Unknown female: I would like to have your ideas about that.

Unknown male: To me it's pretty clear what At-Large has been saying from day one. The consumer constituency that Beau has been trying to put together as a model that we like. This idea of putting together this new consumer thing that hasn't (inaudible 00:00:30) is simply a political attack to try and shut down what Beau and the Australian group is starting. This is pure politics. No, is there another not thinking that?

Unknown female: No. It's just out of the blue. In my opinion should be debated longly before that, not just present a couple of people that is trying to running something new and not debated. Who is our representative in the Non-Commercial? Who is our liaison?

Unknown female: Wolfe.

Unknown female: Wolfe? Who is the liaison?

Unknown male: (Inaudible 00:01:27) What's the difference?

Unknown female: Where is Cheryl? I need to go. Yeah but they start at 11:15.

Unknown male: Yeah, you have five minutes.

Unknown female: Yeah that's the problem Alan. Could you start it? Could you start?

Unknown male: We're just waiting for Cheryl.

Unknown female: Well, the idea anyway, let's just start. The idea is to talk about one of the items that we're going to have in the five minutes is introduction of the consumer interest group which has been formed in accordance with the NCSG proposed recommendations.

Unknown male: Well that's what's happening in the Board NCSG.

Unknown female: I don't know what's going on there because I haven't heard feedback from that. So that's…

Unknown male: But let us start the discussion that we're supposed to be having before Cheryl (inaudible 00:04:32).

Unknown female: Yah, yah.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. The issue on the table is the selection of the people who we will endorse for the Affirmation of Confirmations Review Team on Accountability and Transparency. We have eight candidates so far. They are all posted. I'll put the link to it, if you don't know where it is on the Adobe Chat Room.

Unknown female: Yeah, you sent.

Alan Greenberg: The selection must be made by I believe the 17th? Or 15th of March? Essentially a few days after the end of this meeting. Since many people are going to be either traveling or on vacation at the period of time, it seems to make sense that if we can do the selection during this meeting and ratify it perhaps in an ALAC call at the very beginning of the following week, where we can hopefully get quorum, we will have enough time to do this.

Does anyone have a handle? Mateus, do you know what the date is that we have to have the Affirmation endorsements done by?

Mateus: 17th.

Alan Greenberg: 17th. Okay.

Mateus: And it's not the selection. It's an endorsement.

Alan Greenberg: It's the endorsement.

Mateus: Yeah, take care Alan with the wording because selection will be made by the Chair of the GAC and the Chair of the Board and we have to endorse or not endorse the…

Alan Greenberg: Okay. If I used the word selection I meant that ones that we will select to endorse.

Unknown female: Yes. Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have just arrived and I'm confused.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Unknown male: Cheryl before the bio break, you said, "Here's a list of people that have to come back and the rest are encouraged to go another room."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Unknown male: We're now finding out the other room is probably going to be a closed meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well then there will be hell to pay and I hope they send all of our people back as a closed meeting because the meetings are advertised as open.

Unknown female: It's open?

Unknown male: What?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi Tina.

Tina: Hi, I wasn't quite sure if you were still on break?

Unknown female: If it's open, let's go.

Tina: But I thought I would try dialing in.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Technically we are just winding from a break. It's good to know we've got the audio bridge up and running and well in the world. Makes me feel better anyway.

We said to our people that it will be, and I don't wear a watch so I'm struggling to see, and it'll be a couple of minutes before you start. So if you don't mind.

Tina: I don't mind at all. I'll be on mute and I'll just wait for you to talk me in.

Unknown female: So, if it's open and…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if it's not…

Unknown female: I have only the Board agenda and the Board agenda says nothing about. Normally with the – like in the ALAC or the others – is not open. But it's open, better. Let's go there.

Alan Greenberg: All right. Let us try to start again.

The submission of applications for the Affirmation of Confirmation Review Teams closed the other day. We have eight candidates, eight people who put their name in for endorsement by the At-Large, by ALAC. Our endorsement is due by the 17th. The At-Large, ALAC needs to decide what the exact details are of how we come up with this endorsement.

At our last meeting we deferred it to early in this week. The question for this group is, do we want to delegate the responsibility or do we want a real vote

of the ALAC early next week, prior to the 17th or on the 17th? There will just not be enough time to look at the various details. We also agreed at the last meeting that we would ask all of the candidate's two explicit questions and give them an opportunity an answer. That question has not been asked so we're not in a position today or tomorrow to review all of the answers. So the question is, do we want a small group to make the decisions on behalf of the ALAC? Do we want the small group, and this is likely people who will be here through Friday, to make a recommendation to the ALAC for an ALAC meeting to be held on or prior to the 17th?

I have a strong feeling, a strong personal position, that when you look at the applications, there are several of the applications from people who have had no experience whatsoever in ICANN. That may not be a bad thing. That in fact may be a good thing but we also need to make sure that we have people on the Review Committee who understand the problems that we've seen over the years and make sure they're there.

There are some people who believe, we think, that these review committees should simply say, "ICANN is doing a marvelous job, congratulations." I'm not one of those.

So, the question that we need to discuss and decide on at this meeting is what is the process that we use to go forward?

Sebastian?

Sebastian: Thank you Alan.

Yeah, first of all it will be good if all the members of at least (inaudible 00:11:30) will have the link with the name of the people of the eight who would like to be endorsed by ALAC.

So second point is that during the…

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me. I put that link on the Adobe Chat.

Sebastian: No, because I am sorry, Adobe Chat is not working as a chat.

Alan Greenberg: Where would you like it put on the At-Large Skype?

Sebastian: Either you put it on Skype or you put it on the chat because it's – but you can put both.

My second point – and thank you Alan to give us this link – my second point is that during the presentation yesterday about this topic in the large meeting room, it's by the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC, it was quite

precisely repeated that it must be people involved in our communities. And my first question to the people around this table, to the ALAC Chair and the leader of the region, it's which ones of them they know as participants to at least some work at the regional level or at the worldwide level. And that could be a first thing, we could have two lists of people.

Then we will have to discuss how we will under the list of people who put their name and never show up yet, how we can involve them in the future work of At-Large. But that could be a first step and then the rest, there's a smaller list, we have to discuss that in more detail. And I would like to see if we are going to have a list with – sorry – I am not finding my word – a list with an order or just a list of people. I don't know if it's clear what I asked but, if we will put the first name, second name, third name, in this order, or just a list of people.

Alan Greenberg: The comment that was made yesterday is Peter assumed that any applicants would come from our community. Well, in fact, some of them have not. We still have the opportunity to look at them and decide whether we think they would be good Review Team members or not. That is our discretion. There are people for instance with internet governance experience, a fair amount of experience in the community but not in ICANN. And there are also people with significant experience of review processes but not ICANN. So I think we have to evaluate them all.

Very similarly to what Sebastian said, I would suggest that every person – once we have the completed applications and we will hopefully in a few days – that every person look at the list and make any comments that you feel are relevant. That is you know this person and you strongly support them. You think this would a horrible person for the review and that at no cost should we take them. And then we use that as part of the process in deciding what to do.

Adam first, then Carlos.

Adam Peake: Hello. Bertrand raised the issue yesterday of experts that are also to be put forward. So perhaps we could look at it in that light. That we could have people who we feel can represent the ALAC and it has been pointed out to me by many people that that is a key word, stepping back to earlier discussions. So we have people who can represent the interests of the ALAC but we also have an opportunity to say, "Well, these are also experts. They are experts in review processes or whatever it would be, you know, the other criteria you mentioned just then," Alan. So we could put forward sort of two potential slates – representative ALAC, we like these – others, these are skills the review committee should have – diversity skills would be very important I think.

Alan Greenberg: Carlos?

Carlos: Not quite Janis. Primero. Nuestro supporte nuestra recommendacion (Spanish 00:16:31 – 00:16:43).

Alan Greenberg: Well, of the names we provide, for this committee, the Chair of the GAC and the Chair of the Board will select the ultimate list. And at this point we are now pretty sure of having at least two people, maybe three, based on what was said yesterday in terms of the size of the overall group.

Carlos: (Spanish 00:17:09 – 00:17:28) How many of eight candidates are or have knowledge about ICANN or no? (Spanish 00:17:44 – 00:17:49).

Alan Greenberg: I believe there are, of the eight there are only two who, based on what they have said, have no knowledge of ICANN whatsoever. Two of them, one of those has a lot of internet governance experience though. And two of them have – can use the term ICANN in a list of meetings they've gone to but have not been heavily involved in the processes and I don't think are well acquainted with the organization and the transparency issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And there is a very good reason, I hope everyone has noted, and we will have to wrap this up in a couple of minutes because we need to move to Tina and Bart, so we'll wait until the rest of our maddening crowd returns. We might just break this conversation for Tina and Bart because there's a remote participation aspect of that and we need to run to the advertised time. But as the Chair of the ALAC and I happen to be that at the moment has put in an application, I think it's important that I'm not seen as guiding our conversations. So I do want you all to know that I am declaring clear interest. I also need you all to know that the answer to some of questions you're asking I do have because of conversations I've had with other Chairs of ACs and SOs. So, if I'm going to put something to you as a group, I'm putting it to you because I have knowledge that I wish to share with you to help – I'm not going to not vote obviously – I'm going to vote the way that we are guided to vote by my region. But, I think we need to be very careful what I'm saying and what I'm doing. I just want to make really clear that that's on the record.

Alan Greenberg: Let me make a proposal which has not been passed by anyone. But just to put something on the table to criticize. I would suggest that we appoint a group of five people, one per region, maybe it's the current ExCom, maybe it isn't. But people who can work at least until the end of Friday to review all of the proposals in detail and make a recommendation of what or who to endorse, how many and in what order. And the order may not be honored. But I think it's important for us to put our preferences down.

                    In parallel with that, asking everyone on the ALAC and the regional leaders to provide any insight they can into the candidates.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Confidentially?

Alan Greenberg: Confidentially, of course.

And then we will quickly schedule a meeting to be held on or prior to the 17th where we will formally vote on that process. We can skip that last one if the ALAC wants to delegate responsibilities to the group. But that's obviously a decision that has to be made.

That's a proposal. Like I said, I have not vetted that with anyone, but I think it's important to put something on the table so we can come to closure.

Adam?

Adam Peake: I think it's very important in this that, you know, the process will be documented. One of the things that you get with the Nominating Committee; any nomination type selection committee is people will want to know well why wasn't I selected and so on. And I think simply the fact that we're rushed and we're not able to provide references and all those sorts of double checks, if we can't select someone, then we can simply say, "Sorry, it's lack of information and rush and we're going to do better next time." Because I think a lot of people are actually now saying that we're being forced into a certain path of selection and so, you know, we all know this, we're going to do better next time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In the conversation that I had yesterday that was initiated – Chairman of the GAC to Chairman of the ALAC – to discuss the concerns that when I wrote with the Chairman of the GNSO and the Chairman of the ccNSO – we raised a whole lot of process and issue concerns. He's taken time to talk to each and every one of us. I guess he phoned Chuck. But what you're saying, I'm wanting to share, I hear nothing but intent to get it right, to learn from these experiences and to start proactively looking for the buckets that we can put people in, how those buckets should be delineated, what criteria needs to be made for the other reviews, almost as soon as Nairobi is over and this first team starts. I heard nothing but commitment to let's get the process right next time. So I'm very confident that what we can also say to people who may not get endorsement for this occasion is that they are more than welcome and indeed encouraged to get involved and be involved in one of these future processes. I think we can be fairly warm and fuzzy as well as real and embracing.

Adam Peake: And we don't want to insult those selected by saying you were rushed through the process and we don't actually like you very much. You know, because it does have that double side to it, doesn't it?

Alan Greenberg: Are there any comments on the proposal I made and views on should we delegate responsibility to the group or schedule a meeting to ratify or change the recommendation?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may and declaring my role here as ALAC Chair. We have the rarest opportunity we've ever have, we have quorate majority ALAC in one geographic space and I think the more we can work as a committee of the whole on this between now and the end of the week when we all fractionate, the better. You were talking about a small working group, I think if we can encourage each and every ALAC member here to be part of that, not just the ExCom, that would I think be a better thing. Particularly since part of the ExCom has vested interest.

Alan Greenberg: Then may I suggest someone be delegated, whether it's staff or a committee member, to send out a targeted question to the eight applicants saying the ALAC has specific questions that we agreed to in the last ALAC meeting and we are giving them 48 hours to respond. If they choose, if they feel they need to add anything to their existing statement, I would suggest that we do that no later than now.

Adam Peake: I think I'm probably being dense. Do we have the list of people who have applied and their statements?

Alan Greenberg: I have put the URL in every possible mechanism I know of at this point.

Adam Peake: That just means I'm being dim, sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Skype, the chat, or you can come write it down from my screen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We will tattoo it on the back of your hand later Adam.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, right underneath the muscles, correct.

                    Okay, Cheryl has suggested that in lieu of my recommendation, we work as quickly as we can and try to make a formal decision, which means make it by Thursday which is the last time we formally meet. That doesn't give us very much time given that it's Tuesday to get the responses but we can certainly try.

                    Sebastian?

Sebastian: May I suggest that I guess Alan that you are the best to send the question to the candidates or to sit with the staff to do that as soon as possible.

                    The second point is that I suggest that we organize a meeting with at least the ExCom members but open to all the At-Large, ALAC members, more if they

want. As delegate by the ALAC, the ExCom will be able to work with the inputs of the other ALAC members. If the full ALAC is in the room, it's great. If not, we can still process and go ahead. And I suggest that for this specific topic, Alan will act as a Chair because as our Chair is candidate, we need to have some precedent. My suggestion is that Alan will be in charge of that on our behalf. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: I have no problem with that.

I carefully have not put my name on this one.

We have to stop now. I think we have an intent to try to make this decision by Friday. And if possible by Thursday. If it's clear that we can't we will come up with another process on Thursday.

We now turn the chair back over to the Chair.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much and thank you Tina for being online so promptly and us being very, very tardy. We had some, I will however give you the same excuses I've given every other staff member who's passed through these hallowed halls today, we had some rather difficult interpretation tool issues this morning so we actually lost 15 minutes. So we had attempted to catch our 15 minutes back but we haven't quite managed to do so. We're getting half way there through.

Tina, thanks so much for joining us. Your slides are booted and we're ready to roll.

Tina Dam: Okay, thank you so much and thank you for having me participate remotely. I wish I could have been there. But hopefully I'll see most of you at the next ICANN meeting if not before at some other event.

So I know you don't have a lot of time and I just created the three slides for this presentation to give you an update on the Fast Track process.

There is a lot of detail in these slides that I'm not going to go into details of completely but you have it for reference. Because then I just want to speak for a couple of minutes and then see what kind of questions you might have so that we can focus on the topics that are mostly interesting for you.

So with that let's go to the first slide.

The first slide is just a brief overview of where we are at with the Fast Track process. It's working really well. We find from the staff side, we have a total of 19 requests received, 4 of those have successfully passed through the string

evaluation phase at this point and they're right now going through string delegation. And the 14 remaining requests are being processed actively.

And just a quick note, sometimes you may hear a little bit of a higher number than the 19, that's if you count in spam or unintelligible requests, so it's a total of 19 that are legitimate requests.

They span over 11 languages and we keep them confidential and that has been quite a discussion point, both in the community and in the media. There's a lot of interest in the remaining 15 requests but per the process, we're keeping that confidential until the string evaluation is successfully completed.

And then of course some countries and territories will decide to make the information about their application or their requests public, which is absolutely fine, and I think you know, every country and territory will make their own decision on that subject.

So the next slide and the third slide as well, is just a brief overview of the experience that we have had on the staff side with the Fast Track process so far.

And just to mention up front, that there will be at least annual reviews of the process, but for the purpose of the Nairobi meeting and for the ccNSO IDN policy development for the long term policy for IDN ccTLDs, we gave the ccNSO Working Group a quick overview of the initial staff experience so far. And these are the following topics that that relates to.

One is transparency, as I mentioned, it has to do with keeping the process open and transparent but not posting information about requests until the end of stage two in the process. And I know Bart is going to talk about the ccNSO IDN PDP right after me but that's one of the subjects that the report that's out on that policy development is discussing at this point. Is to try to release that information at a little bit earlier stage.

The second subject is around community support. There's been a need to do some additional clarification about the fact that there is a need for community support for the string, in the string evaluation portion and community support for the IDN ccTLD manager in the string delegation portion.

So you'll see that we're putting out additional blog posts and additional information on this subject to try to preempt any issues during evaluation of requests.

And the last slide, first subject is we have also needed to do some additional clarification about when the IDN ccTLD manager needs to be identified which is not until string delegation.

Then there's the subject of variance. And I think this is probably one of the most important subjects for IDN activities going forward. Karen told you earlier today how we reserve the desired variant TLD strings and we don't offer them for delegation at the time. So a solution for that is still under discussion and we may need to do some additional analysis of d-name, b-name and so forth, and that subject matter, I imagine that's a really interesting subject for the At-Large so I welcome any questions on that.

But the last three topics on my presentation is disputes, where we so far don't see any problems. Because we haven't really had any high disputes in this process so far. Confusion with similar strings – where we are also putting out – I just posted the other day, a blog post on how a string's defined as confusingly similar with some guidance towards that.

And the management of spam or ineligible requests – and these last three topics were something that was not in the process in terms of policy but these are subject areas that we've had to deal with in an implementation of the process – so the last one for example, we decided on the staff, now with some experience, that it would be appropriate to give three weeks of notice for communication or close of the request. So that we, you know, spend time on eligible requests and not on the ineligible requests.

And so that's pretty much what I had. So I don't know if we're going to open for questions or if you have Bart to talk about the IDN PDP ccNSO first.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually Tina, we do have Bart here but I think seeing as we also have some representatives from some of the CJK regions, we might stop right now and ask if there are any questions on anything you've raised, seeing as variants did come into that part of our conversation. Just looking around, I have Hong, go ahead Hong.

Hong Xue: I'm not going to repeat what I've said and I'm not going to talk about CJK issues. Well, I have one question on the slides pages 2 and 3, on page 2, Tina kindly referred that the confidential nature of the request. Of course, if the country or territory decides to publish their string they have filed for, application is OK, but ICANN will not publish that. But on page 3, I guess is slide 3, you can see about confusing similarity string, bullet point 3, the publication of evaluation details to come. Does this mean that if there is a string confusing similarity issue, there will be a kind of evaluation and the details will be published? So that will not be subject to the confidential requirement of the process. So Tina?

Tina Dam: Yeah, so I'm sorry. My slides are not specific enough on that. That bullet point that says, "Publication of evaluation details to come," really just meant that I was going to post some guiding information about how the DNS

stability panel is making their decisions on whether strings are confusingly similar. And so I posted a blog post, I think two days ago, I'm a little bit time zone confused. I think it's two days ago, on the ICANN blog, I posted some details around that. We'll see if that is sufficient or if there's any additional information needed on that subject. But that was what was meant with the bullets. So when I made these slides, I didn't know, I made these slides before I posted that blog post the other day. And so I wasn't quite sure when I was going to be able to post it and that's why it just said to come as opposed to has been published.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Tina. Hong nodded, thank you as well. So I think we're all clear on that. Any other questions specifically for Tina? I see no one else, yes go ahead Sebastian.

Sebastian: Yeah I have one question. I am not following in detail at all the technical side of all that and what is happening at the IATF but do we have some process to be done at the IATF level prior to have those strings into the root or everything it is done to allow that string to go to the root as soon as ICANN finally decides to allow them?

Tina Dam: Yes, so that's a really good question. The answer is that no we don't need anything else from the IATF in terms the protocol before the strings that are requested can go in the root. In particular, the ones that have passed the DNS stability panel review are all okay. What may create a little bit of implementation issues for some of them is implementation of IDNs at the second level under those strings. But the top-level strings themselves are fine when it comes to the protocol. And of course this protocol revision is something that's pretty much completed or very close to being completed at the IATF level. That does not mean that it's implemented in all applications and so forth. So we still need Internet Explorer, Firefox, you know, all of the other browsers, any kind of application using IDNs to implement that new protocol before it works. And that transition is a transition that until the registries, IDN feasibility managers, you know, whatever you want to call these registries, that they need to manage. And it is much of a subject at the second level than it is for the top level. The top level strings are fine.

In terms of support to them at the second level, we are in the process of revising the IDN guidelines and part of that revision will have to do with guidance towards what can be done in this transition period where application developers go from, well, one the old version of the protocol to the newly revised version of the protocol.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Tina. Any other questions around the table? And if not, I see no one else in the Adobe Chat Room. Is there anyone else on the phone bridge who has a question for Tina? I'll take silence as no in this case instead of yes which is how I usually like to take my silence.

And we'll move to Bart. Thank you Bart. The floor is yours.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you. Good morning everybody, it's still morning so we're catching up.

I want to give you a brief overview where we are with regard to the IDN ccPDP process and what is the focus of the discussions this week in Nairobi and for the public comment period.

Next slide.

Skip the second one. You can skip this one. Okay. I know it's the best one but try to catch up Tom.

Just to recap – what is the purpose of the IDN ccPDP? There are in fact two elements to the PDP. One is a overall policy for the selection and delegation of IDN ccTLDs. So the Fast Track was just – it is not a policy, it is merely a methodology or mechanism to select IDN ccTLDs in the short term and the overall policy is for the long term. This part of the PDP is the focus of the current discussions and will be the focus of this presentation as well.

The second element in the PDP is changing the current Article 9 of the ICANN By-Law's which are dealing with the ccNSO in order to include the IDN ccTLDs. Currently the ccNSO is just limited to ASCII ccTLDs and at the time the structure of the ccNSO was designed, nobody had any expectations of IDN ccTLDs so that needs to be adjusted in order to include IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

After this meeting, there will be a Working Group focusing on this particular topic within the PDP and there will be a call for volunteers but that will be mostly limited to the ccTLD community and of course there will be room for public comments for other stakeholders.

Next slide please.

Just a bit on where we are with the process. As I said, the current focus of the process is on the selection of IDN ccTLDs so that was the first topic. We've just concluded the topic paper – that is, in this paper the issues and topics which are relevant and need to be addressed are described and delineated. We are now in the second phase – that is the interim paper – and that is to structure potential directions for the overall policy and give an idea of where we are heading with the overall policy. It is a Chair's draft, it is open for public comment and it will be discussed at the ccNSO meeting tomorrow afternoon and the public comment period is open until the 2nd of March.

So if you look at the presentation Tine gave on the Fast Track process and the experiences, because this is a very high level, most of the experiences have not been factored in yet. These will come into the next version and one important element is not included and that is the one dealing with variants. And the reason why it's not included is, again, what Tina said, the discussions in the technical community and operational implications have not been concluded yet and you don't want to set policy while these discussions are still going on.

Okay, next slide.

If you look at the Chair's draft of the current interim paper, it is built on a few basic assumptions and I just will go into these basic assumptions without going into the details of the paper itself. If you want to be involved in that and participate in that discussion, please attend tomorrow morning's meeting at the ccNSO.

The first basic assumption is – and that is again because of the pre-work of the IDNC Working Group which was a combination of all of the SOs and ACs with a relevant interest in the IDN ccTLDs – is we followed as much the structure of the IDNC Working Group proposals – so principles that shape instructions, recommendations – so if you look at the current paper, you see overarching principles and these guide the policy itself and they offer a framework for interpretation in future as well and they set the stage for the overall policy.

And the second way in which the IDNC Working Group proposal is followed is again the proposed process will follow it and so it includes criteria for the selection of IDN ccTLDs and a description of roles and responsibilities. All of the actors involved in that selection process and in the delegation process.

I think I've addressed the second point already – Fast Track recommendations will be refined and updated to reflect – and the experience of the Fast Track will be included and there will be due respect of course for the nature of the country code for the policy development process.

Next slide, please.

Now we go into more substantive basic assumptions. And one of, I think, the major ones is that the Chair's proposal is that IDN ccTLDs are ccTLDs. It means an equation of ASCII ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs. Which also means, which implies that the current arrangements for IDN ccTLDs and ccTLDs, ASCII ccTLDs, should be similar in other respects. It also implies – the second bullet – that the current practices for delegation, re-delegation and retirement – so the policies that apply to ASCII ccTLDs will apply also to

IDN ccTLDs with one major difference. And that is probably on the next slide.

It is with regard to the selection mechanism. If you look at the way ASCII ccTLDs are selected, that is ingrained in RFC 1591, that is through the ISO 3166 list, which assigns a two letter code to the name of a territory and this policy is mainly focusing on the assigning mechanism of a label to the name of a territory.

And another basic assumption and this will probably need to be thoroughly discussed at tomorrow morning's meeting and will be discussed probably in the public comments is the proposal of the Chair interim draft are limited to non-Latin scripts. So it means it will not resolve some of the issues on geographic names. The main argument for the selection or limiting to non-Latin scripts is that if we would include ASCII TLDs, you start to, you need to address some of the issues in the delegation and re-delegation and retirement practices and policies that are already in existence. Because they provide a mechanism or a policy for the delegation and selection of ASCII script ccTLDs.

These are, I think, the basic assumptions and there will be more, these will be discussed tomorrow morning. I've included some references and one is of the Working Group itself, some members of this community are participating in that Working Group, among one of them is your Chair. And the second one is, if you want to submit public comments, here is the URL to submit the public comments.

That's all, thank you. Any questions?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Bart. And yes, do we have any questions? I see none in the Adobe room but I also have a little bit of latency in my copy of the Adobe room and the blind woman can't see what's going up there. So if you're in the room now and you have a question…

Hong, there you are. Go ahead Hong.

Hong Xue: Okay, thanks.

We all remember how long it took the new gTLD PDP came into being so I want to know, is there an initial timeline for this IDN ccTLD PDP to be completed?

Bart Boswinkel: So, I think you have to distinguish two things. First of all is the policy development process as is. The policy development process itself. And that will take – I don't want to scare you but probably two and a half years. One of the reasons is as I told you it is not just limited to the overall policy but it's

also about changing the structure of the ccNSO. And then we have to go through a very, very extensive voting mechanism so that will take at least two and a half years.

The second element why it can take very long is because on the implementation side. And if one of the recommendations will be there needs to be a list like the ISO 3166 list as part of the implementation, that can take five to six years after the policy development has been concluded. This was one of the reasons why the Fast Track was initiated in the first place because you could see this coming. And we don't know how long it will take.

So first of all you have to distinguish between the policy development process as is and the implementation phase – that is, for instance a very good example was the Fast Track itself. We had the Working Group producing its report and then you had to go through the implementation phase and the implementation Fast Track consultations. That will happen with this one as well.

And then secondly, it is the implementation phase, depends on the outcome of the policy development process, how long it will take. We hope that we can take in the experiences – that's one of the reasons why we want to take in the experiences of the Fast Track – to minimize implementation efforts.

But there will be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Bart. Hong, your hand is still up but I think that's just because I've got this latency issue here. Anyone around the table have further questions for Bart? Go ahead, follow up, go on.

Hong Xue: When we developed the Fast Track one consensus was that Fast Track is not supposed to preempt the future PDP so my question is that, if a territory has already filed application in the Fast Track, can it still apply under the policy development through PDP once it's in place?

Bart Boswinkel: I think the preemption clause and the concept of preemption was to limit the Fast Track mechanism as much as possible to allow for a broader range of solutions in the policy development process because it's not a policy development process. If you look at the Chair's interim report, there is a section in it on the transition, how to include say to ensure that all those IDN ccTLDs who've been delegated under the Fast Track process will be considered IDN ccTLDs under the overall policy. And that was one of the reasons to make the Fast Track as limited as possible so you don't have, you know, you don't have to grandfather too many IDN ccTLDs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Hong, you're nodding yes, that's satisfied? Thank you very much. Calling for anyone on the phone bridge for any questions for Bart? I

see no one on the Adobe Connect room and I see no one around the room. So I think Bart, your work is done. Thank you most sincerely. We appreciate it as always.

(applause)

One minor little follow-up. When our communities – remembering that we don't have all of the regional leaders around here for reasons I'll discuss over a drink in a bar one night with – just for now, it's just poor timing – they may want, as they want to prepare their people to put in regional and local public comments, all of your presentations and everything are public but is it possible for a community call to be set up? Are you willing for that?

Bart Boswinkel: Absolutely. Is what the intention is at least with this policy development process and with others is to be as open to the stakeholders as possible. So there are two opportunities – one through you through the Working Group itself and your colleagues – and secondly through the public comments. And if additional information is needed or questions, of course I'm willing and probably we are willing to participate in such a session.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. Thanks for that. Because of course anytime we have a community call, it becomes an archive and a resource and it means that despite time and various other issues, parts of the community, the At-Large structures, the people out there on the edges, can access it. And that's very, very useful. So we might have our staff talk to you soon. Thank you Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Please arrange it through Heidi or Mateus.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We will indeed. Our usual thanks, with less people around the table, but thank you very much Bart. Tina, do not escape if you're still on the line? Are you still online Tina?

Tina Dam: Yeah, I'm still here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fantastic. Mateus brought to my attention in Skype that there was an Amendment to your presentation. Because we have the Adobe Connect room recording this meeting and there's also the audio record of the meeting, I was hoping if you were still online you might speak to that matter before we close off this session and move to David Olive.

Tina Dam: Sure. Was this the subject that I brought up to Mateus on Skype?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I guess so seeing as he immediately passed it on to me.

Tina Dam: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. So I'm sitting at home obviously participating in the meeting and I get a chance to like read a lot of information and articles online

that I usually don't have time to. And one article that came out just today on circle ID, it was an article around how we can get IDN for everyone and that was in relation to all scripts and all languages and not just the larger population script if you can call it that, or language groups, and not just for the rich nations in the world but for everybody. And so I just thought that that was potentially a great subject for you all to pick up into consideration and further IDN discussions to see if there's something we can do to make reaching out to all languages and all scripts a little bit better than it already is. I mean, I think the Fast Track and the PDP that Bart was talking about, I think we're trying to do as best as we can to make sure that it reaches everybody. But of course, you know, it's hard when you build processes and follow policies to do that. And another area where we do try to keep it open for anybody no matter what is the IDN Wiki but I just thought maybe your members have a lot of good ideas about how we can broaden the scope of that a little bit more than it already is to make it even better.

So there is a link to the article there. I had made a post to it and I just thought it was a great subject for you and all your members to discuss. And I know both Bart and I and everyone else on staff, Mateus and Heidi and everybody, is interested in trying to do as best as possible to help on that subject.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Music to our ears Tina, thank you very much for that. And I can assure you that the community will be very, very pleased to take up that gauntlet. It's going to be a pleasure and I'm going to ask the leaders of the regional At-Large organizations to put that particular matter onto their agenda for their regional leaders meeting through this week. And then that will be able to come back to our final Thursday meeting for the ALAC. So I guess you've got a perfect piece of timing because you've just got it when we're all together and we're all in the mood and all at the right time. I would ask however that Mateus put that link Tina mentioned through into the Adobe Connect room so we have continuity of the record.

And Tina, at whatever particularly nasty hour, I think it must be half past one in the morning or something for you by now?

Tina Dam: Yes, it's only 1am. I'm almost on Nairobi time so it's no problem at all. I'm happy that we have the remote participation, that's really nice.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I was going to say, welcome to my world but most of my stuff starts much later than 1am, but thank you very much. We do appreciate it and despite a couple of little glitches with remote participation, we're certainly heading in the right direction. So Tina, these thanks which may blow the circuits of the audio, I don't know, are coming through directly to you. Ladies and gentlemen, if we can thank Tina for her attention and care with us today.

(applause)

Thank you all, thank you Bart, thank you Tina. And welcome David.

David, we owe you a small explanation. You might note slightly smaller numbers than are normally seen around this table. There is a reason and it goes very much to your role.

It's how, even at ICANN meetings, policies, discussions, full, frank, fearless and supposedly transparent and accountable activies go on, because of the way things sometimes happen, it was necessary when we discovered, thanks to our liaison on the Board, that there was an agenda that was neither public nor in the best interests of what we believe is the public going to be enacted and because the public record showed the meeting as public, we've sent our public to that meeting. So, you have far less talent than we had hoped you would be having a roundtable with, but the others will come back and they will be all jigged up when they do, I'm sure.

David Olive: Well thank you Cheryl. I don't look to the number of the people in the audience, I look to the quality of people and around this table, I see quality people and in the remote participation people staying up at various hours of the day and the night to participate in that. And so to that extent I thank you and I don't count the numbers as a quorum for me to appear or not to appear. I'm happy to appear at any time and so thank you very much.

I take this opportunity very seriously. Looking, as I am, just relatively recently part of the ICANN team assuming the role on February 15th and when I asked a little bit about time for training, they said come to Nairobi and you will be able to learn all that you can. And so I am here to listen and learn and I'm learning a lot including how the flexible nature of the schedule. I thought I would be here at different times and lo and behold pulled in other directions so that my head is now going to be in a 360 position and so I am fully flexible for that.

But I hear, I know we're here to have this roundtable to talk about some of the public policy, policy development process, excuse me. And you heard from one of our senior members, Bart, talking about the new ccTLDs and the role of the ccNSO. And I think you for that. That's part of the team. You'll also hear from another group member soon on the RAA.

On that very point I might just say that in preparation for my work I've been given a lot of materials to read and one particular document was the RAA. And I was not looking forward to the large documentation and lo and behold, just before I decided to get into that part of the topic, a layman's guide to the RAA appeared to which I was very pleased that I could read that and understand that rather quickly. And I understand that is the reason from the recommendations of this group here to have in a plain and understandable

language that helps provide background to sometimes legal or technical documents that we know have to be in those precise languages but it's nice to have that summary that we can relate to in what I would call layman's terms.

So I thank you very much for that. And it helped me expedite my understanding of that procedure as well.

The other point I might add is that the public comments from this group, the At-Large Group and your various networks, is vitally important to the policy development process. And to that extent, I know we try to get these notices out as soon as possible and we do appreciate hearing from your group and from your group's regional and local representations on this. And so the note of community call or some type of further explanation on specific topics, we are, of course, willing and happy to do that.

We're trying to find new ways to communicate in a sense. We had our recent webinar for preparations of the policy issues for Nairobi. As one example, we are also doing podcast recordings so that people don't have to stay up at odd hours of the day or night and can do it at their leisure. And we're looking at these new areas of communication to explain specific topics or explain the policy development process to people and hopefully that could be useful and used by your group as well whenever needed and in a cost effective way.

And of course, any ideas of how we can do that even better, we of course want to hear about.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Are you willing to take breaks in your sections for questions or do you want to wait until the end?

Dave Olive: I'm happy to take a break for questions at this point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, because I did think that when we have regional leaders meeting this week, and looking very much at how their local outreach needs in the community can be met. We've been intimately involved with the development of the podcasts, we were used as a resource from the very beginning and it's something that, in fact, our community has been asking for, let me think, was is Los Angeles? I believe it was.

The term Adobe Connect room was introduced to the world of ICANN thanks to the At-Large Advisory Committee and their use of webinars for calls that we need to make. And we actually, I think, have been the sharp end of the stick in a lot of this.

But I have a question and I'm hoping some others will follow through. You said cost effective. We have a huge outreach requirement and a lot of it is in multiple languages. We need to engage with the edges of our community not

just in a timely manner but in a manner that they understand and there will be cost involved in some of that. So in this Affirmation of Commitment world, we – not now, take it as a question with notice – we would like to think that we'll have an engagement, not just at the ALAC level, with you and your staff. I mean, we have our staff, I know you own them technically, but we do like to think they're ours and brilliant that they are, how we managed without Vizlia (sp?) – it's a pity the Africans aren't here en masse because they'd be standing up applauding – and having Mateus and Heidi, they cover us 24 by 7. And we need to be covered 24 by 7. But it's very easy to make bottom line judgments on these things so we'd like to think that there was a possibility also of working directly with the regions which now Mateus is managing that role. We have monthly regional meetings. We have new possibilities where ICANN is looking at communication outreach and publicity world, and we have possibilities of being the smartest route of advertising to your marketplace. So we want to find nexus, opportunity and partnership. Give a return on investment but be effectively used, so not so much of a question as a statement, but the question is, is it the intention under your guidance to have that close relationship between the parts? You know, what we think, you know, GNSO the relationship's obvious – other than via the At-Large staff, the relationship with ALAC is there but it's the At-Large, it's the ALS's and it's the regions where the work needs be done. And guess what, costs are going to come in. Is it not, you know, your gut feeling that that's going to be even possible with current budgetary restraints? We can help, we can translate, we've had offers from the edges to do things, there's ways we can make it cheaper as well.

Dave Olive: Thank you for that question Cheryl. I will, after Nairobi, the next step is the budget step and we all have comments on the next fiscal year budget. So I'll have to reserve judgment on that. When I said cost effective, I meant something that was both time and cost, that would be able to give the message to the people that need it to disseminate that information. And there is, of course, another kind of budgetary cost factor that we have to look at and I'll be looking at that going forward.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Sebastian.

Sebastian: Yes, thank you. I must do it in French but I will not, no, no I will not. But you have to know that sometimes it happens that other people speak other language. And I would like to say that I will be very, very interested if we can leverage the amount of work done by our community. Because we are always talking about some dollars spent by in the budget of ICANN but I can't tell you and you have near you two of the most example of people who make no commitment on time. They spend a lot, a lot of time working for ICANN issues and this is not leverage as it must be. Because if we put, in front of the time we spend, the equivalent of manpower, I am sure that your budget will be

so tiny that you will be ashamed. Then you have also to take that into account. We are, I will not say a resource because it's not a good word.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's a lovely word.

Sebastian: But we are doing and when I say we, the people that are around this table but also a lot of people in our community is doing a lot of work trying to understand, trying to participate, putting ideas, trying to move the ICANN policy in the right direction for the end users. And that's something we need to be taken into account. And when, at the end of this work, we don't have any feedback about our work, that means it's, we put hundreds, thousands maybe more dollars on the table and our work the equivalent, in our work and no answer. Just once again because my colleague already heard me about that. But we put comments on the strategy planning and no one single answer, yes we read it, that was great. But where it is taken into account in the document, it's still to be proved and told to us. Because it's so important that as we don't have this answer, we don't know how to deal with the next step, that's a budgetary process. What we do? You heard us. You're against our proposal or you totally agree but we don't put it in the document? But you can do online the budget with your project or not? We don't know. Then it's a lot of effort put, a lot of time, then a lot of money and nothing in the reverse. And don't take too much the small amount of dollars that are in your budget with a big amount of time we spend as a community in the ICANN arena.

Thank you.

Dave Olive: Thank you Sebastian. I surely in my past life had two and sometimes three hats which were volunteer work for industry associations or global associations that are not necessarily denominated in dollars or pounds or shillings but are equally as important. And this particular community here, I want to emphasize that I don't mean to downplay – quite the opposite, I mean to praise – the quality and the time spent on a volunteer basis by all of you. And indeed, if there is a lack of feedback, I will make sure that there is feedback. I will be here to report feedback. Because if there is no commentary from your groups, if there is no suggestions, then the entire process is in jeopardy. And we want to continue to make sure that there is a feedback loop so that there's a positive understanding that what you do and the time you spend is worthwhile and taken up to and including the people that need to know – the President, the CEO, the Board, the Board Chairman and the like.

So, no you're right, if there's just commentary without understanding and value, then that is frustrating and I don't want to see that frustration. And my job, to look at it, though I'm new at it, is to try to make the documents clearer, either through summary and in addition through translation, try to streamline the process if I can. Now that's not always easy because you cannot hurry

people in the consensus process or you cannot force people on a certain deadline if they have other work to do and other commitments. But as best we can we'll try to do that. And I don't want to discourage, I want to encourage, the At-Large at all levels to continue their participation. And believe me, your inputs are valued by many people including myself.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you David. That's music to many ears. You might have seen a few nods and smiles, particularly on the feedback. And I'm going to make two related comments here.

It is not the situation – we are a far more mature group and, in fact I would like to posit, one of the most valuable assets that ICANN actually has – and so as an asset we would like to think that if the asset was managed properly, and part of the management of assets properly is to know, I guess, how they need to stored, how they need to be cared for and how they need to be interacted with. And to interact with community, we don't necessarily want to have the, "Oh, we agree with you, everything you say is right," that's not going to happen in this type of multi-stakeholder model. We are not suggesting that because we've said it should be blue, it has to be blue. What we are asking for and in a form that our leaders can take back to those people who spent the most valuable thing they own, their spare time – not our main leadership volunteers – out there on the streets, over their coffee break, responding to our questionnaires and our inquiries. Their time, we have to say that had this outcome. It was considered. And it's that lack of measurable and as you're looking at models, anything that has a measurable, that we can put back in local language because we can handle that end of it, to say, "We didn't get this but it influenced that." Or this is not a priority now but will be considered in the future. Or this is fitting in this very generic term. But officially, it's no good for us to say it, ICANN has to say it. Because this is not a conversation over lunch. This is due process in a transparent way, accountable both ways, to ICANN and to the community, on how information gets handled and managed.

The other part, which is very much part of the care and feeding of assets, is we need a huge shakeup of how culture and expectations of the simplest courtesies are understood from a, I'm afraid, still very American association. Nice to see you had Fujitsu in there. Pity you're not from somewhere other than America. So you've got a huge butt-up with some of our community and I figured you would know that and I didn't have to tell you. But the simplest, as you know, because you are well traveled and you have worked in Africa and you do know Asia, there are certain courtesies and those courtesies are ignored outright by ICANN in these processes. And I think we can all do a whole lot better. And to some extent, courtesies universally accepted such as the simplicity of a read receipt are absent in our processes.

Dave Olive: Well on that very point, one has to be as sensitive as one should be in these international groups and I'll try my best. I'll just relate a story that one thing I will do is I have, I've given to you what I call my temporary card, my temporary business card from ICANN. In my other work, I've always had four or five languages on the reverse side of my card and I've now talked to ICANN about having that done as well on my new cards which will – hopefully the next time we meet – you'll have it in a language that's familiar to you.

But secondly in terms of being sensitive to where you are and the groups that you're with, I would like to just if I may digress, yesterday evening a lot standing friend of mine is the President of the Computer Society of Kenya. And he had asked me to come to a dinner that he was having scheduled for the ICANN meeting and for some of the business constituencies there and he asked me to speak. And it was kind of a busy schedule, I had another dinner that night so I had two dinners but it was worth doing that because of the friendship we had and that we continue to have, and at that point I was able to meet members of his Board and to show the courtesy of our friendship over time. And this includes others that I have met throughout my career internationally that those kind of networks and relationships are important and I hope to establish them with you and your group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you and David, I think I'm fairly safe in saying that there isn't an At-Large structure or regional organization, so that only gives you about a hundred and forty, direct, welcome to my local space and we will make sure you are well cared for, comforted, fed, watered and introduced to the right people, offers now heading your way.

Dave Olive: Thank you. And on that other point. When you talked about the network that you have at the At-Large group. It seemed to me that one should look at how to leverage that in terms of ICANN communications, ICANN linkages. I know we're trying to do that in terms of our monthly policy update, keeping it shorter, putting it into other languages, having that as a usable document. But there are other types of things going forward that might be useful. Press releases or background information or whatnot, that disseminated through your network, is a first line of the people most interested in Internet matters in ICANN matters. And that is a relevant way to keep people both informed and to leverage their ability to inform other people through their networks and relationships. And I'm just thinking, we'll have to explore more on how this can be done, but to use this wonderful channel of context and communications for ICANN materials but more importantly, to get feedback and a way to encourage them to be involved as a two-way street. My years of experience internationally has been – yes I am an American, I understand that – but communication should be two way communication, not one way communication. And so I have learned that over the many years to have a listen and learn but also listen, talk and listen as a mode of communication.

So you can call me on that if I don't do that but I hope to do that with everyone, including this group here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Music to our ears and of course what I didn't warn you about and I hope was made clear to you last visit to us, is everything we say and do is taken down and held against each of us. We are absolutely recorded, transcribed, publicly archived and posted for anyone to find in any simple Google search, so if you ever do want to say anything in camera, you want to make it very clear you want to say it in camera. Because we only have open meetings, we only have records, we have them in at least three languages, so believe me, careful what you ask for because you just might get it.

David Olive: Working for many years with my Japanese colleagues, we'd have an expression, "No commento," which would be "no comment for the record." But what I said I genuinely mean. It maybe sometimes a hard task for me, a high bar for me to achieve but that is my goal. And I hope to work with everyone to make ICANN a better place to be and to work and I thank you for this opportunity.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we'd like to thank you both – I see no questions from the online community in the remote participants, just let me double check. Nothing's coming up on my screen. Is there anyone? I see you Adam. Is there anyone on the phone bridge who wants to raise a point? If not, the floor is yours Adam.

Adam Peake: I think I'm the only person sorry that you've joined ICANN because I've lost one of the most helpful sources of telecoms information in Washington. So that's not very fair.

But, welcome, and just to reiterate this problem about, you know, getting an acknowledgement is extremely important when we do submit policy recommendations and ideas. If our ideas and comments are not taken into account, say why. I think it's a good practice for good governance of the organization to respond to all comments and say how they were included and how were they not and why and to the greatest extent possible.

And it does happen but not as much as it might perhaps and that would be a great development.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It does, of course, go beyond a tally which is at least where we are in some cases now.

David, thank you for your time. And we all look forward, online, offline, in virtual worlds or otherwise, working with you. And we will eventually forgive you for your Americanism.

David Olive: Thank you very much. And that was my layman's, plain speaking way, of saying, nice to meet you all and look forward to working with you.

(applause)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, she says, finding her glasses and desperately trying to work out where we are next. And yes we have Beau in the room so we are now heading towards the Aspirational Registrant's Rights Charter conversation which was scheduled for not too far off this time actually. If we had been on perfect timing, you'd have been close for time, but in fact we've skipped over a few things, so Beau do you have any materials or are you just going to talk from up here or?

Oh, we've got a handout, terrific. Is there a link to the handout material for those online? Okay, for those of you in the Adobe Connect room and on the phone bridge or for the lower band chat, there is paper materials being handed out at the moment. A link to soft copy of this will be made available while Beau is taking us through this extremely important and, let's face it, this is one of the main reasons we're all here, to get this right.

Thank you Beau.

Beau Brendler: Thank you. To briefly explain, I'm not sure that everyone is aware what Aspirational Registrant Rights really means. So I'll give just a very brief bit of background.

This grew out of discussions from the GNSO appointed RAA Working Group Sub team A, which was intended and chartered to take some existing material from the RAA language and use it to create a consumer or registrant bill of rights, for lack of a better term, that was then supposed to be distributed to registrants that they were to link to from their respective sites.

During the process of that discussion, some of us in the community became concerned that the whole operation of it was just sort of transferring a set of points from one document to another. So that discussion grew into something called the Aspirational Registrant Rights.   Which basically means the language on registrant rights that is currently in the RAA has been, you know, has gone through the process. It's been approved. We can't really make any changes to it or additions to it.

But sometime in the future, we're not entirely sure when, but sometime in the future, we might be able to make additional changes to the RAA and there are some other folks within the ICANN community who are supportive of that. So this is where we have the Aspirational Registrant Rights Wiki page here is where we have been collecting suggestions from anyone who wants to make

them as to what we might further like to see in future existing iterations of the RAA.

So that's what's meant by Aspirational Rights. In short, this is like saying now that the RAA review process is done and finished and kind of wrapped up for now, what is it missing on consumers and end users behalf? What are some other things it might need? And we're collecting that stuff here.

So to just kind of go through, to just kind of go through some of these briefly as you can see them here.

The first one is have accurate, current and complete contact and locative information regarding registrars. Although that is currently in the contractual language for the RAA, I believe there are still some issues of compliance remaining among some registrars who are not posting accurate information or some who are not posting any at all.

Number two - would be the sole entity capable of asserting and changing ownership information for their domain. I think this branches into issues related to – there are still some ongoing concerns about the application of principles in the RAA to resellers – and to my knowledge, others may know more, but I don't think the issue of resellers and their behavior and what sort of contract might bind them is still an ongoing concern and one that we should perhaps focus on for the future.

Number three – have ample opportunity to renew existing domains at the same rates as new domains.

Four – protect trade names against unauthorized use.

Five – refuse transfer of personal information to unauthorized bodies.

And six – expect ICANN to enforce its agreements with registrars. Although that is somewhat – number six is somewhat open ended and we did hear some positive news from the enforcement part of ICANN yesterday – it still remains a face that there are a number of registrars who are failing to comply with many of the principles of the RAA and it has been difficult to get information on specific ones that have operations in China are the ones mostly of concern. Although they have, in both cases I'm thinking of, they have U.S. proxies, so.

So that's really it. What would be very helpful would be anyone in the community who wants to make a suggestion for adding to this and we have an avenue I think through another part of the RAA Working Group to make a presentation of these Aspirational Rights. The GNSO Council is aware that the community is working on Aspirational Rights and that they're going to see them at some point. So it would be great to have additions here from you and

additions from you know, the ALS's you represent or just other people in the community.

So that's it.

Unknown male: Thank you Beau. As Cheryl asked me to, she has a session, I will try to do so. Any questions, comments? Hong?

Hong Xue: Okay. On the draft list, it looks very good. I just really understand the point four – protect their trade name against unauthorized use – who are they? Who's trade name? A trade name of registrant or somebody else?

I like point two especially, this is about a kind of a new declaration of property rights over domain names. Let's see whether they will really be integrated with the legal system and really become exclusive rights or whether they're virtual property.

Unknown male: Beau?

Beau Brendler: I can't specifically answer the question about item number four. Evan and I together sort of collected these so I guess I would have to refer back to whoever the author of that particular aspirational right is for more detail. So we can do that if it's unclear.

Unknown male: Thank you Beau. Anybody online want to talk? To ask questions? Okay not online but in the room, Adam?

Adam Peake: Is it all right to go onto additional comments rather than just on the six? I mean, are we at that stage?

All right. Sort of as an addition and it's not quite specific enough to draft but I think some policy or some reference to requiring registrars to make prominent reference to all policies that they've agreed to under ICANN consensus policy, particularly those that are registrant facing, such as what happens with deletions, what happens with grace periods, so that the sort of the registrant has a understanding of what their relationship is with their domain if you like. So it would be prominent display of registrant affecting policies I suppose of some kind. Is that making sense what I'm trying to suggest?

Beau Brendler: Yeah, I think it makes sense. I think it's a good idea. I mean, if you want to just send that to me in an email or if somebody is taking notes and could just capture that and add it to the Wiki or I could add it to the Wiki. The purpose of this page up here to the left is that we certainly would hope that anyone would, anyone who's interested like Adam, would just add statements like that here. And I wouldn't even necessarily worry at this point about, you

know, editing or just ideas are even good at this point and then we can further develop them as we get closer to a point where we want to make a case.

Unknown male: Thank you Beau. Any other additional?

Has Evan come back to the room, maybe Beau you can maybe ask him the question you wanted some feedback from him?

Evan if you can listen please?

Beau Brendler: Evan, the question came up about – if you look at the document that's up on the screen to the left…

Evan Leibovitch: I know it well.

Beau Brendler: Yes. The number four, I think there was some issue of clarity as to what exactly item number four meant and I didn't write it so I don't know, do you?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, number four, protecting…

Beau Brendler: Hong is the one who had the question so she may just want to ask you directly.

Evan Leibovitch: I just meant in general that if a registrant was somebody who conducted business in a certain way, that they had a right not to have what they were doing either phished or otherwise compromised. And the point behind a document like this is it's meant to be fairly broad at this level. So I didn't think it was necessary to go into a level of detail. I just meant that at a general level, that somebody that operated a business under a certain name, had a right not to have that name either taken from them, abused, phished, typo squatted or otherwise compromised. That was the intent. Whether or not that's agreeable or not is certainly up for debate. But that was intended as a – this whole thing was meant as a straw man for people to bash at anyway. It essentially is a starting point from which we could do something else. I don't know if that answers the question but it's the best I could come up with right now.

Unknown male: So Evan, in clarification, so "their" meant the registrant?

Evan Leibovitch: This is a registrants' document. This is a statement of registrant's rights and that's all I was intending to cover.

Unknown male: I was just looking for that clarification.

Unknown male: Thank you Evan. Hong you want some more additional thought or you will work with this document and come back with some ideas?

Hong Xue: One second. (Inaudible 01:35:20) for your interpretation, on their trade name rights, their means registrant? Okay now I understand that. The issue here is that, so who are you claiming this right against? You mean registrars?

Evan Leibovitch: One other thing about the way this is worded. The actual prefaces before these bullet points is the word "registrants shall have the right to:" and then each of these flows from that. I don't know if that makes this any clearer but the intention was "registrants have the rights to: have accurate, current complete, be the sole entity," and so on. I don't know if that clarifies the wording at all but that was the original intent.

Unknown male: Okay, thank you Evan. I guess we exchange on that subject and everybody around the table knows that they could participate in this work. Do you want the final word Evan? I would like to finish this part of the meeting and give back the chair to our Chair.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Obviously I wasn't around here to hear what Beau said. I can probably add some interesting feedback based on what just went on upstairs. Where the whole issue of, well, without going into specific issues such as consumer constituencies which we can go into later, specific issues relating to rights were brought up. And what was interesting is that Avri Doria, who is chairing the meeting, brought this up and you know, that the idea that it was important to get into assertions of rights, immediately after which Peter Dengate Thrush said, "Yeah maybe this is something that ALAC should be taking a role in." Yeah some faces did go sour. But the other thing that was important and it hadn't been mentioned so I put my hand up as a non-Board, non-NCUC person there just to remind them that ALAC and GNSO had actually been working on registrant's rights things. Ironically GNSO and ALAC with nobody from NCUC participating which I don't think they quite liked either. I was actually quite pleased with the exchange that went upstairs. Olivier who was there made the observation that Rod and Peter were basically doing a good cop, bad cop number. And it was actually very nice. Debbie who is the person from the Red Cross there who has been shall we say injected into the proceedings, made some extremely useful comments, and it looks like she is actually working on creating a humanitarian/service agency constituency.

Anyway, I can give more later but that's my bit for now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you and as we suspected, there is a clear nexus between our At-Large and the edges of the communities we serve and need and what was going on in other rooms. And so I thank each and every one of you who gave up, you know, important conversations here, to go and do what you should be doing best which is represent At-Large, lower and upper case At-Large. So thank you one and all. I hope you had time to have a slight deep breath and a sip of water somewhere because we're going straight, straight as soon as

Cheryl puts on her eyes to see where we're heading, ah, that's what you're here for Margie. The non-lawyers RAA guide. Sorry, Sylvia, go ahead, my apologies.

Sylvia: (Spanish 01:39:13 – 01:39:45)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Sylvia but can I also ask that you particularly talk to Dev and to Andreas to make sure those same ideas get on the agenda table for the regional leaders meeting because it's essential for ALAC, it's even more essential for At-Large. And that's the RALOs and the ALSs. Notice I'm doing a lot of pushing down to the next layer lately. Get used to that. It's going to be a song you'll hear for pretty much the rest of my term of office anyway.

Margie, welcome back. We kept the seat warm. There's been a number of people on there but none of them have been game enough to come back and have two bites of the cherry with us in one day. So, but something that I think we're all very pleased to hear about, which is the lawyer's RAA guide.

The floor is yours Margie.

Margie Milam: Sure and as many of you recall, it was the At-Large that asked for this document. The document was put together with – worked through the legal department – Samantha Eisner in the legal department at ICANN tried to take the registrar accreditation agreement and simplify it so that a person who's not a lawyer, who's not trained in U.S. legal principles could look at it and understand what the RAA does.

And so the work, you know, it took a bit of an amount of time, mostly to get the language right and to try to take out the legalize, you know, the lawyer's phrasing that doesn't make sense to most non-lawyers. But we're pleased that we were able to do that and to release it in February.

I don't know if you – do you want me to walk you through the document itself or do you guys have questions about it? I'm not sure what the best way of dealing with this is, but I'm certainly here to do whatever you prefer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I'm going to first of all open it to the floor but then ask the remote participants. Because I'm confident about the knowledge level around the table. I'm less confident about the remote participants. So, unless someone around the table objects, and you never know, I always find whenever I review something I often learn something new, I'm going to ask Margie to give at least some synopsis points. Because it's the Adobe Connect and the remote participants which may indeed value and it forms part of a recorded archive as well. Thanks Margie.

Margie Milam: Okay. So I'll provide a brief overview.

Essentially as I indicated, the Registrar Accreditation Agreement is an American document and it's written to comply with California law and so what this document does is try to take out some of those principles and simplify it so that you can understand what the registrars have agreed to do in the contract with ICANN.

This is a contract between ICANN and the registrars and it forms the basis for them becoming a registrar.

We start off with an overview that basically describes what the domain name registration process. So the nice thing about it, in section one, if you're not familiar with the way the domain name registration process works, we've provided an overview even though it's actually not in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. But we thought that that was useful in order to give people background when they read the document.

The other thing to note is that every ICANN accredited registrar has to sign the same agreement. So this particular document that is the RAA is the same terms that apply to every registrar. ICANN does not negotiate on a case by case basis with registrars. So we highlight the fact that it is a standard agreement.

When a registrar applies for accreditation, they have to provide certain information to ICANN related to their financial and technical and business matters. And when they sign this agreement, there's three parts to it.

The first agreement is the main agreement and then there's also appendices that apply. So if you're a registrar and you want to carry .COM you have sign an exhibit for the .COM agreement. If you want to be a .NET registrar, you have to, you know, sign an addendum for that. So we explain how there are several documents that relate to the RAA.

We also clarify that registrars are not allowed to make claims that they can provide registered name holders with superior access than other registrars. In other words, there's a concept that all registrars have to be treated the same by registries and so registrars are not allowed to say that they have preferential treatment or better access to a registry than any other registrar.

The RAA has five main sections. One is a definition section and then there's a section that talks about ICANN's obligations to registrars. And then there's a section that deals with the registrar's obligations to ICANN. And then there's a section four that deals specifically with creating new specifications and policies.

And this is something that I had talked about earlier today. This is the part of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement where we can bring in consensus policies. So for example, when the GNSO Council develops policies in a particular area such as transfers or deletions, the way that the registrars are obligated to comply with it is that they agree in the contract that if this policy is adopted and it's within certain parameters, that they will agree to be bound by the new policy. So that's a very important part of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement.

Oh I didn't know Sam was here, I didn't realize that. Oh hi Sam. For those of you who don't realize, Sam is in our legal department and she's the author of this document and we really thank you for all the time and effort that you put in doing this because it is a difficult process.

(applause)

And Sam, I don't know if you want to chime in on any of the things that I'm saying? I mean, certainly you're welcome to.

Sam: I do think you're doing a great job going through the document. As Margie noted before, there was a lot of effort and it wasn't just my effort put into this. Margie and her colleagues in the policy department really provided a lot of inputs and really helped get it to a point to make it a little bit more understandable than us lawyers tend to be able to do. So thanks a lot.

Margie Milam: Okay, I'll continue on.

Some of the things that might be interesting to you is that in the agreement, as part of the registrar obligations, there's the one provision that talks about the uniform dispute resolution policy, the UDRP. And as you remember because everything is contract based at ICANN, the way we get the registrars to comply with the UDRP is by referencing it in the contract and so there's actually a section in the agreement that talks about that.

There's also a section that talks about the kind of data that registrars have to provide to the registry operators and this is the typical WHOIS information. So that's incorporated into the Registrar Accreditation Agreement.

The document also talks about obligations that registrants have related to WHOIS information. You know, there's the obligation to keep it accurate and to respond within a certain amount of time if there's questions about the accuracy of the WHOIS information. And so if you have any questions about the obligations of a registrant, it's really nice to now refer to this document and you can, you know, and hopefully it's more clear.

The agreement also has a provision that deals with escrow of the registered name holder data. So in other words, all registrars are obligated to provide all the information for the registrants to be escrowed in the event that they go out of business for example and so there needs to be a way for the information to be transferred in the event that, you know, there's a problem with the accreditation or the registrar goes out of business.

There's also the section that talks about how registrars deal with registrants. And it talks about the fact that a registrar may not activate a domain name until it receives reasonable assurance that the registration fees will be paid. And it talks about the types of actions that a registrar can take when the registration period is over in the event that there hasn't been a renewal. And so if there isn't a renewal of the domain name, the registrar is to delete the domain name within 45 days at the end of the registration term. But there are exceptions to this rule and it's described in this guide.

There's also a section in the RAA that talks about what needs to be in the agreement between a registrar and a registrant and that's called the registration agreement. And that is where the registrants agree that they must provide accurate and reliable contact data and promptly correct it during the registration term. And if the registered name holder intentionally provides inaccurate information or fails to update it when it's been contacted by the registrar within 15 days, that is deemed a material breach of the contact and the registration may be cancelled. So that's part of what's actually in the RAA and that's how some of the obligations that registrants have are created because it's incorporated into the RAA.

I don't know how much detail to go into. I mean, but I mean, is this helpful?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As I said, particularly because we're very keen to ensure we have one opportunity now to get an archival record in three languages that is a hugely useful resource that you're creating while we're talking about this.

Margie Milam: Okay, okay. Great.

And there's also a new section in the RAA that deals with registrar obligations for the acts of others. And this is part of the 2009 amendment process that took place recently. And essentially there's a provision that says that if there's common ownership between a number of registrars – and we see that in the marketplace that some registrars are owned by a common parent – that they are responsible for the obligations of those commonly owned registrars. And they may be in breach of the RAA if their affiliated registrars are in breach of their agreements so there's kind of a, you know, a check there to make sure that all commonly owned registrars are in compliance with their agreements.

And then, for the first time, there's actually reference to reseller relationships in the RAA now. And this, there are obligations with respect to registrars who deal with resellers. And that's, you know, referenced there.

There's also a requirement that – and this is very helpful, came out of the 2009 amendment process – that registrars will cooperate with ICANN and particularly in completing a training course. We're trying to make sure that our registrars are all on, you know, up to date on their obligations and you know, requirements. And so ICANN is currently in the process of developing a training course for registrars so that they are brought up to date and then, this is useful particularly in registrars that are abroad that may not have the ability to come to ICANN meetings and learn all the information that we're able to learn when, you know, here and present.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just a question on that then and it may be preempting a question. Adam, you have your hand up in the room? Is it a question for this section? Oh, okay, it could also be the lag on this beast that they've got me using here. I'm referring to a computer not a real beast for those listening to the transcript.

One of the questions that we want to get some feedback on is how we can make better leverage out on the edges but to that end, is it possible for those out working with registrars and being, you know, At-Large structures, they're going to be seeing some of these issues, to encourage people to say, "We would like that sort of training?" How is that being rolled out so that in the middle of Africa when there's a clear need identified by our part of the community, how do they encourage?

Margie Milam: I think that's a question more for the registrar relations team and I don't know if Tim Cole is going to come talk to you or someone from the staff. But yeah, they are actively working on this program and I don't know, Samantha if you know anything about that? I'm not that familiar with that program.

Samantha: Margie, I think you're right, I know that Tim and his team are actively working on it and they are in good outreach with the registrars and so to the extent that there are concerns, the registrars should be encouraged to contact Tim and his team.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's just nice to have a mechanism on the record that, you know, people can be encouraged to follow up on. Thanks, sorry, back to you.

Margie Milam: Okay. And then the RAA also has a termination provision obviously that talk about you know, how ICANN can terminate an agreement and there's, you know, arbitration provisions. For example, if there's a dispute related to the termination.

There's also, for the first time and this came out of the 2009 agreement, that there's additional compliance tools available to ICANN. For example, ICANN has the right to suspend a registrar's ability to register new names if they're in breach of the RAA or they can face suspension for failure to cure the RAA within a proper amount of time. There's a little more detail there that wasn't there before and so I know the compliance team is really happy about these additional sanctions that are incorporated now into the RAA.

And there's also a provision about acquisition of registrars. In the past, registrars could be acquired and ICANN wouldn't be involved in the process at all and now there's a procedure that, if a registrar provides notice – if a registrar is to be acquired by another entity or a business, they have provide notice to ICANN and certain information to make sure that the registrar has the ability to, you know, the continued ability to meet the accreditation requirements. And so that's useful because it gives ICANN notice that there is a change in ownership and the ability to go look at it and see if, you know, there's any problems posed with the accreditation.

And I think that's basically it. There's also a glossary. If you want to look at some definitions at the end of the document, there's definitions of ccTLD, gTLD, registered name holder, all of that, so it's useful just to provide an overview of what the registration process is all about.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Margie. And Sam, I need to give particular thanks to you because it strikes many of us around this table as quite a challenge for a lawyer to write a non-lawyer's guide. And so we do appreciate it. You probably have to sort of stretch yourself quite widely to not fall back into familiar language and constantly rethink. But to some extent perhaps you understand from our side why it's such a valuable exercise. And it is a hugely useful and valuable document and to that end, I think our community, because we've discussed this at our most recent meeting, would like to know, in the next steps because we want to value this and make great use of it, how do we now take it into all of the local languages, note I'm not saying the six U.N. languages, I'm saying the local languages that would benefit by this? Can we come to some sort of, this is a standardized text and soft copy can be downloaded in the following – we'd like to just explore, no putting things and, there's no blood required here – but just explore with us if that's a possibility.

Samantha: So I'm not sure if Margie mentioned this but you'll note that at the top of the document it states "draft." And this document, of course, was generated out of the request from you Cheryl and was drafted really to assist the At-Large community, the end users of the Internet, but it's also a tool that will be used by all members of the ICANN community. And part of the reason that it's draft is because we recognize it as a living document. So I'm not sure that the text will ever be final, final but of course that hasn't stopped us from moving forward with the translations into the six U.N. languages and to the extent that

additional translations are helpful and necessary to assist the At-Large community, I'm sure that Heidi and Mateus can assist in that. There's no legal barrier from having it translated.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. That's really very helpful because we already identified our need for Portuguese. And we haven't even looked at Asia Pacific yet. But when it comes to that plethora of languages, it may very well be not full print run, you know, it might need to be looked at in a prioritized order, we need to work with you to, we can't meet all needs instantaneously and there is cost benefit analysis to be done and we recognize that. But as long as we can establish a mechanism to do that.

Samantha: And to that end, if there are particular portions of this document that you believe may be more helpful, I'm sure that with the At-Large staff we can work to take out the portions and just note that it's part of a broader document. And also make sure that there are the correct caveats because I am a lawyer, I do like to see caveats in documents to state that this is a translation of a summary document. So it's two levels removed really but we would truly be happy to work with you to cut out sections. I'm not sure that that would involve paring of language but we could cut out sections with you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Okay, in speaking order at the moment for questions and if people can just indicate now if they want to be added to the queue because I'm not planning on leaving this as a long queue. I have Evan, I have Beau, I have Fatamarta. Is there anyone else who wishes to raise a question or discuss this matter? If not, we'll actually close the queue there and because we do want to try and catch back to our time. Thank you Evan, go ahead.

Evan Liebovitch: Hi there. I wanted to ask to what extent you think this is a companion document to the draft summary of registrant rights that was done last year. I posted the link up in the Adobe Chat room and I think you folks were actually involved with that as well. What it did was it extracted point by point to say here's your rights and here's the wording that actually refers to it. I think the two documents are very complimentary and go together very well. I would just like to suggest maybe that as you put this forward as a published, public document, you may want to consider literally having the two together and accessible the same way.

Margie Milam: That's not a bad idea because you're right, the language is very similar but the registrant rights charter is a smaller document and not as complete as this document so it may be helpful for those who are interested in learning more to click to this document and then have it easily accessible. So that's a very good idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan? Oh, sorry, Beau?

Beau Brendler: Yeah, I was just going to ask if there is a mechanism for which there's some interesting discussion about the document that didn't come up in the meetings that we've had before on it, taking place in the chat room, so I don't know if this is the place to analyze what's being said but I just want to make sure that it gets captured and reflected in the further iterations.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Did you want to read those to the record because it will be in the recorded space but I'm happy for you to do it.

Beau Brendler: Well the chat's part of the record, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It should be, I'm assuming…

Beau Brendler: That's fine. That's fine.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm assuming Mateus that the chat stays as part of the record?

Beau Brendler: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Fine. So we'll just have to note that. Thank you. Fatamarta?

Fatamarta: Thank you Cheryl. I would like to make a suggestion maybe and I don't know – it's in French? Okay. Okay. (French 02:02:21 – 02:04:02).

Margie Milam: And I don't know that I can address that. It's really a question for the registrar liaison team. I do know that Tim Cole and his group often have regional meetings throughout the world.

Unknown male: We didn't know that. It's a bone of contention here.

Margie Milam: I'm sorry, I didn't, yeah…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Forgive them, they know not what they do.

Margie Milam: That's right. But I do know that that is part of their program to try to go out there and to, you know, go to the various regions. I suppose Heidi may want to talk to Tim about more coordination with the At-Large community.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Fatamarta, what I hear and what we will continue to do, is find ways to ensure that there are opportunities for this to get on agendas and we will keep working on it. Because it is essential as we recognize that supply and demand have opportunity to share space, share experience and share stories and that is what I hear you asking for. So we will continue to work on that. That was just a classic moment and later someone will explain to you in gory detail I'm sure why we had such a wonderful reaction.

Okay. Is there any other questions before we thank, particularly Sam, for the heroic effort that she's done. And Margie for coming back into the hot set yet again. And truly, it's easy to look around the room with only these few people but, you know, take a note of how many you've got online, recognize that what you've done is making huge impact out at the edges where it actually needs to be done. And we thank you very, very deeply and very, very seriously. It can't have been easy, we appreciate it and in our usual way, thank you for the presentation and the product.

(applause)

Samantha: And thank you for the recognition but I do hope it does not go unrecognized the amount of work that other people within ICANN put into this effort, particularly Heidi and Margie and their teams for spending countless hours in reviewing the countless iterations of it and providing very substantive comments to take it to where it is today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nicely said, nicely noted. And of course, we expect this superb work from these people. We're getting used to this. They've set the benchmark. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to take as short an amount of time as I possibly can and that really is going to be now up to the presenters. I do want to complete now in this session before we have whatever necessity breaks we need and in fact more of us are back in the room by 2pm for the all important meeting with the structural improvements committee and the board governance committee.

I do however want to give Dev and Carleton time to show the other regional members, the leaders and the rest of the ALAC, some pretty amazing and very useful things which I would like think – subtle hint to all regional leads at the table – other regions might pick up on. It's a wonderful piece of work and I really, really appreciate it.

Carleton, I might ask you to squeeze the PAD as much as you can to just compensate to that. Thank you, so a hand over to Dev and finally a word from Carleton and then without any due haste you can all get up, go away, try and stretch, buy a bottle of water or whatever it is you need to do – yes, go ahead darling?

Unknown female: Can we leave our computers in this room over lunchtime?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well as long as I get to steal them, yes, I'll be here. I won't be able to move. Literally, I won't be able to move.

Unknown female: Alan's shaking his head so I don't think he trusts you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll sort that out later. Okay. It's also given enough time for Dev to be almost set up so that's quite useful as well.

Just to remind you all and please let anyone else know that you see out there in that lunch break time, 2 o'clock, back here, we have to get back on to our timed agenda. All right?

Are we set? And we're ready to go. Push your microphone and you're off.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Chair. Okay, let me just quickly start with the improving the PAD.

Now the PAD, for those that don't know, is the Police Advice Development schedule which gives an overview of the status of formal statements currently being prepared by ICANN's At-Large community.

Currently it's implemented as a Google spreadsheet and I'll just quickly switch to it right now. Right. And I'll increase the text size. So that's the existing Policy Advice Development schedule that was being used for most of last year.

The problems with it though is that, you know, it's tedious to maintain because you have to update every single field inside that document. You have to, because if you've scrolled, it's a lot of information there to process and because it's tedious to maintain, it's not up to date. Because if you look at it, I mean, you're not even seeing like a lot of the work that's already been done by the At-Large community, you know, At-Large Board Selection process, etcetera.

So, what myself and Carleton attempted to do was to try to figure out a way to improve this process.

And here is the current version that we've come up with. Okay. I don't know why it's doing this. Okay. So, let me just refresh this. And actually could you all…yeah, yeah, we're okay. All right.

So what we've done is, this first slide, this first section, public comment, this is actually read directly from the ICANN's public comment website. It actually scripts the website, scans all the titles and scans the URL for more details, the opening date for comments and the closing date for comments. So this is done automatically without any user intervention. And you'll notice the second column there is the policy on the PAD or not and I try to color code it so you'll know if something's not on the PAD, you know, it stands out and is requiring action.

Let me just now go to the PAD itself.

Now, the PAD now has several sections and perhaps maybe Carleton if you want to talk about the actual ideas behind how we should treat policies and so forth.

Carleton Samuels: Okay, very quickly. What we're trying to do here is see if we can get the trains to run on time.

And we are trying to use a process and create a workflow for how we do it. So we start by proposing that this is a workflow that we ask for. You get the announcement, we populate it on the PAD and then we have some timelines that is laid out. And these are all variables, you can change them. It is just my idea of what the timelines should be.

You start from when the announcement is going to close and we kind of work backwards and try to get the various areas of the At-Large involved in developing.

The first thing we want to do is to find out whether or not, have a decision as to whether or not we should respond to this. Is this something we should get to? And if we say yes, formal response then there is a process that begins.

You have to go to – notice if there's a work group set up – it has to go to the work group and then the work group has the time to develop an advisory, the advisory gets some time for the advisory to be commented on. Then following the comments then there's time for a proposal to be made to the ALAC for a vote. There's some time between this proposal and the vote. And then we have a vote. And it becomes an official advisory from ALAC.

At all of these milestones, we try to kick off automated e-mails and other notifiers to the various groups. This one is a little involved because we have so many groups that we have to keep involved.

And so we're trying to figure out how we could simplify the communications challenge. See, we have the work groups, we have the individual RALOs and the RALO leadership, we have the ExCom, we have blah, blah, blah.

So we are thinking that we should simplify the communications challenge by simply putting in timed reminders to the lists as often as possibly can. So we send timed reminders to the list. And this is all automated.

And then to certain, to the head of the Work Group or the Chair of the Work Group or so on, we're really trying to, it's a huge communications task, even though we can automate a lot of it.

The problem is you don't want to automate too much that it becomes spam.

So we are trying to kind of, you know, stay on the line between communicating and spamming somebody. And that's not going to be easy.

But that's essentially what we're trying to do here. Remember, all of these milestones are linked as variables in an automated procedure. We can actually go in and change any of the variables. So if somebody objects and says that this is too short, too long, we can go in and change a variable, individually, on every single announcement or as a group.

So that's it basically.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, let me just try to show you what I tried to automate. And actually one of the tools I've been using is something called Google Apps Script and what essentially that is, it's essentially Java script which allows you to manipulate the various Google apps, you know, the Google docs, spreadsheets, calendar and so forth.

So I have the workflow would be something like this. You go to a policy, that's one policy and you click on ICANN Power Tools and you add the policy from public comment to the PAD. So when it runs, it will insert it on the PAD and if you notice, it pre-fills all of the information there at one time. You have the policy issue status, the date open for comment and then what it does, it calculates the deadlines needed for each process step. The date for notice to be sent to At-Large and so forth.

Now, what we can then do is, if you want to like update the status, and I've just done it for the first step, but update policy status. It will run it and then send an e-mail to the notice list.

And if you notice here, you'll see that it's green, indicating that the e-mail was sent.

And if I check my e-mail, sorry. There you go. The notice comes up and it's – I've done a little bit of formatting in HTML.

Carleton Samuels: It just simply says right now look. But we can get more sophisticated.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes.

Carleton Samuels: With the e-mail, you know, what we put in the e-mail.

And the challenge is, keep it simple or get it sophisticated and that's where we're going to need some help as to what the requirements are to make it work.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: So, by saying update status, you see the status is now changed for that policy and again, I tried to make it more flexible, because while we want to automate it, I don't think we want to automate it to the extent that it runs through every single policy and shoots out hundreds of e-mails because I think then everybody would just shut down.

You have to go to each policy. My intention is that you go to each policy and then you update the status of it.

And if you wanted to change the dates and so forth, like, okay, let's say for some reason you get the, you get like, an objection to a date, whatever it is, you can then change that date and it will automatically recalculate. If you wanted then to reset the status you just clear this field and you know, resend the information again to the list.

So that's it for improving the PAD status.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I think that's an incredibly useful tool. It's certainly something that I suspect a number of the regional leaders might be thinking could be applicable locally as well. So you're part of that team so I guess you've got this under comments anyway, so is there any particular questions? I'm very impressed. Evan go ahead?

Evan Leibovitch: One of things that I noticed that ALAC runs into is that there's various issues that require different shall we say levels of expediency. And there's some issues of priority where, okay, we come up with an issue and the issue goes to the RALOs and the RALOs go back to the ALSs, it takes some time but you get complete buy in. Then there's going to be some things that, for whatever reasons, it came up two weeks ago and there needs to be a statement and at that point there has to be a process that at least says, "Okay, the ALAC is there because it's been entrusted by the regions to make certain decisions, it occasionally has to do some things…"