ATLAS II a successful event. And also, you know, also that includes the staff which, you know, it needs to be there and supported this event. Thank you so much. Bye-bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Eduardo. That certainly is a very good summary of all of the work that has taken place. And I'm very glad to note that this call is recorded and will be transcribed. I think possibly part of the meeting of the ALAC call that we had today, the transcripts should be put in our follow up for future generations of ATLAS organizers to be able to reflect upon and read.

There are certainly some lessons learned in that. That, of course, will all be in the hands of the return on investment working group. I think as a coordinating body for the return on investment, and the feedback. And as Cheryl mentioned earlier, 300 to 500 summaries provided by each of

---

the ATLAS II group shares. We really need to put together a set of, not recommendations, but certainly a repository for all of that information.

I note that Wolf Ludwig is back online, well he's actually on the call now. So Wolf, a quick feedback on the survey working group please.

WOLF LUDWIG:

This is Wolf Ludwig speaking for the record. There is not much to say because the work of the first working group, the survey group, was accomplished last year already. It started after the Durban meeting in July 2013, and we had the first draft of the survey which was kept in the group, which was modified and which was accomplished, to my memory, in August or September.

Then it was translated into the key languages, and it was circulated in October. And afterwards, we had given certain period, I think it was extended until three weeks, and the survey was accomplished in November. Therefore, it was a precondition, as we discussed before, supposed to be relevant for the program setting of ATLAS II agenda, and I think with that, the quite relevant for the future planning of ATLAS II agendas.

The only problem that we had at the end, to my memory, is compiling results of this survey, which was unfortunately not possible to get it in a completed way. So we had quite some work at the end in November and December. We had to subdivide tasks in the working group to come up with somehow readable or analyzable outcomes at the end, what was a bit painful in my opinion. But finally, we got those results in a way which is useful for the planning.

---

According to my memory, was more or less the most important thing to report from the survey group.

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

WOLF LUDWIG: If you have further questions, please let me know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Wolf. Thank you very much for this report. And with this, I would like to ask for an electronic round of applause for all of the working group organizing chairs. The amount of work that has been done by this community and by these chairs with their working group has been absolutely amazing. So, quick vote, a round of applause, and a special, special, e-medal for Eduardo Diaz for his great organizational skills in getting this whole pyramid of work to start and to deliver in such a successful way.

So we are all very gratefully indebted to Eduardo Diaz for this really great leadership that he has shown in this organization of ATLAS II. Now, let's move on. Yes, we haven't reached the end of this call. We are now at the two hour mark, and I did tell you that this is going to be a long call. Hopefully, we can go through the last items on the agenda a little bit faster.

Now the IANA stewardship transition update, I was hoping for Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohammed El Bashier, who are the two

---

representatives of the At Large community on the coordination group that has been created by ICANN. And they were in London last week for two long, excruciating days of discussion. I was hoping for them to be on the call. Are they on the call by any chance? Have we managed to get a hold of them?

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, Gisella here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Unfortunately neither are on the call and we can't get a hold of them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That doesn't matter. Olivier speaking. Let me just do a quick update then on these things. So there are three things. First the At Large ad hoc working group on the transition of US government stewardship of the IANA function. What's happened is a first meeting, face to face meeting of all the different participants have taken place in London on Thursday and Friday last week.

The meeting was open electronically for remote participation. And there was a good discussion that was had by all of the participants over there. And so the ad hoc working group we had put together now, is basically feeding the input into the coordination group meeting. And so

---

I'm going to ask for more people from At Large, from the At Large community, to take part in these discussions.

At the moment, we haven't got that many members. And the more we are digging into this, the more it looks as though there is going to be an enormous amount of work involved. The reason is as follows. Several of the participants in the coordinating group are working in their own community, at the moment, to try and come up with a proposal that will satisfy the request from the US government with regards to the whole process of transition of US government stewardship.

I know that the ITF is working on the one hand in their own processes, the regional Internet registries are working on the other side. In fact, there are several functions that seems to be happening in directly involved policies. So for example, the name, sorry the numbering part of the IANA contract, so the IP addressing, etc. is dealt with primarily by the ASO, and also as a result, it is being dealt with by the regional Internet registry. The protocol part of the function, the IANA function, is taken care of by the IETF, the Internet Engineering Taskforce.

And the name part of the US government stewardship, oh sorry, of the IANA function is dealt with by the country code name supporting organization and the generic name supporting organization. The process by which proposals will be brought forward appears to be pressing to the direction that each of the component organizations is going to come up with a proposal, and the coordination group will group those proposals together and then send them on over to the US government.

---

The process by which this was taken place is still a little bit unclear because what happens if there is no consensus, what happens if other participants in the coordinating body do not agree with this, big question marks, not many answers at the moment. What is the true at the moment is that having followed the discussions that are taken place in the other component parts of this coordination group, for example, the ITF discussions, or the IAB, the Internet Architecture Board discussions.

They are looking at their set of contracts with ICANN and with IANA, and they're looking at it on a purely contractual basis on the functions and saying, "Well, we can assume this function without the need of the US government to be involved with this." So the focus is primarily on ICANN's accountability with regards to the US government and how to keep ICANN accountable on a wider bases.

And I've read on several occasions now that, in effect, accountability only relates to the names, the domain names, because ICANN is the only organization that deals with policy and implementation and operational matters under the same roof. That has also brought some calls for some people saying, "Well, this should be separated."

We're still in the early days and there is still seems to be some confusion as to how the policy will be developed. But it seems that this division of the different tasks is one way that has been brought forward. As far as the end user is concerned, I'm afraid to say that so far we've seen very little interest from any other participants to sever the end user.



---

And this is why I'm making such a point of it here. We need to be involved with more people, because what we might have to do is to actually send people to those other forums, to the Internet Engineering Taskforce, to the IAB, to the regional Internet registry policy discussions, and actually press for the end user component in those forums, rather than waiting at the very end.

Plus, in addition to this, we also need to work on our side and make a proposal ourselves. Admittedly, the whole IANA function and the transition of the US government stewardship is a very complex issue. It's not going to be possible for one or two or three people to look at this and to produce results and to produce solutions. I'd like to really urge that we get at least 10 to 15 people that will be able to really know what they're doing, to learn about this, and take on the task of them being our representative in those different forums, and then relate back.

If we don't do this, I have a real concern that the end user component, the serving of the public interest, which is a significant part of what the US government had been doing in stewarding the IANA function, is something that will be completely destroyed and completely ignored. And certainly, I know of at least one discussion that is currently taking place on the IETF mailing list, where Avri Doria has mentioned that the stewardship, so the component, the accountability component of stewardship was really important, and the response has been overwhelming against it, which I find absolutely mind boggling.

And this is why it's important for us to do something about it. Alan Greenberg you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A couple of thoughts. First of all, your suggestion that we have people involved in the various other discussions, I think is a really good one. And I think we need to push. I'm afraid it may not happen organically if we simply say it and expect it to happen, we may need to buttonhole people who we think are good fits, to try to make sure that we have a voice, or at the very least an ear in the other discussions that are going on.

I'm not sure it is entirely bad, although I'm not against us coming up with a proposal entirely on our own. I'm not sure it's entirely bad that we don't. There is not really an user component in the IANA work, you know, for the same reason that we work [inaudible], some of the battles, some of the original panels. It is very much a public interest thing and not necessarily an user thing. And it's not clear that we [inaudible]... One of the domains, but I do think we have [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That comes from Julie Hammer.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. So I do think we do need to get actively involved. If we come up with a proposal, if we want to try to formulate one, fine. If we don't, we need to get involved early. I personally expect, you know, it would be nice to think that everything that's going to come to the group, to the coordination group, is going to fit together nicely, like parts of a jigsaw puzzle, and they will just pass it on.

---

I think all of us worked really hard to try to get good people we trust in this group because there is at least some expectation that there will be controversy, that there will be decisions to be made, and that people are going to have to fight, perhaps, for the issues that are important to them. And certainly from our point of view, it's not our part of the pie because we don't have one as such.

But looking at user and public issue issues, so I think we need to actively get involved. We need to do it quickly and we need to keep our finger on the pulse of where things are going. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this point of view Alan. That's very helpful. And I was going to add one more concern that I've had, which is to hear from several participants that end users are not directly involved, the public interest is not something that's directly involved because this is just a clerical function. And it's, you know, clerical functions are not political functions at all.

And I'm absolutely amazed when I hear this, and at the same time, I hear the hypocrisy of those participants when they want the secretariat, you know, people that basically send the emails out and create webpages, the secretariats be completely independent of ICANN because they think that having an ICANN secretariat would actually be a political thing.

That is just unbelievable, and I wanted to put that over to the record, because it is one of the things that has been having my blood boil as to saying, well clerical functions are not political.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we have Julie Hammer and then we have Tijani Ben Jemaa after Julie. Julie Hammer, you have the floor.

JULIE HAMMER: My apologies. It's Julie speaking. I didn't think that Tijani [inaudible] on the call so I was sent to give you an update for the drafting team on the CCWT, but with Tijani on the call, I will leave that to him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Julie. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier, Tijani speaking. There is still an echo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Julie Hammer. Yeah, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. So you had concerns and I have also concerns and I share your concerns. One of the aspects of this, how to say? This [inaudible] the public interest or the user's interests, is the fact that we are more or less going toward with groups dealing with only the naming

---

services of the IANA functions. Because it seems like standards and numbers, people are working alone without any input from the users.

And for example, for our cross-community working group, we are working on the charter. And the first draft of the charter said that, our work will be [inaudible] to the naming service. And I oppose with a lot of strength, and I was supported by Avri, because if we do so, that means that it will not be a cross-community working group, it will be a GNSO, a ccNSO working group. And that means that the protocols and the numbers, services, of the IANA function, will not be discussed inside this group.

And our only change to have input in this cross-community working groups, so we will only have comments or have inputs regarding the naming services only. So this is one of the most clear aspects of this mess, this kind of seeing this transition as a technical vision only, while it is not at all. There is another thing that was raised during the drafting team call, it was [inaudible] saying that [inaudible] which is done by [inaudible] will not be [amount] the work of this cross-community working group.

Since there is no contract between Verisign and ICANN for this. And I also opposed, and I said that the transition, the NTAA said that they wanted to transition their stewardship on IANA functions, and the transition is for the whole IANA functions, including [inaudible]. So it must be inside our remit, and we will discussing the concept. I think that we managed not to let them move it from the discussion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Tijani. It's Oliver speaking. And very interesting, actually. I was not aware of the discussions within the drafting team for the cross-community working group. Certainly the naming services, the only topic of the ICANN cross-community working group is something that I've heard. So it would be cross-community working group but only on naming services.

And this is why that I think we should really should seriously consider having people that are knowledgeable of the other forums, the other policy discussion forums, and therefore having people on the ITF discussions, and people in the RIR discussions... [CROSSTALK]

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. I do agree with the fact that we do need to have a position, a point of view, statement. We are end users that are representing end users, and that's true. The end user does not participate in this debate. But it is us with our knowledge, with the knowledge that we have regarding our work, and the representation that we have.

The ones that need to participate and represent. So it is very important to get feedback from each and all of the working groups. And I would also say that there are many meetings in relation to the transition of IANA functions where the ICANN is participating, and many other organizations are participating. So, this is a broad topic and there is no simple conclusion from one working group.

---

We need, or get the opinions for this topic, we need more opinions in relation to this topic. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alberto. Did I hear Murray Mckercher earlier?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thank you Olivier. It's Murray. If I could make a comment...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'll put you in the queue, because first we have Alan Greenberg and then you'll speak after Alan. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not sure if I don't understand or the situation is somewhat surreal. To have the cross-community working group only looking at name related issues, does that mean it also looks at issues of confidence and oversight if necessary, and, you know, safeguards? If it does, then they really apply to the overall process and saying it's naming issues is really not really relevant. Because it is going to look at the other issues.

It will look, it may not look at the number issues and the protocol issues, but it will look at naming issues and the overall process. So if that's the case, then I think it's moot, and it's a matter of nomenclature and yes, you can say it's only looking at naming issues, but if it's also looking at

---

the overall, you know, trust issues then it's fine. If indeed, you only look at the naming issues, and not the overall issues related to confidence in the process, and oversights and things like that, then it has no meaning at all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan [CROSSTALK]... the floor, it's Olivier speaking. I was going to give the floor either to Tijani or to Julie Hammer to respond directly to this. But I heard Tijani and then Julie.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. Alan, this is the consensus that we reached at the end. Between the... We'll be addressing the naming services, but not restricted to that, also it will be mainly about the naming services, but not restricted to that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Julie Hammer?

JULIE HAMMER: That is just what I was going to say as well Olivier. Julie speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Julie. Neither you nor Tijani have basically said, will the overall stewardship be looked at by this working group? Because you've said certainly the naming issues will be looked at and will be



---

studied, but the overall stewardship, who deals with the overall stewardship? Julie?

JULIE HAMMER:

Yes, Julie speaking. There are 11 defined IANA functions, that I've defined in the contract, and nine of them are distinctly related to naming, and the other two are not directly related to naming and what is currently being looked at in the charter is that the working group will primarily focus on the nine related naming, but that will not preclude them commenting and providing input on issues related to the other two functions, or indeed, I believe, to anything else that they consider relevant.

So I don't think the charter is going to preclude that, the charter does state that there is a primary focus on the naming functions. At this point in time, the charter is not yet complete.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks Julie. Tijani, did you have anything to add to that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

No. It's exactly what she said. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks Tijani. Murray McKercher, you have the floor, and with apologies to you for letting you, pushing you back in the queue. Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: That's fine Olivier. It's Murray McKercher for the record. I'm sorry I'm not on Adobe Connect so I can raise my hand. Regardless, just a few observations, as I am sitting in Toronto at the moment, with respect to the ITF, so the Internet Engineering Taskforce. There is a, first of all there was a group of folks from ICANN, small table, in regards to IANA participating, liaising with the ITF community to handle any questions that may arise from a technical perspective. So I thought that was a very good sign, that they were participating.

Also, there is a session Thursday, a general session, on IANA, and NTIA, taking place on Thursday, which I'm trying to get into to attend and can report back, and also Evan is participating wearing multiple hats from his ISOC perspective, and obviously connections with ICANN. So at least at some point, there are some end user people observing the process here in Toronto. So I want to let everyone know that. it's very positive. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update Murray. And yes, that's great to have so many people at the ITF and certainly keep your ears open for all of the sessions that will deal with it. I think there are several sessions that will deal with this topic, and it's going to be interesting to see the direction that this is taking. Now, as an update on the coordination group London meeting, just one more thing I have to add, which will not make us feel that great.

---

Jean-Jacques Subrenat made a very good opening speech, if you want, on the At Large perspective, looking specifically at the fact that the working group itself is multistakeholder, but it's still very much influenced in the number of nationality or participants of being US, I think maybe half of the participants are US based. And the rest being scattered a little bit around the world. And he tried to give a sense of the wider, the bigger picture, with regards to the overall accountability of all of those processes, and of the rest of the world looking at ICANN and looking at the component parts of the multistakeholder system to provide a greater sense of internationalized, well not internationalized, but globalization of the functions as well.

I have spoken to Jean-Jacques, and he has absolutely no response from anyone on this coordinating group, which was quite disappointing. It seems as he has been completely ignored in a way. Mohammed El Bashier, he has also pushed for this. We still have to try and gain some traction on that, and clearly it's not going to be an easy way forward. But I would suggest is that the coordination, sorry that the At Large ad hoc working group on the transition of US government stewardship of the IANA function, our own working group should have a call very soon to try and divide this strategy moving forward.

And of course, ahead of the cross-community working group on IANA stewardship transition, which will be created very soon, as soon as a charter is drafted. Another proposal from Jean-Jacques, with regards to the number of co-chairs, or vice-chairs of that main working group, of the coordination group. At the moment, out of all of the people who have put their name forward to be a co-chair, only Jean-Jacques has put his name forward, and only Jean-Jacques is a non-US national.

---

And so he has asked, or suggested that I write to the current interim chair of the coordinating group, and basically point this out. And point that the optics of having only US nationals chair or co-chair that working group would be creating much, very much damage with regards to the overall legitimacy of this whole process. Transferring control from US government stewardship to US industry stewardship is probably not going to please a number of countries around the world.

And we always have to remember the primary reason for this whole change was that, originally there was always a plan for this stewardship to be transferred over to, and transferred out, if you want, of the US government. And the catalyst for it happening so fast is a political thing, as well all know, with Snowden and with the loss of trust of the United States has suffered because of the Snowden revelations.

To be continued, and the working group is currently discussing the issue of sending that email over to the chair, the interim chair of the coordination group. Again, I invite all of you who are interested in these issues to join the working group, the At Large, ad hoc working group on this issues and engage in the discussions.

Finally, moving on. I see still Alan Greenberg still has his hand up. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. Just the point on this co-chair issue, having served as a co-chair or vice-chair on roles like that, you know, the latest being the ATRT, but it's not the only one, diversity is important but having people who are capable and willing to put the time in and to take the role of running a group like this is really important.

---

So it really is more than a matter of just making sure you have diversity, it's really making sure that we pick someone who isn't just there for their diversity, but can actually do the role. Otherwise, you're putting in jeopardy the possibility of this group actually coming up with some useable outcome. So it's a difficult...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. But the point was to try and push for Jean-Jacques to be one...

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I understand, but his statement was somewhat stronger than that. And it's really more of an issue than just diversity. It's a matter of getting the right people on the job.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Point noted. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier. Alan, yes you are right, but we need both. We need the chair to make the [inaudible] of the group [inaudible] good results. Of course, we also need diversity because if we have a third other group from the United States, more than the third, there are 11 over 30, so more than a third of the group are from the United States, plus one from Canada, it's 12 from North America.

---

So if we have this amount of people from the same region, and we have the chair, the chairs, or the co-chairs from the same region, I think the result will be [inaudible]... the people we think it will be [inaudible]. This is an important point that we have to take into account. I wanted also to say Olivier, that all the cross-community working group, we in the drafting team, we [inaudible] case that we can [some initial] work for the [inaudible] working group can start before ending the charter, because time is a very [inaudible] in this case. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this Tijani. I realize we are now two and a half hours into this call, which is a very long call. We need to cover a few more items on our agenda. And so in closing after this, let's follow up on the web. We know where we are going, I see that there is really good interest in that topic. At Large working group update, working group chairs. We've got two quick, very quick working group updates as to next steps.

First the academy working group, Sandra Hoferichter. I realize we actually spoke very briefly about this earlier, but Sandra you have the floor if you need to add any more to what we discussed earlier with regards to the academy working group.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Olivier. It's Sandra Hoferichter speaking for the record. Well, as I mentioned earlier, there needs to be some more follow up between my side and now that staff is full back from vacation. But I want to raise

---

here at the At Large call is that a call for participants, as we agreed in London, will be out by the end of this week, as late as next week.

And we urge you to select or elect your people in your regions as we agreed in London. Just for you to remember, we agreed that each region is nominating one experienced and one incoming leader. And the ALAC will finally decide the composition of the five candidates, which are going to be chosen from the ALAC. Full stop. So please follow up on this. When the RALO chairs receive an email, or when the call is done on each RALO list, so that we can actually proceed with the procedure rather quickly then.

Everything else, there is not much new. The program was out, or we introduced the new program which is likely revised last year already in London. And the next important things that are indeed the participants. Here, I ask for your help and cooperation. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this Sandra. And I draw the attention of participants to this call, on the Adobe Connect, the point that Heidi has made in selecting of participants to be AC/SO leadership organization, please note they must have travel support to the Los Angeles meeting, ICANN 51. They're covered only for the additional days of accommodation. And they are also covered for a stipend for the orientation days that they're going to be in Los Angeles.

But if they are not part of the supportive travelers to ICANN 51, then it's going to be impossible to have them there. Now, the next working group update is the one on the Board member selection process

---

committee. Yes, it's been a few months since we, since the At Large community selected its 2014/2017 Board of Director. But as you know, there needs to be a follow up on the process itself. How can we make that process better?

And Tijani Ben Jemaa, as the chair of the Board member selection process committee, is going to speak to us briefly about this. What happens next? Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. We will have the call, a joint call between the BCEC and the [BNS BC] members, in the first week of August to discuss the issues that worked well, the issues that we will work well. This is for the sake of having a final report for this 2014 selection.

And before that, I will ask by email, all of the [inaudible] to give us what their issues, the points that they want to raise, for this round of selection. I will also need the help of Alan Greenberg and Cheryl Langdon-Orr because they have the expertise and experience, and I will need their point of view, need their point of view and I will send them an email to ask them for input, [inaudible] to the call we have on the first week of August.

And after this call, we'll proceed to write the final report, and then I will come back to Alan and Cheryl, so that we try to have something very well done, that relates, all problems that we updated and all the things that works well. And with the help of Alan and Cheryl, perhaps we'll



---

have, because they have the experience of the last round, so we will have perhaps better point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Just one question. Will you be also interviewing the candidates themselves to find out how things went for them?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's what I said, the first thing. So it will be in the next few days, I will send an email to all candidates asking them about [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, all of them, excellent.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: All of them, without exception.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's fantastic. And just for the record, the BCEC is the Board candidate evaluation committee. That was the committee which selected the short list of candidates, going into the selection process.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Olivier can I...? It's Murray speaking, can I just make a comment?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Murray McKercher. You have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you Olivier. Murray McKercher for the record. I was part of the BCEC process. We had a lot of discussions about improving, and evaluating. Roberto [inaudible] was the chair of that group, and he and I met briefly. And we're certainly are looking forward to providing feedback to the process and improving it for the next time.

So if there are any questions in that regard, I'm happy to field those now or later. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Murray. That's very helpful. We are running out of time. So we'll leave that process to move forward with Tijani very carefully driving it forward. And as far as we're concerned, we have to move on to our agenda #11, ALAC liaison to the GAC, next steps. And I'll do a quick intro, and then open the floor. I think that Alan came back with an answer for this one.

So there were calls in London for the ALAC to get in touch with the GAC and ask for a liaison with, a liaison petition on the GAC, in the same manner as the GNSO has now, or looks now as though they will get a liaison position with the GAC. However the process is a little bit different, and Alan Greenberg is going to explain to us what the bottom line with regards to this. Alan, you have the floor.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I guess two major points. Number one, the GNSO liaison to the GAC is an interim test for one year. So, we cannot assume that it's a permanent thing. And number two, it was put in place or agreed to address some real, some very real operational problems, which at this point, the ALAC doesn't really have with the GAC.

So, I would think it is premature. It certainly is reasonable to discuss this with the GAC leadership, but I would think it would be premature to do anything formal until the GNSO position is in place and, at the very least, if not the year is up, then we see how it is working and you know, get a feeling for that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. I also recall, it's Olivier speaking. I also recall that there was discussion on the accountability and transparency review team recommendation, mentioning that the GAC should have early engagement and should consider having what they call reverse liaisons with all supporting organizations and advisory committee.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't recall whether it was with all, it certainly was with the GNSO. And what they were calling, what the GAC was calling reverse liaison was indeed what we're talking about now, because originally the GAC has had on the books a liaison to the GNSO, which stops [inaudible] in effect, a number of years ago.

---

So what they were calling the reverse liaison, is indeed the liaison from the GNSO we're talking about. I really don't recall whether the ATRT made the recommendation for the other groups or not. If so, then it is an accepted ATRT 2 recommendation, and we can presume there will be some action over the next year. But I have to check to see whether that really was in one of the final recommendations or not.

I'm reasonable sure there was GNSO implication in it, but I'm not sure who was wider. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much for this Alan. So the bottom line really is that maybe we can bank this suggestion for the future, and in a future meeting with the GAC, we can inquire as to how warm they feel about asking for a liaison with the ALAC. But certainly, it would be absolutely premature today with all of the political dimensions, and all of the things that are taking place at ICANN, to demand a position on the GAC, and to demand, or to ask for a liaison.

And just to update you on previous discussions with the GAC chair, and with the ALAC leadership and the GAC leadership, there had been a very light discussion on having a strong link between the GAC, the ALAC, and the consensus was that the leaderships are already working well together. There was no need to establish a more heavy process by which the GAC and the ALAC would relate to each other.

At least, not right away. Let's move to the next agenda item, that's #12, timetable of ALAC endorsement of 2015 ALAC delegates to the NomCom. So the NomCom is the nominating committee, and the ALAC

---

has the ability to have five delegates sitting on this nominating committee. And the nominating committee selects people to go on the ICANN Board, people to go into the ccNSO Counsel, the GNSO Counsel, and also on the ALAC as well.

This process is a yearly appointment process. And in general, people, sorry for the noise in the background. In general, people are... In general, people are supposed to go and hold to the position for two years, unless their performance has not been particularly good in the first year, which way, the RALOs are informed about the performance of their member on the, of their nominee on the nominating committee.

The feedback I have received from the chair of the nominating committee was that the performance of our nominees was absolutely outstanding [CROSSTALK], and therefore, yes, Cheryl happens to be on there. And so we have out of the five people that are currently there, and unfortunately I cannot access the page which has reference to, on the agenda.

I seem to not have the authorization to do so and I don't know why. So out of the five people, three of them are eligible for another term, and if I recall correctly, the three that are eligible for another term are the NARALO representative, that's Louise Houle; the AFRALO representative, Fatimata [inaudible]; the APRALO representative is not [CROSSTALK] is as well.

Yes, okay, I'm just doing this from memory because I don't have any of the information in front of me. And then the two that have finished their term are the EURALO representatives and so the EURALO General

---

Assembly that took place in London, discussed the matter and decided to by consensus have [inaudible] who was selected on their, in that position. And LACRALO representative has also reached a term limit.

And so there needs to be a request, I guess, from all of the RALOs to supply the names of their representatives, and it looks as though four out of the five RALOs have already made their choice. Am I missing anything in this? Cheryl, perhaps...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Cheryl for the record. I think you have it absolutely perfectly wrapped up there. We need only find now from, it should the ALAC wish to wait for the advice from LACRALO, and you are encouraged to do exactly that, you're encouraged as ALAC to make the decision. You are encouraged to [inaudible] to ask for suggestions, but from a RALO. So the LACRALO needs to give you some names, but of course you're not limited to those names.

But it seems to me by the 15<sup>th</sup> of August, you only need to sort out an appointment for one region.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. And yes, just for the record, so Louis Houle was decided, sorry, was selected again for another year. And same also for Satish Babu for APRALO. So staff will be following up on this process. And I think that then takes us to the end of the business part of this call, that is going to reach three hours.

---

Is there any other business? Any other points to be discussed? I must say I'm very impressed with the number of people who have lasted to the so long on this call. I also have to absolutely thank the interpreters for having remained the extra amount of time, beyond the two hour limit, it's very helpful. And in particular to...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Have we lost him?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh dear.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: He is tired. He's finished now. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I was dropped. It's Olivier speaking.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you hear me? Okay. I've just jumped on the Adobe. I was thanking the interpreters and I was thinking in particular the Russian interpreter who had to deal for so long and interpret for such a long length of time. Obviously I have to not thank Swiss Com for having just disconnected me, but that's just a standard thing.

Thanks to all of you having lasted so long. Thanks to the At Large staff. And this call is now finally, you'll be glad to hear, adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**