
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Gisella. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the monthly ALAC call on Tuesday, the 26th of August, 2014. Funnily enough, it says here – gee, it doesn't say here anything. The time is 14:07 UTC and we're going to start first with the adoption of the agenda, as it is currently on the Wiki that you have a link to in the Adobe Connect chat. And a call for any other business. Does anyone wish to add something to the agenda as it is at the moment?

We've got our usual review of action items and our policy – well, ALS applications policy discussion after our reports, and then the main points today are going to be the review of the cross-community working group charter drafting team for the draft of the IANA stewardship transition proposal on naming-related functions. I'm hoping they will by that time have quorum to be able – and I think we do have quorum already – they will have quorum to be able to endorse the cross-community working group charter.

And then, afterwards, items for discussion. We'll be speaking about ATLAS II, about the ICANN 51 meeting, and having working group updates on the Academy Working Group, the Ad Hoc Working Group on the transition of U.S. government stewardship of the IANA function, the CROPP Working Group and the Future Challenges Working Group, finishing with a small thing about IGF.

Rafid Fatini, you have put your hand up. You have the floor.

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.

RAFID FATINI: Hello, hi. I'm just wondering if it is possible for us to add in a small note on processes and how we've adopted anonymous [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The anonymous – sorry. You sounded a bit muffled. Did you have an inquiry about the anonymousness of votes? Is that correct?

RAFID FATINI: That's right. It was in our e-mail that we've been discussing and touching up on the issue, but I think we need to really hit the nail on the head and actually [inaudible] what processes are intact.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right, thanks. So let's put that in the any other business at the end of this agenda. Staff, if you could please mark this down, we will discuss the anonymousness of votes. I think that Alan will be able to give us some details on this, because this is basically an issue – well, not an issue, but this is something that is in the bylaws themselves. We'll be able to make this clear at the time. Any other other business?

Okay, I don't see any other other business, so now the agenda is adopted with that minor amendment and we can go over to the roll call and apologies. Gisella, you have the floor, or whoever deals with the roll call today.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Olivier. On today's call, on the English channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Sandra Hoferichter, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Leon Sanchez, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Rafid Fatani, Cheryl Langon-Orr, Otunte Otuneh, Siranush Vardanyan, Allan Skuce, Pastor Peters, Loris Taylor, Judith Hellerstein, Glenn McKnight, Ron Sherwood, Ali Al Meshal, Murray McKercher, and Rinalia Abdul Rahim has just joined us as well.

On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambroner and Carlos Vera.

On the Russian Channel, we have Oksana Prykhodko.

We do not currently have anyone on the French channel.

We also have our liaisons Julie Hammer and Marry McKercher on the call.

Apologies today noted from Robert Gaetano, Alberto Soto, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Holly Raiche, and Wolf Ludwig.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Kathy Schnitt, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

Our interpreters today on the French channel are Claire and Camila. On the Spanish channel, Veronica and David. And on the Russian channel we have Galina and Ekaterina.

If I could also 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 very important

to speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.
Thank you, Olivier. Over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. I welcome everyone to this call. My goodness, quite a few people who are not ALAC members, and of course you are all very welcome to attend this call. Also a warm welcome to the people listening to us on the Russian channel, which is an addition to our language channels of Spanish and French, so welcome to you as well.

Now we can move directly to agenda item number three, and that's the review of the action items from our last ALAC call on the 22nd of July. You can scroll to the bottom of the page, which you can click on to and you will see a number of open action items and a number of newly-assigned action items.

I'm looking at these and seeing that there are quite a few open action items yet. The first one, Nathalie Peregrine to post a new online ALS application on the Wiki space viewable to the public and to publicize the Wiki space. Nathalie is on holiday at the moment. Is anyone else from staff able to let us know how that is coming along?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, everyone. If I can briefly update everyone on that, please. We have received a memo from legal, which we are able to share with you if you'd like. Basically, the last question [inaudible] has been holding the posting of the new online ALS application has been resolved. There will

just be a slight change, an addition to one of the questions on the geographic breadth of the membership and the leadership. So that one basically can be closed. We just had that yesterday, so we can now go ahead and post that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. The question, I think the feedback from legal was to do primarily with the international side of ALSes. We've had some recent applications which are non-geographical. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. So they have an interest for the Internet end user, but their membership is not necessarily geographically-defined and that has raised some questions within the legal department.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Heidi. I was just going to touch on this very quickly. We have, indeed, some At-Large structures that are not purely geographical in that some actually span more than one country and some span more than one continent but have the bulk of their members from the country in which they have registered from. The rules are somehow that an ALS needs to be a geographical entity, but in recent times we've had two ALSes in the NARALO region that have not been geographical entities as such and that have had members elsewhere.

For this explanation, I see Alan has put his hand up. He might be able to provide a little bit more information on this. I wasn't going to – Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't provide more information on this specific question, but I would suggest that trying to get an online application form is not the right time to change our rules. The process and rules for ALSes were set at this point seven years ago. It's probably time to review them anyway. We've been saying that for the last three or four years. We may well want to change the rules. That may require bylaw changes. Something may come out of it, but getting the online form out is not the time to try to address those problems in my mind. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I don't think anyone has suggested that the rules would have to be changed. Quite the contrary. It's just a concern that was [inaudible]. The only discussion I would say on this is that this should be really sent to the Accessibility Working Group because the two ALSes that are in this specific non-geographical status are ones that are related to a couple of disability-related organizations that not only have members in the United States or North America but also elsewhere. I was going to suggest that they work perhaps with the other RALOs if they wish to also have other parts of the world covered by seeing if sister organizations that are based in the other regions that the world might wish to join. That was the suggestion I was going to make on this. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: What I took from it is that the world is changing and maybe there is a need for looking at ALSes which are not particularly bound to a region,

and if that is the case, then that has to be addressed with rules, not via the online concern.

And even what you're suggesting I think is a way of getting involvement, but I really think we need to separate it from the online process. If we ever change the rules, the online process will change with it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alan. Certainly with regards to considering and having non-geographical applications, that's something which I would personally say be careful what you wish for, because that's a potential absolute can of worms when you have organizations that are both present globally and also with local organizations such as chapters, etc., especially when there are politics related to some of these organizations that might then [spill in] to our own backyard, which is exactly what we want to avoid.

Anyway, that closes the discussion on this topic. Thank you very much. We can mark this I think as being done.

Next, Ariel Liang is to work with Dev and Olivier on the development of an overall work space for the collection of At-Large action items. You will have noticed that Dev is not on this call. He is rather busy this time of the year, so unfortunately we will have to wait for another month or so until something comes out of this.

Next, staff to monitor the use of additional languages over the course of a few months. That's ongoing, of course, and I just mentioned Russian being one additional language that has been added. I hear that we

might be getting Chinese as well. Could I have further clarification on this, please?

Yes, Gisella, please go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. Chinese will be added to the languages proposed for interpretation hopefully as of next month.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you. Next, Olivier to take up the issue of volunteer recognition and configuration with other SOs and ACs chairs as an ICANN-wide issue. I have taken this up with other SO and AC chairs. The response so far has been not that conclusive in that there are so many other topics to pursue at the moment and there's a deeper concern about process, implementation, and the constant struggle for bottom-up versus top-down, staff versus volunteer-led initiatives. Somehow, just the issue of volunteer recognition hasn't gained any traction so far, although there are concerns. We might have to look at this perhaps whilst meeting face-to-face with other SOs and ACs in Los Angeles.

Nest, staff to perform the initial analysis of the PAB public forum contributions – that's, of course, the Public Advisory Board public forum contributions – and the New gTLD Working Group to take up the follow up work. For this, Heidi will provide us with a quick update.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. That will be finished this week most certainly, and we can go ahead and have staff then Doodle out for a call this next week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Heidi. Then let's move on the the Newly Assigned Action Items. On there, staff is to investigate with Web admin if and when we can move the ATLAS II website off Eduardo Diaz's server because the ATLAS II website is running off Eduardo's server at the moment.

Staff, do we have an update on this, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe we're still working on that. I will make that a priority as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next, each one of the ATLAS II group chairs is to provide the ATLAS II Organizing Committee chairs with a specific piece of reporting of about 300 words or so to focus on metrics, measures, attendance, engagement counts, reportable outcomes, etc. – feedback, lessons learned, effectively.

This is actually being done. I don't know if all of the ATLAS II group chairs and the Organizing Committee chairs have provided their feedback, but I will just ask staff instead of taking time on this call to discuss this that you would please check through if there is any report that is missing and follow up with the chairs of those respective working groups and thematic groups.

In the meantime, I can just report that there has been a follow up call of the ATLAS II group of chairs, co-chairs, thematic group chairs, etc., that took place last week where the first lessons learned were shared and also a [inaudible] of ATLAS II follow up was engaged. The call will continue this week then until we manage to implement all of the ATLAS II recommendations. That's the process that is currently going on.

Next, I note here a consensus call: discussions on ICANN accountability to take place within the Future Challenges Working Group. Passed with no objections. I gather that this is not an action item. The only thing is basically that the ICANN accountability [inaudible] Future Challenges, that's also happened. And in fact, there was a call of the Future Challenges Working Group that took place yesterday, and we will have an update on this shortly later on in this call.

Ariel and Nathalie to follow up on the pending ALS decertifications. We will touch on this in a moment. That has been done, so this one can be put as closed.

Next, Heidi is to make sure that the ATLAS II return on investment follow up work into the ALAC monthly calls standing action items. Yes, Heidi. I'm confused.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Mea culpa on that one. I put that one on today's agenda. We can edit it if you'd like.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I'm not sure whether anybody is ready to speak about this. Is Cheryl ready to speak about this? I don't see her on the call. Well, no, she is on the call, but I don't know whether she would be ready to speak to us about it when we go through the working groups.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl posted something into the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. I'm on a hotel phone. Trying to work out how to mute/unmute was very exciting. Other than the note I put in the chat – which was actually writing to the last action item because whilst the chairs of the other working groups have I believe in the main the working groups and thematic groups have posted what worked, what didn't work, what can we do better, etc., – I do not believe that there has been sufficient attention to matters of metrics and statistics and numbers of attendees, and type questions.

So that does still need to be an open action item, or it can be transferred onto this action item, which is now going to be part of future meetings. You can have this oral request as the follow up on the action item on the return on investment for this meeting, and hopefully by next meeting we'll have more deep and meaningful data to work with and report back on, including survey [inaudible] attendees, etc.

So I'm happy to give a brief oral report now but particularly make sure that the leadership of the various work groups and thematic groups

realize that the reporting they've done to date does not satisfy what is needed for the return on investment.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Cheryl. What I would suggest then in the interest of time is if there is little to report now, maybe we will then just decide to report in September and give more time for the ATLAS II working groups and ROI to prepare more and have, I guess, a lot more information than you can present today. Is that okay?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, as far as I'm concerned, I just gave you the report and you'll get another one next month. And there's an AI out of that, which is give me more to work with from the work groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next, let's look at the consensus call. No, we've done the consensus call. Ariel and Nathalie to follow up on the pending ALS decertification. That's done. Okay, I've lost my track here.

Here we go. Tijani Ben Jemaa to organize a meeting of the capacity building working group during the second half of August. Who is going to follow up on this? Tijani, could you please let us know where is the status of this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I asked for a Doodle, and I am waiting for it. Yes, we need to organize it next week. I hope the Doodle will come very soon so that we can do it next week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Tijani.

The next, Sandra and staff to work together to explain the different status of the Academy Working Groups and make a proposal for the next ALAC call. There is going to be feedback on the Academy Working Group, a report from the Academy Working Group later on in this call. I gather we will have this report or shortly later. I see Sandra has unmuted. Sandra, would you like to [inaudible], please?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hello, Olivier and all. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, absolutely. Please, go ahead.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. I actually let staff already [inaudible]. This is still not fulfilled this task to work on this proposal because this happened while we were so busy with [concerning] the participants of the next [inaudible] planning program as well as staff as myself are overwhelmed with this urgent task. And so we had put that aside, and we are going to do this for the next ALAC call. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Sandra. Let's keep this action item open and then make sure it happens in September. That's all the action items for today. Any comments on any of the action items? The floor is open.

No one having put their hand up, alright, let's get going then and move to the next agenda item, and that's the review of the current ALS applications. Who is going to take this? It's not Nathalie, so it will have to be someone else from staff. The floor is open.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I will go ahead and attempt to do this. Ariel, since you're watching the votes, you might need to jump in. Let's take a look. We've just updated this. We have the two ALSes that were decertified from NARALO, so we're now at 178. We have a number of applications pending: Our Rights, ISOC South Africa Gauteng Chapter, ISOC Gambia, and Inernauta Colombia. I think that's basically the update, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Heidi. Welcome to the recently certified At-Large Structures: the Open Sourc Foundation for Nigeria,

the Internet Society Tchad Chapter, the Internet Society Mauritius Chapter. These are three new At-Large Structures in AFRALO.

Then we've got the two currently being voted on that we will soon hopefully see: the Online News Association and the Instituto Panameño de Derecho y Nuevas Tecnologías.

One thing to point out: the two ALSes that were recently decertified, these were from the previous batch of decertification. If you recall, we did not decertify those two organizations because the evidence was inconclusive at the time or at least was not clearly displayed for our ALAC members to be able to consult.

Thankfully, the NARALO chair and staff have worked to get the information on the Wiki, and so we've had a clear decertification of Consumer Web Watch and of The Alberta Community Network Association, both of these organizations I believe having disappeared and having no interest, of course, since they don't exist anymore somehow.

Now this is absolutely a lesson. Of course, it's great to have more At-Large Structures being certified, but it's also important to have At-Large Structures that are active. My suggestion I think to the ALAC is to really start looking at our bylaws and apply some of the minimum participation requirements [inaudible] either suggesting or at least discussing at some point.

I know that some of the RALOs have minimum participation requirements in their region. As we are growing larger and larger – 178 At-Large Structures is a very large amount – we are at this rate going to

reach the 200 mark quite soon. Out of 200 At-Large Structures, there might be some that will have had a change of heart or maybe have changed hands or disappeared.

We need to be very vigilant about this and make sure that not only we have a large number of At-Large Structures but we also are able to reach people at the edges of the world in those At-Large Structures. I ask for your global cooperation on this.

Next, we have the reports. The reports are, of course, from our RALOs, from our liaisons. I invite you to have a look at our Wiki page that has the GNSO, ccNSO, SSAC liaison reports, etc. Usually, we just invite people to go and read those reports.

I thank all of the people who have submitted reports. It is sometimes a tedious task to repeat and report on things that have happened during the month, but it is ever so helpful for people who are just joining the active part of At-Large. [inaudible] people who are interested in doing things and being busy and helping out to be able to catch up with what's going on right now.

At the same time, it also provides a great snapshot of our activities. The At-Large community is sometimes accused of just talking to itself and not going out there and working with the rest of ICANN. Certainly, I think we are the furthest from the silos as any organization within ICANN as far as supporting organizations and advisory committees are concerned.

We just usually ask for a quick three-minute update from our three bylaw mandated liaisons: the GNSO, the ccNSO, and SSAC. Occasionally

if we have time, we'll ask for a quick update from the dotMOBI liaison. Let's start with our SSAC liaison. Or did I hear that Julie – no, Julie is online. I wonder if we could have Julie Hammer's report, please. Julie, you have the floor.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Olivier. Really, the only thing I want to point out to everyone is the [inaudible] SAC067, which is an information document that talks about the history and the functions of IANA. It has been worked on over the last few months to try to present in easily understood language information that will help all of the people working on IANA stewardship transition. I commend that document to you, and I thank those of you who have already given me feedback to pass on to the SSAC on that.

The SSAC is working on a second document that's going to discuss contractual aspects of the IANA functions that are relevant to the stewardship issue, but that is still a little way off publication. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Julie, for this. Always very good work from the SSAC. The IANA stewardship transition document is being passed on to our working group and devoured by our working group members and has been very helpful. Thanks very much again for passing this so efficiently and quickly.

Next, we have, let's see, let's go for our ccNSO liaison report. Maureen Hilyard, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, ccNSO this month, they had a council meeting. They didn't have one last month. [inaudible] council elections of their members on council and for their Board member and an interesting discussion about the IANA coordination [inaudible]. The feelings of those who are discussing are very similar to our own. We [inaudible] Dev and I still working on the database that we established in the London meeting. [inaudible], and I know the staff is still working on a date for the Los Angeles meeting of the group and what we discussed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Maureen. Could you just remind us what the database established in London meeting is, please?

MAUREEN HILYARD: The database that we were establishing to coordinate the ALSes with their country, their ccTLDs, and the GAC membership where we can [inaudible] out in the different RALOs. The database is on a Google doc at the moment so that Ron, Dev, and I can work on it. And are you mentioning the meeting in London? I'm still waiting on getting a date from Heidi and staff I assume who are discussing when it would be an appropriate time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Maureen. One other question for you. You mentioned the IANA coordination group. Is there an IANA issues

working group within ccNSO then, or is it taken on directly by the ccNSO council?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

The ccNSO actually has a committee that is actually looking at selecting – they have a select group. They have a selection committee. Yes, so they are looking at selecting their members for that group. And of course, a discussion has arisen out of the fact that they only have one person on that coordination committee and, like us, I think they feel that it's very top-down the whole process. So, yeah, there's a little bit of a discussion going on there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Maureen. I see Ron Sherwood has put his hand up. Ron, you have the floor.

RON SHERWOOD:

Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to say that at the ccNSO meeting, there was an attempt to work out a suitable date for the joint ALAC/ccNSO meeting in Los Angeles. The meeting was very full, and part of the agenda was still remaining for the next meeting. However, Bart has responded to my request, and he says there is a meeting coordination committee for Los Angeles and he is going to work with them to try and find out what would be suitable for this joint meeting for both ALAC and for ccNSO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Ron. Do we need to supply you – I mean, do we as the ALAC need to supply you with potential topics for discussion at this stage?

RON SHERWOOD: Yes, that would be excellent. First of all, we're trying to find a space for the actual meeting. But yes, both sides need to present topics for discussion. In fact, Maureen has already made some suggestions. But the meeting time – or if there is going to be a meeting if there is an available meeting time – that seems to be the number one problem at this point. ccNSO hasn't got their agenda in order yet to be able to determine where there is space. The last ALAC meeting that I attended, there were still changes being made to the ALAC agenda. I think that's what the coordinating committee is trying to work out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. We'll wait for your official request then for topics when you are ready. I see Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I do think that those meetings with the ccNSO are very important because we both have [inaudible] on every part of the world. I think that we...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, we might have lost you. Have we lost Tijani? Yes, we've all lost Tijani. I think you were discussing using the Adobe Connect, so that's

nor working right now. Gisella, will you be dialing out to Tijani? Yeah, dialing out to him. Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: ...[inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I must say I haven't understood any of this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello? Can you hear me now? Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, yes, you cut out for a moment unfortunately. We haven't heard anything for the past minute. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. I said that I call for result-oriented meeting, and also I call for a timeline and task allocation with dates so that in the future we will see things done on the ground. I will repeat that our cooperation will [inaudible] that the grassroot on the ground will manage perhaps with this cooperation to make the people on the ground perhaps participate better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Tijani. This I hope will be taken on board by Maureen and by Ron as well in the preparation of the meeting with the ccNSO.

Let's continue then. I note there are a couple of points that were made in the chat. Jean-Jacques Subrenat mentioned that the ccNSO has a committee specifically on stewardship transition just like the ALAC. It would be worthwhile suggesting joint positions like for example on the draft of the RFP, which is the request for proposal discussed today in the IANA coordination group. Let's see if you can suggest it later on during your report, but that's a very valid point indeed.

Next, we have the GNSO liaison report. For this, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Not a lot to report. The GNSO and ALAC meetings are out of sync, that they're just following the ALAC meetings these days.

I'll note in the report from the last one, the Business Constituency is talking about a standing accountability cross-community working group. I'm not quite sure what that means, but something may end up coming out of that. I'm not quite sure what.

I'll remind the group that there is the new discussion group on new gTLD implementation that is starting to put together lists of issues that may need to be addressed in future rounds. There are a few participants from At-Large but not many. The group is not meeting very often. The next meeting is probably going to be on September 5, so there's still

plenty of opportunity to get names in if you have an interest. Given the discussion over the last couple of years, I would have expected more interest than I've seen so far.

That's about all to report. There's a meeting next week, and you'll find the report posted pretty well as soon as the meeting is over.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alan. Now I'll open the floor for questions on any of these liaison reports. Murray McKercher, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you, Olivier. Just a quick report on the dotMOBI Policy Advisory Board meeting. The next one is scheduled for September 23 or 25. After that meeting, I'll have a more formal report on the Wiki. Anyone interested in the history of dotMOBI, I will just put in the chat a link to the dotMOBI Wikipedia entry. If anyone would like to follow up, they can contact me directly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this report, Murray. I understand this might be a short report, but I know how hard you've worked to try and get ahold of the people in dotMOBI. It seems to be coming on and off, and they seem to be doing things and then things don't happen for a few months. But it's good to hear that a follow up meeting is going to take place.

I also invite everyone to have a look at the different reports that we have. The RALO reports, again, very helpful. [inaudible] the RALO

reports. We're not going to go through the activities of each one of the Regional At-Large Organizations, but if you have any comments or questions, I suggest that you may wish to write to the RALO chairs and leaders – so chairs, vice-chairs, secretariat – for each one of the RALOs to ask your questions.

I really am thankful for these to be updated because it makes all the difference from all our ALSes.

Now we have New Business. That starts with the Items for Decision. As is usually customary on these calls, the ALAC policy development activities are the center of the work of the At-Large Advisory Committee.

For this, I invite you to have a look at the policy advice development page, which is a page that is very well updated by Ariel Liang, our policy specialist I could say, policy wizard on these things. As you can see, it's a page which has got all of the current pipeline of work, including call for comments. These are At-Large comments. Open call for At-Large comments, closing, the vote announcement, when the vote opens, and when the vote closes, and finally of course when we are going to be sending the submission of a statement.

There is a particular difference with the set of recent statements. The difference is that they're the same. In fact, we've seen a number of requests for introduction of two-character domain names for a whole number of extensions all filed by new generic top-level domain applicants. All of these are currently in [process]. We've had one that we have voted on recently, and the others we have not voted on yet.

I don't know why we still are on the ALAC working group reports on the Adobe Connect, but you are one agenda item behind us and you better catch up, please.

Recently adopted statements, there were three in fact: Universal Acceptance of TLDs Draft Roadmap, the Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace, and the Report: Supporting the Domain Name Industry in Underserved Regions. The Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace was adopted with 30 votes in favor and two abstentions.

We now have Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names in .DEALS and a whole number of top-level domains. The ALAC is currently voting on exactly the same statement as we filed before.

Next, the Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .LUXURY and a whole number of other domain names associated with Top Level Domain Holdings Limited. The commentary is still open for this. If there are any amendments – because it might well be that some of these comment periods which are not just exact copies of each other – it might be that some of the requests are slightly different. So I invite you all to read them and note if there are any differences in the amendments that might be needed to our statement relating to the actual public comment itself.

Thirdly, the Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .SOHU and other names there. The commenting is open for that as well.

I see Evan Leibovitch has put his hand up on this. So, Evan, if you would like to please speak here, the floor is open to you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks very much, Olivier. This is Evan. Since the ALAC has already passed what I would call an omnibus statement on two-letter domains, since we've already done that, I really don't understand the need to revisit each of these unless, as you said, there's a specific circumstance that requires a separate comment.

In terms of trying to make less work for the ALAC and allow us to concentrate our attention elsewhere, can we not simply reply to these statements, point to the original statement that was made? Each of these does not require a separate ALAC vote. We've already made a comment. We've already passed a policy on how the ALAC reacts to two-character domain names.

Unless there's a specific mitigating circumstance that makes some of these different, I don't understand why we have to go through the process repeatedly, why we can't simply answer the public comment for each of them and point to the original commentary which applies to all of them. I think we're just making more work for ourselves, especially with having to go through a separate vote for each of these. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thanks very much for this, Evan. One potential solution that was explored was to ask the staff member in charge of these public comments – all of these, by the way, are run by the same staff member – whether it is possible to have a standing ALAC statement and then point each one of these public comments to our standing statement. The response was that this was not possible. Each one was different and

might be slightly different. There was no guarantee that they would be asking for the same thing.

The only other option is, as you said, have our statement for the first public comment that we answered, and then just point to that statement. The question is one of process then. When do we agree that the public comment is similar or the same to the one that is there beforehand? I understand our point does not really take much note into the specifics of each one of the public comments there, but it's just a question of process basically.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The statement we ended up with said we don't think there should be any restrictions at all on two-letter character second-level names. Therefore, we certainly have no objection eliminating the restriction on non-ccTLD names.

It's somewhat hard to imagine an exception to that, but let's say there is one. I would suggest the next vote we hold essentially say, "The ALAC for this and, subject to revision, for all future comments believes this is that this is the case," and give us the words. That gives the ability of staff to put the same thing each time.

In theory, presumably we have Dave or somebody looking at each of them as they come up and saying, "Yes, this is a rubber stamp" or "Hold on. There's something really special in this one. We need to handle it

differently.” I don’t see a problem in having the ALAC do an omnibus bill that covers future ones, subject to revision. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, everyone. Yes, Olivier has dropped, and we’re dialing him back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It should be just one moment. Evan, you have your hand up. Did you want to respond to that?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes. Alan, is there a reason – sorry. We are on an ALAC call right now. Is there any reason why we cannot move and pass a motion right now that essentially makes the original statement universal? Is there any reason we can’t?

ALAN GREENBERG: Only that we seemed to be tied at the hip to Big Pulse and love online votes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: We’re in a meeting right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Taking the sarcasm out of it, my answer is no. there is no reason.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Then when Olivier comes back on, I'm going to make a motion for consideration at this meeting right now. The motion I would like to make is that – sorry. Just thinking of it right now. I'd like to make a motion that the recent statement that was passed by ALAC regarding two-letter domain names be considered applicable to all such public comment processes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Subject to future revision?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Correct. I've made this motion. Alan has seconded it. Okay, so Leon has seconded it. So we have a motion that is – I guess I can. Okay, Olivier is waiting dial-out. Technically I'm vice-chair, so I'm capable of doing this. Unfortunately, I'm also the mover of the motion, which makes things difficult.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have a second vice-chair.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Isn't that Tijani? Okay, Alan, for the moment, can you take over as chair for the meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can. Olivier just asked in the chat for Tijani to take over. Is Tijani actually on the call, or is he dropped?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, I am on the call now, and I do support the motion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, would you like me to chair or do you want to chair, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. As a replacement for the vice-chair who has given up the position temporarily or the option to chair, is there any discussion on the motion that Evan has made, seconded by Leon and me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Could we please restate the motion? We were not able to capture that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I imagine you can replay the audio. From what I recall, the motion was to make the previous motion that the ALAC passed on two-letter domain names subject to all future public comments on this issue, subject to potential revisions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so wordsmithing perhaps to be done to make sure it's full sentences. What Evan is proposing is that the statement we previously approved on two-character domain names – second-level names, that is – they should be allowed, they should be granted, should be applied to all future public comments on the same subject, subject to ALAC reconsideration should the situation warrant it. If the ALAC agrees, we can make sure the wording says that. We have a transcript of it now. The question is, is there any discussion on this subject, or do people want to go for a vote? Evan, your hand is still up. I have a couple of tick marks.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just noting that Olivier has rejoined the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: In that case, I turn the chair back over to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. [inaudible] speaking and apologies for this. I don't know why I dropped. It looks as if several other people dropped as well. Thankfully, I was able to listen to the call on the Adobe Connect,

and I see that there are seconders and so we're ready. Correct. The motion is correctly there. We've got a motion by Evan, seconded by Leon and Alan. Are there any others seconders that I might have missed whilst switching phones?

May I just suggest instead of saying to make the previous statement that the ALAC previously passed on the second-level domain names should be applied to future revisits of the issue and subject to future revision. That doesn't make sense at the moment. Alan, back to you, please, for the wording of the motion.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can try wording it, but I think the intent is clear and we can get the wording correct after the fact. The tense of the verb is wrong here. With the grace of the group, I think everyone understands – I hope everyone understands – the intent. It is, we're going to take the motion we already passed via Big Pulse and apply it to all future two-letter second-level domain RSEPs, subject to revision if necessary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks very much for this, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll work with staff to make sure the wording is correct after the fact.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, correct. I would say just for the record though that the statement we are referring to at the moment as an example is the Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace, which was adopted with 30 votes in favor and two abstentions. That is the basic statement to start with.

There is one that's currently being voted. I think because it's being voted on we can keep it out. The two that are remaining will be the Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .LUXURY and Two-Character Domain Names for .SOHU and any future second-level two-character domains [related] public comment.

Are there any questions or comments on this? Is anything unclear? I'd like to make sure before we move forward on this motion that everybody is clear. And the vote would be only by ALAC members. I'm also going to ask staff to please note the ALAC members on the call, please, and let us know if we have quorum.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, from my count, it seems we have nine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much, Heidi. That means we have quorum. The other question I have received is whether I would do a consensus call on this or an actual vote. I think that because the ALAC statements require votes, it would be good for us to have an actual vote on this call rather than a consensus call. That would certainly make it clearer.

Maureen Hilyard, do you have a question or a comment or both?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry, Olivier. I meant to put my hand up for a vote rather than for a comment. Sorry. I'll change that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So please, don't put your hand up just now. Now I also hand the floor to Fatima Cambronero who mentions she is seconding this motion, then she has a comment from LACRALO. Fatima, you have the floor.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Olivier, Adigo is dialing back out to Fatima now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, everyone. Apologies, but it seems like Olivier has dropped again, so we do have some gremlins on the line today it seems. In the meantime, staff are getting ready to take the votes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Perhaps you can give the floor to Fatima.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: At this time, they're having trouble connecting Fatima. We will let you know as soon as she rejoins.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry. We seem to have a lot of people dropping, so it should take a little bit to get them back on. In the meantime, Tijani, Olivier has asked that you take the chair and start the vote, please. Tijani, are you able to do that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Yes. So now we have a motion by Evan and seconded by Alan and Leon and myself too. I will ask people who agree with this motion please to raise your hand. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you, Tijani. We also have Olivier back, and Fatima is back as well. Fatima, can you just please [inaudible] green tick.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Back to you, Olivier.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much. Okay, so I'm going to start reading. We have Olivier with a green tick and Fatima.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi, I'm sorry to interrupt. A point of order: Fatima did ask for the floor, and we do need to listen – since she is back on the call – we do need to listen to her comments before voting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Fatima Cambronero, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Can you hear me because I don't know if you are listening to me directly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead, Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Olivier knows about this situation because he participated at the LACRALO meeting when we discussed this issue. The first thing we voted upon on ALAC I have to abstain myself, and I explained the reason, because in LACRALO we were not understanding the issue, and from my perspective, LACRALO does not understand the issue.

I agree to second and to support this motion because otherwise we'll be duplicating where we will keep on discussing the same things. I finally

understood what we are discussing, so I may give a yes to this motion right now, but perhaps this may generate certain comments in LACRALO. We had a webinar at LACRALO, and perhaps in the future we may have some other webinar so that the LACRALO may further discuss and understand the issue, but I [do] and I vote yes for this motion today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this, Fatima. Yes indeed, I was on the LACRALO call and there was some misunderstanding, and I therefore understand the concerns of LACRALO members over the initial statement, the first statement that was voted on. I'm glad that things are getting to be more understood.

It might be, indeed, that there is a need for some kind of a webinar to explain the concept of the second-level domain name as opposed to a top-level domain name just to make sure and to put it to the record this statement does not deal with the top-level domain name. A two-character top-level domain name is still entirely exclusively for country code top-level domains. No generic top-level domains are allowed to have two characters.

We're dealing here with the second-level, which is just underneath that. So looking at, for example, AA.com, that's American Airlines. That's a two-character domain name under .com, and we would be therefore – looking at the applications here – at .DEALS, for example, we would be looking at Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names for .DEALS. So AA.DEALS. That's the simplest explanation I can provide on that.

Thank you for letting us know about this concern. Now we can proceed forward with a vote. I'll repeat the motion again, which thankfully has been cleaned up since we last read it: "The ALAC statement on the Introduction of Two-Character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace should be applied to future public comment requests on the two-character domain name issue and subject to revision." I guess [inaudible] the "subject to revision," there will need to be a revision process to make sure that the public comment requests are the same.

The motion is by Evan, seconded by Leon, Alan, and Tijani. Those in favor, I read at the moment. Heidi, could you please read us through these?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. We have in favor...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And only ALAC members to vote.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, only ALAC members, so Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Fatima Cambroner, Evan Leibovitch, Alan Greenberg, Eduardo Diaz, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Leon Sanchez, Sandra Hoferichter, Raf Fatani, Tijani Ben Jemaa. Ariel, did you capture all of those, and did I miss anyone?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maureen?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen Hilyard.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Heidi. Let's put our hands down. Let's now ask for anyone who is against this motion to put a big red cross. So there you've got the ability to put a red cross. I'll show you what [inaudible]. Like this thing. Like this disagree red cross. I see no one having put a red cross, so there's no votes against. Are there any abstentions? For abstentions, you may put your hand up. Alright, I see Evan has put his hand up, so let's call it something else. For any abstentions, but a red cross then on there since we didn't get any red crosses. Any abstentions? No abstentions. So could you please read the vote?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ariel, please?

ARIEL LIANG: Hello, everyone. The motion has been passed with 12 yes, no no, and no abstentions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. You just said 12 yes, in the chat you put 13, and I thought I counted 11.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ah, yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry. It said 12. I apologize for the error.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we have someone read out the list of 12?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Do you want to read the ones for the yes, please?

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. The yes is: Alan, Rafid, Eduardo, Evan, Jean-Jacques, Maureen, Fatima, Eduardo – oh, sorry. I apologize. It's 11 I recorded one more person twice. Sandra, Tijani, Olivier, and Leon. So 11 yes. I apologize for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Ariel, for this. This is good practice for votes we're going to have in a moment. I hope that it will take a bit less time than on this occasion. Thanks for the motion, Evan.

Let's move on to our policy development. We're going to look at the last two statements on this list. The first one is the Proposed Bylaws

Changes Regarding Consideration of GAC Advice. That is one where the ALAC is commenting on a statement. A first draft was provided very kindly by I believe it was – if my page is able to load. The page doesn't load when you need it. The first one was drafted by Fatima Cambronero and Leon Sanchez. There we are.

At the moment we are I believe – are we voting on this already? It seems that this is not updated correctly, but there you go. We're currently commenting on this statement. A first draft is on there, and I invite you all to have a look at it. My computer for some reason cannot download that page.

Then we've got the next one, which is the Board Working Group Report on Nominating Committee (BWG-NomCom). That's a working group that has provided some recommendations for changing the way the NomCom is put together, so the composition of the Nominating Committee itself.

Then Implementing Rights Protection Mechanisms in the Name Collision Mitigation Framework. On this one, the ALAC is considering drafting a statement. I would have to ask our GNSO liaison about this. Alan Greenberg, is there a need for an ALAC statement on this topic?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. On the NomCom report?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, the Implementing Rights Protection Mechanisms in the Name Collision Mitigation Framework.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry. I was still trying to read messages. I personally don't see a need for a statement, but someone else may see one. This is an introductory one. It's at the start of the PDP. We could make a motherhood statement saying, "Yes, we think people [inaudible] protected." I don't see any need for it whatsoever. We do not have a particularly large vested interest in this issue. I don't see a need for a statement at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I personally think we should stop writing statements which don't really have anything to contribute to the subject.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, thank you very much for this, Alan. I notice that the agenda that is on the screen does not have this last point, but that's in the updated agenda which is on the Wiki page.

Are there any comments regarding the Proposed Bylaws Changes Regarding Consideration of GAC Advice and the Board Working Group Report on Nominating Committee?

Just to give you a quick summary, the first one is to change the threshold by which the Board can vote against GAC advice or can

choose to ignore GAC advice. So far, it has been on the 75% mark, I think, three-quarters. And now they are asking to bring it down to 60% I believe, to a lower threshold.

The second one, the Board Working Group Report on Nominating Committee, asks for some GAC members I think to be added on the Nominating Committee and a number of other small issues to [inaudible].

I see two people have put their hands up on this: Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Alan Greenberg. So let's start with Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. About the Board Working Group Report on Nominating Committee, I think that since the ALAC produced a white paper and in that white paper made observations but also recommendations about the structure of ICANN's leadership, including some things about the Board, may I suggest that perhaps the person in charge of drafting a statement on behalf of ALAC – in other words Eduardo – perhaps go back to our [inaudible] white paper to see what was written there and at least mention it in whatever position we take so that there is some consistency and also continuity between our past positions we have taken and what we will say now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was going to comment on the other one on the voting threshold. But with regard to what Jean-Jacques just said, continuity is important, but we need to make sure that what we're saying is indeed what we feel now, that positions do change. I don't have a clue whether there's any conflict at this point, but I care less about making sure that what we said last time is the same as what we're saying this time than making sure what we're saying this time is indeed what we believe, if indeed there's [inaudible].

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Olivier, I would just like to respond immediately to Alan. Yes, I agree with you completely. I think that it is our current position which is most important, but that does not keep us from going back to what we said the last time at least for our own sake to see where we are, whether we have evolved or not evolved. At least there should be some mention of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was not disagreeing with that.

With regard to the Board threshold, Olivier, I think you got the numbers slightly wrong. Because it's a negative action the Board has to take, the current threshold is it takes a simple majority – that is 50 plus 1 – to ignore GAC advice. The change is recommending that it takes two-thirds to ignore GAC advice. That is, more of the Board has to agree to ignore the advice than before, which increases the difficulty of ignoring advice in theory. In practice, of course, most of these votes are either

unanimous or near unanimous, so in the real world as we know it today – things could change – it will not make any operational difference.

I do have some problem with the statement – and I'll be making a comment on it – in that I believe the statement makes some very good cases why the threshold should not be changed, but it does not present the alternate side. That's not saying the outcome will be different, but I think any statement we make needs to be balanced in that it needs to show that we've evaluated all of the issues before making the decision. And I will be making a comment to that effect. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan, and thank you for your comment, Jean-Jacques. What I suggest is because this is all policy development and policy work that has Wiki pages, I would suggest that you all submit your comment statements and discussions to the Wiki for everyone to be able to pursue, and well in time before the time closes for comments in the At-Large community.

The time is ticking, and we need to move forward now and move to agenda item number 7. That agenda item is looking at the Review of the Cross-Community Working Group Charter Design Team. Tijani Ben Jemaa and Leon Sanchez are with us. They have been working on this charter drafting team for an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions.

Just to remind you all, there is an IANA issues working group in the At-Large community that feeds the IANA coordination group that the

Department of Commerce has asked for that has been created for everyone to take part in from the large number of communities.

One of the proposals is supposed to come from the ICANN community. That's the proposal that will deal specifically with the numbering part of the IANA. What am I doing, the number? The names part of the IANA contract. The numbers, of course, come from the region Internet registries and the protocols from the Internet engineering taskforce.

So in effect the Cross-Community Working Group on IANA issues is the short name for it. I guess that the charter is being drafted in a purely cross-community way. [I have your] colleagues on the drafting team. I don't know who is going to take us through this quickly, Tijani or Leon. I note that this is 20 minutes, but we did overrun by quite a lot on the policy development activities, so if we could try and make this in less time than 20 minutes, that would be great.

I see Alan Greenberg and then Tijani Ben Jemaa. Alan, you have the floor, and then we'll go over to Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. That is an old hand.

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

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. This is a charter that has been drafted by a drafting team. We're Leon, myself, and Julie Hammer, but Julie Hammer was not appointed by ALAC. She was appointed by the SSAC. We three persons participated in this drafting team.

The charter, the work was more or less [inaudible] a real conflict inside the group. I really thank Avri Doria who was the one who more or less understood our concerns and tried to implement it in the charter. The made the good drafting for the path that we [inaudible], especially because of the application of the end users, all the other people or the other groups then, the clients of IANA to contribute in this working group.

This was done, and another very important thing, it was made clear in the charter actually at the beginning that this group will look only at the naming function of IANA and nothing more. So we not yet, and Avri tried to put the right text to make it so now it is not excluded. It is mainly for the naming functions, but it can also deal with the other functions. This is the main things that was raised by the ALAC participants, and now I think the charter is [inaudible].

By the way, the charter is already approved by the [inaudible] council. So now if today ALAC will approve it, it will be two chapters of the organization approving it. Then the GNSO I think it will be the next which has to be discussed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Tijani, for this introduction. Just for the record, I have sent that charter over to the ALAC mailing list for everyone to be

able to read through it. I was hoping if we have a proposal and a seconder, etc., I was hoping that we could pass this charter and adopt it.

I note that the GNSO has not adopted it yet. I'm not aware of any of the other SOs and ACs having adopted it. If we don't adopt it today, we would probably have to go through a Big Pulse vote because waiting for a month is probably unlikely to be a good idea at this point in time.

The couple of contentious issues, of course, are the concern that this charter only would deal with the naming functions, or primarily with naming functions, and not with numbering or accountability issues or any of the other things around it. But as Tijani very well explained now, this is somehow mitigated.

I'll give you a few more minutes and give the floor back to Tijani if he wishes to add things to this. I'll give you all a few more minutes to be able to read through this proposed charter. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. No, I [inaudible]. As for the [inaudible], it was very clear in [inaudible] that it is [inaudible] with IANA functions and actually I don't think that there is a problem in this charter. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you for this, Tijani. Leon Sanchez, you have the floor, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Olivier. [inaudible] with Tijani. There was the concern that there wasn't any linkage between what the working group was going to do with regards to the transition of the IANA [inaudible] accountability and, as Tijani put it, Avri helped a lot in letting us have this new language that accommodated both the concerns on the transition of the IANA functions and the link of this transition with the accountability issues.

In the original charter, anything that had to deal with accountability was completely out of scope, and in the end we could just accommodate it into the charter as not being out of scope but also not being the principle or the main [objective] of this working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Leon. You have thoughts or comments, Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

One of the problems I have with the entire NTIA transition issue is the ICG has said accountability isn't our problem, it's the other group's. We are soliciting proposals from the operational groups. There's a debate going on, but that's currently at least the major source of input into the process.

There's an admission that there's going to have to be linkage and discussion between the NTIA, ICG, and the corresponding CG on accountability. But in my mind, it's going to be hard to put together a cohesive single proposal to the NTIA without factoring in the

accountability issues. It's not clear for me where it's coming from, so I think it's essential that we need to be able to at least comment in this part of the process on accountability issues. In my mind, that's a really important aspect of it, that is not be precluded because it's not clear where else it's coming from if we're not allowed to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. Yes, Alan, you are absolutely right. With this charter, it is possible to comment on accountability in this [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Certainly, reading the charter, it looks like the charter makes it possible to make a proposal that includes accountability issues with regards to the name. Correct me if I'm wrong Tijani and Leon, with regards to numbers and with regards to the protocols, that's an entirely separate process. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. The scope of the cross-community working group is mainly the naming functions, but not exclusively. [The link] with accountability is not restricted, so there is a clear mention [necessary] link.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you please point us to the exact clause that describes this? I just want to be absolutely sure that people on this call are absolutely sure about what we would be voting for if we are voting for it today. It says here, “The work plan should include at least the following action items.” Or is that elsewhere? Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, may I propose that we vote on it online? Because I am sure people didn’t read it and I don’t have it in front of me now. I have to bring the text and try to find the paragraph. But I don’t think there is [inaudible] in the next five days.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Leon Sanchez?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier. If we scroll down to page three just before the section break in section three, the previous paragraph says, “Relationship to ICANN accountability process.” And if we read through this paragraph, it says, “The IANA stewardship transition process is taking place alongside a parallel and related process on enhancing ICANN accountability. While maintaining the accountability of Internet identifier governance is central to both processes, this group’s scope is focused on the arrangements required for the continuance of IANA functions in an accountable and widely accepted manner after the expiry of the NTIA-ICANN contract. Nevertheless, the two processes are

interrelated and interdependent and should appropriately coordinate their work.”

Accountability for the administration of the IANA function. Example, implementation on operational accountability, however, is properly within the scope of this working group. I don't know if that's the part we should be focusing on this discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon. Thank you for this. Are there any comments or questions on this?

I'll express a personal concern I have on all of the current processes at the moment. We are, having just been on the Coordination Group call, where just one of many observers listening to the discussion. There seems to be a drive for the splitting of the different functions, and therefore the NTIA functions will not be under the current process of ICANN-run NTIA. It might be something completely separate, in which case, when one looks at the current charter here for the names part of the work, it's understandable that it's directly linked to ICANN accountability.

There is a question mark as whether the numbering and the protocols part would be linked to the ICANN accountability.

When people say, "ICANN is all about names, it's not about the numbers; the numbers are all to do with the regional Internet registries," I remind everyone ICANN has two Ns. I just feel uneasy and nervous about this.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Accountability is far wider than the NTIA transition. When people say that ICANN is about names, that's a statement saying that, to a large extent, the policies regarding gTLD names are made within ICANN, and for the purposes of that function, ICANN needs to be accountable and transparent and all those good things.

The policy issues on ccTLDs are, to a large extent, non-existent. But to the extent that they do exist, they are also within ICANN. And the policies on numbers, to a large extent, are determined outside of our environment and are effectively rubber-stamped by our process. And that rubber-stamp process, of course, must be accountable. We can't change those rules unilaterally when they come from the numbering organizations.

The IANA transition adds another component to it. If we end up managing the IANA function as we have for the last decade or so, then there needs to be an accountability aspect of that also. But even if IANA gets taken over by the University of Southern California and the [contract] is issued to them by someone, be it us or someone else, [inaudible] accountability aspect for ICANN is we're still setting policy.

It's a multi-faceted issue and simple statements tend to ignore one aspect or the other. I think, Olivier, what you just referred to is one of those aspects where the statement is true for a certain limited scope, but doesn't cover the whole range of everything we do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. You just mentioned with regards to the names.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ICANN sets policy only on names.

ALAN GREENBERG: ICANN creates the policy internally on names. The numbers one, we have some authority to approve, but it tends to be a [pass-through] process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That can be totally outside the – if the numbers are separated, split from the names, then we are finishing with just the names going through a process of accountability, but the numbers are not and the protocols are not. I might be just barking up the wrong tree, but [inaudible] concerns.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the problems I have with the IANA transition group is they are ignoring the fact that under current bylaws and processes, the number policy may be created by the operational groups, but is passed through ICANN. And it's not clear that there has been a proposal to eliminate

that. In other words, to eliminate the second N in ICANN's name, and therefore it's not – ICANN does have a role to play in ensuring the accountability of the numbers [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Here is a direct question then. Since the Board has to approve policy that is done in the numbers [sphere], does the current charter here, the draft charter that we have on screen for accountability, does that cover it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I do not believe it does.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks, Olivier. I'd like to make a remark at this point about the necessities for us to really coordinate between what we're doing just now, meaning the [CWGDT] draft charter and the position we will have to take by tomorrow at the latest to provide the ICG with our own requirement to be reflected in the RFP, which was discussed earlier this afternoon on the ICG call. Olivier, you were there, so you know what I'm talking about.

I think this is the moment we have to get, if not a single [voice], at least a single orientation which can be reflected in both places. Although sooner or later, this may create a problem for the ALAC. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. Back to Alan, and then we will make [inaudible] what to do next. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a re-notice. I do have a proposal to address the RFP question. I'll be posting it to our [inaudible] the IANA transition, I've lost track of which list it is. The At-Large list associated with it.

In essence, the problem right now is the RFP leads off with—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, I'm sorry—

ALAN GREENBERG: Don't talk about it now? That's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're not dealing with IANA at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're speaking about it a little bit later on on this call and we only have 20 minutes left. So thank you, Alan.

I see that there is still some concern here. I'm not feeling right about asking for a vote for this to be passed at the moment for two reasons. The first one being that very few people have taken part in the conversation, which leads me to think that not enough ALAC members have read that charter yet. The other thing is we all seem to be a little hesitant about what this charter covers or does not cover. It might be that we might wish to propose a friendly amendment and this is not the time now to quickly draft friendly amendments.

I note that the ccNSO Council has adopted the draft. I'm not aware – certainly, the GNSO Council has not yet. There is no – well, the working group on which this is being discussed was related to the NTIA stewardship, so IANA Issues Working Group. I guess it could also have some discussion taking place in the Future Challenges Working Group now that we've started on the accountability discussions.

But this specifically is related to the IANA function, so that would be the IANA Issues discussion. Could I just ask that the discussion continues on that mailing list? Anyone who is interested in this topic, please join the IANA Issues mailing list, and we're not going to come back to vote on this now.

Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Olivier. I'm speaking because you mentioned the idea of this in the context of Future Challenges Working Group. This has not been discussed there. We've been dealing overall with the issue of accountability.

Having said that, I wanted to take the opportunity of suggesting that there is a lot of discussion here that probably needs to take place perhaps in another telephone conference, perhaps managed either by an ad hoc working group or an existing one, simply saying that the kind of discussion that we've seen in this meeting right now is something that really does need to move forward, does need to carry on. I don't know if that can be totally done in a mailing list, so I really would like you – I would like ALAC to suggest the idea of either putting this into an existing working group, creating an ad hoc one for the purposes of discussing it or some other mechanism to do this.

And by the way, I am not recommending Future Challenges for this. We now have our hands full. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Evan. So the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the transition of U.S. government stewardship of the IANA function is meeting on Thursday at 14:00 UTC, and that topic will be discussed then. It will be added to the agenda and I ask staff to make sure that this topic is added to the agenda with a link to the charter, because originally the discussion started there.

Let's move forward. Let's go to our next agenda item: Items for discussion. Update on the post ATLAS II implementation activities.

Oh, just before we do that, I was notified by staff earlier that Carlos Vera wanted to have the floor but was not on the Adobe Connect and I somehow missed Carlos's input. I don't know whether we still have Carlos on the line. Carlos Vera?

Okay. Well, I'm not hearing anything, so probably not. So let's go back to Tijani Ben Jemma, you've put your hand up. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I'd like to suggest that mail sent to the list asking for [inaudible] charter and to comment on it on the Wiki page. It will be discussed and [inaudible] be discussed on the Thursday call, so that they count it there to. But also, I propose that we pick a date for starting the vote that be [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Tijani. I'm reticent to set a date for the vote, because we don't really know yet. Probably what we could do would be to have a recommendation for a date after we've done our discussing on Thursday. At least we will have a much better clarity on this.

Staff, please, action item to add to the CWG charter [inaudible] to the agenda of IANA Issue Working Group call on Thursday, the 28th of August, and to publicize this, please. [inaudible] publicize it to the working group, but also to the whole of ALAC pointing to that charter. And if that charter could be put on a Wiki page. I don't know whether it is already on the Wiki page, but it would be on the Wiki page for people

to be able to add their comments underneath on the Wiki page. Let's do it as a way to have clean comment.

Let's move on. Thank you, Tijani, for this. ATLAS II implementation activities, very quickly. We've had one call which took place last week. There were two things, really, that were touched on. The first part of the call was a follow-up on the working groups and we're dealing here with every single working group that took place. So thematic working groups, but also internal working groups of ATLAS II, where each one of the chairs as asked to submit a short report of how things could be done better.

The aim is to have a group report that will be able to help our successors in the future when ATLAS III will be put together. So they'll have a compendium of lessons learned, as such.

The follow-up on this is that a small group is going to put all of these comments together, summarize them into a slightly smaller document in the current very long Wiki page that is in operation. I note that not all reports have been received, and earlier we had an action item for staff to follow-up on the missing reports.

The second part of the call was a follow-up on each one of the recommendations. So far, the ATLAS II report, the declaration itself, was sent to the Board, which was the forwarded to Board members. It was also sent to chairs of supporting organizations and advisory committees. Then a copy was also sent to our sponsors for them to be able to read it.

We have 49 recommendations as far as I can remember and we have ten observations. Sorry, 43 recommendations and ten observations.

This is not the end of the process. It's actually the beginning of the process to implement those recommendations. It's important that these recommendations get implemented. However, some are meant to go towards the ICANN Board and ICANN staff. Others are to be actioned by the ALAC and others are to be actioned by other parts of ICANN or even outside ICANN.

So the working groups now, this follow-up working group is basically going through each one of the recommendations and allocating them to a follow-up process, whether it is an At-Large working group, whether it would be a follow-up implementation – ATLAS II implementation working group that will be formed to implement these recommendations or whether it would feed into a process that already exists like the ICANN accountability process, in which case, we will just fold this recommendation in the accountability process.

So that's the current status. A post ATLAS II activities work space, which is linked from the agenda and has a table with all of the recommendations, one after the other.

There is some concern with regards to timing. Certainly the initial feedback from the Board has been, "Thank you very much for those recommendations, but what do we do with them? Could we have something that is a little bit expanded that's less summarized and actually tells us what you want?" Because so far, we sometimes have just one-liners that are quite generic or general and that don't focus on specifics that the Board needs to do, and that will be the work of our follow-up working group and the tasks of some of the working groups that we have [inaudible] each one of those matters.

And I would say the [inaudible] means that we need to have all of the Board-related recommendations ready before the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles for the Board to start working on those and actioning them from Los Angeles onwards.

I know we had a couple of Board members who were on the call earlier. I wonder whether they might – future board members who can [inaudible] board deliberations and whether that would work with the timing for the Board. I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

Okay. So that's the status at the moment. Any comments or questions on this process? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so we can move to the next agenda item and that's the review of the At-Large meetings at our ICANN 51 meeting in Los Angeles.

We have a link to the meeting agenda spaces, and then of course we've got the different questions that we need to fill. Can we just go through these in five minutes, please, Heidi, or less?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

As mentioned before, Gisella is leading this process this time. So we're going to do this hopefully in less than five minutes. I think at a 35,000-foot level.

And regarding the questions, just to highlight to everyone to, please, there are those pages that are on the agenda. Please start completing the agenda items, the questions for those various groups.

Gisella, are you ready to go?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes, I'm ready to go. This will be done in less than three minutes. I was just in the process of trying to complete the Monday page, but starting on Sundays, [inaudible] to six ALAC and regional [inaudible] working session and we are currently working on the agenda. Nothing much to report there and no other meetings that day.

And on the Monday, which I'm not going to show you, because currently it is blank, we've got the high-interest topic meetings which have been scheduled after the welcome session, hence no other meetings being scheduled on the Monday. And I did ask Olivier about this and he would prefer for no other meetings to be scheduled on the Monday.

Monday evening we have the gala. That page will be updated with that information, but currently blank. We then have the Tuesday where the times in red are [inaudible] so please do not take any of these meetings as set in stone. We will have quite a bit of shuffling around of agendas and meetings to do, probably once the main schedule has been published as well to avoid any overlapping meeting and clashes.

On the Tuesday, we've got the – Tuesday and Wednesday will be the main days for the meetings. We have APRALO, LACRALO, and AFRALO who will be holding meetings. The AFRALO meeting being a [inaudible] one with AfrICANN. EURALO will not be holding a meeting. And apologies, I did forget NARALO will be holding a monthly meeting as well. The only one who will not be holding a meeting will be EURALO.

We've got the Capacity Building Working Group on Tuesday, the ALAC Working Session Part I, the LACRALO Monthly Meeting over lunch, and the ALAC meeting with the GAC. Please note this is still to be [determined] and will be done on Friday once the GAC has had their meeting to schedule the Los Angeles meetings.

And for now, we've got the ALAC Session Part 2 in the afternoon, and scheduled the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the transition of U.S. government stewardship of the IANA function on the Tuesday afternoon for an hour-and-a-half as per Olivier's request.

The Wednesday we will be starting with the RALO leadership breakfast. We have had that over the past few meetings, which has worked out very well. Details for that will follow. It has been put on the main schedule, but it is for RALO leadership.

We have the ALAC meeting with the ICANN Board. You will have noticed that it has moved from the Tuesday over to the Wednesday and the timing is 08:45 to 09:45. So we will make sure that we've got enough time to get to that meeting, and then from our previous meeting to that meeting and then obviously to our next meeting.

What we're trying to do in Los Angeles is put 15 minutes between each meeting to allow everyone to get to a meeting and also to pack up. Otherwise we always seem to run over, and that is also what the Meetings Team have put on the main ICANN schedule, allowing for 15-minute blocks to get you from one meeting to the next.

We have the NARALO monthly meeting. As I said, times in red still need to be confirmed. So nothing is set in stone. On Wednesday we have the

At-Large regional leadership meeting as well, which we usually have at that time.

In the afternoon, we'll be going on to the AFRALO AfrICANN joint meeting. And for now, I've put the ICANN Academy after that, time to be confirmed. And on Wednesday evening, we have the NARALO outreach event which we're busy working on with the NARALO outreach event working group – yet, something else to look forward to in the calendar of social events.

And on Thursday, we have – apologies for the delay in just getting the schedule up. On Thursday, we will be starting with the Future Challenges Working Group. Evan and Jean-Jacques. As I said, not set in stone. I'm trying my best to get all the working groups scheduled.

We have our usual ALAC and regional leadership wrap-up message that morning as well. What I will add on this page is the public forum and the open Board meeting. It will be coming on very shortly.

And Friday morning, no need to show you, on the screen, we will be having the ALAC leadership team meeting from 8:00-11:00. I still have two other working groups to schedule, which are the IDN Working Group and the Regulatory Issues Working Group. Spaces still need to be found, and at this stage, no update yet on whether we are holding a roundtable or not.

Apologies. That was at least six minutes. Thank you, Olivier, and back over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. That was very efficient, indeed. I ask that all ALAC members have a look at those agenda pages. Now is the time if you want any changes to be made or have any questions. Now is the time to ask them.

On the mailing list, as a follow-up item, I also invite you to submit the questions for the meetings with senior staff and Board. The At-Large Los Angeles Global Stakeholder Questions Work Space is ready to receive your questions.

The ICANN Board Questions Work Space is ready to receive your questions. And so also is the GAC Questions Work Space and the At-Large Los Angeles Topics for the Public Forum Work Space.

It's interesting. I ask now for you to all fill those spaces, and then I get asked questions during the ICANN meeting when we are face-to-face on saying, well, who drafted these questions? It really is you. So I'm not the guy drafting the questions. Staff doesn't draft the questions. It's us. All of us have to draft those questions, and we can only make those face-to-face meetings successful if we have the correct questions to ask and the right topics that we want to discuss.

We will have time. Please fill the questions and the comments on the Wiki and we'll be able to build consensus questions out of that.

Next, the hubs. It's an opportunity for At-Large Structures to have put together a hub for the Thursday of the ICANN meeting. On Thursday there will be a number of large public meetings taking place on several topics, and ICANN is ready to help out with some hub.

There are two types of hubs. There's listen-only hubs where there are no limits on how many of these hubs [could] be out there. And then there is a type of hub which is a two-way hub. There's maximum of ten of them, but ICANN would be funding to put together. However, the technical requirements are quite high for those. There is a Wiki page that should be in the Adobe Connect chat right now. That has the details of all of the hub recommendations, the technical requirements.

The deadline for submission of applications is the 12th of September. We have a bit of time to work out whether you could be able to register a hub and run a hub for the ICANN meeting.

That's the current thing. I note in the chat there are questions about the joint meetings and [inaudible] has asked about the joint meeting with the ccNSO and I guess with other parts. That agenda is all to be updated still. It's very likely that by next month we will have an agenda we won't have to change, hopefully, not significantly but certainly with some details.

Next we can go to the At-Large Working Groups update, as we have reached –we're past the top of the hour. We've been two hours into this call. I'm told we have another 10-15 minutes of interpretation time. The working groups are important – very important actually.

Sandra we spoke to slightly a little bit earlier. The ICANN Actually Working Group, could we have a quick update on where we are now and when we can expect to have the second part of that action item that you mentioned earlier actually implemented? Sandra, you have the floor.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. Well, [as we] agreed already, this open action item will be [inaudible] the September call, but [inaudible] a short update on the development of the second leadership training call which is going to be held in Los Angeles, [inaudible] Los Angeles meeting.

I am in close coordination with ICANN staff, especially Heidi, [Susie], and Gisella and we are quite [good] in the process in terms of getting [controlled] participants from all ACs and SOs.

And I'd like to thank all my colleagues from RALOs and from the ALAC that the processes in the At-Large and in the ALAC could be organized so smoothly and so quickly in time. This was very, very helpful indeed, and we are now in the stage of confirming travel and these are issues for all the participants.

Olivier sent a message over the list so that you are actually all aware who is going to be the participant from the ALAC and RALO leadership.

The program hasn't changed that much since my last update. It was more or less agreed. It was a mixture between the [inaudible] training and the [content] part, as we did it in Buenos Aires but a little bit differently structured.

The leadership training itself will be held in the ICANN offices because the main venue was unfortunately not available. But I think having it in the ICANN offices on that part of ICANN is a very good thing as well. I've been there and I think these offices are very good for having such an interactive training, because they have a park outside and so on.

And one of the most important parts of this training is also the socializing aspects. There are at least three socializing events scheduled. One is on the arrival day. It's more welcome cocktail where we just say hello to each other and who we are and why we're there. And the second day will be a [cooking] event. Heidi and Susie are organizing this where we have to [cook] with other SO chairs and leaders. I think that's going to be a very good exercise, because this brings people really together. And the third event will be something where we want to sit in a relaxed atmosphere on the beach, but we are still looking at opportunities for this.

And also important, we don't have trainers in this course. We asked participants to facilitate a session on the topic they have an expertise on. But we do have session facilitators. These people [inaudible] staff people did this job, and this time we have a mixture of staff people and community people who are facilitating a breakout session.

They will get a short training the day before and will then be able to guide the participants to the [inaudible] part of the training and facilitate the session. Not teaching them, but facilitate the smooth running of a session which is very interactive.

So if you have any questions, feel free to ask or e-mail me and I will be happy to answer. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Sandra. Congratulations again for a second Academy Working Group [inaudible]. So we look forward to seeing those new leaders come to At-Large afterwards with all the knowledge

we would have learned during those exciting few days, and hopefully without having poisoned each other during the cooking classes.

The At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the transition of U.S. government stewardship of the IANA function. Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed El Bashir were on the call earlier. Please provide us with a few minutes update, bearing in mind we have a call that will take place on Thursday where everyone is invited to attend for the follow-up on the discussions we had earlier in this call. Jean-Jacques or Mohamed?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I don't know if Mohamed is on the phone. I suggest we have Mohamed, but if he's not on the call, I'm willing to speak to this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed is not on the call, I've just noted from the list of participants. So Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: So the meeting day was the third conference call of the ICG and it concentrated almost entirely on one subject, which was the RFP. I'll give you a bit of the atmosphere. Right from the start, I put the question of why there was such clear distinction. In fact, it looked almost like a discrimination between the operational communities on the one hand and the rest of the community in the draft RFP.

It was pointed out to me that this only reflected language which had already been agreed in the charter of the ICG. Therefore there was no point in bringing this up now.

However, I did insist, and whilst I was doing that, I was exchanging messages on Skype and elsewhere with Olivier to make sure that I was not being unnecessarily rough or too far away from the ALAC position, and he did confirm that it was a real preoccupation for At-Large and for the ALAC to see this kind of unnecessarily divisive decision.

The battle was about the technical communities or the operational communities being able to put forward proposals. I quote the term “proposals.” And on the other hand, the rest of the community, meaning the end user community for instance, only being able to put input or to provide input.

So this may seem quite innocuous, but I think that as for other matters we’ve dealt with over the past few weeks in the ICG, this is more than just face saving. It goes quite deep, actually, because if right from the start there is such an inequality between the operational community on the one hand and the user community on the other, then I put a question to my colleagues. What was really the point of having an ICG in which we are supposed to be equal to have equal status, whether we come from IETF or ALAC or anywhere else?

So the first 10 or 15 minutes was fairly tough and I accepted that because I was the only person defending that position. But little by little, people came to understand the objection and some even

suggested some midway meeting point. Yari Arkko was one of those and that was helpful.

So what has been decided now is that we give ourselves roughly two more days, during which we will sort out the wording problems so that the RFP draft be more acceptable, especially to the end user community.

So whilst I'm in this meeting with you, I know that I have received by e-mail some first proposed amendments by my colleagues of the ICG. I have not had time to look at them, but be sure that just after our present call is over, I will look at that and [inaudible] to the At-Large IANA transition working group, I will send whatever I receive to ask for your input. And on those grounds, I will send my reaction or counter-proposal to my colleagues on the ICG.

Sorry this was a bit long and detailed, but I hope it provides a necessary background. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Thanks for this detail. The call of the IANA Issues Working Group, the At-Large IANA Issues Working Group, will take place on Thursday and hopefully we will have a position that will be reached through our mailing list until then.

I just remind everyone this call is open to everybody in At-Large, so if you are interested in the issue, please join the IANA Issues Working Group or you can attend the call on Thursday. I believe it was 14:00

UTC. Yes, 14:00 UTC. The usual number, the usual details. And of course you can get those from the mailing list.

Let's continue. Next we have the CROPP Review Team. Now, Dev Anand Teelucksingh was unable to join us today. Just to say that all members of the CROPP review team have reconfirmed their participation in the review team for another year. The rules for the fiscal year 15 CROPP Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program review have changed slightly, but all member have had a conference call and so they're all up-to-date with the new rules and will follow up when I get Dev to speak to us about the rules next month on this issue.

Next, the Future Challenges Working Group, Evan and Jean-Jacques. We have very little interpretation time left. Could we just have a quick one or two-minute roundup of the activity of the Future Challenges Working Group, please? I don't know who will speak on this in this case. Is it Jean-Jacques or Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I guess just in the interest of time, just to make it short, the Future Challenges Working Group [inaudible] yesterday. What you have on your screen is a draft report coming out of the results on that meeting.

Essentially, what we chose, what we are going to do is not to duplicate the low-level efforts of other efforts that are going on right now to address issues of ICANN accountability, but more or less to, in keeping with what Future Challenges has done before is looking at overarching issues and looking at the higher level of issue of what we define to be as

trust. Accountability, transparency is not an end in itself. It's a means to an end. The actual end is having public trust in ICANN.

And so we're going to be going forward on this issue. What you have in front of you is essentially a mini charter. Future Challenges has tackled a number of different issues, so right now the main thing on our plate is ICANN accountability and trust. This document will be made available. We'll be putting it on the Future Challenges site. We're delighted to have all the people coming in from Thematic Group 4 of ATLAS to join us. So we're looking forward to a very robust discussion, one that doesn't necessarily get bogged down and details get limited by scope, as other groups have done. So I think we really have an opportunity to accomplish something good here. We can talk more, but we're rushed for time, so I invite everybody to read the document, join the working group, and follow what we're doing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I apologize for speaking fast, but you gave me the constraints.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thanks for this update, and apologies to the interpreters, but we're just trying to shorten the time the interpreters are going to have to remain on the call.

One more thing to add is that, of course, the Future Challenges Working Group is going to [seed] the overall process of the ICANN accountability and governance discussions. I put on the chart a link to the diagram of the overall ICANN accountability and governance coordination, and on there you will be able to see the ICANN accountability and governance cross-community group on the left-hand side of the diagram. That group is unrestricted so as many [inaudible] call for participants will come out by ICANN, as many people as we wish will be able to join that working group.

And then there is an ICANN Accountability and Governance Coordination Group in the middle that has one liaison with the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, and then we have a [inaudible] one liaison with the ICANN Board.

That will be made up of one member from each one of the supporting organizations and the GNSO constituency, but also with members selected by the Accountability and Governance Public Experts Group. Seven advisors who will join that general working group. I think it was last call I showed a slightly different diagram. This is an updated one. It might change again.

What's important for us to know is that a call for expressions of interest will soon be sent out by At-Large staff to populate that ICANN Accountability and Governance Coordination Group to select one member of the At-Large community to go on that group.

And the Selection Committee, which was used for the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, that same selection committee is being

slightly amended in its vendors, membership, because some members will be applying for the position.

So it's actually all running well and we will be in full operation within the next couple of days with at least three members from each region on that Selection Committee, ready to be able to appoint someone in time for the first meeting of that ICANN Accountability and Governance Coordination Group.

Similarly, the ICANN Accountability and Governance Cross Community Group is expected to start operations on the 15th of September. There is no date for the start of operation on the ICANN Accountability and Governance Coordination Group, but to say that it will probably be in operation during the Los Angeles meeting.

Alan Greenberg, you've put your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. Very short comment. I've lost track of how many ACs and SOs and such there are, but it strikes me – and it hadn't dawned on me before – that seven advisors is going to be almost one advisor per person on the group. I just wonder if we need to comment on that. I don't think we want to discuss it now, but something to think about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Alan. Indeed, that's exactly the point I was trying to make earlier with colleagues. Seven advisors is a lot of people. There's a question as to what advisors do in that group. The discussion is ongoing, by the way. And the Future Challenges Working

Group will obviously be discussing this as well since they will be [seeding] both groups – the ICANN Accountability Governance Cross Community Group and the ICANN Accountability and Governance Coordination Group member from At-Large with what they need to push in these groups.

We've kind of run out of time. If you are interested in this process, please follow-up with the Future Challenges Working Group, Evan and Jean-Jacques.

We can now move to the next thing: items for information. Just quickly, the IGF is coming up from the 2nd to the 5th of September next week. There are a number of At-Large activities at the IGF in Istanbul. If you click on the link in the agenda, it will take you to a couple of tables, which will show you the different activities that are taking place. You'll see the At-Large members that will be going to Istanbul, and also various At-Large organized events, ICANN organized events and so on. The table is actually quite large.

Then the second link is over to our – there was a briefing call which took place last week. At-Large participation and activities follow-up to the ICANN staff briefing on IGF. We had a presentation by Rafik Dammak, one by Fatima Cambroner, one by Marilia Maciel who spoke to us about NETmundial, one by Avri Doria who spoke to us about a lot of [inaudible] on IGF. So the recording is up there already in English, French, and in Spanish. I invite you all to go out there and listen to the recording if you are interested in these issues.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Just briefly to mention that the Transition Coordination Group will be meeting in the margins of IGF in Istanbul on the 6th of September. I will not be traveling to Istanbul, but of course I will be participating in the work by remote contact, by Adobe Connect. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Jean-Jacques. And we can now go to our last agenda item, which is any other business. And so the added agenda item was regarding the election of members for the IANA Coordination Group, I believe. I could ask staff to remind me of this please. It sounds like such a long time ago.

Absolute silence. Any other business in the absence of anyone speaking up?

Okay. So one last thing that I have to speak to you about is to do with the vote for the ALAC RALO member that would go to the Nominating Committee. The vote was as follows. The first vote that took place was a vote by LACRALO to show [inaudible] for what candidate they were preparing to nominate to go over to the NomCom to serve on the NomCom.

The follow up then was an ALAC vote with two candidates that were there showing who had the preference from LACRALO. The vote did not produce anyone with a majority. In our rules, in any vote there needs to be a majority. So no one had more than 50%, which meant that we had to re-run the vote again.

The second vote yielded an actual tie, which then brings us to bylaw which we have when ties happen where the ALAC chair has to cast the deciding vote on this, and so as the ALAC chair, I had to cast the deciding vote on whether to vote for one candidate or the other and I have decided to follow the advice from the RALO, from LACRALO, and have therefore voted for Sylvia Herlein Leite to serve on the Nominating Committee for this year. I am open to any questions on this. These are bylaws, thankfully, now take into account those situations – those unbelievable situations where we end up with exactly the same number of votes for both candidates.

Okay. So there we are. We are at the end of this call. I thank you all for having spent the last two-and-a-half hours with us. We are way over time, but we had quite a number of discussions to have here today.

I thank the interpreters for the time that they have spent with us. People on the other channels, I'm very pleased to see so many people still on the call at this time. I thank staff as well.

With this, it's Good morning, good afternoon, goodnight and goodbye. This call is now adjourned. Thanks, everyone.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Bye, Olivier. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]