TORONTO – ALAC Policy Discussion: Part 1
Tuesday, October 16, 2012 – 11:00 to 13:00
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I think we have to get started again. Sala, I don't know if you're still there. Sandra appears to have stepped out of the room and isn't back yet. So we might have to shuffle our schedule around a little bit so that we don't take too much, we don't get too delayed.

Sorry to keep you up. As soon as she enters the room we'll switch over then to the not Capacity Building, the At-Large Academy or ICANN Academy, sorry. All right, let's start the session.

GISELLA GRUBER: Welcome to the ALAC Policy Discussion two on Tuesday the 16th of October, sorry one. Give me a second sorry, I'm way too eager.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In order to start the session you have to get the sessions right.

GISELLA GRUBER: I'm a little bit too eager here. So it's welcome to the ALAC Policy Discussion one on Tuesday the 16th of October. The local time in Toronto is 11:30. If I could also yet again remind everyone, please state their names when speaking.

Not only for the transcript purposes, but for our lovely interpreters sitting in the booths, interpretation in Spanish and French are provided.

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.

In order for it to be accurate, we need to say our names and speak at a reasonable speed to allow them to interpret. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. It's Olivier for the transcript record. Henceforth I shall keep this same voice so the interpreters can remember it because I will not remember to say my name every time unfortunately, terrible.

So we have a session here which is due to last two hours which will start with the Academy Working Group, or should start with the Academy Working Group update, Future Challenges Working Group, ALAC Idea Working Group, New gTLD Review Group, Registered Rights and Responsibilities, and Whois Working Group.

Some of our members are on because we took a little bit of delay are on other meetings and calls. I understand that Sandra has just come back in the room so we're going to get her to work right away.

There's no respite in this place. Thankfully Sala is still on the call and so I hand the floor over to Sandra Hoferichter for an update on the Academy Working Group.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. It's Sandra speaking. I did not prepare any presentation because my intention was to give you an update and get your feedback. And I would appreciate very much to get feedback from the At-Large on what I'm just telling you.

You know that the Toronto Leadership Program has been postponed because there was no consensus in this Working Group. Which I don't think is a problem at all because the direction or the track we are on now is much more solid and much broader actually.

And the meeting we just had before brings another dimension into the rule ICANN Academy Working Group discussion because the picture of an overall framework for ICANN as a rule is getting better and better.

This is one goal of the Working Group and I'm pretty happy I announced this already on Sunday that there is more or less consensus in this Working Group to work on such a broad framework.

However what it will look like at the end, we don't know yet. This is the first I mention of the scope of this Working Group to look at the broader picture for the overall ICANN.

The second scope of this ICANN Academy Working Group is to look into the possibilities to set up a leadership program. Because the leadership program will always be the top on any ICANN capacity building provision because our leaders, they have to collaborate with each other. They are representing ICANN to the public, to the public and globally.

So this will be always something which cannot be resolved by one constituency itself which can only be resolved or which can only be designed by including all ICANN constituency and all interested parties. This was the second scope of the Working Group.

The third dimension or the third scope of the Working Group, and I mentioned this in the session before, how do we collaborate with staff? There are two ways staff has been seen within ICANN. And having

presentation by ICANN staff is not always what the group is wanting to have.

There was a bit of criticism of giving staff presentations to ICANN leaders. They mentioned things like, yeah, it is going to be introduction, sorry, is that right?

[background conversation]

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you very much. You see I still have my problems with the English.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're doing well. Don't worry. We'll never tell.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: It went even worse when they were talking about brainwashing. So I don't share this perception at all. I was actually setting up a proposal together with Phyllis in the best mood, in the best manner.

But somehow it was not received very well and all these criticisms came up later on which is maybe not always nice or always right. But which is I think necessary and brought the overall discussion within this Working Group in a very, very good direction.

Well, that's from my side. Please let me know if you have questions. I will be happy to answer if I forgot something. Or please give me your feedback on what I have just told you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sandra. And I hope, okay I need to learn how to speak English as well. I now open the floor for questions. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the transcript record. Just some questions in terms of dividing up the functions, I think in terms of what's necessary. You were at the breakfast yesterday. I just saw this little publication that Norwegian has done. Which is a real just basic explanation of what the Internet is, what the domain names are and so forth.

So to me there's sort of a technical explanation about what is or does. There's a structural component to what ICANN is and does. And then there's also a policy component which is what the issues that based on. What ICANN does the issues that arise in terms of from our point of view, our constituency?

But probably there are other issues in terms, and this is ICANN wide, if it's registrars, registrants, the business community, and so forth. And then issues for government.

I'm wondering how it can be structured so that there are modules, and I'm assuming there'll be modules that we can use for the people we're speaking to who may be very, very clued about the Internet, very un-clued about ICANN or both.

And then or very clued about the issues or not. So I'm just wondering how's it all going to fit together so that we can use the modules that we actually need in an outreach capacity.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. Matt, I'm not sure, can you quickly upload the pyramid because this will help me to answer your question, from my point of view.

When I did research on what is already existing within ICANN, I found out that for the entry and newcomers level, the offers are pretty good. There is a lot of content on the website already. You just mentioned the green book which I saw also but unfortunately I didn't get one.

[background conversation]

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, thanks. And I think for this group of people, the provisions are more or less sufficient. Everything else can only be done through outreach because the tools are there. There are videos. There are podcasts. There are audios from webinars, off of every webinar that everybody can participate.

If you want to join an ICANN meeting you can easily participate. And the newcomers track, this is marked as newcomers track; this is very good to find your way as a newcomer I think. You mention a good point that different constituencies have different needs.

EN

And this is the point where we are struggling most with the Working Group on the first issue to agree on a framework where different constituencies say, "Yeah, well we need this and we need this. And this will not apply for our constituency, and so on and so forth."

I think the way out is that the constituency, they should do whatever they think is necessary to serve their community. This can only be done in a constituency. This cannot be done by an ICANN Academy Working Group because At-Large cannot discuss. It's funny, me getting too fast.

FEMALE: We're recording this.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: So what is needed in a constituency can only be done within the constituency. It makes no sense if ALAC is giving advice on the business constituency or the on the CCNS on how to train their people. But any effort should be implemented in a global or an overall framework.

And we have to carefully look at what modules or what elements can be used for or could apply for more than one constituency only so that we don't have an introductory node in every of those different constituencies. So this is one point.

The other point is that teaching the leaders can only be done by the Academy Working Group. So these are the two that I mention. When we set up our Working Group within At-Large, we should and I talked about this with Tijani already.

We should always try to deliver very carefully our input within the overall framework so that the At-Large Capacity Building Provision which will be probably the diverse one.

Because we are talking here about five regions which have all their different needs so that our element, the At-Large element, will be properly implemented in the Academy overall framework.

The same applies for other constituencies as well. And maybe I can ask here the liaisons, the GNSO liaison, Alan, to deliver this message when this topic comes up that all the constituencies are now asked to deliver what they need and what they want.

And then it will be implemented by the Working Group because when the Working Group discusses the issues among themselves, I don't think that the message goes really true into the GNSO, into all parties.

And it raises different questions later on when they say, "Yeah, but what are you doing. That does not apply for us." No, they are asked to deliver what they want to have and we will implement it, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sandra, any other questions or comments on this? I know that whilst you were speaking, Sandra, staff has been trying to frantically look for the pyramid and show how it all slotted together. Have you found it? Okay, there will be a link to it over in the chat. Are there any other questions or comments, Yaovi Atohoun?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. I would like just to ask Sandra to explain to me again as she said that the ICANN Academy will not cover necessarily the need of each SO. But once you said ICANN Academy will integrate designating the program. This is not very clear for me. Are you saying that what each SO or SE wants to do should go through or be necessarily included in the ICANN Academy? That's not very clear to me.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Do we have this pyramid? Can we open this please? Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Sandra, sorry. It will be a few long minutes.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. I'm sorry. This was my fault because I did not submit any presentation. I should have prepared something and sent it in advance. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah ha!

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I'm sorry but I thought it was already there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, it's Olivier for the transcript. Since it was Rinalia's suggestion that all the Working Group Chairs should be supplying one small short presentation with a different details, I shall ask the originator of this

EN

idea, Rinalia, who also appears to be quite close to you, to give you a tap on the hand.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: It's Sandra. I'm ready to receive that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, I think that Sandra couldn't prepare something because as things are evolving very fast and it didn't depend on At-Large only. So any presentation she will make will not be useful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani, and that's the major problem with Working in a very fast environment. Whatever gets published is already obsolete. I see that an upload is in progress so maybe you might be lucky in having the pyramid on there.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: It's Sandra speaking, just to comment. On the one hand we are arguing we are too fast but on the overall issue I think is pretty slow to get an Academy set up.

I mean the processes are very slow, sorry Gisella. The processes are so slow. When we started the discussion about a leadership program it was more or less two years ago.

[background conversation]

TORONTO

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, great. Can we enlarge it a little bit? Just to explain to you, the framework or the outreach strategy on the left was developed by ICANN, by Kurt Pritz and his team. It was presented in Costa Rica.

It clearly says that there are different groups within ICANN which are named observer, contributor, leader and ambassador. Later on I made research on capacity buildings and to which group they will fit to.

You see, for the observer level, and I mentioned this already, there are pretty much tools, material, whatever in place. The contributor level and I think this is what Yaovi mentioned, which are the constituencies.

It's the green level and there are similar things already in place and will be developed according to the special needs of the constituency. And for the leadership level and this was the point where our Working Group formally stepped in to say we need a leadership program.

It's the thing which, on my point of view, can be only designed and implemented by the ICANN Academy Working Group. So the ALAC, the constituency, the RALOs will as I see it now be implemented in the green level, in the contributor level.

There might be a change because the newcomers track might go down to the blue thing and there are more bricks coming. I think the structure will change a little bit in the future.

But the idea of having such a structure, according to the different engagement levels which are defined or which have been designed by ICANN staff and by the community of course with the community input.

The overall structure will more or less be something like this, not carved in stone yet, but something like this. And everything which will be developed within the constituency should fit in this overall framework. Does this answer your question?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yeah, correct. So that means that the Academy will be the global framework and everything will go into the Academy. That's very clear. The most important thing now is that to have all the different SO and SE to end up on this picture. That is a very great picture. That explains everything. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Yaovi, Peter Knight.

PETER KNIGHT: Thank you Olivier. Does this Academy I assume in just glancing and maybe I haven't paid enough attention. I've just downloaded the papers I could find.

But there were online, on demand, eLearning opportunities for the Academy as well as what we used to call in the World Banks Economic Development.

We had senior policy seminars. We had two or three where we'd bring together really top level people and then different levels. Is this what you have in mind?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: It's Sandra speaking. Yes Peter, there are online programs on the observer level already. You can participate online pretty good participating in public webinars or downloading videos, podcasts, etc. which is mentioned in the pyramid in the blue part.

Okay. And for the advanced level there is at the moment no online tool in place. This is something which is also very much demanded by other constituency, just to mention the business constituency.

They are demanding also some online capacity building tool, provision, whatever. But this must be developed. This is not in place yet but this should be something which will be implemented in certain framework, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sandra. Next is Sergio Salinas Porto and he will be speaking in Spanish I think?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you Chair. For the record, this is Sergio Salinas Porto. My dear Sandra, I have a question and probably I am putting that question to you out of ignorance. Are you foreseeing to have the videos and podcasts in other languages other than English? That's it. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:	Thank you for the question, Sergio. Actually, one brick says in the blue part multi lingual info material. And it says for infections, glossary, effectual, etc. I know that many of the material are already translated into other languages.
	And I would highly appreciate if many languages can be offered in many levels. However, the At-Large Working Group agreed earlier on, and I think the overall Working Group will agree on the same, that for the yellow brick, for the leadership level.
	We will not offer any multilingualism in terms of as it is a face to face meeting. On the leadership level it agreed or it is stated in the ICANN bylaws that you have to be able to communicate in English for the contributor and for the observer level, I strongly support multilingualism.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Sergio?
SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:	This is Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. Sandra, I am concerned about the basis of the pyramid, the bottom of the pyramid, and not their leaders. So I believe that if we want to train people at least that part has to be focused not only on English speakers.
	In my country, as in many countries in the Latin American region and in Africa, those of us who could not reach university levels do not speak any other language other than our mother tongues.

So it would be very important for all users to have videos and audio material in a version in each of the six languages that are used now at ICANN. Regarding the leadership level, I agree with you .we have discussed this. I understand your point of view. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sergio. And thank you for making this clear. I think there was a bit of a misunderstanding that you wanted the whole pyramid to be in multi languages which of course makes the cost astronomical because it just makes it more complicated. Yes Sandra, back to you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you it's Sandra speaking. Sergio I hear you and I will deliver your request to the work of this Working Group. I agree with you. I would even go on the observer level further to translate the material into more than six languages because to me as a German which is not covered by the UN languages, it's very, very difficult to read and translate and understand the ICANN material. So I definitely support that point and I will deliver this message to the Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sandra. I think we do have to move on through our agenda. I just wanted to ask you to remind everyone when that Working Group meeting was happening. Is it possible for observers to be there?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: It's Sandra for the record. Everybody is invited to participate tomorrow from 7:00 to 10:00 and if you are not able to get up at 7:00 you can even pop in later. That's not a problem.

It is a three hour meeting because it is a very huge discussion demand and we know that not everybody will be able to participate in the whole meeting. But you are invited to step in and out at the time for your convenience. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sandra. I think that when you started taking this project on I'm not sure whether you knew the size of the amount of politics that you were going to have to deal with.

But I must say that for someone who has started this a while ago now, and I can't put an exact date, but I know that it pre-dated a lot of the efforts that now ICANN is starting to look at.

You've done an excellent, really excellent job. Really, I wanted everyone to give you a round of applause for the really excellent work you've been doing. Okay, so now we're going to go to the Future Challenges Working Group.

For this we had Evan Leibovitch but we do have Jean-Jacques Subrenat who is with us for Jean-Jacques to provide us with a quick update on the activities of that Working Group. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques speaking, speaking in French actually. Thank you dear interpreters, thank you Sergio.

So the new element I come to present is that the effort which has taken several months and which has ended with the voting at the approving of a document entitled, *Making ICANN Responsive, Relevant, and Respected.*

That we've seen, and that we've called "Our Three" is no longer simply a document belonging to the working group where it was introduced. That's the Future Challenges Work Group.

But the Chairman of ALAC wanted to have a vote on this document, on this paper, and we had a unanimous vote, 15 votes in favor, no abstentions, and no votes against. And this became one of ALAC's white papers.

So I think this shows that all of ALAC's members agree that they have a need from time to time to introduce a higher vision, less contingent, and to reflect upon the future, and to think of the near past.

The second thing I wanted to say is that tomorrow, Wednesday, at 9:30, no in fact that's 9:00, in Dockside five, and there will be an open session which has been organized by NPOC. We will discuss the multi-stakeholder model and this session has been organized by Alain Berranger, the Chairman of NPOC.

There will be three participants from ALAC that session. There will be Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Evan Leibovitch, and myself. I say this because it will be the first stage of our exercise outside ALAC. And so it's a small way of starting the debate. It is Alain Berranger's initiative and I think it's been very good.

EN

We will be proposing a mutual comprehension between governance questions which are pertaining to Internet and ICANN particularly. And governance questions in a very large context because there will Professor [Samson Franco] from the American University, who will be presenting another application, which is the WTO and the ILO. Sorry.

I think these comparisons are interesting at this point and I think we should be having them. The third element I would like to mention here is that in our Future Challenges Working Group we have already decided on a calendar.

We have, of course, set up goals and objectives. And we aim at having this paper being public, that's that everyone knows about it and would like to contribute to the discussion as well. And so what we propose is that between today and ICANN 46, that's ICANN's meeting in Beijing in April 2013, we would like to exchange with other communities within ICANN but also outside of ICANN.

And finally, we propose at Beijing, at ICANN's meeting, we organize, if our Chairman agrees, a session which would be open to the public and which will deal with the lessons that we have found from this meeting.

And from our activities and to see whether it's necessary or not to update our three paper and whether we have to integrate other ideas or other proposals even to help both ICANN's board.

That's Steve Crocker and his colleagues, but also the general direction of the organization, that's Fadi Chehade and his colleagues. In order to implement what they have announced in such an interesting and convincing way yesterday. That is ICANN's new season. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques and I note that your suggestion was applauded by several members around the table, much to my surprise. And I shall therefore rule that this shall be absolutely impossible. We'll never have such a thing.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: You notice that the applause was initiated by another white-haired man so I think this is unfair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques and for the transcript of course I was being rather cheeky in my previous comment. We will consider this. It's not for me to say yes or no, it's for the community to say yes or now.

But judging from the reception that your proposal has had so far, it looks as though you already have a number of followers. So it looks quite positive. Please go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. I just got an SMS from Dr. Alzheimer. I'm not yet very familiar with him but he reminded me that actually I had forgotten to mention something quite important which was that I'm on the verge of sending you, Olivier, not an SMS but an email with a proposal that because this is now an ALAC white paper, that you send it with a letter to the Chair of the Board as ALAC advice. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. I am also in need to call that same doctor as yours, rather precociously unfortunately. And that worries me because I might have actually done such a thing but I can't remember.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: What's your name please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's the other problem, not remembering ones name when one has to say it to the transcript record. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Trying to be of medical help here. I'd like to point out that they were actually discussing it at the board so I suspect even if they haven't been officially sent the white paper, they've all read it.

So if you could send a letter saying this is from Dr. Whomever and just in case you haven't seen it officially, here it is officially. So we can add to the number of communicates that we've sent them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly for this reminder. What we will do is to check if it's already been sent. If it hasn't we will send a copy. We as in I will send a copy. Sorry. That's another mark of Alzheimer's, speaking of oneself in the third degree, Rinalia.

TORONTO

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Rinalia speaking. Jean-Jacques, yesterday at the Future Challengers Working Group the part that was handled by Evan, since Evan was not here about a response, on the compliance issue using a high level approach. Perhaps you could elaborate on that? Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you nurse. Would you mind doing that instead of me? Thanks.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay, Rinalia…

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Okay, so thank you for reminding me of that Rinalia. Yes. Another item on our agenda yesterday at the Future Challengers Working Group was in fact the question of compliance. We've seen that this was a question that was on and off for many years at ICANN and we collectively feel that not all has been properly addressed.

We're given a lot of detail but what was lacking was a one window approach to this kind of problem. And the political will to solve cases of blatant uncompliance, I don't know if that word exists in English, but a lack of compliance.

So the proposal by Evan which was discussed yesterday was whether this very important topic should be treated or dealt with in the Future Challengers Working Group or somewhere else in ALAC.

TORONTO

This is where I think Rinalia could chip in and perhaps summarize that part of the discussion where I was busy doing something else. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques, back to you Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Rinalia for the transcript record. I cannot remember exactly what the action item was in terms of who was going to take it up. Whether it was the Future Challenges Working Group or Holly, but I think that it is going to fall into Holly's lap so whoever wants to bear the stamp on it, it's fine, as long as it gets done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you. So the floor is open. Oh, Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton for the record. The conversation went a little bit like this. We agreed that if we're going to move the compliance matter forward. We should start at a higher level.

So, one of the things that we wanted to do was to put together a group that would include the compliance people. That would look at the barriers that they identified to their work.

Then taking those into consideration, prepare a high level strategic document for the Board. That was the interest from the [archery] side. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Carlton, any other questions or comments, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Nurse Carlton has been superb. That's exactly what we decided to do. I think there was, given that Carlton and I sat through the meeting of the Dr. Amnesia has stepped in as that was yesterday. The public meeting that we attended that was perhaps less than satisfactory.

                           We all walked out and thought we're going to do something at a very high level and it's going to be larger than just Whois. It was an update on the RA negotiations but a lot of those issues are Whois.

                           So it's sort of everything is collapsing into by the way we actually think this needs to be moved up. So we're all going to work together.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you. I think we've pretty much gone around the whole question here. I suggest we move on to the next part of our agenda, the next Working Group. Which is an update from Edmon Chung and Rinalia Abdul Rahim who is very welcome to also contribute on the ALAC IDM Working Group, Edmon you have the floor.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Olivier, Edmon Chung here. So there was a presentation, what was that? Oh, sorry. I can pretty much speak through it.

TORONTO

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're faced with technical problems again locally. One computer has gone into password mode and nobody can remember the password. It's this Alzheimer problem that is affecting everyone suddenly. But then the other one is the presentation where no one can remember where the presentation is. So, it's there. It's loading. Okay, finally, back to you Edmon.

EDMON CHUNG: Okay, in any case it's just a couple of slides. So I'm going to skip over the first slide until it comes. Oh, there you are. I guess we'll wait. Okay, the first slide, okay. So the IDN Working Group including myself, currently these are the people that we have on the Working Group.

We have a pretty good diversity there but we are always looking for more volunteers. So if you're interested in some of the things and you're not on there yet, please let us know and we'll add you in. and I see a, which means we should add you in. okay, so next slide.

These are some of the issues that we're talking about. The first one is I guess a happy results. From it the prioritization of IDN TLDs and the New gTLD process, it seems like that's getting support. And the new processes now prioritizing IDN, hopefully that the public comments after the public comment period it is still the case.

I guess we probably could add a comment into that to further that. The other main item for ICANN is the IDN Variant TLD projects. There are essentially a few projects that are ongoing to talk about the IDN Variant TLD issues.

TORONTO

This is, and the current process, there is a document that is out for public comments and the main concept is that there would be a primary panel and a secondary panel to create these language tables, essentially, that would be used for the root.

And basically the primary panel is conceptually the linguistic group that will come together and talk about the issues and present a proposal. The secondary panel is sort of thought to be like a technical group that will see if there are any security and stability issues and so might accept or reject the proposal.

One particular item that I think is of I guess concern with the group here, there are two things. One is generally the, it seems like, the two panels based on the current draft, is not drawing on expertise from the pulse development side nor from I guess an enlarged point of view.

The secondary panel goes a little further. The secondary panel in the current proposal is to be formed exclusively of ICANN paid consultants. It's very specific on paid consultants. There are justifications behind it but we see that might be a concern.

Sorry you moved the slide a little bit earlier than I thought. Oh, okay. No, no worries. Yep, there we are. So that's the idea in Variant TLD project and the other one that we're working on which we hope to bring a statement together is the IDN Country Code, well the IDN ccPDP, the Country Code Policy and Development Process.

They came out with a report. It looks fine. I think it's very similar to the fast track process with some learning from the few years that we've run

the fast track process. I think it's quite, there's not much there. But I think we could just commend their efforts.

There is also the discussion on how IDN ccTLDs would be included in the ccNSO. That one I think was a closed working group. We continued to watch the outcomes of which it seems like they just consider them as a equal member. So that's sort of the suggestion there.

Again, I don't see any particular concerns. If there are, please raise them. Finally, the Joint IDN Working Group between the ccNSO and JNSO, one of the main things that are being discussed there is the universally acceptance of IDN and TLDs.

That is a growing problem, especially with the IDN ccTLDs that are now functional. A lot of the applications and a lot of the databases around the Internet is still not accepting IDN TLDs.

So that is one of the things that is being discussed there and hopefully a report will be produced and urging ICANN staff basically to do more work on the particular subject. Then there's one item that will be coming along that hasn't quite started yet.

But IDN and Internationalized Registration Data, that is the Whois data addresses and names and email addresses as well, internationalized in the Whois. So that's upcoming.

Next slide, so we're Tuesday now so the Monday meeting is finished but our own IDN Working Group will be happening tomorrow at 4:30 back here.

So if you're interested to participate please be here. The IDN Variant Program also has a public meeting on Thursday. So if you're interested be there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Edmon for this very comprehensive review of all the work that's been undertaken. Are there any questions, Oksana Prykhodko?

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you Mr. Chair, Oksana Prykhodko for the record. I repeat my question about IDN ccTLDs in ccNOS. Do you know the number of different ccTLDs and the IDN ccTLDs in one country? So you understand me, yes?

EDMON CHUNG: So how many IDN ccTLDs that are not the ASCII ccTLD? I actually have no idea but I can go and try and find out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Edmon. Of course please note my deep disappointment that you don't know these statistics off-hand. Sir, you should know the exact numbers.

EDMON CHUNG: My partner in crime might. So Rinalia wanted to jump in.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Regalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: This is Rinalia for the transcript record. Oksana, I don't have a number for you but in terms of the policy development process of the ccPDP Working Group there is a specification in terms of for the non-ASCII stuff.

                            They look at the number of official languages of a country and they say for each language you can have one. That's as far as I can remember it. Can you confirm Edmon?

[background conversation]

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here. I guess that's probably a different question that Rosaria is asking. She's asking the entity that runs the TLD that would be different from the entity that runs the ASCII ccTLD. I'll try to find that information but I don't have it now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: She wants to follow up on something.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oksana, you wish to follow up, yes go ahead.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Yes, This is Oksana Prykhodko. Just for explanation because on the fast track or for IDM it was obvious there's no information about who applies for IDM because over (inaudible) tension between ccTLD and new applicator and now this process is open. Are there any tensions between such constituencies? Do you know any examples or maybe Ukrainian example is unique. This is my question.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here again. As I said, I don't have that information. I'll try to see and find out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Edmon. Heidi has just asked me if maybe she can find out from a staff member perhaps if that's possible. There's a queue in operation. The first one in the queue was Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the record. One phrase in passing at the RAA update yesterday was the possibility that one of the things the registrars would like is to do away with the thick Whois requirement.

Now I don't know if that's going to be followed up but I thought that was interesting, so Edmon, I don't know where that's up to with this Working Group but I just was fairly surprised to hear that yesterday.

TORONTO

EDMON CHUNG:	Edmon here. I don't think it is directly relevant. But there might be two items that that could be relevant. One of them is in the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs.
	The particular subject that is being discussed is whether we should require registries and registrars to accept IDN TLDs in their Whois records and name servers and stuff. So there would be an additional requirement on registrars and related to thick Whois.
	The other one that's coming up is the Internationalized Registration Data which would also put some burden on registrars. But in terms of thick Whois, I don't think it's related directly with IDN at this point. But I don't have any particular.
FEMALE:	I think we might actually have to attend the Working Session just to follow that up because it's all part of the Whois issue.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Please all give your names before you speak. But there is a queue in operation and I'll first have Jean-Jacques and then you Carlton. So Jean-Jacques Subrenat now, please.
JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:	Thank you this is Jean-Jacques. A more political question to Edmon and his colleagues of this IDN Working Group, I was very interested by your account about the possibility that IDNs or IDN Operators could be included in the ccNSO.

I wanted to ask you have you already felt pushed back from the ccNSO community. What are the arguments on the two sides? And most of all, what is your evaluation about the likelihood of IDN Operators being accepted in the ccNSO officially as members of the ccNSO? Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Edmon here again. For lack of better wording, the ccNSO is very protective of that particular piece of policy. In fact I believe that's what they spin off as IDN ccPDP 2 and that's a closed group that only ccNSO members can participate. I think there were a few models that were discussed.

The ventral model, actually I forgot what the ventral model was but I believe it was fairly simple. It's that IDN ccTLD, and again this is IDN ccTLD. It has nothing to do with IDN gTLD. So IDN ccTLDs would be able to be full members of the ccNSO and basically equal members as the ASCII ccTLD.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you this is Carlton for the record. I wanted to pick up where Holly left off in the impact of Internationalized Doman Names on the Whois record. If you look at the domain name registration data model, that's a new model that they're putting forward.

There is convergence in the collection of data by that model. What we are concerned about is that the amount of data that is collected is not

correct or the data elements that are requested in that model does not, is not fit to purpose for the Whois record that we are obliged to provide. That is the issue for us and we are following it very closely.

As Holly says, we've been tag teaming this for a little bit and we are going to go to the Working Group to see what comes out of it. but that is the issue really.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Carlton, Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Yes, thank you Carlton for that clarification, Edmon speaking here again. That's very useful because one of the things that the Internationalized Registration Data work down the road is going to touch on.

And it's also why it has turned from a joint working group into a GNSOPDP is that there is this Whois accuracy discussion and whether to allow Whois records in local languages exclusively.

So there is argument that you let's say allow a Chinese person when they register a name put in a Chinese name and address it could be more accurate because if they're forced to do ask you right now, they'd probably do it wrong.

But there's also a concern on the flip side that you have who can read it, how do you parse it, how do even judge the accuracy of which. So that particular part is now going down the path of a PDP. It first comes in the form of a request from the Council for an Issues Report from the staff first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Edmon, any other questions or comments, Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is an observation on working methods. I think that there is a need for, what's the word, discussions between Working Group Chairs where the issues intercept.

And because we're looking at IDNs in the context of Internationalized Registration Data, Whois is implicated and ccNSO issues. I think it would be important that the individuals responsible for these issues come together and identify what the issues are, flush it out, and then brief the ALAC and the At-Large.

Because I think it's important that we have a more comprehensive understanding of the issues. That's the first comment. The second point is that we do need to vote on a statement that we have drafted on the IDN ccPDP Working Group One.

It has a short timeline and I would like to know when we are doing this vote in order to make sure that it is submitted in time. And the third point is that there will be a statement that we will be drafting on the IDN Variance TLD Project.

Because I think that's quite important. Edmon and I sat through two full days of the label generation rule set process which is basically about coming up with a procedure for determining the label generation rules. There are some issues there that implicate our Internet users' community worldwide. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. So with regards to the voting, all voting will take place during our wrap up session. And I believe it is in just in time for the statement to be submitted.

I think that you have all been that' the ALAC has already been informed of the presence of the final text on the Wiki and if ALAC members have not yet looked at the final text on the Wiki.

Then I suggest that you all go to the Policy Development page that we have. Link on to the Wiki and have a look at it. We will be voting on it on Thursday. Any other questions or comments and I think we might have to move forward, Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Thank you Olivier. Just a quick comment I guess. I just want to thank, especially thank, Rinalia for chasing me on many of these things. A lot of the work has actually been led by Rinalia. So thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Edmon. I must also then extend a measure of thanks then to you, and to Rinalia again, but to both of you for having managed to sit through the Variance Implementation Project meetings.

I had about five minutes of that when I went to pick up my bag in the room and I nearly fell asleep at the time. It seemed to be a very tedious process, but very, very involved as well. So very hard work from you guys and of course these meetings took place before the ICANN meeting even started.

So for you this is probably the fourth or fifth day of constant work. Thank you. So we'll now move on through our schedule and we have the next pod which is the New gTLD Review Group led by Dev Anand Teelucksingh. However, Dev has already spoken to us yesterday about the New gTLD Review Group.

I just wondered since we are, I wouldn't say running out of time, but we wish to go swiftly through matters and not repeat things. Do you have any additional parts which you could just update us on please?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. I think what I can do really quickly is just give a summary of what was done between Prague and now. Rather than go through the substance of what the objectives you've seen so far since we've covered that before.

As you know, the application comment period was 60 days from June to August 12th. And the review group decided to extend the comment period from At-Large from July 11th because of the ICANN Prague meeting and so forth to July 26th.

It was just before July 26th that a comment was received from Internet New Zealand. Also after the Prague meeting, one of the Review Group members, Rudy Vansnick, stepped down because of a perceived conflict of interest. But with Rudy Vansnick being on the ISOC Board of Trustees I believe.

He stepped down just to avoid the perception of conflict of interest, not that there was any. Since Rudy was selected by EURALO, a replacement

EN

was sought and EURALO selected Louie Houle to be the replacement on the Review Group.

Dave Kissoondoyal stepped off from the ISOC so he is still on the Review Group. Kenny [Huang] cited a conflict of interest because I believe it is [Nat. Chinese Limited] has provided registry back and services for one of the IDN applicants. So as long as there's no comments received on that, he will then be recluse from that.

But to date there has not been any comments on that IDN application. As you know the application comment period was extended to September 26th and as such the Review Group adjusted its activities again and sort the comments up to that point.

And then received the second comment from IT for Change India just literally before the deadline and I think that's about it because I've already covered the substance of the objectives and the actions taken. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this very concise report. Just to add for the record, with regards to Rudy Vansnick, when he applied he was not part of the ISOC Board and then he was selected unbeknown to him, rather surprisingly for him I think that he was actually selected.

Therefore, he did the very, very honorable thing of standing down just in case the optics of someone being on the ISOC Board of Directors were going to be wrong. I think that's really a great thing for At-Large.

We're all very transparent and we all uphold the highest of ethics with regards to these matters. Whilst we're on the subject to the At-Large Review Group and the New gTLD Review Group, first any questions to Dev on his report? Seeing no one putting their hand up, I believe that Alan will be speaking to us just a few minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you this is an unplanned commercial message. I sent out a note yesterday afternoon on the IOC Red Cross on yet another proposed wordings talking about freedom of association and freedom of speech.

And I would like to be able to reply to the Work Group on a consensus, or at least some input from the ALAC. I've had comments from a number of people. If people have not yet weighed in on this go round, even if you weighed in on the previous one.

A very short one line message saying support or reject, or any other editorial comments you have, would be useful so that I can reply to the Work Group not just on my own behalf but on behalf of the ALAC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Hands now, everybody up who supports it.

ALAN GREENBERG: We could.

FEMALE: Sorry, please speak into the microphones otherwise we're not getting anything in the booths. Thank you.

TORONTO

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the record. I'm suggesting that there's probably from what I see at least everybody supports so can we just do a show of hands so Alan can walk and say, "Everybody around the table supports me."

ALAN GREENBERG: I would not put it that way please. The question is do we support the changes proposed by Avri? Do we not support them? My personal position is I support the concept, however I believe that there is no real issue in this particular case of needing to look at those explicitly.

Avri has more recently made the case that in fact the issue is so relevant it applies to all gTLDs, new, current, and all planned. Although I don't agree with that, if that is indeed a true situation then I think it needs to be addressed as part of a separate review.

And not part of this focus one which was explicitly of limited scope and should be evaluated on its own merit. If the change is rejected by the Work Group, and I haven't seen enough answer in the Work Group to know whether that's the case, it will surely be brought up in Council.

Whether it would be accepted as a friendly amendment or pass as a voter on amendment, I personally think it's probably not likely. But I'm often surprised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Holly could you please turn your microphone off please, thank you. And we have a queue in operations. Sala, I see that

EN

you have your hand up. But first I wanted to turn over to Seth. Seth Reiss points to Glenn McKnight and Glenn McKnight points to Seth Reiss. One of you two should…

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, it's me, Glenn McKnight. There was a little discussion just now in terms of voting. I haven't had the opportunity to read this document so we just need clarification. If you want us to vote on something, you need to actually be more explicit.

ALAN GREENBERG: The question was explicitly asked of the ALAC because I'm trying to get ALAC feedback. We don't have time for a formal vote and the issue was related, it was asked in that form.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sala you are still on the call I gather. Do you wish to speak?

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcript. I would just like to go on record to say that I support every proposed refinement to the actual text. There are potential ramifications to certain stakeholder Africans, some of whom would benefit end users.

I think we should try to see where she's sort of coming from. At the same time, I'd like to put a caveat to my comment. In fact, I'd like to put a preface to say that I strongly support SSAC and a recommendation in

TORONTO

relation to the board making a consideration, due consideration, to consider having a registration use data policy to proceed.

And could it be more chatter pertaining to the thick WHOIS? I make this comment particularly in regard to the context and specifically with regards to the explicit mission and scope of this particular proposed PDP, which states existing and future use. And I just wish to have this recorded, thank you Mr. Chair, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sala. The sound wasn't that great here but I think we caught most of what you told us. And certainly it will be on the record. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi this is Evan. Alan, from your reading of the Working Group, and there're a couple of people in this room that are in that working group. The feeling that I got was that at least from within that group, it was mainly Avri who was putting forth that and the original responses were almost all in the negative.

Mikey has tried to do a suggested compromise. But it's my understanding that even under what you might consider rough consensus, the rough consensus of that Working Group basically is to keep the original wording. Is that not, would you not say that's accurate?

ALAN GREENBERG: That was accurate for the wording that was proposed last time. This wording is changed in that first of all it is lowercase instead of uppercase. Which that may or may not matter to some people but it does matter to some people.

And there's a reference to internationally accepted policies which is interesting in that the national laws that are done in acknowledgement with international, internationally accepted means you have a national law that goes along with it typically.

Those are heavily variant throughout different countries with different philosophies. So those are the changes and I haven't looked at email in the last hour or so. There hadn't been a lot of other comments at this point. I believe at this point Avri is still the only one on that Work Group advocating it. but I won't swear to that because there may well have been other comments since in the opposite direction.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. And I think we've pretty much touched on the subject. I know you wanted to get an answer here. However, the fact that Avri is not present, I think it is difficult for us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. All I was asking for was for people to send me a response. I would like the ALAC members to respond to email.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect, yeah.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: And there are some references to the various statements that Avri has made and the mailing list an archived mailing list if you want further. All I was looking for was an informal poll of people who care one way or another. I've gotten several answers. I'd like a couple more before I do a formal response to the Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Do you wish the matter to also be put to the ALAC Wrap-up agenda?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can tell you what happens then because this is going to come up at the GNS council on Wednesday afternoon. It may of course be deferred which makes it moot and there's another month.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this commercial break which lasted a little longer than expected. We're now going to move on to our previously scheduled program, The Registrant Rights and Responsibilities Working Group with Holly Raiche and Cintra Sooknanan.

Holly, I believe the floor is yours now. Apologies for this, maybe then we can, shall we just in the meantime because the clock is ticking in the meantime.

TORONTO

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay I can talk to a non-slide. I'm good at that. I can talk to a non-slide because the first thing I was going to say is the actual group began since Genesis much earlier than just the issue that's come up here.

It started off its life as a GNSO working group as was said yesterday by Steve Metalitz. There were a bunch of us who sat on phones many hours early in the morning to come up with recommendations.

It's those recommendations that were the subject of the RAA negotiations. As we've all pointed out, what the board did or compliance did was take the law enforcement recommendations which were made and act on those.

But the actual report was a lot bigger and it's in… oh, here we go. Thank you. That was the original group. Now can we go to the next slide? Just a history, it was a report in the GNSO Council and it's about 120 pages long so you don't have to read it.

 It was a set of list to the board issues, mainly the LEA issues got picked up. But separately, and what happens after several of us in ALAC realize that the only things that were going to be negotiated on were the LEA recommendations, and there was a heap more that we all had to say over a two year period.

We met informally, a bunch of us, in March and said, "We should reform, or at least continue our work to deal with the other issues." The first item on our agenda was let's actually go back to the report.

There were two teams. One was supposed to come up with a charter. And if you read the final report, you'll realize that was a lot easier

TORONTO

thought of than achieved. There was an aspirational charter as well as a bunch of issues that should be addressed.

Next slide please. That was the charter that came up and there are a lot of issues here. This is what we wanted. This is what the A-Team wanted and that's not a bad basis for thinking what policy issues in ALAC should be addressed in the future.

Accurate and current contact information, with some capable of asserting and changing, ownership rules, ample opportunity to renew their existing domain names, there's a lot of things in there that are probably worth picking up as issues.

At this stage, the aspirational charter is simply, its status is it's in a report somewhere and nobody has acted on it. So it becomes something that at some future point we might revisit. But next slide please. These are the issues that we identified in Team B and thought needed future work.

The privacy proxy issue took a lot of discussion amongst us and it's certainly taken a lot of discussion amongst the RAA in negotiations now. We talked a lot about Whois including processes of validation. We talked about full contact details. We talked about reseller accountability.

Some of these things are being negotiated. We don't know where they're up to. Some things have been agreed to in the RAA negotiations. What surprises me is they've now got cyber-squatting on the issues which I'm surprised. The other was a code of conduct and we did talk about a code of conduct at some point.

So where we're up to now, next slide because it will say where we're up to. Essentially what are the key issues because the original working group which is the GNSO Working Group identified a whole heap of things that needed to be done?

It's not something that we as a group can just take on about 20 issues and deal with them. I think we have to prioritize and I think the things that we've prioritized are the Whois report, some of the privacy proxy issues, and compliance.

I think if this Working Group is going to have a future, the thing that it ought to do this afternoon and I invite everybody to the meeting, is to say, "Let's prioritize one of those issues we should follow."

And I think compliance is going to be the first one. But then maybe set some issues in order of priority to see number one, should the Working Group exist?

And I'm not sure it should continue because right now it has a membership that includes members of the GNSO as well as members of ALAC and RALOs. So what is the membership? What is its Remit now? I can say at the last meeting, it was Beau, myself, and Wendy Seltzer. And I'm not sure I'd like to continue with that membership.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. On the list first is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. This is Evan and Olivier I've not seen you make that face yet this week. Sorry for those participating remotely, you missed something.

Holly, I'm more than happy to participate with you. In fact I have a suggestion that may give a little bit more teeth and lends to things that have come out earlier during the week.

I'll put the issue forward to you and you tell me if you think it's worthwhile. I think it deals with the whole issue of transparency, the process of doing this in the first place.

We can suggest things until we're blue in the face and we can keep working on this and come up with wonderful things. And then it goes into this darkness and we can't see what's happening.

Then they come out and say, "We have something." Or we don't even know. We don't know what we don't know. So there are negotiations coming on. Alan you'd mentioned this earlier in the week and it had been put to the public questions.

The concept of having an opaque and secret negotiations was defended. So even despite all these changes being recommended, the process itself of negotiation is still meant to be shut out of public observation, let alone involvement. I don't know if this is something that this Working Group can take an initiative on. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to reply, what I would like to do. What I decided yesterday after the compliance meeting that we wanted to have a sort of a high level letter that said, "These are our concerns." And maybe use the existence of the RAA Working Group, reformulate it in with new membership I hope, to draft something that says go to the board.

TORONTO

Quote Fadi back at Fadi. And say, these are the things that actually worry us. There are negotiations going on. There may be progress, we don't know about it. But at this stage, compliance seems to be a very real issue.

Some of the Whois issues seem to be real issues, and actually work on the kind of response that we were talking about yesterday. And then maybe at the next meeting say, "Well, let's rethink what we do."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. You did not say it was Holly for the transcript, but thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: That was Holly for the transcript records.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alan Greenberg.

HOLLY RAICHE: You thanked yourself.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Thank you, I'm Alan Greenberg. The "I'm" was implied. Given that you said you have a Working Group of three, one of then I happen to

know has resigned already, because he's resigned from the RALO. I understand largely for job related reasons, Beau Brendler.

I would counsel that whether your group dissolves or not is moot. I think it needs to go into a balance pending the outcome of the RAA negotiations. By the way, we do know what the current status is. There was a report on Saturday. I'm sure it's public.

I don't have it on my computer but there is a list of the unresolved items, both those demanded or asked for by the registrars and those by ICANN staff. There are a number of outstanding issues. One of them is on the timeline of what comes next is the last item of the approval of the agreed to RAA, assuming we get through all the hurdles.

And I asked what I knew was a leading question, approval by whom? Because the 2009 RAA which should have been a 2008 RAA, it was a very ugly situation where the RAA was negotiated, brought to the GNSO, asked to rubber stamp it, and they said, "No, why should we rubber stamp something we're not part of?"

So we don't know what the process is. I think let this one go through. We're close to the end. We have a new administration running the show right now, who are stuck with this process that started before they came on board.

But I think they're willing to take more risky paths in the future so I would say action and letters at this point in time are not worth an awful lot. We have better things to do with our time. That's my suggestion at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. We have a queue in operation here with Garth, Carlton, and Eduardo, so Garth Bruen first.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you this is Garth for the record. I apologize for not being in that meeting that was so desolate, Holly. I just was not in Prague. I couldn't make it to Prague. I would have been there to support you if I could have been there. I think this working group should continue. I think there are few areas, some topics that could breathe new life into it. And I want to discuss that at the discussion later.

                           Also, I might differ with Alan on this a little bit. There are some problems with the contract right now that are not being discussed in the negotiations. They're very, very serious problems. If we can get on the record at least that they're not being addressed I think we should take that opportunity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Garth. Next is Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you this is Carlton for the record. I'm going to support Garth here and differ a little bit with Alan. Here's why. I think it's important to be on the record before this thing is closed that there were issues pointed out that have not been discussed and that is a fact.

                           The second reason is that if you listen to what they said, they said that they intend to have this closed by the end of December. Then they will

TORONTO

put it out for public comment. You remember that statement? I'm not so sure what that means.

But it's very important I believe for us to go on record even before the public comment phase to see what our concerns are and what we have seen from the update information so far. Some of those issues are still not being discussed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Carlton, Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, Eduardo for the record. This RAA negotiation, I have been hearing about this and I am not an expert on it. I have two points. First Holly I think we discussed previously or this morning that there will be some kind of meeting with compliance and ALS or something like that,

I heard it somewhere, to get at least the things that compliance needs in order to have results. I think it was J.J. that said this. The other thing is it preoccupies me, I don't know if that's the right word. That I hear these negotiations are happening and here we are.

We don't know who is negotiating this. What's the process? And we talk about transparency and I don't see that as being too transparent. That's just my comment.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thank you very much Eduardo. Sala has actually raised a point in the chat and then after you Holly. Matt would you please read this to the record?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi this comment comes from Sala. She notes, I support Garth's position and want to say that we should continue with the group.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record since there's a lull, I didn't say disband the group. I just said I don't think there's any action needed at this very moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan for this, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Eduardo, just to pick up something that Alan said, he's absolutely right. Yesterday we did have a briefing on all of the issues, what's been decided, what hasn't been decided, what the registrars/registrants want, and I've already sent that out. Everybody should have my report on that.

That said, the negotiations are still, there are just two parties. There's ICANN and there's the registrars/registrants. That's it. That's all that are in negotiations. We're not there so we are reliant on the reports that come out, particularly the things that are sticking points. And it's also clear we can look at what's being negotiated and understand what's not being negotiated.

TORONTO

I think the third element is when we listen to the compliance briefing; they do have tools up to a point. But what I think we all walked away with is a feeling of are those tools adequate. And one of the big questions was, well one two, which may or may not exist.

There was a word used yesterday called termination and I don't think they meant machine guns. Maybe they should have. But what action can be taken if somebody keeps accepting one time after another a registrant with no details, no Whois, and there keeps being bad registrants with bad records and so forth.

What is the final action and that was the question that Carlton asked. It was the question that we all sort of walked away with and thought, you know, is there a penalty for continued bad behavior? What is it? And if you look at 3.7.8 which some of us have memorized, it's sort of not there.

So probably we would be picking up things not that are on the record because there are plenty of slides and plenty of discussion yesterday. It's all on that record. But it's the things that we think still need addressing and that will be probably what we discuss this afternoon under whatever group name we've got.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly and in the interest of time, because we are running out of time. We still have one more subject to deal with, one more Working Group to deal with. I'll just take Alan; you just wanted to add something?

[background conversation]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. There's a, I didn't know that like this. If they sent a message like this is "I want the floor", fair enough.

ALAN GREENBERG: I invent them as I go along, Alan for the transcript record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well thanks very much for this big discussion on this work. I'm very pleased to see that the Register and Rights Working Group is fully functional and there is an enormous amount of work on your plate Holly. And it's piling up very, very fast.

But it's great to see that it's getting tackled as it comes. We are already three minutes over time, but we do have one more Working Group and that's the Whois Working Group with an update from Carlton Samuels. And Carlton is, okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Olivier, Carlton for the record. I just put up what the policy perspective is, on Whois it is also in the affirmation of commitment and Matt will put it up momentarily. And this is the starting point. Got it?

Our interests, the At-Large interest has always been very simply if you register a domain name, there should be adequate information for us to contact the registrant, for redress of grievance.

That information should be available to a typical end user without any kind of hindrance. That is the position. As we look at the changes that are going around the RDS, they had the Whois Review Team. They did a review for review, they made 16 recommendations. The ALAC has actually endorsed all recommendations.

There is one wrinkle that we have a slight difference of opinion and that is the issue of the privacy proxy service. At present, there is no policy prescription for privacy proxy service. We believe that there should be because we do believe that there's an instance where a privacy claim can be legitimate claims to privacy.

But that should be handled within the framework of a privacy proxy service that is defined by consensus. We are at the stage in looking at some new forms that are coming into the discussion. The word is we don't like the Whois service because it tends to aggravate. So we're going to talk about RDDS, Registry Data Distribution Service.

Matt if you put up the second piece, the Registry Data Distribution Service says when you make a Whois request, these are the pieces, these are the elements of data that should be returned either in the port for registry service or on the Web service. And Matt's putting it up momentarily.

It's just information about technical contacts, administrative contact, and so on. Their new element that's been introduced is the Registry Data Model. Registry Data Model, RNRDM. Here is what we have to ensure.

This new data model is supposed to be a comprehensive model of the pieces, the elements of data that the registrant should provide the registrar. In that model, there is the Whois element.

With respect to Internationalized Domain Names, we have to ensure that the data model that is being proposed does not degrade the ability of users to get the information of who registers, where they're from. That is what is important.

Edmon spoke earlier about some of those issues that could come from the International Domain Name Registration Model and those are absolutely correct. But our Remit is to ensure that so long as a data model proposes makes adequate submission for handling internationalized domain data, that is specific to Whois requirements, we shall be happy with it.

So we are keeping a very close eye on that data model and the instructions concerning its collection and access to that data model. That's about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for much for this update Carlton. And I'm looking, anybody with questions, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: More of a comment than a question. I sit here and listen to discussions like this and it's not a first time on this particular subject. And I just marvel that we could have released IDN names and not have thought about this issue before that if someone is registering a name in Chinese,

EN

perhaps they will be registering it in Chinese. And that somehow we have to address it. I just marvel at the fact that we've got to this stage and are talking about these problems now, just an editorial comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton for the record. Well actually in the past couple of years I've heard the conversation about that specific thing, yes. What has happened though is that the presumption we're all, everybody was that the record that is no, the Whois service record was adequate.

 If you look at the elements and the way the elements are defined, you have to have data management skills to figure it out. You would see almost automatically that it would not be because I know that I don't read Chinese and some of those elements that I see there if you translate them to Chinese they're totally different. So that was the thing.

MALE: And the ASCII database they're stored in can't store Chinese.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And the last sentence was…

ALAN GREENBERG: This is not a new subject. I've heard it discussed since 2006.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That is even the more acute one thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Gentlemen, this is really point when, and this is Olivier for the transcript. But when the people read it in the transcript they're not going to make any sense of what you're saying since two people are saying something slightly different. Anyway, Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. I bring this up only because it was mentioned by Alan a couple of minutes ago. I was no the Board when the decision was taken to go IDN as it were. So I'd like to give a non-technical explanation.

What was the context then, there was a very strong push from the community, and rightfully so, for IDNs to be authorized. There was a feeling on the board, the majority of board members felt that there was sufficient wherewithal to go to that position to allow IDNs, even though there was a sense that the legwork had not been completed.

We put a whole spate of questions to the staff. Very specific things, including the kinds of things you have just been discussing now. We were not always given accurate or satisfactory replies.

But in spite of that, we took the political decision to go ahead with the idea. So I just wanted to remind you of the context. Thanks.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques and I see several nodding heads. Any and I hope that the nodding heads are with regards to that, any other comments or questions on this issue? Okay, Carlton, have you finished with your report?

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton for the record. Yes, that's about it. Well, I could tell you next steps. It's very important. If you look at what's been happening, if you go to the RAA negotiations and you've been to the board updates, even this morning, you hear two things come out of there.

The Whois record is still a sticking point to the RAA negotiations. The board said this morning, and I noted it directly that the Chairman himself said, "The time has come for us to grapple with the Whois issue, at last." That's what the Chairman says.

And if you see the nexus of those things you recognize that we have cross Working Group responsibilities here. And the suggestion is registrants, right Holly, and I'm riding with Holly on that.

Then the Whois Working Group and the Future Challenges Working Group should get together and we should then formulate something that pitched at the very highest level. I think that is what we are proposing as next steps.

Because if you look at what's happening there's a combinant situation with respect to Whois and registrant rights and so on future challenges, thank you.

TORONTO

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Carlton and I see that people are very, very hungry so we're going to close this. But just before closing, this afternoon there will be a Policy Discussion Part 2.

And there is going to be a session on At-Large Policy Development, ALAC Working Group Relations which is going to be exactly the sort of discussion we will have about Working Groups working together.

Or at least liaising on their work so perfect timing. Thanks to all of you. When it's 1415 to 1500 so 2:15 to 3:00, they will probably be a little bit late starting because I see that we all have to go and get some food.

[background conversation]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm a little concerned about making it 15 minutes later than planned because that will mean we'll start half an hour later. So let's stick to the timeline. So let's be back at 2:00. Let's aim for 2:00 and please, please try and make it as close to 2:00 as possible.

I do understand we've had a very long session, thanks to everyone. This meeting is now adjourned. Thank you and thanks of course to our interpreters, the amount of work they've done this morning has been incredible. And of course with our remote participants,

Sala and other remote participants also, the chaps behind the desk that have made sure everything is working very, very well. I must say the sound has been really great so thank you.

EN

[End of Transcript]