LOS ANGELES – ALAC Work - Part I
Tuesday, October 14, 2014 – 10:00 to 12:00
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, it's 10:00 in the morning, and we will soon start our next session, which is the ALAC Work Part 1. We have a very long agenda today, so if you could please get ready to take your seats soon.

Do you all have your name cards? I notice that we have John Laprise, who has a very well-executed name card – and two John Laprises. We have the twins. Identical twins. I hope the recording is still off at the moment. Anyone else with name cards missing, or…? You forgot yours upstairs? You will not have a voice. You need a name card. I cannot identify you otherwise. Okay, I'll make sense of that. We got Vanda. Tijani, you have your name card? Ah, perfect. It makes it easier, putting them up. Do we have the full ALAC here? They're coming in.

Oh no, Jean-Jacques is here. I thought you weren't. I was looking for you. I think the first item, Ad Hoc Working Group on the Transition of U.S. Government Stewardship on IANA Function, we can both do together. It's I think one of the things you're involved with that will be – so we've got the first. The second is yourself, and Evan and Evan is coming in second, and the third one is Evan.

Are those people following remotely? We will be starting in a couple of minutes. Just a few people have gone out to get their name card. I think a bit of coffee, as well. And there's a bit of a queue outside, so just a couple of minutes more.

Before we start, I can also welcome people who are in what one calls the audience, but of course you're full participants here, so if you wish to comment or add, we have a flying mic that can go around the room. I notice a few members who are here. Good to see them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's have the recording on, please. Good morning, everybody. This is the session of ALAC Work Part 1. We're only Tuesday in the week. It's 10:00 in the morning. We have quite a full agenda today on our first session.

First, we'll have an update on the At-Large working groups. Then we'll have an IDN update (Internationalized Domain Names), when we will be seeing Sarmad Hussain from the IDN program.

Then afterwards we'll have an update on compliance with Maguy Serad who will be joining us, and finally a discussion with the 2015 Nominating Committee leadership. That will take us from now until I think 12:00, so two hours of important discussions.

Just as we start, Gisella Gruber was here a moment ago and wanted to make an announcement, but of course she's just gone. Interesting. I think I shall make the announcement on her behalf. She has shared with me that when you are wearing your headsets, which are these thing, and speaking at the same time, apparently feedback loop starts and the interpreters are having problems understanding things because there's

whistling going on, so if you could please, when you take the microphone, take the headsets off. Don't put them around your neck because they're even closer to the microphone. But take them away from the microphone.

As with every At-Large and ALAC session, all of our sessions are interpreted, so if you could please say your name when you start speaking, and at the same time, of course, we will use the rule of putting your name card or your tent card up if you wish to be put in the queue.

We also have remote participants that are present. If you have any questions, remote participants, then you can type them in the chat, and staff will be monitoring the chat for questions and comments.

Now, since we have everyone here, I think we can start immediately, then with the updates and reports from the At-Large working groups. These are updates and next-steps, so they're meant to be an interaction between the ALAC and the working group. I know that many of you are part of those working groups, but some are not.

The first one is about the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on the Transition of U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA Function. As you know, we have two members of the At-Large community that are on this IANA Coordination Group, a worldwide group that will deal with the IANA stewardship transition. Those two members are Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed El Bashir. Jean-Jacques Subrenat is with us, of course, and I thought perhaps handing the floor over to Jean-Jacques Subrenat to provide us with the working groups' activities.

As I'm the interim chair of that working group, I'll also be jumping in on occasion. Jean-Jacques Subrenat, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I'd like to start with a sense of the timeline for the ICG because I think that will have a determining factor on many other aspects.

For me, the timeline is a lot of internal work going on now, and then in January, there will be the contributions or the input from community to the ICG. It is on that basis, and on that basis alone, that the ICG members will sort out and clarify and perhaps put into shape the proposals which will then enter into a plan, and the plan in turn will be sent to the NTIA through the channel of the Board of ICANN.

So it's not the ICG is not busy now. It's simply busy on perhaps more internal and organizational matters, such a getting an independent secretariat to work for it – things like that. So I think the most crucial part with actually start in January, and will continue until we are able to finish that plan and convey it to the NTIA through the ICANN Board.

There was some discussion about when the task of the ICG would actually end. I think it's still a fairly open question. It's round about the autumn. There is a timeline which is published, so you can refer to that.

I won't go through all that now, but just to give you a sense of the fact that they are very important political steps which will have to be gone through, such as the NTIA receiving the plan, and then reacting to it.

The person or opinion, there are two ways for it to react. One is, "You got this and this and this wrong, so you have to correct that," or, "No, sorry. It's not acceptable, so we cannot accept the plan." There again, in the case of non-acceptance of the plan, I think – but this is a personal view – that there are several possibilities, one of them being you have to start again, or start at a certain stage of the work.

In saying this, I want to be very careful to impress upon you that there is no Plan B in the ICG. We are not thinking of going back and starting all over again or having our work refused. Of course, we will do our utmost for this to meet all the criteria set out publically by the NTIA. But we must recognize that it is a tough job because there will be so much input from so many various parts of the Internet community and the ICANN community.

Right now, there has been discussion, and I think it's not entirely clarified yet, about the transmission of the ICG's plan to the NTIA. It is the strong feeling on the part of the membership of ICG that this plan, once it has been written out and approved by the full ICG, it is sent to the NTIA through the Board of ICANN, and it is the hope and expectation of the ICG that then the Board of ICANN will not amend or modify the content of that plan.

On the other hand, it seems to be that some members on the Board may have a different opinion and consider that if the plan has in fact to go through the Board of ICANN, well, they would be completely in their rule and therefore entitled to modify what they thought needed to be amended or improved.

I personally, as just one out of the 30 members of the ICG, will not give any pronouncement on what solution is better because that entails many considerations, and I don't have the time to go through all of them now.

I just want to make you aware that there is such a discussion just now. You'll remember that when the ALAC received the visit of the CEO and President of ICANN, I had asked him to be aware that the ICG was keen that the transmission to NTIA is through the ICANN Board and would not entail any modification of the content itself. And I had asked him to make the other members of the Board aware of this position.

This morning, I was, as a former member of the Board of ICANN, at our traditional meeting of the former directors of ICANN with the current members of the Board of ICANN. That aspect was touched upon briefly, and that's where I realized that some members at the Board level perhaps had some question about how to proceed.

So this is not a source of worry. If I'm mentioning this, it's for the sake of clarity and transparency. But I'm not especially worried. It's simply that we have to be aware that there is such a discussion, or that there are such questions. So much for timeline.

The other things are less consequential or less important. We are in the process of choosing a firm which would provide secretarial services – what is called the independent secretariat for the ICG. As I said the other day – I'm sorry if I repeat this for several of you – the notion of a dependence is of course important. It will take its orders only from the membership of the ICG through its chair and two vice chairs. But we

must be cognizant of the fact that the secretarial function thus performed will be paid for 100% out of the ICANN budget.

Any other aspects to the work we're doing in the ICG I will now leave to questions or comments on your part. I think that will be more efficient than my rambling along on our little stuff.

Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Just before we go into questions, I thought I would complete your [intercession] about the ICG with the developments of the Cross-Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions, which is the group of the ICANN operational community that deals with the domain name part of the three contracts that we're speaking of with regards to the IANA contracts.

The working group met yesterday to a really packed out room here in Los Angeles. A few steps forward were taken with regards to the composition of the process, if you want, moving forward. No real actual work on the work itself took place. There was a lot of procedural time taken.

There was a presentation of some work which was undertaken by one participant already – I think it was the country code ccNSO community, which looked at the actual IANA contract with ICANN as one of the parties, and with the NTIA as the other party, and summarized the different component parts as a first step.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, it could have been someone from SSAC. Anyway, the attribution – it was somebody who – SSAC, okay. Thank you very much, Holly, and thank you, Jean-Jacques, for that. So it was someone from SSAC that went through this. Unfortunately, we did not have time to actually plow into this work, but it looks as though it's a very valuable first step to be able to first understand the contract.

Clearly there are two paths forward. One is to just look at the contract, modify the parts which need to be modified so that the U.S. government is not explicitly named, and that said, everything is resolved.

However, the point was raised that actually the contract is with the U.S. government, and now that they U.S. government is not involved, there is not contract. So the questions is, what replaces the contract? ICANN cannot have a contract with itself. ICANN cannot have a contract with IANA because IANA is not a separate legal entity or anything. It's just a function. So we really are at the very beginning of this question.

The timetable for the work was one which was particularly difficult – challenging should we say. First draft of the proposal should be making to the ICG by the end of January, and that means a very intense schedule, which many expressed was maybe unrealistic in some way, given the complexities of the process and the fact that the IANA stewardship process needs to run in parallel with the accountability

process, which as we know, has been somehow delayed and hasn't even started its work. It's just being defined at this very meeting.

So it sounds like we're all going to have a great time working day and night on this to try to be able to fit within the timescales and the time limits that are needed. It looks as though those deadlines are not extendable due to the very process that you've given us.

So now I open the floor to questions. I see already Eduardo Diaz is in the queue, so we'll have Eduardo, Holly, Evan and I saw you, Tijani. Let's start with Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yesterday I participated in the CCWG meeting. They were there. This gentleman, Larry Strickling, mentioned, as far as I understood, that this business about the timeline is flexible. That's what I understood. We're using the date where the contract expires, but he said we have leeway to do this because we have to do this right.

Here the first thing that comes to mind is that we're setting up this timeline where maybe the output eventually will be not the best output that we may want to have, especially between holidays and things like that.

I don't know if it's possible or not to go back to the timeline that the ICG put together for this for everyone to have reports by the end of January, and maybe get something better because we will have more time.

That's my opinion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Jean-Jacques, did you want to respond briefly to this? Are the timelines extendable for the ICG to receive the proposal?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, if the U.S. authority –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Headphones. Be careful – the feedback.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Sorry. Thank you, Olivier, for the reminder. This is Jean-Jacque without earphones – or actually, the – this is what I should take away, not the earphones.

I think that there are two considerations. One is political. The other is practical. The political consideration is that now it seems to me the U.S. authorities, and through Larry Strickling, expressed the possibility that there was some flexibility.

But I think that for practical purposes, our group and other groups involved in this should stick to the timeline as it is already defined. Otherwise, we'll have moving goal posts all the time. We won't make it.

If we come to a crunch point sometime in the, let's say, spring or summer of 2015, when we realize, and the U.S. authorities realize, that we're on the right track for the content, but that there is really a calendar problem, then I recognize that we should make use of that flexibility.

But I think that it would be very bad policy and a very bad practical approach, at least for us, to start with that. We have to abide by the timeline which has been published.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. Yesterday there were I suppose two important statements. One was the actual department secretary herself, Pritzker, who was 100% in support of the multi-stakeholder model.

But more important, it was Larry Strickling who said a few very important things. Number one, accountability actually goes through both streams because one is sort of a technical accountability. You've got all these technical requirements. What happens if there's no compliance? So there's that kind of accountability that has to be built in.

The other accountability – and it obviously worries him, and he said it twice – was what happens if somebody tries to hack in the Board, take over the Board? I suspect that's what he's hearing politically because that's what he's saying loud and clear: you haven't told us what you're going to do. So that's the level of accountability, and I think the level of concern.

His statement about timelines specifically was we suggested a timeline which was the expiry of the IANA contract, not the other two, that September. Then he said it's up to the community, and I took a deep breath and thought, "That's a level of flexibility I haven't heard."

I suspect that Jean-Jacques interpretation of that is correct, that we shouldn't start to think there's flexibility because there's nothing on paper yet.

So I think there has to be text on paper, and my suggestion is, while we're all here, I think a few of us should sit around the table and start to put some thoughts on paper about even sketching out levels of accountability in the two ways.

One is the response to SSA68 – well, 67 is the background. 68 actually sets out the three contracts. One is with ICANN, but then there's an MOU with IETF. There's another arrangement with IAB. Those three actually are all about the IANA functions, and SSA68 makes it clear that there isn't a body of IANA, per se. There are functions. They are contracts to perform functions. So you've got almost three contracting parties, so we're actually talking about something more complex

Even a roadmap of that would be really, really useful to say, "This is the complexity of the roadmap. This is accountability in this context. This is why the U.S. says, "This accountability is part of this stream. There is a larger accountability which relates to the kind of what happens to the multi-stakeholder model if it is under threat."" That's the kind of analysis that you look to by-laws, constitutions, whatever, whatever, what's there, what do you build in. So that's I think a more complex task than the functions one.

But they see them as intertwined, and I gather from what Larry Strickling. He said, "I want it stress tested. I do not want any holes." I translate that to mean, "This is going to go into a political hole in the

United States. They are going to be under enormous scrutiny and pressure."

So he'd rather have us get it right if it takes a little more time, but I guess my proposal out of that is we, as a smaller group, start at the very least to put words on paper.

Then I'm also to question if this, a smaller group, whatever we call it, should we be sitting in on the Friday meeting? Because from the ALAC perspective, I think we actually have to start supporting something as well.

Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. In fact, we have in a few hours' time, at the end of the day, we will have a few sessions specifically about the IANA stewardship transition, so we'll be able to actually do exactly what you've suggested.

I've closed the queue in the interest of being able to stick to our timelines this morning. I have Evan, Tijani, and Alan in the queue. First is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier. In the interest of expediency, I'll save my comments for the later sessions so we can not take so much time on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan, and I hope you get paid well for your advertising thing that you just said here. We have Tijani Ben Jemaa. Expedia versus expediency.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Jean-Jacques, I don't think that it is in the remit of the ICG to decide on a Plan B because if it doesn't work, that means that we would have reached the date of the expiration of the contract. And in this case, it is a high policy. It is not in their remit.

The group is tasked to collect the participation of the proposals, and to submit it. That's all. That's why the group cannot have a Plan B in any way because it will necessitate something that is absolutely outside its prerogatives.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques for a response?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Yes, Tijani, you are absolutely right. I may not have formulated it properly early on, but I said there will be no Plan B. I didn't cite all the reasons, but of course, the main reason is the one you cite, which is that the mandate does not include such an approach. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Alan has just told me he will pass in the interest of not being delayed, and of course, as I had mentioned earlier,

we will have this afternoon first a session with the Address Supporting Organization Address Council and Number Resource Organization, and the topic is going to be IANA stewardship transition since they are one of the operational communities.

Immediately afterwards, we will have a meeting with members of the ICG (the IANA Coordination Group). We are one of the only two communities that the ICG is coming to speak with bilaterally, one being the GAC, and the other one being the ALAC.

Immediately after that, for a full afternoon of IANA stewardship transition, if you still have the taste for it, we will have our working group meeting that will basically do what has been suggested just now as to what our next steps are, proposals, etc.

I'd like to move to the next working group now, and that is the At-Large Working Group on Future Challenges. For this update, we have Evan Leibovitch and Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I'm not sure who would like to speak to this: future challenges. You're both being very kind to each other. One will have to pick up the microphone. Evan Leibovitch, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, you have a diplomat and a Canadian there trying to figure out what to do, so you have that kind of result. We could go for another half hour with "You, please," first.

Just a very brief summary. Most of what Future Challenges has been doing lately has been addressing the accountability issue. Those of you

that were at the meeting with the Board earlier saw that we had a number of things on our plate to do with that.

The accountability issue has sort of become an overarching thing, but again, trying to use the methodology of Future Challenges, it's the kind of process that drives a detailed-oriented person absolutely mad because our agendas tend to be two-liners, and essentially we're trying to be very free-from, very open-minded, and very forward-thinking about things.

That being said, we have a lot on our plate. We have everything that Thematic Group 4 from ATLAS put on our hands. We have the overarching issue of accountability. At the last phone conference call of the working group, in fact, we discussed the concept of trust, and that is transparency, accountability, and similar mechanisms are not end in themselves, and that there is a core issue of trust and legitimacy, and that increasing accountability and increasing transparency are necessary components of building that trust.

There's a perception in many communities that ICANN has, shall we say, a trust deficit amongst the public. This has been brought forward through a number of things, not the least of which is my awareness that a number of the members of the community have been called by a reported for the Wall Street Journal, who is in fact trying to dig up stuff on ICANN.

There are perception issues, and one of the ways that ICANN has to address this is to be accountable and to be transparent in a way that builds trust.

I'll give an example of that. At one level, transparency can mean just making every meeting open, every transcript available, every possible bit of conversation that happens just to be presentable to the public by this massive stream of data.

There's an absolute deluge of information that's coming out. Does that mean that ICANN is transparent? In one level, yes. But the volume is such that it still becomes an impediment to participation. It becomes an impediment to awareness. So at one level it's being very transparent, at another level there are still lots of obstacles to overcome. So that's just one example of the kind of things that we're dealing with.

Our output previously has been in the form of white papers, rather than advice. There's likelihood or possibility that that still may happen in this case. That's just an indication of how we're working on this.

Jean-Jacques, would you like to add?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No. Your eloquence has covered everything. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques, and thank you for this update, Evan. A quick question to make sure we're set regarding the accountability track. We just had a meeting with the Board a little bit earlier, and there were some recommendations that were sent to the Future Challenges Working Group that involved some follow-up as such. How will that work with the rest of the work of the working group?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier. Just as was indicated earlier when we discussed talking about those recommendations, you saw we split them up into the ones that required long-term activity and the ones that had to be dealt-with immediately because they were IANA-related timeline-related.

So we right now have our own internal challenges of dealing with those two things separately. As you noticed earlier, it was Holly that was speaking to the immediate recommendation, so we are trying to work with some mechanisms. They may be inside Future Challenges. They may be brought outside into something else. But we're aware of the distinction between some recommendations that need to be dealt with immediately, and the other ones that we can use our traditional sort of high-level method of working on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. I believe we also have an action item from our first meeting on Sunday, where there was going to be another ad hoc accountability track to respond quickly to the accountability track.

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Where we wound up on Sunday, which this is just my impression because I'm not sure – let me go back to an earlier decision on what to do with the Thematic Group 4 recommendations. A lot of that got lumped into the Future Challenges, and there was some initial work done on accountability by Evan in that group.

What became apparent in discussion, however, is the quite different nature between some of the high-level staff and what has to be done immediately.

So where we've left of is we need a few people. We need the advice of Jean-Jacques, probably, and whoever, so that we're feeding whatever we do up.

My understanding is that we have to approve something, and I was just thinking, "Should I work on a few sentences to say, "This is what we're doing." Could we actually officially create a group or something?" because we originally thought this would be a working group of Future Challenges. We don't necessarily have in the by-laws a way to do that.

So I think where we got to is we need something officially constituted. I don't think anybody's terribly fussed as to where it's constituted. I think I'm very happy to write up a few sentences as to what the task of it is, which would be literally just taking Larry Strickling's words and saying, "We have to do this, and we have cooperate with and feed into what Jean-Jacques and [inaudible] are doing so that there is an ALAC group that's working on accountability."

I don't know how that's constituted, but I know it's urgent, and I'm happy to put pen to paper and title it whatever you'd like.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Holly. Actually, I have the action items from Sunday, 12th of October. In the hot topic 2 NTIA IANA function stewardship transition, a motion was made, a motion to create an ad hoc working group on accountability and governance. It's difficult to do

a sub group of a working group. It's primarily for logistical issues – mailing list and this sort of staff, staff allocation and so one.

So, "Create an ad hoc working group in accountability and governance with initial task of IANA stewardship issues." I think it said "stewardship issues" since this will have accountability, and we never know what other parts there are in there. "To include current members of the CCWG to be confirmed," so the cross community working group that we have. Alan Greenberg, two members of the ICG, of course, and the vote will take place of course the ALAC, when creating ad hoc working groups, needs to vote on this. So I think that Alan had volunteered to draft the motion, which was just a couple of lines, which probably is this.

Then we would have the vote on Thursday for the wrap-up, and in the meantime, staff has already started creating the mailing lists and all that. So immediately after this meeting, we're all in operation. We don't have to discuss process but can go straight to the meat and work on this.

Any questions or comments on this topic? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, I didn't draft anything, and I think I had forgotten I was supposed to if I was, but if someone else has drafted it, I'd be glad to move it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan. I don't think anyone has drafted it. We're all looking at you. We have until Thursday. That's fine. But just a kind reminder.

Holly, and then we'll probably have to go to the next working group. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm happy to forward to Alan or anybody a [inaudible] of what Larry Strickling said because it seems to me that's exactly what we've got to do. He actually said, "This is what accountability means. This is what we're looking for." So it strikes me that's what we're looking for.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Any other questions? John Laprise?

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for NARALO. I just want to emphasize this. This has come at previous ICANN meetings, and also at IGF meetings. We're all very focused on meeting the requirements of the NTIA letter. But at the end of the day, whatever comes out of us gets approved by the NTIA, or doesn't get approved. They are the final gatekeeper, and meeting their requirements is crucial. Keeping an eye on all of their requirements, including the implicit ones, is crucial for success. So Strickling's comments are perfectly in line with U.S. positions.

One other thing is that, with regard to U.S. domestic policy, speaking in my capacity as a U.S. citizen, I would not be too concerned about political changes overall in U.S. government for its impact on the

transition plan. The executive branch has a very different view of this than what you see in Congress. A lot of Congress is a lot of noise, so don't worry about that. The executive branch is where it's at.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, John. Also realize the topic is a dark start, a potential black hole, that sucks everything in its path. We are on the Future Challenges Working Group, and we've gone back to IANA. We'll never get away from that.

Any other questions or comments regarding Future Challenges? I'm seeing no one.

Let's move on then to the next topic, and that's the New gTLD Working Group, and again back to Evan Leibovitch, our chair of the New gTLD Working Group. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks very much, Olivier. I'll take the time that I have now to go back to the meeting that we had last night where we had a face-to-face meeting of the working group.

Essentially we are now charged with two tasks, one of which was deferred, so I'll deal with that first. The At-Large approach to what happens in future rounds of new gTLDs is a concern. Certainly there were things that we can look at that need to be fixed from the first round, and so we have a significant task ahead of us to look at the metrics, to go back to your communities, find out where the

consequences of the gTLD expansion, and then to come back to us so that At-Large can make recommendations.

We know now, as of yesterday, that ICANN will be taking a very deliberative approach to the second round, that it will not be jumping into it too fast. This is very good to know. It gives us the time to be able to step back, catch our breath, review things, look at metrics, go back to our communities and be able to make some very, very serious comments moving forward, specifically addressing issues that were important to us, such as community evaluations, applicant support in developing countries, and the like, as well as things like the objection process, which did not serve us very well as it was designed.

But that is being deferred because that is something a bit longer-term. ICANN has said that we have a little bit of time to work on that, so we will take that time.

In the meantime, we have an immediate issue that we want to deal with because it relates to the current round, and that has to do with the concept of public interest commitments. This is a component of the gTLD program, a part of the applicant agreement with ICANN intended to provide some public safeguards based on analysis from members of At-Large. We [inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: Now that works. Power's off. Do our interpreters hear? Yes, they do. The show can continue. The show must go on.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yeah, it certainly must. Okay, so I will continue with the hand mic until those other issues get addressed.

As I said, we had an evaluation that the public interest commitment process, as it was presented, presented a lot of challenges and had a lot of deficiencies. In fact, over the summer we put out a public comment process, which is not something that ALAC does very often, but was done because the ICANN Board did not want to do that. It was the belief of senior staff and the ICANN Board that this issue has been dealt with satisfactorily.

We did not see it that way. We put out a public comment process. The very quick summary of it was the comments that we received from the domain industry said that things are okay as they were and we shouldn't change anything, and the responses from just about everybody else said, "No, they are a bad thing. We need to fix this."

There's another part of the community that suggested a remedy called a policy advisory Board as a possible solution. While we found widespread dislike of the PIC process, we found a divergence of opinion on whether or not policy advisory Boards were a satisfactory answer.

So the way that in fact I think we want to go through this is to split those issue up, one into building widespread community support that agrees that the PICs are a bad idea. We believe we have some support for that within governments. In fact, as part of the meeting that we have with the GAC, we're going to raise this issue, and as a result of the meeting we had last night, we will try to engage with some individuals with governments to put together a joint ALAC-GAC position on this that we hope will provide a very compelling statement to the Board that will

freeze a handful of very publically sensitive TLDs until we can address with public commitments and safeguards.

So essentially, that is where things are at. At the present time, two people – that is, Raf Fatani and myself – are going to be working on a statement, possibly for presentation to the Thursday ALAC meeting for ALAC advice that ICANN Board freeze a small number of TLDs, pending the resolution of proper community commitment.

In the meantime, in our interaction with the GAC, we will see if we can put together a small group of ALAC people, At-Large people, and government people brought together to try to figure out a solution.

We have widespread consensus that the PICs are a bad idea. We don't have consensus on a solution, so we need to be able to say that we're working forward on that time, while at the same time we say the existing regime does not work.

I'm open to question on it at this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. We are faced with a power issue for our mic system, so we have flying mics that work for this.

Any questions or comments on the report by Evan? Yes, Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a short suggestion. When we talk about the PICs, I recommend not saying, "PICs don't work." There are aspects of the PICs which are in

enforceable and do work. They're not the parts that we're talking about that are important for our aspect.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I guess when I say, "PICs don't work," I'm oversimplifying things. There are two components to the PIC. Component one is a mandatory set of PICs that are in all the contracts. They mainly deal with intellectual property issues.

The other set of the PICs are optional, and those are the ones that are supposed to deal with public protection, and those are the ones that have the serious deficiencies.

So you're right. What I said is a bit of an oversimplification. But there seems to be widespread consensus that the public interest components of the public interest commitments have a lot of deficiencies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And a follow-up from Alan, and then we have Tijani afterwards. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Evan, I really wasn't concerned about lack of precision. It's just by making a global statement, someone can shoot you down and invalidate the important parts of what you're saying. So a little bit of precision helps.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You have my word that one the final statement comes out, the term " PICs won't work" will not be found in that statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, gentleman. Yeah, just as a reminder, the meeting with the GAC later on today has the first topic on public interest commitments and GAC Category 1 safeguards. Then we'll have IANA stewardship transition as a second topic and At-Large Summit as a third topic.

I hope we will able to quickly go through the topics and not spend so much time. I think just one hour for three topics is going to be challenging.

Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa, and I have to pass the microphone to Tijani for this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Evan, I would like that the work be really and clearly separated – the work on the subsequent round – as to start now, and it has to continue. We don't have to work today on this and tomorrow on this. Perhaps it will be a mess. You have to know that there is a work done by the discussion group, and I am sure that they will continue with a higher speed, because if the GNSO has created this group, I think that they intend to go further and to work more.

So we have to be on time. We have to prepare our positions. We have positions very clear, so we have to prepare them, and be ready for any surprise.

Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Tijani. In response, I'm merely talking about the immediate work at hand. When we had the gTLD working group meeting last night, the entire time of the meeting was taken up with dealing with the public interest commitments because the immediacy for this week, because of the meeting with the GAC, because of the need to put something in front of the community this week.

It doesn't mean that the other work immediately takes second class, but for the purpose of this week and the work we need to do, the PICs are taking center stage. As we go on, it's been made very clear that just because ICANN is being deliberative about the second round, they're collecting information about it immediately.

I am a part of the discussion group, and so I have already been adding my comments in about this kind of thing. We have problems with the community evaluation. We have problems with applicant support. We have problems with Module 3.

This is all understood. This is all moving forward. This simply a matter of prioritization for this week because this is what we're dealing with right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. So you mentioned a potential statement that the ALAC would have to vote on during its wrap-up on Thursday. Could you elaborate a bit more as to when that statement will be ready, or that draft will be ready, and proposed to that ALAC since we are all very busy? And of course, the earlier the better if something like that was to be drafted.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You noticed as you said that that Raf and myself were exchanging furtive looks at each other. I guess the thing is we will be working on this almost immediately after this meeting with the goal of having something cogent to present on Thursday. I believe that some of that, in fact, will be guided by how things go with the GAC today.

If we succeed in having a partnership with certain GAC members, or an overall consensus that the GAC sees issues with this, I think that will have an effect on our statement, but I can assure you that one is being worked on in post haste, and it's our intent to circulate a draft in as far as advance of the Thursday working meeting as we can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Evan. I think that as a result, if we want to expedite things, the first thing is that you cannot wait until Thursday to provide a first draft to the ALAC and then expect the ALAC to vote on it there and then.

What I would suggest is that, as soon as you have a first draft, this gets put up on a wiki page, which turns me over to At-Large staff to create a wiki page on our policy development part of our wiki.

Ariel, if that could be done as soon as possible. And then of course let Evan know about this. Therefore, the moment you have a first draft, we can immediately issue a call on the mailing list to At-Large for them to immediately read that and provide their feedback.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Understood. Just so you're aware of the mechanics we're using, we will be using for the first draft a shared Google document. If there are other members of the community who would like to participate, either watching us as the factory is going on, or in fact to make substantive additions to it, that's certainly welcomed. Having more than two penholders always helps it go faster.

But like I say, as soon as we have something, you and staff will be sent the first draft, and we can distribute it any way you'd like.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Evan. Can we have that for tonight, please? Evan, there's only music night tonight. It's that or you have to go on stage and sing.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You will have that draft.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, sorry, Evan. No, just have it for as soon as possible. But obviously this is a very sensitive thing. Of course, it will all depend on our discussions with the GAC later on today. But it is something which we

have been pursuing for a while, and there's been significant pushback from the Board to look at this issue and expand on these issues.

You did not mention one thing: the appointment of someone with regards to public accountability. Did you with to say a couple of words on this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I can only share my personal opinions right now, and that is one thing for ICANN to establish a staff position of public safeguards based on our current understanding of the public interest commitments. That person has very little to enforce right now. So having a position that enforces public safeguards with no safeguards in place seems to be a rather empty thing, and it's our intention to work on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this. It's now 10:59. In a few seconds, it will be 11:00 in the morning, local time, and that takes us to agenda item number 2: Internationalized Domain Name update with Sarmad Hussain, who is the IDN Program Senior Manager, and Jia-Juh Kimoto – she's not here, okay – Business Intelligence Program Management. Is she joining us later, or will it just be you, Sarmad? Oh, excellent.

Well, I first met Sarmad in Nairobi at the ICANN meeting in Nairobi, and while he was not part of ICANN then, he was part of the Pan-Localization Project. When at that time anybody spoke about IDNs, it was a big question mark in everybody's minds, having non-Latin character sets being implemented on the Internet. What kind of a weird idea is this?

Then, Sarmad seemed to be the only person that knew absolutely everything and everything about it, and I did ask for him to join At-Large. He never did. I think it was NCSG that you – oh, SSAC. So he joined SSAC, of course – stability relating to these topics – but now he is the IDN Program Senior Manager.

So we basically we have an update from you. I realize you have a few slides. Unfortunately our microphone system has already died. We are very verbose here and it overheated, and so I'll have to hand the hand mic over to you. Sarmad?

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. Basically what we've been doing since Singapore is we've been going out to all the SOs an ACs and providing an update at each ICANN meeting. So this is the update for the IDN Program to ALAC.

Can we go to the slide with the agenda? Thank you.

So for today's presentation, I'll very briefly introduce what the IDN Program at ICANN does, and then I'll focus the presentation on an update on the IDN-TLD Program and outreach efforts we're doing to the community to get the community involved and keep it informed, and then very briefly the next steps as we go forward.

Next slide, please. Next slide. Yeah. So as far as the IDN Program at ICANN is concerned, we're largely focused on three areas. One of the main things we do is assist in the IDN ccTLD string evaluation for eventual delegation. So we actually implement the fast track program for IDN ccTLD application.

In addition, we have a fairly large program which is currently running to develop a label generation rules set for the root zone. I'll get in a little more detail for this program in the next slides.

Can we go back to the previous slide? Thank you. The third thing which we work on are what are called IDN implementation guidelines. These are guidelines which are developed in joint consultation with ccNSO and GNSO. We have volunteers from these groups, which develop guidelines which are applicable at second level, not at top level. They are focused at reducing consumer risk and confusion.

The last time they were updated was 2011. We are now looking at the possibility of revisiting these guidelines and revising them based on GSNO and ccNSO input. This time, we are also interested in getting ALAC involvement in the [inaudible] process.

Then obviously the work we do are trying to know do an active outreach effort to the community to let them know what is going on within the IDN Program.

Next slide, please. Next slide. Coming to the IDN-TLD Program, basically if you look at the traditional domain names, if you look at the second level, we have domain names like ABC-123, but at top level, the domain names have even traditionally been very restricted, more restricted than second level.

So for example, you can have letters at the top level, like XY, but you cannot at top level have hyphens and digits. So even for ASCII, the top level domains have been always more conservative than second-level and other levels.

Next slide, please. So when we go to these other scripts beyond ASCII and go into internationalized domain names, sometimes it becomes unclear – so in ASCII we have letter principle. The top level domain can only include letters, not digits, not anything else. But these other scripts, when we start including them, it is unclear what a letter is or how the letter principle for ASCII can actually be extending to these other scripts.

So we are actually running a large program now which included community effort in all these scripts, and community groups need to be formed to advise ICANN on what is “a letter” for their script – the script they are using. So we have to define what characters can go into a label for top level.

In addition, the way Unicode defines these characters or these tables in these languages, sometimes there is confusion between two different code points, and if that is the case, those two code points have to be defined as variants so that consumers do not get confused in the use of those code points. So we also have to define variance.

Then we have to define any additional concerns on these labels because ASCII is a very simple writing system, but when we go to these other writing systems, they have very complex rules, for example, of forming symbols, or what can come after that, so these are actually context-sensitive writing systems.

So this TLD program is basically focused on devising all these rules for forming a top-level domain label so a label can be formed in a very transparent machine-possible way, rather than somebody applies and doesn’t really know whether that label is illegible or not for top level.

Next slide, please. This program started back in 2011,where there were six cases studies done to define or understand what the kinds of issues are. These issues were then integrated together, and based on the integrated issues, a plan was devised to solve the problem.

Next slide, please. Yeah. Basically, in somebody, what the plan is that we start from what is called a maximal starting repertoire, or MSR, which is the list of possible code points, obviously excluding things like digits or hyphens or punctuation marks. That is given to each community. Each script community forms a panel of volunteers, and they look at their portion of the maximal starting repertoire, and based on that, give a proposal to ICANN on the characters which could be used to form a top-level domain name.

ICANN receives individual proposals from each community on different scripts and integrates that into one large language table, or what we now call root zone label generation rule sets. That is done through an integration panel, which is maintained by ICANN. But the generation panels, which are the community-based volunteer groups which are actually in a way hosted and run by the community themselves.

Next slide, please. At this stage, the Arabic Generation Panel has been formed. The Chine Generation Panel has been formed. MSR1, the starting point was for 22 scripts were released in January. In December there are six remaining scripts. Those will also be released in December this year. So MSR will be completed by the end of this year, which will be the input to L- generation panels for developing their proposals.

We're anticipating that the Arabic and Chinese Generation Panels will finalize their work towards the end of this year, or early next year, to go

into the first release of LGR, which is expected to come out at the end of the financial year.

Next slide, please. These are all the scripts which we need to work on, and anything which is not green needs more active participation, but we've actually been reaching out to the communities. For many of these communities which are yellow in color, there is some activity that just started out, even though this is not finalized.

Next slide, please. Next slide. We've been also trying to work with community and engage the community to let them know how we're doing, and what the requirements are because a lot of our work is based on community outreach, so we actually have been going out the communities. We do regular updates to ICANN SOs and ACs during meetings, but we also go to regional meetings and try to get more people involved in this process.

Next slide, please. We have also a lot of material on our website.

Next slide. Next slide, please. As far as going forward is concerned, we will continue to work on the IDN-TLD program. We are now looking at guidance from community on IDN and implementation guidelines that will be coming up later this year. Obviously, we continue to support the IDN-TLD fast track process.

Recently, strings from Iraq and Belarus were approved, and there are a couple of more strings now more in process which are going to be announced soon. And we continue to reach out to the community.

Thank you very much, and I'll take any questions you have.

By the way, we have two sessions on IDN tomorrow, so if you are interested in more details, please come and attend. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Sarmad. As you know, many members in the At-Large community come from varied locations in the world that have different scripts, and I think many of our members already are involved with the LGR and with the work of your department.

I see Siranush in that corner. I'm not sure, was it Armenian? Are you involved with the – no, the mic does not work, unfortunately. Oh, it does work. Oh, perfect. Oh, well, okay. Fine. Good news. Nobody tells me anything in this house.

Go ahead, Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Chair. We have applied already for IDN scripts, so this in the process of due diligence. We passed the first part of it, and we are following the process. It takes time as you all know, but are involved and we have already discussed with Sarmad to organize to have some volunteer group from Armenia to be involved in these language discussions and to conduct training for local professionals.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this. I just saw behind us from our ISOC Japan, one of our more recent ALSs, Mr. Kitamura. Are you involved in any IDN Program scripts?

YASUICHI KITAMURA: I'm sorry. I'm not. But actually the ISOC Japan chair is here. He is also –

TOMOHIRO FUJISAKI: Yes, my name it Tomohiro Fujisaki. [inaudible] chair. As an ISOC [inaudible] chapter, we have a member from the JPRS , the .jp registry, and actually, he was deeply involved with here IDN, but [inaudible] now here. So what did I say? [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Tomohiro, it was just to ask basically whether you would be interested in taking part in the label generation rules, or anyone in your chapter, to be involved. Sarmad Hussain is here. He's the program director for this. So it's a good moment perhaps that you could speak with him. I think there is definitely a need for a Japanese script.

TOMOHIRO FUJISAKI: Yeah. Okay. Actually, we got very interesting such types of topics. Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. So just afterwards you can probably – now you see each other. And I see behind Satish Babu as well. Satish from India?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. In India, we have five languages right now in the [indie] pipeline, plus the three coming up. The community is railing around the

process, and they've been trying to also help out. So definitely we'll see some action from the At-Large site in India. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Satish. And you have right next to me sitting the Program Director. I think members in your organization need to get involved for all the different scripts. I certainly can't read any of these scripts in India, but really great.

The last question, I wanted to go back a couple of slides, please, on the this, and this is just as a personal question I'm asking, thinking really, but there is a bit further back, looking at the different scripts, the complexity of the task that you basically have – back; there we go – tieng viet. Now, what is the difference between tieng viet with the accents and without the accents? How can you really differentiate this as far as a user is concerned? To me, it looks like the same thing. It just seems to be a few specks on top and underneath, but I know there is a big difference. User confusion is potential.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Right. So what we are now actually also doing is putting together a Latin Generation Panel, which will look at and decide which of these characters should be allowed in addition to the basic ASCII, then what kind of variant relationship they have with corresponding characters which are not decorated.

So, many of you are Latin-script user and can actually get involved. We had an initial meeting with the Latin script community yesterday, in which we discussed – we're again starting to put this together. We

actually have a Cyrillic community meeting today. If you're interested let me know and I'll give you information about that as well.

So these are informal meetings. We're trying to get the generation panels together. So please get involved for your script, and if you need any information, please feel free to contact me and we'll follow up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Sarmad Hussain. I remind you all that this is quite historical. It's a real change from Internet and Latin script to Internet and all the scripts, so I really urge you to take part of this, and I would say even be part of history of how things are moving forward.

So with this, I can see it's a quarter past, so thank you very much, Sarmad, for coming to speak.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Of course, as I've mentioned, Sarmad, please go and speak to the people involved. I would hope you'd be able to exchange details so as to proceed forward and have more people in there. Yes.

Great. So joining us over the table, next is – let's see – Maguy Serad. Oh, Maguy: compliance update. She's VP of Contractual Compliance Services, and I can see she's joined by Owen Smigelski, who we know as well. Welcome, Owen. Welcome – I see Victor Oppenheimer as well, or at least his name card here.

UNIDENTIIFED FEMALE: Who is driving the slides? Oh, okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ariel is driving the slides.

UNIDENIFIED FEMALE: All right. Cool.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, Maguy. So as soon as the slide deck is ready, then we can get going. I don't see any slide decks at the moment. There is a huge amount of movement behind.

MAGUY SERAD: [inaudible] Gisella acknowledged them in receipt last night. I sent them last night.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And this, ladies and gentlemen, is how we lose minutes.

MAGUY SERAD: No. We never lose minutes with me. You know better. Good morning everyone. Thank you for another opportunity. I really look forward to coming to ICANN meetings. It's like family reunions. You see everybody. Some members you just are excited to see. Some are going to complain

more, and some are going to share. So I'm really looking forward to another exciting week here.

With me in the audience, I'm proud to announce my new boss, Allen Grogan. We'll give him the opportunity to speak after we address the questions and the topics updates.

But mostly, I'm really proud to have the Los Angeles-based team to join me in person. If you don't mind, I'd like them to stand up. I have the pleasure and the honor. I'm really honored to work with such a wonderful team. Our team in Istanbul is joining us remotely, and our team in Singapore is also. So you're in good, trusted hands.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So is anyone in the office today running the Internet?

MAGUY SERAD: I knew Olivier was going to ask that. Mr. Chairman, people have worked early in the morning and late in the evening to be able to come and meet the ALAC Constituency Group.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

MAGUY SERAD: Yes. So what we hope to do is give you a very high-level update on topics that are relevant to this audience. We look forward to your comments and feedback, and if you would hold the question to the end.

We'll give you a very high-level update, and then we definitely are here to listen to you. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm going to sit there and drive the slides.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Victor [inaudible] I'll sit with you so [inaudible]

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Good morning. Oh, I'm trying to avoid the microphone issues.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Correct.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Okay. Next slide, please. I have a loud, booming voice. Next slide.

So here's just a brief agenda of what we're going to do. I'm going to speak about registrar. Victor will then speak about registry-related issues, audit program update, and then we'll do the Q&A.

Next slide, please. Since ICANN 51 – oh, go back one slide. Since ICANN 51, here are some of the steps that we made. We brought in a WHOIS Inaccuracy QR, Remediation QR, and abuse updates, and so we'll go ahead and cover those now.

Next slide. One thing that we did was take a look back at all WHOIS inaccuracy complaints that were resolved because the registrar suspended the domain name. This data you see here represents all complaints between January and June 2014 – about 1300 complaints. Compliance went back to ensure continued compliance with the RAA, either confirming that it was still suspended, or in some cases deleted.

Otherwise, we followed up with the registrar to ensure that proper steps were taken to ensure either verification of the address or whatever the inaccuracy was.

Out of that, we had a 100% compliance from the registrars for those complaints that we reviewed.

We've also rolled out, since London, a remediation quality review, or a remediation QR, and that is a process to ensure that when a contracted party does a remediation, either through the informal or a formal resolution process, that the contracted part remains in compliance. Not all issues, like a WHOIS inaccuracy, or something that can be resolved right away in closing the tickets, sometimes there does need to be a change in the system or the processes, and the contracted parties know that we're doing this now. If we do find later on that there is an issue that's not fixed, that will result in an escalated notice, which the contracted party have five days to cure. Otherwise, it will be in breach.

There's been a large increase in the abuse complaints that are ongoing with the 2013 RAA. The most common ones that compliance is seeing in order are ones about online pharmaceuticals, malware, viruses, and the spam.

There are a couple of them that we do not process and we actually close, and that is when the registrar is one the 2009 RAA. That is not something that's binding. There's no requirements for abuse processing in the 2009 RAA.

Another is one the reporter is just contacting ICANN about the abuse first and has not followed up with the registrar. We want to make sure that a process is followed and that the registrar is receiving the abuse complaints.

Compliance and other ICANN staff has conducted ongoing outreach with registrars and abuse reporters, as well as IP rights protection groups to explain more and level expectations that, in terms of what is and what is not in the contract and what kind of steps are required to be taken.

Next slide, please. Something that you may have seen because ICANN blogs about it was some concerns regarding fraudulent domain renewal e-mails. Compliance is seeing a large number of these, and these are not ones that are coming typically from a registrar. It's coming from what appears to be a reseller, and generally it's targeted to either trademark owners. There's a high degree of sophistication sometimes that will use a person's first name. It'll include the domain name.

The concern is that often there's a very high premium being charged. They're asking to protect the domain or something like that, and these then contain links to a website that you can't tell who the registrar is. You can't tell what's going on, and it would appear to be a payment collections and personal information phish attempt, or something along those lines.

So Compliance is following up with inquiries to the resellers. We've also engaged the registrars to review whether they're resellers or not, and in some cases, report abuse to them, so we are taking some additional steps so that to clean up the ecosystem.

Some of the 2013 lessons learned: RAA is ongoing. There has been some concern regarding what is verification versus validation of information. Verify means you actually check that it is correct. Validation means that you confirm that it's in a correct format. There's been some confusion with registrars about that, so we're working to clear that up.

Also, some registrars just aren't investigating abuse complaints, so we're working with them to ensure that they do have a process in place to receive a response and track abuse complaints.

There's also been some issues with registrars not sending the proper renewal reminders as required by the ERRP. We're working with them to resolve that.

Then also there's been some issues with UDRP, where registrars are not verifying the person who's subject or the entity that's subject to a UDRP complaint, or allowing an improper transfer, or they're not maintain the status quo pending the UDRP proceeding.

And with that, I'm going to pass it onto Victor, or Senor Oppenheimer, as Maguy calls him.

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: Thank you, Owen. Again for the record, my name is Victor Oppenheimer, Senior Manager, ICANN Compliance. I'd like to provide a

brief update on activities since ICANN 50, starting with the public interest commitments.

I'd like to highlight a few items. Number one, the PIC DRP Standing Panel that is part of the PIC DRP or of the big [inaudible] is in place. I encourage you to click on the link and read the information about the Standing Panel at your leisure. I can listen to the GAC and community concerns about the readiness of registry operators to comply with the mandatory and voluntary PIC provisions, and it launched a proactive monitoring back in late August, and it's on their way. I have a slide later with more information on that.

Regarding the PICs, essentially all the TLDs that as of 1 October 2014 were in general availability are part of this proactive monitoring.

I also at the bottom of the slide encourage you to follow our progress with this project. Just clicking on that link will take you to ICANN's website, and you can track our progress regarding this proactive monitoring.

So I stated before that ICANN is monitoring mandatory provisions, and ICANN is verifying, number one, that per the RA, per the registry agreement, registry operators are only using 2013 RAA registrars, that they have included the mandatory provision in the RAA, warning the registrant that any type of the abusive containing the provision can result in up to suspension of the domain name.

ICANN is also verifying that registry operators are maintaining the statistical reports on the security threats detected and the actions they

have taken based on those reports. So we're asking them to provide data on that.

ICANN is also checking that the general registration policies are being published in their websites, and that unless they are .brands, they're not imposing restrictive registrations of this sort that only .brands are allowed to.

Regarding the voluntary provisions, there are quite a few. It varies among registry operators. I'm highlighting some of the ones that we considered more sensitive; for example, where some registry operators are not entirely committed to perform WHOIS audits and taking remediation steps; others committed to exclude registrars with a history of non-compliance. So ICANN is inquiring what processes they have in place to determine whether they're in non-compliance.

ICANN also, as part of the voluntary commitments, many of them have the requirement to establish a collaboration pathway with governments, industries, self-regulatory bodies in the various countries to ensure that abuse reports are addressed properly.

Finally, some voluntary commitments also are about limiting domain name proxy and privacy services, only to registrars that enforce the accuracy of registrant data.

So ICANN really is asking for information on what processes they have implemented, they have in place, to assess the level of compliance and take the appropriate steps.

MAGUY SERAD: Victor, if I may interrupt, I know we're providing some information. I just want to be mindful so we have some Q&A. So if I may, these are some stats about where we are – the preliminary statistics – and why we're doing it. There are some slides on the name collision slide and an update on the audit program.

I'm looking at the clock. It's scary because it keeps counting down, and I know you like to ask [queue] questions. So with that, I'm sorry, Victor, I interrupted, and, Yan, you're not going to present.

Talk to us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maguy. And yes, we have this countdown clock specifically to give you shivers when making your presentation. It's not specifically you, but pretty much me as well. It keeps me in check.

Let's open the floor for questions. There's been a lot already that's been worked on here. Evan already just put his hand up by just a simple smile a couple of hours ago, before the meeting even started.

So we have Evan, Holly, and Alan in the queue. Let's start with Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks very much, Olivier. My questions I guess are mainly for you, Victor, because you mentioned in the first slide that the issue about PICs was going to be done with consideration of GAC and community input.

I'd like to get an idea of your awareness of what the community feedback has been on public interest commitments. You may or may not be aware, but At-Large had a significant debate about this going into a public comment process, and we've received significant feedback.

I'd like to get an idea of what your perception of the community feedback is and how you are modifying what you're doing in order to accommodate that as you said in your first slide.

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: Sure. So my understanding of ALAC in particular concerns are based on, like you mentioned, the comments that ALAC submitted for the PIC DRP in particular, so comments were very tailored to the PIC DRP, per se. At least that's my perception, or my understanding.

What this proactive monitoring is actually doing is very fine what is at compliance with the contractual requirements.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, so I'd like to expand that to get your opinion on a couple of things. First of all, the issue of third party standing. For instance, if somebody is not directed; that is, they're not the registrant, but somebody – a third party, an Internet user – is affected by something going on, do they have standing within the PIC system?

Secondly, I'd like to find out what are the remedies? Based on our reading of the PIC regime, in terms of if a PIC is declared to be in breach, what are the remedies? It seems like there's only two options. Either the contract is in breach, or nothing has happened. Are there remedies?

Are there penalties? Are there any kind of remedial functions that are possible that are not just sort of one extreme or the other? Is there actually a published set of interim measures that can be taken outside of the extremes of, "You're in breach, or there's no problem?" Thanks.

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: So I guess two different questions. One is, "What about the standing of third parties regarding the public interest commitments?"

Third parties would not have standing under the PIC DRP. However, that doesn't mean they are no other avenues for third parties, including, number one, directly talking to the registry operator, or submitting a complaint outside of the PIC DRP process to ICANN, and ICANN will investigate as well.

Excuse me?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. What can ICANN do when such a complaint is received?

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: ICANN will follow their informal process, like we do for any complaint. Basically, there will be an evaluation of whether there is at least one violation of the PIC for that particular registry operator, and depending on the determination, contact the registry operator.

Secondly, you ask about remedies. I think the question was, "Is there anything in between a notice of breach, or do we do nothing?"

Again, we go back to our established standard processes. ICANN always tries to collaborate with the registry operator and avoid if possible going to breach through our informal 1-2-3 process.

If that doesn't work and ICANN breaches the registry operator, then the only remedies are the ones included in the registry agreement, which are curing the breach within 30 days, and any other alternative dispute resolution available under the registry agreement for the operators.

ALLEN GROGAN: Hi. Let me just jump in for a second here. A couple of things. I think in terms of who has standing, any party that can show they've been harmed has standing, so I'm not sure what you mean by third parties, [all right]?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Do you recognize non-financial harm?

ALLEN GROGAN: It doesn't specify financial harm, so I think we would. In terms of remedies, if you read the PIC DRP carefully, there are references to, for example, the Expert Panel being able to include a recommendation of remedies, and that's very broad. So I don't think that the remedies are necessarily limited.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, and welcome to the table, Allen Grogan. Let's go through our queue. We've got Holly Raiche and Alan Greenberg next. Holly, you're first.

HOLLY RAICHE: First of all, to Allen, I'm decided you now have added consumer safeguards. I think at another meeting I'd like to know how broad your remit is because in fact they're scattered throughout what you do, all the way from the RAA information that's sort of saying, "I keep running across consumer safeguards, or rather lack thereof," so that's interesting.

A couple of things that were mentioned yesterday. One, have you taken onBoard it was I think Heather Dryden and Peter [inaudible] who pointed out that the statistics in the way that you gather statistics, which has a definition, which is does something in terms of accuracy, is the format right as opposed to is it accurate? And it's differently constructed in the NORC study, so I think there was kind of a, "Could we have comparability?" or some kind of comparability, and I want to know if that's possible so it's possible to determine the extent to which the 2013 amendments have made any progress.

I'll stop there for the moment. Thank you.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: For that, yeah, I think the NORC study is a first step, an attempted baseline to see where it is, and there were some issues identified in there that stuck out that were highlighted as either being too high or too low, and where Compliance is participating, as with other parts of

ICANN, to review the methodology and how that's being calculated in there.

We're also then taking a look at the raw data as well to see if there's areas for improvement before the process is set up to send those inaccuracies to the registrars. We're going to work with the registrars or registries as it may be if there's a systemic issue that we can identify and work with to clear up some of those inaccuracies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A quick follow-up from Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's not a follow-up. Victor, you mentioned privacy proxy. When the specification which is being developed is finally developed and passed, there are going to be accredited privacy proxy providers, and obviously there's going to be a whole slew of people who are accredited who nevertheless act that way. I trust you're going to deal with both.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Next is Alan Greenberg. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two questions. First, a very small own for Owen. Can we roll back to one of your first slides – the one with the pie chart about checking whether domains that were taken down are still down, or what the status of them is?

I think you said 100% of registrars are compliant. I thought I saw a number saying for 1%, the domain was active even though the WHOIS was unchanged.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Correct, and what is doing that is the registrar verified that the domains have to be suspended within 15 days of WHOIS inaccuracy complaint if there's no response from the registrant. So the domain gets suspended. Our ticket processing system closes the complaint. We then go back to check and we notice the data isn't changed and the domain is no longer suspended. We request the documentation from the registrar to show at what point was that data verified as required by the RAA so they demonstrate compliance on that matter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan –

ALAN GREENBERGL So you're saying there was a complaint –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, please give your names before because of the interpretation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So you're saying there was a complaint. It was taken down even though the WHOIS information was actually correct, and then was put back up?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: There was a WHOIS inaccuracy complaint because there was a non-response. The registrar suspended the domain, and then when we go back and look at it with a WHOIS QR, the registrar is able to provide that and whatever date it was that did receive the required verification for that information.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so you have found that at this point time, there are no more of the embarrassing situations where a domain goes down validly and then comes back with still wrong WHOIS information that's essentially non-existent?

OWEN SMIGELSKI: We put this in place to avoid situations like that. That was something that came from ALAC. But we continue to run this ongoing, and it's something that we may even run again, but it is an ongoing process that we have now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. My recollection is the new registry agreements have terms in them that, once a certain percentage of registrars that they use have signed onto the 2013 agreement, that within a certain period of time, all of them do. There's a number – I think one or two 270-day delays. Where are we right now where we will be able to effectively stop saying someone is still on the 2009 RAA?

MAGUY SERAD: I don't have the answer to that. Allen, would you know?

ALLEN GROGAN: I'm not entirely sure I understand the question. So signatories to the new gTLD agreements are required to use registrars who are signatories to the 2013 RAA. The legacy TLDs, the non-signatories to the 2013 RAA, are not required to do that, so there could continue to be registrars under the 2009 RAA for a legacy TLD.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe for any of the legacy ones that have been resigned or signed again recently, such as .org, there is a provision which include some delays, but also requires them to eventually move.

ALLEN GROGAN: Off the top of my head, I don't remember, but I could find that out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Heidi's asking whether it's an action item. Perhaps, yes, so the action item is to find clarification on this topic. We'll have to check afterwards on the exact wording of it.

Evan Leibovitch, please.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. What is the anticipated cost to a complainant that has to file something through the PIC DRP?

ALLEN GROGAN: I'll take that. I don't know that we can predict what the cost would be because there are a lot of different folks in the road. In a PIC RDP, it could be resolved simply informally between the complaining party and the registrar. It could be a matter that ends up going to ICANN Compliance. It could be a matter that's referred to a panel. It could be a matter that's referred to a panel and a decision is made and then it eventually goes to mediation arbitration. So there's a wide range.

I think our hope would be that the PIC DRP process leads to rapid, quick and cheap resolution of the issues.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I only make the comment because getting into the PIC DRP at the beginning entails a cost, so I'm just wondering from a purpose of public education. So if somebody believes they've been wrong through what they believe to be a breach of the PIC, what are their processes, and how can they be informed of what this is going to cost them in order to launch the complaint?

If there's so many unknowns, this could be a barrier to entry in terms of somebody launching a complaint, so I'm wondering if there's any opportunity for clarity for talking to the public on what's involved in doing this and what are the potential costs, even if there's something like, "Here's the minimum it's going to cost to get involved in this."

Certainly there's precedence. Certainly there's examples that can be used to try to demonstrate what the likely or even just the minimum or what the range of costs would be to get into this process.

ALLEN GROGAN: If you're just talking about the cost of initiating a PIC DRP, I think the cost is probably minimal. It's a matter of filing an online report complaint identifying the PIC that you believe has been violated and the facts surrounding the violation. That essentially kicks off the PCI DRP process, and that could lead to a quick resolution, or it could go on for a longer period of time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, gentlemen. I'm just saying I'm letting the discussion go as we're still waiting for Stephane Gelder, who is the Chair of the Nominating Committee. That's the session immediately afterwards.

But Maguy has told me we have a time limit as well, so if you wish to pursue – Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. Just as a matter of clarification, as long as this information is made clearly on the website to just try to give as much certainty as possible to people that are coming in that believe they've been wronged by something that can be resolved through this process, how much clarity can we give potential complainants about what's involved in doing this.

That's all I'm really trying to drill down to: to give some kind of idea in plain language to somebody that believes they've been wronged in such a way that requires the PIC DRP process what they're going to go through should they proceed.

All I'm asking for is that this kind of clarity be provided at a public level at an accessible level. Thanks.

ALLEN GROGAN: I understand what you're asking for. Let us take that back and take it under advisement.

Real quickly, since I'm here, I am an Allen Grogan. I'm the new Chief Contractor Compliance Officer. I will have Maguy's team reporting to me, as well as a newly formed position. That's a Consumer Safeguards Director.

In response partly to your comments, Holly, I think we've always viewed that a number of the safeguards built into the agreements are really for the protection of consumers in the Internet community, not just registrars and registrants. That's the reason there are provisions dealing with things like malware and viruses and so forth, so one of my tasks is going to be to think about what we can do to specifically focus on and enhance consumer safeguards in connection with these agreements.

Potentially where the agreements are insufficient to address some of those concerns, are there other ways we could address that that's consistent with our limited mandate and mission, and consistent with our core values? Could we publish best practices to help self-police the industry? And so forth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. We have John Laprise next.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise from NARALO. Thank you, Allen, for coming and speaking with us today. Can I ask one question? Why, as a part of your title, you are in charge of consumer protection rather than user protection? It seems that if we want to be really inclusive to everyone who is part of the Internet that we want to be as broadly inclusive as possible, and "consumer" for some has a certain connotation that "user" lacks. [inaudible] users more open.

Do you have any thoughts on that?

ALLEN GROGAN: We considered and discussed a whole variety of titles, and I'm not sure I can reconstruct exactly what the semantic discussion was that led to the current title. I think you could debate which one is broader because users might be limited to Internet users or users of our services, and consumers might even be broader than that.

So I'm not sure. I don't think you should read too much into that distinction.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Allen. There are more than three billion Internet users, so that's large enough, probably.

ALLEN GROGAN: Right. Real quick, also I will be speaking to the ALAC leadership team on Friday, so for those of you who will be here then, you'll have an opportunity to talk to me then, too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Holly, since you will be in the ALAC leadership team, can we –

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, but –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But? Go ahead, Holly. Last question, quickly, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then you'll have to deal with Stephane and with Cheryl if you waste time.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's all right. I'm brave. Next time, could we have a briefing? Because I think there are probably a lot of heads around the room that would like to contribute to and help you define what it is that we would like to see from you, and it's broader than just the team.

ALLEN GROGAN: Yes, absolutely. It's about 24 hours ago I was appointed this position, so I didn't have time to prepare a briefing for this one, but next time I will.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Allen. Finally, last words, Maguy Serad.

MAGUY SERAD: I want to say thank you for this opportunity, and I want to also congratulate Allen. I'm looking forward to working with you in the future. Good luck this week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, everyone. As people come out of their chairs, we now have Stephane Van Gelder, the Chair of the ICANN Nominating Committee. We also have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, one of the Vice-Chairs, and I think we have here Yjro Lanispuro also, who will be joining us at the table.

Welcome, Stephane.

Welcome, Stephane. Yes, we have to start. We have not a hard stop, but we've got a very short break at lunchtime, and then this room is being used. So we need to move forward.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Olivier, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ladies and gentlemen, your attention please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You got it now.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: That was Cheryl. This is Stephane Van Gelder. Thanks for having us. We had a set of slides, but as we are short on time, and I'm sure it's of more benefit to you to have a conversation with us, it's certainly of more benefit to us to have a conversation with you and understand or answer some of the questions you may have.

Can I just start by introducing the people that are with me at the table? At the far left here, I have Yjro Lanispuro, who was the 2013 Chair/2014 Associate Chair, and is a member of the 2015 committee.

Just next to him, Ron Andruff, a member of 2013 and '14 committees, and just been Chair Elect of the 2015 committee.

Just next to him, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who you obviously all know very well, an Chair Elect – I'll get it right, I'll get right by the end of the day – of the 2013 committee, Chair of 2014, and my Associate Chair for 2015. Thank you for accepting that role, Cheryl, and passing that experience on to me. It's very much appreciated.

I was a member of the 2013 committee selected by the Board to be 2014 Chair Elect, and I'm now 2015 Chair.

That being done, I just want to go to one slide, which is the slide showing who we are recruiting for in 2015, please. You will find that two or three slides down. Perhaps just leave the slide up there. It's very quick, so I'll just go through it. It's the slide further on, please.

We are recruiting for three members of the Board in 2015, three members of ALAC, and that's –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Next slide, please.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yeah, it's the next slide. Just one more. One more.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you. Perfect. Thank you. Three members of ALAC – one from Africa, Asia Pac, and Latin America – two members of the GNSO Council, and one member of the ccNSO Council. You have the terms up there on the slides.

With that, can I just, Olivier, open it up for questions and before doing that, perhaps just hand the mic over the Cheryl, Ron, and Yjro in case they want to say anything?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Stephane. Over to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a good idea to just have more of an iterative process today. You as a community have been very ,very engaged in Nominating Committee World. You know you send regionally five members to sit on the Nominating Committee.

Many of you have served on nominating committees, and you do realize that there is always the pressure of time.

This year coming, I'm hoping that they'll have a little bit more time than this year now closing had. We had the shortest amount of time I think on record to do our appointments, and we did a revamp of our site and our process of appointments.

So this coming year, we have made some proposals from 2014 to hopefully have 2015 NomCom take these up and perhaps modify them slightly. But what we're hoping is that where there were some minor points of confusion and glitches – and Jimmy, you probably noticed you did have to remember to take the next page step in that SOI process, which we've made it easier; we don't think we'll have as many "have I finished yet?" questions. So there's a little bit of working still happening. It's all about making it more transparent and keeping up the accountability.

But I just want to say one thing to you as ALAC and now start thinking about it because this is what we want to hear back from you, and that is we're sending you in this coming year three members. You do need to think about giving us a good, clear brief for what you're looking at.

Over to you, Ron.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you, Cheryl. Good afternoon, or good morning/good afternoon. I'm not sure what it is toward everyone.

I just wanted to say a few words about the representatives that you've sent to the Nominating Committee. I've had the pleasure and the honor of serving two years as a member, and so I've served with a number of your colleagues.

This past year, the leadership team determined that it would be advisable to do a peer review. So you may not be aware of this, but shortly a peer review will be released, which basically is a score card, if you will, of all of the members of the Nominating Committee rating each and every one of their fellow colleagues.

The purpose of that is really to up the game and to try to make sure that the sending organizations are completely informed as to the quality of the representatives that they sent, and also with the hope that that will encourage every sending organization to send their brightest and best to the Nominating Committee.

So I would take my hat off to the colleagues. As I look around the table, I worked with many of you over the years – Siranush and Mr. McKnight over there – many, many of you. Rather than going around naming you all, congratulations for the great work you've done so far, and thank you for that. The peer reviews will be out shortly, so you can see how the other committee members felt about your members' collaboration.

Thank you.

YJRO LANSIPURO?: Well, I think that everything pretty much has been already said. I'd like you all to attend, if possible, tomorrow the Board Working Group session on the Nominating Committee because it's pretty decisive for

the future of the Nominating Committee what kind of community response their final report will get.

You know my personal thinking from my comments on the wiki page, so I don't need to go there. But I just urge you to participate. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They've got me. They've got me [sordid]. I just wanted to mention with the peer review that we have in fact already published, or it is in our 2014 final report, which may or not be on the websites already. I'm not sure when they go live. But it is presented to the community this week at our public meeting.

In that report is an aggregated peer review already, so what you will be able to see is the average scores on all the different questions. It is a good snap shot that if you want to look at now even now before we send the material out the sending organizations, you've already got some graphics in your head.

Over to you, Stephane.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks. Eight minutes. I suggest we just open it up, Olivier, if you're okay with that, for questions. Alan looks like he's got his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There's always a tendency in such reviews to not want to say negative things about your peers, even if it's a secret one. From the

view of the chair, do you feel that the final appraisals were moderately accurate and you're comfortable with them?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm more than happy to get this. Two parts to my response. I'll take the second part of your question first. I have not a microsecond's worth of doubt that it is a true and accurate record of what I have seen to be a team that have worked collegially and effectively throughout a very hard year.

In fact, if I was giving them some of the scores, I may have scored some of them higher. So put that to rest.

In terms of not saying brutally honest thing, you should go on site and read Stephane and mine's external reviews, which were not an internal review, but one done by a third party company – the same group that do the ICANN Board.

We are at a loss to know where some of the things that they way we should improve – where I should improve – came from. There's statements in there such as how aggressive I was once to him. Poor boy. He couldn't handle it.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER?: You'll notice I haven't said I word since I've sat down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But believe me, there is no holding back. What is important I think is the choice that Stephane and I have made this year, and that is to publish what has only been last year started, which is a 360 review of ourselves.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yeah, absolutely. That's the point I wanted – sorry, Alan, you wanted to come back.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I was just going to mention the external review. You mentioned the external review, that we should go see it. It is posted somewhere?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Yes. There's two things I wanted to add. The first is that this is a new development, and something that's not been done before. And I think it's important that the leadership of the 2014 NomCom, Cheryl and myself – the leadership that's selected by the Board – we should not forgot Yjro, but Yjro was selected as Associate Chair, by the Chair, Cheryl. So there are only two positions that can chair within the NomCom bylaws – that may be an important thing to highlight – the Chair Elect and the Chair, and those positions are reviewed by the Board. The Board has decided that there should be a review, and they've asked an external reviewer to do it.

Both of us in full agreement decided this year that that would be transparent. We did so before we saw the results.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But we stuck to our guns.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: We announced it publically in a moment of madness before we saw the results. It was my fault. I was trying to get reelected at the time. So that's one thing.

The other thing I wanted to say is that the decision to do the internal reviews is Cheryl's and the 2014 committee's. All decisions are committee decisions. They are collegial. But each committee makes up its own rules.

I hope this will continue in 2015. I think it's a very important development, and I think it shows that the NomCom is committed to being fully transparent and accountable to you, the community, who are sending us people and helping us do this important job.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I have a question, actually. When does the application period start for positions? Because it's not mentioned anywhere and the website is not updated.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: The 2015 website will be online soon. The reason it's not specifically mentioned as a date is that it's a decision the 2015 committee takes, and that committee starts work this Friday. It will be working for two full days at the end of this week, so the 2015 members already get a taste of what they can expect in terms of the hard work.

I can give you a general window, which is from December to April. It should be window of opportunity to apply. We do have a slide – I don't know who's running the slides – but there is a slide showing that generic timeline if you want to put it up there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That goes to the flowchart. Back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I guess the NomCom pages need to be updated then because there is nothing mentioning the 2015. At the moment, in fact, it just says, "Application period closed on the 1st of April 2014."

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: That's what I just said. The 2015 NomCom will be online soon.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're separate pages.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But the whole NomCom will be online, or just the –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They're entirely separate pages. That's the 2014 page. That will be archived. The 2015 page will be launched when there is a 2015 NomCom. All right? So as handover happens, then you can expect new material.

Vanda? [inaudible]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to recognize that the review work 360 was posted for everybody to see in our group. Also, it was reviewed by the peers so everyone can see our performance and so on.

So that's very, very important, and I believe it will continue and will never stop because this is real, whatever the results are. [inaudible] anyway.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Vanda. And I think the community should be pleased that we're working on this. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: My question is about the nature of the criteria and what you're looking for as opposed to the review. Are you done with talking with the review?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: All right. The normal time when you come and talk to us, it has to do with what you're looking for, what the criteria are, and so on. Normally, when you're looking especially for instance to fill the Board position,

there are certain specific talents, certain specific geography, and certain specific things you're looking for.

Could you go into a bit of detail going forward what it is you're looking for so we as a community trying to help you find people have a better idea where to contemplate?

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks, Evan. Actually, I'm going to turn that around. The way it works is that you tell us what skill sets you need, and we try to fill those skill sets.

And you're absolutely right. That is, we are slightly remiss because we've taken up time on other things. But that is a very important part of the reason why we're here today representing the 2015 committee. It's that we're here also to ask you as a community to please do send us your skill sets. What do you need? We've shown you the three positions we're recruiting for. You know the other positions are in ALAC. What skill sets do you need to be filled, and please do send that to us.

We ask each of the groups that we recruit for for their skill sets. They are published when we get them. So if you go on the 2014 page, you'll see the skill set for the Board members, and we act upon that. So please do get together and send us that info. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just to follow on from Stephane, we get the information, of course, from each of the individual groups, but you also asked about the geography. We have as of today during our learnings talking to people, I

believe Stephane is going to ensure that there is a chart that shows which of the Board members that are NomCom-appointed who's terms will be looking for replacement – not that they have to be replaced – but their terms in this next coming year.

But just so you know, it is George. It is Olga, and it is Gonzalez. Okay? So to give you a sense of the geography, okay? All right? So that's important.

But we get from the Board what the Board believe are their particular skill set requirements, but they get added onto the general ones, and they always publish on the website.

RON ANDERS?: One other footnote to that, apart from what the Nominating Committee is tasked to do, there will also be other replacements from ASO and other bodies, so we will certainly have that on our mind, insomuch as when the final selections are taken, it's always to create a holistic Board that all bases are covered.

I think that's one of the trickiest parts of the applicants because they put their names in and they feel that they have the capability to be on the Board, and quite frankly, they probably would in another circumstance because we now need someone who's more technically-minded or more finance – whatever it might be – and that's one of the issues that we deal with.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. We have to finish because we've got LACRALO and that whole thing. So, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, I was just going to say: don't forget, use your representatives into the NomCom. Brief your five people. Make sure you as ALAC and At-Large leaders, RALO leaders, talk to your NomCom people and send the information through to us.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you much, Cheryl. Just for the records, our NomCom delegates are Fatima [inaudible], Satish Babu, Yjro Lanispuro, Sylvia Herlein Leite, and Louis Houle.

So you know who they are. Go and speak to them. They're all here.

Thank you very much, Stephane. No doubt we'll be speaking to you in the future again, and we'll be complaining about your selections. And we'll be praising you.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: [inaudible] skill sets.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But we won't forget the skill sets, certainly. And with this, this ends our morning session, ladies and gentlemen. Thanks to the interpreters and to the technical people for having fixed our microphone system.

In five minutes, the LACRALO meeting starts in this very location, so we'll have to do a quick turnover. Please respect LACRALO for the time that they have. It's a back-to-back session with more sessions afterwards.

Thanks and good afternoon, everyone. Bye-bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: You may want to avoid this side of the table. The power isn't working.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]