BUENOS AIRES – NARALO Monthly Meeting
Monday, November 18, 2013 – 16:00 to 17:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHAIR: If everybody could take their seats? When everybody is seated at the table I will ask staff to begin recording and announce the meeting.

MATT ASHTIANI: Welcome everybody to the NARALO Monthly Meeting on Monday, 18th of November 2013. At the table we have Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, Glenn McKnight, Maureen Hillyard, Darlene Thompson, Garth Bruen, Silvia Vivanco, myself Matt Ashtiani, Julia Charvolen, Heidi Ullrich and Chris Mondini.

CHAIR: Thank you. Eduardo Diaz has a conflict but he has authorized me to be his proxy on any consensus. I believe Olivier was here but then he stepped out. Can the Secretary please review the Action Items from the previous meeting?

DARLENE THOMPSON: No, I can't. I don't have it. [pause] The Action Items are: #2.3 – the NARALO DST ended Sunday 3rd of November 2013, and you can see more for details. #2.4 – staff perpetually reserve October Monday designated as Canadian Thanksgiving, which would be cool on this day in the US. #2.5 – Heidi to work with CT to determine if a ticket system can be implemented to facilitate tracking of travel-related reimbursement.

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.

CHAIR: Thank you Madame Secretary. The next section concerns meetings. The first part of this section is the current meeting in Buenos Aires. We had a special request by Maureen Hillyard from APRALO to give us a little rundown on metrics, so I am yielding the floor to Maureen. Welcome.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Thank you Garth. Yes, this is actually… Metrics is actually an ALAC Working Group and for our sins – I see Alan Greenberg down there – we were involved in the development of the new ALAC Rules of Procedure, and in those new set of rules, the section 9, which was section 21 in the old rules, section 9 looks at performance metrics and remediation for ALAC.

The Metrics Group is looking at devising a set of metrics for ALAC, for ALSes and for RALOs, but we're first of all looking at ALAC. Looking at… Just to give some introduction, in the beginning of that section 9 are four points that actually outline why we've been given this task and why we've been assigned to look at metrics.

It does actually state the ability of the ALAC to represent the interest of Internet users depends on strong participation from all ICANN regions, and that furthermore the ALAC can function effectively only if all ALAC members and appointees meet the obligations of their positions. Satisfactory performance, although a complex concept, includes both objective and subjective issues and must include very significant personal contributions made by At-Large volunteers.

Moreover, the ALAC and At-Large receive significant funding for ICANN, both for travel and other activities, and the ALAC must be able to justify such expense. With those points in mind, and also considering that at today's presentation Fadi mentioned metrics, he also mentioned cost. I don't know if I actually volunteered for this Working Group but I got put on it.

What my role is to speak to the RALOs, to actually speak to ALSes, and how many ALSes have we got here? Six? I assume there are more. What we want is feedback on this section really, so that we can get some feedback and hopefully devise some appropriate metrics. Now, it actually says that it is a complex concept. People are all volunteers, so to measure performance is an extremely difficult situation.

But what I'm pleading each of the RALOs that I'm going to be speaking to this week, is if you can gather some feedback? We'd like to know that if we're going to devise some metrics at all that they at least consider the concerns of ALSes about performance evaluation of people on the ALAC. It's going to affect me, so I just think that I would like to think that I was performing as expected by the people who've elected me onto the role of ALAC.

There is a Wiki. If there's anyone with questions or queries we'd love to hear them. You can put them on your own Wiki. We'll find it; just let me know. Or contact me with any questions or queries that you might have. I'd love to hear from you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Maureen. I have a query for your query, and that is if we could have a specific query for the ALSes that I can submit in email to them and have them answer specifically, and then I can route it back to you.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: On our working I actually drafted out a set of criteria of the sorts of things we might be looking at measuring. What I'd like is your feedback on is it too much, is it too little, is it over the top? We want to know… Also if you've got any ideas about how we might appropriate measure? I think one of the feedback comments that I got was, "Should we be looking at benchmarks rather than actual measurements?" and that sort of thing.

If anyone's got any solutions that might help us make it a little more user-friendly, that would be really helpful.

CHAIR: Thank you Maureen. If you provide me with a link to that Wiki, and staff too, we'll make it an Action Item to follow up from this meeting in our next NARALO call. We will start soliciting answers from our ALSes. Now, in terms of questions I know that there might be some remote participants. Matt, do we have anyone with questions? No. Thank you Maureen. Any…?

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Not at all. If you've got any questions or queries please get in touch.

CHAIR: Anybody in the room have any questions for Maureen? No? Okay. Thank you very much for your time. We'll move on. Okay, next Item, #¡3.2, concerns ATLAS II in the timeline for ramping up to ATLAS. I see that Olivier has joined us. Does Olivier or anyone from the ATLAS II Team have anything they want to discuss about this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Garth. The ATLAS II has several Working Groups that have been created, effectively. The first one, the one that had to do work immediately was the Survey Group, that designed a survey and sent it to all the At-Large structures. We had very good response, thanks to the work of all the RALO Chairs and Leaders. Thanks very much to the NARALO Chair for the work that he's done and the NARALO Secretariat – that they've done in the region here.

The responses have been analyzed. They are now all on the website, and the next step is to take the responses and start dishing them over to the Group that puts together the Agenda. From there onwards we have a clear idea of what our ALSes wish to be discussing and what they're interested in in the run-up to the At-Large Summit in 2014.

There is a concern that I personally have with regards to the amount of involvement of At-Large structures in the Working Groups themselves. There's still only a very small subset, and the aim is to get the community to build this Summit for themselves. I would urge RALOs to

go to their members and ask them to take interest and take part in the preparations and in the Working Groups.

I note that a vast majority of respondents to the survey said they were ready to get involved. They were interested and eager to get involved. We now have a list of those who are interested in getting involved. I think it would be good for the RALOs to look at that list, identify the members in their region and contact them, perhaps directly, to try and let them find out which of the Working Groups they'd be interested in.

I'm not asking for each ALS to take part in all of the Working Groups, but if we can share the load between the different Working Groups, that will certainly make life easier for everyone and will of course be a lot more inclusive. AT this point in time the results of the survey, as I said, have been analyzed. The next step really is for the other Groups to start getting in motion.

There is an additional, parallel sidetrack going on at the same time. In London, as you might or might not know, ICANN's meeting in London will be ICANN's 50th meeting, so it will be a pretty big affair. In conjunction with the At-Large Summit, there will be a number of additional opportunities for press and for additional events that will take place.

To that extent we're now working with a small crew of people based in the UK, working with Sally Costerton and her Team, to try and coordinate all of the activities that we'd like to put together over there. In addition to all of this there's also a search for sponsors specific to the ATLAS II.   There were thought, which were submitted, that the

sponsorships could be used for some of the social events for our ALSes when they come to London.

There was also a suggestion that some of the funds could be used to bring more people than just the 160 people. I do understand that there might be issues of logistics at that point, due to the number of hotel rooms available in the hotel itself. Funding might not be the only issue. It might be a case of actually finding accommodation for them, but this is something that's still at a very early stage, since this is just a discussion at this very moment.

No sponsorship has been secured so far, because all companies usually wait for December/January to put together the next year's budget. The good thing about it is that we arrive before they've built their budget, so we're not arriving and asking for funding when the budgets have closed, and then there'd be very little that they could provide to the Summit's activities.

That's all for the time being. Thank you for letting me explain. If there are any questions I am of course able to answer them.

CHAIR: Thank you Mr. Chair. I have a recommendation for building capacity for ATLAS II, is that we take some of the vagaries out of volunteering. If there is a tasks list of specific items that need to be done, we can assign them to people and that is a way to get them involved. I think that's a good route to take and I could help facilitate with that. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that's an excellent idea. Would it be possible t have this as an Action Item for staff to relay to the ATLAS II Working Group? I think that would be great, definitely.

CHAIR: Thank you. While I have you, Olivier, maybe you could reflect upon… Apparently there was a statement at the opening ceremony this morning about ALAC, from Steve Crocker. Is this true?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you. There were several statements about ALAC. There was first a reflection on the work that took place here last week, which was the Leadership Training Program, that was composed of facilitation skills, two days of facilitation skills, and two days as an orientation course for newly selected people coming into ICANN – not only At-Large, not only ALAC – we're speaking about people selected for Board positions, new GAC members, etc.

Steve Crocker, Chair of the Board, very eloquently thanked the ALAC for working on this and having been the source of the work that was done there. Also, Fadi Chehadé did go through a number of metrics, because there were a lot of numbers there regarding what ICANN had done since he had arrived, and also in the last few months since the last meeting in Durban. The ALAC was mentioned on several occasions as having done some excellent work.

I know my name was mentioned once – and I can't take the credit for this; I think it's the whole community that needs to take the credit for

this and I'd like to transmit this over to you so that you can tell your members you're being recognized. This is something that really hasn't happened in recent years. Things have improved. It hasn't happened a few years ago. There's definitely some recognition of the work of this community and I'm really glad this is the case. I really think this community deserves it.

CHAIR: Thank you Mr. Chair. Our next Agenda Item is a brief about the next NARALO meeting that occurs in North America; in Los Angeles. I have a question for staff: do we have any deadlines or anything we need to prepare in terms of budget for that? No? Nothing. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, not at this point.

CHAIR: Thank you. What would be the normal timeframe in order to submit budget for a GA?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Keep in mind that all RALOs will be holding their GAs at the Summit in London, so there will not be any GAs the next fiscal year. There can be a showcase perhaps, but the Summit is really seen as the big event for all RALOs and At-Large for 2014.

CHAIR: Okay. Just for clarification, isn't the Los Angeles meeting in the following year?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's in the following fiscal year, but again, it's the next meeting, so the Summit in London is in June 2014 and the Los Angeles meeting is in October 2014. NARALO will be asked to have their GA in London. One representative from each of their ALSes will be there, so that's really an opportune time to hold a GA.

CHAIR: Understood. Thanks for the clarification. Briefly, the next meeting after this meeting is ICANN 49 in Singapore, Singapore. I imagine there's nothing pending that we need to discuss in terms of that? Unless anybody has anything? No? Okay. Moving onto Agenda Item #4 – communication and outreach strategy.

One thing I've been soliciting from all of our ALSes is a list of ten additional potential recruits, organizations, and in order to make that simpler I want you to pick five in two separate categories. One category is the type of organization, and the other category would be the geography of the organization, and hopefully something that's located close to where you sit. If you're in New York, try and find five organizations in New York. Same goes for Toronto.

I know Toronto has been heavily recruiting in lots of different areas, so those trees may have all been completely picked, but you never know. Next Agenda Item concerns CROPP. I don't know if Murray is remotely

connected, but I think that Glenn – you had some questions that you needed clarified about CROPP?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: On the last call we discussed… Is that my feedback? As I was saying, Murray was selected as the Outreach rep. We need to reps – one from the FBSC and one from Outreach. We need a second person as well. Heidi, you're saying no? That's not the case? Did staff have a follow up? I believe staff can help with the… Okay, I think it's gone. Did staff have a response for Glenn's question?

DARLENE THOMPSON: For the CROPP Review Team it was very blankly stated that every RALO have one person from the Outreach Committee and one person from the Finance Committee. Here in North America we have two people on Outreach, which was Eduardo and myself. Eduardo is already on the main CROPP Group, so that left myself.

On the Finance Committee there was myself and Alan Skuce. So I roped Alan Skuce into being our second person, and he was happy to step up. Just as Olivier was saying, there are people out there that want to take on more responsibility, and he was one of them. He was like, "Yes, I've been looking for somewhere I could fit." So he was happy to do that.

That's why it's myself and Alan Skuce on the CROPP Review Team Committee – mainly because there was no other choice, because there's nobody else on the Outreach or Finance Boards that could take it, so that's why that ended up the way it did.

CHAIR: Glenn, does that answer your question?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I guess it's confused me, because Murray's on that Outreach Committee and we assumed, I guess, but Darlene says there's two people assigned, so that's great. We can go through the process of they're the assigned persons so we can start populating our suggested ideas for 2014.

DARLENE THOMPSON: I very carefully went through the list of who's on each Committee, and Murray was not there. That's why it happened the way it did. There you go.

CHAIR: Okay. I think it seems like there's been some confusion. There was confusion about which Working Group Murray was supposed to be on. We can sort this out later. All right. Agenda Item #4.3 is a redundant Item. #4.4 – we have to get back to revising the online application and hopefully maybe I can have some offline time with Matt to start discussing that again at some point.

                               Item #5 – our community. First Item, remembering Gareth Sherman of Telecommunities.   We had a moment of silence earlier, and as I understand, there is some movement to get the Board to recognize Gareth's contributions to ICANN and At-Large. Is this the case? Is anybody handling this in particular? I think so, I just have "Board

recognize Gareth's contribution". I didn't know if that was specific to this meeting or in general.

HEIDI ULLRICH: During the Board meeting on Thursday there will be a notice from Steve Crocker about Gareth, and a certificate will be provided, so if you could work out among the leadership who'd like to go ahead and take that certificate, that would be appreciated. Please let staff know about that ahead of time and then we'll arrange for that.

CHAIR: Thank you Heidi. Can we have that as an Action Item? I didn't have the details of that particular event, I just had a general Item here. #5.1.4 – collaborative Circle ID article. I've been telling everybody who worked with Gareth to provide me with commentary, hopefully via email or text, so I can cut and paste it and then format it.

Once I have a complete article with a lot of people's different viewpoints I'll put together a draft and send it around the community for approval. We want to figure out ways we can continue Gareth's work. Is there somebody in his community, from his ALS, who is going to become the ALS rep? Does anybody know?

DARLENE THOMPSON: I am the Vice Chair of Telecommunities Canada. I wanted somebody else to take on the work of ICANN, and so therefore there is another person that will be stepping up to do that. There are actually two

people that are very interested in ICANN work in Telecommunities Canada, so we do have definitely people that are interested, without it having to be me.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. If you could forward their contact information to me that would be appreciated. Of course, we're open to any other suggestions for remembering Gareth.   Item #5.2 – regional advice needed on an ALS application for the Hispanic Educational Technological Services – or HETS – de Puerto Rico. I'm going to take a quick consensus here.

Hopefully everybody has had a chance to review their information I've been posting. Eduardo has already given me his authorization to give his approval. That's one vote and I can give another. If anybody wants to put a check mark in the Adobe room? If I could just see a quick show of hands on who wants to move this application forward, and if staff could just take a quick note of who's voted in favor of it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: From the meeting room – if anybody's doing a green tick in the Adobe Connect? – we have Alan Greenberg, Evan Leibovitch, Glenn McKnight, Garth Bruen.

MATT ASHTIANI: On the Adobe Connect we have Gordon Chillcott, Thomas Lowenhaupt and Joly McFie.

CHAIR: Can we add Eduardo to the list of people who've approved this? That would be great. Seeing that we apparently have a majority, I believe that we will give our approval of advice to this ALS. Item #5.3 – a move to decertify ALS, the Alberta Communities Network Associations. This has been a long time in coming.

They've been more or less unreachable and fairly non-existent. I believe they haven't voted in quite some time or appeared at a meeting in quite some time. I sent them a postal letter, which was not responded to. Phone calls have not been received and emails have not been received. Matt, do you have any idea of their last voting or last attendance at a meeting?

MATT ASHTIANI: No, not off-hand, but I can look into that.

CHAIR: Thank you. Darlene, do you have a comment?

DARLENE THOMPSON: I actually know the guys that were part of that association. The association has now fallen apart completely. It does not exist.

CHAIR: Okay. Unless there are any objections we'll move forward with the official process of decertifying that ALS. Thank you. Yes, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Garth. By moving forward with the decertification process, could you please clarify?

CHAIR: Yes. Evan, are you able to clarify?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, just my understanding on the process that it's not NARALO that does the decertification, but NARALO that makes a recommendation to ALAC, which itself has the sole authority to do that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, it's the ALAC that decertifies, however there have been some other ALSes that have been decertified so… I guess Alan can give us the exact details of how this works, but we already have had some decertifications.

If you're not aware on what type of information you'd need to provide to the ALAC then you're very welcome to inquire with staff or myself, or check out the bit of the website that shows the kind of documentary evidence that you'd need to produce. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: My only comment is, the NARALO, according to its operating procedures however does have the ability to… I don't remember the exact word… I think it's "deactivate" an ALS within NARALO. That serves the purpose

of removing it, essentially, from the denominator in calculating quorums and vote participation.

So it removes their ability to vote and therefore it doesn't count against us that they don't vote in any given instance. That is a RALO thing that the RALO can do, and should, because given that there's a Board position coming up which may well involve votes, you want to keep your tally straight.

CHAIR: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: They may already be deactivated in that sense, I don't remember.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, they already have.

CHAIR: Okay. Darlene, you have a comment?

DARLENE THOMPSON: I would also like to put forward the matter of Consumers' Web Watch. They no longer have anybody that's interested in ICANN matters. I've been told this by Bo himself, and I think they should be falling along the same path. So I'd just like to put that as an Action Item; to start talking to them.

CHAIR: Thank you.   My hope was to use the Alberta Community Network
                        Associations as a test case, so we understand the process better. Then
                        we can look into any other ALSes who may qualify for this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is not only do they not have anyone interested, they
                        don't exist anymore, Consumer Web Watch.   I believe their domain
                        name no longer exists. They fired all their staff that have any interest in
                        it. I just think we need to document it.

CHAIR: I just want to make sure that we get the process right, so I'd like to do it
                        one at a time. Thank you. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I was essentially going to repeat what Alan just said. To the best of my
                        knowledge, Consumers' Union Act have actively disbanded that
                        particular union.

CHAIR: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Garth. If you have documentary evidence, whatever evidence it is, provide it and that will really help the ALAC and help a smooth decertification process.

CHAIR: Just because this is a delicate issue and we don't want to speedily remove people from our own rolls, I do want to do it one at a time. Thank you. Darlene and then Alan.

DARLENE THOMPSON: Very quickly – I spoke to Bo about this and he thought that he'd already put in the paperwork to decertify them. It's just a matter of putting it through.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, the RALO does not need to take any action if the ALAC chooses to do it itself. I don't know… Olivier, I don't remember if the…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. The RALO might not wish to do anything, but historically as we've seen in the last round, when some decertification came up, there were some very embarrassing pushbacks from some ALAC members saying that there was not enough evidence and this was a hasty process, etc. I'm just trying to avoid NARALO receiving this kind of beating.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't suggesting we do that, I was just pointing it out.

CHAIR: I think we're in agreement that this has to be a careful and thoroughly documented process. Thank you. Along the same lines, Item #5.4 we have some lapsed groups, some delinquent groups, including Web 405 and People Who, and I'm going to make aggressive attempts to reengage them and find out what their status is.

Just briefly, Item #5.5 – in terms of our votes, to make sure that they work properly, I want to do test votes whenever we have a vote on a null item. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Is that an Action Item?

CHAIR: I'd like to make it an Action Item, yes. In terms of a null item I just mean the vote would be, "Are bananas yellow?" or something like that, just to see if everybody has the ability to functionally vote. Thank you. Evan? You've seen green bananas?   I've heard of blue bananas too. Supposedly they taste of vanilla ice cream. They only grow in some remote parts of the world.

Moving on, Agenda Item #7 which actually should be #6… Oh, Alan, and then Susie.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Susie was simply saying that I had my hand up. Regarding test votes, my recollection is the last time we took a vote everyone actually voted, but you might want to check with Matt on that. You may already have the test vote?

CHAIR: That's true. I want to make sure that prior to every actual vote we have a test vote, because in addition to people not voting or voting, there have also been technical issues, and there's also been confusion about the actual voting officer. I want to address all of these issues before we have an actual real vote. That's all.

Moving on, Item #7, which should be #6, we've been discussing drafting a proposal to reserve At-Large and related strings in the DNS, and I've been working with Tom Lowenhaupt on that. We've actually solicited some collaboration from other RALOs who are also concerned about this issue, and we're going to start building that. if anybody wants to discuss that with me they're certainly welcome to.

Agenda Item #8, which should be #7 – these are different Working Groups and the first one concerns NomCom, which we now have Louis. Unfortunately, because of the NomCom schedule, Louis is not arriving until later this week. We had a meeting earlier today, chaired by Evan, concerning the future Working Groups. Evan, did you have any comments on that? Anything you wanted to tell anybody?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Simply to thank all NARALO members who've been a part of the R3 paper, and just to let you know that activity inspired by that continues to go forward. The R3 paper itself and the distribution itself, that issue was closed, but we continued to do some further work. Jean-Jacques has started an initiative regarding a personal view of secrecy and privacy issues. So we're going to be creating a workspace for that.

We're going to ask the ALAC in its Thursday meeting to approve this workspace, and without any boundaries just to see essentially where it goes from there and what kind of work can come out of that. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Evan. The next Item is ATRT. Does Alan or Olivier wish to give an update? I know that there are several meetings planned this week for the ATRT. Any comments? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a meeting tomorrow with the ALAC, at some time in the afternoon. I don't remember exactly when. We are actively soliciting input from the ALAC, from individuals or any other entities, which could include ALSes or RALOs. We're looking for information one whether you believe the recommendations we are making are appropriate. Have we left out anything? Have we recommended anything that's stupid?

We've been told about a few of those already, so you don't have to feel embarrassed by doing that.   I'll point out that one of the recommendations, specifically one of the PDP, includes a section which

says, "People who are not funded by their companies," – and this is not verbatim, "Should not be disadvantaged in trying to participate in PDPs," and that clearly applies to At-Large as well as a number of other organizations.

There is a footnote, or a note, depending on whether you're looking in the executive summary or the body of the document, which says the ATRT 2 is considering a recommendation that widens that, not only to PDPs but to participation in ICANN in general, which again applies to At-Large, NCUC, SSAC in this case, because SSAC urge people generally not funded by their companies to participate.

At this point it's not a recommendation. To make it a recommendation we're likely to need some explicit support from the community, so you might consider supporting it and anything else. A number of the recommendations are closely related to things that the ALAC and At-Large has been involved in. There's certainly a number on the GAC with who it may resonate. I would suggest people look at them. It's a meaty document. I apologize for that, but it is a substantial amount of work.

The official comment period ends Thursday or Friday of this week. We've made it blatantly clear however that the reply period, which doesn't end until the 13th or 11th of December, we're quite happy to take comments all the way through to the end, but obviously the earlier they come in the better we can do things with them.

We are required and determined to have the final report out by the 31st of December, so we don't have a big window between the time the comments stop, and we have to have a final document. So please take a

look at it. There are things there that I think will matter to At-Large and NARALO, and you may want to comment. Comments can come from individuals or any entities as you wish.

CHAIR: Thank you. Olivier, you have a comment? Evan, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Garth. Alan, I remember some time back – I don't remember if it was your or somebody else – somebody mentioned that there was going to be an effort to try and percolate the particular bits of the ATRT that we should be paying attention to and perhaps supporting, to sort of flesh those out. Do you know if there's been any effort to draw attention to the specifics?

The kind of things that you're saying that you think ALAC might want to support? We have a policy meeting on Thursday. If there's a desire to craft something to put before the ALAC in saying, "Get an endorsement while we're here, a particular component of the ATRT…" time allowing, this is as good a place as any to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Rinalia is already drafting something to put before the ALAC. I did send out a document, and I think it was to the ALAC but I will not swear it was only to the ALAC, several weeks ago. I would be glad to dig it up and reforward it to anyone you want me to reforward it to.

CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any other Working Group leaders in the room?
                                 Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Another point which I think the ALAC might want to be looking at
                                 specifically is the suggestion, or the recommendation, that advice from
                                 all ACs would be treated by the Board in a way that would provide a
                                 response to the ACs when they provide advice. At the moment this is
                                 done informally, and we have been told by the Chair of the Board that
                                 the recommendation, as currently worded, has a high chance of being
                                 accepted.

                                 That said, the current Chair of the Board might not be around when this
                                 advice would be considered by the Board, and I think it would be good
                                 for this community to strongly support this specific recommendation.

CHAIR: Alan then Evan.

ALAN GREENBERG: That being said, we were also told there might be some pushback,
                                 specifically from the GAC. Not necessarily to the content, but to doing it
                                 sooner rather than later. So again, any support you have reinforces the
                                 chance that it may actually stay in the report and then get implemented.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: To both Alan and Olivier, when we heard from Steve at the beginning of this week, one of the first things when we talked on Sunday – which was just yesterday [laughter] – we were made aware of this dashboard that is now being used to track things and that says, "Here's advice being given by the ALAC and the SSAC, and shows explicit response cycles and what is being done."

In the opinion of the two of you that are here, to what extent does that dashboard satisfy this particular recommendation? Or does it go well beyond that?

ALAN GREENBERG: The difference is this is an operational procedure of the current Board and the current Chair. We're suggesting it be in the bylaws. One presumably has longer longevity and something you can hold up to a future Chair and Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: After having spent many years in ICANN, we've seen a lot of new things which were implemented very abruptly, and which then disappeared off the radar very abruptly as well. So we do have to push for it to be ingrained in the bylaws, so that if it had to be gotten rid of in the future it would take a while and it would take a battle.

CHAIR: Any further commentary? No? Okay. Are there any other Working Group leaders in the room who wish to give a report, or are there any

remote participants who wish to give a report? No? Seeing none. We'll move on. We're getting close to the end of our hour.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Garth, sorry, just for those who may not have seen the Board tracking device, we've just put it up on the screen. Julie, could you scroll down and just show what this is? Again, this is only for ALAC and SSAC. It's policy advice statements to the Board, so it's something that the ALAC's been asking for for quite some time. You can see that each resolution… if there's been a policy advice statement in there for recommendations, each one of those is indicated here.

If you click on it there will be a little screen that pops up with what the Board action on it was. Thank you.

CHAIR: Very slick. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's currently only for the ALAC and the SSAC, and the SSAC in fact has a long history put in. The ALAC one is not… The same level of history is not provided. The intent is to use it for other sources of advice and to flesh it out once the details are settled. It's still a work in progress.

CHAIR: Thank you. This is all a work in progress. Moving onto the next Item, which may have been covered already, is the ALAC – any issues which

EN

the ALAC members present wish to bring to NARALO's attention. No?
Seeing none we'll move on. Oh?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, I didn't want to jump the gun in case there was anything already
on the Agenda.

CHAIR: No, there were just some generic items, but I'm willing to give you the
floor if ALAC needs the floor?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: One of the things that I think we need to address at this meeting is the
issue of an affiliated representative going to the Summit in London.

CHAIR: Okay. Do we need to take consensus on that?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, essentially, I guess this is a report, and either you're welcome to do
it or ICANN is.

CHAIR: Please, you can take the report.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Essentially what happened was we had two people come forward indicating an intention to represent NARALO's unaffiliated membership at the London Summit. We have the ability to allocate one person from the unaffiliated, much as every ALS gets one person to go. Over the last little while expressions of interest were collected. Two were received – one from Peter Knight and one from Murray McKercher.

The two of them agreed to a process that allowed the five leaders of NARALO, that is the three ALAC members from North America, as well as the Chair and Secretariat, to jointly decide between them on which of those two should go. A meeting to that effect was held yesterday. A consensus was achieved, and so I guess I'm happy to announce Murray has been selected to represent the unaffiliated of NARALO going to the London Summit.

I appreciate Peter's effort and I hope he'll stay involved with us and that this isn't seen as a slap. Both were very well qualified, both would have easily represented unaffiliated well. It was a difficult decision, but I guess it will be Murray.

CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I hope that Peter and Murray are listening and understand.   Now, I believe somebody from the audience has a question. If she could come to the table please? Thank you.

SALA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Just one quick comment, since you invited the ALAC to… Very quickly, simultaneous to this meeting there are ICANN strategy meetings and

Strategy Panels – five of them actually – and I would really encourage the RALO community to engage within your stakeholder groups to channel thoughts and strategies and suggestions to the diverse groups. I know for a fact that for the past two years there's been some very interesting, substantive content being channeled up through NARALO and through the ALAC, which may not have necessarily gone into statements of policy advice.

It's certainly very heartening to see that the Strategy Panels are certainly considering some of the issues that most of you have raised in previous years. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you very much Sala. We have run out of time and I know that LACRALO needs the room to prepare for their showcase tonight. If there is no other business I'd call the meeting to a close, but I'm going to give everybody a moment to respond. Julia?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: For the any other business we had a question from Joly McFie, saying that: "Something I'd mention in AOB is that there's a proposal coming from TOR PGP community to reserve some TLDs for non-DNS use, AKA pseudo TLDs." You can see the dot in the Adobe Connect chat. "Is this within our purview?"

CHAIR: Well, we will take it under consideration. Do we have a name for the person who posted that?

JULIA CHARVOLEN: This is Joly.

CHAIR: Oh, Joly, absolutely. We can talk about this offline too.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, there's already been a little bit of discussion that's gone out about this in some of the sessions so far, and I think the initial answer that's been given right now is that at its current state, what's being talked about is simply a proposal to the IETF, is not been discussed, approved as a standard. It's something that's being put forward. It's being looked at, it's being followed. That's right.

It was in the discussion with the SSAC yesterday, and so it was specifically raised, and I think it was Patrick that answered it and said they were following it. They're aware of it. But right now, even in its current form as a proposal, it hasn't gone too deep into the IETF process, and so I don't know if it's something we can talk about right now.

It's on the SSAC's radar, they're following it. We can probably come to them for technical expertise on this when necessary, and I'm certain that the alarm bells will be sounded by them if it causes an issue as we go forward.

CHAIR: Thank you. I think we can talk about anything. That's one of the things we're here for. If there are no further comments I'll call this meeting to a close and thank you all for your time. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]