

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's 8:42 which means we're already behind schedule. That doesn't fill me with joy. I think that in future meetings we will have to turn up at the right time because I do not want to start a meeting at 8:30 with a room that is only filled with three or four people. I think it's not particularly productive. So that's something to keep in mind for the next meeting in Dakar. Anyway, we'll start pretty quickly with the first thing being the report from the liaisons; and I believe we have both Alan and Cheryl in the room. Who wishes to start? Alan, do you wish to provide your report please; so, Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: This has been an interesting meeting in terms of the GNSO for some obvious reasons and some less so and I will be doing a more formal report once I actually go back and try to figure out what happened. Clearly there has been a significant sea change with respect to the attitude towards cross-Working Groups and things like that. There was a very, I think, productive and interesting discussion yesterday at the GNSO meeting, if any of you happened to have wandered by, on cross-Working Groups; because a small drafting team has been set up to look at issues related to Working Group rules and such. And there was, I think, a productive discussion.

A number of things became obvious during the discussion, which if I or we had thought of them earlier would have made our lives an awful lot easier. One of the issues that was raised during earlier

---

*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.*

---

discussions was some on the GNSO were somewhat surprised that we were surprised that they hadn't done anything with the first milestone report. It was typically GNSO practice going back a long time not to forward interim reports or anything. On the other hand, it is completely standard practice for Working Groups of all sorts to simply publish their interim papers for comment. And if in our wisdom we had simply had the JAS Group publish its interim milestone reports for comment all of our problem pretty well would have disappeared from that perspective. So you learn a little bit as you go along.

Obviously there is a lot of discussion about new gTLDs but not a lot of action because the GNSO is almost out of that path at this point. A lot of discussion over the weekend, I don't know if any of you are on any of the Working Groups that Mikey O'Conner is on. He resigned in a rather flamboyant way yesterday because, perhaps partly because of discussions that went on over the weekend about how to handle the RITPB recommendations.

And there was a lot of discussion within the Working Group about should some of them be rejected, should they be changed; and he feels strongly that Working Group output should be handled, rejected, accepted period; not changed. And ultimately that is what has happened, but it's interesting that he reacted to the discussion that went on on the list, which was a very productive, interesting discussion which wandered off in various directions and then came back again. So, to the extent any of you see articles, because

---

there's a number of blog posts about it already, take it with a grain of salt and look at the real details.

I'm not sure there's anything salient that needs to be reported today. As I said, it's been an eventful week, but I don't think anything else that requires action or your prior knowledge to at this point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. Are there any questions with regards to Alan's preliminary report? Yes Hong, Hong Xue.

Hong Xue: Well Alan also raised a hand. The UDRP Reveal Issue Report was actually turned down by the staff. So I want to know is there any follow up from the GNSO. Is this going on or this is the end of the process? Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I certainly could have expounded on that for a while. It's been another one of the issues of great debate and I didn't think there was a great interest, around this table, of urgency so I didn't mention it. It's not at all clear. There is some very, very strong feeling that we really don't want to open it up at this time, at the time that we're adding other intellectual property safety provisions

---

with regard to the new gTLDs. There are people who feel very, very strongly that there are a lot of procedural issues that must be addressed because they're causing them problems on a regular basis. There is also the, I'm not sure I want to be quoted with this and I probably will be but, a veiled threat from the intellectual property people that if we open up the UDRP right now, they have a bunch of things on their wish list too and this is going to become very complex.

There is some discussion now of forming an investigation team, let us call it, something that is not a formal PDP Working Group to try to understand the issues and investigate them. Or there were a lot of comments made during the comment period and perhaps flesh those out, consolidate them in some way better than just what the comment period did, what the comment summary did. So although that it is not a PDP at this point, it's the first step of what a PDP might be if we started and it's a way of trying to understand the issue without making a decision to formally strike a PDP or not strike a PDP.

The views range all over the map. I tend to side with those saying it's been around for 10, 12 years, it's a significant part of our policy process and it should be reviewed on a regular basis. On the other hand, there is some truth to the fact that opening it is opening a Pandora's Box. The one single thing that has not had an awful lot of public comment but a fair amount of private comment is the comment from ICANN staff that a work group might not be the right way to do this because if there are not the right people,

---

sufficiently knowledgeable people on it we could end up with something that is very bad as a result. And I find this s curious statement because although completely true, it is equally true of any PDP and yet the work group model has effectively been imposed by the Board as the model that we use for fixing things.

So, it's a bit disturbing that staff would say the workgroup model is not to the UDRP where it's up to other things. And although this is certainly an exceedingly complex thing, and the lawyers may understand it and the non-lawyers may not understand the subtleties of the process, if workgroups are good for everything else it's not clear why that excuse should be used in this case or alternately why we shouldn't use the excuse for saying the workgroup model is badly flawed and let's not use it anymore. So we have a bit of a controversy here and this is not the end of it. This discussion will go on and exactly which direction it will go in I'm not sure. So the answer to Huang is I don't know. We haven't heard the end of it though.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan. Next on my list is Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch: Good morning. This is Evan. Alan, one follow up to what you were saying before I go onto my original point. While on one hand the issue of staff rejecting something that GNSO puts out is internal to GNSO and perhaps of not total interest to us directly. I've got a concern, considering that we have frequently had

---

situations of staff rejecting things that have been put forward, and I have a real concern about subscribing to accountability, transparency and the bottom up process if you have something that the community is raising that is being rejected and punted back by staff. I see a bad precedent here. It's happened to us. It's happening to GNSO. I have a real concern about this and I'm not sure what to do about it immediately, but its part of a trend that totally is countered to ICANN stated principles and I think something that may need to be addressed.

On the issue that I wanted to raise has to do with how fast are they going to be moving on the issue of considerations of rules for CWGs because there's about to be a new one proposed very quickly. So, I'm curious how fast they're moving on how they want to do CWGS because there's about to be a new one proposed to them.

Alan Greenberg:

Okay, first of all on the UDRP I object strenuously to using terms like "rejected and punted back". When the issues report is finally issued, and I do not believe it has been issued yet, but we've been talking about what it will likely contain, the concept of the issues report as detailed in the current bylaws, and in fact the proposed bylaws for PDP, give staff, one of the requirements on staff is to say whether they recommend or do not recommend a PDP; that's not rejection.

---

The bylaws explicitly have different voting thresholds for the GNSO approving a PDP if it was recommended by staff or if it was not recommended by staff. So let's not use the term "rejection". Part of their requirement is to state whether in their view is recommended at this point or not. So it's called for, it's requested, it's demanded that they make that judgment call; we don't have to agree with it. There are examples of the GNSO initiating a PDP against recommendations of staff. So let's keep the words on a level basis. We employ policy professionals and we may not agree with their judgment, but that's part of the process.

In terms of the cross-constituency Working Group, I can't tell you when they're going to report back. There was significant discussion yesterday at the GNSO meeting on whether we need to build a huge set of rules for this new entity, new type of entity which is not all that new. I pointed out that the ALAC is looking at a lot of the GNSO rules to adopt with whatever changes are appropriate. And the GNSO may want to follow our example of not reinventing the wheel completely but tweaking if necessary. That's number one.

There was a reference to the DSSA and the fact that it is a cross-constituency Working Group that was chartered amiably. And I did point out that that was chartered amiably by an informal group composed largely of the Chairs and vice Chairs, which didn't have a charter for that group, which got together and quietly wrote the charter which was then adopted without change by the organizations that were ultimately comprised the DSSA. And that

---

worked well because the people who did the drafting were trusted to do a good job and factor in the various changes, factor in the various issues. And surprisingly, although the GNSO tends to like to mold things to the desire of the Council, there was a general feeling that maybe this was something which was acceptable, even though the GNSO normally shies away strongly from delegating responsibility to its Chairs and vice Chairs.

So that may end up being a way forward; it may not. But there was some light in the tunnel when that was brought up. I'd like to say I was the one who brought it up, I didn't think of it.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay. I'll be interested for your input when I do a little bit of a report later on, follow up from the consumer issues session and the action item from that was the CWG.

Alan Greenberg:

And Rosemary did allude to that in her report.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Alan and Evan. I open the floor for any more questions on the report. And I gather there are no hands up so the next person I my list is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the ccNSO report.

---

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Most unusual I have a frog in my throat. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record and thank you very much for putting up the place and space which each and every one of you will immediately bookmark and watch for all changes because that is a liaison report space that is regularly updated. It's updated before each ALAC meeting and it gets updated between meetings when things happen in the ccNSO world. So if you want to know whatever is happening, if I know about it and I can say, this page will have a link or information on it and if you subscribe to changes or to email updates you'll never be out of date.

Now, the detail summary and report will go here I'm about to talk to. So, if you'll indulge me for just a few moments and then also, note my apologies as I run from the room because I'm already some minutes late for another meeting. The ccNSO met formally over two days at this meeting here at, where are we? Oh, yes that's right it's Singapore. We had also a one day Tech Workshop which ran on Monday.

From the reporting and activities that ran on Tuesday some of the highlights were reporting on the ccNSO Work Plan, the Affirmation of Commitment Review Team update, the ATRT update; we had a very, very rewarding presentation and the Power Point's are on the links where it says "summaries and presentations" – they're not 100% there, but most of them are live there now and they're in Creative Commons mode so you can look at them and use them.

---

There was a very, very interesting presentation from Cost Rica, specifically looking at the lessons learned from their unfortunate security incident. The Japanese experience of earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear plant accident from a ccTLD operator's perspective was, to say the least, amazing. There was also the inevitable discussions between ICANN and the ccTLD operator's on DNSSEC, anti-phishing and then a number of reviews from the work teams, which I won't go into, but there are some nine or ten other reports.

Moving to the Wednesday part of the meeting, and this is where it gets kind of exciting, there was some very, very interesting presentations on the state of nation I guess from ccTLD operator's including .sg our hosts; particularly looking at IDNs in the second level from .my and I thought that was a very, very interesting area to look at.

I've got my notes in draft form here and just on the .my situation, the Malaysia with their IDN program at the second level, they've overcome considerable technical difficulties and issues, particularly with the script [Jawa]; looking at how they did that and looking at what they're hoping to get, which is to get local content being developed in country, I think there's some examples in those models for many emerging and developing economies to look at.

The other one that I found absolutely fascinating was from the Faroe Islands. Now you all know where the Faroe Islands is don't you? Pop quiz – who knows where the Faroe Islands is? Hands up! Oh well done! For the rest of you who are struggling to grab a

---

map, and the ccTLD community actually have a map with all the ccTLDs labeled, so if you find one of these grab it and put it in your handbag, commit it to memory. That's how I learned how to spell country names like Namibia as I just had to type a moment ago. We actually have the Faroe Island, they're 18 islands in the middle of the North Atlantic Ocean – and I mean in the middle of the North Atlantic Ocean.

They have a 50,000 population. They are a self governing part of the Kingdom of Denmark. And they have some enormous lessons for us all to learn from; from IPv6 and DNNSEC and most importantly, I suppose, the advantages and the disadvantages in how one can look at when you need to liberalize your country code rules and regulations and why you need to liberalize them.

They're taking an exciting approach of modernization at the backend of their registry, but they're also looking at the fact that you still need to front up with a passport and a form of identity and prove who you are. And then prove whether or not you do or don't have the right to the name. If you do have the right to the name and it's clear, it's Fast Tracked. If you don't, there's a process. And I actually think that's a very interesting model for some of us to look at.

They then went on – and I unfortunately needed to leave the room at this point so I have someone who will be getting back to me, but .tv also reported and I look forward to seeing what they had to say. Then we followed with .uk, .cd, there was an AfriTLD and an APTLD update, but just before I close, the Council meeting, which

---

I also attended, sorry – I missed something terribly important. They did this little panel thing – it was very, very worthwhile. And I won't report on that because in fact Olivier sat on that panel and if I could pump that over to you, because as you know, that was part of the time when I wasn't in the room. All I heard was how rewarding it was, how useful it was, how much information was shared. So I might leave that to you.

But from the important announcements part that I believe is kind of exciting actually, in the Council meeting, having had ratification all in the affirmative for three new ccNSO members from the ccTLD community; the Council approved yesterday both .gg and .je. They are Guernsey and Jersey from the Channel Islands. So that's a huge welcome to two new members of the ccNSO community. There is, in principle, support and there is no impediment.

A third one, .na, Namibia, which is why I had to look up my map so I spelled it properly, is to be accepted as a member. There was a small administration hiccup where a cover letter associated with the application had not been circulated to Councilors. So that will have been circulated after the Council meeting and we can be pretty assured that we now have three new cc members that is .gg, .je, and .na and I think this means we're living in very exciting times where all parts of the ICANN community are growing to both big and small countries. I'm open for any questions. Thank you.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Before opening the floor for questions I just wanted to say a couple of words about the session that took place yesterday. It was a session on ggTLDs. Now ggTLDs are geo-gTLDs. They are about to come upon us because they are those geographic locations that have names of towns, places, etc. And the main set of questions included whether those ggTLDs would be subjected to the same type of rules and specifications as ccTLDs, whether the service provided by the registrars and registries around the ggTLDs would need to be the same as other places, what was the legal framework, etc.

So a very interesting session, a lot of different viewpoints in there, and certainly much anticipation in the launch of these new ggTLDs. Now any questions on the ccNSO report by Cheryl? The floor is open. Well I see no hands up which means you've probably submitted a very comprehensive report. So thank you very much, Cheryl.

And now looking down my list we have three other liaisons. The first one being SSAC, Patrick Vande Walle. I'm not quite sure whether he is...is he online or has anyone taken on the...? Edmon? Edmon Chung?

Edmon Chung: Thank you Olivier. I just wanted to say if we are going to the IDN liaison report I would like to go first.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You're anticipating, at the moment we're on the SSAC.

Edmon Chung: I want to go first because I think with Cheryl I need to lead to the IDN ccPDP work.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: CDDP work. Okay, yes. IDN liaison Edmon Chung, please.

Edmon Chung: Thank you. Actually I just sent it to the Skype as well and I was anticipating I might run out of time. So the three areas that IDNs are being discussed more, I guess more vigorously, the IDN VIP – the Variant Issues Project; and the JIG – the Joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN Working Group; and the IDN ccPDP, which is a ccNSO PDP for a long-term IDN, right now it's the Fast Track IDN. So I guess I'll start with the third one.

The third one is IDN ccPDP, which is restarting. It was sort of suspended in observation of what the IDN VIP is going to be doing, but it is being restarted now and the meeting is happening as we speak; it's starting as we speak and I'll move to that after my report.

On the IDN VIP, that's the Variant Issues Project, the six study groups were created. I think a number of us are already on those teams. The aim is to produce the respective reports, the six reports by the end of September and then to combine those reports and

---

produce a final issues report by December. That's the current target. In the earlier meeting with Dennis, which is coordinating the group here, afterwards I raised the issue whether myself as the ALAC IDN liaison should be there, be on the study teams as an observer. He felt that it was generally acceptable for me to be on those, but he didn't feel that it was necessary to formalize it. I am already on all of the study teams as, wearing my different hat as co-Chair from the JIG.

In terms of the JIG, that's the Joint IDN Working Group between cc's and G's, the work is continuing. We are coordinating the work between the IDN VIP and some work with the IETF. And another item for the JIG is that the charter, right now, comes to a conclusion in a way because it was predicated upon the approval of the new gTLD applicant guidebook. But there is also a provision that if both the ccNSO Council and the GNSO Council agrees it will extend, continue its work.

So that is underway and I think the general feeling is that both Councils would like the JIG to continue its work for the remainder of the remaining two items that were identified as issues of common interest. One being IDN TLD Variants, the other being universal acceptance of IDN TLDs; especially on the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs, I'd like to use this opportunity to urge more people from this community to participate because it is less about policy development, but more about outreach and how we're going to do that.

---

This is going to be an opportunity to rally, I guess, both the G's and the cc's to join forces to ask ICANN to put some more resources into talking about this issue and educating essentially the world about this issue. Because as new gTLDs come into play, the universal acceptance of TLDs usually is only a G issue, it is now also a ccTLD issue with the introduction of IDN ccTLDs. So it is a very good opportunity for us to join in and talk about all the issues and rally the G's and the cc's on this work.

So this is again, the universal acceptance of IDN TLDs and hopefully if anyone wants to participate in the discussion just send me over Skype or over email and we'll add you to the mailing list. Thank you. Any question?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Edmon. Any questions from the floor? I see...alright we do have some interference from someone who is currently being taken out of the room. Security please! Next we have the NCSG liaison Beau Brendler for a short report please. Beau?

Beau Brendler: Everybody knows the NCSG is now, in essence, made up of, or is supposedly going to be made up of three constituencies- two of them are established, one of them is the NCUC and the other is the NPCO, which stands for Non-Profit Operations Constituency, which is run by Debra Hughes of the Red Cross and which is evolving into something of a trademark protection endeavor for

---

non-profits. And then there's the consumer constituency, which I think everybody here, or most people here know I've been trying to get off the ground for three years. So the Board supposedly is taking up validating the NPOC charter, possible the NCUC charter, but the NCSGs charter has yet to be ratified. And that has some relationship to whether or not the consumer constituencies charter gets ratified.

If this all sounds like a lot of processed gobbledygoop you're right. There's not a lot of policy discussion happening really at all, except peripherally. Some of you may have attended the workshop the Rosemary Sinclair of the GNSO ran yesterday. Other than that, basic NCSG news – there was an election for the Board seat that the NCSG holds. The incumbent, a guy from Canada, Bill Graham won another term.

Konstantinos Komaitis is now the Chairman of the NCUC, which you probably already know. Other than that there does not really appear to be a great deal of news outside the continuing attempts to establish the constituencies within the non-commercial stakeholder group; or NCSG, also called the non-commercial house; and if that's not confusing well...anyway. If anybody has any questions about that or doesn't understand it please email me and I'll attempt to explain it to you.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Beau; any questions. It looks like there aren't any. So next we have the report from the RALO Chairs and we will start with APRALO.

Charles Mok: Thank you Chairman. This is Charles, Charles Mok for the record. A quick report about ourselves and what we've recently done at this particular meeting: I happen actually to be the third Chair of APRALO within one calendar year and I was just elected to fill the position in May with a very big shoe to fill from Hong who is unfortunately unable to continue to serve as our Chair. But thank you for her service over the past almost one year.

The biggest issue that we face is on continuity and stability. And while we currently have 21 ALS members, the fact is that we have a large continent and we have more than 70 countries in our continent and that means that our representation in terms of number of countries with ALSes is actually still relatively small. And in fact, some countries or regions have more than one ALS among our list. So in fact we do need to expand on our outreach work quite significantly.

And in the past, under a system that Hong helped us develop, our two vice Chairmen split their responsibilities on outreach and policy. And unfortunately at this time both of our vice Chairmen cannot join this particular meeting and this actually is also a reflection on the fact that even though because of the size and travel distance and so on of our continent, in fact, having a meeting

---

being held in our region doesn't necessarily mean that we will get a bigger representation at the ICANN meeting.

But I'm still happy to report that we just had two new ALS members that are newly added to our list being ISOC Calcutta Chapter in India and also NetMission.asia from Hong Kong. In fact, with the support of .asia organization more than 10 of these young people came to the ICANN meeting funded partially by .asia and also they came over here last week for the Asia Pacific Regional IGF, which is held for the second year in a row in Asia. And probably, that might have set a record for participation from one single ALS in Asia; the number of people attending as well as maybe for APRALO in particular, in general.

So I think one thing that we will look to the future to focus on is to increase the participation of our ALS members and volunteers and so on. We have been making an effort to try to promote and recruit more new ALSes, forming some new ties and promoting or inreaching or outreaching to them at various other events including, for example recently, in February in Hong Kong we had an [Epicot Acann] meeting with 1500 attendees and so on. So we will continue to make use of these opportunities to get the word out.

Last but not least, we had an APRALO Showcase on Monday that was smoothly held with a lot of great support from staff. Unfortunately again, as you know, because of schedule probably the time that we chose, which was the best time when we chose it was too good to be true because in the end ICANN put in the new

---

gTLD updates at the same time slot. So I wished our attendance would be bigger, better, but I think overall it was a good show and we had a live cast and also put it on the web right now and I'm seeing emails from other people saying that they have been watching or listening to the audio cast and they have been quite impressed by particularly the speeches that was give by Dr. Ang of Singapore and (inaudible), our first APRALO Chairman.

So looking to the future I think we will continue to focus on getting volunteers, participation and raising the awareness about ICANN and APRALO in our region. And I believe with the New gTLD Program now set in place we are getting more attention and this will actually be a good opportunity as well as a challenge for us because questions will be streaming in from the community, people that weren't aware or have never heard of ICANN before and now they're saying what are you doing giving me all these troubles or opportunities with all these new domain names; what is it all about. So we actually will be trying to set up some programs hopefully within Asia, and we'll start with Hong Kong where I am, easier, trying to promote or inform the public about what the new gTLD is all about. Regardless of what support or programs ICANN will be able to give us in the future.

There are also new opportunities for us to get a number of new ALS members, including happily to report, Dr. Ang, who gave the keynote speech at our APRALO Showcase has just formed and been approved with the formation of ISOC Singapore. So some of these major Asian internet economies around, for example, like

---

Singapore, Malaysia, Philippines and so on; we actually don't have any representation within APRALO for these countries. And that hopefully will be able to change in the coming year. So that's about all I want to say. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Charles for this very comprehensive report; certainly very, very good to see so many young people in the APRALO region coming over here. It was heartwarming to see that. And well done for the APRALO Showcase, which was really, really great and I think we all really enjoyed it. So, thank you.

Next we can move on to the AFRALO report. I will ask if we can make it a little bit short because we are a little bit late at the moment in our schedule, so I'd appreciate that please. And I was going to actually say do we have any questions, but what I'll do is to take all of the reports and then I'll ask if there are any questions regarding any of the reports which are given.

UM: Thank you, Olivier. I'm going to speak in French.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Please introduce yourself.

Aziz Hilali:

I'm Aziz Hilali. I'm the Secretariat for AFRALO. I'm going to begin by speaking about the ALSes which was proposed to us 11 months ago, it's forecast in Congo. And after some discussion and exchanges of email we decided to advise ALAC to accept this request. We could give more details, I can give more details if there are questions.

Second point, this concerns the budget that we requested from ICANN. Unfortunately we spoke several times about this by telephone and we are a little bit disappointed that this request was not accepted by ICANN. It is actually two budgets, one for workshops that we wanted to organize for Dakar; and another concerned the meeting of IGF where we proposed to AFRALO would have a workshop. And that was accepted. We hope to do it even if the financing was not granted.

Third point concerning regional activity. We have been used to, during ICANN meetings, to have a meeting with the African community and there was one yesterday here in Singapore where we spoke. Several people here were present at that meeting. And we were making recommendations for the Summit, the Ministerial Summit that will take place just before the ICANN meeting in Dakar.

We also discussed about teleconference calls because we will have to give a showcase next time in Dakar and we are going to try to succeed in that effort. I remind you that AFRALO was the first to give a showcase at Nairobi and today we've gone around to all the

---

five regions have done a showcase and so it's our turn again in Dakar.

So if you have any questions I'd be happy to answer them. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We'll move quickly to EURALO next.

Wolf Ludwig: Thank you Olivier, this is Wolf Ludwig, Chair of EURALO. Well let's say there was quite a lot happening over the last couple of weeks and months in EURALO. I will try my best to keep it as short as possible. We finally had a new round of vocations on our bylaws suggesting three modifications to our bylaws. The first modification is to include individual members into EURALO, what was discussed since a couple of years and we had to finally do it. The second amendment was the possibility to have a term extension of RALO officers and Board members. And the third one is to align our EURALO election terms with ALAC terms.

And we finally, at the end of May, could realize that we could do all three amendments, what was approved by a vast majority of our members. We needed a two-thirds quorum as a minimum to have these bylaw modifications accepted and we had much more. So we could do this successfully. And we had, one week later, our first EURALO General Assembly in line with the European Dialogue on Internet Governance, what took place at the end of

---

May in Belgrade and what was a good opportunity to have our General Assembly back to back with this EuroDIG, which became now, let me say, the biggest forum on internet governance in Europe with more than 500 participants. A lot from EURALO actively participated in this event like Olivier, Sandra, and I.

And while we had some re-elections of the EURALO leadership, the Chair and the secretariat and our Board members and we had quite a busy time. But busy times sometimes can also be productive. And we had some close relations with many of our members again, what I always appreciate. I think that's more or less all – if somebody else from EURALO, our outgoing secretary we will come back to this point later. Olivier can add something and I will introduce Oksana now.

Oksana is, as many of you know, Olivier is the outgoing secretary since our General Assembly, Oksana is the incoming secretary for EURALO. She's representing a new ALS, the European Media Platform from the Ukraine and she helped us a lot to get better known in Eastern European countries, which is very essential to me to improve our outreach in the Eastern countries. And I'm glad to have Oksana on board because she is fluent in Russian and all the languages needed and I think she is a perfect complement to our strengths in the EURALO into next year. So, welcome Oksana on board.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Wolf. And Rod Beckstrom, President and CEO of ICANN has come into the room and I think that in order to not move his schedule too much, we might wit and move the LACRALO and NARALO reports until after Rod's visit. Thank you very much for joining us.

Rod Beckstrom: Thank you. An honor to be here Olivier. Thank you Cheryl, thank you Evan and thank all of you for what you do in guiding and leading and developing ALAC. With the launch of the New gTLD Program it's obviously an exciting moment for all of us. We do also know, you registered concerns early on in the process, and at the same time many also constructive comments and I really appreciate your help now on the JAS Working Group as well as, I guess the ALAC Working Team – I think that's the right language; is that correct? On developing countries...?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No it's the Joint Applicant Support Group I believe.

Rod Beckstrom: Right. There's a Joint Applicant Support Workign Group, or JAS Working Group, and there's also an ALAC/GAC Working Team isn't there?

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: There is also yeah, there are a lot of teams all over the place, but yes.

Rod Beckstrom: So anyway, it's great to be here in lovely Singapore with you. Also, just want to recognize your tremendous productivity this year. I believe that ALAC has issued 16 policy statements so far this year, and I think that's a record, by far by this time. So clearly you're upping your level of policy engagement and advice to the Board and the community and that's really appreciated. And also just want to congratulate you for having, I think what, 134 At-Large Structures?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's right, yes. We've had the last four, and that's actually a confirmation since we voted for them on the Tuesday session. So yes, 134.

Rod Beckstrom: Sure. And I understand that each of your At-Large Structures may have different views on whether they want to participate in a new gTLD outreach or not, but to the extent any structures do, please let our communications group know so they can take that into consideration. They'll assume you're not interested unless you indicate that you are interested. So that's a potential opportunity.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, there is a mixed set of use. Some ALSes wish to take part in outreach, but there's of course a difference between outreach and marketing and it really depends on the local topology. In some areas, of course in the developing world, outreach is particularly important and so the New gTLD Program will certainly be pushed a lot. Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi Rod. I think some of the issues are different for us because we're sort of at the bottom of the food chain. This is not registrants, this is end users. It's not like they need to be promoted to buy new domains. So our challenge is different. Our challenge is the new TLDs are coming, lots more new domains are coming, how does this affect you and what do you need to know going forward.

So I think our message is less of a promotional one and more of an educational one; that is, what does the internet using world have to deal with now that there's going to be this huge expansion of domain names out there? So I'm just saying, there's a subtlety in the difference to our approach since we're not talking to registrants, we're not talking to people of what's your choice in buying domain names because our population isn't buying domain names, they're using it. So our message I think has a subtlety different feel to it.

---

Rod Beckstrom: Evan, I very much appreciate that clarification. Just one minor comment I have is we're not promoting the program either, we're communicating and educating. We're not advocating that people apply for these, we simply want to make sure that organizations know how the program works and that it's available so that people have a good opportunity of access if they wish it. But I fully understand your point that you're mostly focused on the consumers and end users and who could be users of the system once it rolls out and not potential applicants.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. And in fact, there's already a waiting list for questions so I will go quickly through the list. First is Carlton and then Alan and then Dave Kissoondoyal, but first, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Chair. I just want to say two things. It's interesting that the CEO recognizes the amount of work that is coming out of ALAC in terms of policy statements – 16 and that's a good thing. Because would you know, that there are members of our won community who continue to say that we have not done anything all year. So it's very interesting because those 16 statements actually relate to probably more than no more than three or four persons taking the lead on those statements and it involves tens of hours of research and reading materials to get those statements out. So it's interesting that you recognize that there is some work being done in all that.

---

That said, there is in the At-Large, there is a distinction to be made between marketing and outreach that should not be lost with the communications department of ICANN Corporate. And where we would excel and we would wish to see the At-Large go is in the outreach direction. That means the way that collateral is developed and the way collateral is positioned is very important to the outreach objective.

So I'm glad to hear you say that we can interact with the communications department and try to make common purpose with them, but as part of that I just wanted to let you understand, and you can probably through your good officers pass it on, that the perspective of outreach may require some rework of some collateral and we are very willing to help with that. Thank you.

Rod Beckstrom:

Great. Thank you very much Carlton. And also, wanted to mention the marketing communications plan, specifically for the New gTLD Program, has been posted online and is open for public comment. So if in the context of that plan you have any specific suggestions, please provide your input. I also want to thank you personally, I think, Carlton, I believe you were one of the respondents to the NTIANOI is that correct?

Carlton Samuels:

Yes.

---

Rod Beckstrom: So I want to thank you and thank ALAC as well. I know it took a lot of hard work for ALAC too, I'm sure, to synthesize a view on your position on the NTIANOI response, but I thought you had an excellent response and I very much appreciate your taking the time to do that. And it's clearly up to you, but obviously, we would be very happy to see if you had a response to the FNOI as well; whether individually through your own organizations or chapters or through ALAC as a whole, but we're very happy to see ALAC standing up and making very clear its position on the global stage. So I just wanted to thank ALAC in general and thank you Carlton in particular for providing your response.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Rod. Next we have Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Two comments...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And if I may just add also for transcribing purposes...

Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg, liaison from the ALAC to the GNSO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. That's a bit more information than what we need but...

Alan Greenberg:

On new TLDs – we’ve just alluded to but we haven’t had a lot of talk within ICANN on one of the significant impacts on new TLDs and that’s going to be what I would label as mass confusion among a fair number of the less technically alert people who are among the several billion people who use the internet. If you remember when people started using ccTLDs there was an inclination that if I said my ccTLD was magill.ca, someone would implicitly type in magill.ca.com because obviously I just left off the ending of every TLD.

I think we’re going to see similar things like that and I don’t know what we do about that, but I think we have to be aware of it; that not everyone is waiting for the new TLDs and think they’re the greatest things around. They’re going to be confused by them when start appearing for the first time. So, I hope our communications program will factor in that kind of thought.

With regard to all the work we’ve been doing, we still have a significant problem in terms of getting more people involved in each of these statements. Each of the statements tend to be crafted by one or more people, there is input from a number of people; we cannot say that each of them has gone all the way down to the bottom of the food chain within At-Large and come back up and been impacted by it.

There are certainly people who would like to see that happen more, as would we all. And I’d just like to tie that to the discussions we’ve been having over budget and outreach and regional assemblies and things like that. The way we get people involved

---

on a more day to day basis is by familiarizing them with what we do and why we do it. And the two are tied together; it's not just that we like having parties.

So, as we go forward over the next couple of years I think it's important to keep that in mind. Thank you.

Rod Beckstrom:

Thank you Alan. I hear both the points. First one on the issue of how to we help educate end users and consumers on these new offerings and sort of prepare them so they can be, I guess, sophisticated or aware or knowledgeable consumers; in part so they don't fall prey to anything. I think it's a really good point. And again, if there's anything – I believe the communications plan is focused in part of the general public as well, we want applicants to know that the system, potential applicants, that the program is available, but also to help the public understand it.

As you have seen already, there's been a tsunami of social media and press hits on just what happened here Monday; it was kind of quite surprising to us the level of interest. Spreading both some information and some disinformation about the program as people speculate on what it means. So, I think it's a really significant communication challenge for all of us. We appreciate your help and again any input on the plan, please feel free to give it.

On the question of further volunteer engagement, I'd love to hear your thoughts or the groups thoughts on what's the secret of doing that. I mean I think most of the, a lot of the SOs and ACs are

---

struggling with this; that it tends to be a few people that put their hands on the rows, row the boat – put their hands on the oars, excuse me, and row really hard.

And there's other people that help from time to time, but part of building the strength is getting a good ratio of rowers to other participants and encouragers and those that help bring the boats to the water and prepare the boats and encourage the team etc. But how, and you mentioned more travel or more events to engage some of that, but I'd just be curious to hear how you've looked at over the history of ALAC. Because my sense is you're getting more productive so at least that's very impressive to see from the outside, but it's great to hear the issues that you're facing on the inside too.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I believe Alan has an answer for that.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah on both points. In terms of consumer education, do remember that that's something that's going to become relevant towards the end of 2012 and we need to time it so it's not long forgotten by the time it's relevant to these people. In terms of how do we get people involved, we are a little bit different that if you look within the other constituencies, registrars for instance, there are some who are involved because they're big players, there are others who are involved because it's either something that they feel is interesting and it's a payback to the community or it just

---

happens to intrigue them. Our groups are different in that the first issue is education of who we are or why we are or why they should bother – they don't have any money in the game to be blunt.

So it's a different sort of issue in getting these people and it's going to be a lot harder. For every 1000 people you talk to you're going to get fewer people who say yeah, I'm willing to slave away for no money and that kind of thing. So it's a different sort of game and I don't think the rules that work in the registrar or registry constituency or the intellectual property lawyers are going to work for us. It is really a different game.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. Evan Leibovitch has got a couple of more things to add.

Evan Leibovitch: The big difference, and this is just to keep going a little bit on what Alan said, is that registrars, registries, civil society, ISPs – they know where to find ICANN; nobody has to tell them why they want to be here. Our challenge is, as Alan was saying, literally going out into the public, grabbing people by the throat, trying to make ICANN relevant to them and this is a task.

And without belaboring the whole going back into the fiscal year budgeting stuff, I want to, at a very high level, express what seemed to be a disjoint between the strategic plan and the budgetary results that we saw coming back. The strategic plan

---

says all the right things about outreach, about getting out there, about putting the word out. But when At-Large came back with a whole pile of ideas of how to do that, the response that came back said on almost anything that had to do with external outreach – it said the priority is on re-engaging people that are already here. And that was actually a line item that was put in the spreadsheet in response to the request.

Now, we are very familiar with the term inreach and that keeping volunteers engaged once they're here is a challenge unto itself. However, when we see the strategic plan saying outreach and getting out there and finding people that wouldn't normally know what ICANN is, let alone get involved with us, and turning that into action. And this has had all sorts of, every single region came in with really, really good ideas and the fact that almost as a group they were rejected in saying right now our focus is on engaging existing people that are already here. That really shows, at a high level, a sort of disjoint between the strategic plan and what came back to us as we engaged in the budget process.

Rod Beckstrom:

And Evan, if I can ask because I don't know, where do you think that feedback came? Was that from other members in the community or other groups in the strategic planning process or?

Evan Leibovitch:

Which feedback do you mean?

---

Rod Beckstrom: The feedback that we want to focus more on engaging the people that are already involved.

Evan Leibovitch: That was actually statements that were in the return spreadsheet to us when the projects were rejected. That wasn't, this isn't rumor or anything, this is actual statements that came back.

Rod Beckstrom: So you're saying you think that came back from staff feedback not from the community.

Evan Leibovitch: Oh absolutely. The spreadsheet that came back to us – accepted, accepted, rejected, rejected and all that. And the explanation for the rejection, every single rejection that had to do with outreach activities had a line associate with it right now our priority is on re-engaging existing communities.

Rod Beckstrom: Interesting. Thank you for bringing that to my attention. I think the other thing that would be interesting, and maybe you've already done this and I'm not aware of it, because the beautiful thing about the ICANN starfishy, highly desensitized model is there's so much going on. I have to admit, as CEO I'm aware of only a fraction of what's happening and trying to do my best as a

---

servant to keep the organization moving, to support the community and react and also to execute the programs. But are there metrics that you use or you have of sort of the return on various outreach efforts and various expenditures and projects and programs, or is it just kind of a general sense that they're good and they yield a harvest. Or is there some way that we can develop, or ALAC has metrics or could develop metrics to better inform this discussion?

Evan Leibovitch:

The one metric that I know is clear is that there is a goal within ALAC, within At-Large to have at least one ALS in every country in the world; that we're still quite a way from reaching that goal. But that's one metric that's very clear and very gaping as we look at all the holes in what is not involved with us.

Rod Beckstrom:

Great. And where do, I know you have 134 structures, but I know I think in the United States for example there's more than one in the US. I'm a member of the San Francisco Bay ISOC Chapter and I think there's others. How many countries are we in right now roughly; if that's a metric we're tracking?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay. I think we were looking at about 70 something. Just remembering vaguely what we said in San Francisco, so around 70. Okay, thank you Evan. The next person on the list is Dave Kiskoondoyal.

Dave Kissoondoyal:

I'm Dave Kissoondoyal for the record. I'm speaking on behalf of AFRALO. Yesterday we had a very successful ICANN meeting. And then one of the discussions we had was new gTLDs and support for needy applicants in Africa. We see that the new gTLDs will create a lot of opportunities, especially in Africa. And it will have like, it is an important opportunity for Africa.

So we think this is the reason we are looking for ways and means, when I say ways and means I'm referring to the project that we submitted in the budget. Ways and means to do outreach activities to reach the maximum numbers of ALSes, but unfortunately the budget has not been approved for that. I think that outreach activities is important, especially in Africa where we know that not ICANN is not that popular, that well known. So we have a lot of work to be done in Africa.

On a separate note, the proposed Summit for the developing countries, which we discussed yesterday also. I think this will also be an opportunity to promote, to enhance the participation of the African community with the ICANN process. Thank you.

Rod Beckstrom:

Great. Thank you for your efforts there and I appreciate your continued advocacy for ICANN and ALAC in Africa. Africa is a particular challenge right, given the span of the continent and, I don't know what is it 54 or 56 countries and for example we only have one staff member focused on all of that and some other

---

organizations have multiple offices and lots of people. So it really is, I think, a resource challenge for us. Thank you for your advocacy David.

Dave Kissoondoyal: One of the discussions that we had also was that as part of the outreach activities our ALSes are going to meet at the government, issues of governments and then ask them to join the GAC.

Rod Beckstrom: Excellent. That would be very welcome; great. Thank you so much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. Next on the list is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Okay, very well. You said our projects have a return on investment or is there a feeling that this is coming to fruition or not. Last year at IGF, AFRALO did organize a workshop about ICANN AFRALO. ICANN organized, ICANN didn't spend any money, but did organize it. This workshop was very, very successful and I think you had a return about it, you heard about it – it worked very well.

Many people here, present can tell you how much of a success this workshop was. This type of activity has strong return on

---

investment because as you know ICANN does not only have friends, some people are against ICANN; we have to be aware of it. Some people don't like ICANN. And sometimes we talk about the multi-stakeholder program and they listen to us, they say we are just doing some marketing. We have to show them, we have to prove to them that there are multi-stakeholder organizations. ICANN is not the Board, it's the community; the ICANN community.

I think it's a great return on investment and I can tell you that people were very excited and they didn't want to leave the room at that workshop. I think that ICANN can get a lot from these types of workshops and I am absolutely excited about the fact that ICANN is not aware of the importance of those actions for the communication; we need some more communication activities for ICANN. We requested to have another IGF workshop this year, and it's very hard to get a workshop at the IGF. This year we did provide a request and we are going to have a workshop at the IGF. We might be in trouble with financing though.

Rod Beckstrom:

Thank you very much for the success of that AFRALO Workshop and that sounds like a great example of the benefit coming from doing this education. And to the extent we can data in terms of how many new members of ALAC or structures or engagement that could be held, that sounds like exactly the kind of successful case story that's really valuable and I'm excited to hear that you're

---

working on the IGF workshop as well. So thank you so much for all of your efforts.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. We are running out of time and I just wanted to touch on one last question, which was on our agenda, the ALAC initiated policy topics. Traditionally ALAC has been responsive to policy comment periods, to various subjects always being brought up and ALAC being reactive to it. T

he question that we have for you is whether you see ALAC as being more proactive in its comments and in its activity? Recently a Future Challenges of ALAC Working Group has been started and is actually Chaired by Jean-Jacques Subrenat. And so the question really is how receptive is ICANN to ALAC initiated, and we mean, it's not only policy topics but commenting on anything that takes place in the ICANN sphere.

Rod Beckstrom: I can certainly say as CEO I'm extremely open. My job is to try to be a servant and a steward to make sure that they staff and the organization is providing the support to the community that the community wants, and is delivering on the programs the community approves through the strategic plan and the operating plan and the budgets.

And so my own views on the multi-stakeholder model is it seems rich and it seems diverse, it seems to have a lot of healthy tensions,

---

seems to have a lot of healthy input. And I think what's exciting about ICANN, and what ALAC and others bring to it is its constantly evolving. And I have no opinion whatsoever about how ALAC should or should not evolve. I'm more a curious student and a servant so that if you decided where you want to go then I will watch that and witness that and hopefully our staff helps to support your deliberations around that, but I have absolutely no fixed opinions because that's not my job.

Now if you wanted to have my opinions as sort of an individual brainstorming exercise, I might enjoy the discussion. But I think it would be inappropriate for the CEO of ICANN to have a view of what any SO or AC should do. It's just not the role. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Alan, you just wanted to add – if it's going to be a very short comment or a question on this specifically.

Alan Greenberg: It's a very short comment and I am explicitly not asking for a comment because a comment from you on what my comment is probably completely inappropriate. I'll just note that in our discussion with the Board yesterday, when we raised a related subject, I won't say we were slapped down, but it was pretty close. Getting a message of feeling that the Board was not particularly interested in us investigating new areas and things like that. So, I appreciate your answer and we will continue working on the other side.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Alan and thank you very much Rod Beckstrom. We'll let you go now, thanks.

Rod Beckstrom: Thank all of you. Thank you for the time. Thank you for everything you do; you're amazing.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well returning to our original schedule, we still have to do our report from RALO Chairs and I believe we have now reached LACRALO. So Latin America please.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you Chair. Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Since San Francisco we've submitted, LACRALO has submitted comments to the Notice of Inquiry on the NTIA. We've also begin testing the email translation list. Many of the bugs identified from San Francisco were squashed. And there were also elections of both the Chair and the secretariat in which Andreas Piazza and myself will return as Chair and secretariat respectively.

We've been having a lot of discussion regarding inactive ALSes and how to treat inactive ALSes and also trying to get ALSes involved in LACRALO and in the ICANN policy discussions. This has culminated in a summary document that was presented to

---

the RALO secretariats regarding how to deal with such inactive ALSes.

We have also received a new ALS application request from [Ageadenci] Colombia and the regional advice for this should be presented shortly. Also, we submitted extensive comments on the FY12 Operating Plan and Budget. And we've seen most of our comments were incorporated in the final ALAC statement.

Also regarding the progress of the translation of the email list, there was a breakdown of the translation during the month of May and it really disrupted our online communications because emails were not being read by other members of the list and so forth and it was a breakdown.

And that lasted, I think, three weeks which was really not good. So the new translation list that was developed by ICANN staff has now been put in place and has featured some improvements. Although, I note that while we seemed to have crossed our hurdle, unfortunately there's now a new hurdle ahead that since the new translation is based on Google and Google has announced it's going to discontinue support for its translation APIs by the end of the year. So we're going to have to come across, look at another solution by then.

[background conversation]

---

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Maybe. I think that's it. Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. We'll go to the NARALO report with Beau Brendler. Beau?

Beau Brendler: Thank you, Olivier. Darlene wishes she could be here. I believe she's convalescing from a cold that's come on for her so I will give the report that she largely put together. NARALO has members on each of the remaining work teams for At-Large improvements – the Future Challenges Working Group, the JAS Working Group – and our work is progressing on all these. I was working a bit with Dev the last couple of days on helping for some of the consumer documents for Work Team D and things like that. So, we're playing a role in that.

We're also playing key roles throughout the At-Large policy development processes helping to drive issues, such as registrants right, bringing good sense to the new gTLD process and holding ICANN accountable for enforcement activities. NARALO has submitted, as we know, a range of budget requests for the region for next year intended to increase visibility, participation, and outreach.

These others I have added – we took consensus on making a NARALO statement on potential consumer concerns regarding pre-registrations and the offers some registrars were making.

---

However, the ICANN Board vote on the New gTLD Program on Monday in Singapore has prompted us to re-evaluate the statement to determine if it is still applicable. A couple of other things – we evaluated our policy within the NARALO on mailing list communications after what I characterized as some heavy kibitzing on the new gTLD issue, that bordered, in my opinion, on abuse. And in consultation with staff, I took some action that I believe was relatively well regarded and that we got some feedback on and helped us to further establish communications policy, if you will, on the NARALO list.

And actually as of this morning a member of NARALO has filed something of a formal complaint about the lack of an allied quorum at one of the meetings the last couple of days; I was here at the time but I can't remember which meeting it was; and has asked ICANN to withhold travel funding until it self-polices this issue. So I just wanted to bring that up as a heads up. Evan alerted me to it. So, that's the stuff we've been working on since San Francisco.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Beau. And now I open the floor for questions and comments on all of the RALO reports. And I see Cheryl has got her hand up so Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Beau, by incorporating individual members, or perhaps not individual members but an individual person in NARALO, I'm not sure about

---

the member statuses; note to the abuse of community travel support guidelines. Are we to take from that that it's only a heads up or that there is considerable concern in the region from those issues? If you could clarify that I think that would be very useful, for me at least.

Beau Brendler:

Oh no – this is Beau Brendler again – I'm not aware of any widespread concern in the region. The complaint was from an individual who is fairly well known to all of us, you'll see it on the list. It's from Danny Younger who keeps track of these sorts of things to some level of detail. So it's not a widespread concern in the region that I'm aware of, but this is in the form of a written complaint so it's going to show up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Just a small follow up - Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record – the reason I wanted to ask that is that the Executive Committee obviously and the ALAC certainly have not discussed or responded to this as yet, but one of the things I was planning on bringin forward is a formal response either from the ALAC or the Ex Com to deal with what is in some ways a perspective on issues as opposed to a factual record of what is meant and what happens. I point out that of course we did reach quorum as Danny actually noted, but there was also some extenuating circumstance which have only been recently brought to light for some members not to be in the room, including serious illness.

---

So I think what we need to do is respond in fact, and I wanted to know whether it was going to be just a matter of us responding with our factual reply to this list, or also to NARALO formally. So I just wanted to make sure that we had that pathway cleared because this has got to be done relatively promptly. Thank you.

Beau Brendler: Just in brief response – I hesitated to bring it up just given the fact that I’m the Chair of the NARALO I figured it was necessary, but I hesitated to bring it up but it is, anytime you see something written down it will take a life or it can take a life of its own and it’s a bureaucratic fact of life.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments on the RALO reports? Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Olivier. Two things – yesterday we had the meeting AFRALO ICANN and we went quite late and I forgot to thank the interpreters. I would like to thank the interpreters now. And second point, ALS did have a request and I’m going to ask staff if they got that request and if their due diligence started?

Matt Ashtiani: Not that I know of but I can look into it and get back to you.

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And that was Matt Ashtiani speaking. Okay, thank you. Any other comments, questions or...? Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Chair. Dev Anand Teelucksingh. This is more of a question for EURALO, you mentioned that you did bylaw modifications, I don't know if there's time enough for this, but I guess I would like to know how that was done because we are also looking to update our bylaws. Discussions are continuing on the concept of it, but I just wanted to know whether it was approved in one motion, was it done at a face to face General Assembly when the vote was taken or a virtual General Assembly?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev. Do we have an answer for this? Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd like to know which bylaw modifications we're talking about seeing as I came in at the very end of these reports. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Well in regards to the LACRALO bylaw modifications. They've been having discussions regarding how to deal with inactive ALSes, so that was one aspect, which is now being treated at the RALO level to try to get consistency as to the concepts to deal with that. SO that's one aspect. The second aspect was the increase in the terms of the Chairs, the length of the terms of the

---

Chairs – sorry, let me start over again. Increasing the length of the term for the Chair and the secretariat from one year to two years and also including a proviso that no person can serve more than two consecutive terms.

Another topic for discussion, which there's been no consensus yet, was that to increase the term, the possibility of an ALAC representative elected by LACRALO to serve more than one term. Currently we have, it is now specifically stated that it can only be served one term. But there's been a discussion whether to include a diversity requirement into those ALAC representatives.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Dev - Cheryl Langdon-Orr from the record...*for* the record, perhaps not from the record, although – you've helped me a great deal because I thought I was hearing two things and in fact it is two things. So if I may bifurcate – apologies to the interpreters – my answer. A bunch of that stuff, everything but what you do with an ALS that you deem in some way shape or form inactive belongs to the RALO structure. It's borne out of the documentation that was prior to the signing of the memorandum with ICANN. In each of those, and I am dragging on my memory, but having read each of them for each of the regions, each changed to your rules of procedure or memorandums in articles are required to be under particular vote structures.

There are some different, some have to be at a General Assembly, or an annual general meeting, not fussed about the word. Some

---

RALOs have a particular level of vote, a two-thirds or a super majority or whatever. So there's variance there, but to every single RALO those types of things are done at a meeting off current membership.

Some regions define the membership able to vote a only those At-Large Structures who have been accepted by the ALAC at the time the announcement of the vote and information goes out. So you may find differences between region one and region two as to whether or not if you became accredited between the announcement and now, but there is also to my knowledge something absent in many of these sets of advice. Part for in fact they're not harmonized or have common language.

I remember at no point any of them saying how a reconsideration can be done. Thank you. And I'll come back to my second part after you respond.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: My question to EURALO wasn't so much the intricacies of the actual wording or how they implemented it, it was more about a question of how the actual modifications were approved. So not so much the substance of how they, what the language they used. Because the problem is that there's extensive modification that's needed in the bylaw modifications – sorry in our bylaws – because there's been discrepancies discovered between the different language versions as well. So it's tricky. I'm not sure what's the

---

proper way and probably I need to talk to ICANN legal perhaps for advice and to get some more feedback on that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Can we have this as an action item please to facilitate speaking to ICANN legal about this?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I further that action item - Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record – ask a consideration to further that action item, that that conversation would be well had with a representative from each of the regions. Because to my knowledge, and perhaps gathering them all together into a single telephone call would be good, to my knowledge each region is looking at significant changes to its members' procedures or bylaws depending on how they're identified in their documentation. And I think having a little bit of a what you can and what you can't and why we do and why we don't discussion would be very good before people go too far down.

If I could come back to the ALS issue, one needs to be very cautious and one would be encouraging, or this one at this end of the table would be seriously encouraging, the regions to work to harmonize these types of rules and regulations. And they need to remember that what they're going to be doing is suggesting to the ALAC, note that – the ALAC, what it does or does not put out as minimum criteria; because it is the ALAC that accepts or rejects an

---

ALS. So I suggest work together and get back to us is the pathway on that one. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. Any other comments, questions, etc. I see no other comments. Perhaps can we move to the next part of our agenda which is the At-Large improvements dialogue regarding the final report and next steps, and I believe that Seth can speak to us a little bit about this please, with a quick update on that.

Seth Greene: Hi. Seth Green for the record. We had a meeting while here in Singapore with the co Chairs of the work teams in which we simply reiterated the next steps. And very briefly those next steps are the planning of the final report, which will basically include three simple sections – the list of recommendations for the ALAC coming out of each work team; the tasks on the simplified outline for which the work team has decided a recommendation is no longer timely or relevant and why that it; and third, for the two work teams that have summarized their either motivation pre-improvements or their recommendations into flow charts will certainly include those flow charts in the final report. Thank you Matt.

Following that, the report will go to the ALAC...

---

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Seth, the reason why the microphone is being pulled away from you is you're about to eat it. You need to be a little further out.

Seth Greene: I have to not skip breakfast tomorrow. The report will then, we'll take, staff will then take that data, complete the final report and it will be, it's next stop will be the ALAC where it will be considered and then the ALAC will start the implementation phase. Thank you Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Seth. Are there any questions or comments with regards to the At-Large improvements? Great. So I gather everyone knows what we're doing now and we can all push, do this one final push for the recommendations to reach the ALAC. And oh - Cheryl Langdon-Orr has her hand up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Just to make the point that if you have a sudden – oops, I meant to say something and I thought about it later; the reason we like to get, as the Executive Committee, the reason we would like to make sure this is tied up pretty well now is because on Friday, when the Executive Committee meets with some of the finance and controlling senior management in ICANN, one of the questions we want to be able to ask is, what commitment do we have from ICANN, or what continuing commitment do we have from ICANN

---

affirming a previous commitment that improvements would be appropriately funded.

And so to actually have that game change after might be problematic because we're going to go into bat to make sure that with the proper improvements implementation program in place it will be properly supported and facilitated. So this really is closing down the opportunity for change. There will be it later because we get reviewed again, in fact we're only two years away from our next review. So there is not a total it will never happen again, but do get to us very, very soon, like today if there's something that you think is desperately wrong or missing. Don't wait for it to go to vote or till the end; it's too late then.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Cheryl. Did you say a new process will start in two years?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I believe so, might be modified, but to my knowledge on the cycle of things, GNSO should be reviewed sometime in the next 12 or 18 months again. Why I'm saying something might change is because all of their implementation has not happened and we are the cab that leaves the rank immediately after the GNSO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Cheryl. I remember the discussion I had yesterday with some members of the GNSO and the amount of work that a review

---

entices and the fact that sometimes one is not finished with the previous review the next one already starts; so you have to review the review which becomes a little confusing.

Any other questions or comments on this part of the agenda and if there aren't any, are there any online questions? I see none. So we'll move to the next part of the agenda which is the review and wrap-up of ALAC business.

Now, there are just a handful of points, I think we've pretty much covered everything that we've discussed here. Maybe we could have any questions to be asked – Wolf earlier had a question with regards to were all of the At-Large, ALS applications processed? Yes, that was voted. But there are a couple of specific issues, first just an announcement, or just feedback. The Ex Com is going to have lunch with some registrars, a registrar leadership team. So we're going to continue the dialogue that we've been having with the registrars. I think it's particularly important that we engage in such a dialogue, specifically with regards to consumer issues and education for users. So it's particularly important.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Not decided where, Gisella is taking care of that. So that's really important as a dialogue. But then we also have two small issues which, well large issues actually which we need to perhaps have an

---

update on. The first one is what's going on with the JAS Working Group. There's been a lot happening here certainly during this week, on top of everything else. And so for a little update on this I am giving the floor over to Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch:

I just wanted to pay a little bit of heed to the work that has been going on intensively between the GAC and the ALAC as a result of the meeting that we had on Sunday, which was very well received, we found some very good common ground. And as a result of that there was an extremely surprisingly effective meeting between a small number of ALAC people and a small number of GAC people that took place to try and come up with some wording on a joint statement. The good news is that that statement has been made. The bad news is that the GAC has not had the time to be able to ratify it in time for this week's meeting.

So, here's where things stand as of right now. In the GAC communiqué that is being put out as part of today's public comment there's going to be explicit mention of the JAS Group and specifically a request of ICANN to properly resource and provide expertise to the JAS Group because it has a lot of work to do in a very short period of time.

So, while the volunteers have been concentrating on the decisions and the high level, we're going to need some very, very good detailed level people to help word the document. I've heard a rumor that there have been people freed up who no longer have to

---

work on existing applicant guidebooks that may be able to assist us with the ongoing work of this. We're definitely going to need documentation of similar quality for needs qualified applicants.

So, there's going to be a JAC component of the GAC communiqué and the statement is still very much alive. The GAC is looking to still ratify it and send it out as a joint letter. This will be raised as future ALAC business when this comes up, probably at the next ALAC teleconference. At which time I will be bringing forward to vote on a joint ALAC/GAC letter that will be submitted as joint advice to the Board.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. I was waiting for your mic to go off. I thought you still had a few things to add. Any questions or comments on this particular subject? I don't see anybody's hand up. Okay. So next on my list of extra topics that were dealt with here is the one on consumer related issue. There was a session on consumer metrics, consumer confidence metrics and we had both Beau Brendler and Evan Leibovitch who participated in the panel. So yes, Evan could you say a few more words on this please?

Evan Leibovitch: Just an update from that session. There is an action item that involves the creation of the next ICANN cross community Working Group. That is going to involve not only At-Large and the GNSO, but for the first time this group is also intended to include explicitly from the beginning, ccNSO and the GAC. So

---

this will be the first four-participant CWG to deal specifically with consumer issues. Right now the terminology being used is “consumer choice”, “competition” and “consumer trust”. I personally have a little bit of problem with the way that that is expressed because some of it is done as a suppliers side view of the public interest as opposed to the consumer or the public interest perspective on this. This is yet to be determined obviously, but you can be assured that we will be coming back to all of you to find participation in this group because this issue is important, it needs to be embedded in ICANNs very way of working.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Evan. Just to add also we had an additional policy meeting that took place on, I think it was on Monday, either Monday or Tuesday; it just feels like a long, long day actually. And that discussed specifically the comments that were open and so several action items were taken from there. And I believe that the Executive Committee will be taking up those action items in their meeting on Friday afternoon. Any questions or comments that anybody wishes to bring up? Yes, Dave Kissoondoyal. Well it’s really any other business in a way I guess now.

Dave Kissoondoyal:

Yeah I have two - Dave Kissoondoyal for the recording – I have two small things. The proposed submittal for developing countries – I think if the ALAC can put it somewhere, I don’t know where, but at least we can start thinking about it. The second thing I’ve

---

got is for a question of Rod, concerning return on investment as well. I think if we can set up a small group of people really taking care of it because we do not want to be embarrassed with so much money spent on ALAC and what is return of it. We have to, we know that all our ALSes of the ALAC, we are doing a good job all the time we are locating to the conference calls, meetings, etc. But we want it to be documented or something like that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dave. That's a very good point actually, but I would have thought part of track record speaks for itself, but certainly it's something to consider. It's just I'm a bit concerned about diverting resources from doing the work to doing the marketing about the work, but perhaps there's, this is the world that we live in. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. Carlton Samuels for the record. That's my concern. I mean quite frankly when you get into that in this kind of environment, it's a set up for a pissing contest. And I personally don't think, the reason why I made a specific reference to the CEO taking count of the amount of policy initiatives that came out of ALAC was specifically for that purpose. So I want to let him understand that I know he's counting.

And I want to put that on the record because some of our people simply don't get it. I don't have much patience for these kinds of things, everybody knows this. It really is not going to help you if

---

you start marketing about what you do and this is politics babe, this is high politics. And we need to understand that what we need to do is to continue to get in their faces with the policy statements that we make on the record. And when they mention that they notice that we have said that, that's where we head in and that's where we do the marketing. Yes, we're saying these things, glad to know that you noticed them and by the way we're coming back at you again. That's how we should do it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. Evan wanted to say a few words as well.

Evan Leibovitch: This is Evan Leibovitch. I have a brief follow up to Carlton and another question to Dave to see, I want to get some follow up from the actual meeting on the Summit of developing countries and to get a little bit more information. But on the issue of the number of things that we do and that we send out, there is a part of me that has a concern that the sheer volume of what we send out in fact may be as much of a problem as a good thing. In that when the GAC comes out, and they do very few communiqués, but they have the gravitas because almost the scarcity of them in fact inflates their importance.

So in fact ongoing we may want to consider the idea that we have important statements that we release in detail but less frequently and additional comments or letters that will indicate what we're

---

doing that will happen more frequently, but we don't need to get the Board's feedback on every little thing that we comment on.

But Dave, if there's a way, maybe not right now, but to do a small debrief to us on what happened about the Summit for developing countries because I was, I had to be in another meeting at the time. This is an important thing and it does need ALACs support and help, and this is information I think needs to go out to the broader community and I definitely want to see you get the support that this project needs.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And Dave, before you answer, I see Cheryl waving away so it might be something she just wishes to answer Evan about.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. It's not a point of order but it was becoming perilously close to it. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Evan I couldn't agree with you more, but I'm going to ask Dave not to respond. The reason I'm going to ask Dave not to respond is one of giving it the right time and focus which we do not have the luxury of now.

I think this is a hugely important issue so I would like to put forward that this is a single purpose discussion that takes at least a 45 minute slot in the earliest possible ALAC meeting or joint regional leadership and ALAC meeting and it becomes an action item for that. I don't believe we can do justice to it in the short

time we have available. So I didn't want to have Dave cut off and we really need to have a proper discussion. That was my issue. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Cheryl and I see that Carlton has supported your statement. Seth, you've...staff has recorded this. Right. I think that we've reached the end of this meeting, but we do have a couple of extra items that we need to deal with. And the first one is to do with some of us who are leaving. A couple of people from RALOs have left their positions. The first one being Hong Xue; and the other being Andres Piazza, and Andres had to...

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh no, well the third one is still here, is shackled to this table. Well I guess it's a matter of thanks and a measure of appreciation for all the time that you've spent in your tireless job as Chairs. I think that we'll start with Hong. Hong please come forward. Stand up and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Come on up.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Photo opportunity – who’s got a camera?! Quickly!!

[Applause]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr taking over because I do. I just wanted to note that of course Olivier was far, far, far too humble. The work he has done as the EURALO regional secretariat has, in my view as I wrote on the card, set a benchmark and I think that’s a benchmark that we should all be very well happy. So I’d now like to recognize Wolf, go ahead. Thank you, Wolf.

Wolf Ludwig: Thank you, Cheryl. I couldn’t agree more with you. I think about Olivier’s with some very special observations. He was elected to the EURALO Board at the General Assembly at the Summit in Mexico. He stepped in and I would say he made a lot off noise but very discreetly. He made a lot of noise but he did it very discreetly. While he was participating in the secretariat function he was an incredible help to the EURALO leadership and he made an incredible career within a relatively short period of time from EURALO secretariat to ALAC Chair.

---

And this is something very remarkable and I guess not necessarily stand up setting, but Olivier, thanks a lot for all you have done for EURALO. You are now in a much better position except for I'm somehow pleased letting you go because I think you can be certainly more important where you are now than where you have been before. But I'm still proud that you are part of EURALO and thanks again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Here, here.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well thank you very much. Thank you very much Wolf. I must say I've had a great time as secretary of EURALO. The team is really fantastic and thanks for your great help as well and for the openness, with which the whole Board at EURALO allowed me to come into, come there as easily. I think it was a real model of openness so I was very happy and pleased to be able to help in that region.

Of course, I'm also very thankful having put as Chair of ALAC and the team that we have here, I believe, is among the best teams of any group at ICANN. I wouldn't be able to do any of this without all of you people who are here who work for, well you spend your days here for no salary whatsoever, I'm not quite sure why, but fair enough. I often ask myself that same question but yeah, it's really great to be here and I'm really enjoying the ride and I hope that you all are as well. And I think we are really

---

making a difference, which is really important in the context of ICANN. Thank you.

And finally also, a vote of thank for Andres who is leaving us as many in At-Large who have to work so hard for so many days and nights, people usually leave with a promotion and Andres has now ended up with a job in LACNIC I understand. And this is great for him, we're all really happy for him. So thank you Andres. I don't know whether he's – he's not here. Well, he's already been snatched from the room I guess. So well done and thank you Andres for being with us and good luck in the rest of your career. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

...realize what I brought down behind but I know you were very keen to see it. So perhaps you would like to take the microphone from me, but I can't help myself, I preceded you so I'm going to do it again. This is a very special cake which we're all invited to share. It's been organized by Heidi to give her heartfelt thanks and support to – where's Matt, where have you gone? Matt! Pay attention boy! Thank you. Stand there and be complimented. Thank you. Heidi sent this cake specifically for you all. And I hope she is? Great. Sophia's let her talk. Over to you Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich:

HI Cheryl, thank you. I wanted to give a few moments of my heartfelt thanks to the At-Large staff for their extraordinary efforts these last two months and particularly working, I can see from the

---

emails, 24 hours through the Singapore meetings and in the week or so prior to that. I mean this cake was partly the work of Olivier and Cheryl and myself in one way of thanking you for those efforts and for the next two months while I'm bonding with my beautiful daughter. But also I wanted to just say a few thanks to those who are departing and that would be again their roles in the RALOs – Hung, fantastic job.

Thank you Andres, I know you're not there, but for the record it was a fantastic job. And as Wolf said for Olivier, thanks, you did a great job as secretary but I think in your current role as ALAC Chair it will be good to have you, to have 100% of the time for that very important position. So again, enjoy the cake, wish I could be there to help you enjoy that, and we'll see you shortly in a few months. Thank you.

Seth Greene:

Thanks very much Heidi. We appreciate it and can't wait for your return for many reasons.

Gisella Gruber-White:

Thank you Heidi and thank you to everyone else. And thank you to the community for all the hard work you guys do because I mean I know we work long hours, but you guys all have your day jobs and you do all the hard work as well. So thank you to all of you for making it possible for us as well.

---

Matt Ashtiani: Thank you Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Thanks Matt.

Matt Ashtiani: Thank you for also giving me the opportunity to work with the At-Large, like a wonderful set of people who work very hard and very diligently. I really appreciate the opportunity, so thank you all as well.

Heidi Ullrich: Keep in mind Matt that this is only about 20%, just wait until I get back. Okay, thanks everyone. Enjoy the cake.

[End of Transcript]