

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Monthly Teleconference Call on Tuesday, the 21st of January, 2020 at 1600 UTC.

On the call today we have Abdulkarim Oloyede, Dave Kissoondoyal, Tijani Ben Jemaa. From APRALO we have Maureen Hilyard. We Humberto Carrasco, Javier Rua-Jovet, Jonathan Zuck, Andrei Kolesnikov, Barrack Otieno, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjo Lansipuro, Hadia Elminiawi, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Vrikson Acosta, Jose Lebron, Kaili Kan, Karen Mulberry, Gabriel Bombambo, Vanda Scartezini, Sebastien Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, Anne-Marie Joly Bachollet, Avri Doria, Erich Schweigofer, Greg Shatan, Hanan Khatib, Isaac Maposa, Judith Hellerstein, Justine Chew, Pierre-Jean Darres, Roberto Gatano, Satish Babu, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Yeseul Kim. On the Spanish Channel we have Harold Arcos, Waldimir Davalos, Humberto Carrasco and Alberto Soto. On the French Line we have Gabriel Bombambo Boseko.

We have received apologies from Glenn McKnight, Ricardo Holmquist, Bastiaan Goslings, Ali Almeshal, Matthias Hudobnik, Marita Moll and Dev Anand Teelucksingh. From Staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Gisella Gruber, Evin Erdogdu, Alperen Eken, Yesim Nazlar, Herb Wayne and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management. Our interpreters for today are David and Veronica on Spanish and Claire and Isabelle on French.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the language channels. Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you Maureen.

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.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you very much, Claudia. Welcome everybody. A little bit disorganized this morning. We have a slight hitch in connectivity today. It appears telephone guys, while they have been laying some of the cable for our new cable connection that arrived last week, they uncovered a slight problem, which means I've had no phone or internet services for nearly 10 hours.

With the wind and rain, which is also happening around us, thanks to the wonders of the mobile service, thankfully still being able to participate in this call. If there are some issues, I apologize in advance. We'll just go with the flow, see if we can through this meeting without too many mishaps.

One of the first things, of course I can't see the agenda and it's a priority, although I do have an earlier version that I downloaded, preparing for this call. I'm assuming that everyone else can see it and that they're okay with it. I also assume that not too many changes have been made without anyone telling me about it. We'll just take it that the agenda is -- we'll go with it as I've prepared for it. The meeting as per normal for ALAC is really to update us on any of the key issues within At-Large.

Is there anything that anybody wants to raise, add to the agenda as it's stated at the moment? I can't see people's hands up on my small phone, someone's going to have to tell me if there's a hand up, if someone wants to say something. Can I leave that to you Claudia, if you could tell me that?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, of course. We have Abdulkarim with his hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I would like to bring up an item on AOB.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I had hoped that there would be some items on AOB, that was something I had asked Staff to do.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I have added an item, as you requested, just right prior to AOB. If you would like me to, I can move that to AOB? Claudia, have you refreshed the agenda? I will move that item to under AOB. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: The AOB items, they're reminders that David Olive had stated in his newsletter and I just want to make sure everybody is aware of that. Thank you Abdulkarim, that's fine, you will get your chance, especially if we can get through, there are many items that we have to get through anyway. Anyone else, please let me know. Anyone else with their hand up?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Not at the moment.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Let's move on. We can adopt the agenda as given and let's move on to the action items. Any action items we need to deal with?

HEIDI ULLRICH: There's just one that is still open and that is Jonathan to work with Joanna on next steps regarding the At-Large Policy Platform. Everything else has been completed.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I thought that was going to be work in progress anyway because it's going to be an issue that we're going to raise in Cancun.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Joanna and I have been talking and the next step is to take the selected policy issues and put some position points down on paper for them and then try to go back to the CPWG and then ultimately ALAC for approval of those points, at which point we'll then put some pro's behind them. Until this time, I feel like we've spent most of our time just engaged in a kind of political battle about this and what should be in and what shouldn't be.

I think we've got a rough consensus with the possible exception of Sabastien who I think still wants gender equality to be in there and there might be a compromise there. But otherwise I think we have

consensus on what's in scope and what isn't and so the next step then is to research our historic points on those things and put some bullets out there for discussion on CPWG. That won't happen tomorrow but perhaps the week after.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

That's great. Also, thank you very much Jonathan. I think to, it's going to be an important document for Outreach and Engagement Capacity Building, it's something we really need to move on with. It's great to hear there's progress going there. We can now move on to the Policy Development Activities with Evin starting off, I guess.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks Maureen. We have a slide deck as well for the Policy Comment Updates, which is something we usually have on the weekly CPWG meetings and now we're going to start having them for the ALAC Monthly Policy as well, so please reference those. Since the last ALAC monthly meeting there's been quite a bit of activity.

There were three ALAC Statements that were submitted to Public Comment and the Executive Summaries are on the agenda and as well as the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on DNS Abuse, which was submitted to the ICANN Board on the 24th of December and has been received positively, the Board is discussing it currently. Leon has also provided some updates to the CPWG on the next steps on the document.

In addition, informal ALAC feedback was given regarding ALAC chair's letter to the Sub Pro PDP Working Group co-chairs in December and the co-chairs responded to this in early January. The ALAC also responded to a GNSO invitation to provide input for PCP 3.0. Currently there is one Public Comment open for decision, it's the Proposed Amendment 3 to the .COM Registry Agreement and this closes on 14th of February, in addition to this there's quite a lot of activity, policy activity.

Currently there is a response in development which could be potential ALAC advice to the ICANN Board regarding the ISOC PIR issue and this is not a formal ICANN Public Comment but it is one the ALAC and CPWG have been following closely and there's a Goggle Doc in development with some comments on this. The goal is to have a statement for advice by the end of this month.

Also, at the end of this month there is an ICANN Public Comment on ATRT3 Draft Report. A single-issue call was held on the 6th of January and a small drafting team has been formed and there will be discussions on Wednesday regarding putting together consensus regarding this issue.

There are two ALAC Statement Drafts being developed right now that have been posted regarding proposed dates for ICANN Public Meetings and as the proposed final report of the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG. Please check out those drafts on those places and comment, those close in February.

Finally, there is an ICANN Public Comment on the Draft FY21/25 Operating and Financial Plan and Draft FY21 Operating Plan Budget.

The FBFC held a call about this the week of the 13th of January and they will hold another call this week and Marita will present it during the CPWG just regarding the Multistakeholder partition of this Public Comment. Those are all in development, there is also an ongoing work space regarding Sub Pro updates, you can look at those as well. Thanks very much, I'll turn it over to Jonathan or Olivier if they'd like to comment about this or any of the penholders. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I wanted to just have a small discussion if we could about the potential advice on the .ORG transaction and kind of check my feelings or assumptions about this.

I guess the first of which is that I have an ongoing discomfort the At-Large sort of taking the lead from a Community perspective on this, even though there seems to be a lot of pressure on the CPWG mailing list to do so, much of that pressure, not all of it, is coming from folks have found it convenient to join the CPWG only very recently, including those with a strong business interest in the outcome and then others that have been traditional participants that have found their way back if you will.

I think we're bed to be the representatives of end users and not non-profits. I think there's plenty for us to do as the voice of end users on this but I think it's very easy for the comment to get polluted with the interests of non-profits, which to me seems to be NPOC's responsibility.

I'm thinking of trying to hold the line on that, on the CPWG call as well as potentially recommending that those with non-profit affiliations,

including me, taking the opportunity to potentially engage with NPOC to build out the perspective of non-profits themselves so that we stick to our knitting as a voice for end users and get to some of those issues of trust, DNS abuse and things like that, where we've already put a stake in the ground and this is another great opportunity to land on those issues.

I guess that's my first question, is how people feel about kind of holding the line on that distinction and perhaps comments of which there are many that have non-profit affiliations in the At-Large consider participating in NPOC as well if they're being slow to act? I welcome your thoughts on this. I see Sebastien has his hand up. Please go ahead.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. It was not on that topic and you can come back to me after, sorry. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes sir, I will. I see some comments in the chat that seem generally positive to that approach. Alright, excellent. Then I guess the second question is -- oh, Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. I agree with you on the discomfort with regards to whom are we actually representing as a group of people. I have found some pushback from end users as well with regards to the transaction.

It's not something that is widely held from everyone but as you mentioned, this is a complex issue and there are a lot of people out there with different points of view and we're obviously the most vocal ones, the vocal ones are the ones that are against and the other ones are just keeping quiet because they're thinking, "Well, that's nothing to do with us really, so we're not going to say much about it."

What I might suggest and really, it's for ALAC to decided, is whether we, we as in the ALAC could basically say that ideally it would like the Board not to approve move forward with this but alternatively push on the strong points that we have drafted in the statement. This is an either or knowing full well and this is really something that's quite obvious, it's quite unlikely that the Board will block this thing outright so we can't just, "We want this to be blocked outright."

At the expense of being completely ignored, so one could say, "We prefer this to be blocked, however we might find that a second position can be emphasized to what we've drafted in the statement." I'm not sure how that flies with the ALAC and this is why I'm throwing it here to find out how people feel about it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. Sabastien, I see that you've got a question on the topic now, so I'll come to you. I guess and this is just a finger on the pulse kind of reading, is that I don't actually see a lot of people that are huge champions of PIR's handling of .ORG and there seems to be the possibility and it's been mentioned by many and including the comments from the NCSG that ethos might be fine if we get some

contractual things put in there so that it's a condition sale or something like that.

I don't know what the end game of blocking the sale is in this particular context given that there is no this stain if you will on trust of PIR, etc., that blocking the sale feels complex. I think this outside org that Ester Dyson is trying to form feels like a red hearing and that I can't even imagine a world in which the ICANN Board will believe that they have the basis to take the domain away. That just feels completely impractical and a huge president for them that doesn't seem likely. I agree with you completely, I think that end users are impacted by this, Olivier and we should just focus on that voice because I think there are things for us to say there.

One of the things that sort of drew this home is that among the ideas that Roberto came up with, was the idea of some At-Large board representation at PIR and I raised the point then, that I don't understand why the board representation should necessarily come from At-Large but instead should come from the non-profit community and it would purely coincidental if those were people that were also members of At-Large and that's kind of what I mean by sort of taking the non-profit voice.

At-Large is not the representatives of non-profits so why we would be suggesting that someone from At-Large should be on the board of PIR? It seems instead that we would should be suggesting that a third of the board members should come from 501C3's or equivalent charitable non-profits around the world. That's my thought in terms of again,

keeping to our knitting, that's why we're discussing it. Sebastien, go ahead.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. Three short points. First one, I was informed by ISOC that they're writing a comment or a statement on this sale and as soon as I have it, I will send it to the mailing list. Second point, my question, don't we have something to do as NRO of trigger something with the Empowered Community, as ALAC is a member of the Empowered Community?

My third point, I would like very much that you take also into account that it could be a good idea to each any gTLD but specifically in .ORG that are also voice of end user and that if you want, it's not the right place, the right time to do that but it was one of the reasons I joined some organization around the .666, it was not at all because I wanted business but it was because I thought it was important to have an end user perspective. It's not say that end user must be at the place of non-profit but it must be one voice and it's also an important voice in those type of TLD. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. On your second point about the NRO thing, we definitely have something to discuss there, that was the next thing I was going to raise. On your last point, your point is well made that perhaps we could specifically say that there ought to be an end user perspective and then make the distinction of that from representation by non-profits, in other words maybe it's two different recommendations.

I just don't want anyone to assume that somehow the non-profit perspective is covered because we have representatives from At-Large on the board. I'll certainly present tomorrow your idea of doing both, Sebastien. Any other discussion on that particular piece?

I feel like I've got general agreement but we should probably -- there's a particular point and we can leave this with the CPWG and let it percolate back up to this group or we could decide here, which is do we want to suggest that we don't support the sale outright but if it goes through we want these contract provisions or do we in fact want to make the point that we don't support the sale in the first place?

Does anybody else have a perspective on that? Yes, Cheryl, deciding here will help clarify CPWG's job, it just might be perceived as top down right? I know sometimes I swing at a hammer at the CPWG and so I'm looking to get folks opinion about that here.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We have Humberto on the Spanish on audio only, he would like to speak.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. More than just clarify, the question Jonathan posed and the information of Olivier and others. I am a bit confused. It's not really clear for me. I understand there are different points of

view with respect to what is the role or what is interest of end users and that we do not have an agreement because of cultural issues, political issues because of experience issues as well.

But actually, all these .ORG issues is not really clear for me. What's not clear actually is, if we want to the process to be stopped and I would like if somebody could clarify me on and orient me on whether -- on what is the opinion of the majority or what is the dominate opinion so far? Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Humberto. I don't know that anybody has a hard answer to that question. It's my impression that we don't have consensus to try and block the sale but that we do have a rough consensus to try and mitigate the possible negative consequences of the sale. That feels to be something on which nearly everyone on the list agrees. Focusing our efforts on how to make the sale more successful from the perspective of end users, feels like the best use of our time and mental energy at this point because we don't have consensus around blocking the sale.

We won't get consensus around handing off a TLD to another entity, I just don't believe that we will. But we do have I think a strong consensus around the idea of, let's get some mitigating stuff into the contract to make the best of the sale and potentially even improve the situation over the one the statuesque with PIR. I hope that answers your question. Olivier next and then Tijani.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. I understand we try an operate in bottom up and so trying to get the reflection of what our colleagues in At-Large structures and individual members think and of course we've got this big discussion going on in the CPWG on this. The reason why Jonathan and I are bringing this over here is that ultimately it is the ALAC that will vote on any statement that gets drafted.

While there is this bottom up side to it, if there is significant opposition on the ALAC for any component part of this statement, it's better for Jonathan and I and the drafters to know early on about this because we don't want to end up with having the statement done up and so on and then the ALAC pushing back on a statement that being drafted, especially in something as important as this. I just thought I would mention that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. To answer the question Humberto, I don't think there is a consensus on anything. There are different points of view and there is only [inaudible] persons who are saying that they want a successful while most of people to whom I spoke didn't say support anything about the sale, nobody said we want to block but everyone has a big concern about this sale. For several reasons we discussed on the mailing list and also on teleconferences.

I think that Olivier, I agree with you, that ALAC will vote but the ALAC is supposed to reflect the opinion of the whole community of end users and at least if we want to have an idea about that, at least we make our members, we make a survey with all our members, our ALSes, members of ALSes and then give your numbers about this issue and see what is the comparator so that when we express a point of view or the points of view of ALAC, it reflects at least the closest position of the whole end users. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Tijani, very much for your comments. It looks like you may have inspired others to chime in. I think the idea of polling and things like that is very interesting. I don't know that we're equipped to do that yet but it's something that we need to spend more time on and I think some of the projects, including a proposal that Justine that is putting together, start to head in that direction.

I think that that's a longer-term objective to get the lines of communication open, to have a broader kind of education one direction and feedback the other direction, kind of workflow, that we don't have the luxury of in this particular case.

Again, I feel -- as you say, there isn't consensus Tijani but there seems to be a universal view that there are potential negative consequences to the sale and that being the case, that it's worth our efforts to -- to make an attempt to mitigate the possibility of those negative consequences. That feels like a constructive approach to the sale to me and that's

where I was thinking of trying to take it on the call. Maureen, you're next in the queue.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Jonathan. This is having actually been a really great starting point for the ALAC especially. I think that as guide, I totally agree with you, we need to get some discussion going and that the ALAC must involve in that discussion. I'd really like to see the CPWG call that is upcoming does involve the ALAC leaders and that they get to hear the discussion.

I can see the interest that is being developed that we probably have another 60 plus attendee call coming up and I think that's great. I think as long as we end up with a statement that actually reflects the end user perspective, I think also taking into consideration the views and answers [inaudible] and advice to the Board, we must be cognoscente of all of those.

Another thing is that we are fortunate in that we will be at a meeting very shortly with SO/AC chairs and will have an opportunity to talk to the Board chair and to get a face to face discussion going on where the Board stands. If they say to us, "There's nothing they can do to stop the sale or whatever." That there is some kind of -- it gives us something to lay a basis of our advice. Are they any more hands because I'd really like to move on to our other?

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Yes, we have Alan with his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, just Alan is left and Alan did his own letter so I'd love to give him a chance to talk on this call and then we can move on. I feel from like I have some, from the chat and everything, some basic direction for the call tomorrow. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to speak on my letter, I sent that to the list for people's information and it says what it says. I put my hand up in response to Tijani's comment about ALAC members surveying the community. Let us point out that ALAC members are required to vote essentially as they believe. There is individuals, certainly those appointed by RALO's may well want to consider what the RALO's and the parts the RALO's think.

NomCom appointees may choose to do that as well but the ALAC vote has to vote based on what they believe is the right answer for ALARGE and for the ALAC and for ICANN. That's why I sent a note about another Public Comment that I had some concerns over and I'm not going to talk about details but I think it's very important that as a Olivier said, ALAC members get involved in this, especially when there is controversy and some difference of opinions because ultimately the ALAC members should not be rubber stamped and signed but voting for what they believe. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. It's always a good reminder. Tijani, okay quick, because I want to honor Maureen's desire to move on. Go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I know that the ALAC member for themselves, for what they believe but don't forget that ALAC and At-Large as a whole are the voice of the interest of the end users. If it is 15 persons, I don't think that they can reflect the point of view of the end user and our duty is to reflect the point of view of the end users. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tijani. Maureen, we can move on. I feel like I had basic framework of a conversation to have tomorrow. Thanks, everyone.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Jonathan. There's been good discussion and no doubt that will continue tomorrow. Let's move on to the next item, which is of course is looking at the ALS.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Maureen. I'll do the ALAC snapshot and then turn it over to my colleague Alperen for the individual discussion. So, there's been quite a lot of activity here as well. There were two recent ALSes that were certified, one from AFRALO and one from LACRALO and they're both Internet Society Chapters, the new total is reflected there. Just closed this week, there was one NARALO ALS that was decertified at the request of the primary contact who has dissolved the organization and is now becoming an individual member.

Then there was one more vote on an application that also closed this week from AFRALO, so those numbers are changing. There are quite a few applications as you can see awaiting advice, either internally or externally. A couple more undergoing due diligence, waiting for some feedback from the applicant themselves and then a few that have been put on hold. I will turn it over to my colleague Alperen for the individual.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

I did see him but I believe he dropped, let me reach out to him. In the meantime, I believe Olivier had his hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. It was a comment on the previous agenda and I've put it in the chat. Which basically it says, at the moment the FBSC call is scheduled on the week of the 13th of January, I believe it's actually this week that we Finance and Budget Sub Committee will be discussing the item regarding the Financial Plan, Operating Plan and Draft FY21 Operating Plan and Budget. That's just a little thing to note.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Olivier and I just from my colleagues that Alperen has dropped off the call so I'll just quickly cover the individual then. There is also some activity here which you can see on the agenda, there were two new individuals accepted, one from AFRALO one from APRALO and there's currently another applicant from APRALO who was also an

ATLAS III participant. That's a lot of activity for membership. Back to you Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Evin. [Inaudible] the movement that's actually happening between the ALSes and individual members and there's also work going on with that as well. The next item is any reports. Does anyone, the liaisons or working chairs, RALO chairs have anything that they would like to raise, they can do so now.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: I will send it to the mailing list.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, thank you Andrei, nice to see you. Is there anyone else who has anything they'd like to say?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Just a brief update on where we are with the GAC intersessional. Today actually I got word from Julia Charvolen that the GAC Public Safety Working Group would like to have an informal meeting with some people from us, talking about the DNS Abuse in Cancun and I promised to take this up tomorrow at the CCWG and we will find those who want to talk.

Then, on the sub group, I'm still waiting to hear from WHOIS advice, who is the chair of the GAC group on Sub Pro, there should be a

meeting in January and we have a few people in this small group of Sub Pro, headed by Justine, who will take part in that meeting. Lastly, just to inform you that my counterpart in the GAC is leaving. There's been a reorganization of these matters in Portugal, this is why there is going to be a liaison, I hope, from the GAC. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Yrjo. It's really good to hear that their potential for some involvement intersessional and it's something I know that Minal has been very keen to get up and running. They do have their policy group working and I think they're inviting us to part and I think that that's brilliant. Are there any other hands up?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, we have Sabastien and Cheryl with their hands up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great, thank you. Sabastien. Sabastien, if you're speaking, you are on mute.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, thank you. I just wanted to underling you received it all but for the first time EURALO have made a letter, an information letter and I wanted to thank Natalia for this hard work. I hope that we will continue that way and if there are some issue it could be shared between the five RALO's it will be great. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great, thank you for that Sebastien. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maureen. Liaison to the GNSO. Very briefly and of course all of my very attentive viewers to the GNSO liaison page will know that we've posted the agenda for the upcoming GNSO meeting, there's nothing earth shattering important for us to discuss or be aware beyond of course you're welcome to listen to this audio cast of the meeting.

The meeting GNSO if of course the council with the exception of liaisons from other parts, like me, are gathered together for their face to face planning session in LA, sub meeting will be held at a slightly different time to normal, it's on the 23rd of January at 2200 UTC. Anyone who wants to delve in deeper and of course read the minutes of every single meeting held, is also welcome to visit that page. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. Remembering to that, I can't believe that there aren't exciting things in the RALO but it's always good hear what is on top for RALO's as well. If there are no other hands, let's move because we've got quite a busy discussion session section here. Moving on to -- I've made a PowerPoint to look at some of the issues that we're going to be looking at in this particular section.

Before we start, Item 7 is to get some feedback, just very brief feedback on the different activities are taking place as part of post ATLAS III 2020 vision activities that are part of this year's workplan. The first one is of

course the ATLAS III Reporting, which has involved the survey and the reports have been done by the ATLAS III participants. Eduardo is in charge of that, is he on the call?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: No, Eduardo is not on the call, sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. What we can actually have is perhaps Heidi and Alperen if he's on, they can do a report on the ATLAS III feedback that they've been given.

HEIDI ULLRICH: In terms of the -- Maureen, did you want just the pep or did you want the quick update of the surveys and the reports as well?

MAUREEN HILYARD: If you can do both that would be great, thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: On the survey, I believe that we have an excellent feedback on that and we're waiting for Eduardo to provide information on the small group and the first steps on meeting. For the report we have I believe 75 percent returned, which is quite good. Where we are still in need of some of the reports, particularly LACRALO, so we are going to work with them, likely give them a slight extension, I know that they celebrate the holidays a little longer than others.

We'll do that and also start working on their analysis as well. But well done everyone on the reports. In terms of the At-Large Regional Policy Engagement Plan, the former name of that is the ALS Sustainable Management but we've changed the name and we are ready for implementation. We have finalized the planning of that, we've set things up internally for that.

What this basically going to be is a way to communicate, collaborate, better with the GSC side of the regional VP's or their liaisons with At-Large staff managing the regions as well as the At-Large RALO leadership. We'll have more information on that, it's going to include regular calls between those three groups in order to plan for activities and communicate on those activities and to help the regional leadership to better engage with their ALSes and their individuals in their region, so I think it's going to be a good way of streamlining the activities, in particular with the resources issues that we have with At-Large staff as well. Thank you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Heidi. I just want to reassure those who -- we went to a lot of trouble to do the survey and the report. The survey looked at issues relating to what happened in Montreal but the report looks at [inaudible] and we got some excellent information from the surveys, I've viewed them personally. Just to assure that what information you give, it's so important for us and we will be incorporating into the views that we bring to the work that we're going to be doing.

Moving forward then, I think we've had Jonathan give a very comprehensive overview of what they're doing the CPWG and Policy Involvement but Jonathan, I just would like to get, if possible, some idea of some of the involvement of the policy discussions that we may have in Cancun so that we can give people a bit of a heads up on how they might be able to contribute to that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure, Maureen. It's DNS Abuse, DNS Abuse and DNS Abuse is the theme and I'm perfectly happy with that. I think that's going to become the At-Large mantra for the foreseeable future. As we continue to refine our DNS Abuse talking points, I think that we will find a way to make those talking points a part of nearly everything that we do so we become a complete squeaky wheel on those issues and constantly reinforcing the things that we put in our advice to the Board.

What we have going on in Cancun is, the first session on the weekend is kind of a DNS Abuse primer that is designed to get everybody on the same page and up to speed on what DNS Abuse is and what we're talking about, as well as getting everybody on the same page about it being a mantra, that's very early in the meeting, getting everybody energized to talk about DNS Abuse intelligently, from the same hymnal and constantly.

Then there is also a session that Joanna, is Joanna on the call? It might be worth having her discuss it, describe it herself. I don't see her. She's putting on a session about DNS in a global, political context and so that's coming together.

Then based on -- this is not for sure yet but we're going to attempt to help nudge along a conversation that Alan has been calling for for some time, which is a conversation between the contracted parties and contract compliance to try and get a common ground on what compliance, what powers compliance actually has and whether they're sufficient because that's been an open discussion.

Compliance is kind of always off the record, said that they don't have the tools they need to appropriately enforce discipline around DNS Abuse and the contracted parties believe that they have plenty of power and they have tools that they're not using and as Alan has suggested on numerous occasions, the two need to be in a room and what I think we might be do, is actually try to put them in a room for one of our sessions.

That's an experiment and we'll see if we can make that happen, but that's one of the things we're trying to make happen in Cancun. Those are the three DNS Abuse sessions planned for Cancun. I'm happy to take any questions.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Are there any questions?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Sebastien first and then Alan.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: First I don't know if somebody is following the chat but it seems the transcript has stopped and therefore there is a technical glitch. In fact, my question was prior to that. When you will give those information gather to the regional leaders and when you will decide that it could be [inaudible].

I think we can be worldwide but sometimes to integrate people it must be better to start by the ground and the ground is ALSes and then the RALO's. I hope that you will take that into account in how you want to organize any working group and post ATLAS work. I don't think it's fair to keep that at a global level, give that to the RALO's and they do a good job and ICANN report on that issue. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for that Sabastien. I think that you raise a lot of different issues and the -- that's what the ATLAS meetings are about, to raise those sorts of issues that would be good if you could actually put forward a paper or something and send it to everybody so that we're all dealing with the sorts of things that you think are important for us to deal with in the matter that might be helpful for us to look at in the future as well. Who is the other person sorry?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan Greenberg, Maureen. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I may have misheard what Jonathan said but to be clear, I have never advocated that ALAC convene a meeting between

contracted parties and compliance, in fact I would strongly recommend that we not do it. I suggest that the Board or ICANN Org make sure that such a meeting is held. I don't think it should be under our opuses, we have no jurisdiction there and in fact for a variety of reasons I would that it would less likely to succeed if was convened formally by us. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, Alan, sorry I didn't mean to credit you with suggesting that ALAC with At-Large convene, just that it ought to happen. I guess my thought is that this might not be the ultimate meeting but if that was -- if specifically discussing the tools was a meeting that we organized because we've identified DNS Abuse as our number one issue, does that lay the ground work for it and requires the meeting you're describing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We certainly could invite both of them to present why one side believes there are tools and the other side believe there aren't but the meeting of the minds to come to a solution, I don't think should be in our presence or under our convening. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That makes sense. That's important. Javier, please go ahead.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

It was a point similar to Alan's but I'm going to take the chance to say something else. Just a question, Jonathan you mentioned the session

by Joanna on DNS and Geo Politics, you're talking about a session in Cancun, is that webinar, what is it exactly?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, it's a panel decision in Cancun. I'll find the proposal for it and circulate it to the ALAC list. I feel like I'm a poor representative of it, so let me just forward it to everyone but that will a session in Cancun.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

If I can just jump here. I'm sorry if I'm jumping the gun with someone who may have their hand up. This particular session that Joanna is coordinating, we actually put it as an ICANN Plenary Session, it was proposed as an ICANN Plenary Session, with us coordinating a panel of speakers on the issue. Clarification got in too late, we decided because it relates to an issue that's been identified already within the CPWG as something we can make a really strong stand on within an ICANN meeting for At-Large that we run our own Plenary.

We're just trying to find a time where it might be possible for people to come along to it. It's gaining momentum and it's becoming an interesting session that's Joanna's organizing with Jonathan's involvement. I'm really pleased we're going down that track.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Maureen, that's all the hands. Back to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Awesome, thank you very much, Jonathan. Daniel, an update on Outreach and Engagement, excluding the capacity building that Joanna's taking. Is Daniel with us?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Maureen, not seeing Daniel on the call either.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, I know that Daniel has been working hard with his Outreach and Engagement co-chairs, some really exciting that they're planning. Is Natalia here.

NATALIA FILINA: I can give general information. Daniel and I with the help of Glenn, we prepared and post the table of Internet Governance for 2020. We publish it on the wiki. Our community members note their participation, I believe it will be very useful tool. We can use it for our upcoming event and will more import. Now, we are discussing what we're going to do during our ICANN67 week.

We plan our activities as a [inaudible] for example something new, something old regarding those ideas. We will try to prepare a fresh session with the participation of Siranush and an interesting session new generation, new people with participation of the Board of LACRALO.

Now, we want to prepare for [inaudible] of our guests at the booth, it will be hopefully electronic form that will form a letter with a request

for additional information from our visitors. Again, just an idea but I hope we will do in the best way. I think other details we need to discuss and their present to our community. Thank you for now.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Excellent, thank you very much for that Natalia, I'm aware that there's quite a bit of a buzz happening on the Outreach and Engagement chat, so that's great to see. Following on from that, moving into [inaudible] everything else that we're doing. That's where I'd like the PowerPoint presentation because I've actually summarized some sections so that we can move on from there. Number 8, to do with the At-Large Review Update and Next Steps.

Last meeting, we mentioned that the At-Large Review Implementation Status Report was being prepared and was put in to the committee that the review reports are put into. We've actually had some good feedback on it, that's a plus. One of the things that we do have to do of course, between now and June of 2020, is to look at finishing off the eight items that we have made a start on.

What I've actually done is first all explained the bar graph which Cheryl has inserted into the report which gives the status of each of those items. Some as you will see in table beside it, we've actually got three issues that are complemented and several that are pretty close but of course, there is the issue number two, which is the ALS Mobilization Working Group which is currently working on their and I'll get Alan to give a brief overview of that very shortly.

The Outreach and Engagement Dashboard, which Daniel is working on with Staff. There's a few things that we need to get groups of people working on so that we finish those completely. Of course, once we've finished those, the first seven, we enabled the metrics group to be able to carry out their work of developing measures that we can use as ongoing evaluation of the work that's being put in place. Cheryl, is there anything you want to add to this with regards to the plan and what we need to do?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Maureen. Only thing would add is something I was just going to raise with Staff actually and that is that at the beginning of this year it's probably a good idea as we move towards the April, May, June work of the metrics working group, we obviously have people within the [inaudible] which are going to be on that metric or are in the metrics working group as well as acting in the capacity for the [inaudible] work here but I think it's probably timely as the Outreach and Engagement refreshing and reconfirmation of membership and of course the GDPR permissions which are now also required, is that we probably need to send out one of the metrics [inaudible] the metrics subcommittee, if that can be just a noted action item Staff and I will get on to that over the next week. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Awesome, thank you for that Cheryl. Moving forward on that one as well. That's the status, if anyone puts out a call for some support and assistance please put your hand up, join in and we'll be able to get this

under belt and move forward to the next review. Before we can move on of course, Alan's got to get this ALS Mobilization Working Party up and running [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen, Alan has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand was raised for the slide that just disappeared.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we could move back to the previous slide please? Thank you very much. I'll simply note that some of you have heard me talk about my dissatisfaction, that in posting the dashboards for specific reviews, ICANN Org has on regular occasions said things are 100 percent done when they're not and I'm somewhat disappointed to find we're doing the same thing.

Issue seven on working groups and I'll remind you, this was an issue raised by the external reviewer saying we had too many working groups and our answer was, we don't have too many working groups but our documentation on the web and the wiki is really, really out of date and needs to be updated. We've marked this as 100 percent complete and yet the information on our web and wiki is still very much outdated and

hasn't been fixed, can we please get that work done or change the rating to not claim we've done it if we haven't. Thank you.

MAURENN HILYARD:

Thank you for that, Alan. In fact I've been working very, very hard on that particular issue and the wiki space on working group is up to date and only contains working groups that are actually active. Now, about the website however, the website is actually -- it's not our responsibility, we can give information but the website staff are able to make those changes, out of our control but the wiki space is within our control and we actually have made sure that anyone who wants to know anything about any of the working groups, to join up for example, can get on to the gateway, can access the working group page and can make contact with the staff who are listed and join up. I'm not sure which wiki space you've actually been looking at.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, I'll also point out, that you were individually invited to comment on this report and indeed all of these details well in advance to it being finalized. I am disappointed that you're noting that perhaps it should be at 95 percent or 98 percent if we're talking about just the website but everything that we have control of was reported as completed. So, sorry it didn't get picked up by you and reflected in our report in a timely manner.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, I apologize for not noticing it at that point, I have noticed it now and just expressing my concern that our website still points to groups that have been non-existent for a long time, although it appears there are changes being made now and yes, the volunteers don't have control over that but Staff does and I'm just pointing out that we really -- I wasn't really saying we should fix the report, I was saying we should fix the website, just to be clear. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Make sure we've actually passed that information on to Staff to actually do something about the website to. Judith, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You also have Abdulkarim with his hand raised too.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great, thank you, I'll put him down.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, I think what you're commenting on and I've noticed too and I made mention. Often sometimes the links, on the website when we mention the working groups, there's a link on the name of the working group that comes to an old section of the wiki as well as all the things, what we need Staff to do, is go through that and correct all the links. I've been telling Staff when I seen them, what it is and they try to correct but it's not the wiki, it's just the websites and the links to the

wiki and sometimes they don't see it because they don't realize that the name has a link on it or some other parts have links and those ones are incorrect.

Someone really needs to go through all the At-Large websites on working groups and actually review them so that people can actually find the right information because otherwise, you have to then go to the old pages and then go back to the new, clicking on the wiki part and it's a mess.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Judith, thank you for interpreting what I meant. What I meant was exactly what I said and in fact the website is being updated now because something I noticed two days is now gone, so it's getting better, I just pointed out that we need to be careful when we say things are done. Thank you.

MAURENN HULYARD:

Thank you for that clarification, Alan. Can we move on? We've got Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:

I just wanted to find out, when you have something like 25 percent of completion, what does that mean? How is that quantified? I noted that you are not within the zone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to take that, absolutely delighted. I need a quarter of 100. What 25 percent always means. Apart from that little glib response, it is a five by five percent increment, we decided to use that degree of granularity rather than the other option, which was two percent by percent granularity, simply because the particular project management recording tool offered us those two options and we went for five percent by five percent increment.

It's looking through a course lens as opposed to a fine focus. It is with relationship the specific work items that are stated in each issue as needing to be implemented and as they are implemented, they are ticked off subset in the work plan and that's reflected in an increment of five percent and five percent and five percent, which can of course change to two percent if you finer granularity. Does that help?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes, in a way. Remember the engagement, why is it only 25 percent?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At the time of writing this report, which was early December, the work outlined to the implementors in response to the issue identified as issue to member engagement, including but not limited to At-Large Structure Mobilization Working Group Activity has commenced but had not progressed as far as, for example, it has now.

If I was to be downloading an image would be today or more importantly next week, when we're having our weekly meeting, we would see that some other percentage. This report and this data is mid-

December data and the ALS Mobilization Working Group has commenced more of its work of 2020, what's reflected here is what was arguably in December 2019 and of course it's compared to the very small amount of just Staff work that was reported in June 2019. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Good question too because obviously something that would have been asked. As you heard from Cheryl's explanation it was a little too technical for me and I have just used the percentages in the graph, just to give us an idea of the fact that there's a still a little bit of work to be done.

As Cheryl pointed out, for example, the membership issue was from that mid-December when the report was being writing and a lot of water has gone under the bridge since then. Alan's made a really good start on that. If we can move to the next slide, then Alan can explain exactly how far along he's gotten.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The group has been convened, we had two meetings. At yesterday's meeting we almost got through the original list in the plan of what we expect of ALSes. I think we got down to the last item we didn't get but a couple more that people have suggested. We're making at this point, good progress.

In looking at what we need from ALSes and how we should change the rules to ensure we get. At this point, we're making good progress. If we continue at this rate, we will have something to report to the ALAC in Cancun. My hope is that we will have a final report and a proposal to the ALAC for its approval very soon after that.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Great, thank you. Are there any questions or queries on that? This working party is looking at ALSes, there's also then the query about the individual members and I know that there's a group that have been looking at that as well. We do have to make sure that there is some -- for us as At-Large, that we're looking at our membership overall. There was in the report an important issue about the value of ALSes and this is actually that Alan's working party is looking at how we can value our ALSes and make them -- contribute more to our work. That's also making sure a ready supply of active participants in At-Large.

Let's move on if there are no questions or queries on that. Moving on to number 10, which is looking at what we're going to be at ICANN67. Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

My apologies. Brief update on ICANN67. Thank you very much for displaying the ICANN67 page. As everyone knows, this is our one stop shop for the ICANN67 meeting coming up in Cancun in March. To date, I'd like to emphasize on the fact that we have the ICANN67 prep week, which is taking place in February, the registration is up to the 14th of

February to register for the webinars which will take place the following week, the week of the 17th of February.

Again, we will display all the information on this page. Apologies if it's not there, I thought I had added it there. With regards to the ICANN67 agendas, we are in the process of putting together the At-Large schedule for ICANN67. At this stage we've completed all the meeting forms to request the meeting room and interpretation for all our meetings and the deadline for that is tomorrow.

Once all the forms have been submitted by the various groups, we'll be able to troubleshoot and conflicts we have with our current schedule and then build onto our schedule to allow for us to have our sessions, hopefully with as little conflict as possible with the other session. With this I'm specifically referring to Joanna's session on DNS Abuse which will during the week and not over the weekend during our At-Large sessions.

Any additional information that we receive over the next week will be posted on this page and any useful links, again will be posted here and if there's anything important, it will definitely be posted on the ALAC. Again, if you would like to participate and we highly recommend that you participate in the prep webinars, which will take place the week of the 17th of February, we'll make sure the links are sent out on all the lists for you all to register. Maureen, is there anything you would like me to add at this stage?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Gisella. No, that's great. What I wanted to refer to is this particular page. Gisella didn't give me permission but I rehashed the page a little bit because I really wanted to highlight the fact that before we actually go to ICANN67 there are some really important items that I'd like people to draw their attention to and Natalia will support. For example, the sign-up sheet as well as the At-Large questions that we need to ask for the GAC and other meetings that we actually have.

These are some pre-ICANN things that I would like some input from people. That's really the only thing I wanted to mention. Anyone interested, please come along for the ICANN67 planning meeting and put in your input if there's anything that you want to include into the two day program that we have on the weekend or if there's something important that you think should be included into the ICANN program as well. Any hands up? Any questions on that?

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Judith has her hand up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I posted in the chat. It used to be we could have some working group to have meetings during the schedule and is there an opportunity for working groups to have meetings and when do we need to get the requests in?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Judith. Come along to the meeting. You can send a message to Gisella, she will add it to the list, we will try and see if we can include it in the Saturday or Sunday or a lunchtime meeting.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Also, everyone's travel should have already been booked and constituency travel I think closing the date, so when is that list going to be open so we can provide information?

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's an action item for Staff. Anything else?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Really quickly. In response to Judith. Those are called pop up sessions I believe, the ones with no services. If Gisella's signs up for them when she's on the ground in Cancun. What we could do, Maureen, I like the way you've reorganized this page, what we could do is add a page for people who would like to sign for pop up meetings, they could simply put their requests on this page and then Gisella could sign them up once she's on the ground. Would that be something you'd like to do Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yup, that sounds great.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Heidi, I'm not talking about pop up meetings, I'm talking about working groups getting meetings with services that we've had in the past?

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's a whole different ballgame Judith and we need to have advance warning of that and also, there needs to be some sort of discussion as to what sort of meetings we're going to be holding. Put a proposal to the ICANN67 Planning Committee and we'll what we can coordinate because it's a little bit late in the day to be asking for services. Are there any other hands up for Cancun?

We do have to move, we're actually already over time. Let's go next to the -- this was to go with the ICANN67 planning, it's already the list of things that have been proposed that we've got to fit into programs but that's what you've got to do.

Now, we're moving on to the Additional Budget Requests. Heidi and were given the role to go over these. I'll leave it up to Heidi to go over very, very quickly. I'll highlight those on the day, we're given an approval and it may be with conditions, I don't know.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Excellent job on this clarification here, Maureen. I might actually use that internally. Again, for the ALSes, fiscal year 21, beginning first of July 2020, going for the one 12-month period. We received 14 and FBSC fully approved I believe eight or so. A few of them will be revised and resubmit and I'll be reaching out to those who had that.

The only one that was not approved was the one from AFRALO for a compositum on digital opportunities that I think had requested 30 travel spots, that was just too many. For the most part excellent requests coming in and just a few needing to be a little bit more revised, given overall strategy. There will be an FBSC call likely, somehow, we'll need to fit that in next week, so we can get those submitted the 31st. Thank you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Are there any questions on that? I guess there was a really great discussion on the ABR's. We're giving some time for those that needed a little bit more tweaking and even those that have received an approval, some of them may need a little bit more information. It's a really good if you can make it because we're not the one who actually make the final decision. That's something to work on.

Of course, as has been mentioned before, the first meeting was related to ABR's and our meeting this week is going to be looking at, as Olivier said, the Financial Budget and Operating Plan of ICANN that will be discussing the policy related financial priorities related issues at the upcoming meetings. If anybody is interested in that, please come along and join us. Any hands up that I'm missing?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you. I just want to get clarification from Heidi. You said only one was not approved from AFRALO. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Let me clarify. Only one was not approved at all. The other ones were revised and resubmit, so I'll be getting back to you today and the rest of your leadership to try to incorporate an overall strategy in to some of your other ones. Just to clarify, there were two for SIG, School of Internet Governance and then one for a Capacity Building Element in the 2021 African Summit but again, a lot of these included significant travel and that was a concern. We'll get back to you on that. Thank you, Seun.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Great, thank you, Seun. Was that they only hand up? Looking at what myself, Joanna and Jonathan will be involved in, those AC chairs meeting in LA next week. This is the first time we've actually had a face to face meeting outside of the ICANN meetings. There's always SO/AC chairs meetings before each ICANN Meetings. This is an opportunity for us to look at things a little bit more long term.

There are discussions that we will have with Goran and Martin and I understand Leon will be there as well. I think they will have just had a Board meeting. We're looking at governance and priorities and being able to explain to each other what's on top for us and it's one of the reasons we're pleased to be able to have Jonathan and Joanna at this particular meeting, it's usually just the chairs.

It was a great opportunity for them to hear and to be able to bring back to our community the sorts of things that we need to be aware with relation to how others are operating and what's important. The other part I wanted to emphasis is that we have some funding for that

proposal and I did want these connected, I'm not sure if I actually attached the agenda but I'm assuming that they were just to give you an idea of what it is that we're actually proposing.

From what I understood from our last discussion with the chairs, they have not proposed any activities, any projects and they're still looking at what is the criteria, what we're proposing is that we will show what it is what we're actually asking for and they can assess for themselves and that's probably what we'll discuss more, making a decision on the actual funding, we'll be able to assess what other criteria that they think are appropriate for this particular funding issue.

If anything, it's supposed to be use before the end of June, I'm hoping they will make a decision very quickly at this particular meeting. This is just to give you an update on what's happening in that respect.

We are well over time but I do want to go over the [inaudible] to Any Other Business, we've actually had...

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I have a question. Glenn had said he worked with some of the other SO/AC's to submit a proposal for the flexible funding [inaudible]. I don't see it listed. It was on travel insurance.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

That's a very recent one, Judith, that actually may come up, yes. That's only in the last week. They've got to put forward a pretty full proposal and stuff on it. It's where they're looking at the criteria. No doubt that that will come up. Thank you.

Moving on then, one of the reasons, as I mentioned before, in Any Other Business I wanted to include the reminders that David gave to all the ICANN leaders. The first thing was of course the preparatory webinars. I think they are really important. There's quite a comprehensive list of them. Go through the list, see if there's anything of interest to you and do listen in, they're usually really interesting and informative in preparation for the ICANN meeting.

The second one was of course, as I've already asked if you want to actually have some input into the new operating plan that ICANN Org has presented, I think it's very well laid out, it explains in detail, the things that are considered a priority to ICANN but we need to look at them and say, are they fully addressing the needs of end users, so that's where in need your input and if you can read those documents and find something that's of interest to you, a particular section and bring your views along to it.

The third thing of course, is the fellowship mentor issue. If I can just make a brief statement on that first off. As a result of a recent consensus call that I presented to the members of the ALAC, I was actually asking for their views on making a call to Sarah Keddin, who had stepped at the very last minute to take over from Amrita, who had been appointed to the NomCom and could not partake in the fellowship mentor role which she had been appointed to.

As it was, Amrita was able to attend Montreal at all, due to Visa issues. It was as well that Sarah was able to provide that valuable service to the fellowship committee. I asked ALAC members to make a consensus call as to whether they would accept Sarah being able to continue the role

as a fellowship mentor for 2020? The usual process is of course nominations are made to the At-Large applicant -- appointment subcommittee, this happened last year and Sarah was just cut at the post by Amrita.

We really did appreciate that fact that she was able to step in when required for that final meeting. The call that I put out was that, if anybody was absolutely -- that the selection process should go ahead again as the normal, that's fine with but offering that option. At the meeting, even following the meeting there were two people who were - - two members of the ALAC who opted for the selection process to be resumed and according to our consensus, there really should be more than three members to insist -- that doesn't make a full consensus.

We had a reached that threshold, my opinion was that the consensus call resulted in accepting option one, which was the view of the majority. We had some discussion between Abdulkarim and I and I would like Abdulkarim to be able to have -- I know that he wants to mention something.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:

Thank you very much. I want to [inaudible] and I want to try as much as possible to do this in a very respectful way. [Inaudible] anybody on this issue. My intention is for us to follow the lay down procedure. I actually believe the consensus call was my consensus call, I want to emphasize that because there are three ways in which you can vote.

You can either vote in yes, you can vote in no or you can abstain when you're having a vote. When you're calculating consensus, consensus

means yes. Anybody who abstained cannot be counted as part of consensus, so I believe there was no consensus on that issue. I believe the most appropriate thing for us to do is to ask for [inaudible] whereby every ALAC member will be asked to cast a vote and if they want to agree to it or they want to disagree.

I believe that way we are going to make our process transparent and I also believe that way we are going to make sure that our outcome, I want to be honest with you. The outcome [inaudible] process and I believe there is a need for us to make sure that we follow the process and that is why I believe I need to make this point. I totally disagree that there is consensus and even there is consensus, the rules of procedure say if an ALAC member is asking for a vote verification, then you need to verify the consent by voting, it's still within the rules.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Abdulkarim, have you concluded?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes, I have concluded. What I'm asking for is a formal vote on this issue.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Alan, did you have something that you'd like to add?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen, we also have Dave Kissoondoyal with his hand raised too.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, that's great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you want me to go first or Dave?

MAUREEN HILYARD: We'll have Dave first.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: [inaudible] option one on the mailing list, [inaudible] I'll prefer that to be holistically the rules and procedures. There are some that might be the same but I would personally vote for the [inaudible] must follow strictly the rules and procedures as are requested by Abdulkarim. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Dave. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Maureen. I've looked at most of the documents or all the documents and emails that Maureen has sent me and from my point of view, I believe all the rules in this case were followed.

Abdulkarim is correct, that if after a consensus call a member wants it ratified or verified with a vote, that is the right of an ALAC member to make but as far as I can tell, that request was not made anywhere near the decision point that was made, that it was made way after the fact.

There is a reasonable time that one has to say, I disagree with the consensus call, please do a vote. That's point number one.

Point number two is, as I said, I think the rules were followed. The rules for appointment give the ALAC a significant amount of flexibility in determining whether we do a formal call or use some other method. Maureen did suggest to use another method and asked the ALAC whether there was any disagreement and at that point there was only one person who raised disagreement.

Now, Abdulkarim says he believes a consensus call should be judged based on people supporting it, not disagreement. In accordance with our rules and I'll cite Rule 11.4.5 for consensus decision made via email, all ALAC members are deemed to present and the lack of consensus is determined based on disagreement expressed in accordance with Paragraph 12.1.3 In my mind everything was followed.

Now, just to give my credentials, I was the one who was the drafter of the original rules of procedure, not that I invented them but they were decided by a large group of very active members from At-Large, but I was the one who actually put pen to paper and drafter them and I believe I have authored all of the amendments since then and I was chair for four years, where those of you who were on the ALAC or watching at that point understand that I'm a stickler for rules.

I agree completely that we must be following our rules and if the rules don't seem to be appropriate any more, then we need to change them. I agree completely but in my mind the rules were followed in this case. I don't see anything that indicates otherwise. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Do we have any other hands up?

ALAN GREENBERG: You have Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. Thank you, Alan for your response. I actually think there is nothing in the rules for timing, that is number one. In terms of timing, I raised it right immediately, during the consensus, that's when I asked for -- the first thing I asked for was a vote, a formal vote on this and it was [inaudible] before the deadline, I wanted to go back to the emails, look at what I sent in those emails. It was within the -- before the deadline. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for that clarification. I was wondering, we could get -- to satisfy both sides, we could get a call of our ALAC members if we have got representation from all our regions but I have a suspicion that we may still be missing -- Cheryl, just looking at if could just a quick vote online at the moment but there are some people missing, that makes it a little bit difficult, to ensure that we've got everyone voting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, may I come in?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes, sure.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If you have quorum at this meeting, that's at least eight ALAC members and each region is represented, then you could start a vote at this meeting and complete it via telephone with the members who are not here over the next two or three days, our rules allow that. That is assuming you are queried and all regions represented. If you are not, then you have no choice but to do it via [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay. I think we may not -- we don't have representation from Europe.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

[Inaudible] is scheduled at 1800 now, so they're probably all going to drop and also, Humberto had to go.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yup. Okay, I think there's been enough discussion on this and really, we do have to resolve and because we don't have representation from EURALO, we could probably do a quick [inaudible] call. I'm happy to go with that. If it will resolve everything, to Abdulkarim's satisfaction, it meets those criteria, then I'm happy to go with that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Maureen, if you'd like some help in wording the motion, to make sure this covered, I'll be glad to help. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Awesome. Abdulkarim, are you okay with that? We'll go with that.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I just wanted to [inaudible] EURALO's representation. I think Matai sent an email to Staff asking me stand proxy for him in this vote.

ALAN GREENBERG: A proxy does not satisfy the quorum requirement.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, you and I are saying the same. Sorry Abdulkarim, but you're following the rules, you need to follow the rules and that means all the rules, including [inaudible]. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I am not talking about the quorum; I am talking about asking me to put in a vote. I am not talking quorum now.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We'll do it by [inaudible], that will be a lot easier. I think that is done then. An action item is that I will advice on the actual motion to make sure that is clear and we will initiate that as soon as possible. I think we also need to refresh our ideas about consensus and what is actually

required in that too. It's the ALAC only who will vote in this particular instance.

Really sorry, we're well over time but thank you everyone for coming and for staying in this call and for your contributions. It's been a very productive call; I really have appreciated it. I'm getting ready to leave the island this afternoon. It's a pretty busy time for me. Hopefully when I get back to island the connections will all be in place and I'll be able to communicate with the world. Thank you very much everyone, have a great day or evening, wherever you are. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Thank you everyone, this meeting is now adjourned, enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]