
PRAGUE – ALAC & Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Meeting
Thursday, June 28, 2012 – 11:00 to 12:30
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. We're going to start. Can we have the recording on please? Is it ready? Okay good morning everybody. This is the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap-Up meeting. Today is Thursday the 28th of June 2012 and the time is 11:04, and we are going to go through our wrap-up pretty quickly today, we haven't got much time to go over time at the end of this session. Welcome everyone, welcome to those people watching us...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Testing. Testing, this one's working.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Hello? Okay we're back. Sorry about this. That was definitely not censorship, that was just a technical hitch. Right, let's get back to this. Thank you. So we'll start our meeting with the report from the liaisons and the first liaison, should we start alphabetically, so maybe we can start with the ccNSO liaison please. And we have to make this short please, so...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I am highly motivated to do just that. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And it will be short and there's not audio-visuals. The ccNSO has as usual met technically over three

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

days, because it has its Tech Workshop on Day One and two days of member meetings. It has been a thrill packed and exciting agenda with reports from ccTLD community members on things like their security systems, various challenges in terms of perspectives on new gTLDs and a whole bunch of other good stuff.

Highlights from ccTLD community meetings and indeed with the ccNSO meeting would include the work from the study group, I think I've got the nomenclature correct there, which analyzes budget and strategic planning on behalf of the ccTLD community to look at what ICANN does. And as I'm sure you've heard in a number of Byron's presentations in the past, the excellent work that that group has done. It comes to pass that we can now actually say it appears that the ccTLD community through this workgroup now knows more about the ICANN budget than ICANN does, and I pause for affect.

That said, we have also had reported by the ccTLD community from Xavier something which I want to take a second to report to report to us here, and that is in that in Xavier's opinion, this is our Chief Financial Officer, he finds the EAG, that tool which we have all used to measure the cost center that we are to this organization as a, I think if I'm polite I'll call it fragile. If I'm realistic I'll all it faulted. And if I'm going to be an Australian, then you can fill in the dotted lines.

That said, Xavier has undertaken – Tijani is smiling at me; at least I didn't say it Tijani – Xavier has undertaken to work with the Chair of the ccNSO and a few key staff out of the particular study group I'm referring to, work group I'm referring to to look at this and get this right posthaste. There is no time other than as soon as possible. What it will mean

ladies and gentlemen is the way that we have assessed for the last few years what we've cost the organization will be different. Whilst this will have an effect on ccNSO and GNSO I think as the user, the cost center, not the contributor, the income source, although we could define ourselves as the original source of a lot of the income, changes in this model will affect all of us.

So as we're thinking about from regional leader perspective and RALO leadership plans, we might need to be aware that there will be a number of budgetary discussions in our not too distant future which might have whole new paradigms for us to look at. I will keep you posted on that, as I will keep you posted as I always do, via sorry Sala – via the Wiki site. If you wish to subscribe to the ccNSO liaison Wiki site I'd encourage you to do so. Be rest assured that unlike some of our wonderful ICANN staff, Matt I do hope you're listening and paying attention, I tick the box at the bottom of the Wiki page that says "do or do not distribute a notice on an update."

So if you subscribe to my site you will not know every "i" I have dotted and every "t" I have crossed and every piece of formatting that I have ever done, but you will get a message in your email box that says "new news" is up on my page. And it's a constantly updated page. There is a lot of data gathered, a huge amount of presentations to look at and all of that will be linked from the page we've set up for the liaisons. I'd like to open very briefly for questions, but because your ccNSO liaison also serves on a lot of actual productive working groups, I do need to actually be in the ccTLD IDN Working Group right not, so open for any very brief questions.

Are there any on remote participation? In which case, with your permission sir, I believe I'm free.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Cheryl. I don't know if you're free, but you may go if you wish to. Just a note, the ExCom will be meeting with Xavier Calvez on Friday morning and no doubt there will be discussion of what you mentioned earlier. We'll move on swiftly to the GNSO liaison. Unfortunately Alan could not make it, he's already in another meeting, but he has sent in his report and so I will read the report to the transcript.

"It has been a busy but relatively calm meeting, at least compared to the last one. In terms of immediate actions required to the proposed ALAC statement, on the ".com agreement" is the only one. The most interesting session was a review of a number of GNSO issues with ICANN staff. It was a jaw dropping session in that there were a number of issues that most of us in the room found outrageous. The two main issues were number one, ICANN doing significant work related to the implementation of the Trademark Clearinghouse, including hiring a consultant to develop EPS for extensible provisioning protocol, the mechanism used for communications of the registries extensions all without any involvement of or communication with registries or registrars; the ones who are the experts in EPS and who will have to implement the results.

Number two, the URS, one of the key protections that ICANN has been claiming to provide security to trademark holders has been found to be unimplementable at the specified cost. Although the URS was

developed by the GNSO body, with an involvement of ALAC, the only notification of this problem was that there was a line in the proposed budget that ICANN was providing funds to hold summits to attempt to resolve the issue, all without any explicit involvement of the GNSO.

Number three, digital archery. One understood that the Board did not consult at all. There has been a considerable discussion on issues related to the Red Cross, Red Crystal, International Olympic Committee, intergovernmental organizations and the wider nongovernmental international organizations and charities in particular. There are multiple activities going on and this is an issue that will continue for some time. It is quite controversial within At-Large and I would strongly suggest more At-Large and ALAC involvement as the processes go forward.

A statement on the open preliminary issue report will be drafted over the next few days, and that's an Action Item for Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch and Holly Raiche. I did not attend the bulk of the open GNSO session yesterday as I was in the ALAC Rules of Procedure meeting. I will review the records of the meeting and report on that on the agenda. Any questions or comments?" Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro for the transcript. We were also at the meeting and we just came; we apologize for coming late. There was some interesting dynamics in relation to the .com issue and also in relation to the review process. Clearly there was some distinct conflict of perceptions in relation to delaying and quickening the review process, which will of course impact the process in general. The other

comment I'd like to make is in relation to the trademark Clearinghouse session that was held.

One of the interesting things that was mentioned during the panel was that because the registrars were pushing for, they were saying "look we need to be consulted in relation to the consultancy reports," and so they were pacified when they were told that a working group would be created for the registrars. What was interesting is that nothing has been, I'm not sure, made perhaps a communique has been channeled to the ALAC, but in the event that there isn't we need to be in there monitoring and also putting our views forward, particularly in relation to the trademark clearinghouse processes and also the impact on pricing and how it's going to affect the ordinary global public interest. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Sala, and if I could just suggest perhaps that you coordinate with Alan to make sure this is done. Any other comments or questions? Okay, thank you. Now we have two other liaisons, we have the IDN liaison and we have the SSAC liaison. Both the IDN liaison and the SSAC liaison are in other meetings at the moment and what I suggest is that their reports will be put online for the ALAC to read in their own time. And that's also a good thing in the interest of our own timings here.

Okay so in a little reshuffle of our agenda, we will now proceed with votes; I believe we have quorum on the room. And I will require the assistance of my vice-Chairs, Carlton and Evan. We have two statements that we're going to vote on. Matt can we have the first

statement please? There's one on the language policy and there is one on the travel, FY13 travel. We'll start with the first one that's on your screen, whichever it is that you can reach faster. Language services is the first one, and I will have to resort to the...

I will resort to the screen that we have in front of us. Matt has also put a link in your Adobe. Okay, so the statement is three pages I understand, and the LACRALO statement is appended to the main statement. It would take probably too much time to read through this; we have discussed this earlier in our last meeting. There have been extensive contributions to this, and I do thank everyone who has contributed to the discussion and also thank Cheryl for leading this effort and also Sergio for having done a lot of work on that.

So the motion is to ratify this statement, so ratify the statement as posted, and you all have it on your screen. Could we have a proposer Evan, second Sala and Carlton? And if we could now proceed for a vote; only ALAC members, could you please...I see Heidi is having problems with names today. It's contagious. Carlton you are now called Rinalia. I'm really sorry Rinalia. So let's say it again – proposed by Evan, seconded by Carlton and by Sala. Could I please have all ALAC members who are in favor to put their hands up please? And keep their hand up while votes...

So could we...wait, read it.

Heidi Ullrich: This is Heidi. So those in favor are Eduardo, Rinalia, Sala, Carlton, Evan, Olivier, Jean-Jacques, Tijani and Yaovi. Not yet Olivier. I was questioning her.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So how many do we have?

Heidi Ullrich: Voting in favor are nine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Could I know have the abstentions?

Heidi Ullrich: Abstaining is Sandra.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And then could I have the votes against please?

Heidi Ullrich: Voting against is Sergio and Natalia.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Before you speak Tijani, I'd like to give a chance to Sergio and to Natalia and Sandra as well, if they wish to provide any information. Thank you.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Only I will speak on Natalia's behalf and on my behalf. I will wait for you to place your headsets on. So for the record, I am Sergio Salinas Porto. For the record. And Matt I will speak slowly, only that. In the meeting that we had in this city of Prague regarding this issue we expressed all we had to do regarding the document to be presented by ALAC. We submitted a document that was in ALAC and what we had to say there, we said it. And this has to do with the fact that for us it is a priority to have the possibility that persons, internet users, final users that are participated in the region have the possibility of expressing themselves in the language in which they were educated and not with a language that perhaps they did not have an access to.

We come from an emerging country and for that reason we highlighted the issues, such as having a minimum of two people to have interpretation and to be viable the possibility of having the same participation and representation of the final users as well as those from the academia. And this has to do fundamentally because those who could not have access to a higher education or educating in another country in another language. I represent; among LACRALO I represent final users, and some of them do not have secondary education. And they may not have the possibility of sitting at this table.

That's why we highlighted that ALAC has to be permeable to multi-linguism. Thanks to the understanding of the global internet community, Christina Rodriguez came with a presentation where it says that there will be six languages provided for the citizens of the world that speak those languages. And I think this is very good for our community. This is our position and we accompany that with the

document that was sent to the language services department. Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Sergio. Natalia, do you wish to add anything? No, okay. And Sandra, your abstention?

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, it's Sandra Hoferichter speaking for the transcript. I'll be very brief. I appreciate the input I could give to this document about putting effort into translating documents to provide a sort of balance for people who are not covered by the six UN languages or the languages that we are interpreting and translating right now. But the document from my perception goes not as far as I would wish it would go, but as I understood it was a process which has started before I joined ALAC and before I started to participate in this discussion.

I see that it would be a turnaround and it would and it would give a bad light on ALAC, such a turnaround, as I also received by Christina's message when she was here. I cannot agree with the document as it is, but I also don't like to object against it. I'm sorry. I hope I could make myself clear.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Sandra. And we just have room for one comment from Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: At the beginning I wanted to ask to our friends Sergio and Sandra to say something and now that they've said it I can tell them – Natalia, sorry – I understand completely their point of view and I want – can we say that the content of the statement...

[noise in microphone]

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay 1, 2, 3 – everybody hears me? Okay great. I wanted to say to Sergio and Natalia, are you against the content of the actual statement or do you think it's insufficient. What you proposed was not integrated. If this is the only reason, I think in the general we could do a comment in a comment to say "I'm not against the content of this statement, but something is missing; this and that is missing."

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We really have very little time. Oksana and you, so start with Sergio.

Sergio Salinas Porto: I am Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. It is very brief. Tijani, the fact is that this has not been contemplated. I don't know if it has been read. We sent it in English and it was translated by the translation service of ICANN. I don't know if it was read. It was submitted as a PDF file and it rested there. We proposed some things that are not in that document and they were not taken into consideration to include that; only to have them as an attachment, as an annex, as the opinion of LACRALO.

This was the submission of a collective; it was not an individual opinion, although I was the person that wrote it my RALO expressed in that sense. So for the bottom-up process, this should have been taken into account. Since it was not included, we are sending the final document of LACRALO that are not many issues against or different, but some issues that were not included, the ones that we wanted to see. Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Sergio; Oksana.

Oksana Prykhodko: Thank you very much Chair. It's a very short comment. On discussions we heard in Prague about formation of maybe a working group involving community for quality of translations of glossary of any information on material, especially in Russian. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this comment Oksana. I have been told that in the document, I've been reminded that further down the document there is a short paragraph which mentions the work of LACRALO and which is integrated in the main document. So it's not just an appendix, it is appended, but there's also a paragraph in the statement. If you wish I can read that specific paragraph.

"The ALAC appreciates the importance of an effective and efficient language service policy for an international organization using a multi-stakeholder, as ICANN does. Moreover, we further appreciate that

sectors within the ICANN community will use and benefit from this provision of services, more or less depending upon geography and need. An example of how important it is to a significant number of internet end users and domain name registrants is exemplified by the work done by our Latin American and Caribbean Islands Regional At-Large Organization, LACRALO, with a specific review and comments on the draft language services policy, which ALAC has received and is delegated to append as written.” Go ahead Sergion.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

We highlighted – this is Sergio Salinas Porto. We highlighted also the issue of the “three to two” as we said in the last four meetings that was never respected. That whenever we’re defined two then it said three and always the number three and no the number two that was defined in this table. We highlighted that and this was not taken up. Is that clear?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. Could I just have the final counts please, because I understand that Edmon has voted online. He’s made his vote known in the Adobe Connect, so I’d like to have the final counts please.

Matt Ashtiani:

This is Matt Ashtiani for the transcript record. For the ALAC statement on the draft ICANN language services policy and procedure statement, for “Yes” we have Edmon Chung, Eduardo Diaz, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro, Carlton Samuels, Evan Leibovitch, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Yaovi

Atohou. For “No” we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Natalia Enciso; abstaining we have Sandra Hoferichter. So 10 in favor, 2 against and 1 abstention.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. And can we now have in the chat the next statement that we have to vote on please? So I ask everyone to scroll back up, the next one if the At-Large public comment solicitation for FY13 community Travel Support guidelines. And the link to the workspace is on the Adobe Connect. Now again, this statement is, actually it’s just one page long, so perhaps this one can be read to the record, or not maybe.

Okay, so I’ll read this to the record. “On behalf of the...” The statement is the one that is actually in the PDF file, not the one on the – the PDF file is in the Wiki, but it’s not the text underneath that in Wiki type. So the correct text is the PDF file. There are three parts to it, they’re very short. I will read it to the record. “The concept of repurposing the funding allocated to 10 regional leaders towards regional assemblies has repeatedly been rejected by the ALAC for very well documented reasons.

Having regional leaders present at all ICANN meetings is absolutely necessary for the At-Large to be effective. Moreover it is incorrect to state that this is how the regional participation in Dakar and Cost Rica were funded. In both cases, separate funds were made available. These obsolete references in both sections 3 three and five should be removed. Number two, regarding how regional assemblies or summits should be funded, the ALAC is in ongoing dialogue with Senior ICANN

Financial Management. It is documented in section six on special requests.

Number three, regarding the concept of At-Large only requiring support during its startup, it has always been clear to all of those actually involved in At-Large that to withdraw Travel Support would effectively kill any semblance of At-Large and ALAC effectiveness. It is true that some have proposed lower or no funding, but that concept has never been implemented, nor should it be if ICANN wants to have the input of the world's internet user community." End of statement.

Any comments of feedback? Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Jean-Jacques Subrenat. A tiny point, item three, line three – delete “the” after “kill.”

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Has staff recorded this? Okay, could I have a proponent for this please? I see three, Eduardo, Jean-Jacques and Evan and Tijani as well. Well we can have seconders; some of these can be seconders. Eduardo is first so Eduardo proponents and seconds is Sergio and everyone else. Well everyone else as i.e. Tijani, Jean-Jacques and Evan. Okay, so all those in favor from the ALAC, would you please put your hand up?

Heidi Ullrich: Those in favor are Eduardo, Rinalia, Sala, Sergio, Carlton, Evan, Olivier, Jean-Jacques, Tijani, Sandra, Yaovi and Natalia.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay thank you. And let's find out if Edmon is as well.

Heidi Ullrich: Edmon has indicated that he is also in favor.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Anyone voting against, please raise your hand. I see no hands up. Anybody abstaining, please raise your hand now. Okay, so could we have the results please?

Matt Ashtiani: This is Matt Ashtiani for the transcript record. Voting in favor of this statement I have Eduardo Diaz, Salanieta Tamanikawaimaro, Sergio Salinas Porto, Carlton Samuels, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Evan Leibovitch, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sandra Hoferichter, Yaovi Atohou, Natalia Enciso and Edmon Chung.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Bearing in mind two members were not able to make it here that's unanimous. Tijani, you wanted to make a comment?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Just to say that since we're talking about Travel Support and Steve Antonoff. We had a meeting, it was in the program and he came with his staff. We are too to participate in this meeting, it was to Dave and myself, Alan came at the end of the meeting. I believe that when we

are scheduling the meeting like that we need a minimum of participation because I was feeling terrible that we were only two participating in this meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yaovi?

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi, I agree with Tijani. How was this information with regards to this meeting was sent? Was it the same as daily notices? It's really to...I would like to know if there was notification because it's too bad that not a lot of people attended.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: ...from staff. It's Olivier speaking, and it looks there was no reminder specifically sent out from At-Large staff. Now outside, I'm not aware. Okay, so I have to – oh Dev, just a few words?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh. The meeting was published on the ICANN Prague schedule, but as Tijani said even I was surprised that is was literally only me and Tijani in attendance, nobody else was attending until Alan came towards the end.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much Dev. So both statements that we have dealt with this morning are ratified and will be submitted to the public comment process as soon as staff has five minutes to be able to do that.

Entering the room is Rod Beckstrom, President and CEO; welcome Rod and thanks for coming to see us on this, well is that your last day in ICANN or at least meeting of the, well maybe not last meeting...

Rod Beckstrom: It's my last day in a pseudo remote office. I mean I'm legally on the hook until Sunday at noon UTC, to be precise. But tomorrow is a travel day, as I head off, so this is my last in the ICANN team and community.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And it's your last meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee and the Regional Leaderships.

Rod Beckstrom: That's right.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So the floor is yours.

Rod Beckstrom: Thank you very much Olivier, and thank you all the leaders of ALAC for your incredible work. And by the way, this is the one ICANN community that I'm a member of and will remain, because I'm a member of the San Francisco Bay ISOC Chapter, which is an At-Large structure. So you are my touch point going forward. And my leadership. No, that's good; it's a very good thing. I'm in good hands and I appreciate all your leadership. But congratulations to you on completing another really

busy productive week. I understand you've had 21 meetings in total. That sounds almost as bad as my schedule, if that's possible.

No, a lot that you've done, extremely productive here. And since I've been here I've just been really impressed at your professionalism and the continuous improvements that you're making. And I've noted, for example, that actually, I made a statement the other day, but now I'm reading that you've submitted 40 statements in 2011 and more than 20 statements to date on policy issues to the Board. And I'm also extremely pleased to hear how you continue to improve that process within your own community in terms of getting the five regions to participate and submit their materials; that somehow you miraculously work through and synthesize probably with just smiles on everyone's faces and deep spirit of collaboration.

But it's really great to see ALAC focusing on that level of performance and integration across the world. And as I did say the other day, it is so vital that you bring a voice to the silent individual internet users, in terms of many of them are not here and not active in ICANN and you're giving them a voice and you're making sure that their perspective on issues is concerned. And that is a vital role for appropriate balance of the multi-stakeholder model that ICANN represents. A model that's imperfect will always be imperfect, but it constantly evolving and can be improved. And I think that your improvements help ICANN to improve.

I also want to congratulate you on the ALAC At-Large Improvements Implementation Project, which is yet another accomplishment for Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Where is Cheryl? Is she sitting here?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: She's so busy she didn't leave her cardboard cutout behind. She's in the ccNSO meetings and other working groups that she's involved with.

Rod Beckstrom: Fine. Well then congratulations to the rest of you, please take credit for her work because she's not here. And I know, I'm sure it was a collaborative effort of so many people. And also, I understand you have a second project going on which is the RALO capacity building sessions. And I understand these sessions took place in Dakar with the AFRALO At-Large structure reps, and also in Costa Rica with the LACRALO At-Large structure reps. And I know there was some very heated discussions I heard in Costa Rica, but that's good too. That's part of the healthy growing pains of a community that's working through issues and seeking to have a greater integration.

And I thank the RALO leadership for ensuring that these capacity building sessions continue to have a lasting impact. And finally, I'd like to thank the ICANN community for developing initiative of the ICANN Pilot Leadership training, formally known as the ICANN Academy that's intended for the new coming leaders within the ICANN community, including Board members and AC SO leadership. So that's another excellent initiative.

So, it's been an honor and pleasure to be one of your members way down in the system, and it's been an honor and a pleasure to serve you as CEO. And I'm looking forward to finishing my responsibilities on Sunday and being a free man again. But much enriched by this opportunity to serve you, and I do feel that collectively we can feel proud of many of the accomplishments that we've made. And as always

there will be plenty of work in the future and plenty of room for improvement.

But thank you again, thank you for the incredible amounts of time that each of you put into this effort. It really makes a difference. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Rod. And I can also announce that the SIC has recommended for the improvements report to now be put to the Board for final approval. So it's the end of the ALAC At-Larger improvement cycle, which lasted so many years we can't even count them, but which certainly has made a great impact in our community, a positive impact as well. Any questions or comments? Jean-Jacques, Evan – Jean-Jacques first.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Hi Rod, it's nice to see you. I hesitate to say welcome to the group but you announced yourself that that would be your connection with ICANN. If I may ask for a high level view of your experience here as far as the user community is concerned. We felt, on our side, that some of the sticking points, which remain and which really need improvement is the actual means of participation. I don't mean remote participation or all that, I mean funding. Funding in order to allow us to attend a certain number of things both inside ICANN but also outside – IGF, not crowds, but selected people who can really bring added value to that.

So I'd like to get from you a sense of why that was difficult, and perhaps seek your advice on what should we do from now on in order to gain

that, not legitimacy, but perhaps that visibility which would then entitle us to the proper level of funding. Thank you.

Rod Beckstrom:

That's a good question. I know that the financial planning process each year and the budget planning process each year from the organizational standpoint and staff standpoint is challenging because the requests exceed the amount of dollars that are there and most groups do seek additional Travel Support and funding. I think that you just have to keep communicating, keep the pressure on, keep making sure you're participating in the strategic planning sessions early and often, and weighing in regularly with comments for example during the comment period on the budget. You've got 144 chapters or something out there and countless thousands of members and they certainly have an opportunity to I think make your case.

I'm not sure what beyond that I would specifically recommend. I mean you've got other opportunities like the public forum and other places, but I would just say communicate, communicate, communicate to share your case and seek what you can get. I think that there will be continued growth in the core operations of ICANN. You've got the normal growth in the gTLD registrations that lead to the growing of the overall budget probably within the next two years. Certainly we all hope there will be new delegations going into the root from the new gTLDs.

So there will be some incremental constant growth in the basic core finances of the organization and clearly you're an important

constituency group, advisory committee that should be seeking your fair piece. So I wish you very well with that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Rod. Yes we're not a constituency, we're an advisory committee. We can comment on everything and anything.

Rod Beckstrom: That's right. I know you're not a constituency. I meant that in a very generic sense clearly.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We're your nosey neighbor basically. Next on the list is Evan, Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there Rod. And I'm absolutely looking forward to your participation in some of our working groups now that you're a part of ALAC. You bring some shall we say very, very good input into what we're doing. And to take that a step further, now that you've been involved at the top of ICANN and you've seen us trying to get the attention of ICANN, trying to get on the radar, trying to get our policies in play, is there something you can tell us in terms of going forward? What can we do better in terms of style, in terms of tactics, in terms of what would be your advice based on the history that you've seen that would make us more effective in getting the voice of the end user heard within ICANN? And I invite you to be blunt.

Rod Beckstrom:

That's a good question. I don't have any specific recommendations. You can go take something from the notes of "Occupy" perhaps. I mean there's a lot of interesting movements out there. I actually always wondered if I was going to come to a meeting and see a set of tents up front. Then I joked to someone else to, I think ICANN already is Occupied. But I think that it has been interesting to see the evolution and social movements, whether it's Tea Party movement or Occupy movement or the Arab Spring. It's kind of the era of people organizing online and in the physical world to strongly express their views.

And I think you might want to think about that; what possibilities that you might have. And of course I think one of the most fascinating movements that we've seen in the last year was the anti-SOPA movement that Jimmy Wales really led. And by the way, Jimmy Wales deserves credit for inspiring Music Night at ICANN. A little side note but it relates to our culture and how we all connect. But Jimmy personally took me to a Wikipedia Music Evening, they don't call them Music Night. And they had not only an open mic but a play along band. So people from the Wikipedia community could play along.

And Jimmy was explaining to me, he said "Rod the reason" – this is before I took the job; this was in my previous role. And he said "The reason we do this share music is that there's so much conflict in the community with people fighting over articles and editing, there's a lot of tension in each of these local communities, and we find a common humanity when we get together and we dance and we sing." And so I

had that experience with Jimmy at a Wikipedia evening in San Francisco, probably about six months before I took this job.

And then when I was hired at ICANN and I knew how tough this community could be, I said “We need Music Night.” So that’s why we first experimented with Music Night in Seoul. And I remember people saying “What are you doing? Why are you doing this? We don’t do music. This is an internet and policy coordination body.” But I said “Yeah, but it’s a lot of great human beings and we need to have that sharing too.” So Jimmy shared Wikipedia’s practices with me, and that was one of the things I had an opportunity to bring here.

So in a similar note Evan, I would say I’d be looking at other – and so that activism that they did with the Wikipedia blackout led to 10 million letters coming in to US leaders and the whole country politically, or those that had been behind SOPA spun like a dime. So I don’t know, I would think about that a little bit. What symbolic actions can you take or organizing actions that might be different or new in addition to all the good efforts and approaches you use already.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: I think Rod you have already a tent and a bike, so go ahead.

Rod Beckstrom: You’re right, I do.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Perhaps Rod could we put you in charge of the working group that would look at this?

Rod Beckstrom: You know I will tell you I am going on a bit of an ICANN sabbatical so.

Evan Leibovitch: Well when you come back there's an Occupy Working Group waiting for you to step in.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Next in the queue is Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Thank you. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcripts, aka Sala. I'd just like to publically acknowledge the excellent work that you've done over the years Rod. And in this brief time that I've joined ICANN, what I've seen in you is the fact that you're very global in your approach and how you relate to people. I was very impressed with how you spoke in Spanish at San Jose, and just your collegiality. And I also recognize that ICANN, as an experiment in multi-stakeholder-ism is not your ordinary beast to manage. And just delving in the complex politics and managing the risks and whatever not was difficult in itself.

Having been corporate counsel myself I recognize the internal challenges and external challenges. And so I would say "Rock on Rod." And also, I very much look forward, you know when you made that statement that you were going to be part of the At-Large community I was so excited because of the extent of the technical knowledge, the resource that you will bring to the community. It will only enhance our

work. And with that, I'd like to say thank you very much and kudos and we love you.

Rod Beckstrom:

Thank you. Thank you. That lifts my heart and I appreciate that enormously. It's been a great honor and a tremendous amount of work and it's challenging, this has got to be one of the more, or if not the most challenging organizations on the planet to lead. And quite appropriate given the book I wrote on leaderless organizations, because *The Starfish and The Spider*, the subtitle is something about leaderless organizations. I'm blanking out right now. Oh *The Unstoppable Power of Leaderless Organizations*. And I think ICANN has an unstoppable power. And ICANN both needs a leader and needs a CEO and doesn't want one and you have to live with that dichotomy and many others, which I think is fine. And some time I'll probably share more thoughts on sort of the management philosophy I brought to it and how my management philosophy evolved in trying to work with and understand balancing the counter veiling forces to try to find the sweet spot.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Rod. There's one more question, and so far we've only asked nice ones, so now for the hard hitting one we have Carlton Samuels. The last one is always the...

Rod Beckstrom:

I sit on the member side now.

Carlton Samuels:

Alright, you have a friend here. For the record, it's Carlton Samuels for the record. Even my colleague anticipated my question and asked it on my behalf, and I listened keenly to what you recommended so it's just left for me to say to you that my personal thanks for the work you've done and the leadership that you've provided. I got the sense since I've been around since about 2007 that we all have detractors, but in my opinion you have moved the ball further up the field. A lot of it is grinding work and you know how that works. Sometimes you don't see the immediacy of the action, in the immediacy of the action you sometimes miss sight of the achievement.

And you should take courage to know that some of us believe that an immense amount of work has been done and significant achievement has taken place in this organization from your leadership, you were at the helm and you should take credit for that. Thank you.

Rod Beckstrom:

Well thank you Carlton. You're extremely kind. And as you know, the reality is it's all teamwork. And it's the incredible efforts of the community and incredible time and effort of the Board and the staff, the staff at ICANN I'll tell you works so incredibly hard and we're so lucky to have them. And I often viewed one of my most important jobs was defending them or helping to create the space so they could do the great work that they could do and get the internal support they needed within the organization. And boy have they done that, so let's give a huge hand to them if we can.

So thank you, I appreciate that. And you know, as I shared my opening remarks, it's an honor and a pleasure to serve an organization like this

and the learning experience is just incredible. And I'm very pleased Akram is going to be stepping in on July 1st to help lead this organization forward; that was my strong recommendation that that take place and it will stretch him in new ways too, which is good. And please support him and please support Fadi who I hope will come on October 1st or whatever date. It's a tough job and your support really counts.

But I just hope to see, and I congratulate all of you again on the great progress you've made here and I'm honored to be one of your members. But thank you for your wonderful, gracious, kind remarks Carlton and all of you that I appreciate so much, I do. It means a lot to me. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Rod. And I know you might not miss ICANN, but we're absolutely sure you will miss At-Large, and remember, the door is always open in At-Large, so you would be welcome when you feel that you can come back to this crazy skillet of a place.

Rod Beckstrom:

Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay. And as much as I know many of us want to leave as well, unfortunately we still have more things to do. Over to Alan Greenberg, perhaps to discuss the .com statement. Oh yes, in between actually I know that we have missed the RALO reports for the meeting. What I suggest, due to the amount of time that we have is for these to be

posted and then they will be discussed. Is that okay with you RALO leaders? I see one, two, Wolf okay? Wolf you look puzzled yes, sorry?

Wolf Ludwig:

Sorry. Wolf Ludwig for the record. Just one question. We just wrote an annual report on EURALO which really includes the final information which was submitted to our General Assembly and I think this report would be useful as a RALO report. And it makes no sense at all in my opinion to write anything new.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay thank you Wolf. What I suggest actually, because I do want everyone here to read what the RALOs do, is when they all are posted to send a reminder to the list. And I really want to the ALAC to read those because the work of our RALOs is vitally important in our growth and in our scalability. It's really important that us as ALAC know what is going on in our region, and not only in our region, in the other regions as well. No need to just read your own regions report, read the other ones as well. And we've got the tools for that, they can be translated etc, so this has to be done.

Okay, so the next thing, the .com – I'll pass the floor over to Alan for this please.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. Just as a prefix, it's not clear whether the GNSO will in fact pass that statement today. I suspect it will be deferred for discussion on the list and probably passed at a later time. I can't guarantee it of

course, but I'm not sure that that's a reason for us not taking any action today. There have been a number of comments – should I go over the substance or presume everyone's read it. Okay, the issue is following:

The .com agreement was up for renewal the end of this year. There was a comment period, we submitted a comment. The substance of our comment was we like a lot of the provisions, we regret that they did not do Thick WHOIS, most of the other things we had no comments on whatsoever. There were a lot of comments on this comment period, far more than there normally are. And they were summarized pretty well in the summary report, and pretty much everything was addressed with an explanation of why they weren't doing it or some alternative, so we weren't expecting a lot of changes.

However, the staff did put the .com agreement on the forum agenda for today. It's still there last time I looked for the 20 minute session. Therefore some of us were rather surprised to hear that the Board approved, ratified the contract last Saturday. Now it was known that it was going to be on their agenda, their agenda is published ahead of time and it did say .com agreement. The presumption was there would be discussion on it, not necessarily passing it. And in this time, when there is so much criticism of ICANN and transparency is so important, to say we're going to listen carefully to your comments on Thursday and approve the agreement the previous Saturday is shocking perhaps.

Now admittedly they did listen to all the comments and they did address the comments, so it's not clear there would have been a lot of new things. But in that case it didn't warrant a slot on the forum agenda. So the combination of those I find quite inappropriate, the

optics of it are poor and I think we should comment. There have been a few comments on the list saying we should take this opportunity to twist the knife saying “you didn’t put WHOIS in and we asked for it”; I think that would be a strategic error.

It’s something we asked for, we didn’t get it, this is not the appropriate time to whine and say we really wanted it. It’s too late to change first of all, second of all there was a rationale, there is a GNSO PDP already initiated on the subject, and I think the power of this statement, if we make it at all, is in we’re talking about accountability and transparency, not we didn’t get what we wanted, or not WHOIS is not structured the way we wanted to be. So I feel very strongly that if we put the two together we are better off not saying anything, because I think we’re going to water down an important statement with a complaint, and I don’t think that’s appropriate. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan. So we have a queue, there’s Sala and then Holly. First Sala.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcripts. In relation to what Alan just said, I would like to agree with what Alan just said. I think it’s critical that we keep the issues narrow, stick to the accountability transparency argument. And also in relation to the statement, I would suggest that we invoke the Affirmation of Commitment, particularly 9.1.2 on accountability and transparency, and remind the Board that

they're obliged to at least hold public consultations in relation to the matter, or at least to be seen to be transparent.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Sala. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Just to be clear, they did hold public consultations. They held a comment period, they held a comment period which was very well addressed and they answered it responsibly and reported on it responsibly. So I don't think it's an issue of consultation. I think it's purely a matter of optics of them sending a very direct message that it is still on the table for discussion, but approving it ahead of time. So I'm not sure we need to mention the Affirmation of Commitments, invoking the words accountability and transparency I think do that automatically, but I'm not particularly, I don't object to that, but I wouldn't imply they didn't consult. They did, and I think they did properly.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Well we need to let other people speak as well Sala. Holly Raiche.

Holly Raiche: Thank you. This is really a point of clarification. What was in the draft agreement was not that they omitted WHOIS, it's simply they said WHOIS, a Thick WHOIS will be required pending some technical examination about the possibility of it. So what was in the draft agreement was a "we will do this after a public comment about how we

will do that.” Now if that hasn’t been changed I don’t have a problem because it was always going to be we will talk, we will work through this. And if that’s what they’re doing, then I’m very comfortable. If they have actually omitted that bit from the contract then I’m not comfortable.

Alan Greenberg: There were no changes from the draft. There is no question that VeriSign is required to implement it should it become consensus policy and there is an ongoing PDP to look at.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. And since the clock is ticking, Alan I’ve seen a lot of support here. There’s also support on the Adobe Connect from Edmon as well who agrees with your approach, and I’ve seen people around the table nodding to that affect. So we’ll leave it in your hands to proceed forward.

Alan Greenberg: I can’t proceed forward. I’m not on ALAC. If ALAC wants someone to move the motion and have it approved, it’s your call. I can’t take any further action unless you want me to redraft the statement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay right, so let’s accept the motion then, but we have to create a motion first and I don’t have the exact text.

Alan Greenberg: I can read it for you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay please Alan. It is there now.

Alan Greenberg: As soon as I find it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I've got it so I'll do it. So the motion is as follows: "the At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to express its disappointment with the Boards decision to meet in a closed session on Saturday 23rd of June to adopt the draft .com, as in punct com, renewal agreement." I'm not going to read the full length of the page. "And that ICANN staff had placed this on the Thursday public forum agenda some time ago and the .com renewal item remains on the public forum agenda today," perhaps we should change that to today.

"So today the 28th of June 2012. Although we were aware that the .com agreement was on the Boards agenda, we were not aware of the intent to approve the agreement at its closed session. This comment is not in regard to the merit of the Boards action. The ALAC finds the process followed by the Board to be objectionable at a time when ICANN is subject to increased scrutiny. It is therefore imperative that the Board hold itself to the highest standards of transparency and accountability that it is mandated to uphold." Comment from Holly?

Holly Raiche: I'm not sure I'm allowed to comment, but I think that should better articulate what the problem is and it doesn't. The problem is that on the 23rd you made a decision and on the 28th you said you were actually going to discuss it. So I think the statement needs to be a bit clearer. The problem is simply that there was an appearance of listening to people and in fact an intention that you didn't, a fait accompli that you didn't. And that's not articulated in there.

Alan Greenberg: I will quickly redraft and send it to the group before the end of this meeting, which is in 15 minutes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Indeed yes, 15 minutes. Okay will you just add a line of change it completely?

Alan Greenberg: I'm going to change as a few words as possible to say what she said.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so next, in the meantime, I'm going to give the floor over to Evan. We do have statements that we are making here, but there are also, as you know this afternoon there is a large public comment session. The statements that might be made by our community, we do not have time to ratify; there are many, many of them and I don't expect everyone to read through those and make their direct choices on whether they want to support them or not. What we do want though is broad support

from here for these statements to be read by several individuals. Evan, shall I pass the floor to you? Go ahead Evan.

Evan Leibovitch:

Thank you Olivier. In both the Adobe Connect room and on the At-Large Skype chat I've sent the link to a Google Document that has the work that has been undertaken by a number of people to create statements on the public forum on three different issues. And at the top of each subject are essentially the subject leads that were intended to actually make the statement. What I'm hoping to do here at this meeting is to try and get a sense of whether or not these views are commonly shared as we go forward to state them, whether we have to say them on our own behalf, or whether or not we're expressing a view of a consensus of the group here.

I didn't think an explicit vote was needed on these things, but we're trying to get a sense of whether or not these are generally held statements. So what I was going to do was have the three specific subjects in turn read by the people that were going to raise the issues and take questions, make changes as necessary and then determine whether or not you think it's better to read these in the public forum, submit them in writing into the forum that's been allocated or both.

Anyway the first one is to do with gTLD prioritization and I'll hand this over to Carlton.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you Evan. Carlton Samuels for the record. This is a statement that we're trying to put together especially our IDN community, and it

reads as follows: “The At-Large community notes with concern ICANNs challenges regarding the safe processing of hundreds and hundreds of gTLD applications. Generally there is not much interest by the end user community in how all these applications are prioritized, with two exceptions. We note the small number of IDN TLD applications and request that those without variant related issues be placed at the top of whatever evaluation processing mechanism, if any is eventually chosen.

Having more IDNs to us is a critical improvement to the name space that needs to happen as soon as possible. We also request expedited treatment of applications that qualify for applicant support, as they demonstrate both community relevance and geographic diversity.” That is the extent of the statement we would wish to put on the record in the public forum. Comments?

Evan Leibovitch:

There is also one addition to this. The terms “those without variant related” is actually in square brackets at the request of Edmon who has asked that that particular part be deleted and that we simply ask for all the IDNs and not just say IDNs that don’t have a variant issue with it. Edmon’s point, and I hope to express his rationale properly, is that given the way that the processing is taking place is that by the time these are actually churned through that we expect the variant issues to be dealt with and this becomes a non-issue. So both sides have been expressed.

With the consent here we can take out that part within the square brackets and just say “all IDN applications” and not just the ones unencumbered by variant issues. Tijani?

Carlton Samuels: Yes, just to say that I'm noting that Edmon did speak to me about that and we're happy with it on his recommendation. Tijani, sorry about that sir.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I 100% support this statement, but I would like to add to it the priority of applications coming from the regions in which the web industry is very poor. I mean as you have seen for example there is only 17 applications from Africa. So what I want to add to it, we put two things here; we put the IDN and we put the support. If we can add to that "applications from regions like Africa," developing countries like America and Africa.

Carlton Samuels: Evan, are you taking notes? So let me just say this Tijani and this would be the second – you want us to extend the second sentence and note the small applications, number of applications from emerging or developing countries; that's the term we would like to use here.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes and adding them to those who will get priorit.

Carlton Samuels: And we want them to prioritize those too; that's the statement. Everybody got it? Tijani is suggesting that in the second sentence, which begins "we note the small number of IDN TLD applications," he

wants us to make and we also say applications for applicant support. He wants us to add to that statement “recognize the small number of applications from emerging economies and request that those also be in the priority list for evaluation.” Did I get it right Tijani? That’s the point. We have a clarification or objection? Come on, this is an open – please.

Louis Houle: For the record, Louis Houle, ISOC Quebec, member of ALAC also somehow. I don’t participate that much. I don’t think that we need to add that to the whatever you call it, the statement sorry. They must all be in, they must all be accepted, prioritized. All of them. No exception. For any reason we shouldn’t agree that those geographic and cultural and even IDNs shouldn’t be prioritized. This is my point.

Carlton Samuels: So no prioritization at all?

Louis Houle: All of them must be accepted as soon as possible.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: What wording do you propose?

Louis Houle: The wording? Well I guess that’s what I just simply said.

Gisella Gruber: Sorry, we need the microphone and names please, thank you.

Carlton Samuels: I am so sorry. Carlton Samuels for the record. I'm trying to get clarification on what the member is saying here. You are actually, am I understanding you correctly to say that you would instead say "all 1900 TLDs be prioritized?"

Louis Houle: What I say is that culture, geography, small IDNs, big IDNs whatsoever, those ones community – I think the key words there are the following: community, geographic, IDNs with no problem with the string whatsoever and there's, I missed one, municipalities.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, so you're expanding the list. Okay.

Louis Houle: Yeah, four items.

Carlton Samuels: Alright, thank you very much. This is Carlton Samuels for the record. I think I understand. What the member is saying now is that in addition to the insertion that Tijani has supported, he's actually supporting an extension to the prioritized list, and he wants to add community TLDs and those associated with cultural groups, linguistic cultural groups be prioritized for evaluation. That's what the member is saying. That's what's on the table now. Chair, you have the Chair.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay thank you. We still have, I have a list here, Holly is next and Yaovi has raised his hand afterwards.

Holly Raiche: This is really by way of question, is there enough in an application to make a distinction between culture, which might mean some very well heeled, very popular, very able to look after itself art gallery as opposed to a small culture? I mean I'm not sure whether we actually want something as broad as culture. I think what we've got now is what we were supporting, which is IDNs. We have got from emerging economies, and I can understand those two. I'm not sure that we can draw sufficiently clearly lines around what you're also arguing for so that we could support that.

I'm just; is it possible to make those kinds of distinctions easily so that it's a distinct group as opposed to letting in some people we don't want to?

Louis Houle: Louis Houle ISOC Quebec for the record. There is three kinds of TLDs – culture, language and regional ones. The second one is anew gTLD group - .sport, .info, .home, .family and there is a third one, brand names. That's it. What I suggest is that this is the order that you have to work on the new TLDs, approve them and put them on the root as soon as possible, when they're accepted. That's all I propose. And what I add to that is that all of them, especially the two first groups if they are accepted, they have to be put in the root as soon as possible.

They represent communities, real people, linguistic concerns, developing countries, most of them when you look at them. So I think that if we are an internet community this is what we have to propose and prioritize.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. The debate is going on, just Evan and Yaovi and I think we need to get a move on on this.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. Louie there are two issues. Number one is we've been working on this for a long time; this particular issue including whether or not to include community into this prioritization has been ongoing in At-Large for some time. And it's been considered and there are a number of reasons why we did not explicitly include community applications into this. And part of this happens to be with the way ICANN has narrowly defined what a community application is. ICANN makes no distinction between a cultural community and Audi owners.

So we basically discussed this and because of the way in which ICANN has defined what a community application is, we didn't feel that this entire group, and they make no distinction internally between Audi owners and cultural groups, so we decided that IDNs were absolutely poorly underserved and needed to be there. And the applicant support issues, because of such a small numbers of applicants from developing economies, we believe that those two elements required more prioritization than even all of the others.

I'm simply giving the response in the fact that this has been debated in some length within the At-Large community, up to and including today.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Louis Houle.

Louis Houle: Thank you. When the whole venture started a few years ago I would have agreed with what you are saying today. There has been some evolution. We've learned that there would be a big amount of new TLDs. We didn't know what kind of priorities ICANN would select, would be made. We didn't know the mechanism that would be used. But there is one thing that we know today, is that the preoccupation that you just mentioned could be treated more globally because technically it's possible to add more to the root rapidly than what has been previously observed or commented by ICANN.

So this is why I think that we could accept to enlarge a little bit our views on what has to be prioritized. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Louis, I think the point has been made quite clearly. Now we move to Yaovi and then we'll get moving.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi speaking and I think Louis started maybe asking what I want to be clarified. It's just to know the impact of the prioritization of the process giving some priority to some TLD; the impact on the final result that will

be announced. So that is what I want to understand, the impact of you give priority to some of the TLDs it's very important to understand that. The process – while suggesting that priorities should be given to some TLDs. In that process of reviewing the applications or processing the applications, so my question is to know the impact of how some of the TLD processing priority.

Carlton Samuels:

Carlton Samuels for the record. Thank you Yaovi for the question and this is now my understanding of what we're asking. We're saying that we want to have a priority for certain applications to get into the chute for processing first. Hopefully what happens is that they come out at the other end first. Now when they come out of the other end they are candidates into the root, which means that they become active and people can actually find them someplace. But that is not to say that we are 100% sure when they will enter the root. It's just that they would be eligible from the time that they are outside the end of that evaluation process to enter that root, but there are some other things, business reasons, whatever that might detain them from entering the root.

So we can't be so sure what the end process is beyond saying they are available for entry to the root.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Carlton. Just I want you all to bear in mind we have spent more time on this specific point than any other point during our wrap-up. We also have to bear in mind that we might be wasting our time

here because there are some serious discussions taking place outside of these walls to have everything in one go. There is serious opposition to batching from many parts of the community. So we might just be going around in circles. I have to leave unfortunately. I will vote yes to Alan, having seen the modifications that he's made. And so my vote will be positive. I'm going to pass the Chair over to Evan for the remainder of this meeting.

Evan Leibovitch:

Could I ask one thing? Could you have a look at the statements in your meeting online and just convey either in a chat or Adobe your feeling on them?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well I think I'll be away from the computer for the time unfortunately, however I have read the statements as they were being drafted, well I read them yesterday I hope that they haven't changed too much. Okay. The yes that I was saying is to Alan's statement and comment that's on the screen. To be clear it was not a massive no to the others that you're going to work on in the next 20 minutes. You have by the way 20 minutes, or barely 20 minutes to finish this meeting, 15 minutes now. Thank you, now over to you Evan.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay. We have two other statements to go through and the second one has to do with – okay, so we'll move this up. Alan has sent in the revised wording, okay. Alan did you want to read into the record the statement?

Alan Greenberg:

“The At-Large Advisory Committee wishes to express its disappointment with the Boards decision to meet in a closed session on Saturday the 23rd of June to adopt the draft .com renewal agreement” – URL is provided to the Boards resolution. “ICANN staff has placed this topic on the Thursday 28th of June public forum agenda some time ago and the .com renewal item remains on the public forum topic list. Although we were aware that the .com agreement was on the Boards agenda, we were not aware of the intent to approve the agreement at its closed session.

This comment is not with regard to the merits of the Boards action, nor of the comment – should be nor to the content of the .com agreement. The process followed by the Board is objectionable at a time when ICANN is subject to increased scrutiny. To give the impression that the Board is interested in additional community comment, but then take a decision five days earlier is not appropriate. It is imperative that the Board hold itself to the highest standards of transparency and accountability that it is mandated to uphold.”

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay I see a nod from Holly that that very well incorporates her suggestions, so I’d like to move very quickly on taking this to a vote. Can we get someone to move to adopt this? I see Carlton, Jean-Jacques seconding, Tijani seconding. Okay, all in favor, ALAC members please raise your hands.

Heidi Ullrich: We have Eduardo, Rinalia, Sala, Sergio, Carlton, Evan, Jean-Jacques, Tijani, Sandra, Yaovi and Natalia. And Olivier, we have that noted.

Evan Leibovitch: And Edmon online?

Heidi Ullrich: And Edmon is in favor.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, any against? Any abstentions? Okay I have that as unanimous then. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: For staffs knowledge, the first sentence of the third paragraph I was trying to correct on the fly is “nor on the content of the .com agreement”; so “of” should become “on,” the first “of.”

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. So next we need to move on to the statements for the public forum. Since these are not going to put to a vote, essentially what I’d like to do is just get them read out and if you have comments or suggestions on how to modify them between now and the public forum please come to the authors and we can deal with that later. So what I’d just like to do is have them read into the record as they are now by the people who will be presenting them. And then from then if there’s comments we can take that offline after the meeting because we’re not

taking these to a vote. Is that acceptable to everyone? Okay, so I'm going to go first.

The one on the gTLD prioritization has already been read. The second one has to do with contractual compliance and is the result of a couple of interesting meetings we've had and right now the person slated to read that is myself with a lot of participation from people including Garth Bruen who I want to note for his contributions. It has been a real task to put this under the two minute allotment for the public forum.

"At-Large participants in this meeting have been severely disappointed at the results of multiple meetings we've had with staff in relation to ICANNs ability to enforce its own contracts. In advance of this meeting ALAC submitted numerous well documented examples of identified breaches that have either fallen through the cracks or come to a dead stop. This work represents many hours of volunteer time, however the answers we received to these and other matters were incomplete, contradictory and in some cases evasive.

To call the engagement unsatisfactory would be an understatement. Our concern is enhanced by the introduction of many hundreds of new TLDs as candidates for oversight. On the evidence it is extremely difficult to have confidence in ICANNs ability to enforce its new gTLD contracts when it is unable to adequately enforce the less than two dozen gTLDs that already exist. This is not just about contract enforcement, it's a core matter of ICANNs accountability, transparency and public trust.

Upon extensive investigation and research, At-Large has concluded that Clause 3.7.8 of the RAA, even in its proposed new form, does not and

cannot enable sufficient enforcement to serve the public interest. To this end, and conscious of the draft language in the “new RAA under negotiation,” the ALAC show a proposed new wording for 3.7.8. We hasten to caution that simply throwing more bodies at compliance will not bridge gaps in public trust, especially if ICANN continues to be seen as allowing bad actors to conduct business as usual even after being called out.

On Tuesday ALAC encountered what seemed to many a surprising statement by ICANN legal staff. We were told in very specific terms that ICANN is not” – okay, Garth has been changing this one me – “that ICANN does not provide regulatory function.”

Beau Brendler: Excuse me, it’s Beau for the record. That was me. I was just correcting a quote.

Evan Leibovitch: Actually I read the mp3 from the meeting Beau, so the original wording was exactly what they said.

Carlton Samuel: Yeah it’s very important that we say it exactly and it’s even more powerful that they use that term. She actually said...

Evan Leibovitch: Beau I listened to the recording and exactly what Samantha said was “ICANN does not have regulatory authority”; that is exactly what she said.

[background conversation]

Evan Leibovitch: Anyway, if we can deal with this after the meeting to try and refine these words, I mean it’s subtle, but it can be powerful if expressed properly. “Such a posture does no service to ICANNs public image and raises the issue of what organizations function and identity is; most specifically in the area of contract management. More to the point, it forces us to reconsider whether the compliance department has any value at all. ICANN has some substantial work ahead to gain public trust in this regard.” Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the record. First of all I would like to say that I disagree with the content of this statement for these reasons. I think that ICANN compliance conducted its explanations to the best of their ability and it made rationale and legal sense as far as I was concerned. They’re not regulators, one. And in relation to the enforcement issue, that’s a challenge that exists that we need to work together with compliance to identify probably solutions, however that works.

And I know that CZNIC during the opening ceremony, they had sort of even mentioned that they had jurisdiction over .com, aside from .cz. And I think the reason why ICANN compliance swayed that way is because they know the minute you say that you're a regulator you step on, you're exceeding your jurisdiction and you're stepping on GAC territory and government regulatory bodies. So the use of ALAC in that statement, I am one ALAC member that disagrees. I apologize but that's just my position. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, so noted. And in response I would simply say that in the question and answer session that we had with compliance, we had presented a number of very concrete examples of contracted parties that had breached their obligations and ICANN did not act upon them in any way. That gives a message to other contracted parties that the contract that they signed really has absolutely no weight and that the public interest is not served by the fulfillment of this contract. That was the concern. Alan?

Alan Greenberg:

Evan, the concern you just raised is completely valid and I don't think you'll find many people who will disagree with you. Using the quotation from the ICANN attorney, ICANN legal counsel that ICANN is not a regulator will make us look silly and foolish. You are just asking; by ending with that, you are giving on a silver platter the opportunity for the Board or their legal counsel to come back with a retort saying "We're not a regulator, regulation in law is a completely different thing

rom what we are. We are not a regulator. We do not regulate. We may do things that are comparable...”

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, can I suggest since we’re running out of time – Carlton quickly, but what I’d like to do perhaps is get together Alan and Carlton and Beau and myself afterwards and see if we can find a nuanced version of this wording that brings the point across. Carlton, quickly.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, this is Carlton Samuels for the record. There’s two things. Alan would be right in saying what he says, and I actually am sensitive to Sala’s concerns, but the wording, and that is why I said it’s important to use the wording that the staff used. She says “ICANN does not have regulatory authority” – regulatory authority; she didn’t say they were regulators, she said we don’t have regulatory authority.

The contract is the means by which ICANN is enabled to perform a public interest. And however you want to say it, and this is why I think it’s powerful to use her exact words, which is “regulatory authority.” Then something is missing from what is supposed to do; that is the business of this community. To show that some of the things that you are contractually obliged to do in the public interest is missing. So let us understand when she says “regulatory authority” it is exactly the right term she uses, and that is where the point of the [project] has to be.

So in my opinion there is a difference and a distinction to be made in this statement by using the exact term that the counsel uses. And perhaps we could refine it. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch: Sala is there any minor modification we can make to this that would satisfy you or you just opposed to even the tone of the general statement?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: The modification that I would suggest is this...

Evan Leibovitch: Okay we're short on time – can you – I'm saying I'm going to ask you to get involved in perhaps nuancing this statement before it goes to the forum. Okay, we have a third statement. Holly had been working on something. Apparently it's not here in the final, but there's one here on RAA negotiations and I have Jean-Jacques, Holly and Beau's name to it. Do any of you want to speak to it? Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes please take away my name because I have an appointment of which I am not the master of the timetable, so I can't skip that and I will probably miss part of the forum. So I don't want to put this statement at risk by being involved in having to speak on it. I'm sorry about that. I would have liked to do it but I won't be available. Thanks.

[background conversation]

Evan Leibovitch: Holly barely recognizes it from the original.

Beau Brendler: Why don't we just take it offline and just work on it. Let's just take it offline.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I guess that's the problem with having many authors in a Google Document. Okay we can take some of this offline. So there's a two statements, the first one of the TLD prioritization which we have discussed. The second one, myself, Carlton, Alan and Sala will get together and see if we can do some properly nuanced wording on this. And with that this part of the – is there any other business at this point? Yes Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: Mr. Chair, sir. I would like to pass a motion for our SSAC liaison to please talk a little bit about the statement that was done in and also the work in terms of the liaison report.

Evan Leibovitch: You wish to have ALAC pass a motion to request something?

Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro: To request Miss Hammer to actually give her report because it's a very critical area right now in...even for two minutes.

Evan Leibovitch: Do we have the time for that? Okay, I'm instructed we're running 40 minutes late already, 20 minutes late. Julie is there a way that you could submit a report in writing and that it goes out to the mailing list?

Julie Hammer: I'll certainly do that. All I'd like to say is thank you very much for your very warm, warm welcome to the ALAC. I've really enjoyed my first ICANN meeting in that role. I'll do a written report which I'll send out to you very shortly and there are one or two issues that I think we need to have community input on from the ALAC. So thank you, I'll get that out to you.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks very much Julie. And any final, any other business? Okay, with that I will turn things over to Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you. This is Heidi for the record. We would like to have Tijani and Jose come to the front table. We are going to be presenting certificates to those AFRALO and LACRALO members who are in the room who successfully completed the capacity building sessions in Dakar in October 2011 and in LACRALO in March 2012. So again, Tijani and Jose and perhaps – I'm just doing this alphabetically, so Tijani if you could do the AFRALO ones.

[background conversation]

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I'm going to do it in French. These are the certificates of participation. We're going to start with Hadja Fatimata Ouattara, please. You

remember that we had a training session for the ALS of AFRALO in Dakar and our dear staff had helped us to do this certificate that are signed by the President of ALAC and also the President of AFRALO. It's a very good idea from Jose who told us to come in the center so everybody could see us.

The second certificate is for Michel Tchonang but I do not see him here. So therefore I will keep it. There was one for Fatimata, but she's no longer here so I will give it to her later. Mr. Aziz Hilali is in front of me and I will give him his certificate, thank you. You come here for the picture please, for the picture. Our dear secretary Aziz Hilali, thank you very much. Thank you so much. And the last one on my list, Mr. Yaovi Atohoun. Thank you so much. I'll do it for Fatimata who is giving an interview. Usually our President does that, thank you.

Jose Arcé:

Good morning everyone. The first certificate I would like to give is to Sylvia Herlein, Sylvia is not here so...for later. Carlton Samuels, where is Carlton? Not here? Sergio Salinas Porto also known as Sergio. Natalia Enciso, also known as Nattie. And the certificate for Dev is to be signed. I apologize, a round of applause for Dev and if you want to approach here just to come around or is it complicated. But this is a small gift on ICANNs behalf for the secretariat so we would like to congratulate you. And I personally would like to say thank you for your work, so congratulations.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay I guess we can – sorry. I'd like to close the meeting but first I want to thank both our staff for having slogged through us for this entire week; guys you've been absolutely critical to what we've been doing,

over and above many times over and I don't think we can thank you enough. And also to thank our folks in the back that have been providing the translations to us, again, above and beyond. And the technical staff, the ones that are hidden behind there. I don't even see them behind there.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Evan but we will need them tomorrow.

Evan Leibovitch: Yes but most of you won't be seeing them again, so this is it. Now the meeting is over. I just want to take the microphone and Holly was able to find the text for her statement. So again, if we've got comments we'll take them offline with Holly; our goal here is just to get a sense of the table of what people think about it. A yes, we'll – yes.

Beau Brendler: We have to leave the room?

Evan Leibovitch: Okay so unfortunately the translators have to stop. Holly is going to read her statement and again, since technically the meeting is over and closed, Holly is going to read the statement, if you've got some comments about it before the public forum please let us know soon. We'd like to get a sense of your feeling about it.

[End of Transcript]