And here in the conference room we have Cheryl, she’s been very, very busy these days, but she managed to come and join us early morning Cartagena time. And we have kindly help offered by Heidi and Mattias this morning actually, and we have Edmon and Terry, they are working very hard on the computer, and we had the Vice-Chair, Fouad Bajwa is reading the report, and Hong is now talking to the phone. I hope the other two; the Professor Vivakanandann will be joining us soon. I called him, and he swore he will be here after breakfast. James Seng arrived yesterday, but I don’t know his room number, I hope he could manage to find the place. So this is our original presentation so far in Cartagena.

Of course, anybody else on the line, Heidi, apart from Pavan? We have you, Pavan, online. Let’s go to the agenda page, please. Today is Tuesday, the 7th of December, Cartagena local time 7:43. We have agenda on the screen as well. The first agenda item is roll call, so we finished that part. The second one is we will offer summary minutes for last call. Would you please click through to go to that page, take a quick look? Any objection to this summary made by our great staff? Any comments, revisions, supplements? No? Pavan, are you okay with this?

Pavan Budhrani: Yes.

Hong Xue: Okay, thank you, and all the others are nodding their head, so okay.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, I forgot to put the microphone on. I was just thinking, it is getting close to Christmas, and at these seasonal times, at least in Australia, I do silly things. I know you’ll be surprised at that. I wear earrings with bells; if I was nodding my head you would be able to hear me, but it’s a little pre-season, so I’m nodding silently.

Hong Xue: Okay, we hear the jingling bells, that will be wonderful. Looking at agenda item three, update from Cartagena meeting. We have two issues to update; one is the key policy discussion happened so far, and another is ALAC (inaudible 0:03:01) for the key policy discussions. Oh wow, there’s so many policies, it will be a very long report. I cut a long story short, because we only have 40 minutes, and Cheryl will have to leave for another meeting. For the policy, the most important policy that’s been discussed so far here in Cartagena is the new gTLDs guidebook, and yesterday we were in a very long discussion meeting from morning to afternoon. I was there the whole day. It’s going to kill us; it was very hotly debated about a couple of issues I try to summarize.

One is the famous NTIA documents, stirred up a little discussions about economic analysis, but many people jumped to the public forum microphone and wanted to say what kind of analysis you want to do. What kind of study? We have been doing many, many studies. Anyway, ICANN is going to fulfill its obligation on economic analysis, and this has been built into the policy making process. Another issue that’s hotly debated is vertical integration across ownership. Cheryl, you have comments on this? Yes, this is
a really chilling topic, and hopefully it won’t affect the interest of the user community.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Unfortunately, Hong, I fear that it will affect the interest of the community, and I fear it will affect the user community in our region in particular. Because with the issues of the separation and non-separation, and with the issues of very new and rightfully so opportunistic entrepreneurial new gTLDs happening, a lot of that is going to happen across our region.

I think there is a very important role for our At-Large structures, working with government regulators, decision makers, and communication to consumers to ensure that they understand when they make choices now; there will be a big difference now between registry A and registry B, depending on whether or not they are associated with registrars. A brand new registrar may not be as robust and secure and knowledgeable in its compliance if it’s part of that. So I just see it as an opportunity for the ALSs in our region to perhaps be very useful to ensure that the outreach, the consumer protection issue is done, and we might actually get some more ALSs out of it as well.

Hong Xue: Thank you so much, Cheryl. You just opened up my mind, especially it strikes me, one key legal issues; the cross ownership could have some impact on the anti-trust regulation. Especially this is a legal system very much developed in our region. Australia, of course, is doing very well. China anti monopoly law is very new. Hong Kong is developing anti-trust law, but it’s still
in draft. So if this involves anti-trust, of course it impacts the users. They could charge monopolized price, very high price, yes. Trust agreement to more dominate the market, yes a serious concern. We should bring it up in ALAC, why ALAC people say this is not big issue? Other friends on this? Edmon?

Edmon Chung: I think your characterization is fairly direct and probably should go up in the priority level.

Hong Xue: The guidebook is a more than 300 page document, and is a very large document. I read it through, because I’m a lawyer, it’s part of my legal interest, but if you ask me to give a summary I suggest you to go to ICANN’s website and click the link. There is a one page summary to summarize all the key issues, like economic analysis, new contention procedures such as for IGOs. Unless we have more time, I suggest we move on. Edmon, please.

Edmon Chung: How we put it into action is perhaps something we want to talk about. I know we can come back to that later. Having identified an item that should come up in priority, we should start to work on action items.

Hong Xue: Thank you very much, yes indeed. The agenda item three is just for briefing, for actions we go to agenda item four; that’s regional policy priority, yes of course. This is not empty talks; we do want to put it into actions. For ALAC members, as far as I can remember, we’ve been doing two important things. One is ATRA comments; we have ambassador Cheryl on that panel. You take
your team, we made a comment and it has been drafted overnight. Cheryl gave us a few hours; she does not let us sleep. The comments have been analyzed and submitted yesterday afternoon. Another matter is ALAC – At-Large Improvement work team A to D. We have Fouad to represent us on all these teams. Any comments from you?

Fouad Bajwa: Regarding Work Team B, we shared a brief summary in the regional leadership workshop on the preparation day of the Cartagena meetings. Our concern on that is currently we’ve been looking at the latest membership by-laws for the At-Large RALOs, and along with that we were looking at things which had already been discussed and how we could look forward to implementing them. For example, providing all the ALSs a web presence to the community Wiki, so that we can have a systematic process in place to receive information about all the ALSs; what’s happening over there, and for them the activity participate within the community Wikis.

So it’s like a double edged sword, I think; one, they will be able to get on speed with the Wiki, the community Wiki, and second they will be able to share their information on a regular basis. Third, it also answers a question from the ALS survey, that many ALSs did not have a formal website. So it actually covers many aspects on that. We’ve also been looking at, in Work Team B, we’ve been looking at what things need to be done on a regular basis in a systematic process, for example review of technologies for collaboration, Web 2.0 making it much more effective.
Suggestions like using Posterous to automatically update social networks by ALSs and by ALAC members as well.

Then we also looked at the opportunities to represent to our outreach material such as our brochures, from all of the regional At-Large organizations. We’re producing fairly well on that, and we’re more or less moving into a stage we will be soon finalizing our recommendations. Apart from that, the ALS working group is active again, and there was a series of meetings to consolidate results and bring out some recommendations based on that, so that directly inputs into the Work Team B work, and Dev Teelucksingh is actually managing that aspect.

On the Work Team C, they also gave their summary. I’ve not been actually able to attend the past few meetings, but still I’m keeping an update on it. There was a SWOT analysis, please correct me Cheryl, if I’m wrong. There was a SWOT analysis which covers the strengths and weaknesses of the current – I think those recommendations were limited to finance.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not at all. There are four separate areas, so there are actually four SWOTs, and I think we’ll find that’s a very robust mechanism. One that I think we might also, when we’re finished, look at bringing into the regions as well; how we have managed to recharge and perhaps revision some of our thoughts from pre-Mexico to now, doing that SWOT analysis – analysis? Whatever the word is – is a very good thing, and perhaps something as a region we might consider doing regionally, and sub-regionally. It
does seem to be a very worthwhile tool. Not an easy thing, but it’s something that we might explore.

Fouad Bajwa: Well, we definitely have been undergoing that process from AFRALO, so we know that is promising very well. There’s going to be presentations in the next day or two from all the Work Teams and their progress, to ALAC. An important role that APRALO members have played along with the ALAC leadership was our participation in the Board candidate evaluation committee, with Cheryl’s leadership, and I believe we’ve done a – I don’t want to make self claims, but I believe we built a process and we did a very good job.

We can see that from the way we managed the participation process, and how we helped our Chair reach a decision on the first round of votes for the ALAC Board candidate position number 15. Of course, we as a RALO congratulate Sebastien Bachollet on his election, transfer and election onto the Board seat. So these are some of the activities surrounding ALAC from APRALO member’s participation, and of course we’ve had a series of elections, I think you’ll shed more light on that. Thank you.

Hong Xue: Thank you very much for the At-Large improvement. Many interesting happenings.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just one moment – on the Work Teams, it would be remiss of me if I didn’t insert into our formal minutes to ask that we have an action item later, that all of the Work Teams are looking for more
involvement, more people, so there’s an opportunity for our At-Large structures to get involved and it’s exciting times now, so I think it’s a good time to try and bring people in who are not sure “What do I need to do?”, well, this is a great way of getting them comfortable, getting them working as a team, getting them owning.

And Asia needs to own, let’s face it. It’s important that we feel we have a right to be a major part of the process, we shouldn’t be leaving it to others. But if we don’t go out and invite people to do it, then they will wait for the invitation. I think now is a time to make some of those invitations.

Hong Xue: Thank you very much, Cheryl. That is very important. We will make sure that part is put into the minutes. Pavan, are you online? Will you please draft an email and circulate through our regional list? Encourage our ALSs to participate voluntarily; any of the Work Teams is really encouraged to do so. As Cheryl says, we want to own something; we also want to share.

Fouad Bajwa: I would like to suggest that since (inaudible 0:16:38), the project manager, has been compiling summaries of all of the Work Teams, it would be useful actually to share with ALAC to read that document, a summary of one or two pages, that we can circulate throughout the ALSs and that would be a very good encouraging thing. It’s one of those things that ICANN is delayed in doing, but ALAC is successful in doing; summarizing all the activities on a regular basis. That can be a very good encouragement point for people to go there.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Might I then suggest that Pavan then makes that action item that we, the ALAC, is to supply to we, the region, what we need to put out with more than just a call, but a call and some briefing materials and some things to make people understand clearly what they are going in to.

Hong Xue: Right, thank you very much. Pavan, when you send out the email, please include those links to the Work Teams documents. They’ve been doing a lot of work, so this background information report is full of information. For all of you present, and for you Pavan, online, Professor Vivekanandan joined us. Say hello.

V. C. Vivekanandan: Yes, hello Pavan.

Hong Xue: Oh, he’s muted. I know you’re muted, but I understand he is online. Okay, let’s go to agenda item four. There’s a very long item that’s written on policy priorities. Actually, Mattias and Pavan sent me the draft; the list was much longer than this. I cut it short and made it into three categories, for your easy reference.

First of all, I want to thank the Vice-Chair Charles Mok, who is unfortunately not here, but he sent in his apologies. He’s drafted a regional policy work plan, and we have seen the plan. It’s a very good one, working group based, and he basically involved everyone available in the plan. Secondly, considering our limited resources, we need to prioritize our policy work.
It is not possible to cover everything, so it is prioritized following areas. One is IDN; this is very strong, important, critical for our region. It is number one, has always been number one in our region. Our region is particularly strong that we have IDN liaison on ALAC, where is Mr. James Seng? He’s not here, but we believe his spirit is with us. We have Edmon, who is a top technical expert on IDN. He recently drafted an IDN table for Hong Kong Chinese characters, it is very useful. It’s going to be in the repository of ICANN. For IDN, now we are particularly looking at two things. One is the fast track reveal.

I was at the workshop; I submitted my report; please go online and see my report, very interesting, very critical. I guess our IDN lady won’t be very happy with the report, but I tell the truth. Fatima said we can send in the comments, even after December 16, so she is very flexible. We have an IDN working group, Charles is to compare that; I’m sure Edmon is the expert, but you are the expert advisor to the working group.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, I will definitely help.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just perhaps a placeholder, before you move on from IDNs. I would very much like to interchange with us, as a region, on some issues; particularly on the cc/full PDP processes.

Hong Xue: Yes, that’s very important. The fast track is going to develop into a PDP. It is developing into a PDP, and the joint cross constituency working group has been formed by Cheryl; two of us are
representing us. So APRALO would like to connect with that interface. The PDP will be more comprehensive and hopefully resolve those problems, re-evaluation screening, and the unfortunate controversial things that happened in the fast track. Okay, that’s fast track.

Another thing is IDN whois. This is really important, look at the current registration information page for IDN domain is very confusing. We can only see en - -; we can’t really see the screen; that’s useless as an IDN user. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think it’s important here that perhaps APRALO might ask for a briefing, because the technical team at ICANN are working on this, but of course, like many things, it’s hidden under a basket somewhere behind a wall with a ‘beware of the bear because we’re not ready yet’ sign on it. I think it’s important that we understand how far, from a technical point of view, we’ve gone on that. I was pleasantly surprised, when I was talking in a corridor, and I think the rest of the region and the ALSs should be brought up to speed. So if we can organize a briefing, that would be very good.

Hong Xue: Thanks Cheryl. Yes Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Speaking of that, actually I happen to be wearing a different hat; I happen to be the GNSO co-chair on the working group for what is called the International Registration Data, which is essentially the IDN whois. That’s not a very accurate way to describe it, but it’s actually not only about the IDN, but also about contact
information, like contact names, for those to be internationalized as well.

I do think it’s probably a good idea to get a briefing, because we are probably one of the regions that are most affected by it. In order to save myself from being somewhat schizophrenic, I think it’s probably better to ask staff to give the briefing, and we can further discuss it, and see how we can interact with the group on an ongoing basis, actually.

Heidi Ullrich: Just to follow up on that, we’ll make that an action item for an At-Large community briefing call, is that okay?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: At an Asian friendly time, the rest be buggered.

Heidi Ullrich: That’s very important, thank you. Would you like that to be in December? What’s the timeframe for that?

Hong Xue: December is okay, for our region, even though Cheryl will be celebrating Christmas.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I am a god, I don’t need to reverence one; it’s all right. (laughter)

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, well we’ll try to plan one; we have another action item for another community call, so we’ll plan one at an Asian friendly time, in probably mid to late December.
Hong Xue: Alright, thank you very much, Heidi. I’m sure it’s really important–

Heidi Ullrich: But just a note that we will have to respect the hard working staff’s well deserved holiday time.

Hong Xue: Right, sorry. Just try to avoid your holiday time.

Heidi Ullrich: We will avoid that. I guarantee that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (crosstalk) -- on their vacation, it’s their problem.

Hong Xue: We have to be considerate; they are human beings with families, right? (laughing) I know Cheryl got up at midnight, 1 am, 2 am, 3 am; she’s fine all the time, around the clock, it’s incredible. You call yourself, many times; it’s incredible, how could this happen?

Heidi Ullrich: Cheryl’s not human. We’re mere mortals here.

Hong Xue: For the rest of us, we prefer Asian friendly time. For me it’s difficult to do that. Okay, so yes, Edmon can keep us informed of any update in that working group, and Heidi will organize a community call. Thank you very much. According to my experiences with UDRP, it is an internationalized information registration has become a big problem in a lot of aspects. Okay, that’s about IDN.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My placeholder, before you move from IDNs? I am most concerned about the representation we have from our region in the very important work. Edmon is obviously there in the tech side of it, we’ve now got him back where he belongs. We need to repurpose, I think, our face into a lot of these active groups. It concerns me greatly, for example, that I have been the only representative from our region that has attended any of the full PDP process meetings.

They are happening weekly. I’m not saying that it is not work, but it is a concern that in a full blown ccTLD/IDN process, someone who doesn’t even speak English is there, but it’s not that it’s a known language that is involved in IDNs. It’s Australian, right? I desperately want another APRALO voice representing IDNs, at least in the working groups, if not as a liaison, because we are failing to perform, and I find that embarrassing.

I find it embarrassing for our region, and I find it embarrassing for the huge amount of work we’ve done under previous liaison guidance, and we’re falling behind. I’m sorry to report that, but we have the opportunity to fix it, and fix it this week.

Hong Xue: Thank you so much, Cheryl, for the information. We are embarrassed, and we are so grateful that Cheryl has been following this IDN discussion from the very beginning. Even for the fast track working group one, we were debating, she was kindly there. But as far as we know, we have and IDN liaison, he should be there.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He is a member; he has never attended a single meeting. Let me be clear for the record.

Hong Xue: Oh, that’s really sad, but he is appointed by NomCom, we cannot supervise him.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Our liaisons, appointed by ALAC, are renewed this week. Let’s not make an error.

Hong Xue: Absolutely, absolutely; in order to not embarrass our region any more, I can – I myself can join that, as a secretary of you, to help you to discuss about IDN issues. Unless anybody else – Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, I’m happy to. I’m more than happy to help, and I will be wearing a different hat right after this week, and to represent the APRALO and the ALAC. I’m happy to do that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Edmon, would you be happy to take a nomination of IDN liaison for the ALAC? If I was to make such a nomination? It’s not an onerous task; it involves being an interface with these working groups.

Edmon Chung: Okay, I think a couple of things; I’m more than happy to play the role. Currently I think, we mentioned about James, I think – and also because I think the decision is going to be made within this week, I’m not sure whether – but if you feel that it is appropriate, I’m more than happy to contribute in that way.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There is another advantage, from my perspective, is we do need someone who can also come with the trust and understanding from the fast track processes as well; is the dynamic that happens in these work groups, and you have that, and Hong has that. Perhaps it is the absence of that which has made James feel a little less motivated, I don’t know. I know he’s busy, but that still doesn’t make it less embarrassing for us.

Hong Xue: Thank you very much Cheryl and Edmon; hopefully these things can be sorted out very quickly.

Edmon Chung: And just to add to that, I guess the hesitation earlier on, I just feel that I don’t want to step over people’s shoes as we move on, especially during this transition period. Also with all the conflict of interest that I did already mention –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alternatively, of course, if our Chair was willing to serve that is another alternative. I would just like APRALO to discuss the alternatives, in a frank, fearless, and probably off mic manner, and for someone to join me in the wonderful world of IDNs. Whilst I can carry the flag, I actually can’t talk the language.

Hong Xue: Cheryl is holding a lot of flags, and she managed holding the IDN flag.

Fouad Bajwa: From Pakistan we have a great deal of work from the South Asian countries; from Dr. Sarmad Hussain, he wrote a book From
Protocol to Production: Implementing IDNs in 2009, with the help of IDRC, Centre for Research, in Urdu language processing. I’ve been trying to get up to speed with the IDNs issues, and somehow try to bridge and work with Sarmad to get that knowledge, but at the bottom level. Dr. Sarmad has been sectored into the security and stability committee.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And unfortunately, some of these committees are very onerous; so let me make it very clear for the record. I cannot who, I care that, we have an effective, vibrant, engaged, capable IDN liaison for the ALAC. They then partner me in things I will be continuing. I am happy to continue and give the consistency, so they don’t have to be there 100% of the time, but to be there 0% of the time is unsatisfactory. I put it to APRALO now to tell me who they want me to nominate for the role. I now have to go, so sorry.

Hong Xue: Well, thank you very much for all the comments. Our fair lady is leaving, unfortunately, for another meeting. Let’s welcome our colleagues from EURALO, and the new chair of ALAC (laughing).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Watch it!

Hong Xue: Sorry, sorry, not until Friday.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can we just delete that from the record? That’s not the case.

Hong Xue: (laughing) Oh, so sorry.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We have a nominating committee serving man here, he may have a job later but we don’t know what it might be.

Male: And that’s twice as bad, because you’re on the NomCom with me, Hong.

Hong Xue: Okay, is improper disclosure, thank you so much for this IDN issue because it is so important for our region. Hi, hello, Eric. Welcome. For the IDN is so important, personally of course, I’m so willing to listen to all of you, and I’m only following your guidance. My role is to serve the community, rather than making a decision. My personal preference is to have one interface with ALAC, with the working group, with the community. I don’t know if Edmon would like to do that, but of course if Adam is very busy or have other concerns, we should enforce them.

Edmon Chung: I think it’s probably best to take it offline with Cheryl and we can convene and discuss, and then a person out and circulate around, that might be the best way.

Hong Xue: Thank you. Thank you very much, the issue here is that we don’t have a nomination place, that is only ALAC, only Cheryl has nomination power. You will be a member, you can nominate yourself. Professor Vivek, you look mysterious. Are you playing 007 again? (laughing) Oh, a microphone, this gentlemen who is going to be on the NomCom says he won’t say anything, to follow
the mysterious tradition of NomCom. But of course, I fully agree with the proposal made by Edmon.

Let’s put it offline, make it an action item for the discussion that we may not have a poll or vote from this, it is up to ALAC to decide, but suggestion made by Fouad Bajwa is interesting. You can also put it in the list and let other people know. Urdu is a very large IDN community, Arabic, CJK, and we really like to have more involvement from different IDNs in the community.

Okay, action item on the IDN for new gTLDs. For new gTLDs, this is so important, and probably we need another working group. Charles is not here, but I am going to talk with him very soon about a formation of this working group. The new gTLDs is a very large issue; it is as complicated, if not more complicated, than IDN.

It involves different aspects, different policy elements, so we may need a lot of people. I see young man, Terry, is smiling at me. Are you interested? We need young people to come to the – you’re the future of the internet. So probably we will have another working group on new gTLDs, I just must talk with Charles first, because he is working on policy issues.

As now new gTLDs, there are a few deadlines--always time sensitive. For these we will make quick review; one is our application guidebook. I assume there will be some new development after this meeting; such as ICANN will decide
whether to do the economic analysis, what is timeline? What is timeline for the new gTLD launch? We’re watching that. The other two things, one is the Rec six; the morality and the public order has been replaced, but there’s still an issue on this. We are wishing that large community has been commenting on that. Another is support for the new gTLD applicants. So for these three things we should keep close eyes on. Oh yes, Edmon, please.

Edmon Chung: I just—in the interest of time, Charles and I connected on some of the things because he can’t come, and we talked a little bit about the process of the policy and how we comment and provide input into, and we prepared a little bit of thoughts. I don’t know whether we would have time to maybe bring it up.

Hong Xue: That would be great. You can have three minutes to talk about that.

Edmon Chung: Sure, if I can project a little bit, it might be easier, but I don’t know how to do that. Is that possible? I’ve prepared a few notes, that would be easier for people to understand if I can project it. Just for here? Is Pavan the only person who is online?

Hong Xue: Pavan is the only one online.

Edmon Chung: So Pavan has it already, so if it’s possible – but before that, perhaps you can continue.

Hong Xue: Alright, sure. At the same time, for new gTLDs Edmon is going to present the notes for reference. The third priority is not really a
priority; it’s a cluster of things. It’s about HERA comments, of course every RALO is a member of the community has been involved in the drafting and the comments, and on the by-law amendments, and about NomCom non-voting chairs, and especially ccNSO review. These are a few new things, new public comment issues which have been announced.

We can’t have so many working groups, we have to make selections for which one we want to join, ALAC group, which one we want to make independent comments on behalf of your RALO, and which one could be handled by individual At-Large structure. So this is three levels, we can be flexible on methodologies. I bring this up for your consideration. These are on the ICANN review.

The last thing, last but not least, is geographical regions review. This one is very relevant to our region, because a specific island country has raised a concern that they feel not very engaged by this very large region. It is from Norway, to Pakistan; from Mongolia to Indonesia, it is very, very large. But there could be sub-regions; a recategorization of the regions. For this geographical region review, Cheryl is our representative on that panel. So we also count on Cheryl. So that is a quick review of these items. Edmon is ready, so go ahead.

Edmon Chung: So Charles and I were talking about the process, and right now a lot of these comment periods, they have certain time frames; how can APRALO better respond to those? So we were looking at it, and we felt there was really two – in terms of APRALO making
comments and a statement, there were two different types. One is APRALO ourselves, making comment or a statement, and the second is APRALO creating an input that is given to ALAC, and then ALAC making a comment. So when we think about prioritizing each different issue, we might want to think about how to distinguish between the two. And then in terms of deciding on the importance and priority, there are a couple of things we came up, two aspects.

One is the urgency of it; sometimes those like the Rec six working group, you only have 14 days or something to respond to something. Also the impact; is it a big impact? How big is the impact for the Asia/Pacific region? What that implies, the implications of which in terms of how we actually make decisions and put forward those statements, I think there are two different types.

One, if we create a statement, whether we would then require a sort of affirmative action, like do we need to have a vote or some sort of polling before we send out the statement? And the other is whether we can just circulate for a period of time, and if there’s no objection then we can move forward. In terms of process again, how do we assign the priority and the process? So in terms of process, whether it just requires circulation and non-objection, or whether it requires affirmative action, such as a polling or a vote.

So that’s sort of the framework, and then we were thinking a little bit more in terms of the actual getting it done within time frames
that are possible. So looking at things that if the public comment period closes within a certain time, then we probably should act faster. If we have more time, then we can do more deliberation; but in general I think there were three sort of stages before we can submit our response.

One is identification of key issues, probably just bullet points on what are the main issues we are concerned about, and how we would like to respond, and then a more fully drafted actual comment statement, and the third one, actually once that’s finalized, is that being circulated either for a non-objection, in the case of a more urgent situation, or whether we circulate and do a voting or a polling for things that we have a little bit more time on. So that’s sort of the thinking right now; I just want to throw it out and see what people think.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you, Edmon. I think this is fantastic, and I really appreciate your initiative on this. I just want to highlight that it might be useful for you to coordinate with Work Team, the At-Large Improvements Work Team C, the co-chairs of that particularly Dev Anand from LACRALO, and Rudi Vansnick from EURALO.

They are actually preparing, as one of the tasks for their Work Team for the At-Large Improvements, they’ve actually cross developed a new PAD process for this, so I think it would be useful for you to coordinate and maybe insert some of these ideas in that. Secondly, the issue of the 30 days; we basically now have the ability, the ALAC has the ability to request rather easily, an
extension to 45 days, so that’s something you might want to consider as well. But thank you, again for this really interesting initiative.

Edmon Chung: That’s very useful, because when Charles and I talked about this, it was very focused on APRALO, we didn’t take it further to the ALAC, but I think it’s useful to get to get it and understand. Also on the other point, while ALAC can request for a longer period, APRALO might not be and also other items that sort of working groups – we need to create statements for the working group, which before the public comment period, there are issues that might not be for public comment that you need to provide input into.

Heidi Ullrich: Chair, I’m just wondering, should we make that an action item? Particularly for staff to initiate the coordination between Edmon and the Work Team C co-Chairs on this?

Hong Xue: Thank you very much, Heidi. Yes, we can make an action item.

Edmon Chung: It should be Charles; I’m happy to help, but I’m talking on behalf of Charles at this point.

Hong Xue: Okay, so on behalf of Charles. This is so good, this brainstorming, very thoughtful. If it could be linked up with Work Team C, it would be even better. This is a contribution from APRALO to the whole At-Large community, so you will be doing two things. You
used one stone to kill two birds, that’s great. Fouad, you have comments? Yeah, sure.

Fouad Bajwa: This is actually – let me just bring it up – as part of the inreach and outreach suggestions that I was giving for APRALO, first for IDN inreach was that staff, upon approval from APRALO leadership, should communicate with all ALSs through a monthly or quarterly email newsletter that shares updates of APRALO activities, of different ALS activities, new members included in APRALO, and the open issues that ALSs can participate and contribute in.

So the last part in this suggestion is open issues that ALSs can participate and contribute to. This would be actually a useful – if we just start the email from this aspect, suggesting the format of the dates, the time periods you gave on policy issues, the early document which we- That could be really useful in getting more policy participation from the ALSs, because then it would be ongoing information, on a monthly basis, to all the ALSs of the issues that are open, because obviously we use all the heads we can.

Edmon Chung: Absolutely. I don’t know why I can’t get rid of this window, this is supposed to give you a sense of the things Hong actually mentioned earlier on, the different public comment period and the days left in terms of the public comments. So I just – we made a list that ranges from something closing tomorrow, end of the week, to about 54 days.
Fouad Bajwa: Heidi, can we use this list as a starter? Like having this on a monthly email basis to the ALSs? It would be useful to open issues where ALSs can participate?

Edmon Chung: We can certainly do that. Perhaps we should wait until the coordination between Work Team C and this presentation is brought to a conclusion, just in case there is something we can scale and take to the other RALOs as well.

Fouad Bajwa: Okay, right. I was just suggesting that we have confidence in this already there, I’m just suggesting to start. By the time that we do get the final recommendations from the Work Teams, there would already be a process in APRALO.

Hong Xue: Can I go on? We are actually behind the schedule, now is one hour already, and we still have two agenda items. Okay, we have a very privileged guest here. Go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you Hong. Olivier Crepin-Leblond. I just wanted to suggest one thing with regards to this table, just triple things. First to order it in the most shortest remaining time possible first, so that you start with the things that are just one day to comment in; of course a status column as well so that you can track it and so on. Also keeping things which have been dealt with already being ticked as done, so that it gets this sense of achievement, “Okay, we’ve already done quite a few of these things”. Thanks.
Hong Xue: Thank you, as I said, this is brainstorming. I guess we have a lot of improvement with this, I personally prefer to make it a program into the confluence Wiki, so we can track the development every step. It will be interesting. Actually for the two layer, I have one supplement. Apart from APRALOs independent comments, and APRALOs input to ALAC, it could be the encouragement of At-Large structures to make individual comments, so there’s another method to engage At-Large structures.

There will be other supplements or revisions, improvements to this note, but it’s a very good start. Thank you very much, Charles and Edmon, for doing this. For the improvement procedurally, as Fouad said, we can have a briefing with staff before identifying the issues. As a response to Mattias’ comments, of course we would really like to integrate this wonderful initiative with Work Team C; on the other hand, at every monthly call agenda, we actually have a link about all the recent announcements and public comment period as so far is practiced. We can view it on that.

Okay, so much for this agenda item, we are running late, and the other people we will be walking in, and we still have two agenda items. Item five, this is past trimester; we have a shot of what we have been doing for the past six months since Brussels. Pavan has kindly submitted a report for us, and it is being circulated. You can see the hard copy as well as the email soft copy. The most important things I highlighted here; there are four issues. The first one, we finished the election of leadership positions.
This is really important, for the first time APRALO has all the leadership positions properly elected, we’re very happy. Congratulations to Charles, Edmon, to Vivek, to their wonderful work. To myself? Oh no, no, I’m stepping down; I’m not the issue here. So the region put the trust in you, and we’re sure you will not let us down. We are counting on you, you are our faces to the world. Oh yes, Vivek, please.

V. C. Vivekanandan: We will work hard to meet your expectations, and we look forward to your leadership longer.

Hong Xue: Oh, thank you, that’s Professor’s humor. (laughter) Okay, that’s the first and most important things we completed in the last six months. The second thing is regional outreach and inreach plan, thanks to our Vice-Chair Fouad, he drafted a plan and circulated, it’s widely supported by the whole region, and it’s very thoughtful. Just as he mentioned the email communications within our structure; he has wonderful ideas on further ways of this, so we are relying on him.

Thirdly is regional policy work plan drafted by Mr. Charles Mok; the work plan of course is very thoughtful and is improvement significant we can see from Edmon’s briefing just now. So it’s not only working group structure, now we have the flow chart. Last but not least, the most important thing we have been doing is At-Large director; interesting exercise at a regional level, the regional petition and then we have a poll to decide who the Chair would vote for among the final slate. It was a very interesting exercise;
there were a lot of lessons to learn from this exercise. Of course, I try to make it very transparent to all the At-Large structures, I communicated closely with all the leaders in the region, but of course this is the very first time and we’re all learners.

There could be some shortcomings and thankfulness; I apologize for any procedural, substantive – and thankfulness. If anyone has a comment on this, I’m very happy to listen. Oh yes, Fouad, please.

Fouad Bajwa: First of all, thank you for recommending me to the BCEC, Hong. I will replace you on the BCEC, and it was a very interesting process for myself. Through all that we went through, I would say that the process isn’t perfect, but we developed a very interesting process in order to tally all the nitty gritty of the selection process and the SOIs and the Work Team scoring and everything. I’d like to say that I believe that APRALO managed post BCEC slate, the APRALO managed a really good process here.

We responded in a very good manner with regards to the petition process, and we also responded very good as part of assisting you during the electoral rounds, and I think we worked very, very well with regards to ALAC’s Board position 15. So I would like to congratulate everyone for participating and extending their hand and helping Hong to reach a very good decision. Thank you so much.

Hong Xue: Thank you, Fouad, for those very kind remarks. Well, this is a very interesting experience, I guess it’s the experience of a
lifetime. For the petition, it is an extraordinary process; I am very much inexperienced with this, so I tried to make it very transparent and very fair to all the parties, so I put actually all 19 people past the due diligence that has not been selected by the BCEC for the regional polling.

Fouad commented that this is a silly approach, but of course I agree it is silliness, but I don’t know how to select, because second round selection to decide which one we should petition is the very dilemma. I’m looking for a more smart approach. Maybe we can learn from the other regions. We will have a cross regional meeting, I really came to listen for the other – to Tijani, he’s my mentor actually.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, in AFRALO we did it differently, actually. We organized our monthly teleconference, and during this teleconference we decided on several things. First of all, all the participants was against any petition, so the problem of petition was solved there. Second point, the teleconference decided that the vote of the officials, of the original leadership would be directed by the ALSs, and we decided to collect the opinion of the ALSs through the restricted list of the ALSs, and we asked them a question very clear, because what happened in EURALO did not happen for us, because we already thought about it.

I asked them to give us the first choice, that would be the choice for the first round. Then if our candidate, if the candidate that you select failed, or isn’t moving from the first round, then we will be
obliged to choose between the two remaining ones. So give me your first choice for the first round, and give me your second choice for the second round, and everything was clear, there was no problem.

Hong Xue:

Thank you very much, Tijani. That is very inspiring to us, and to all the regions, thank you so much. That’s for agenda item five. The things we’ve been doing busily in the past six months. And for item six, what we will be doing next. Here, I highlighted three things. One is very important, I raised this at an ALAC meeting already, the planning for the AGM 2011.

I assume I want to hand it over to Fouad to handle this, because his term will start and my term will finish in March, so for this very important issues, I guess we should rely on him. On the budgetary planning, the AGM planning, it’s very important, and maybe election that could be held parallel to our AGM, we could have online voting plus in person communication would be very helpful, and have an APRALO showcase for sure at ICANN meetings, so this is very, very important. I guess Charles and I will be more than happy to help you. It’s been decided, but it’s not been announced. We better not to speculate that, it has not been announced, but it will be in Asia. Remember the showcase we will do.

And secondly, our internal organizational development, such as for the inreach and outreach, and you are also responsible for that, and I hope you can work closely with Pavan on the survey, and build
on the survey results. Work Team 3 to improve our inreach internal integration and outreach to the other regions and to ALAC. These are the priority as are listed here. The last but not least is the policies. We have a policy plan with very good initiatives, and thanks again to Charles and Edmon, we want to build on that for sure. That’s agenda item six. Any comments on this?

Fouad Bajwa: We’ll start a rolling process in all the monthly meetings to include the AGM planning, so we’ll be working on each suggestion. I don’t call them recommendations yet, unless and until we discuss them in full quorum, so that member ALSs are aware that we may be supporting some improvements with regards to membership processes and by-laws. So these two, I’ll keep these two items only on a regular basis.

Hong Xue: Thank you very much. Very last issue on agenda item six is the review of operational principles and the by-laws of APRALO. I was the drafter of the by-laws in 2005/2006, primarily because I’m a lawyer, to use my legal skills to draft these provisions with the help of my colleague, another lawyer, Stanford Guest from Pacific Island.

That was just an experiment of course, five years ago, everything is happening in the internet, so probably you will think about better we need to rebuild to the provisions. For example, on the shuttle bus Floyd mentioned a new idea, that we need to include individual members in APRALO. So far they can be observers, but they are not real members. A good point to think about. Okay,
we don’t have time, very sorry we are running late. The very last item is any other business. Any other business colleagues? Okay, we don’t have any. Heidi, Mattias, any other issues? No? Pavan, if you are still online, thank you very much.

Pavan Budhrani: No problem.

Hong Xue: I assume you took notes about action items, it seems we will have a very busy schedule before Christmas, and even over Christmas. Thank you very much, meeting adjourned.

[End of Transcript]