GISELLA GRUBER:	Good evening to all. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday, the 23rd of February at 12:00 UTC, one of our new rotating times.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Garth Bruen, Maureen Hilyard, Sébastien Bachollet, Sandra Hoferichter, Vanda Scartezini, Harold Arcos, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Wafa Dahmani, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Ron Sherwood, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Allan Skuce, Daniel Nanghaka, Eduardo Diaz, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Glenn McKnight, Alberto Soto, Barrack Otieno, and Yubelkys Montalvo.

On the Spanish channel, we have Harold Arcos. No participants so far on the French channel. Absent from the call so far from the ALAC are León Sanchez and Seun Ojedeji. Apologies so far noted from Holly Raiche, Siranush Vardanyan, Timothy Denton, Kaili Kan, Breda Kutin, Wolf Ludwig, Aziz Hilali and Jimmy Schulz. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco, Yesim Nazlar, and myself, Gisella Gruber. Ozan Sahin has joined us as well.

Our interpreters today on the French channel are Isabella and Camila. On the Spanish channel, we have Veronica and Marina. We do not have Russian interpretation today, but the transcript will be translated into Russian.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other channel and to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you very much. Over to you, Alan.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Gisella. The agenda was late again this month, but is there anything in it that anyone either questions or needs to change, and is there any other business that we should add at the end? It is a pretty packed agenda. Our target is going to be to complete within two hours, but it will remain to be seen. We may have to do some juggling to accommodate that as we go forward.

There is another meeting for some of us immediately after this one. Alright, seeing nothing, then we will accept the agenda as displayed on the wiki, and proceed. The first item is ALAC Policy Development status, and I'll turn it over to Ariel for that.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Alan. So far, compared to the previous ALAC call, we've already had much change in terms of statements that are in development. Domain changes actually occurred last night. We had two new public comments just open, and I will talk to you about that. The first one is the Draft Framework of Principles for Cross-Community Working Groups. I'm going to paste the link in the chat, so you can see the details. That public comment will end April the 2nd, and then the second new public comment just opened is Charter Amendments of the GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group, and that one will end on April the 4th. These are the main two new additions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. The first one, Framework of Principles for Cross-Community Working Groups, this is the group that has been working in parallel with many cross-community working groups, coming up with some overall rules for how you run Cross-Community Working Groups. It's a relatively critical one, and I think it's something that we're going to have to pay a fair amount of attention to. Luckily, we have a lot of people with experience on cross-community working groups right now, so I don't think there'll be a real problem finding people to work well. Maybe a problem finding people who are willing to work on it, but we certainly should be able to put something together on that.

The other one I suspect we will not comment on, but we'll need to look at it in some detail. My only question is regarding the open ones, and one of them is the geographic region one, which has a very long response time. Can we have a brief report from Tijani as to where we are on that one? Because I checked the wiki, and I noticed there's nothing there yet. Tijani, are you around?

TIJANI BEN-JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, I am here. Thank you, Alan. It is not forgotten at all. I agreed with people who asked me when we will have the drafts done. I told them that we will start just after Marrakech. We've received some feedback, some opinions. We have taken all of them, we have collected them, and we have them under hand. We will start just after Marrakech, drafting the first draft. We have time till April, don't forget it, so it is not late to start after Marrakech. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Would it be possible for you to put together a few slides just summarizing the kind of comments that you got? As you know, in Marrakech we either will have a very tight schedule, or because of discussions on the CCWG, we may have abundant time. I think that's one of the things we want to be prepared to put some time into, if we end up having some time.

Perhaps if you could, somewhere along the way between now and a week and a half from now or so when we meet in Marrakech, if you could put together just a couple of slides summarizing the input. No real processing, you can even say where the input came from, so we get some idea and perhaps can discuss with those people. I would appreciate it.

TIJANI BEN-JEMAA: This is possible, even if it will put more pressure on me, because I still have a lot of work to do for Marrakech, but I will try to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. If it looks like we're... Looks like we'll give you time in Marrakech, if necessary. Alright, any other questions on the public comments right now? If not, hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we'll go on to the next item. The next item is summary of a review of current ALS applications. For that, who do we have? Silvia or Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hello, everyone. Currently, we have 197 At-Large structures. The latest one, Internet Society of China, welcome to them. We do not have any

being voted on at the moment. There is a regional advice being sought from NARALO for the greatest Washington DC chapter of the Internet Society. I do know that there was an action item to have Nathalie update on the status of the ISOC Gambia application. She did, and the ISOC is still waiting for a new leadership election from that organization. Once that happens, ISOC will inform us and the process can continue. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I believe that NARALO did give us advice on Greater Washington DC chapter of the Internet Society, and that was to proceed.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, perfect, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I take my hat off to Heidi, where it's 4:00 AM in Los Angeles right now, so thank you very much. Some of us feel your pain. Next item is reports from liaisons, working groups, RALOs. Again, most of them have been deposited. Are there any ones that need commenting at this point? Gisella, I see your hand up.

GISELLA GRUBER: Just to say that we did skip action items, if you wish to get back to that, agenda item three.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: We will go back to that. my apologies.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone who has provided reports want to give any insight into them? I see no hands. Oh, we do have Olivier. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I was going to give a quick report. Unfortunately, I can't load my report. Give me a second. Okay, so we had a GNSO conference call last week, and the majority of the discussion came around a couple of points. The first one was the vote on the initiation of the policy development process for the review of the rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs and discussion of the proposed charter of that PDP working group.

There was a lot of discussion that went into this because there was a question as to whether the rights protection mechanisms discussion should be performed first, followed by review of the UDRP, which is the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy, so whether it should be going in this direction or whether they should do the UDRP first followed by the review of the rights protection mechanisms. With no real consensus on this, it was just voted to proceed forward with the charter as it was

proposed and to hammer out the actual charter and the order in which work was going to be undertaken in Marrakech.

That was the first thing that a lot of time was spent on. The second thing that spent a lot of the two hours of the conference calls was, of course, the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability. There was a good discussion as to where the GNSO should move forward, next steps, and there was some concern from some council members that they would not have enough time to ask the opinion of their own members. What I did do was to provide details of what the ALAC was going to do, including the description of the community calls that will take place tomorrow and on the 25th of February.

With this, the GNSO Council decided to have a single-issue call on the 29th of this month and to discuss where they were and prepare for ratification in Marrakech. It was unanimously rejected to not have anything until Marrakech, because so much had to be discussed before that, they thought they would run out of time until then.

So that's where we stand. Next Monday, the 29th is when GNSO Council will discuss all of the points in the reports and invite experts and members of the Cross-Community Working Group that are the representatives on the Cross-Community Working Group. That's all for the GNSO Council. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. Any questions for Olivier or any other comments on any of the reports delivered? I see nothing, then we will

go back to the item on action items. Are there any action items that need to be reviewed by ALAC at this point?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan, this is Heidi. There are two. The first one was actually the update on ISOC Gambia, so that one has been completed, and the second one is "Alan Greenberg to start a consensus call via the ALAC mailing list. ALAC endorses the work of the New Meeting Strategy Working Group, and the working group continues its work on finalizing the proposal for the three meetings this year."

ALAN GREENBERG: I apparently didn't do that. I think we need to put an action item on to remind Alan to address the action item from the last meeting. Any other comments? Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I'm a bit confused about this action item page. We are looking at the 26th of January, 2016 page, are we?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's a section, Open Action Items, and then at the bottom, there's Newly Assigned Action Items, and there are quite a few there as well. I'm not quite sure, are both of these to be there?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. No, actually, as has been the case for some time, open action items are more long term ones, and then the newly assigned action items are the ones that are more current and to be actioned upon. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, the ones that are long-term, we decided not to spend time reviewing them during the ALAC meeting. They are reviewed periodically. If you believe we are shirking our job by ignoring them, then we can indeed review them on a semi-regular basis in these meetings. Olivier, your hand is still up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much, Alan. I'm just asking because there are some long term action items which are so long-term that they are in the past. The "Alan Greenberg to create a motion for the ALAC to approve by April 30, 2015." Well, how far is that? I'm not sure. I'm hoping we're not going to reach April 30, 2016 to take that one off.

ALAN GREENBERG: We might. Thank you for pointing it out, and we will try to be a little bit more diligent on this. Hearing nothing else, we will go on to the next item. The next item is Olivier. This is another one that has been around for a very long time. For those without the level of history, I will quickly review it. In the Beijing meeting, which I no longer remember when it was, but it was a long time ago, the GAC provided advice on a number

of the new gTLDs, TLDs which are classed as highly sensitive strings, and advised the Board to implement a number of safeguards on these.

The Board did implement some safeguards going along. There were in fact eight safeguards which were recommended for this large group of new gTLDs. Some of them were implemented with pretty well exactly what the GAC asked for; some of them were not – were implemented in somewhat different ways. The GAC, for various reasons, did not ever close the issue but never pushed it either.

When these TLDs started being revived in the Los Angeles meeting in 2013, the ALAC issued advice to the Board – one of our few times that we issued formal advice to the Board – saying since we had seen no action on the Board of reviewing some of these TLDs, which we and the GAC believed and a number of people within the GNSO, specifically the business constituency, believed are indeed sensitive and should warrant some further attention, we took the radical approach of telling the Board to freeze all deployment of new TLDs until these things were addressed.

We didn't really expect them to do that, but the wording was expected to catch their attention. It did. We have since then entered into a number of discussions, although as you know from the CCWG, the Board is not mandated, required to discuss with us our advice, they did in this case. The bottom line is, nothing happened. The registries involved basically say, "We don't see a problem." In many cases, by the time we actually looked at things, contracts were already signed, which cannot be unilaterally changed by ICANN. We've continued to sort of muddle along.

We have had a number of meetings with the GAC, and there is still some interest in the GAC to go ahead with it. Essentially, the "it" we're talking about is a cross-community group. Not a CCWG, but a group made up of various parts of ICANN, which would include, among others, ALAC, the GAC, and registries, to review these TLDs on a one-by-one basis and see to what extent there really are issues that we need to address. The ALAC did such a review quite a while ago. It didn't put a pointer in the agenda, but we can provide one easily enough. Essentially, rating each of the TLDs, each of the strings red, green, or yellow.

Green saying we believe there either isn't an issue with this TLD despite what the GAC said, that they overreached, or the implementation proposed by the registry is adequate. Yellow meaning we're not quite sure, for one reason or another, and red saying that there is a problem. The number of red ones was actually quite small. The proposal on the table is to form a group of people from the various interested bodies and review them together and try to decide to what extent are there real problems. At that point, it's not clear what can be done.

The Board probably does not have any authority to take any action at this point to change things, but we felt it was important to go through the process. Partly because it fits well with the review that's going on, the consumer trust review that's going on as part of the AOC, and it fits well with the PDP that is going on that was just started that will be looking at rules for the next round of new gTLDs. This letter essentially says that to the Board.

What I would like from this group now – and I'll turn it over to Olivier to either read it or excerpt the letter. It's not very long. What I'd like from

this group is if there's a will of the ALAC to give the chair and the ALT permission – with suitable editing, because the letter does need a bit of cleanup, certainly reformatting, but also needs a bit of cleanup – and to incorporate the results of this vote into it and send it off prior to Marrakech so in fact we can have a discussion with both the Board and with the GAC on the next steps forward.

I would like to turn the floor over to Olivier first to briefly review what the letter says. Not necessarily read it verbatim, but to get the gist of it, and then I'll open the floor for any further discussion. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. The letter revolves around a letter that was sent in by Cherine Chalaby on the 30th of September of last year. In there, the following paragraph is mentioned. "The NGPC, [which is the New gTLD Program Committee] does not believe that it currently possesses the authority to establish a new community-based mechanism like the PICS review committee suggested by Mr. Andruff. Rather, consistent with ICANN's bottom-up stakeholder model, we think it is more appropriate to provide you with Mr. Andruff's proposal for your consideration."

Based on this paragraph, the idea here with the current letter is to provide a response and say that we are in a position to ask for such a committee to take place and for such a PIC review committee to work. With this, we hope to get the GAC to also agree to this, and if the two advisory committees are saying, "We are interested in this," there would be also some members or some parts of the community from the

GNSO that would be interested in taking part. That then respects the bottom-up process by which the communities are asking for something and the Board can say "Okay, the communities are asking for it, we can move forward."

That's the whole point of this letter, and we are also mentioning in this letter that for all avoidance of doubt, the ALAC will participate in the review committee. We're just making this very clear. One thing to note is that we're now sending it to Dr. Crocker as the chair of the ICANN Board, because since the response of the New gTLD Program Committee, that committee has been disbanded, and so our response has had to be to the Board. That's the bottom line for it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just to highlight the difference between their position, that they don't have the authority to do it, and are claiming they do. The original proposal from Ron Andruff was to put together a committee to review the TLDs and provide information back to the Board so they could fix the problems. We are recognizing that the Board does not have the authority to unilaterally fix the problems, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't go through the process of understanding them and perhaps learning from the process. That's the difference, and that's one of the reasons that this has taken so many months to essentially come down to the point where we can make that statement. Questions, comments?

Sending this letter has two implications. Number one is we're trying to move forward on this issue, which we believe is somewhat critical.

Number two, there's a sentence in bold that Olivier has added in the middle of it, saying "For all avoidance of doubt, the ALAC will participate in such a review." That means we actually need people to do the work, so the support of this letter by the ALAC not only means we support it in concept, it means we will support it with people.

The original review that I mentioned – that was quite exhaustive, but simple compared to what we really have to do at this point – was done by Evan, Olivier, and me. Evan, at this point, I don't think has the time and interest in it. Both I and Olivier have our arms full, so although we will certainly participate with this and act as advisors and certainly get people up to speed, we will need other people to go ahead with it. So the real question I'm asking – and I'd like more than just nods – is will we get people who will put the time into it to get up to speed and think about this thoughtfully?

It's really not a blind operation. You do have to look at what the TLD string is, what kind of protections were requested by the GAC, are they reasonable, what has the TLD put in place, and is there a gap between what should be there and what is there? As I said in the review that we already did, we only found a handful of TLD strings that were in the red category, and in fact three of them were the same string, .doctor I believe.

There's a fair amount of work to be done, and the question is, are we likely to actually get the commitment to do that? I open the floor, and please, I would like some people to give their opinions on this. Thank you. Olivier, how do you read the lack of hands at this point? Is it all going to come down to you?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It sounds like it, doesn't it? I'm fine with that, because I think it's a really important thing for the public interest. I have a strong conviction that this is the case, and I'll probably stand down from other, less important things if it clashes with my time.

ALAN GREENBERG: And of course, you can go out and recruit people personally one-by-one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'll be sure to take a gun with me to Marrakech.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wouldn't do that. Alright, is there anyone who would object to doing this? We are going to take a formal vote, that allows us to carry the vote over for a few days to capture the people who aren't at this meeting. Does anyone feel comfortable with taking and starting to vote right now? We would like to send this letter prior to Marrakech, which means we just have about one week to do this in. In fact, I'd like to get the letter out on Friday. I see no hands. We have one tick. I've heard no objections to this, then I do ask staff to please take a roll call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Could you take a look at your Skype, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Take a look at my Skype.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Skype, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would have to turn on my Skype in that case.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Basically, just a reminder, you may wish to set a motion and then have a seconder for this vote. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. I appreciate the reminder of how we should be doing this. The motion as the letter will be recrafted to make sure we capture it properly, but the motion will be that this letter – with suitable edits – be sent to the chair of the Board. And I ask for a seconder. Seconder can be any ALAC member.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I second.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have the second from Vanda, and now I request what I requested before – ill-advisedly at that point – to do a roll call vote of the ALAC members who are present.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just reminding everyone who is voting yes, raise their green ticks please. Is that correct, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: You could use your ticks, or you could actually call their names and ask them to speak. I'm not going to micromanage at that level.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Could those in favor of this motion please put a green tick? If you're unable to do that, then please either write in the chat or just let us hear from you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Staff can read out into the transcript for those who are not looking at the display later on, who the green ticks are from.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, we have green ticks from Garth Bruen, Harold Arcos, León Sanchez, Maureen Hilyard, Sandra Hoferichter, Sébastien Bachollet, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Vanda Scartezini, Wafa Dahmani.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if you scroll back to the top.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. That's who we have for the yes. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Any of those who would like to vote no, please put a red X. Okay, I see no red Xs. I do see a hand raised, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Garth. Garth, you put your hand up. You may have been trying to take down your tick, but your hand is up. And his hand is down.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you, and then if everyone could put their green ticks down, please. Tijani and Wafa still have green ticks.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can do abstains with voice, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you. Abstain by voice. Okay, Alan, I see that apparently Seun has a question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun said can he vote later? Yes, you can defer your vote. We will be following our practice, those who cannot vote right now – and if you claim you cannot vote, that is suitable – and we will be capturing the votes within the next day or two. Mark Seun down as absent from this vote. Thank you very much. I believe we had ten votes for, so it has passed, but we will go through the motions of checking with the rest of the people, see if we can get unanimity or not.

                        Thank you very much. Let us go on to the next agenda item, and that is number eight on the CCWG-Accountability. Has León come onto the call yet? He is on the call. Alright, let me summarize where we are.

                        The final proposal was supposed to have been published to the draft to the chartering organization last week. Because there was a discrepancy between what the Board had approved and what was in the draft

report, there has been a rather extensive discussion on whether it is appropriate for the Board to have intervened in this way. They claim – and others support it – that this was part of the process, and others are saying no, they shouldn't have done anything at this point. There are others who are strongly supporting what they have said, and therefore we believe not only is it appropriate for the Board to have intervened, but we support the substance.

Bottom line is there was enough controversy that the co-chairs decided to not dispatch the report at the appropriate time last week. There was a meeting held, ending about 4.5 hours ago, that was a substantial discussion on this one particular issue.

The essential issue revolves around the carve-out, which says the GAC cannot participate in community actions related to GAC advice that they had previously given. Because they cannot participate, that lowers the number of decisional organizations, the ACs and SOs who are allowed to exercise community power from five to four, and brings into question the powers that require four votes, because we had adopted a principle very early in the process saying that no action would require unanimity. That is a single ACSO cannot veto an action.

Because these require four votes and therefore there are only four groups, that requires unanimity, and therefore the carve-out also said if there is a power requiring four votes – and specifically the power to remove the whole Board is the one that has been critical from the Board's point of view – that it would be lowered to three. The Board has objected to that strenuously, as did the ALAC and some of our ALAC

members in a more absolute sense than others, and that's where we have stood.

There was a substantial discussion on the issue last night. There is a lot more flexibility in some people to say we don't really care. This is a case that pretty well will not happen, and therefore we're not going to die over which way it goes. There are some people who are willing to die and essentially stare down the Board and say, "We will ship with the words that are offensive to the Board in it." If the Board objects, then there's a process which must be started, which will take probably several weeks of negotiations between the CCWG and the Board.

There are people who are saying the Board will not dare invoke that clause because they don't want to kill the transition because of it and others who believe that the Board's request is in fact reasonable, and therefore we should go ahead with it.

That's where we stood at the meeting. The meeting ended with a number of polls being taken of all of the participants. The results of the polls in terms of the absolute numbers -- that is, who voted in which way, and are they formal members – the charter allows formal polls to be taken with members only. This poll included everyone present, and currently the results have been published. The co-chairs are asking, did we capture this information correctly? Once that is determined, we will make a determination on what the results of the poll are.

Certainly, there are more people saying remove the offensive lines than are saying keep them, and there are more people saying "Take the lines out before you ship rather than ship as is." But how skewed the vote is

when you look at perhaps the actual members, when you exclude Board members, who some people feel might have packed the meeting. I believe, I was told there was also a staff member who voted, because the co-chairs did ask for those present at the meeting to vote. They did not put any restrictions on it, but the analysis presumably will add some restrictions.

So that's where we stand right now. León, do you have any comments you want to add? I can't report where we are. My gut feeling is we will remove the offensive lines and publish without them, but that's not a done deal at this point. León, do you have any comments that don't violate your privacy or the secrecy of the discussions going on among the co-chairs?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: No. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Excellent. You have described the situation very accurately, so I won't have anything to add, although I would signal that the results from the different polls that were conducted during our call were published to the list.

We have of course made the exercise of signaling which members from the CCWG actually voted, because as Alan rightly said, there have been

some comments that maybe the Board and staff have packed the meeting so they would have the outcome that they wish to have. But in reality – although we did allow everyone to actually raise their hand and voice their thoughts, what we are doing here with the results is to actually show who in the CCWG – as member – took the vote and vote either in favor or against each of the positions that were asked.

Of course, the end results will not be taken into account those votes by Board members that are not appointed to CCWG, and safe to say that it will also not be taken into account those staff members who have voted through the polls. So that's just a clarification that I wanted to make. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, León. Just so you have the numbers, there are 26 people formally appointed by chartering organizations to the CCWG. Of those, about 15 were either present or present and active. There were one or two people who were physically at the meeting but were in Away mode at the time the polls were taken. So we had about 15 who were in a position to vote out of the 27. Not the greatest of numbers. León, if other members or other participants choose to contribute votes now, are you asking for them or are you just asking for corrections for what happened at the meeting?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan, we are just asking for corrections.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So that's where we stand, there is nothing more to report. As I said, a brief glance at the numbers that I did just as the meeting was starting indicated that there was certainly a majority who were saying, "Fix the problem and get the report shipped," but a non-insubstantial number would prefer to ship it as is. So a decision will be made and the ALAC will have to factor that in when we make our decision, whichever way it goes.

There is a webinar tomorrow, which may or may not be talking about that, because the Recommendations 1 and 2 are involved, so probably it will be in the discussion that we have on the briefing calls that start tomorrow.

Do we have any other comments or people want to raise anything? I don't think there's a lot more to say. We do have a number of people on these calls who have strong opinions on this, but I think we've heard them all before and at this point it's sort of out of our hands, which I don't feel completely uncomfortable with. I'm not sure I envy León. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think it's also important to say to the ALAC member and the other participants today that we spent time – two hours before this call – on the CCWG, with IANA working group or ALAC IANA working group, and we discussed that issue to see how we can be participating to the call this morning – it is morning for me. I think it's important to explain that we are trying to work collegially, collectively to try to find the best voice

for At-Large and for ALAC, because at the end, the voice of ALAC will need to be expressed in this document. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. Yes, and that was another long call, and with very strong opinions expressed by pretty much everyone who spoke. I can readily report that, in general, our opinions are aligned with each other. There are some people who feel much stronger about some of the issues than others, and that's as you'd expect. I'm always suspicious when any group is lockstep in line with each other. That almost tells you that at least some of those people are not really thinking of their own, but simply saying, "Yes, I'll agree."

Any group of thoughtful people on a complex subject will tend to have some range of opinions, so I think we're in a strong position, certainly compared to some of the groups. We are doing a lot of consulting and a lot of joint discussion before going into these meetings. I'm comfortable where we are. I can't predict where we're going to go, but I think we're in a strong position. Any final comments from either ALAC members or participants in the process as to where we go at this point? Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I was just going to remind everyone we do have this call tomorrow and the day after, so maybe at that point we'll be able to dig a little more regarding our points of view. But certainly all of the participants in the IANA Issues Working Group are all pretty much

of the same mind at the moment, so it will be interesting to discuss this in the next couple of days.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and like everything in this whole process, everything is down to the last minute. I will be contacting a few of you to do presentations tomorrow. Any further comments? See nothing, let us go on to the next item. We are currently slightly ahead of schedule, but just slightly. The next item is ICANN 55 and our next steps. I'll turn it over first of all to Gisella for the first item.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, thank you. Sorry. Just with regards to the schedule, the schedule has been published on the wiki pages, and you can see all the meetings from Saturday through to Thursday. I'm not sure if we would like to discuss the Saturday, Sunday, and Tuesday agendas at this stage. The only update since last time is that we have an ALAC regional leader and liaison dinner on the Saturday night. Everyone has received the details. There will be a few more people added to the list of invitees, but I'm just working on that now. Heidi, I'm not sure if you wish to mention anything more on the agenda at this stage.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Gisella. No, basically as people mentioned, they're all set, except for Tuesday afternoon. I think we have about 90 minutes still left open. Also, just to add that all of the speakers that we have reached out to have confirmed. Fadi is now tentatively scheduled to meet briefly

with the ALAC I believe on Sunday. It might have been the Saturday, but besides that, that is basically it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think it's really worth going over the detailed agendas. They are going to be revised or reviewed once we have gone through the briefings, because I think we'll get a tone in the briefings as to whether we're likely to need the full amount of time that we've allocated to discuss CCWG or whether we need to do a bit of juggling. Obviously, what happens based on how the report will be sent out based on today's deliberations will also impact that. So I don't think a lot has changed from the last thing.

We did a lot of juggling. You'll remember that there was some substantial discussion on this, how are we going to make the decision, how much time do we allocate to it? There was at one point a request or suggestion that we allocate all of Saturday and Sunday to it and essentially scrap all of the meetings we have with other people or other items. We're not doing that, but we have allocated effectively a whole day spread out over a period of time.

I don't think we really want to spend the time going over that detailed agenda. It is on the wiki. We encourage people to look at it. If you find something that you believe we should have been talking about but is missing, please let me, Heidi, Gisella, or León know. It may well be one of the things we're holding in our back pocket, if we have the time to do it.

But please, look at it. We often get comments at the end of the meeting saying we didn't do it properly, so please, look at it ahead of time. If you have comments, there's still time to make them. Any other comments on the allocation of time within the meeting? Gisella, are we still seeing a lot of changes from other parts of ICANN, or is it sort of stable at this point?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, at this stage, it's stable. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sébastien, you have your hand up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. Just to add one point, how we will organize the days, I was suggesting to have the two days dedicated on just that, and we will see where we go, but I would like very to be sure, and it's aligned with what you say before. We don't want to be a group where people vote because another one votes in one direction or another. We need to be, as much as possible, the 15 member of the ALAC with enough knowledge to take their own point of view on the overall document.

Unfortunately, the last version of the document will be published not a lot of days before the meeting itself. Fortunately, we have the two calls tomorrow and after tomorrow, but I just want to add one point. When I and others suggest to have two days dedicated to this, Saturday and Sunday, I add another proposal. It's to have an interim meeting as other part of the organization, to have an interim meeting to allow for the

other substantial work we have to do. It's not to say we will just spend our time on that and not do the rest, but it's to postpone the rest for few weeks or two months, because I think it's very important to have as much as possible time for discussion on CCWG-Accountability report during Marrakech. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. Any other comments on agendas? Then we can go over to item number B, and we have agendas for the GAC and the Board. At this point, we do not have any substantial questions I believe – correct me if I'm wrong, staff – in both of those. I'm expecting to have an interaction with Thomas Schneider on the GAC, and I'm expecting that we'll have essentially our standard list of items on that. I'll be following up on that this week. The Board, if we issue the letter that we just talked about on the PICS, will clearly be one of the items to discuss, but at this point it is not clear.

The CCWG will obviously be an item that they will be curious where we are and how we got there, and I think that will occupy some time. But if there are other things that we believe this is an opportune time to discuss with the Board, then we would like suggestions, and there's still an opportunity to get them in. We will be asked – as I'm sure staff already has been – as to what it is we want to discuss, so there is not a lot of time to formally do that, but I do still welcome any input if we have any. Sorry, I'm not at my desk right now.

Do we have any hands? Seeing nothing, no one has any input. Then we'll do our best and go on to the next item, which is "Request for ALAC Report at Marrakech meeting," and I don't know what that is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, that's just a reminder to everyone that you will be – I believe – speaking on Monday, as all AC/SO chairs about…

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Do you recall?

ALAN GREENBERG: I do.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, about what the ALAC is doing and their achievements. And the emphasis is on achievement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I do realize it's only Monday that you'll be giving that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi is starting to get used to me doing things at the last moment. I still do welcome – again, I'm going to stand up there and give a report. If anyone provides input for me, that will guide me with what I say. If you don't, then I'm on my own. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, thank you, Alan. Yeah, just want to be clear. You will give a report on At-Large activities. There's a question of names. Our group, it's quite difficult. We always talk about the ALAC report, but it's the At-Large report. What we have done with new ALSes, what we have done in the region. We need to show to the rest of the organization a broader picture, not just that the ALAC met three time and votes on X issue. It's really important that we give – because when we ask the GAC to give a report, if they do it, they will not talk about the 15 people or the chair and the vice-chair. And we need really to be consistent.

And I think that if you have some help from the leaders in each region, it will be very good to have a broad view. For example, I think it's important to report what just happened in New Zealand from APRALO, what they have done and met. It will be better for what we want to achieve in this part of the report of the structure of ICANN at the beginning of the meeting on Monday. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To put it in perspective, my talk is probably less than your intervention in terms of the amount of time I've been allocated, so this

will be a very brief overview and hit on some high points, not necessarily a detailed review of everything going on in At-Large.

Question anyone? Anything else on this item?

Then we will go on to the next agenda item, and the next one is General Assembly and ATLAS II Timeline and Next Steps. Olivier Crépin-Leblond, I turn it over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I'm going to ask staff whether they've been able to update the agenda to the correct page.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We are posting it in the AC at this time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Now, you've already seen this proposal, which has already been discussed in the past.

Now, there are a few changes based on the last meeting that we had, and if you scroll down to page number seven, I believe, let me try this. The scrolling should be enabled for everyone. Go ahead and scroll to page number seven. Sorry, no. Page number four, Full Proposal.

Now, we had all the starting points with all of the reasons why a multi-year project is better, why face-to-face meetings are important, and historical background of the At-Large face-to-face meetings. All of that has been unchanged.

Beyond that, the proposal itself, the feedback that I received was that the table is a little complicated for people to understand and whether we would be able to have a table that was in-line with the document so that whoever was reading this document could actually print that document and take it with them. So on page four, it starts with just a very brief summary of having Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, Year 4, and Year 5, and then page five has a table, which is much reduced from the original table.

I've tried to take the essential columns. If you think that there are some columns which are not essential, please let me know, and we can always shrink it a bit further.

But what it says is it basically looks at the historical funding roadmap to start with. It says: "The table will summarize the historical rotation between General Assemblies and Summits from FY09 to the present day." So, we're seeing Cairo, Mexico City, and Sydney. We can see that the ATLAS was during Mexico City.

Then the next year, we can easily see that there is no general assembly. The year after, there was one in Cartagena, the year after, one in Dakar, and the year after, there were two, one in Toronto and one outside the ICANN meeting.

Scrolling further down, we then see the general assemblies that took place in ATLAS II with the ATLAS II taking place in London, and then there are two years since ATLAS II. FY15, we had no general assemblies at all, and FY16, we just had one in Dublin.

Then there's a little text to explain the table and taking the preferred locations for general assembly, etc.

The next page then is the proposed roadmap for a proper rotation of General Assemblies, leading to a projected third At-Large Summit. We've got two projected for FY17, two projected for FY18, and then the ATLAS III in FY19, possibly at any one of these three meetings. Probably a C meeting, so in October 2018, or an A meeting in March 2019; B meetings are a little small to have an At-Large Summit.

That's how the tables read. I just wanted to add also, it doesn't take into account any extra faults with regards to LACRALO. I know that LACRALO has asked for a face-to-face meeting in the current fiscal year, and that will have to be worked out one way or other. The reason being that we might then have to shuffle a few things around. North America, this year, is possible for FY17. It is also possible for FY18, if needed.

I think that's all I needed to say. The rest of the document has been largely unchanged. But I'd like to collect feedback on the table itself please because I think that's the key part of the document. If you can't understand that table, neither will Board members or indeed any other readers and that's a problem. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Are there any comments at this point?

I'll, first of all, call upon Heidi. This item was not listed for decision today and it will not be for decision. We can push and try to have this decision

made prior to Marrakech, or we can allocate some time for it in Marrakech.

My level of comfort is that I would prefer to have an opportunity for people to do fine-tuning of this prior to sending it in Marrakech and not trying to rush it before. It's a large document, and I think everyone has to have actually read it.

There are very few things that people feel as passionate about as our General Assemblies and Summits, so this is a document that will perhaps make or break our ability to do this properly in the future, and I think pretty well all regional leaders and ALAC members have an interest in making sure that this is presented in a way which is more likely to be successful, not less likely.

So, Heidi, I guess I'll ask you. Do you see any difference in how this will be viewed? We originally said this should be sent in way before the special request budgets are sent in. Clearly, we did not make that. Do you see any difference between doing it in the days leading up to Marrakech as opposed to doing it at Marrakech?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. My thoughts would be there is still time. I would think that Marrakech is a prime time to show this. What I was thinking is that if everyone could take a look at this, including the RALO chairs, leaders prior to Marrakech – and I will take a look at it again – then on Tuesday, we are meeting with Xavier. Perhaps we could have him comment on this.

Then there's a one hour. I mentioned I think one hour or 90 minutes on Tuesday afternoon where perhaps the ALAC could do a deep dive into this, and that would be in time to finalize it before the ALAC meets with the Board on Wednesday. I do think that at least many of the new Board members are quite keen on seeing more General Assemblies and another Summit. On a recent Board briefing I was on, there was a lot of interest in the next Summit. So, those are my suggestions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. So that would imply the schedule for the outreach has been readjusted now – I don't know if we've had a formal announcement or not – to allow the people who are out to be back for the last hour of the ALAC meeting, and that might be an opportune time to do that. We wouldn't be in a position to formally take a vote then, but we certainly could take a sense of the group and talk about that at the Board meeting and then vote.

Actually, our meeting with the Board is after our wrap or before?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's before. It's prior to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, yeah. We certainly could indicate an intent of how we plan to go forward. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I believe that Heidi sending it now is not useful for me. I prefer to, not lobby, but to at least talk about it with the Board before sending it and also talking with Xavier before. It's good because we may have input from Xavier that would make it better received by the Board, so perhaps we need to have this input from Xavier also.

The general idea is to wait until Marrakech, and in the wrap up session we can vote on it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. Olivier, well done. A very interesting and useful document and a very clear proposal on where to go and how to go and how to implement that to take that out of the each-year request but to become a pattern inside the budget. I guess it was suggested in the chat by Rinalia, but I think it's important to have some discussion also with the Board Finance Committee and with the CFO to see how we can have that involved in the normal budget, not in the request we have to do each year, and if it's possible, then it will be less trouble for us to do that each time.

Now, when we have to vote that by, there is no big deal because I don't think we are in the process of discussing in Marrakech the full budget of ICANN in detail. Then if it's done at the beginning or at the end of the Marrakech meeting, it's, I guess, equal. But if we can have some discussion with both the Finance Committee and with the CFO, it will be

great during Marrakech. Thank you once again, Olivier, for all your work on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Sébastien. We seem to have an echo at this point.

It dawns on me that we may want to make reference, either in the paper or in the cover letter, to the current financial situation with the CCWGs where essentially ICANN's budget is being pushed harder than we thought it was going to be by a significant percentage of the budget. That makes it difficult to allocate money for this kind of thing but, on the other hand, more prudent to do it ahead of time so these expenses don't suddenly pop up in a year where they weren't expecting them ahead of time, so we may want to do a little bit of focus on that.

Heidi, to what extent has Xavier seen this already, and, if you know, Cherine?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, I don't think that they have seen this yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier, is it in good enough shape right now to send it as a draft just to give them a heads up in your mind?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan. Yeah, absolutely. It's fine. I was just waiting for your green light to proceed with it.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. I understand. I was just asking. If we could put an action item for me to send it to Cherine and Xavier, and we should also try to schedule a time for either me or the ALT to meet with Cherine early in the week. That obviously will have to be done really soon because schedules are starting to get really blocked at this point.

Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. I am not sure that ALT is the right – I mean, I think that you need to bring Olivier, and I can suggest that I can join you for different reasons – as ex-Board member, as BFC member, and one of the [initiators] of the ATLAS. But at least, Olivier needs to be with you in this meeting with both the BFC and the CFO. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The CFO, I was not planning on something ahead of time because we will be meeting with him and have an opportunity to discuss. Cherine, as head of the Finance Committee, is a different issue and that's why I was suggesting that, and his time is more likely to be even tighter, so we'll see what we can do. But, yes, thank you for that advice.

Alright, sorry. I've lost track. Any further items on this one? Again, please if you haven't read the document, read it. It's certainly not too late to still make changes in it if you feel that anything can be done either to change the substance of it, or more importantly, make it clearer, so please do take the time to do that if you can.

Sébastien, is that a new hand?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Alan, yes. Just one reminder. I just looked at that. If I remember well, Rinalia, please confirm me, but there are now two chairs on the Finance Committee, and we need to go and meet both with Asha and with Cherine. I guess they are both the chair of the Board Finance Committee if I am not mistaken.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We'll take that under advisement. Again, at this point, having tried to set up a meeting with one or two Board members already, I'm dubious that we're going to be able to make it, but we'll try. Any other comments?

We are ahead of time at this point and we will go on to the next item, which is the ALS Criteria and Expectations. Can we have the document up please?

While the document is coming up, let me tell you where we are. The group met yesterday, the taskforce. We had an exceedingly productive meeting. I feel that we are now in good shape to start putting together some formal decisions on ALS criteria and expectations.

Now, to remind people, criteria are the things that we will essentially require people to meet in order to become an ALS. Expectations are what we expect on an ongoing basis. There are still a lot of questions.

I will be sending out a document in the next day or so, and it's very important that this be looked at, not just by the ALAC members and regional leaders, but by other people. To the extent that you can get input from ALSes, this is important because we are going to be changing the rules under which the ALSes operate. This should not be coming as a surprise.

There will be some time allocated in Marrakech to further discuss these issues. I know at one point, I had hoped that we could make a formal decision in Marrakech. I don't think we do. There are still enough question marks that I think we have to use that time to try to eliminate the question marks, but not necessarily to lock it in frozen at that point. So, there will be other opportunities to further discuss this. But it would be good if we can essentially finalize this by sometime in April, not very late in April hopefully.

So, where we stand right now. If you look at the document, I'd like to spend a little bit of time on it. The criteria that we were looking at, the basic criteria will be unchanged. We spent much time and effort, I guess, about eight years ago, looking at how do we recognize an ALS. We spent a lot of discussion on how do we handle the fact that in different parts of the world, organizations like this evolve in different ways.

I think we ended up in a strong position that has worked reasonably well as we have gone forward. That is ALSes have to be predominantly controlled by individuals. They can have other involvement, and that seems to fit well in most parts of the world.

One of the problems we've had universally is ALSes disappear, contacts disappear. Some RALOs ask for one contact, some two, some three. The three was used in APRALO and seems to have been moderately successful. They claim people don't disappear as often when you have three people whose names and e-mail addresses you have, and that looks like a good way going forward.

We are going to require this. Right now the Memorandums of Understanding between the RALOs and ICANN say things like the RALOs will help disseminate information and get information out to end users.

We have never asked the ALSes how they plan to do that. We have always acted as if, if we send something to the representative, we have met our target. And yet, it's very clear that there is a substantive difference between just the representative and the real ALS that in theory has joined At-Large.

We're going to go into a deeper dive in terms of asking them just how are they going to do these kind of things and essentially take some of the requirements that are in the Memorandums of Understanding and make sure that we have vehicles to actually implement them at the grass roots level.

We have never explicitly asked for what do you plan to get out of ICANN. Why are you joining ICANN? Why are you joining to work with ICANN? What is your interest? Again, I think we need to ask the questions. We need people to think about why it is they are an ALS.

You can read the other items. Some of the things that are question marks on is the issue came up of what if an organization is already a

member of NCSG, for instance, which is the most common intersection. Is that a problem? Do we want to know about it?

The feeling within the taskforce is we definitely want to know about it. It's not clear it's bad. It may even be a good thing. If we have likeminded people in NCSG, they may make decisions closer to ours instead of often diametrically opposed to ours, so there is some synergy in doing that.

There was a question of if someone is a member of both, should they be allowed to vote? Typically, ALSes vote only to select leaders, and typically, NCSG members vote only to select leaders. Is that an overlap? It's a good discussion to have. It's not one we'll have today, but I think it's one we need to have. It's not obvious what the answer will be. I don't think it's an onerous answer either way, but there are things like that.

The concept of a cross-region ALS does not exist within the current bylaws, but the situation has arisen that there are groups that seem to be valid ALSes, but they don't meet the criteria. We cobbled together an ad-hoc way to handle it in the past, and the question is should we do something a little bit more formalized that is something that actually meets the target.

Along the way, we came up with a number of things that we realized we want to ask. They're not decision points, but they probably should be on the application. These are notes for the design team A that Nathalie is running on the application process. That's things like are you members of other organizations, and what expertise do you and your members bring to At-Large?

In the discussion on expectations that we'll go into in a moment, there was a question of why do we want ALSes and what do we expect from them. One of the things that we expect is participation. But in some cases, these ALSes are very specialized and they have no real interest in participating just to attend a meeting. But when we hit on their subject, they can be exceedingly valuable. But that's only useful if we know what their subject is. We have a number of cases like that.

Let's go on to the next if you can scroll to the next page please. It's unlocked. People can scroll themselves now. Oops. It's now locked again. Somebody is tearing down their building. Whoever is tearing down buildings in the background, please mute. Thank you. If I could ask staff to try to locate where that noise is coming from.

The expectations are essentially what do we want from ALSes. The first one is we have been talking about some level of annual report. It should not be onerous, but we want reassurance that they're still alive out there. So that is one item. The details clearly need to be flushed out.

We expect them to redistribute information, and we'll talk about where that information comes from in a moment.

If the ALS has a website or a Facebook page or something – and certainly most do – then we believe they should be proud of the fact that they're an ALS and they should mention it. We have had situations where people are members of ALSes that don't realize they're a member of an ALS. They recognize they're a member of the Internet Society Chapter, but they didn't know their chapter was an ALS, so we're going to have to look at that.

Again, I'm not going to read these items. I would like you to read them.

We came up with a number of possible expectations. We have always had voting in many of our RALOs or perhaps all of the RALOs as a requirement, but many RALOs don't vote very often. It's not really clear that voting in an election once a year is a sufficient level of activity to count.

There is a requirement in some RALOs, or at least an expectation, that you attend monthly meetings. But the messages we've gotten back from some people are that the monthly meetings don't have much value to them, and if they are contributing in some other way, why do they have to attend meetings.

There are a whole bunch of these kinds of things, and it has become obvious that we need to have some flexible criteria. That simply a one-size-fits-all saying, "You didn't meet these hard criteria and, therefore, you're out," when the ALS may in fact be a group that is valuable to us in one way or another is probably too rigid a position, so we're going to have to do some work to develop that. That's one of the reasons I don't believe this is ready for approval at this point.

It is also clear that RALOs might impose rules over and above the At-Large-wide ones, and we're certainly not prohibiting that, but we're trying to make sure there is a level playing field over all.

Now, out of that comes RALO expectations because RALOs have a part to play. The five bullets you have there are largely defined by the Memorandums of Understanding that were signed between the RALOs and ICANN. There's a little bit of rewording in some of them.

The last items, for instance, were not explicitly said, but they were implied. That is, the RALO must be acting as a conduit in both directions, and the RALOs also have an obligation to try to develop programs for individual members. That was a recommendation out of the first At-Large Review, and I think it's one that still applies.

The concept that has bothered many of us along the way is are the ALSes that often have one person that do anything, and the question is why do they have to form an ALS to be able to do that? I think that's an important question. We have a different design team that is working on the individual member issues. They still have a fair amount of work to do.

Lastly, there is a section on staff expectations. Clearly, if we are going to be sending something out on a monthly basis to ALSes for their redistribution to their members, that document has to be created and that's a staff responsibility. We want briefing documents on things that are of potential interest, and again, in language that can be understood by these people who are not heavily ingrained in ICANN.

These are all things we've discussed many times before, but we're going to have to put these in place. Where there are things that we can measure, staff will have a responsibility to do some of the measuring. And of course, things like welcome webinars, onboarding, to make sure that when someone comes or joins, we can get them up to speed at a reasonable time.

So that's where we are right now. I'd like to open the floor for any comments at this point. Are we going in the right direction? Do you see

things that are really wrong here, either requirements that shouldn't be requirements or things that are blatantly missing?

There are a fair number of people on the taskforce, but if there are people here who have new thoughts that don't match what we're doing, this is a good time to raise them. There will be a substantive discussion on this in Marrakech. I open the floor if anyone has any comments at this point.

Judith, go right ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I also wanted to add that I had put the welcome webinars on the discussion, but as [inaudible] have found, it's not just when ALSes join.

Oftentimes, when ALSes, they are left. In our case, it was when there was an ISOC chapter that their board changes, and the person who's responsible for being the contact point for the ALS has changed, and they don't know anything about that. The welcome webinars are not just for new people, but they're for anyone who's a new contact. So the ALS could have been going on for years, but we have a new contact, a new person who's doing it and they have no information, and that's what we've been finding when we did a survey of all our ALSes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good point. Thank you. Anyone else? Okay, then this item is closed on the agenda. Again, please take the time to read this document over. There will be another version of it going out on e-mail very shortly. Take

the time to look at it, pass it on to your constituencies, and let's get feedback.

The next item is the FY17 community budget requests. Heidi, we have five minutes on that. We do have some extra time if you want to go into it in any more detail than necessary, so please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, thank you, Alan. I don't think we need that much time. Just to let everyone know that ALAC submitted a total of 18. One request that we were made aware of that did not go through the ALAC or FBSC process was a request from LACRALO for a capacity building workshop on DNS issues. That is now posted on the finance wiki, which I will put into the chat.

Then one small request change was the EURALO study in Studenkreist, which went from just travel support to a panel including travel.

So the next process is that this week, I will be meeting with staff, who are working on these requests, and I can hopefully provide some feedback after that session. Then in Marrakech, Xavier Calvez will be able to be asked questions about that on Tuesday.

I think that is it, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a request to un-sync the document, please. Thank you.

Judith, is that a new hand or an old hand? Old hand.

I must admit I was somewhat shocked to find out yesterday that a request had gone in from a RALO completely bypassing and ignoring the process that we've had in place for many years and was submitted directly to ICANN finance avoiding all of the discussion that took place and refinement of these documents as they go forward. There is some discussion going on, on how we treat that one.

Any further comments? Heidi, that pointer you put in for the finance, that points to everyone requests, so you might want to look.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: But there's a left sidebar. I think that points to the request from the other ACs and SOs.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. For example, the GAC had 1. The GNSO I believe had 35, but I need to double check that. But they had more than the At-Large did. RSSAC had 3, and SSAC had 1.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but people may find it interesting to look at the other requests.

Rinalia asked in the chat whether we've analyzed which things should go into annual budgets and which things should be really special requests. Our accompanying text in some cases makes that clear. We

also have a number of requests this year which are rather unusual in that they should not have ever been AC special requests.

But in frustration over trying to get things done, we are making special requests. We made one special request this year to not give us money, but to fund IT, and that is to fix the translation tool, which has been in place since 2008 and never been fixed. We are making an explicit budget request to please give some money to the poor people in IT so that they can get someone to fix the translation tool. I find it shocking that we have to go through those pains to get things fixed.

We are also putting in a special budget request that involves no money whatsoever, but to allow us to spend money that is already allocated in ways that are flexible and meet our needs. So, we are using these budget requests, aside from the "give me money to do good things," to send messages to ICANN senior management, which have otherwise been completely deaf to statements that we've been making in some cases close to a decade.

Comments? Rinalia has a comment that I can't read because its moving. "I suggest raising these non-special but key items with Cherine when you talk to him about Summit budgets."

Well, I suspect we should raise the issue. That's probably one of the things we should raise at the Board level, and if staff can make a note to suggest that. We shouldn't have to use this budget request as a way of talking to people who otherwise won't talk to us or otherwise simply ignore what we say. If we're moving in a direction where when we say

something to the Board, they have to answer us. Perhaps that should be true for staff, as well.

Any further comments on budgets? Seeing none, we will now go on to the next item, which is the At-Large website review. We have five minutes allocated to that. I think we have a little bit of flexibility. We have about 20 minutes left.

Just as guidance for handling this particular item, is there anyone who plans to at the end of the meeting request any other business? Seeing no one, then we have about 20 minutes to go ahead on this one, so if you'd like to take a bit more time than you were planning, Ariel – and I don't know if Laura's on this call or not – but go ahead.

The real question is this is not under decision making, but we have a decision that we have to make effectively. It's not a formal ALAC decision, but we need a sense of the ALAC as to whether this website is ready for prime time. Do we release it and go to it production, or do we hold on and do more work on it?

The Website Review Team spent some time earlier this week on it. The website is amazing at some level and still has a large number of – I won't say bugs – but things that need cleaning up. My personal preference is I would far prefer to say, "Let's hold off on making it public and get people to really focus on reviewing it and fix the problems."

The pragmatic part of me says, "We're never going to get people to do that." People have too many other things, and as long as it's not something with real deadlines in place, we're not going to get around to it; therefore, the alternative is to release to the website soon and hope

that IT is in a position to respond quickly as we identify problems in what is then the live website.

That, at this point, is my recommendation, but I would like to hear from other people. I'll turn it over to Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Alan. In fact, Laura is with us for this meeting and also Ozan, our colleague in policy department is with us, too, because he helped with this website design effort, as well.

So just to recap, this revamp project started in the summer of 2014 after ATLAS II, and then after a year and several months of work, it's really towards the end of the tunnel. We did the final demo to the taskforce, and as Alan rightly pointed out here, the taskforce pointed out several issues and we actually already fixed them over night. So just to let you know, IT and the development team are committed to make sure the website will be launched in the right way.

To let all of you know, this is the new website that you see on the screen. I'm going to place the link in the chat. All of the elements that you see on the screen, they're clickable and they link out to their respective content, so we welcome you to do a deep dive and look through the pages.

To give you an understanding of what we have accomplished so far, we put together a quick slide. In order to make sure the website is launching in a proper manner, we made sure to migrate historical content from the old site. There are about 5,800 class links on the old

site that the product team, the At-Large staff, and also the developers have reviewed diligently, and then made sure they are migrated over in an orderly manner. Some content, they were really [inaudible] to certain pages of the site, so we don't lose the history.

In terms of language translation, we have fulfilled the request to make sure the existing translations are implemented. So, if you look at this new website, the policy part of the pages have the translation. So you can see the language bar on top of the policy pages that publish statements, and also you can download all those translated statements from the website.

This also applies to a news section. We do have quite a few news articles that are historical, and they're translated into other languages. This is about translation, and then in phase two, post-launch, we will keep translating more static content and other labels, and that will be an ongoing effort.

In terms of other features and functions that we are working on, there's only one remaining item, and that's the ALS application page. That will be delivered by June 1. That's the only remaining major function, and all the other major functions are complete.

In terms of accessibility, we have received the detailed review from the vendor, Simply Accessible, and we have got a list of issues that IT will work on, on an ongoing basis. Laura and a representative from Simply Accessible can provide a detailed review of that during the Marrakech meeting in the Cross-Community Committee on Accessibility.

So here you can see we have the checks for go from the various teams that are involved in this website revamp effort. And so to recap, the content migration is done; the language translation, we just need the language service to do a final check of the Arabic issues on the policy page, and once that's done, we will expect a check; and then the features and functions and [inaudible] gets a check; and accessibility will be ongoing. And then IT also gave the green light, product team gave the green light, and then from At-Large staff side, we also will support the launch for the website.

So now, we just need the ALAC to provide the final verdict whether we should launch of not. That's all, a very quick over view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I note Garth has asked for an AOB, so we will allow some time for that. I'd like to open the floor. Comments on what you've seen? Are we ready for launch? Do we believe there's more work that has to be done?

Ariel, can you go to the list of ALSes? Now, where is the one where you can select various criteria to sort? I'm sorry. Not the list of ALSes, the list of working groups. My apologies.

Just to give you an example of the kinds of things that we talked about the other day, some of them are really trivial to change, some of them are maybe somewhat harder.

On the right-hand side, you'll notice it says, "Workspace" and "Forum." The Forum points to the mailing list page. Now, "forum" is not a term

we use at all within our environment, and so it was suggested that we change that to mailing list. A small change, but again, it's something which changes from something that we're familiar to, to something that is an interesting word, but not one we use.

Another example, if you can show us the problem with the pull-down lists. Now, you'll notice the pull-down list is just the right size for the words that are there. So if we go to IANA, for instance, in the topic, now you'll notice that box shrinks.

Now, try the pull-down list again, and notice the one on Accountability. You did it too quickly. Go back to IANA and just pull down the list so we can read it. You'll notice things like accountability have been shortened because the box shrunk to fit IANA, but it no longer fits the longer ones.

So these are operational things that are fixable, but they're not neat and tidy and will potentially confuse people as they try to go forward, so these are the kind of things. There's an awful lot of small things like that that simply need to have the bugs worked out. My feeling is they're not debilitating enough to stop the launch, but as we identify them, we're going to have to fix them relatively quickly, and that means we need a commitment from IT to have resources allocated to us so indeed, as these get reported, they can be fixed on a timely manner.

We have a hand up from Alberto. Go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: I apologize, but I'm alone at home and someone rang the bell. I was off the communication. I read on the chat that I was asked for an

EN

explanation on something. I think it is about the request for funds. Am I right?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, Alberto. We did not ask for an explanation. We simply pointed out that one of the finance requests had bypassed all of the At-Large procedures and been sent directly to finance without any knowledge of ICANN staff or the Finance and Budget Subcommittee. That was the issue. We didn't explicitly ask for a reason. You can certainly provide one if you choose, but that was not the intent. But we can go back to that after we finish the website review.

ALBERTO SOTO: Well, then I hope I will have the chance to use the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will give it to you in a few moments then.

Anyone else have any comments on the website? There were a couple of comments on the chat saying: "Websites are a work in progress." I believe we do have a commitment from Laura that resources will be allocated to fix these problems quickly as they come up.

No further comments? Anything else that Laura or Ariel want to point out at this point? We seem to be getting a general statement here that there's no reason not to launch as soon as we fix the current problems that we've identified, and then get it out there. I think we're looking for the indication that, indeed, you can work quickly to address the issues

we have found, and then let's get it launched. What's the date that you're planning, Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The date is tomorrow, so I guess we will launch it.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you'll have some work to do today.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, we have been working days and nights. Yes.

Also, I want to just real quickly thank everybody from At-Large, especially all the taskforce, all the great work that you have done and also the great input you have provided. Without you, this website would never be live, so we really want to thank you all for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. You have a sense of the ALAC that you can proceed, and thank you for presenting that.

Back to Alberto. Alberto said he would like the floor for a moment to talk about the finance issue. Thanks.

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes. The issue is the following. In Dublin, we had a meeting requiring prior meetings, online meetings, a face-to-face meeting to try to

complete and work out all the issues and problems that make LACRALO un-operational.

ALAC, at some point in time, tried to request several General Assemblies. It wasn't successful. I think out of five, it got two. On that day, Rodrigo de la Parra also tried to get it for LACRALO, and it wasn't successful, as well. This was known by the region in all meetings since Dublin to date.

In the last monthly call, we reported that we had requested this one. That should have been the ending of all agreements to work out all the LACRALO issues. That was the need, but everyone agreed, ALAC, the GSE, and the LACRALO leaders, that it had to be a face-to-face meeting so that we could work everything out for LACRALO to operate properly. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. The request we're talking about is not the one for the General Assembly. It is a request for a DNSSEC and IPv6 Workshop, so the issue of the General Assembly for LACRALO was not the subject in hand. It was a capacity building session that's completely different.

Alright. We are down to the last item, and we're back on time at this point. I'll turn it over to Garth, who said he had an any other business item. Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

ALBERTO SOTO: Is it clear that IPv6 is one of the workshops we had coordinated and we are preparing it? We are not yet planning to brief on that. That's how we've always worked. We have an issue that has been completed, and as soon as we have a speaker, we will report it to the list. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Garth, please go ahead.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I wanted to remind everybody of our push on consumer trust within ICANN compliance. We had received a response from the CEO, which was somewhat lacking. I had drafted a response to the four points, sent it out to the list. Holly Raiche seemed to agree with this, and I want to make sure we push forward with it.

There are two particular items, and I'll resubmit this to the list so everybody can see it again. They have to hire, as they promised, a consumer safeguards director. Now, in the letter, they say that they will announce their progress at the Marrakech meeting. We want to hold them to this, and if they don't do it, we want to have a plan B from them. We want some movement on this.

Then of course, we want them to include us, obviously, include At-Large within their outreach, within the decision making. So we want to take them up on their offer to meet with At-Large and, even if it's just for five minutes during our normal meeting day, to come in and brief us on what they're doing in terms of actual outreach for consumer trust from

compliance. I think that that is something we should hold them to. I'll be happy to take any comments or questions during the call or later. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Garth. We didn't have a session scheduled with compliance. It was one of the items that the vast majority of people said they were not interested in having. But please do send that again to the list. Heidi and I will work on it and see if we can arrange something within Marrakech for at least a short time on those particular targeted issues. That is going to end up being contingent on the ability of freeing up some time, but we'll do our best.

Any other business from anyone else? In that case, I will call the meeting to a close three minutes early. Thank you very much for attending at an awkward hour for some people and a delightful hour for others I'm sure. I guess we'll see most of you, hopefully, on the briefings in the next two days and then again in Marrakech a few days later. Bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Bye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Bye, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye, everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Bye, everybody.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. The meeting has been adjourned, and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]