
BUENOS AIRES – ALAC & Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Meeting

Thursday, November 21, 2013 – 09:00 to 12:30

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The time is 8:52 a.m., November 21, 2013. In ten minutes' time, we'll begin the ALAC & Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Meeting for ICANN 48, Buenos Aires.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll be starting in two minutes. Okay. Let's have the recording on, please.

Okay, good morning, everybody. This is the ALAC & Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Meeting at the end of a very, very, very long week. We've got a quite packed schedule for the next few hours. Well, I think we can just get going immediately with the report from the RALO chairs.

As per usual, the rules apply of being able to say your name before you speak, and also speak slowly for the interpreters. It has been a very, very long week for them, too.

The first report is going to come from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, our ccNSO liaison. I'm not sure – okay, oh excellent. So we're going to have the report from Maureen Hilyard, who is now our – actually, I was going to start with the liaison. Okay, let's do with the liaison first since you need to be going. So Maureen Hilyard, with the ccNSO liaison, please go ahead.

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.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Olivier. A brief report on the ccNSO meetings. Okay. I attended my first official meeting over the past two days, and although I have had contact with the group over the last year at ICANN meetings as well as being a member of two ccNSO-related working groups over the year, I have to admit that there were several issues that arose that were relevant to the Pacific communities. So if you don't mind, I took note and relayed directly to PICISOC members the issues that arose.

The first point of interest for me was, of course, the financial report seeking confirmation about the voluntary charges, which are of interest to me as I will be seeking applications for membership from across the Pacific. There are not too many members from the Pacific that actually are members of ccNSOs, so it's going to be one of missions to get more members from the Pacific.

The general meeting content focused on capacity building and security issues, which are of interest. I've posted some information directly to our community on those decisions, as well. The council meeting helped me to identify people of interest. I do have to note that I thought that Byron Holland is already establishing himself as a really respected leader and sitting at [his mark] with that group.

At the council meeting, there were final reports relating to the joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN Working Group and the joint DNS Stability and Security Analysis Working Group and, of course, their Finance Working Group as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. I'll ask if there are questions on your report. I see nobody putting their hand up, but I would like a round of applause because this is your first ccNSO report. [applause] And you've got big shoes to step in following up after Cheryl Langdon-Orr, so it's great to see you're assuming the position and that you're taking position in the ccNSO, which I hear is quite a different group of people.

So next we have the GNSO liaison report. Yes, Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. It's just to notice that our meeting with the ccNSO this week wasn't productive because we started very late and at the end we didn't do anything. So I am really sad for that. We should plan it better in the future, and perhaps we should work more closely with them because I think we can do a very good thing together.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Yes indeed, there was a bit of a scheduling conflict on this occasion. I've spoken to Byron about this, and what we will be doing is to start work as soon as possible. So, Maureen, you've got your work cut out to prepare for the Singapore meeting when we will be able to expand and start the real work. But it was good to, I guess, just see each other and just make first introduction. It has been a while since the last meeting we had with a ccNSO.

Next is the GNSO liaison reports, and that's Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Interesting week. The council meeting held yesterday had a couple of good things and a couple of surprises. The translation/transliteration of IDN registration data PDP was finally kicked off, and it was approved that a working group be formed.

This is a rather interesting and complex problem, and there have been some interesting perturbations. As is normal, a drafting team had been formed to create the charter. That process went through.

When the motion came to council to approve the charter, and therefore kick off the formal working group, there were objections that it didn't address some critical issues without a real understanding, from my perspective anyway, of why those objections were not raised during the chartering process instead of later. Regardless, the motion was withdrawn at that point. It has now come back, been revised, and was unanimously approved.

It sounds like a trivial issue. It is not trivial, largely from the point of view of the task of translating and transliterating registration data, which is the data that people submit when they register a name. It's both expensive, possibly complex, and unclear whether translation or transliteration is the proper thing to do.

And from a cursory analysis of the data that people submit, the answer is, yes, one or the other is appropriate, but it varies from case to case. So I wish this PDP good luck in coming to some good answers. And if anyone has an interest in these kinds of issues, I suspect it's going to be a really interesting group, so I would strongly recommend it.

Sorry? Oh, okay.

There was also a vote finally on the IGO/INGO PDP. If you've been following the process or even reading the statements that ALAC has produced, the group decided to take all of the recommendations that were being looked at – and there's a large selection of them – and do a consensus call within the working group to see what level of support it had.

A consensus call within a GNSO working group is a very complex thing because, since participation is open completely, you can't just count how many yeses and nos. Some of the yeses and nos are very clearly statements of a large group. Some are individuals.

The working group also had a fair selection of paid lawyers representing various interests. This, I think, is the first time a GNSO PDP – at least to my knowledge – there's always lots of lawyers because half the people wandering the halls here are lawyers. This is the first time that I'm aware of that there were lawyers on the call who were being paid by the hour for the calls, or however – by retainer, it doesn't really matter – that were actually representing clients as opposed to just being lawyers. So it was sort of interesting.

None of the recommendation received full consensus – that is, unanimous support of the working group. There was at least one entity – a significant entity, not just an individual person – who did not support everything.

Some of them received consensus, which means a significant majority of the group supported it. The group also put forward a number which had strong support, but not deemed to be consensus.

And if any of you looked at the draft report that came out a few months ago, at that point they were sort of lumping everything together. In the final report, they carefully separated them.

The end result is the council unanimously, including NCSG that didn't support the content at all, approved all of the recommendations that had consensus-level support and rejected by a significant amount those that only had strong support. So even those on who the consensus call – or some of those on the consensus call – who supported those rejected them as not having enough support to pass onto the Board.

So an outcome that some people were expecting. Apparently, I wasn't, so I was a bit surprised by it.

Other than that, I think I'll be doing a full report, and I don't think there's anything startling. There are a bunch of activities that I've highlighted before that are starting in the GNSO that require work group support, and I'll be highlighting those to try to encourage people to participate. Yeah? Evan?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Evan. Go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. I would just add that that particular working group – the IGO/NGO one – was so strange that it had something that apparently was relatively unheard of in that there was a proposal put forward that had a consensus against, and it took them quite a while to figure out

how to deal with that because they had never, it seems, had to deal with that very much.

It was always either there was divergence or there was partial consensus or there was full consensus or there was unanimous. The concept of a proposal being put forward that had a consensus not to do it seemed to be something they had a hard time grasping.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think the concept is that rare. What the problem was was, in the first pass of the report, all of the things that were considered were presented on an equal footing and stating what their consensus was.

Normally, something that has a strong consensus against doesn't make it into the final report as a recommendation. And since they were passing, at that point, all of the things that had not died along the way forward, if you were going to maintain the exact wording used in the consensus call, that's as close as one can get to the answer saying, "It wasn't the consensus for, there was strong support against, but divergence is the strongest level of support against."

In the end, the chair accepted the concept of changing the recommendation from a positive to a negative, thus allowing consensus to be applied to it. That was done against the strong recommendation of those few people who wanted that.

So it was partly semantics and partly that we were presenting things as recommendations which had no support whatsoever, which I thought was an error in how we presented it. And eventually that did change, so

it became irrelevant because it fell into the group of things that didn't have support.

So it's interesting but I think largely different by semantics and a rigidity of process which didn't have to have been there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Any other questions or comments? Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Chair. My comment and question is not on the substance of the reporting that Alan had done, but rather on the issue of how would we move forward to manage and cope with current and upcoming PDPs because Alan has indicated that, though he agrees to continue his role as GNSO liaison, his expectation is that there will be redundancy build-up/capacity build-up for other people to also take up some of that burden and responsibility.

My question to Alan is: how many PDPs do you expect to come up in the next year's horizon? Is it going to be more than what you've seen for this year? So that I have a sense of what the workload will be and how much of a capacity you need to help support you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll answer the question you didn't ask first.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: You know what I didn't ask.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know what you didn't ask. I don't know why you didn't ask it, but there was an implication in the start of your sentence that, as liaison, I'm obliged to sit on every PDP and contribute to every PDP that exists, which is not part of the job description, although I have participated in an inordinately large number.

So the issue remains regardless of whether I want to be GNSO liaison for life or not – which I don't – so I think that problem remains, and we really need to get a grip on it. If the ALAC is going to have an interest in commenting on outcomes of these PDPs – in other words, if we believe that the subject matter is of relevance to the users that we represent, that we speak on behalf of – then we need to get more representation.

And it's not clear how the suggestion that you had at the ATRT meeting – I think it was you – of a webinar going along with the call for participation was exceedingly well-received by all parties, and I think we're likely to see that put into effect very, very quickly.

Pardon me? No, no. Now I'll get to the question you asked: how big a workload? It's very hard to tell. This was beat up bag year because we were working on a combination of things that had been dragging on forever – the various IRTP ones – and other things that were triggered. The UDRP locking one was another one of those that it was a follow-on to other things. We're getting near the end of the ones that are ripple from earlier ones.

There's going to be a stream of new ones. The GNSO is no longer afraid to approve a PDP. A new one was approved yesterday on enlarging the URS and the UDRP so that they are usable by IGOs and INGOs who might not otherwise have access to them because certainly the UDRP is restricted to trademarks and marks that are theirs because of other classes of law do not allow them to use the UDRP.

So we have gone ahead with that. That's something that goes back to 2002 and has been sitting around undone for a bunch of reasons that I won't thrill you with today.

But there's likely to be a string of them, but the good part is most of them the GNSO is trying very hard to put into doable chunks that are not too onerous. Some of them will be of interest to people. Some I think are just interesting education to those who are interested in the overall venue.

I participated in when should domain names should be locked if someone has taken out a UDRP against them, and I found it a fascinating thing and a real nifty learning experience and I think I contributed to the process. Although it wasn't of dire interest to users, there were some user aspects in it which turned out to be somewhat out of scope.

So it's really a matter of catching people's fancy. I think there's lots of interesting things that will go on. Many of the working groups are not contentious like the IGO/INGO one with people sparring for power, but really getting together to try to address a problem and come up with a good solution. So they can be interesting experiences.

I'm hoping we'll be able to, with a combination of the pre-webinar, with education going out, I think there's an increasing understanding within ICANN that we need to put things out in languages – not the language – but in language that is simple enough for people to understand who are not already in the field.

So I hope a combination of that will get people interested. Other than that? Magic.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro?

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you, Olivier. First of all, I'd just like to say thank you to Alan for the remarkable work he's been doing in relation to the GNSO stuff/material and communicating it back to the ALAC, noting that a lot of the issues are somewhat complex and often affects our communities.

To that note, I would just like to add that I would be interested in joining a group of people who'd understudy the policy processes within GNSO. Over the past two years, I have attempted to read some of the archives and that sort of thing. And to a large extent, to be frank, I still feel overwhelmed at the vast spectrum of policies in the GNSO.

Having said that, I do note that next year I will have a lot more bandwidth, and I'm not necessarily looking for a position. I am not interested in a position but just interested in increasing capacity and content and knowledge base so that I can better articulate this down the streams and down the corridors within my region. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Any other questions or comments to Alan? Yes, David Olive?

DAVID OLIVE: Alan didn't want to scare people –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You're going to need a microphone, David. I can recognize your cigarette from behind.

DAVID OLIVE: In terms of numbers, there are seven active PDPs in the GNSO, and probably four more coming in the next few months, so we're talking about eleven. And they don't happen and complete in two months/three months, so there's time there that they'll be going through.

But Alan has been actively involved with that, but I don't think he wanted to scare you with the numbers. But possibly up to eleven.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, David.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll take that positive interpretation. I just didn't remember.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And of course, just as a reminder, the GNSO working groups are open? Is that correct?

I think you have to use the microphone; not earphoned.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's been a long week is all I can say. GNSO working groups are open. They are generally receptive. Obviously, if you're going into a group where you know absolutely nothing, you probably shouldn't pretend you're the authority at the first meeting. So there is certain behavior which is not written in a rule but is common sense, and I think it could be a lot of fun.

Mikey O'Connor, who's made an unpaid profession of working on GNSO working groups over the last little while, has done some studies and looked at the participation. As you may have seen if you read the report attached to the ATRT draft report, participation from developing countries from outside of North American and Europe is abysmal and for many of the reasons we understand and for some we don't understand.

He's gone further than that and looked at participation from within the ICANN community and determined that there are about 20 people who form the core of workers on PDPs. If you put those 20 people on a bus and it crashed, the whole policy process at ICANN would stop to a large extent.

So we not only have an outreach problem; we have an in-reach problem. The number of people who participate in Constituency Day on Tuesday in the various GNSO constituencies and stakeholder groups is a far larger number than 20. But we're not successful at even getting those people to be very active.

So we have a real problem, and it's a problem which questions the credibility of ICANN claiming that we have this multi-stakeholder model which works from the bottom up. It's a problem that is not likely to be ignored. Whether it's going to be fixed is a different issue.

But our community is just as guilty as the Registrar Stakeholder Group or the Business Constituency in that there is a small core of people who do a lot of work and a much smaller number who contribute across the board. The Registries Stakeholder Group is probably the only one where they scatter the work around and you see different faces in different groups. And each of them try to represent the whole group and bring the information back and forth, which is a very useful thing.

You don't have to have a lot of people from any given group if they're communicating well and can formally speak on behalf of. If you don't have that, then having more voices helps. And in some cases, having more voices helps just because you can shut people down. So it varies from group to group.

I'm not sure I've fully answered whatever the question was. I'll keep on talking until the chair isn't busy.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I didn't hear you complain about me just now. Thank you. Any other? I don't see anyone. I gather that what Alan was trying to say is, "Please get involved in GNSO working groups."

Okay, so let's continue then with the next liaison report, and that would be the SSAC liaison report. I'm not sure whether we have Julie Hammer online. I can't see her at the moment. Judging from the fact we haven't got an answer, it sounds as though we don't have Julie. So I'm not sure if anybody was on any of the SSAC discussions this week. Nope? Okay, we'll bank this one for the time being, and we'll get Julie to send her report in writing.

The next report is from our NCSG liaison, and that's Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LIEBOVITCH: Hi there. There's not too much to report. We're still continuing to work with them on finding common areas of interest. We're going to be meeting with them, in fact, this afternoon after this meeting to try and figure out some other common areas.

It continues to be a challenge sometimes to find common ground. Finding the issues I guess is not always the problem. Finding common positions sometimes is a bit of a challenge. There's been times where we've taken different stances from the NCSG. Sometimes the meetings we've had between them have essentially been making sure that we're aware of each other's stances and politely agreeing to disagree.

Considering all the things that are facing ICANN right now, I think there's a good likelihood of finding some more common ground going

forward than we have recently. And so I continue to be optimistic about it, and we'll proceed on that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Any questions or comments? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so let's move on to the other liaison that we have, which is the .mobi liaison. As you know, the position is not filled yet, and this will be filled shortly. So we will soon have some .mobi liaison reports.

Okay, let's move on then with the RALO Chair's report. Knowing that Wolf needs to go in a moment, so I'll call first upon Wolf Ludwig for the EURALO report.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Olivier. Basically, it's not much to say. Most of what's said is summarized in our monthly report. Let me perhaps highlight that, after the summer break, we were quite engaged with the preparations for the IGF. Around seven EURALO members participated [without any funding from the ICANN side], so they all managed to organize their own funding by other sources.

I think it's very good for the region that when many people are involved in the European Dialogue on Internet Governance and also can afterwards make the link to the global IGF. This was one of, I would say, the key issues after our first face-to-face general assembly in the summer of this year. And then we had the mobilization for participation and completing the ATLAS II survey, and this was quite successful again.

Now most of our activities over the next month will obviously concentrate on preparing At-Large ATLAS II in London. I think there may be quite a number of EURALO people hopefully involved in this process. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. Yes, certainly a big forthcoming challenge for the next meeting that will take place in Europe. Any questions or comments? None? Okay, then we'll move to the AFRALO report. For this, I will call upon – who shall I call upon? The new chair or the old chair or the previous chair? First, I have to call upon Fatimata Seye Sylla, the chair.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Fatimata Seye Sylla, outgoing chair of AFRALO. I would just pass the floor to Aziz to read a summary of the report. So, Aziz, you have the floor. Aziz is the incoming chair of AFRALO.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But current secretariat.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: And current secretary. Yes, thank you, Olivier.

AZIZ HILALI: I will speak in French if it's no problem. Okay, so after the Durban meeting where we had the sustain of AfriNIC, the African Register, to invite 15 students and teachers and different people to come with us to

sign a memorandum of agreement with them. and we worked on the preparation of the Internet Governance Forum. we participated on the topic, "How the Internet can be a driver of development." And AFRALO participated to the work of different groups of ALAC and of the ATLAS Summit, the CROP, the PCEC, and the SPC.

We also have worked on the normal meeting we organized in the ICANN meetings with the AfrICANN community that we call AFRALO-AfrICANN meeting. And we have worked after the Durban meeting. Fadi asked us to work on that topic. We worked on an assessment of all the declarations because, in each meeting, we drafted something for the ICANN staff about problems for Africa.

So we drafted this reports, and we made a table in which we tried to brief and to give our opinion on all the declarations of ICANN and their impact in our activity.

Yesterday, we organized a new meeting on the problem for the AfrICANN community. It is the strategy of the ICANN meetings. And we have adopted a statement to ask ICANN to keep the current system rotating among the three ICANN regions.

We had also new demand for accreditation for ALS. It was from the Internet Society of Sudan. We have also two requests more from the Comorienne Federation of Consumers and from ISOC-Kenyan. It's a new request.

And then we have also had, during July, the AFRALO election, and Fatimata told you the result of those elections. So we have a new team

with Mohamed, vice chair of AFRALO, and Philip Johnson who is from Liberia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Aziz. Are there any questions about the AFRALO report? Thank you very much. The next region is – oh sorry, I didn't see you, Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to speak about a subject that was addressed here on behalf of what's-her-name, well, about – I just wanted to speak about the AfriNIC. Okay.

The agreement we signed with AfriNIC that was requested by our colleagues from here – and I wanted to tell you that it will be available. I'm waiting for the official signature of AfriNIC to show you this document that we can amend if you want, and you can also suggest new ideas. We can also suggest new ideas for the agreements you sign with your own registries.

We want to work together with the regional registers to do some capacity building for the local structures, and we want to participate into the development of policies for the region. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Aziz, for your report. I want to ask you a question in English. You had an AfrICANN-AFRALO meeting – there was a joint meeting focusing on the African region. I was not able to be there. Was there something that pertains to a strategic direction for the African region that was discussed, and was there a concrete recommendation on moving forward? Could you share that with me? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fatimata?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Okay, I'm going to answer in French. Yes, we had the session number ten, I think – this is the session number ten with joint meetings with the ICANN community from Africa present here or through teleconference. And this time the topic was “Strategy meeting of the ICANN meetings,” and as I told you, the tendency/the trend is to exclude the regions who don't have the necessary logistics to host the ICANN meetings.

So our recommendation was that we don't have to exclude Africa because with what already happened with this meeting. In this meeting, there were a lot of people, important people for ICANN [inaudible] who was nominated at the ALAC team and he wasn't able to come. So if we also analyze what happened in Durban, we were able to have more African communities participating because we were on the African continent.

So we really want that this concern is taken into account in the debate that takes place into the group on the African strategy. This is a

recommendation because we want to have a rotation among the five regions. We don't want to work only in the regions who can host those ICANN meetings.

The second recommendation is to ask ICANN to find some solution to help us to get the visas for the countries who are hosting the ICANN meetings. What we are asking is, if a region is going to host the meeting and if there are some difficulties, why can't we ask the regional hub to help us and to host the meeting there? We have to take into account the visa problem for some people in Africa. I wanted to summarize what we said into that meeting.

And also during that meeting, we spoke about the local mobilization/teleconference tools, but we also said that we need some face-to-face meetings and that we have at the African level some problems on the connectivity level. At the technical level, we have a problem to participate in an efficient way to the teleconference. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And a follow-up from Rinalia? No? Then we have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is not quite on-topic for the regional reports, but it's very on-topic for what Fatimata was talking about, and that's the visa issue. After Toronto, which was the first major problems we've had – we always have some problems – the answer was, "Yes, we understand. It will never happen again." I received a lot of flak – I think is the right word –

from Canadian colleagues for standing up at the open meeting and saying I was ashamed to be a Canadian because of that.

This is now the second time that it's happened in large quantities. There's some indication that it's gotten the attention of people on the Board, and maybe something will be done about it.

I would strongly suggest our chair not just accept the fact that, yes, we're working on it – trust us, it won't happen again. But if there's an ongoing activity, get someone involved. I'm not saying it should be you, but have someone in the small team that's keeping track of it and making sure that it is being followed up and working with whoever in meeting services or the board to follow up on it.

We're always going to have some visa problems. That's life. We're living in a world like that. But it should not be as global as it was this time again, or as it was in Toronto. I think the "trust me, we're working on it" just doesn't fly anymore, and I think we want active involvement. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Allen. We've got a queue. Evan, then Tijani, and then Aziz. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Good morning. We need to start working on this very soon, especially considering that we are having a summit coming up in June, and that is going to require a massive increase in the number of people coming in from around the world.

We also know the UK can at times be very strict on immigration issues, and so I don't think it is too early to start working now on ensuring from the UK government that we can assure the visas of the people traveling, especially since it's my understanding that the number of people traveling to the summit/the number of ALSes responding to the summit is already fairly well-known by this point.

We've done the surveys. The summit group has done a very good job in determining who is able to go, how many are able to go. That has already been done, so we already have a fairly good idea of the people who are going at this point. We should be able to ask ICANN to say, "Here is our list of people. Now, in December, please make sure with the UK government that this is expedited so we are not running around in April and May in a panic trying to do this."

So while I don't expect Singapore will be too much of an issue because ICANN has already been there and it wasn't much of a problem last time, but I can foresee issues with the UK, especially given the large number of people who are going to be traveling there as on At-Large business. So if I could ask At-Large staff to please make sure with ICANN global staff that they are starting with the UK on visa issues with the summit now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Actually, there is a logistics sub-group in the ATLAS At-Large summit working groups, and there is I believe an action item for this working group to start work ASAP. This was discussed during the ATLAS discussions.

We have Tijani, Aziz, and then I'd like to move on to other discussions.
Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. This issue of visa should not be treated as case-by-case or meeting-by-meeting. Now we are obliged to do so because we don't have the new strategy. But in the new strategy, I am working toward putting inside the strategy a condition to accept any country to hold ICANN meetings without agreeing on special arrangement.

I am not saying about removing the visa or giving the visa to everyone. I am speaking about make the procedure easy – that's all – and not make it impossible as it was for this meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tijani. Next is Aziz Hilali.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you. I wanted to confirm what Tijani just said. The issue of the visas is a complex question. I met with the ambassador for Argentina in Raba in order to help with the visa of Beran, who is a new member of the ALAC committee.

And what he told me is that the issue with your meeting is that it is a public meeting, and so anybody really can have an invitation. All that you need is to register, and you don't even consider whether or not this person is a member of ICANN. He showed me three or four files that came from people who weren't really people who came from ICANN.

So he told me we pay attention to this type of thing. So I would like to confirm what Evan said. They need to list names in advance for any person that we might invite and send that list directly to the embassies so that they might have this list.

This is exactly what he told me for [Beran]. He said, "If I have a list that comes from Foreign Affairs or from ICANN with precise names of specific people, then I will give a visa."

There is one more thing that I would like to add, and that is that most people from Africa, when they request a visa from an embassy, the embassy has rules. And amongst the rules, one of the questions is, "Do you have a salary? Do you have a job?"

And when this person, even though they might be an ALAC member, this person may not have a job. They may not be paid with a salary. So the problem is that, if you don't have a salary, the visa will be turned down. That is the case of a lot of African people that I know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this explanation, Aziz. It's very, very helpful. I gather that the Summit Working Group will be able to work with this, and if they do start work as soon as possible, which is actually the aim at that point, they will be able to also deal with things ahead of Singapore.

Okay, Alan, I know you wanted to just say one more word on this. Just tell me to – okay, let's then move on. Any other questions on the AFRALO report? Seeing no one put their hand up, then we'll go to NARALO now.

You will notice, Garth, that there is actually no order to the reports today, which was done on purpose for you since NARALO always ends up last due to its alphabetical order. And rather than going reverse alphabetical order, I thought, "Let's go completely random." Garth, you have the floor.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Request and actually having somebody comply at an ICANN meeting is wonderful. It's great to get recognition. It's fantastic and appreciated, Olivier.

First of all, in NARALO, I thank my region for returning me to the chair for a second year. I appreciate your confidence and your faith and hope to return the favor. I'd also like to recognize we have Glenn McKnight as our new secretary and Louis Houle, who is at the table from ISOC Quebec, is our representative to the NomCom. So we're moving up, moving on.

Some of the initiatives in our region – Evan brought a duck with him. We're moving forward to reach out to some of the what are called either first nation indigenous peoples or sometimes Indian peoples. I know that word can be conflicting in its meaning.

But these are groups of people that have somewhat autonomous regions within the United States and Canada. Not all of them have the best resources for telecommunications, and we want to make sure that they're properly represented. And so we've been pushing for some scholarship-sponsorship programs to identify some of these

communities and bring them to the ICANN meetings and get them involved.

We're also trying to reach out to the disabled community. I've been banging this drum a lot this week and making sure that the ICANN outreach staff understands the importance of this issue. Many people may not know, but the Internet actually exists as we use it today in its textual format because of a deaf man. Most people were comfortable with using telephones throughout the history of telecommunications, but obviously a deaf person cannot use a telephone.

So a man named Ken Harrenstien helped develop textual systems where people who could not hear could use telecommunications, and this contributed in a huge way to the Internet. Ken actually deployed at the ARPANET the very first network information center server and many of the services that went along with it.

Ken also converted the machine code-based programs that ran the early Internet into the higher-level C languages. So we all actually owe a great debt of gratitude towards the deaf community.

And Vint Cerf himself is also hard of hearing, and many people don't know that. But we don't see these communities at the meetings, and we don't know how they use technology today. So I think it's very, very important that we reach back to these communities and bring them to the meetings.

I've also been talking to people a lot about language issues, not so much in IDN deployment but in the documentation that's available to users of the Internet and registrants. It seems to be lacking in the language

interpretation and some of the basic lower functions of the Internet, which is missing.

In North America, we don't have as much of a language issue as there are in other regions. The language barriers can be much greater in some other regions, but I also want to acknowledge that this is a really universal problem.

People who use my particular ALS service, most of them are from North America, but at least 20% of them are from all over the world. And I want to make sure that their issues as users are properly represented, and obviously language is going to be one of these concerns.

We've also been pushing forward on a number of compliance-specific issues. We've identified people in our region and in other regions, too, who have been more or less disenfranchised by the compliance process. And we want to make sure that their issues are getting the attention that they need and that the system works better for Internet users than it's working right now, which from my perspective isn't working or is really invisible to the end user and even the registrants of the Internet.

And I think that's enough. If anybody has any questions, let me know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth. And so I open the floor for questions, and we have Rinalia Abdul Rahim in the queue.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Chair. Garth, as I recall in my involvement in the World Summit on the Information Society 2003 and 2005, leading up to that

and after that, there was a very vibrant movement on communities involving people with disabilities. It was a large group. It was global, as I recall, and I think that we need to pick up the networks again and connect them.

So I think it may be worthwhile if we get people who know specific groups who are working on this issue so that we can identify who needs to be connected so that the movement can be bigger. Then we can bring them to the fora that we are involved in and support their voices. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia. Any other questions or comments?

Well, thank you, Garth, for this report. Certainly a lot of work going on in NARALO at the moment.

The next one on the list, the next region, is going to be – let's have a look – APRALO. For this, we have Siranush Vardanyan. Siranush, you have the floor.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Chair. As a new – I was actually came here in April of last year, but since yesterday, I became APRALO Acting Chair. So I will speak from that capacity.

We had a meeting – APRALO monthly meeting – yesterday, and this cast several things which are taking place within the region. First of all, there are several changes in leadership positions, and I would like taking this opportunity to thank our outgoing ALAC members – Rinalia Abdul Rahim

and Salanieta – and welcome our incoming ALAC members – Rafid Fatani and Maureen and also our incoming NomCom members, Satish Babu, this year.

One of the major points we have discussed during APRALO meeting was the discussions around MoU with APNIC. And we move forward, did a quite good job in that direction. And the draft MoU has been discussed, and we are in the process of finalizing this.

And we are going to formally sign MoU with APNIC in Singapore, but we also started another direction with the support of our new ALAC member Rafid to start discussions with RIPE to include the [Middle East] part, which is also APRALO. So we hope that we will move forward with that and have some good news together with formally signing MoU with APNIC.

We also, as many of you may know, that APRALO Working Group has been established and a lot of work has been done on that direction. There is a draft charter being worked out by that working group, and right after this meeting we are going to send it for comments to APRALO ALSes. After which as a liaison nominated by this working group, I will be going to share that charter with all other RALOs just to know what has been done by APRALO and may be used by other RALOs as well.

We also discussed the Working Group on Metrics, which was presented by Maureen. And I also would like to encourage once again all of RALOs to come up with their comments and input on those metrics.

And as you know, the next meeting will be in Singapore, so it will be in our region. We started the preparatory work for Singapore, including

showcase. And the very active group of ALSes who are here in person started already works on that direction. The only thing that I can tell you: welcome to Singapore. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Siranush. I now open the floor for questions. I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

Well, it certainly is a very busy region indeed as well, and of course you are the region that will host the next meeting. I'm particularly interested to see as you've now decided to bridge the difference between the RIR regions and the RALO regions, so that will certainly be interesting to see how it pans out with RIPE.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, we really are looking forward to that. It's the one point that's challenging to work in two different directions, but this is diversity of APRALO.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Okay, well let's then continue with our RALO reports, and we will conclude the RALO reports with the LACRALO report, last but not least. I kept it last because you keep the last, well, it's the best, isn't it? The last part, so let's have the dessert.

JOSE ARCE: Probably you didn't say this because we are a little fat. Sylvia and I are a little fat. Seriously. Okay, so good morning to you all. There's something

I would like to highlight. We had a discussion in our teleconference with respect to the future of a possible agreement with an MoU framework with their original registry.

And it seems most of our region is not in favor of this, and they give very good reasons for this. So this is something to highlight because it seems this is not happening in other regions where there seems to be some consensus for this is to happen.

In the Latin American and the Caribbean region, most of them did not want to sign this. They see more disadvantages than advantages on this, so we will discuss this.

We are a little bit behind to say that we are able to sign something. However, the relationship with our RIRs is excellent, and there's always been mutual support for many issues.

In the Durban meeting, we said that one of our organizations is a member of LACNIC. It seems to be bizarre, but this is what they allow.

At the same time, I would like to state that LACRALO is about to upload to the wiki a declaration on the Brazil meeting that's going to take place next year. We would like to provide it today if possible, and if there is some consensus, we will try to look. This way, we will see if there will be sufficient time to present this at the public forum. So in the next hour, it should be ready. We just need to have a final review.

Something that happened as well in the monthly meeting was the reactivation of an internal group within LACRALO dealing with the LACRALO governance. That is to say, after Costa Rica, four important groups were created. And they were about to define the future of the

region, and they were to model it from now on to see how we would work from now on.

Some of them had some inconveniences, so a new group was formed that has already met yesterday. We met for the first time. We already established guidelines and deadlines for the final work to be ready by January.

At the same time, we are really committed here in the Latin American and the Caribbean region because we now are having all the looks on our region because of everything going on, because of everything that's led to the Brazilian meeting and Fadi's public declaration that everything now seems to be focused or will start to be focused in our region.

So this has reactivated and has committed many more people. We will start to be working in different groups, and I think this is really positive.

We in our region have also been analyzing and working with respect to the summit to be held next year. Our region had a lot of acceptance. There were only two associations which could not reply to the survey, so we are pretty satisfied with what has been done in the region.

Thanks to Sylvia, all of the data in the associations were updated. And this was really good because it was out-of-date. And we continue to have an updated database, so this will allow us to have a greater and better way to reach the associations and to have them involved in the different work groups as discussed in yesterday's meeting. Tijani said very clearly that we actually need to add more people and to call upon the working groups.

And we're also, in the region, we are working on the Latin American and Caribbean strategy where Fatima and Dev have been congratulated for the work they have done recently.

And there are many groups. I work in a communications group, and this group is on the implementation stage, so we will some results very soon.

I would like to highlight one more issue that I find important. During the Buenos Aires meeting, we had a meeting with Fadi, just the Argentinian people. And in that meeting, we saw for the first time that the stakeholders in our country could sit down at the same table.

And this was very beneficial because it created a space for us to grow as a country so that we can later on have some leadership role in the region. But if this is not the case, then we can organize internally to improve participation and involvement in the different meetings on Internet governance.

I think this was very beneficial, and if it can be replicated in other countries, perhaps the multi-stakeholders did not have such a big dialogue. So now I urge you to try and do this because this gave us very, very good results. That's all. Thank you, Chair.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jose. So I now open the floor for questions. I first have Rinalia Abdul Rahim and then Evan Leibovitch. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM : I have a question for Jose in English because my Spanish is really bad. Jose, you have piqued my curiosity in terms of why does the LACRALO region find it problematic to sign a framework of collaboration with the IRR? Because your region was seen as a leader in terms of collaboration, and I was wondering whether it is primarily a legal concern or if there are other concerns which you could perhaps share with your colleagues here. Thank you.

JOSE ARCE: I knew this question was coming. Still, I'm not ready, but I will try to answer it anyway.

This has to do with how we Latins are. Perhaps we like to have arguments and bring different voices, and we are not really used to reach quick consensus. So this has been a problem in the region for a long time, and we expect to be able to solve this.

But some of the arguments proposed for this not to be signed have been legal issues saying that our region has not been legally incorporated, and that is why it is not in the condition to have an agreement with an international organization to sign this kind of agreements.

Those who brought those voices have their reasons, and other people do not want to have any kind of a link in a document with an organization of this kind. They believe in LACRALO's independence. They think we can continue our work with these organizations and with others informally without this frame work.

Throughout this time, we have seen this is possible. Others just bring their concern in terms of the money issues. If these agreements are signed and there is money involved, who is going to manage these? What is accountability going to be like? They are more concerned about those kinds of issues.

So this has been reflected on the LACRALO showcase as well. We have shown that LACRALO can manage money and that we can have accountability. We had some sponsors and nobody doubted about what happened with those funds where it was invested. It was something rather transparent for the whole community.

And these are perhaps not very substantial issues, but the idea is to listen to the whole region and, if the majority by vote does not want to sign, we will not sign it. But there are many arguments just saying that they do not want to sign. It works this way, so we should not modify it and should continue working that way.

It's like the Internet. One of the principles is that if it's not broken down, then we should not fix it. So this is it, basically.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Next we have Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Good morning. I was wondering if you could possibly give a little bit of a hint to us of the statement that you're considering for the public comment regarding the Brazil meeting because this is something that's been of great interest. You know about the 7:00 AM meeting yesterday.

So I'm very interested to know in advance at least a summary of the kind of statement you'll be making, the kind of approach that LACRALO is taking towards the meeting. I imagine you're going to want to be significantly involved in that, so I'm very interested to know what approach you're going to be taking there.

JOSE ARCE:

Thank you, Evan. This is another of the questions I was expecting. Anyway, this will become public shortly. We have drafted, and it started being drafted yesterday 7:00 AM in the morning when most of the region participated. Was it yesterday? Thank God it is the last day. I'm tired.

So we started drafting because we think it is relevant for our region because of everything that happened. What this statement aims at is to support some of the ideas that the community has and that became evident in the questions and in the comments during this 7:00 meeting and in other sessions that we had with some other stakeholders or special groups.

But we want to make a global statement stating that we support the multi-stakeholder model. We support the opening of more spaces where this model applies and, in the end, support the way that is how the process will be where we will have a participation or a legitimate representation. This is to state that in black and white and to provide some proposals on how to do that.

So I think shortly you will be able to see that. That is the idea. Support the initiative, looking into the future affirmatively.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Next question is Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Chair. A couple of things: the issue with the Memorandum of Understanding with LACNIC. I have been following the debate on the list, and I have studiously remained silent on it. Not because I don't have an interest but because where I come from we're not in the LACNIC region, and so I thought it would be prudent to give those who might be more directly related an opportunity to say their piece.

But for the record, I am firmly in support of an MoU with LACNIC. From my perspective, LACNIC has done an exceedingly good job of participation and support for Internet activities in the region, including where I live. It would be remiss of us not to have this agreement go forward.

The fact is that of all of Internet-related organizations in the Latin America and Caribbean region, LACNIC has demonstrated its commitment to building capacity of all of us around the region. And it seems to me when this organization – this LACRALO – exists merely on an MoU with a private corporation that is not even resident in the region, it's very odd that you would have no legal argument to say that there is risk involved in signing an MoU with LACNIC.

Jose has spoken about the questions of the financial obligations, and so on. I won't say anything there. I think it's demonstrable that that fear is also overblown and it has no merit.

So I'm putting that on the table. I'm unwaveringly in support of signing the agreement with LACNIC, and I think it should go forward without any further hesitation.

With respect to the statement on the Brazil summit, you would probably know that I fully support any effort to ensure support for the initiative. I do believe that it is an important development not just for the region but for our particular interest and the model of Internet governance that involves multiple stakeholders consulting and exchanging views and coming to consensus around some issues.

I just think that, while we should read the statement, it would be good to post the statement on the list, even if it's only an hour before the statement is read. I think that is appropriate.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Carlton. Any response? Any further questions? I have Fatimata in the queue at the moment, so Fatimata Seye Sylla?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you, Olivier. I would like to ask specific questions to Jose. Maybe I did not understand. Are you saying that LACRALO can manage the funds received from sponsors? Because we were not able to do that because we don't have a legal status so that we can receive funds. We don't have a bank account and we were not able to receive funds from sponsors, so how did you do that? Thank you. If that was the case. And this is why we signed the contract with AfriNIC to manage our funds, by the way, in Durban. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatimata. Jose Arce.

JOSE ARCE: Thank you, Carlton, for your words. First we would like to answer to Carlton question. I support the signature of this agreement with LACNIC, but the one deciding is the region. We will try to have pros and cons and the arguments and expose the arguments and to see what the regions decides, but LACNIC work has been very important for all the users of all the multiple stakeholders. So I would like to have something more formal to help them and that they can help us. It's a two-way street.

And regarding the issue of funds, we did that directly. We did not receive anything because we have the same problem that you have. We are not legally incorporated, but the way to do it transparent is saying we need sponsors, for example, to have food drinks in the showcase, and the sponsors pay directly that to the hotel. This is a way to handle funds absolutely transparently and that doesn't go through us. I think the same thing happened to you.

So the argument of transparency in the funds or accountability in the funds does not have any agreement issue in the MoU. One more thing. Another part of the money went through ICANN staff, so we're really thankful. And they had to register as suppliers of Google, so we forced them to do a lot of red tape to the staff, so we're really thankful for that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jose. Fatimata, you have a follow-up question or comment?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Just for clarification because these international organization sponsors – the big ones like Google and others – they would never do the work for us. They would give you the money if they accept your project, but they wouldn't do it.

Now I'm raising an issue with staff. Were you able to get the money? Because that would require, for example, regarding Google that ICANN get registered in their database and all that to receive the money. And it wasn't also possible for staff to arrange the logistics, maybe because of the timeframe. Yeah, so that was the problem we had. Thank you, Jose, for your reply.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Merci, Fatimata. Heidi, you have a follow-up on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. Just very briefly, Fatimata, and, yes, the main issue is that the level of logistics that your project involved and the rather last-minute nature of that. That was why.

In the past, yes, what we've done with LACRALO and APRALO in Beijing was that they – the sponsors – worked directly with the hotel.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next we have Evan Leibovitch in the queue.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Actually, I want to expand on the point from both Fatimata and Jose because this is now becoming a recurring issue. I remember we had this with the NARALO showcase in San Francisco when we were collecting money and we had issues with how it was going to be collected and how it was going to be dispersed.

We have this now recurring. Is there possibly a way that there is a mechanism that we can institute within ICANN – either a dedicated bank account or a dedicated procedure – that can collect sponsorship on behalf of the RALOs? Not necessarily just for the showcase, not necessarily in the case of getting money from LACNIC for LACRALO.

Since the RALOs themselves are not incorporated bodies, we're relying on ICANN to provide the level of infrastructure above that. Is it possible to ask from the ICANN financial team the ability to create something sort of semi-independent either bank account or accounting facility that allows the RALOs to actually collect and disperse money?

Whether it is for showcases, whether it is for activities based on agreements with local organizations, or even being able to, say, approach Google once internationally and say, "Fund our showcases" without going to them each time. To be able to perhaps go to Google in California, get a single amount, and then you don't have each RALO constantly going back to the same companies over and over and over. Say, "Here, for this year, can you fund the three showcases?"

We can't do that right now because the infrastructure isn't in place. Is it possible to do that, and if so, what do we need to do to start that happening?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. So I understand there are two questions here. One being organizing things on a yearly level with the sponsors and two being the logistics of receiving the funds.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: They're interdependent but yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. Thank you, Evan, for your question. Yeah, staff are increasingly being aware of this because the RALOs are becoming so successful at getting sponsorship now that this is an issue that needs to be institutionalized.

When staff return to Los Angeles, we're going to be having a meeting with the finance staff and the meeting staff on this issue, so we can get back to you on that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Can I ask that you include the RALO leaders in that? Because they have a direct say in how this is going to need to be done.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, might I suggest that we have an internal meeting first and then we can feedback to you and we can invite them onto a call with you?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. Garth Bruen?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I think we have to be very, very careful here. We all get along so well, and I would really hate for us to start fighting over money. So whatever relationship we come up with, especially in between the regions, has to be very, very carefully laid out – extremely carefully.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth. Any other comments? I think Alan was first, and then we'll have Carlton. So Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a very brief one. Someone – it may have been Evan – said we're now sort of getting money from Google for multiple things. We have to remember that in some cases this is local money, not Google-central money, and we just need to be cognizant of that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And we have Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Alan. Yes, because that is a little wrinkle in it. You have to be careful because it's different accounts. It's not from Google Central. It could be from the Google region or a local people. But the concept that should be explored is called funds in trust. This is not something new. It happens all the time with international organizations or those that aspire to be international. It's the way to deal with it, and there are several examples of that around.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Carlton. So let's go back to the LACRALO report, please, everyone. Okay, Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to say that I think when we did the NARALO showcase in San Francisco, I think there was a way ICANN paid for something and then they billed Google or somebody to get the money. That's another way of doing sponsorship.

ICANN puts in money with the statement that Google will pay for it, so ICANN billed Google for that expense. That's the way we did it at that time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Eduardo. I think I'll close the dialogue on this funding thing. There is a Finance and Budget subcommittee that can deal with this. And we also have now a Sponsorship Working Group on the At-Large Summit, which could also be tasked to look into these issues as soon as possible. I think that's probably the good way forward.

I still have a question for LACRALO leadership. This is a question which I think they're not going to expect, as opposed to the previous questions. Oh yes, now we're getting very serious.

I have noticed that, behind my back – behind my back – well, actually, behind me, there is a booth that does interpretation in Brazilian, well, in Portuguese. And no one has actually spoken Portuguese whilst being around the table. Although I have a listened to the Portuguese channel sometimes and listened to beautiful singing, since Portuguese and Brazilian is very melodious. And I wondered whether you could say a few words in Portuguese, Sylvia Herlein Leite.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE:

[speaks in Portuguese] Portuguese is not my first language. I am a citizen of this country. I am very happy to listen to the interpreters, and they are doing a wonderful work. And to be able to listen the meeting at 7:00, I was listening to the interpreters in Portuguese and I was very pleased by that. And this would make Brazil to be more included in this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Sylvia, and I guess we will have a lot more of this with the Brazil Summit coming up, so you better all get down to learning Portuguese. You've got three months.

Okay, that closes off our RALO reports. Ah, we still have Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN: Un pregunta. Jose olvida el informe mas importante. Jose is going to become a father.

JOSE ARCE: I really appreciate that, Garth. Thank you very much. Olivier? Sorry, one more thing. The statement is already in the wiki, so I will send the link to the ALAC chat on Skype.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Very good. Thank you very much, Jose. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So, obrigado.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well that closes off our RALO reports. Multilingual, it's just incredible, and just imagine when we'll have the six language hopefully one day. Then Tijani will be able to speak in Arabic as well, and we'll have some wonderful – and of course, we'll have our Chinese friends speaking in Chinese. German will have to wait maybe until the seventh language turns up. But then at some point, we'll have not enough space in the room because there will be so many booths for the interpretation that it will be a bit difficult.

Anyway, let's move on. We are a little bit late, but then again, we're having fun. It is the last day; we do need to relax a little bit.

We have a list of ALAC action items to go through. It's a very long list indeed. And when Heidi showed me the list and turned me on that, she was trembling from fear with the number of things we have on there.

What I suggest, if you are all okay with it, is that we just go through the ALAC action items themselves. We have had a lot of working groups meeting here. We had a lot of different Regional At-Large Organizations meeting here. I gather that the RALOs will be following up on their action items in their region, and the working groups will be following up on their action items in the working group itself.

Oh, and I'm told that we have to refresh because Heidi is trembling a bit less. A few of these action items are already completed, so that's great. But we'll go just to the ALAC action items.

The first set of action items was the ALAC Metrics Sub-committee, and that I gather we can leave that until the sub-committee follows up directly.

The next one is the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Sessions. These are ALAC action items. The first action item is for Heidi to ensure that Christopher Mondini liaises with Garth Bruen on how to ensure that ICANN is working to ensure that the blind, dumb, and disabled to take part in ICANN activities. That is completed and, in fact, Heidi will be able to provide us with a quick update on this. She has sent me a list, but there's just so many things on the screen at the moment. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Is this working? Okay. ICANN staff did hear the concerns that Garth raised and others raised about the issue of accessibility to the ICANN

website, etc. for the disabled. There was pretty immediate action on that from staff.

And on Monday, there was a meeting with Garth, Glen, Christopher Mondini, Darlene, and myself on this. And I think there was some discussion made for forward movement, and I do believe that there will be continuous forward movement on this item as we approach the summit in particular. This will be just an ICANN-wide activity; it's not going to be just for At-Large. It will be for all of ICANN. That was seen as very important. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It works now. Okay. Thank you. That's all come back on. I don't know why it stopped. Very strange. Okay, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Well just possibly, I'm sure that action item there is a typo. It should be "deaf" in the action item, so just a note.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you. Okay, let's move on. The next action item is for Heidi to work with the ALAC on travel-related concerns and, of course, that is directly-related to the visa issue. Heidi did send me a note, and there was some Board action that was going to be done because the ALAC spoke with the board about this issue and, as a result, there were two action items which came out of this.

The first one is for Karine, who is the Board – Karine Perset, I believe – who is the Board support now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: She's the Senior Director of Board Support.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: The Senior Director of Board Support – is to add the issue of visa to Steve Crocker's list of issues to look into. And Fadi Chehade, the President and CEO of ICANN, will work with Steve on this.

Fadi is to call the ALAC and At-Large members who were prevented to participate in the Buenos Aires meeting due to visa issues. That's how high it's gone.

Olivier – the next thing – okay, that's the issues that Heidi has spoken to us about. So these are action items that will take place based on these issues.

Yes, Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Also, Susanna, when we met with her, she committed to look at this particular point of visa and to address it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. That's great. Then we have the joint BCEC – the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee – and BMSPC – the Board Member Selection Process Committee. Thank you very much, Leon. You're getting the hang of the acronyms faster than I have. Goodness, it must be tiredness or whatever.

But we have quite a few action items on there, and that's directly related to the ALAC so I think I'll just list through them. We know the process is moving forward, thankfully. So Matt is to ensure that only those BCEC members who have completed their statement of interest will have access to the confidential Board Candidate Evaluation Committee wiki page.

Heidi is to ensure that a process be put in place to ensure that members of the BCEC sign hard copies of confidentiality documents in Buenos Aires. Since we had them here since, of course, the process will be totally confidential.

Heidi is also to ensure that the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee members read the background materials from the 2010 selection process.

Heidi is to ensure that the confidential – COI? I thought it was the SOI? Hello? Okay, no echo. SOI is approved by legal so that the BCEC members can sign it in Buenos Aires.

Roberto Gaetano, who is the chair of the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee will complete the final version of the expression of interest by 21 November and send it to staff. That's completed as well.

And Heidi is to ensure that the delegated authority of the chairs can be given to either chair.

There could be perhaps. Can I just ask for Roberto to clarify this action item, please? I think it's probably the right time to. Heidi is coming with a handheld mic. Oh, go ahead.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah, I think that this is related to the fact that we don't want to have to be forced to have a plenary meeting of the BCEC if there are some technical issues on the sending out of the documents. I'm talking specifically, for instance, the SOI that has a cover letter, the document is made but there's a cover letter. Once we leave Buenos Aires we don't want to remain stuck for some procedural matter that needs a signing off.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Roberto. Has that clarified the AI, Heidi? Thank you.

Let's move on. So the Future Challenges Working Group is not the core activity of the ALAC, although I was just going to ask Evan if he could give us – I think you have a length of a tweet for a report, if you may. Maybe 30 seconds.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, my other option was speaking fast, but I won't do that because of the interpretation.

The main reason I asked to speak is simply because there is a call for action attached to this. As a follow-up to the R3 paper, which we gave closure to during the meeting, we also recognized that there was more work to be done, especially considering the meeting we had yesterday at 7:00 AM, the Montevideo statement, the Brazil meeting, and, for instance, the LACRALO statement ends up being essentially the first input into our future work going forward with trying to do future ALAC work regarding reacting to this.

So there's going to be more activity. I'm hoping the Future Challenges Group will bring something forward to ALAC on moving forward with this. The 1net initiative is a very complex one, as we saw yesterday morning, and so we hope to have some activity within ALAC.

I especially want to invite our new members, both ALAC members, RALO members, and ALSes. We need more people involved because this is, as you know, a very important thing. So please, I invite anybody to get in touch with Jean-Jacques or myself on this initiative going forward. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. I'm told by Heidi that there is a problem with the last action item on the list on the Future Challenges Working Group where Heidi is to ensure that the issues regarding Compliance be directed to the Regulatory Working Group. Why would that be Heidi?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Olivier. I believe what happened was, because this was a formal handoff and because essentially what was called the Regulatory Issues Working Group is something that was rechartered. So there's a little bit of a what came first. First we needed a new chartering of the new working group, and then the Compliance-related activities that had been done in Future Challenges were to be handed off to it. That was my understanding.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Does that clarify the situation, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm just wondering what actual action that entails for me.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Now although the chairs of the new Regulatory Group are Holly. You're involved, right?

HOLLY RAICHE: We renamed it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's been renamed? Holly, do you want to talk to this? The new working group has been rechartered and renamed and will be [inaudible] the Compliance functions that were in Future Challenges.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I see we're starting to cut the meeting into pieces at the moment. This will be dealt with afterwards, so let's just punt it to the side and we'll come back to it afterwards when we deal with the actual agreement from the ALAC on the rechartering of the group, if that's okay with you.

It wasn't my question. It was Heidi's question. Thank you, Heidi. Let's take it off. Let's move it to later. Thank you. No, I'm just mindful of the time. I'm sorry, but we always get stressed towards the end.

Now the next set of action item goes over to NARALO, and I gather that NARALO will be addressing those in their own time.

The next set is the ALAC Policy Discussion – Part unknown. I gather this probably is Part 2. And on that, Matt Ashtiani and there's actually two Matt Ashtianis since it's "Matt Ashtiani are to send Cheryl Langdon-Orr a copy of the transcript of the ALAC Policy Discussion, Part 1, from the Buenos Aires meeting, specifically noting Evan's presentation." Does this make sense, Matt? Matt 1?

MATT ASHTIANI:

Matt 1, for the record. Yes, it does.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. For those of you who didn't get this because Matt sometimes is Matt 1, Matt 2, Matt 3, Matt 4 on the Adobe, so it's obvious that from now on there's more than one Matt.

Any questions or comments on this? I see no one put their hand up. Okay, let's move on: LACRALO monthly meeting. Those action items will be handled by LACRALO.

ALAC/ccNSO meeting. There was an action item on that. The ALAC and the ccNSO are to consider the following areas for future collaboration: joint statements, shared calendar space, joint meetings at ICANN meetings, coordination of activities in the Internet ecosystem.

And I think that there was a second action item from this meeting, which was that the Coordinating Group to prepare the ALAC/ccNSO meeting in Singapore should start work as soon as possible.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you repeat that, please?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is this recorded? I've just recorded. I just said it. Repeat. The ALAC/ccNSO Working Group on coordination – the second time is never good as the first time. The ALAC/ccNSO Coordination Group should start work immediately to prepare for the Singapore meeting so as to have a good set of subjects. I gather that Maureen is going to have to oversee this. So Maureen Hilyard, you could be put on as the owner of that action item, please.

Next is the APRALO monthly meeting, and APRALO will be handling this.

Then we have the joint ATLAS II Organizing Committee, Capacity Building Working Group, Academy Working Group, and Regional Secretariats Meeting. I wanted to go through these action items because this, of course pertains, to the second At-Large Summit. And as we know, it is something that not only affects the ALAC but affects all of our At-Large structures. I'd like to put it to the record and to remind you all of the amount of work that we have ahead of us.

So Julia is to schedule an ATLAS II working group call for the week of 2 December and discuss planning for ICANN 49 in Singapore.

Julia is also to schedule an ATLAS II events sub-working group weekly call starting from 2 December, so that effectively means that the calls are going to start and go on until we actually have the At-Large Summit.

Carlos is to provide Tijani Ben Jemaa with a list of rooms and their availabilities for ATLAS II by 2 December.

Carlos Reyes is also to finalize the list of At-Large Structure travelers by 31 January 2014, and this links in with the suggestions that were made earlier on in this meeting.

Heidi is to ask Constituency Travel about visa application invitation letters for ATLAS II participants. That was something we didn't touch on today during our visa discussions, but it is basically that rather than having participants ask for a visa letter, whoever has registered already will automatically receive an invitation letter that they can use to apply for a visa.

Yes, Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

On that issue, I hope we will not ignore the other aspects of notifying the receiving country. It's quite evident from what people have been talking about that there's a great international business in identifying conferences that attract people and generating counterfeit invitation letters, so sending an invitation letter to the recipient should not be viewed of instead of having more direct paths.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. Tijani Ben Jemma?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I continue on what Alan said. I think that we need to have the host country to work on the list of the participants of the summit to be sent to all embassies so that the participants of the summit do not have any problem to get the visa to come. Specific action – it’s not a normal procedure, [if you want].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, we’ll have to add this. Did you catch this, or do – no, Matt. Matt 1, could you –Tijani 1, could you please also repeat.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, Tijani 0 will.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You have to be careful. We have the chair of the Address Supporting Organization Address Council, who’s right behind us, and as soon as you start discussing numbers, you –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So, seriously now, ask the host country to work on the list that ICANN will give them – the list of the summit participants – so that this list will be sent to all UK embassies to facilitate the visa obtaining.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Every time we deal with travel issues, we start getting late. If we weren’t like that all the time, we’d miss all our flights. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. Just to simplify things, you already have an action item that a list is to be compiled. That list should go to the U.S. Foreign Office, essentially saying, "Let's tackle this," and we assign somebody on ICANN staff to make sure that that is handled. It doesn't need to be more complicated than that.

If it's invitation letters, if it's something else – whatever is necessary – we have a list of genuine people who are authorized to go. That list goes to the U.K. Foreign Office through ICANN's contact with them, and then somebody is just charged with making sure that that list is dealt with. Period. I don't know why it needs to be more complex than that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This is what was said exactly: the list has to be given to the foreign office of U.K., and that's all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. It's clear now. So next action item: Julia is to schedule bi-weekly calls for the ATLAS II sub-working group chairs. We have several sub-working groups, so it was thought to be a good idea to coordinate them.

Heidi is to ensure that RALO leadership mobilized ALSes in the ATLAS II. I'm coming to you, Heidi. Don't worry. I see you in the corner of the eye and I know you wanted to speak, but I'll just finish this list and then you can address everything in one go.

Heidi is to ensure that RALO leadership mobilizes ALSes in the ATLAS II sub-working group, so Heidi will be the person who'll be cracking the

whip on everyone to go and crack the whip on more people to try and get more people involved and bring them into the process. Of course, “crack the whip” being a kind thing, as in gently bringing people forward to help on this.

And then Eduardo Diaz ATLAS II Working Group is to keep in mind global Internet governance issues as the planning continues, and that’s for you to juggle.

Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I may change this to incorporate things we have to keep in mind because if I’m keeping it in mind, it’s already checked.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That’s great, Eduardo. It’s good to keep things in mind. It’s even better to incorporate, so let’s replace “keep in mind” by “incorporate,” please.

Now, Heidi Ullrich, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. Just a question on the action item: “Heidi Ullrich is to ensure that RALO leadership mobilized ALSes in the ATLAS II sub-working groups.” I’m just wondering, is that an action for staff, or is that more an action for the RALO leadership to ensure that they are in contact with their ALSes and activate their ALSes? Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I may answer that, Heidi, I think I answered the question just a moment ago. So staff should work with the RALO leadership. RALO leadership should work with the ALSes. I think it effectively shows a lot of support from staff on this, and this is going to require a lot of support – increased support – from staff on these issues.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you, Olivier, for that clarification. And then given that Silvia Vivanco is the manager for the RALOs, then I would suggest that it be Silvia that works with the RALO leaders on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. That sounds like a fantastic delegation. And Silvia has nodded, so I gather this transfer can happen. And of course, since we're on the bridge of this Starship Enterprise, I'll say, "Make it so."

Alright, Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I asked yesterday to the program call for the Capacity Building Group not next week, but the week after. It is not in the action items. Can we add it?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, it will be added. Thank you very much, Tijani. Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Chair. At this meeting, there was no update about the IDN Working Group, and there is no action item from the IDN Working Group meeting that I co-chaired together with Edmund Chong yesterday. I just wanted to explain to you that there was no specific action item, but there were substantive issues being discussed.

Typically in the IDN Working Group if you pop in, you will see that they are more experts in the room than they are community members. And that's not a bad thing, actually. We actually have a very good, substantive discussion.

One very urgent and important issue is universal acceptance of IDN, IDN TLDs, and IDN Variant TLDs, and it is apparent that, in the ICANN system, this topic is being shelved. There is no urgency to it, and there is even confirmation at the Board level that there is no urgency to it.

So I'm putting my focus on strategic intervention in the near future on focusing attention on this issue. And I made an intervention yesterday in the Public Responsibility Framework Strategy Panel that it is something that they need to look at because it is about access for a multilingual world. And when I'm ready with a concrete initiative then I will come back to the ALAC with a proposal, and that will be without my ALAC hat but just as a community member. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Actually, that surprises me because some of the first new gTLDs to be put into root will be IDNs, so I'm just surprised that's the case.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: A response, Mr. Chairman? Yes, IDN TLDs are being delegated. But the issue is sometimes as a user you may not be able to see your script correctly presented because there's a disconnection in the Internet layers or systems. And the coordination of that hasn't been looked at, and it's quite critical. So that's why we're talking about universal acceptance of IDNs. It is a complex problem, and no one is owning it. So I'm going to focus on ICANN and try to get them to do something about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia. Holly Raiche?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE : I'm just amazed that they would have actually put those names first if they haven't sorted the problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And for the record, there was a face that Rinalia pulled. Right. We are spending a little bit of times still on this because I'm waiting for our staff to be ready for the next part of our call – or our meeting – and that's the ALAC Action.

So let's close off the action items. I gather there aren't any comments, any additional things. I know that Maureen Hilyard wishes to add.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. Just noting that there are some unticked items beside my name. I just wanted to mention that they mainly relate to the visits that I've made to the RALOs, the communications that I've had with RALO leadership in relation to the Metrics Working Group.

I made personal contact with LACRALO, NARALO, and, of course, APRALO and have made contact with the leaders of AFRALO and EURALO to ask if they can actually sort of like get some feedback from their ALSes about the issues. And I really would appreciate if the RALO leadership does actually get down to the ALSes and seeks some feedback for us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. And your microphone is still one.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Okay. Let's move on now. ALAC Action – these are the statements. We're going to have to do two things. First, to find out if there is quorum in the room, and I do believe that there is. And the second thing we need to do is to also announce any proxies. I have received a note from Sala that she provides her proxy vote over to Evan. Do we have quorum, and could we have a list of the participants here please?

Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since I presume at the first formal ALAC meeting after adopting the new Rules of Procedure, which reinforce the previous intention to do things by consensus, I presume we might actually adopt these by consensus. In such case, it is important to not only know that we have quorum, but who is in the room. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. That's what I've asked. I have a problem with my Skype. It's very slow. At the moment, I just see Alan's name on my Skype. Oh, here we go. Now it's come up.

Okay, so we now have three votes for the ALAC Action. We've got ALAC Action to establish the Regulatory Working Group, a Regulatory Issues Working Group, and to archive the WHOIS and the RRR – what is it called again?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: RAA.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: RAA Working Group, yes, not the RRR. I thought that was a bit strange. And then the announcement on the new ALT and Liaisons is what we have afterwards.

So the three votes are on three statements that we have coming up. It depends which one is the first, Holly. The renaming of the working

group. Okay, well we're doing that afterwards. We're first doing the statements and the policy advice.

So the first statement of the ALAC is the At-Large Policy and Implementation Working Group "work space" it says here. What is the name of the statement, please? Can we have the mic please?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi. It would be the At-Large statement on the Policy and Implementation Working Group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matt. I think it can't be the At-Large statement. It has to be the ALAC statement.

MATT ASHTIANI: ALAC statement. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So please modify this. Amend this. We have sent notes yesterday out to the mailing lists that this was coming up, and of course the wiki has been open for the full, well, for the past few weeks on this issue.

Any comments or questions on this? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. The statement has been modified this morning to reflect the comment that Rinalia made on the wiki. I will read the revised statement. The issue was that one of the principles that was stated was

that when a decision during the “implementation period” – what we are today calling implementation – impacts the community, the community must be involved in a process to decide on how that is carried out.

Rinalia pointed out that the recognition of when things are going to impact the community is not a trivial issue in its own right, and I have modified the statement to say there must be a methodology to recognize when a decision will impact the community, and such decisions must involve a bottom-up process in addressing those decisions.

Other than that, the statement has not been altered since we corrected the grammar and other things that Olivier pointed out.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Matt Ashtiani.

MATT ASHTIANI: Alan, I was just wondering if you’ve actually updated it on the wiki.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have, twice.

MATT ASHTIANI: Okay, great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Once to make the major change, and second, to remove an “S” that I incorrectly had on a word. The last update was done about three minutes ago, so I’m not sure if you’ve captured it or not.

MATT ASHTIANI: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. It would be nice to have it on the screen, please. It’s a bit – and send a link also in the chat, yes, so we can all have a look at it.

The floor is open for questions/discussion on this. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: You might recall that the working group asked a long laundry list of questions. Since we have good participation in the working group and its many sub-teams, I’ve chosen not try to answer specific questions, which I think partly because I think the questions will change over time, anyway, but to lay down what I believe are the core principles where we want to come out of it.

That is, regardless of what we call things, the community needs to be involved, and recognizing that “involved” is an undefined term right now. We have the formal policy development process, which details how policy is created to whatever level the PDP Working Group decides they will be specific. There are no formal processes for how one make decisions that come up later in the game, as we all well understand from the new gTLD process.

The policy makes it clear it cannot be unilaterally ICANN staff making decisions on our behalf. And there's going to be a lot of discussion and contention over the N months over how one comes to closure on issues where the community is deeply divided and has strong vested interest in seeing one outcome or another.

It's not going to be an easy issue to address, and it cannot be as long and complex as the PDP because these are going to be issues that come up during implementation, and we can't stop for a year each time and settle a problem.

So it's not obvious what the answers, and we're not pretending we know the answers. We're just trying to set some overall standards by which it be done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. The floor is still open for comments. We have Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, I was just going to say, Alan, this is great, and I would move to adopt.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Now the statement is rather long, so we will not read it to the record, but I gather you have all read it. So the motion is proposed by Evan Leibovitch, I see here. Thank you for putting this together. The proposal is to support this ALAC statement on the Policy and Implementation Working Group. Thank you, Matt.

Do we have a seconder? Rinalia and Tijani? And now noting that we have quorum, I will ask for all those in favor. So this is only ALAC members – current ALAC members, yes – to put their hand up, please, if they are in favor of this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ready, Matt? So I see Eduardo –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Your microphone does not work, Heidi. Sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It is working.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, now it does. Go ahead, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, we have in favor: Eduardo, Natalia, Dev, Rinalia, Alan, Holly, Sandra, Evan, Olivier, Carlton, Tijani. How do you wish to vote for Sala? And then a yes for Sala.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And that's the proxy that Evan holds. So Sala votes yes. Thank you very much. All those who are against this statement, would you please raise your card now or your hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't see anyone raising their hands or their flags.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, thank you. And all those who are abstaining, would you please raise your hand now? I see no abstentions, so could we have the results, please, Heidi?

MATT ASHTIANI: For the ALAC statement on the Policy and Implementation Group, it is passed. Yes: I have Eduardo Diaz, Natalia Enciso, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Sandra Hoferichter, Evan Leibovitch, Oliver Crepin-Leblond, Carlton Samuels, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. We have no votes against it, and no abstentions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Matt. So that's twelve votes in favor, no votes against, and no abstentions. Actually I just thought – are there any ALAC members online in case, and I do not note any ALAC members online. I was referring specifically to Jean-Jacques Subrenat, whether he was. Okay, thank you. So this is carried and passed. Let's move on to the next one.

So the next one is going to be the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team ATRT 2 Draft Report and Recommendations. For this, should I ask Rinalia Abdul Rahim who was the penholder to tell us a few words on this? Again, quite a long statement. So please, go ahead, Rinalia. You have the floor.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Chair. I hope that everyone has had a look at the policy development wiki page on this statement because it is quite a long statement. I have essentially communicated the bulk of the contents of this statement during our discussion with the ATRT 2. There is no significant deviation from that, except there may have been details that I did not say during the discussion, so it would have been very important that you personally look at the text.

Based on the discussion itself and the questions that our chair asked, whether or not there are any gaps in the ATRT 2 recommendation, I noticed in the discussion with the review team that there were several issues raised by our ALAC members. I did not capture those. I did ask colleagues to send or post your input on the gaps, but I did not see any of those. So that segment remains blank.

What I would suggest, Chair, is that we separate the gaps section, submit the current content as the ALAC statement, and if there is consensus in the ALAC to submit something – another statement or follow-up statement on gaps itself – that could be a second-parter to this statement. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia. Comments are open. We first have Evan, and then we'll have Alan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So if I hear you right then, we should simply add another line to the end of this saying a further statement defining further gaps that we've identified since may be submitted at a later date.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I gather that is a friendly amendment? Okay. Yes, Matt?

MATT ASHTIANI: Evan, can you please state that one more time.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. The idea of putting a sentence at the end saying, "A future comment regarding gaps in the original statement that have been identified during the Buenos Aires meeting may be submitted." It doesn't commit us, but says if we can put something together just to reserve that we may be submitting additional material.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. And this is a friendly amendment. Anyone vehemently against adding this line? I see Alan Greenberg is frantically waving his hand. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll just point out it's not really necessary. There's no reason that we need to commit or not commit or give notice that we might be doing something else. It doesn't hurt, but I do have a question on the rest of the statement when we finish this debate, though.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I do agree with you in a way, but it doesn't hurt to have that sentence. It doesn't hurt, yeah. This keeps the option open.

Just to note that the ATRT 2 will consider any statement and input until the 13 December date, which I believe is the closing of the actual comment period. And now over to Alan Greenberg for his comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, plus I'll point out that things given verbally were noted, and several of them have already been acted on. So we're in better shape.

I have a question. I have a computer that is refusing to respond very quickly. On the statement on the financial analysis, I had made a statement in my comments that I personally thought it was in far more detail and prescriptive than it needed to be. Did you reflect that in the statements or just say, "We support it."

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. I just said that the ALAC supports this set of recommendations. As I recall, your comment to me was, "This is Alan saying I think this is overkill." In my opinion, I think it's not a bad thing for the organization to be prudent about financial accountability, which is why it still says the ALAC supports this set of recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: In that case, I'm happy because, since I wrote that statement we had a discussion with the Board on it, and the Board said, "Most of us already

done anyways, so fine.” So whether it’s overkill or not, apparently it’s on the books.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan, for this clarification, and thank you. Sorry. Thanks very much, Alan, for this question and Rinalia for the clarification.

Carlton Samuels?

CARLTON SAMUELS: So essentially, this is a “me too” statement – most of it. I hate those.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I often hate “me too” statements. However, in this case since we don’t know what comments are being made by other people, some of these statement are very controversial in some circles, and we – the ATRT – are fully expecting and have already gotten negative comments on some of them. Then the support statements may help to counteract the negative ones, and therefore in this case I strongly support the “me toos” because there will be pushback and there has been pushback on some of these issues already.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I have one more question again because of my machine, which is acting up. Did you change this statement or are you planning to change the statement with regard to that reference to the footnote that was on the PDP one, which says, “Support disadvantaged groups in all parts of ICANN”?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. I did amend the statement, and the revision reads, “We strongly support and urge the ATRT 2 to generalize the fourth bullet of recommendation 10.3 to facilitate having such volunteers,” which are essentially are volunteers from all the disadvantaged and less representation in the ICANN world – “in all areas and not just the GNSO PDP to ensure that the public interest it properly supported in all ACs and SOs.”

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just as a point of interest to this group, the areas involved I thought when that was originally drafted were largely ALAC and the non-commercial users, both of whom of course are supporting it. What surprised me is there was another group I had forgotten and that’s SSAC who are also supporting it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Any more questions or comments on this? So what we need for this is a proposal. Evan? And a second I guess, which is Holly Raiche.

If we can start with the votes. So I will repeat the name of the statement: “The At-Large Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team Draft Report and Recommendations Work Space.” I gather this would be a statement of the ALAC on the ATRT 2 draft recommendations. All those in favor, could you please raise your card now? ALAC members only.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I see Eduardo, Natalia, Rinalia, Dev, Alan, Holly, Sandra, Evan has two hands – one for Evan and one for Sala – Olivier, Carlton, Tijani.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Anybody against this statement, would you please raise your hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I see no raised hands.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any abstentions?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I see no raised hands.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. Matt, would you please read to the record the results of the vote?

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi. In the ALAC statement on the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team ATRT 2 Draft Report and Recommendations, for the statement we have Eduardo Diaz, Natalia Enciso, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Sandra Hoferichter, Evan Leibovitch, Oliver Crepin-Leblond, Carlton Samuels, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. We have no votes against this statement and no abstentions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Matt. If you could correct the spelling of "Raiche," I'm sure Holly would be delighted. That's great. So this statement is ratified as well. Thank you.

Let's go to the next one, and that's our third statement. You will find the link in the chat and, of course, you'll be able to link to it from our policy page.

Is that the framework of interpretation? I haven't got the actual list in front of me at the moment. It is, yep. Okay, it's the Thick WHOIS Policy Development Process (PDP) Recommendations, and that doesn't work for some reason on my machine. If you could just hold on.

Okay, so the person who was holding the pen on this statement was Holly Raiche. Holly, would you like to say a few words on this, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: I suppose the first thing to be said is I'm sorry, Alan, I didn't shorten it because Alan probably rightly pointed out it's a bit redundant. What I

did when I looked at this statement was to go back to the sort of earlier statements we've made on Thick WHOIS, capture what we've said in summary form so that if you come into this statement and you haven't read previous ALAC statements on it, you have a feeling as to why we support it.

I'm perfectly happy if – I don't think that's too much, but I'm really just echoing what we've said previously and kind of trying to stress why it is that we still think the same thing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. The floor is now open for questions and comments. I see Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: The comment I put on the wiki was two parts. Number one, a personal statement saying I prefer terser statements. That's a matter of style and I didn't draft it, so the drafter gets to put the words in. That wasn't requesting a change.

I did point out that the fourth bullet of the reasons we support, which currently reads, "The possibility of a registry requiring consistent labeling and display of WHOIS information, which may be of particular benefit for internationalized registration data; and" I believe that is no longer really applicable because the new RAA and RAs enforce a consistent display of data. So I would suggest that we remove the fourth bullet and move the "and" up to the third bullet because it's now the second to last one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. So just to clarify, the sentence: “The possibility of a registry requiring more consistent labeling and display of WHOIS information, which may be of particular benefit for internationalized registration data; and” should be deleted.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the “and” moved up. And I saw a nod of the head of the drafter, which implies that it is considered a friendly amendment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Or they’re falling asleep.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Any comments on this friendly amendment?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I wasn’t falling asleep. It was assent, spelled a-s-s-e-n-t.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, are you – okay. Yeah. Okay. Consent or assent. Okay. No, but with regards to everyone else in the room, I see consensus. So let’s do this. Let’s take that sentence out and the statement is rather short so you may all read it.

Let’s have a person to motion. Alan Greenberg. Do we have a seconder? Carlton Samuels, Evan Leibovitch. And let’s start the vote. All those in

the ALAC – ALAC members in favor – will you please raise your card or your hand now?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I see in favor Eduardo, Natalia, Dev, Rinalia, Alan, Holly, Sandra, two for Evan – one for Evan, one for Sala – Olivier, Carlton, and Tijani.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi. Matt, would you please read the results?

MATT ASHTIANI: For the ALAC statement on the Thick WHOIS Policy Development Process (PDP) Recommendations for Board Consideration, for the statement we have Eduardo Diaz, Natalia Enciso, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Sandra Hoferichter, Evan Leibovitch, Oliver Crepin-Leblond, Carlton Samuels, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. We have zero votes against the statement and zero abstentions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: May I request in the future and not take time at this meeting to do it, but that vote results include an unavailable or absent for the future record. Three years from now, someone trying to research who was in fact on the ALAC at this point in time it may be almost impossible. The

record should include those who didn't vote, but let us not spend time doing it right now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. What we can do is to mention who was unavailable for the votes, so we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, who was unavailable, and Titi Akinsanmi unavailable. And of course, we are only 14 members of the ALAC at the moment, for the record.

So thank you. This statement is accepted and ratified. So we've now gone through the three statements. We now have some consensus calls to make. Could we please have the consensus call on the screen? I know that, Matt, you're trying to update things as we go. Let's start with the charter. Yes, please. Apologies for the delay. It's just a technical issues at the moment.

So maybe whilst this is going on, just a quick intro and let's speak about this. So, effectively, what has happened is that there were two working groups in place. There was the Registrant Rights Working Group, and there was a WHOIS Issues Working Group. The Registrant Rights Working Group was chaired by Holly Raiche, and the WHOIS Issues Working Group was chaired by Carlton Samuels. Maybe a quick intro from you, Holly, and then a note from you also, Carlton? Let's start with Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Carlton and I had discussed actually merging the two into one. Its original title was the "Regulatory Issues." We decided to call it

“Registration Issues” because the issues include any follow-up from amendments to the RAA.

Some of the main issues involved at the time were the WHOIS, which is tied up with the RAA, obviously; the EWG, which is the Expert Working Group, which is proposing different ways to deal with registration data; and the Compliance Issues. They’re all actually very related as one topic, so we decided in fact to merge the two working groups together because they’re already centered around registration data, both past and present, and perhaps future handlings of those issues.

What we’ve drawn up is sort of a draft description and really a document to charter the working group to cover these sorts of issues.

In fact, one of the things that Carlton and I did this morning was the Privacy Proxy Working Group has just been formed. It’s one of the new issues to come out of the RAA as approved by the Board in June this year.

One of the changes will be a privacy proxy specification that is being developed, so there will be new items coming out of that working group as the sorts of changes to the RAA and the EWG occur but all under that one banner of, say, Registration Issues.

So that’s the rationale behind the merging of the two, and that’s also a quick list of the sorts of issues that will be addressed within that group.
Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. Now we have Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you, Olivier. We have formally agreed that we will have a convergence in the issues, which then makes it logical that we have a single working group to deal with them.

We have prepared a draft charter for the working group, which we are going to circulate and put it in the working group space – space for the working group on the wiki. So we’re going to ask you to – it’s on the board there – we’re going to ask you to look at it and see, not here but certainly on the wiki, see if you agree with the charter, and then we will take it from there.

A couple of things about the – because the issues converge, this working group I suspect is going to be fairly busy. Holly just told you that there’s a new initiative to develop privacy proxy specifications, and it appears I’m on the working group. It’s the GNSO Working Group. Holly is as well.

I would urge those of you who are interested in this WHOIS registration directory services business to join the working group. It is important for us to have as many voices from all sides there because I suspect this is going to be a doozy. I already see in the discussions this morning outlines of the fight that is going to come. So I would need more support on that one.

It’s also going to be a focal point for the output from the Expert Working Group on next generation registration directory services. I sit on that working group, but while I would be party to the output, I think it’s important for the At-Large constituency to look at what we’re saying

because there are some significant impacts on the end user constituency.

So that said, we are hoping that this working group will see renewed vigor. I doubt if it's going to be one that is going to work any differently. We'll post issues on the group. These are issues that require some thought. You have to think it through. It's not just about reaction. You have to really think it through.

I'm going to make a plug for the new WHOIS website: WHOIS.ICANN.org. It's probably one of the best-organized websites I've seen in ICANN's history, and they should be congratulated on it.

It's a lot of information collected there, and for those of you who want to get involved, it has a whole history section. It has a Compliance [pool] there. They have some good plans for development of it. This working group is going to be integral to the conversation about what goes forward in the WHOIS Working Group and that WHOIS website.

So if you're interested in it, I would urge you to go to the WHOIS.ICANN.org website and follow it. There are methods for you to follow changes on the website. I urge you to put in to that so that you see the updates. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Carlton. And I will now read to the record the chartering of the Regulatory Issues Working Group. Yes, Alan? We do need to move forward.

ALAN GREENEBRG: I understand. I'm very terse. It will take less time than you telling me that. I just wanted to support what Carlton said. It's not only the best document; it's the best user-type document. We spend a lot of time complaining about things, especially ICANN's Web presence. If you agree with us, tell someone. Say so. Put a comment in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. So the question on the table is the chartering of the Regulatory Issues Working Group. I beg your pardon? I see Regulatory Issues at the moment. So there needs to be a friendly amendment to Registration Issues?

HOLLY RAICHE: May I please have an amendment? By having "regulatory" that's too large, we're really confining that to the issues of registration data.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, could this be amended, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Anyone against this change of name? I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sorry – clarification. What's the name of the new working group?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Pay attention, Dev. The Registration Issues Working Group. I thank you – no, that’s fine to clarify. Registration Issues Working Group. Could we have the new name, please? We’re not going to do this six times, please. Registration Issues Working Group charter. We cannot have Regulatory Issues Working Group charter and then have a consensus call on that. It needs to be as it should be. Could you amend this, please, Matt?

So in the meantime, while the technical thing loads – here we go. So whereas the declaration on the role of the At-Large constituency in ICANN and declaration of the role of the At-Large WHOIS Working Group, and declaration of the At-Large Registrants Rights Working Group, and declaration of the role of the RAA 2013 place in the DNS space, and the declaration of the At-Large view of the role of ICANN compliance in the stability and security of the DNS, the ALAC has determined that the issues are complementary and constitute a framework that is a de facto a regulatory in objective and for effective stewardship for the interest of end users.

The At-Large constituency is best served if a single working group is constituted and defined that engages our community in furtherance of these connected interests.

In recognition of these connected interests, resolved

1. A charter of the At-Large Regulatory Issues Working Group is defined to include the following objectives:

A. Propose the model for and promote an equitable framework to record all interests and monitor the criteria for a registration data services consistent with the interests of the end user community for enabling a safe, secure, and stable Internet. The group may be augmented time-to-time with the necessary expertise to make specific recommendations for policy development in this area.

B. Define policy objectives, promote the policy perspectives, and monitor the mechanisms by which the rights and responsibilities of domain name registrants are enabled and ensured towards the sustainable security and stability of the Internet and from which the end user interests are protected.

C. Recommend compliance mechanisms and practices that conserve the end user interests in a secure, stable, and safe Internet and monitor their implementation and enforcement.

2. The working group shall define its own schedule and modality of work by its membership from time to time.

3. The working group shall report its activities by its own rules and methods as agreed and consistent with the directives of the ALAC as appropriate.

The floor is open for questions or comments. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I just want to point out that in one point it should be changed from “regulatory” to “registration” issues.

MATT ASHTIANI: I've updated it in the Word doc that I will send back to the chairs after the vote is closed.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, but it needs to be put to the record, so that's correct, yes: At-Large Registration Issues Working Group – correct. Any other comments or questions?

Now I have a comment on this. Nowhere does it say that the working group is open to all. Would this need to be included in there? Because I do have a concern about one sentence under 1A. "The group may be augmented time-to-time with the necessary expertise to make specific recommendations for policy development in this area." This implies that the group is a closed group. Alan or Evan or Carlton? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I read that as saying the group may explicitly go out and seek information. By default, our working groups are open. I don't think it needs to be stated in this charter, in my mind. But it doesn't hurt, I guess.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Mr. Chair, I have no absolutely no difficulty in stating that it's open to all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. It's my understanding that working groups, unless mentioned otherwise, are open. That's implied. If it's to be explicit here, I don't think that's a problem, but I generally thought it was implied throughout. I read that sentence the same way – augmented, that is if there's expertise that needs to be brought in explicitly, that it would authorize the working group to find such expertise. But I hadn't read into that that it would otherwise be closed. Again to me, it's an implied openness. If there's a desire to make it explicit, I don't see that's a problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Chair. I'm endorsing Alan's understanding of it. That is exactly what was intended. And as well as Evan, I don't have a problem making it explicit that it's open, but by character At-Large working groups are in fact open.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. Back to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think Alan's wording, which was "may seek additional" would clarify. Even if we don't add a sentence, using Alan's words would make it

pretty clear that we are doing something additional to. So if we use those words, then perhaps we don't need to add any. But I'm comfortable either way.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Holly. There was a point, actually, with regards to an earlier action item where issues of compliance were to be directed to the Regulatory Working Group, which of course this needs to be amended if this working group gets chartered, that it would be Registration Issues Working Group.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is that an issue for Future Challenges?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so we've read through the document, and what I'm going to conduct is a consensus call on this. I believe that there is consensus, so I will just ask for anyone who is against the adopting of this document and therefore the chartering of the Regulatory, I mean, Registration Issues Working Group. You've spoken to me about Regulatory Issues Working Group for months now, and you change the name on the last day; it's just so unfair – Regulation Issues Working Group. Anyone who is against the chartering – first we have a comment from Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Did we decide to use the words of Alan to avoid this confusion?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think I have to give my permission. Holly suggested it. No one complained. I presumed it will be done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Yeah, that's fine. I did ask whether it was a friendly amendment and whether there was anyone against it.

Okay, so let's start again then. Consensus call, bearing in my mind the people we have in the room is the same list of people as on the previous votes. Is anyone against this working group being chartered? And seeing no one put their hand up, we have consensus, so the work group is chartered. Well done. Which means we now have an At-Large WHOIS Working Group and an At-Large Registrants Rights Working Group.

I think we can speedily go through this as well, and I will ask for a consensus call on the At-Large WHOIS Working Group, bearing in mind of course that all protocols are observed. In other words, that we will have the archiving of all the work, that it will be referred to, and I gather that staff will be proposing a plan forward as to how the information will be archived, etc.

Okay, I also gather that, in the creation of the Registration Issues – I’ve still got Regulatory on my screen – Registration Issues Working Group there will be a new mailing list created as well? So new mailing list created of course is an action item for the regulation issues, and then staff will have to find a way to link the WHOIS Working Group mailing list and link the Registrant Rights Working Group mailing list as well so we don’t lose that information. I’m particularly concerned about the loss of memory in this organization.

So the first is a consensus call on the closing down of the At-Large WHOIS Working Group. Is anyone willing to make a comment or?

CARLTON SAMUELS: All protocols observed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All protocols observed, correct. Thank you, Carlton. Anyone against this? I don’t see anyone putting their hand up, so we have a consensus in the room about the shutting down of the At-Large WHOIS Working Group. Rest in Peace. I didn’t see any applause. I think it deserves some applause because of the work that Carlton has done.

And then we have the next working group, which is the At-Large Registrant Rights Working Group. And I’ll be glad to see this one go because I seem to have a speech problem to say “registrant rights” every single time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And you can’t say 3R.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I can't say R-R-R. Holly, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to be really cheeky, we could always rename the X Group as Registrant Benefits.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: For this working group, same thing as well. Please, we have to move forward. For this, can we also observe all protocols with regards to the archiving, etc., etc., and so on and so forth? At-Large Registrant Rights Working Group – here we go. You see? I stumble every single time – consensus call on closing it down: anybody against?

Okay, I see everyone not wanting to say anything, so that means we have that consensus on this, and therefore the Registration Rights and Responsibilities – that's a hard one – Working Group is therefore shut down and closed and archived, etc., so Rest in Peace as well. Thank you very much, Holly, for having held the flag on this one, and of course, for the previous chairs of this working group who did a significant amount of work at various times during its lifetime.

Okay, so we've done this part of the call. Now what's the next part? I believe we've gone through our consensus calls and we now have the next part, which is the appointments, isn't it? So I'm going to need a

little bit of time for my – oh, Alan Greenberg first. Yes, great – you can fill in.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we should note for the record, since earlier in the week I proposed an addition to the rules of procedure related to the electorate in the Board selection, and that was going to have two effects. Number one, if someone holds both a chair position and an ALAC position that the RALO could name a replacement for the chair so a single person didn't hold two votes. It also allowed, if someone is sick or otherwise indisposed, for a replacement to be identified.

Since we understand that the issue in APRALO is no longer relevant, I think there has been a consensus among a number of people within the leadership of ALAC that sickness issue, although it could kick in and be relevant at the time of the election, is not very likely. That the optics of making a change at this late date are probably not worth fixing that problem, and we'll put it in line for a future change when we change the rules of procedure but not take any action now. I just thought we should have formal note that we didn't forget it; the decision was made not to forward with that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. Next on the mic we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm more than happy with that, but I do think the ALAC should note that this is still a matter to be dealt with in the manner of Alan's proposal. I would suggest posthaste because it would be very easy for the ALAC to, in the amount of work that will be ahead of them, just not make this amendment. So whilst I'm happy for it to come off the table today, I would strongly encourage the ALAC to consider taking this online and resolving before the end of the calendar year if possible. Certainly, it means that you then won't have an issue in the future. Go ahead, Alan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Back to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'll just note that a few other issues have come up that we've said "oops" to, and I've asked that staff catalogue them. I hope that it has been done. So there's a small laundry list of things that need to be fixed. So thank you, Cheryl.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Let's make this an action item, please – to have it as a follow-up action item. Thank you. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan, for this proposal. It is one of the points that was bothering me, and I am so happy that we will not touch the rule of procedure today. Let's do it after the election. And I agree with Cheryl

that we have to put it on the record that we need to review the rule of procedure in this way.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Any follow up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani, please repeat very carefully because I'm specifically saying that it is my strong advice and encouragement for you to deal with this and the other laundry list of things, be it a small one, for modifications to your rules of procedure before the end of this calendar year – certainly not after the election. If you have a disagreement with that, we have a debate.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, I am happy to discuss with you this point, but since we started the process, I don't want to touch the rule of procedure during the process. That's why I prefer to do it after the election. So we can discuss, Cheryl.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well this will be a follow-up item after this meeting. You can discuss it in the corridor, and if either of you lives beyond that, you can discuss a lot later on this issue.

Okay, I'm being asked to open the issue and to discuss this. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would very much like to understand, Tijani, and I think it would be of great benefit to all of those around the table who will be deciding and deliberating on this what the rationale is because I would like to understand.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Cheryl. The main rationale for me is that, since it will be an online vote, we would not meet to vote. So even if you are sick – you are at home – you can vote. So there is not a real need to change the rules. And normally, when we start the process if we change the rule during this period, it will not be well-seen because normally we had rules and we have to use those rules for this election. When we finish this election, we can think about it to change it. But today, since we started the process, for me it's better not to touch the rules.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm not going to comment on whether we should do it now or not, but I'll point out that people can be sick and indisposed such that they cannot vote.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: They can be in the hospital. They can be run over by a car. Things happen.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. Tijani, with respect, I really would like to tackle this now. I understand the procedures have taken a long time to develop. We're here. I think the issue is clear. I'd really like to get it done. I don't think it would take that long. It doesn't look like it's controversial, and it sounds like it's very necessary. So if we're going to touch the rules, we might as well do it while we're all present here in the room face-to-face is my point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So if you are going to change the rules, we will change them in the right way. That means that we will make a real change of the rules. It will not be a motion. It will not be a particular – how to say – a particular case. It will be a change of the rules in the regular way.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely. That can be done. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: We cannot do that today. Formal changing of the rules requires specific notice be given, and a variety of other issues have to be adhered to, so they cannot be changed.

The addition that we were proposing can be done today, should we choose. We could follow that with a formal change later, should we want to, but we've put protections in the rules to stop a change – not an addition, but a change – being made on short notice like this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Can I just ask you what would be the advantage of doing an add-on today versus taking the next three weeks to make a formal change to the rules? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: My personal reason is there are other things that need to be fixed. I don't have them ready. I'm not prepared to send out a notice tomorrow with wording for the others. And although we shouldn't be afraid to change the rules, we don't want to be doing it every two months. We've just started operating on this. This is the first meeting. There are other glitches likely to come up. I just don't see the need to go through that complex process immediately if we have a shortcut around it.

A rule of the ALAC cannot override the rules, but it can augment them, and that addresses the issue we have today. That was the rationale.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. So may I make a consensus call as to finding out whether there is any objection to having the add-on added today? Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Since we will change the rules, I proposed earlier that we restrict the number of supported candidates by the RALOs to one supported candidate so that we will not end up with a very long list of people added to this late, and you know how it will complicate the vote after this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. We've got Evan Leibovitch and then Alan Greenberg.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I think we're mixing up a couple of things. Alan has proposed a very specific thing to address an omission from the existing rules. This is not about changing what is already there. This is not changing the number of people selected by any particular process. This is simply addressing what was an omission in what was there. That's why it's being called, as I understand, Alan, it's an addition. It's not a change to anything.

I think that can be done here. If there's an intention to open up things, like what you're suggesting, Tijani, that goes through process. What I'm suggesting is that this is a separate thing. One is the addition that Alan is proposing; the other one is a collection of other things that may need to be fixed that can be done through the conventional process.

The addition Alan is suggesting is an addition, not a change. It's addressing a deficiency and it can be added without changing anything that's there, and I think that can be done today. What you're suggesting, that is a genuine change, and that needs to go through full process.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Alan Greenberg is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: On the substance on what Tijani is suggesting, I will tell you that I haven't through it through. I suspect, if I did think it through, I would not object to it, so I'm not commenting on the substance.

I am commenting, however, on the fact that such a change, number one, essentially says only one candidate can be added through the whole process – not one per RALO, but one. Since three RALO supports are needed, there's only one candidate that could be added totally.

And as I've said, I might well support that, but the process we went through to develop the selection procedures was very contentious, and the RALOs being able to add candidates was a trade, essentially, in exchange for other things that people were objecting to. It was agreed to as a way of moving forward, and it therefore is a substantive change, and I would think we would need some level of consultation to do that. That's number one.

Number two, although I personally do not think we want 12 candidates running for a whole bunch of optics reasons, I think the BCEC is charged

with coming up with a reasonable number, and hopefully there won't be too many that they delete who are really good candidates.

But nonetheless, the voting scheme says that the first round of voting will reduce the number to three candidates, period, whether it starts off with four or starts off with 493. So I don't really think it changes the complexity, and if we're going to do something as substantive a change, again whether you or I like it or not, I think it's got to involve a more consultative process.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And at that point, others will open the discussion to things much more radical.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We have Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I propose that we move forward with the add-on. We say what it is and just move forward. That's my proposal.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to a consensus call, but we do have voice against from Tijani on this. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest a vote if we're adding onto the rules of procedure so we're documenting exactly who is in and out.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And an objection [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, given what Alan said, I formally move to make that addition.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani Ben Jemaa? No, Tijani, you're first, and then Carlton.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. My motion is to make the addition proposed by Alan to address the deficiency – not to change anything. My motion is to propose an addition to the rule.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will not make you vote. I will stop, but I want to make it very clear what I mean. First of all, for me, if you give this possibility of proxy, you are changing the electorate. For me, it is a main change. So for me, it cannot be changed like this.

Second point, why we don't need a lot of addition to the slate? Because we don't want it to be as someone told me. And – yeah. So it is clear and I made this proposal even before Alan proposed the modification. So I will withdraw my opposition. I will let it go, but I want you to understand what I mean.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Carlton Samuels?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Chair. I want to pick up on what Tijani said. It's just that, if we're going to use proxy, the proxy has to be defined in the rules, and the proxy is already defined in the rules, so we don't have to make any changes to that – not defined in the rules.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. If I may speak, Chair. The proxy is a vehicle for ALAC voting. This is the vote on the final selection of the Board seat, which is not the ALAC. It is defined by a completely different section, and we already have several cases where the RALO can name a replacement if the person is unable to vote for a number of reasons. We omitted the sickness and unavailable reason, and we're just trying to fix that part.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's what I'm saying, Alan. I understand it's within the Board [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible] I was just saying let's not use the word proxy because it's a defined term in the rules for something else.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I accept that. I just want to make sure that we understand what Tijani is asking for. As long as we understand what he's asking for and we agree to it, the it means A) we have to add to what exists today, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. What Tijani is suggesting is a change – a substantive change – to the rules that are there, which does require a change to the rules of procedure. What I had suggested to solve the illness problem, and originally the duplication of votes, is an addition.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's an addition.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I understand that, but I heard Tijani say he's withdrawing his request, okay? So that has nothing to do with the first one. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So I'm a little adamant about pushing through this because, at the moment if Carlton is confused, I see faces looking at me thinking

we're even more confused than Carlton is. And I would suggest that we punt this to two weeks from now and have an explanation as to what the change is and let people mull over it and then we'll have a vote on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. In that case –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is it important to do it now, or can it wait two weeks, Alan? We're running out of time on this call.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't believe there's any difference functionally between now and two weeks. We have better attendance here than we tend to have on conference calls, but you could do it by an electronic vote, as well, should you choose.

I will resend it in really clear language with a real nice title in the subject line so there's no misunderstanding.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Okay, so now we've gone through all the votes and motions and so on. We're going to have the chairs' announcements. This should have happened ahead of time, but thankfully, we're late again. But that's fine. We have some people who have arrived, some people who are leaving us, and so we're going to go through a list. I wish I had the list with me.

MATT ASHTIANI: It's in your e-mail.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: First, we'll start with people who are, I guess, are leaving us since we need to make space at the table for new people coming in. First, we'll start with the At-Large Advisory Committee Leadership Team, and two people are going to leave us this year and leave the ALAC, too. The first person is going to be Rinalia Abdul Rahim. Rinalia, just a few words, please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very short because I know in this community there are people who are very eloquent and they can take quite a bit of time to express themselves. I would just be very terse, and sometimes I can be impolite, but I want to say is that it has been a privilege, an honor, and a pleasure to serve with all of you. I really appreciate your guidance and your support, and most importantly, your friendship. It means a lot to me. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Then we have another person leaving us, and that's going to be Carlton Samuels, who was the vice chair for LACRALO – sorry, vice chair from the LACRALO region. Carlton, a few words?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you, Olivier. I want to thank all of you for fellowship and friendship and for the work that we have done. It has certainly been a privilege and an honor, as Rinalia has said, to be a part of this team. I especially want to thank a couple of people who have been very helpful to me. I want to thank Dev Anand Teelucksingh, who has been a great source of support behind the scenes for me. He's probably one of the best researchers I know, and whenever I need some good information or need anything to clarify or qualify what I have to say, Dev is always available – sometimes at 1:00 in the morning – to answer me, and for that I'm eternally grateful.

To Alan Greenberg, who for the longest while has been very helpful and supportive to me from the time I came into the At-Large. He's been extremely patient, especially with explaining the goings-on in the GNSO and sometimes the shenanigans that will come out of that group. Alan, I am very, very grateful to you, sir, for the help you've given me all the way through.

And of course, there is Evan Leibovitch. Most people will know that, apart from Dev, Evan is probably my closest collaborator in the ALAC, probably because we tend to have the same kind of outlook, maybe expressed in different ways. But Evan, thank you for the friendship, and thank you for the help that you have provided me.

To my friends from the region who've always put up with me, it's been a journey and we're not at the end of the journey yet. I may be off the ALAC, but I certainly would be involved all the way through. Cintra, Sylvia, Jose, Carlos, Sergio, and all of those who are – Antonio Medina –

all of those who have been traveling the journey with me, thank you all very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Carlton. We have a gift –

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm not – one thing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You're not finished? Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I forgot. Chair, I want to say this – the staff – I want to thank the staff. Heidi, Matt, Silvia, Julia and Nathalie – Gisella especially – for the great work they have provided in helping me. Matt especially has been very responsive. Whenever I call Matt or send him a note, Matt is responding within the hour, and I truly appreciate the help from the staff in producing in what I have managed to do in the ALAC.

I want to give you heads-up, Chair, that I will have a longer statement to make this afternoon, but I want to recognize leadership in the ALAC since I got here. The leadership has been spectacular and has allowed the ALAC to grow and let others see the growth. I'm particularly mentioning Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Both of these have been outstanding leaders, and I believe the At-Large has been exceedingly lucky to have them.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Carlton. Well, it's very sad to see both of you go. Both of you have worked very, very closely with me. You've were both on the Ex-Executive Committee, which is now the Leadership Team. I think I speak to both of you more than I speak to my own family. Actually, I don't think; I think it's the truth. I do speak more, And they get jealous about that.

It was a real pleasure to work with both of you, and I'm very sad to see you go. But I hope that you'll remain within the At-Large community and remain with us and continue to help us bring the voice of Internet users forward into the ICANN processes. It's been really, really great working with you.

There's a gift for both of you. We'll be distributing the gift I think in one go due to shortness of time.

We do have another set of ALAC members that will be leaving us. There's Yaovi Atohoun. Unfortunately, he couldn't be with us, but then he's not really leaving. He's just turned over the Dark Side, aka staff. Sorry, Heidi. Well we are in the Spaceship Enterprise, aren't we after all?

There's Titi Akinsanmi, who couldn't make it either, and it's really thanks to Titi that we had that wonderful showcase over in Africa in Durban. That was really, really great.

There's Salanieta Tamanikawaimaro. What's really terrible is that I took quite a while to learn her family name, and now that I can say it without problems whatsoever, she's leaving us. But she's done some great work for us, as well.

And there's Natalia Enciso. Natalia, would you like to say a few words.

NATALIA ENCISO:

I will say it in Spanish. I'd like to thank everyone who has helped me participate in ALAC. It's been a life experience. I'd like to thank my colleagues in the region: Jose, Cintra, Dev, [Rinalia] we think is part of LACRALO. The staff – thank you very much. Especially Matt, who has never let me lose in voting, and I think you'll remain in good hands. The region will be well represented by Fatima and Dev, who do a very good job. Thank you very much, everyone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Natalia. Your words will echo the words of the community towards all of our departing ALAC members. In fact, to replace all of you, we've got a new bunch of people that have come in – some of who have no idea what they've let themselves in. Well, they're now going to be officially ALAC members, so I guess it's time to smell the coffee and find out the reality of things.

We have Hadja Ouattara, who has just stepped out. Okay. We have Beran Dondoh Gillen, who unfortunately could not make it here due to visa issues, but hopefully we will see her in Singapore. We have Rafid Fatani, otherwise known as Raf, who is in the corner. We have Maureen Hilyard, who is our new ccNSO liaison. Hadja has just stepped in; Hadja Ouattara from Africa. We have Fatima Cambroner. She's not here, but we've seen her before. She's been very active already. And of course, we have Leon Sanchez. So welcome to all.

And then we also have, since you've heard the name of Maureen Hilyard, someone who's leaving us. That person knows exactly who she is. It's our ccNSO liaison, perhaps one of the last official roles that Cheryl has held in this committee. As such, I'm saying "in this committee," not in this community because I'm sure you will hold a lot of more roles in this community, but not in this committee.

Cheryl, you have the floor. Please keep it short.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Wow! Astounding, Cheryl. Thank you very much. Then we have regional leaders also leaving us or some moving position. We have Fatimata Seye Sylla, who is the chair, a fantastic chair for AFRALO. I know that several of us have heard what she does in addition to chairing AFRALO. My goodness, Fatimata!

Of course, now since you just couldn't leave completely, you said, "Let's go on to NomCom. Let's try and see how we can stir that cup of coffee and see what more people we can bring to this community." So Fatimata, great move.

We have Tijani Ben Jemaa who has just stepped out of the room – oh, he's back in. He stepped out the room and he comes back in. But Tijani was the vice chair of AFRALO, and he is going to remain on the ALAC. He's going to be – no, he's leaving, isn't he? Exiting vice chair. He was vice chair. But he's going to be the vice chair of the ALAC – that's right.

Then we have Aziz. Sorry, the others are staying where they are. Well, Aziz Hilali is becoming chair of AFRALO. Mohamed El Bashir, who was sitting here – everyone’s disappearing – oh, he’s there – is going to be vice chair, and Philip Johnson is going to be the secretary. So well done.

In APRALO, Holly Raiche is the chair, but we have an acting chair, Siranush Vardanyan. And Siranush was elected vice chair, so I guess it’s acting chair as vice chair.

And the other people are re-elected, so we have Fouad Bajwa at ISOC Hong Kong. It’s interesting always to see a secretary – it’s actually a secretariat position – so it can be an organization.

In EURALO, there is reelection of Wolf Ludwig and the election of Yuliya Morenets as the secretariat.

In LACRALO, we have the reelection of Jose Arce and the reelection of Sylvia Herlein Leite.

And then, okay, we also have exiting leaders in NARALO. Darlene Thompson is now leaving us, as far as the secretariat function is concerned. She’s not able to join us. Okay. But that is Darlene’s last meeting as secretariat.

And, of course, we have an incoming secretariat, and that’s Glenn McKnight. The person with the camera, that’s right. We’ll have everything documented – not only transcribed, but also filmed from now on.

In addition to that, of course, we have some more people, if I can just go to the new Leadership Team – sorry?

JOSE ARCE: Olivier? Here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Jose Arce, please?

JOSE ARCE: Yeah. Sorry for the interruption. Just an initial comment. With Sylvia, we are more of the outgoing positions that because we were not reelected. So maybe I don't know if you said that, but it's just the common because our position is we are going to have that position until 5 March for next year. So we are not reelected.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine. Thank you. But you're still here. But you were reelected the last time that there was election since the last time we went through this change process, so you still are here.

Actually, there's additional people also who were in the room who might have disappeared. That's the ALAC delegates to the NomCom – the Nominating Committee. First I have to thank all of last year's Nominating Committee members who managed to find us such wonderful candidates.

This year's committee members are going to be Fatimata Seye Sylla, as we mentioned earlier, from AFRALO. Satish Babu from APRALO. Is he here? Vanda Scartezini from LACRALO, and Vanda was here. Veronica Cretu from EURALO. And Louis Houle from NARALO. You will have to bring some poutine over to the NomCom, and no doubt that will make some lovely –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You don't like them?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No, it's lovely. And of course this year, Cheryl Langdon-Orr is going to be the NomCom chair.

So that's as far as appointments is concerned. We do have more appointment, and that was going to be I believe a consensus call, and that's to the Leadership Team.

The list is as follows. As vice chairs, there would be Tijani Ben Jemaa and Evan Leibovitch. I believe there is no rapporteur position anymore.

But the two other positions there for the rest of the Leadership Team are going to be, well, I'm going to be there, aren't I? So that's one person is already there as chair, which is fine, and there's going to be Dev Anand Teelucksingh, who is going to be there for the LACRALO region, and Holly Raiche will be part of the leadership team for the APRALO region.

So that's the committee by acclamation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since there are no other candidates, it is by acclamation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It is by acclamation.

ALAN GREENBERG: All we have to do is applaud, not say yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And then we have these liaison positions, which also need to be mentioned. Louise Houle?

LOUIS HOULE: You mentioned poutine. I want to make it clear. If you want to have the recipe, you come and see me. It has nothing to see what some people in Russia.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Alan Greenberg has to respond.

ALAN GREENBERG: The correct recipe probably does come from Louis, but someone just sent me a YouTube video of the Swedish Chef making poutine, which we can all share.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, and leaving the Canadians to the side, I see there's an increasing number of Canadians here, as there should be.

Okay, the liaison positions – I think we need to remind everyone. For the GNSO, Alan will go on for the GNSO as GNSO liaison.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the moment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: For the moment? Okay. Maureen Hilyard for the ccNSO. Julie Hammer for the SSAC – the Stability and – and then Evan is going to continue with the NCSG liaison position?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: For the moment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: For the moment.

And then we do have a contest for the .mobi liaison position. As you know, it was an unfilled position for a while because we weren't quite sure where we stood. There is Darlene, Eduardo, and Murray going for this position. We will probably have – what I suggest actually is that there would be a selection committee to make the best selection. Alan, you know exactly how it's called.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I don't have the rules here, but the rules say liaisons and such – and the ALT for that matter – should be selected by consensus if possible or if practical. Alternately, there can be a formal vote or the ALAC can identify a sub-committee to make a recommendation to the ALAC for a formal vote.

Given that this position is contested, given that we have had statements from some of the candidates but not all, I'm suggesting that we solicit a statement from each of the candidates. And then a small group – and

I'm suggesting the ALT may be as a good a group as any – make a recommendation to the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani? Oh, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What am I doing?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I don't know. It says Cheryl. Okay, false information. Thank you. We're starting well. Cheryl has a microphone already.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have my own personal microphone, Tijani. It's not a problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so there's no IDN liaison. As you know, the last year was the last year we have a IDN liaison. We have a IDN Working Group chair. We might have co-chairs, but that's for the IDN Working Group to decide on, whether they wish to bring this forth to the ALAC. But this year will be the first year without an IDN liaison.

And I believe that's all of the business of the day. NCSG are already arriving, and they're very welcome I guess to join, and we'll be closing this meeting.

I thank you all for the work you've done this year. It's been really tremendous. As you know, I was asked a question: do you want to

remain another year? Do you want to do the further year? And I thought, "Hell, yes!" because the team is just so fantastic.

When I get the praise for all the things that we're doing at the moment, really it's not me. It's all of you. It's all of the people who have not been able to make it here, as well. But it really is as a team, and I feel that we've got a very strong team here. So I thank you all for your support and for the work you're doing. It's really great.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And I don't know where this came from. That must have come from the voice in the sky – the NomCom. Thanks. This meeting is now closed. We got the giving of slices of cake, and there's also gifts for all of the departing members. The gifts are over there, but I'll be just handing them over.

Heidi, over to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Olivier. Welcome the new ALAC and welcome the new ALT. We're looking to have a very exciting year ahead of us.

Just some housekeeping: currently we do have a meeting in here, so if you could maybe eat your cake very quickly over onto the sides because

we have the ALAC and NCSG meeting here. So new members of the ALAC, please keep seated here.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]