

---

PRAGUE – Joint At-Large New gTLD WG & Review Group

Tuesday, June 26, 2012 – 15:30 to 17:00

ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

[transcript begins with previous session in progress]

Xavier Calvez: ...answer questions that you may have on any matter but I am assuming more specifically on the budget and operating plan; and I will answer any question that you have and focus on that because I don't want to start making a presentation and eat up your question time I guess. The only thing that I'll say is that the budget has been approved on Saturday.

[Applause]

Xavier Calvez: It's funny when I say that to others, I receive tomatoes. [Laughter]. I'm joking but...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Exactly, Olivier here, you can trust we always react opposite to everyone else here.

Xavier Calvez: And you like it don't you? So we have the first question from Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

---

*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.*

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Bonjour.

Xavier Calvez: Bonjour Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: A simple question of scale. We're going into a new ICANN period with a new CEO, etc., but also for physical reasons which is the size of the available funds; so there are questions about how you allocate those funds, etc., but in terms of managing it, we're going from roughly a 16 million budget, which I was familiar with, let's say two, three years ago to I don't know how much, far larger. So does that entail for your team a change in scale, a change in method, or not so much?

Xavier Calvez: So it does create an increased volume. I wouldn't say a change in scale, I'll continue in French, because – you asked the question in English but you're French, so I'm going to speak in French.

Yes, we are going to have more volume, it doesn't change in a radical way the amount of people that we need in our team except the analyzing aspect and reporting aspect that I expect to be more important because there will be analyze to do, more important costs and services that we are going to use for evaluation, etc..

And there will be more volume too in terms of bill-out too, but not in a very important way. The key part of the cost in volume and the volume

---

term is going to come from ten providers, two monthly bills for those ten providers. It makes 20 bills per month. So it's okay, it's normal rhythm for us, it is not a very important element here.

And the third element is the management of treasury, it is something important for the staff regarding the staff. I have two people working with me, one for reporting, analyze of course, and the other for treasury issue that I added to the organization, we also decided because of the new gTLD and other reason, we decided to have more bandwidth, I don't find the word in French, so bandwidth for the registry and registrar payment, it is for specific zones and there is a management programs too with supervision needed.

So we wanted to increase the bandwidth for some functions to absorb a general volume of work, because two persons for a team of eight or nine persons, it's important, so it's a good increase regarding the staff. We can also increase our resources in a permanent or temporary way with resources less important, but that can help us. I'm not concerned, I would say that financial is not only the department that take care of finance which is more impacted by the increasing of responsibilities and people.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Tijani, well, I'm going to speak in French too. Okay. I wanted to say something and I wanted to ask something. An observation Olivier, I wanted to tell you that in ALAC we appreciate your way to work with us and to listen to us, and I say this this morning to the Board and I say it now, we have time to discuss the budget and we appreciate that. And

---

there is a tendency it seems to adopt the strategic plan that will help us to have more time. This is the observation.

Xavier Calvez:

Tijani, I didn't understand what you said, we are satisfied by your activity in your way to interact with us, but there is a problem of time for budget. For the common part and the interaction part too, or the lack of interaction. So the solution could be to go on in the adoption of the strategic plan first part, then the question if we look at the number six note for the additional request, we can see that there was 100,000 that was allocated – I'm sorry but your two comments are in a different areas. If you want I'm going to make a comment on the first part of your observation and then we'll go on.

So the process problems on the budget are going to be looked at the meeting tomorrow, a meeting planned for this reason, it is clear on my side that the comments that were made in the past on the budget process included in all the pillars and all the organizations in a general way, it is very clear we can say there are comments on the process in itself, the timing, the deadlines and in the timing, I'm going to include the problems of interaction with community. Because it's a problem, it's a timing problem but not only a timing problem, we have seen that.

We have to approve the strategic plan earlier, it will help us, it's okay. It's sure, it will give us more time, it is – we have a deadline, so we have to work at the beginning and work on it at the beginning, it will help us. But it's not the only problem we have.

It's not only a question of time, it's also the nature I think the nature of the interaction in itself that we have between finance, staff and the rest of the community and this is what – this is what is more difficult, I would say, because it's difficult to find solutions in that problem. The interaction nature I mean when I say that, I mean the way that we are going to exchange views how we are going to ask question and answer question. The public comment process is very, how can I say, very – well very structured and also everybody can use it, that democratic principle very important for our organization and necessary for our organization, so it's okay.

But it's not a working process, it's not a work process for a technical issue as budget, it is not, so it not really adapted and it is necessary for budget it is true, but it is not enough I think. So which solutions can we have to address this issue? Well, we are going to talk about that tomorrow. And to finish on that issue because it applies to all the problems regarding budget, we can say that we are going to speak about the [tenth] level, we are going to speak about alignment between strategic plan and budget. We are going to speak about document on the projects, etc..

And to finish this on this issue, I will say that this examination process tomorrow we are going to have the kick-off of the process and what – I don't want to anticipate on this meeting of tomorrow, but I'd like to have a deadline for the ending in Toronto, because the budget process is going to end there. The process we are going to kick-off tomorrow will go on forever, but we need to have a deadline, a very clear deadline, that this deadline will be Toronto.

- 
- Tijani Ben Jemaa: The question now Tijani speaking the question now. Tijani
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: On Friday morning during the Ex-Com meeting as well, so Xavier is going to come back to speak to us again on Friday morning. I just think maybe that we can formulate more questions. I know Evan is also in the cue for questions. You can formulate questions on Friday morning, because we're really are running out of time. We have to speak with Alan regarding a statement after this, and then there is another session following up back to back, two sessions.
- Evan Leibovitch: Can I ask the question in anticipation on getting it answered on –
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Great point, ask the questions now, and perhaps you can come back with the answers on Friday.
- Xavier Calvez: And if I can answer very shortly which I'm not known to do, I will do it.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So first Tijani's question since he was in cue and then Evan's question. Tijani?

---

Tijani Ben Jemaa: The note number six under the table for additional requests, you remitted the amount to 100,000 but if we look at the three issues that are under six in the note number six, if we sum up we have 154,000, if we sum up. The note number six, 154,000.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, I understand the question, the question, the question we will see it on Friday. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks. I just wanted to ask at a conceptual level. I don't claim to have a deep background into the finances, but in terms of how money is allocated and how things are prioritized, do you see us going to a situation where At Large is saying, okay, here is your allocation for the year, within At Large, you choose the programs on which you want to spend it. As opposed to we send in our programs and you say yes, yes, no, yes, yes. Is it possible to flip things in such a way that you tell us what we're able to spend and we set out the prioritization.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And no answer is required right now.

Evan Leibovitch: No, and this is deliberately asked not to get an immediate answer.

Xavier Calvez: I appreciate it because I think there are several elements to the answer, so I'll note it and we'll talk about it on Friday.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thank you very much Xavier for coming to see us and as we said we'll follow up on Friday, and we're moving directly over to Alan Greenberg with a discussion on the draft ALAC statement on the preliminary GNSO issue report on the protection of international organization names and new gTLDs. I invite everyone to click on the agenda item and look at the Wiki page. Alan you have the floor. You have about 10 minutes.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. The issue report is a complex one. I would suggest however that people download it, I'll send you the links and take a look at it, just to get an idea of the complexity, because it really is a complex one.

It ranges from including the Red Cross and IOC who the GNSO is already working on to intergovernmental organizations to even a wider form of international organizations. Some of it in my mind is a no-brainer. There is no way we should be looking at multi-national for profit companies in this although they have been included as an option in the issue report.

It does not include, however, international charities and things like that, that are not truly governmental. So there is a lot of nuances that we have to look at. First to focus on what this comment is about. This is a preliminary issue report, therefore there are two things that we want to comment on.

Number one is the issue report on target? Has staff forgotten anything important? And I think there are one or two things and I'll identify



those when I draft something for you. I mentioned one of them this morning in that it didn't highlight the fact that an international organization is often not able to use the UDRP or the ORS, because they are not technically trademarks.

The second question is this is our kick at the can to tell the GNSO, assuming the final issue report is close to the first one, do we think they should embark on a PDP? We're not telling them what the answer to the PCP will be, if there is a PDP, there will be lots of opportunity for At Large people to participate in the discussion of the actual outcome.

In the past we've had very little luck getting people to participate, maybe this time we'll do better if and when this launches. So it's the focus on the two things, not is there merit about giving protection to international governmental organizations, but should we be talking about that actual substance or not? So in other words we can toss it under the rug right now and ignore it completely, or and in this particular case given that the request originated from the GAC and the Board, I don't think it's particularly wise to say nah, we don't want to do it, it will likely come back in a different form from the Board where we won't have a choice.

So you'll see my results there. In my mind, embarking on a PDP can only be done if we first get number one formal advice from the GAC that this is required. So far we haven't had that other than for Red Cross and IOC. And I certainly don't think it's up to the GNSO to decide whether intergovernmental organizations deserve special protection.

So first I would like to see (inaudible). Second, there is an issue of scale. The issue report estimates that there are over 5,000 intergovernmental

organizations around the world. I don't know who it is that is going to enumerate them and decide which ones are worthy and which ones are not worthy, but it sure isn't ALAC, it sure isn't the GNSO, and I don't think it's ICANN staff.

So if the GAC does not want to take on that responsibility I don't see how we can ever implement a policy like that, so I would like to have ALAC say that, that is that is an absolute prerequisite for going ahead with the PDP, because otherwise we'll have a marvelous policy applied to an unknown number of groups, an unspecified number of groups, and that's a waste of time in my mind. This is going to be an expensive PDP in terms of effort I believe. So I think we need to make sure it's going to be framed properly.

Now, in terms of the nuances of do these people deserve protection or not; I think we have to be careful and make sure that we're looking at things from a user perspective, not as we have in the past sometimes from an anti-intellectual property lawyer perspective. You know if there is danger of users being duped by fake websites in either contributing money to a charity or doing something else with some international organization, like UNICEF, then I think we have to look at it from a user perspective. It is to our user's benefit if we don't have fake websites that are masquerading as real ones around the world.

On the other hand, we don't want to duplicate protections which they don't need. One of the issue report is completely silent on as well as any statistics I've seen is with the current hundred or five thousand IGOs, is there an incidence of cybersquatting and problems on the current domains. I don't know, I wouldn't be surprised if people

masquerade as UNICEF to collect some money. I'm not sure people masquerade as UNESCO. So I think we need some real data on which to base any policy that comes out of it. But we don't need that data going into the decision to look at it.

So I'm going to try to draft something which is relatively generic, if you've heard anything here which you object to strenuously tell me soon in person or in writing, so I'll try to word something that will be acceptable. If we simply say don't do it, it's not likely to have much effect, I think we've got to back it up with rationales and we are looking at the public interest and I think we have to look at it from a public interest point of view, even if it gives, forgive me even if it gives the Olympics an unfair competition over other things, I think we have to look at it from the public view.

And another one of the things I think I'm going to suggest probably to be ignored is that the GNSO treat the IOC different from the Red Cross even though the two were requested at the same time, they may end up with the same result, but I don't want to bind them to having the same result for both. So if that sounds semi-reasonable, I'll toddle off over the next few days and try to draft something. The deadline, we passed the deadline a day or two ago for submitting it. We did submit a token comment saying we'll submit another comment soon, but that means we have about two and a half weeks to get this done, if I remember the timing correctly.

So since people often disappear for a week after this meeting, we don't have an awful lot of time to do something. If someone else would like

---

to take over writing this, I'll be delighted to let them do it. If you want to work with me, let me know.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alan, we have two minutes for questions, there was Evan already in the cue and Holly and I think we'll probably be finished by then. Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: The first thing is an offer of help. I can't take it over, but I'm more than happy to work with you on it.

Alan Greenberg: Noted.

Evan Leibovitch: And secondly I am a little confused by one or two issues of this. I almost had the impression that this is something that the GNSO cannot refuse to take into a PDP. Did they actually have that choice? Because it seems the way this has been framed, this is something that the GAC has been pushing very strenuously on; is it something that the GNSO actually has the ability to say we don't consider this significant enough to take to a PDP, is that even an option?

And also I'm going to suggest as we move forward that I think that ALAC should take a fairly strong stance making a distinction between charities that do try and collect public money for which public confusion actually causes fraud and people to lose money as opposed to intergovernmental organizations who number on naturally already have

a place within .int, whether they use it or not, number two very often work in acronyms and anyway, so we'll stop it at that. It's just I have a number of confusions and maybe we can take that into the drafting of this.

Alan Greenberg:

Two quick comments. Does the GNSO have the ability to refuse it? Yes. A few years ago they started the process to look at protecting IGOs, which is prior to new gTLDs, in other words modifying the UDRP or putting an equivalent process in, they ended up voting it down and didn't do anything on it, we're now living with the result of that. We're looking at it again. Given the origin of these request that is it came from a letter from the IGOs, it was sent to the Board, the Board forwarded it to GNSO and GAC. The GAC is debating and it sounds like I suspect they're going to come out and recommend some sort of support for it. If the GNSO were to simply say no, I would not be surprised if the Board would request another issue report, and if the Board requests the issue report, the GNSO has no option but to continue.

So I think the net result is it probably happens anyway, I'm predicting the future and that's a dangerous thing to do.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay, one last question from Holly. We have to close this meeting. So Holly, make it quick please.

---

Holly Raiche: Love to work with you and when you said you get data, I'm a little bit confused, where you get it, what you're talking about. I think I've got an idea but it's probably for another conversation, another time.

Alan Greenberg: The getting data is if we were to embark on it, on a PDP we would need data going into that process. I'm not saying do it before that.

Holly Raiche: I wasn't asking that, I was just asking the nature of the data. But Olivier is going to cry if I don't say goodbye.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I will either cry or start shooting people. So one of the two, you'll probably be happier if I cry, but I don't offer cry, so the second one might be...

Alan Greenberg: You'll get an email from me today with a URL – with some pointers to where the issue report is so you read it if you have the stomach. Number two, you'll hear from me soon, drafting I have support from Evan to work on it with me. We'll identify what we agree on and what we disagree on in the first draft. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Alan and I've seen that Holly was also interested.

---

Alan Greenberg:                      And Holly.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:            And several people around the table have now also heard that, and might be also interested and they can speak directly to you. Over – this meeting is now closed, and we can immediately pass the chairmanship over to Avri, who is going to deal with the next session which is Joint At Large New gTLD Working Group and Review Group Meeting. And I apologize Avri, for being 35 minutes – 25 minutes late, I can't even count, but we just talk too much in this place. Thank you.

Avri Doria:                              Yes, you must have been talking too much today.

[start of New gTLD WG session]

Avri Doria:                              ...new gTLD Working Group and so therefore just as sort of a proper, normal style was to basically have it as a joint meeting before I turn it over. Just a couple points that I've made before, but I want to make them again, hopefully we have Cintra online. In terms of the At Large New gTLD Working Group, I remain it's Chair as I've been careful to say many times and will keep saying so no one can ever say that I didn't say, obviously I'm conflicted. I not only work for one applicant, I consult for another. The one I work for is .gay LLC and then I consult for is PARs .NGO and .ONG. So therefore I obviously cannot participate in the review group that's working on the objection process.

Insofar as I'm every useful in terms of just doing administrative stuff in the background, I will, but Cintra who is the Vice chair of the At Large New gTLD Working Group is the one that will hold the responsibility for this task within the working group which is one of our three working groups. If she had been here, I wouldn't have even been starting this meeting, but since she's on the phone, it was just as useful for me to be here. Okay.

And not only am I conflicted in terms of that, I'm actually scheduled at two meetings at the same time. So I will start this meeting and then I will depart.

In terms of the objection process just to reiterate, a process was put together, we had a conversation with Kurt at our last meeting about how this process will feed into whatever needs to happen with ICANN staff in terms of getting any objections that the review group comes up with and in terms of getting it funded. So that connection seems to be being made.

The review group has been picked, has been approved by ALAC, and has been through two days on training that ICANN staff through the efforts of Carol there and many others on the IT staff has brought about for us. So that – okay, that's the part of my personality and my shadow that I didn't know about. But anyhow so very much appreciate that work. I think everything is in place now for this group to actually begin its work, and I believe that this meeting after I stop it will basically be the beginning of that effort.

One of the pending things on the administrative side, and that's one of the reason I believe Carol is here perhaps, perhaps not is that the group



has already expressed an interest that they may need some more help in the process and going through the work, I really don't know what that is. But I know that several times it's been 2,000 applications we have to go through, that's a lot of work, we may need some help in the upkeep of the Wiki or whatever.

So I will continue to track that issue, but in the meantime, the group Dev was appointed as the interim Chair of the At Large New gTLD Review Group. I believe it's up to that group once it starts meeting to decide whether Dev should remain the Chair for the effort, or whether you want to go through some different process, pick a new Chair, pick Co-Chairs, have no Chair, it's really up to the group to decide how it wants to work. Are there any questions for me on the administrative side of this all, that I can answer, any problems that I should follow through on at this point? No. I'm sure Dev will pass on to me anything he needs me to do administratively after the meeting. But at this point, I'd like to turn the meeting over to Dev, the At Large New gTLD Working Group part of it is essentially over, this is now a meeting of the At Large New gTLD Review Group that's going to discuss objections. If you'll pardon me I'm going to leave and go to the other meeting that I'm at at the same time. So thank you. Thank you, Dev, it's yours.

[Applause]

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you very much Avri, Dev Anand Teelucksingh here. Good afternoon everyone and possibly good day to everyone on the remote channel. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh interim Chair of the New gTLD Review Group and on this meeting we're going to be talking – well,

---

the Review Group has had two meetings, one on the [DDTL] procedure regarding how the procedure for the At Large to file comments on and submit objections new gTLD applications and also review of our dashboard.

So I would like to open it up to the group, having looked at the dashboard were there any specific concerns to either of these two items before I continue. Eduardo go ahead?

Eduardo Diaz:

Hello, this is Eduardo Diaz. I have a question before getting to that. I'm kind of confused on the limited public interest type objections and there is another one, there are two of them, but when I looked at the page here go the gTLDs, the other one doesn't appear to be there, there are four kinds. Like it says limited public interest, legal rights, string confusion, and community. Is that the community the other one that we want to be working on?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Thank you Eduardo. So as an outline in our procedure the ALAC is starting to object on two types of grounds, the limited public interest grounds and the community grounds. So in that procedure document there are relevant excerpts related to what the limited public interest is and what the community grounds are.

I should mention that it is a meeting, and I'm not sure whether staff will be able to help me with that, that will be a meeting with the dispute resolution service providers, so I think that's the most vital meeting to attend. And I think there will be a much broader discussion as to what

---

exactly is a limited public interest objection, what is a community objection, and I think those type – so I think that session will be most critical for everyone to attend and get a better understanding, a better grasp of what those objections mean.

Eduardo Diaz:

This is Eduardo again, when is that happening, do you know?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

I'm sure somebody is going to work perhaps Matt could probably find that. There is a meeting scheduled with the dispute resolution service providers somewhere on the ICANN Prague full schedule, so we can probably find that and repeat that during the meeting. Any other comments or questions from the review group members?

[background conversation]

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Ah, thank you, it's tomorrow, thank you Matt, it's tomorrow at 9 a.m. Any other comments or questions regarding the – Carlton Samuels.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you Dev, Carlton Samuels for the record. I've had a concern you know about scope with review and my opinion I think the two issues, one the ALAC has a heightened – it really is required to look keenly into objections, whether it is on the limited public interest or the community on the one hand. And it's also I believe in the public interest to keep a

---

keen eye out for objections that might be raised from outside the At Large community in those areas.

In the second instance it is to say to ensure that frivolous objections do not get into the mainstream and in fact the process. That will require access to a lot of information and exchange of information from other groups that are standing to raise objections on an early warning basis, and this morning, we were in the GAC meeting. One of the GAC members raised several times if there was a place for sharing of information between the ALAC process and the GAC. I want us to take note of that because I believe while the question – I don't believe it was adequately answered, but certainly from our perspective, I would wish for us to see full embrace of the GAC in sharing information in the first place.

And I would want the record to show that we much respond to the GAC and give them the green light to say, and this is my own fix on the problem at any point during the process we would welcome sharing of information from the GAC is the first thing.

And with regard to looking at the objections that may come from outside the community, I believe we have a duty to give those objections the same if not more scrutiny than the ones that come from our community, at the minimum we must give them the same scrutiny. And I think the process that we have now outlined might not be so clear that that is also one of the requirements of the At Large Advisory Committee in this process in the public interest. Thank you.

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Carlton, Dev Anand Teelucksingh here. In regard to the first question regarding the sharing of information between the GAC and the At Large New gTLD Review Group, and the Wiki pages and so forth, the answer would be yes. First of all the Wiki pages are all public, one, and if anyone wants to make a comment, that can be shared with the At Large community, the email address that would be set up and that will be coming up later in the call whether all of this is in place, that once that email is – once a comment has been submitted it will then be put on the Wiki for all to see. So once the sharing of information from the GAC is published it will be published on the Wiki, so that's the first question, answer to the first question.

With regards to the second questions being able to track, well comments and possible objections that have possibly been filed, okay, the gTLD, well ICANN has its own public comment forum where these comments can be submitted during the 60 day application comment period. Now it is in a form very similar to the Wiki tool that is used to browse the applications. So two things, well one is fairly familiar to what we see for how we look at the applications. But the down side is and I don't think – the down side is there is no easy way to like link directly to the application's comments. And that's – yes, so you will have to manually interact with the gTLD comments .org website and then well select the application or select a string and then click go and then you'll see it. And it's also not even on one page you have to go, you know you see one line in the database, you click on that, and then – so I don't know how that can be resolved and I see Fouad has a follow up.

---

Fouad Bajawa: Thank you Dev, Fouad Bajawa for the transcript. I can recall from the BCEC process because we had the IT team doing a lot of work with how we wanted the dashboard to work in our case. Do you think there's a possibility of putting in frames to depict those two different separate sections, because I think the dashboard is bringing in all this information from the single point that ICANN has already set up, and we're just extracting it from that into the dashboard, so that's why we don't have a direct link to that. But if we want to show it in parallel, which means it's not linked to it, but we see both on the same screen, so that technical hindrance which we're facing is not a fault, it's a situation whereby we can probably work with the IT team to bring it into a single display anything we can use. I won't go into the technicalities of it, but I think we can do it because we did it before.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Dev, Carlton Samuels for the record and Fouad I agree that there is one way technically to address access to it. The difficulty though with that is the multilevel drill down that you have to get to, to get all of the objection data and information. This is my concern, because if – here is the thing, if you're asking me to look at the information critically that is submitted as part of an objection process, I would wish to have all of the data in front of me. I would wish to have ability to trace the data from origin. It's important to know not just what the objection is about but who is making the objection. It was very important in my view. It's probably even more important to know

---

who is making the objection, because that qualifies at the serious level the value of the information that you get, it does. And so this is my concern. Thank you I think Fatimata want to say something.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Thank you Dev.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, go ahead Fatimata, then we'll hear a question from a remote participant. Go ahead.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: I think this was my first concern when we just started setting up this group, Fatimata Seye Sylla for the record. When I was asking the question of how much work we have to do to read those objections, those filed objections, and how are we going to proceed to do it seriously.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, thanks well just a quick query and follow up, when you say the five kinds of objections you mean the comments for the evaluation panels?

Fatimata Seye Sylla: I mean we, our role, the way I understand it will be to look at the objections filed, is that right or not?

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes, it is.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Yes, it is?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: And then to see if we have – if you are in the public interest ground or the community ground and look at it, and evaluate it in our – and see if really we have to make comments for ALAC. We discuss this, deal with it. And I was wondering because for me and I think Carlton is saying the same thing we have tremendous work to do just in looking deep into one objection and what if you have many of them? How would you proceed to do it seriously? How would we organize ourselves to do it seriously? So that's my point.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Fouad. Sorry about that, I forgot about the remote participant, and I'm not seeing the screens myself, so sorry about that, so please Matt could you read the question for the record.

Matt Ashtiani: This is Matt Ashtiani for the record. We have a question from Rudi Vansnick, Rudi asks do we have to handle comments posted into the public new gTLD space from ALSs as being comments that this review work group has to take care of?



Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thanks, Rudi for the question. I would answer that by saying in my evaluation on thinking was that it was not the review group itself that would be driving that looking at public comments in the public comment forum, rather it would be the At Large – it will be the At Large community. So ideally what could happen would be the actual RALOs would now that the process is started you know somebody should be looking at these public comments in the ICANN public comment forum, and see hey that comment that somebody made, that's a kind of interesting comment, I want to share with the At Large community and then bring that one comment. So that is how – it was not really intended for the review group itself to just simply be monitoring, unless of course there are tasks by the RALO itself to do it. So just one more thing, was there any other remote questions, Matt. Okay thank you, go ahead Fatimata.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Fatimata again. You know in some communities at our level we don't do the work, I don't think we'll be that successful. Because if we're waiting for our community, you know from the bottom up to come up and tell us and make comments and objections and then take those comments and work on, we might not have that many work to do. So therefore, I think we'll take both side and I think we said that too, we will have to go to them and tell them look at the comments, their comments online about our region and then try to make comments on those objections and then work on it later. I don't know if that makes sense to you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I guess I wasn't quite 100% following this, and probably because it's a late day for me Fatimata, so would somebody want to also clarify it then? Try again.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Okay, let's say we have ten objections.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Now when you say ten objections you have to make sure we understand what we're saying here. Are we talking about comments for the 60 day application period or are we talking about objections as informal objections during the seven month period, which are you referring to?

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Okay, let's talk about comments which are easier. So let's say we have a certain number of comments for our regions. If as RALOs we just want to wait for the community to come up with those comments if they don't know, I mean this is not in their habits, you know to be informed and sensitized about the issues really and within the time frame we have, would we have enough time to inform them enough, to have them involved enough and make the good comments so that we can come up with something within the group.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: I see Darlene and then I see Fouad.

---

Darlene Thompson: And another thing that Fatimata mentioned is that we are supposed to be a grass roots organization where we are receiving comments from the ground on up, so it's very important to receive those comments. Is that part of what you're saying too?

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Yes.

Darlene Thompson: Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead, Fouad and then I'll answer.

Fouad Bajawa: Thank you Dev. Fouad Bajawa for the transcript. I think what Fatimata is sharing is towards playing a proactive role towards actually helping simulate or making the process like what you call it, getting the process working at the grass root. I have a small question within that context as well, which is I don't know but somehow obviously people share around, I've been approached by many people during the ICANN meeting we were discussing the new gTLD which were issued as if they're trying to make sort of comment to complaint or an objection right, so the word is differently laid out over there. So now these comments which we're getting right, how do we funnel this into this process, because this will not be a grass roots process, this is me in an

---

ICANN meeting with people approaching me who have nothing to do with my ALSs, right in my RALO, right? So these are comments coming and what do we do about these?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thanks, okay Yaovi, go ahead and then Darlene.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi speaking. Two weeks ago we were talking about a failure of applications (inaudible). And I was saying that we are doing something very, very important and then we need to be sure that we are going to fail at the end. So I want to say and my suggestion is that during this meeting we have to the maximum to talk about this objection, and then people presenting the region I know that you have session, I'm not part of the review group is important for people in this group to understand, and I think it's the responsibility of these people this region to explain to people, people from ALSs to explain to them that there is this option that you can comment. You can do these things.

So I think that people in the review group, they have a responsibility and this has to start as soon as possible, like in a week, people should know like we are here people should know that they can send comments, they can do this thing, and then they're represented. People in the review group they are as you said, my understanding they have to go through this comment to collect to pull this thing together.

But if the ALSs we don't inform people we have to understand, go back, inform them, they will participate, they have to necessarily go through us. I think that on the Wiki people can go there also. So finally we need

---

to inform at this level and also when we go back, we have to understand clearly inform people so at the end we have information, we don't spend many weeks and at the end we say oh, we don't comment, we don't have nothing to do. That's my point. So during this meeting we have to try the maximum to inform people. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Yaovi, okay Darlene go ahead and then I'll respond to these questions.

Darlene Thompson: Absolutely, Darlene Thompson. And I'm just reading off comments here that are coming in through our remote participants. Rudi Vansnick said I full agree with Fatimata, we need to communicate strongly to our ALSs. If they don't know the process, we will fail in our mission.

And then we have a comment or question from [Fasel Hassan] from ISOC Bangladesh, and he says in many developing countries there are no ALSs. Does ALAC have any initiative to develop capacity in those places so that people can express their feelings about new gTLDs concerning their community.

Another comment or question from Rudi Vansnick is at the new gTLD comment/objection space there is no information to the public mentioning community comments. Can also be given to ALAC. That's it.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, go ahead Fouad.

Fouad Bajawa: Is there a possibility that we may need to set up sort of a remote meeting where we can send out email invites and they can sort of bring in people, one hour, two hour meeting online remote, where we can have this commenting or objection submission activity. I don't know how this is possible, 2,000 applications regular, I don't know how.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, thanks for these questions and it's good to have some people thinking about this actively. Okay, let me see if I can answer the question.

So to answer Fatimata's concerns, the review group is going to be like – sort of like the evangelists or to really promote to the RALOs listen, hey the comment period has started, you know we have this time to be able to submit comments to the Wiki. If you have any comments you have to please let me know and I will help you put it up on the Wiki or go to the Wiki itself and create Wiki pages and so forth. So, Fatimata that's where the review group is not really meant to be in a silo by itself trying to look at all of the applications and trying to do it.

If a person wants to do that then great, but that's not the goal. The goal is get the bottom up and get all our ALSs, get the RALOs involved, and so that's why each week there will be updates, hey so all the meeting list would on the mailing list, I'm sorry, all the RALO mailing list will be given a status update on what's happening, that when we see the comment, we got two, three comments on this application. So go and read them and again it has to be – you can't evangelize hey go and read these

---

comments, if you agree with it, get involved, participate that's what has to happen.

Let's see if I can remember all the points being made here. So let me answer the question that Darlene thanks for pointing it out, and again I'm looking at the screens on the dashboard. So the question from [Fasell Hassan] was that in many developing countries there are no At Large structures. And does ALAC have an initiative to develop capacity in those places so that people can express their feelings about new gTLDs concerning their community?

That's a very good question. I suppose one way we could do it would be to try to promote – have a webinar and this is tying into what Fouad was trying to say you know that we could have a webinar where everybody can make comments. The problem is well the timing is short for a 60 day comment period, that's only my real concern. I guess what somebody could do is, go ahead Carlton, you said something about a comment.

Carlton Samuels:

This is Carlton Samuels for the record. There are a couple of ways. We need to have an evangelistic approach to this. The idea is that there are many ways to get to Jesus, you might choose the one you would wish, so all the channels all the communication channels that we use should be open, so all the lists should be set up to pop any comment that is received directly to the regional list. That is possible, that is possible an automated process, we can do that. Any comment that goes on that list you can pop an email into the RALO list to say there's this comment, you can follow it, that's the first one.

The second one is of course in the monthly meetings you can have a kind of an abbreviated comment that says here is what is happening and so on, that is why you have a RALO appointed people on this review committee. That's where they come in because they're supposed to take back information into the RALOs.

The third one and this is a way where you don't have At Large structures, and this is probably the one that is most niggling. The only other way you can get information out to that public is by the public airwaves and I'm not so sure that at this stage we're set up to do that. So to me there is a disability that exists, but I would not be so let's say – there are other avenues for objections to come in, for example through the government, the GAC process and that is one of the reasons why I am saying to you that it is important for this review process to be conversant, fully conversant with any of those objections that are raised from those channels outside of the ones that we have some kind of control, an integration with.

So it's pervasive communication using all the channels and watching channels that we would not normally watch to ensure that we're covering and getting everything. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Thank you Carlton, okay Fouad before I go to you, I have to also follow up something that you had a question that you had asked before we looked at the remote question.

In terms of the people coming to you and asking that hey I have comments and so on, what you can do is to tell them okay there is going



---

to be one email address for the review group, so any email that goes to address will be – well it will be seen by all of the review group and then from that, it can then be placed onto the Wiki, so it's not just you – how I should put it, it's not just you independently adding it to the viewer's comment pages. So that's the way we were trying to funnel them all in so everybody could see it, so then it could then be processed and added. So that answers that question. So Fouad, go ahead now.

Fouad Bajawa: Somehow I've seen people not to follow the rest of the meetings but somehow to follow the public forum. So is there is some way we can sort of get the word out at the public forum.

Avri Doria: I don't understand what you said.

Fouad Bajawa: It means that for example in previous cases like a year ago, I was getting comments from ALS members actually following the public forum, that's what struck my mind, that if somebody of the whole ICANN meeting they tend the follow the comments in the public forum. I know the public form is for the Board, but sort of just to get that one-liner out, that you know we've started the process in our parts of the world, and that I don't know how to do that. I really don't have the experience to say anything.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Cheryl, you want to say something to that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I wanted to say something on another matter, so put in the line. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. How to put this, we would be preaching to the converted, we would be talking to those that are already ICANN savvy such as they understand how ICANN is built, that there is a meeting on, that they are either here or that they are listening to the transcript following the archives, etc.. So I don't see that as expanding your reach. I think we do need to look at expanding the reach, but to be honest I'd rather hire an airplane and drag a sign along behind. That's going to – you know what I mean. We need to get to the people who are not here, not the ones that are, and do leave me in the cue, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Cheryl. But Cheryl you said you wanted to respond on another track, and I know there is one issue that we really have to consider and that was something that was posted to the review group earlier, just before the Prague meeting started. So go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh thank you, I thought you had a cue and I wasn't intending to jump the cue; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. You realize of course we will get complaints, some of them spiritless and some of them fascinating, some of them not worth the time it took to type them to the keyboard, and some of them absolutely deadly serious.

But they're not compulsory, it is not a mandate that the community rise up in arms waving flags, banging at the castle door saying hey, those

that are motivated and have a problem will frequently find a way to make their voices heard. What we are doing and I'm not a part of the group, I was part of how it was made, but I'm not, as you know, I'm at arm's length from all length from all this.

But from my perspective you are a conduit, you are a facility, you are doing the best to put a set of best practices including outreach that is transparent and accountable that has clear and concise rules, that says we don't react just because one person says boo-hoo, I don't like CLO as .CLO, right, which of course how could you object to that, really. I might however, because that's my almost common use trademark right. So people who have a problem will find conduits, you are a particular conduit and you've got thresholds which I think are laudable. It's not a knee-jerk reaction.

Even through this process, not one, not two but three and I'm saying this for the record, because you guys help build and I know you know it, but this is for the record, three regions have to support that concept before it becomes an objection. So I'm slightly less concerned about popping down the street and asking who I meet how they feel about the new gTLD program in ICANN, because if they don't know, they don't know. And if they don't know, they may not care. If they hear .CLO is out there and there's a whole bunch of CLO ownership issues or people who think the word LNO should never go together, I'll hear from them, do you know what I mean. I think you're overthinking the problem. Thank you.

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Cheryl, okay, thanks. I want to bring up one issue that I think we have to really discuss carefully. This was an email that was – well our archives are public I think, we talk about it. Rudi Vansnick who is a member of the review group has been – I don't have the email in front of me but has been...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: He needs to declare an interest.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Yes. And let me see if I can find that email quickly what he said.

[background conversation]

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Probably yes, faster than I could find it. Yes. But that's general thing. Let me just try to paraphrase it. Rudi Vansnick who is a review group member from the EURALO region has now been elected to the Board of Trustees of the Internet Society. The Internet Society through PIR is an applicant and has applied for several strings. So given this declared conflict of interest, what would be to address this conflict of interest. My thinking and I'm just going to start on my thinking on the matter.

My thinking of the matter is that if there is any possible drafting of any formal objection to – or comment, I should say or objection to a string that PIR or ISOC is involved with, I think Rudi can stay on because he does need to as I say evangelize the need for posting comments on

---

applications and so forth. I just want to get some thoughts about this, and I was hoping for – well, my gosh, it's a miracle. So I just wanted to open this up to review group for their thoughts or comments on this matter. So Fouad, go ahead.

Fouad Bajawa: One thought would be to first look back and ask the group that put us together, the ALAC see what their stance on this is. And the second level is that within the objection process like as you mentioning, anything related to that particular organization to which the [COO has been chaired] on, he wouldn't be able to sort of file anything on that.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh here, or work on that statement, definitely I think that is the case. Any opinions or thoughts on that? Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Plus one.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Oh, plus one, anybody else, Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record putting on her queen of process mantle. We do not have a finalized set of rules regarding our conflict of interest, etc., etc.. But I think what I'm hearing is an intention for best practice, and because we do not have a set of ALAC rules of procedure as yet adopted, you know they're in the (inaudible) we know;

I would encourage you to have the evidence of this discussion and whatever outcome you come up with and what the ALAC instructs you to be very much up front and public, because it's so much easier, if people have to dig through and find and go oh, oh, oh, did they think about that, that's always – that tends to people think oh, they've hidden something or did they not know.

So put it right up there on the most front page you can find, declare, declare, declare, that said, having lived in elected local government rules where everything over a particular dollar value must be declared, when we get to that level, I think that what you're suggesting would be fine but should there be an objection come in, I would suggest he may need to be replaced rather than just recused from that discussion.

So there is no claim that even though non-active in any vote or tally or consensus call you make, he may have had influence in the room. I think you have to be beyond scrupulously clean on this one. So just let the field, but if it happens, I would go the whole hog, and surgically remove the limb if needs be. Okay, but declare, declare, declare.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Thank you Cheryl. I think that's definitely any conflict of interest would have to be identified definitely on the Wiki as such, but I saw some hands here – Carlton or Fouad, Fouad.

Fouad Bajawa:

Supporting what Cheryl has said, I think it's – the first point of reference that we have on the dashboard or the public Wiki is the list of our names and the links to our COIs according to our acceptance to the

---

AGB's particular COI articles. So right over there under the name, this piece can also be added, this particular email can be added in consultation with Rudi how he wants to phrase this, right.

So it doesn't actually show that it's a negative aspect, it's a very positive effort of our own member, that he has been up front and he's shared that clearly, it's an example of our transparency and that we're accountable to the community. And at the same time, he can give a link to where his name has shown up on the PIR or so, so that anyone who reads it up, shows that we've followed our due diligence. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Fouad, this is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Any other questions thoughts or comments? I don't know if Olivier as the ALAC Chair you have also seen this email from Rudi Vansnick and if you want to share your opinion from what you've heard so far.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Dev, it's Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the transcript record. I agree with the point that was raised by our queen, our procedure, especially in the very matter that we appear to be very concerned about uptakes in addition to everything else, so the perceived conflict of interest, especially in this, which is an operational matter, which is something that is really under the spotlight, that needs to be considered.

So I therefore call upon my friend and colleague, Wolf Ludwig of EURALO since Rudi was appointed by RALO, by EURALO, that this might be something that the RALO might have to look at and might have to

---

think of a replacement in case there is a need for Rudi to be picked out of the group.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thanks, as Cheryl also mentioned that it was actually not only just Rudi Vansnick who had declared a conflict of interest it was Dave Kissoondoyal who was also on another committee, another Board within ISOC. So sorry about that, I just want to put that also on the record that that was also received. And so we are considering this situation regarding both of these persons. Wolf?

Wolf Ludwig: Wolf Ludwig for the transcript. Just a short comment on this. When we did the selection weeks ago, this situation was not visible for us and therefore we nominated Rudi together with Adele, etc. and the nomination and election of Rudi came up afterwards. But Rudi immediately informed us about this potential conflict of interest and I think as long such a situation is clear and transparent, I see from the EURALO point of view for the time being no need to re-discuss the selection and Rudi clearly indicated that in case of any discussion in the working group of the issues he is involved, he would immediately step back, and this is enough [assuration] from his side to the community, so I think the situation is clear and settled.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Wolf. I see Alejandro and then Fouad. Alejandro?



Alejandro Pissanty:

This is Alejandro Pissanty, I think that – I’m very thankful for the statement now about the situation with Rudi. Actually I would like to commend Rudi for being so prudent that he even warned you in advance that there could be this situation. It is not clear that this is a definite conflict of interest. It’s being discussed in many other places, the whole fact that someone could perceive it is important for him to come forward, and I think – I’m only taking the microphone, not to congratulate my friend for being so [good hat], but to commend the example.

ALAC in general will suffer badly in its good name if there are other people participating in ways that can shape the policy process or the decisions or the selection of gTLD applicants, and then it is discovered that there was a conflict. If there is some astro turfing to use the American word for artificially acting as grass roots, bottom up representing or favoring commercial interest. That would be very destructive to the basic concept. [I think it’s been] repeated enough, the basic concept of the present incarnation of the ALAC which is a web of trust. It means that each of us in our organizations are vouching for the others.

ICANN centrally does not necessarily know the organizations, but the concept is if ICANN knows the organization where Holly Raiche works, then she can be asked whether she knows something about Sergio’s organization, and that comes back as a web of trust. And if we tear that web it will tear all the way.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Thank you Alejandro, this Dev Anand, Olivier and then Sergio.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'll let Sergio first. And it was Fouad also who was in the cue.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, well Sergio then Fouad. So Sergio please go ahead.

Sergio Salinas Porto: For the record this is Sergio Salinas Porto, thank you for giving me the floor, Dev and Olivier. I don't want to charge, and please take this into account. I don't want to charge through this situation. I will wait for Rudi for get his headphones, so I am concerned about the fact that despite Rudi has given or shown his flag regarding his situation. I am worried about the fact that we might be attacked for having our colleague there in the group. So I am really concerned about this.

There is a very extensive and strong work on the part of the ALAC, and it would be worry that somehow we might be attacked due to that. That is the bearing in my mind and telling me be cautious, be careful about that. I would like to publically acknowledge and recognize Rudi's support and input for the internet community but if we can have someone replacing Rudi, I think this would be better for the work that will be done in the future, only that, thank you very much.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Sergio. Alejandro, you wanted to follow up.

---

Alejandro Pissanty: Thank you this is Alejandro Pissanty, I'll be very concrete about this, and I'm sorry – thank you for letting me address and hopefully close this point before passing to other speakers thank you very much Dev, and for your patience.

The tradition and the written rules that we live in this ICANN world is declaration of interest, the recognition of a conflict of interest is not necessarily pre-emptive not by the fact that you have an interest, do you automatically presume that the interest is in conflict. You have to find out. There may be no competing gTLD that can affect the interest for which now Rudi is a trustee.

No conflict, but you know in advance, it's transparent, it's open and since it's EURALO who designated him and EURALO has a particularly traditional sensitivity to these things I think you know the game is open, we know of the interest, and we can walk along the road maybe you can prepare a potential replacement, from your list of people you voted, anything, but the point is we should see more declarations of interest.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Alejandro, and Fouad I think I'll go to you before I comment, go ahead.

Fouad Bajawa: Before I comment, I'm actually waiting to hear from Olivier, then I'll make my comment. You wanted to comment Olivier?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Fouad, I was actually to add another element which of course is Dave Kissoondoyal has also advised the Chair of the RG committee, of the review group that he might also be conflicted and I just wanted to put the ALAC on alert, because he was nominated by the ALAC, so put the ALAC on alert, also to consider that there might be a requirement for a replacement of Dave.

But again same terms as with Rudi, he has also been so kind to alert Dev. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead Fouad.

Fouad Bajawa: Fouad Bajawa. I see a very interesting situation. At the personal level I would congratulate for Rudi's personal growth definitely and at the task level that we've involved in right now, he's actually, apart from that group involves larger organization's reputation as well. So that is why I'm more concerned towards ALAC and how they would like to address this issue at their level and probably start a guideline if they feel appropriate at this moment – at this moment during this time in this week that we have and probably come back to us, sort of advise us in the next meeting, because this might go on for a long time. So that's where my small concern is, maybe leave it to our seniors who can help us out on this.

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay. Thanks for that. I think there is a question on the remote, on the Adobe Chat I'm sorry I should say, I think it's from Cintra, I believe let us read it into the record here.

Cintra Sooknanan her question was what about ISOC chapter leaders? Should they also be recused from discussion on PIR or replaced and what are the review group's thoughts.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What about people who use NGOs or ORGs, I mean how far are we going to go?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Go ahead Carlton Samuels, you want to make a (inaudible) please? Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton Samuels for the record. In this dispensation it might be tempting to be like [Potifer's] wife, above reproach. But there is a couple of things that we need to take note of, context is important, Rudi has declared a potential conflict of interest that is good. He is also prepared to take a step that is more than currently required on the existing rules, and we must, and I implore you to take note of that, the member himself declares that he is willing to go beyond what exists, and that is something Alejandro was trying to point out to us, you know there's a context in which this happens, and we must be prepared to accept a member on that basis.

Now, there are voices that say that perhaps the best way to deal with that is to have his entire and complete removal from the process. That sends a taint, ladies and gentlemen that we are volunteers for Christ's sake and it's – you don't want to taint the man when the man himself came forward and made a presentation that is above and beyond what is required on the practice today.

Okay, now that is a preface to answer Cintra's question. In my mind, it goes way outside the pale to require people or heads of chapters to recuse themselves, withdraw, eliminate themselves, however you might – whatever constructs you want to use for that. Quite frankly if we did that, most of the active people in the At Large community would have to withdraw on conscience and that is a practical result of taking that posture.

So please let's not go overboard with this huh? The man came forward, he made a declaration, he made a declaration that in the spirit of the contemporary times: "I am willing to do more than what is required." Let's accept that, let us make sure we have it documented so that folks can follow it, we don't have anything to hide, and let's not now go outside the bounds and cripple the ability for volunteers to participate. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh:

Thank you Carlton, this is Dev. I wasn't too sure, did I see a hand go up here, no? Oh Yaovi, go ahead.

Yaovi Atohoun: Just a question, I just want to know if you have some ISOC leaders also in the group and my comment is that we cannot – for me we cannot take people at the same level. Like if we take somebody in the structures' governing board it's different from somebody as a member of the group, so they are not at similar level necessarily. It's a comment, thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: All right Fouad, very quick because we're running out of time, and there is another meeting after this.

Fouad Bajwa: Like I've been a member of the ISOC, the global membership which is free to and open to everyone. I have never seen such a clause and I'm responsible from ISOC where I have to abide from ISOC to their side activities like the PIR or anything. I think they're all independent from that, right? It's sort of [an integral] community, internet societies, [it's the civil] society. It has nothing to do with PIRs and TLDs and all that stuff.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Alejandro we have like two minutes, so it has to be a very quick comment here.

Alejandro Pissanty: This question is being discussed in ISOC as we speak during these days and several of us here are members or hold or have held leadership positions at different times in ISOC. As you know I am the chapter

---

leader for ISOC Mexico, Eduardo Diaz here present in LARALO is the chapter leader for ISOC Puerto Rico, and there's a number of others involved. So we are trying to be very clear about where if any conflict exists or you know where the direct material interest stops.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you...

Alejandro Pissanty: Most important point of interest is material interest, whether you stand to have financial gain or some other one that would really lead you to avoid a loss or promote your gain against someone else. As close to a final position that we are is that we privilege ISOC's ability and role as a steward and a thought leader in the internet space in general and we wouldn't sacrifice for any of these other gains.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, thank you Alejandro, Fatimata.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Please wear your headphones.

This is Fatimata speaking. I would simply like to ask a question on a point of clarification as regards to the pre-requirements to become a member of the group. I recall we said we had to speak English and to understand English and that we had to make a statement of interest. And that we had to state whether or not we had a conflict of interest.



---

I wonder with this statement is made because we have to manifest whether there's a conflict of interest and act consequently, or as Alejandro said whether it's simply a matter of formality. I don't wish the members to see that this is a problem, because if it wasn't stated from the beginning, everything depends on how we ask the members to adhere to the group and that will determine how the members approach the group. I do agree if we had to make a statement of conflict of interest, but I wish to know so from the beginning.

So I wouldn't say that Rudi has to go, it's EURALO that should be manifesting itself on the matter and then he will act accordingly and decide accordingly, but he has to be informed of the pre-requirements which you defined at the beginning.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Fatimata, I saw Cheryl nodding, so Cheryl please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I was just affirming that what the requirements once you've made the statement of interest is of course under continuous disclosure to update that, and that's exactly what Rudi has done. So what he has done is in keeping with the criteria that set absolutely perfectly. It's not a problem.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: And just very quick, I'm sorry, Aziz – we're already running into the next meeting that was supposed to started I believe in this room here. So just to follow up on what Cheryl was saying and what Fatimata was

saying is that, and this is why we in the call for members of the review group is also to declare that even during the applications that they find themselves conflicted out, they notify and again, it's very good Rudi and Dave Kissoondoyal have done so and I'm also going to have to now bring this to a close now at this point and I just wanted to talk to everyone, because I also wanted to get this discussion on – you know that we're all aware and so forth and the next steps would be two things.

One, I was hoping to have some time to discuss talking to ICANN staff as to getting some staff support for the Wiki comments. I think looking at the possible number of applications and looking at the nuances of the Wiki management to meet the comment pages happen and so on. I think it is advisable to have the discussions here. So as interim chair, I will discuss it with the staff but obviously not at this meeting, but during the Prague meeting and to keep you informed about it.

Time for the next meeting I would like to consider have a doodle sent out, well let me ask a quick question from staff when do you think a conference call can be done?

Avri Doria: Week of the 9<sup>th</sup>.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Very quick answer. So thank you for anticipating that and I think the doodle should – yes, thank you very much for that. So I think obviously, the doodle can go out and so that we can have that call.

---

But in the meantime obviously the mailing list is there, obviously we can still talk about this issues we've got in the review group, you know with me directly and so forth. So okay I think at this point then apologies to Beau for taking the time from his meeting, so at this point I'll close the meeting, thank you all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. Can we stop the recording please?

[End of Transcript]