| TERRI AGNEW: | Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the ALAC Leadership Team (ALT) midmonth meeting on Thursday, the 17th of July 2014 at 19:00 UTC. On the call today we have Julie Hammer, Maureen Hilyard, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Alan Greenberg. We have no apologies. Oh, it looks like Evan Leibovitch has just joined us as well. Perfect timing, Evan. |
|---|---|
| | From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Kathy Schnitt, Gisella Gruber; and myself, Terri Agnew. |
| | I'd also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Olivier. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you very much, Terri. Have we missed anyone? Is anyone on the call whose name hasn't been called? No? Okay, let's get going again. I'm going to do something which we don't actually have on the agenda at the moment, and that's a friendly amendment to the agenda. On ALT calls, we usually do not have the adoption of the agenda, but due to the fact that in some parts of the world we're dealing with very antisocial hours, there was a call for an important part of our discussion. Agenda Item #8, review of arrangements of working groups on NTIA, IANA, and ICANN Accountability. |

*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.*

I was going to suggest that we deal with this immediately after the action items. So between Agenda Item #2 and the items for discussion Agenda Item #3. Any comments about this? Any objections for this? Hearing no objections, we'll do that. Let's go [inaudible] Agenda Item #2, and that's review of the ATLAS II action items, including the ALT action items of our last day of the week, Friday the 27th of June.

We will very quickly go through these, an update of what's been going on since the meeting. I invite you all to open that page. We will start with the ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session [inaudible]. The first one is At-Large staff to follow-up with SSAC staff, and the possibility of preparing a [inaudible] on the domain name [security]. And also the [inaudible] SSAC to be given more than 30 minutes at the next ICANN meeting.

There is some feedback here, which is probably due to someone being both on the call and also on the Adobe Connect. One of the two will need to be [inaudible], and it sounds like it has been.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Olivier, sorry to interrupt, but Julie has her hand raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:          Yes, thank you. I was going to ask Julie Hammer, since she is our SSAC liaison, to contribute to this. Julie? Julie might be muted at the moment.

| | |
|---|---|
| TERRI AGNEW: | This is Terri from staff. Apologies. That noise is coming from the Adobe Connect site, so we are going to disconnect it and try to reestablish it to get a better connection. Julie, it will be one moment probably before you're able to be heard. Apologies for the delay. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Okay. Thank you, Terri. In the meantime, perhaps could I ask staff to give us an update? And then over to Julie Hammer. |
| HEIDI ULLRICH: | I was actually looking forward to Julie's intervention, because I for one need additional information on what exactly would be in this beginner's guide. I have not yet followed up with Julie Hedlund because I'm waiting for more information. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Okay. Thank you for this, Heidi. Julie Hammer, are you able to speak now please? The Adobe Connect link has been reconnected and [inaudible]. Okay, Julie? |
| JULIE HEDLUND: | Are you able to hear me now, Olivier? |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Yes, [inaudible]. Go ahead. |

TERRI AGNEW:              Apologies for the delay, the issue that we're experiencing. Julie, if you could please private chat me, I think we may need to dial out to you today. And anyone else that may need to be dialed out to today since there may be some issues with the Adobe Connect line. Again, anyone that we can dial out to on the telephone, if you could just please private chat me, I'll certainly get a dial out right away to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay, thanks very much, Terri. We'll move on to the next action items and come back to this one as soon as we work out the technical problems with Julie Hammer.

The next one is discussion with the Communications Team. Staff to ensure that Chris Gift has all the—

HEIDI ULLRICH:            Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH:            Sorry to interrupt. You skipped one, the second one regarding the SSAC.

**EN**

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, but both of these are going to be with Julie Hammer, Heidi. We are not able to speak to Julie Hammer at the moment, so that's why I'm saying we'll move on and come back to this afterwards.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I didn't think that Julie needed the SSAC. That was more of a scheduling item, isn't it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, it's not exactly the biggest action item, is it, on the planet? And to be given more than 30 minutes of the next ICANN meeting, should we open the floor for discussion? We'll have five minutes on that please. Come on.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Basically, I just wanted to say that Gisella is now handling all of that. That's in progress. That's what I wanted to say, so we can move on officially.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thanks very much. I see Alan has put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It's for the one you were trying to talk about on communications. It's not our website, but the ICANN website, I have been exceedingly frustrated with the new website, unable to find things and all sorts of problems. I did talk to Chris at the meeting a bit. He said,

**EN**

please, anytime you find something specific, send him a note. They know about a lot of the problems, but they're trying to document real problems and make sure the site is usable. They know it is not at the moment. Just a thought that if you come across something where you're particularly frustrated, dash off a quick note to Chris Gift. He appreciates it. Or he says he does. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much, Alan. Yes, I can also say I've been on many pages that point to nothing, and to a [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:    You get a lot of those, but you also get pages that are there that are just impossible to find. Google can find them. ICANN search engine can't, and since we're going to through the [inaudible] seems to be impossible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    They're not linked to anything yet, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Well, they are linked. You just can't find out how they're linked.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Google couldn't find them if they were [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  Okay. Anyway, the fact is [inaudible] to provide us with an update on the good news with regards to the previous At-Large community survey.

ARIEL LIANG:             Hello, everyone. This is Ariel from staff. We have discovered – it's actually not a survey, but it's more like a research interview of the various At-Large members regarding the At-Large website. I have all the documents and I shared with the other staff members as well as Olivier. I'm not sure who else should I share with or should I put it on the wiki somewhere?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  Thanks very much for this, Ariel. I think we should share that obviously with Dev Anand Teelucksingh as well, because he is the chair of the Technical – not technical issues, the other working group that he is on with the technical things.

ARIEL LIANG:             Technology Taskforce.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  Technology Taskforce, that's the one. Thank you, Ariel. Of course he's also chairing social – all of the communications and networking thing. That's going to be important. I believe that the group has been tasked

# EN

with helping Chris Gift and his team in designing the new At-Large website.

I note no one else has put his hand up on this. That's fine. That's an action item that's done. I've seen from the chat that Julie Hammer is back on the line, and hopefully we should be able to have an update from her with regards to the Beginner's Guide on Domain Name Security. Julie, you have the floor.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Olivier. While we were in London, I had a discussion with SSAC staff on this and they felt that this type of task was really more appropriately targeted to [inaudible] security staff could do a lot of outreach into the community, and also more educational and informative programs, whereas SSAC staff really [inaudible] some supporting the more deep, technical work of the SSAC.

So Julie's suggestion – and I did discuss this with Heidi – was that this action item should be reworded to be "follow-up with ICANN security staff" rather than SSAC staff. And they felt that they would have some quite useful material that could easily be adapted to produce [inaudible]. So I wonder if we could reword that action item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much, Julie. So, in effect, what I understand is the SSAC would not be drafting such a beginner's guide. It would be ICANN security staff that would be drafting such a draft.

**EN**

JULIE HAMMER:                     That is certainly the SSAC staff's suggestion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay, thank you very much. Heidi, could you just provide us a quick background in how these beginner's guides were drafted? Because I understand these are projects from different staff. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH:                     Correct. Basically once we identify the topic of a beginner's guide, we identify then that the relevant staff to draft that. So this is something that would require SSAC support staff or members, we would then need to liaise with them. And then once the text is drafted, we work through the communications staff on developing the format, etc. on that.

And then we send it out to a review, for one review and then a final review. And then it's published.

JULIE HAMMER:                     Yeah. Heidi, the point is, though, that it's not SSAC staff. It's ICANN security staff.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                     Okay. When you say it's not SSAC staff, I'm not sure what you're saying because the action item is for Julie Hedlund. She that not be….?

**EN**

JULIE HAMMER:          No, no, it's not. Remember we had that discussion right at the end during our Friday meeting? You and I had the discussion outside and I explained that. That Julie Hedlund [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Correct. I remember the [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER:          …on SSAC work and that this task should be on ICANN security staff who are a completely different team to SSAC support staff as you well know.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Okay, I agree with that. So that action item should be slightly amended then because [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER:          Yeah. Delete SSAC security staff and insert ICANN security team.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:          Okay, thank you very much, Julie. And thank you for this, Heidi. This I guess remains then as a staff action item. We look forward to hearing from you during the ALAC call in a few days' time. Hopefully there will be an update on that. With regards to the SSAC to be given—

JULIE HAMMER:          Unfortunately, I'm probably not going to be able to make that call. I'm sorry if you were saying that to me or Heidi. I wasn't sure. Sorry, Olivier.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    I was saying this to Heidi. If At-Large staff could follow up with security staff. It would be an update from At-Large staff.

JULIE HAMMER:    My apologies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    And with regards to the second action item, the SSAC to be given more than 30 minutes at the next ICANN meeting, if we can have this banked for the preparation of the L.A. meeting, that would be great, but at least we have instructions.

Julie, I was going to ask you, how much time would you think would be best, 60 minutes?

JULIE HAMMER:    I think 45-60 minutes, because often we're late starting. Yeah, if we allow 60 minutes in the schedule, I think that would be very good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay, thank you. Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE:    Just a comment. A lot of the stuff that SSAC has done, and theoretically we heard they're going to be translated into English or have English summaries. Those would be really useful, too. [inaudible] some of the

earlier stuff that are actually aimed at users. So if we're going to have a beginner's guide, I think there ought to be a follow up at some point on at least some of the SSAC documents, that when they're translated into English, which is what Patrick promised, and they still don't read well, then maybe we can [inaudible] with them and get a bit more on security. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you, Holly. Julie?

JULIE HAMMER:    Thank you. Holly, have specific reports been identified for translation?

HOLLY RAICHE:    No, they haven't, but there are some that I've read and I'll happily [inaudible] with you particularly to say some of them would just be very useful as well. Or maybe incorporate some of the text there into a beginner's guide.

JULIE HAMMER:    Thanks, Holly. If you could identify those, because I'm not aware at the moment that any have been requested specifically for translation. So if you could identify what would be useful and which languages you think they ought to be translated, then we can pass that on to staff.

| HEIDI ULLRICH: | Okay. Thank you, Julie. And I suppose that's an action item on me. Thank you. |
|---|---|
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Okay, thanks very much for this. Let's move on to our list of action items. We've got the different RALO General Assemblies. Alan, you put your hand up. You have the floor. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | I have. I'm looking at a ticked-off item that, as the unaffiliated rep in NARALO, I should note something about. So can I talk to Ariel and/or Heidi after this call please on it? I think we have a problem. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Okay, thanks very much, Alan, for this. Let's move on. NARALO General Assembly. We're not going to go through all of these. What we have asked from staff is, of course, to follow up with each one of the RALOs on their own action items. When you read through these action items, if there's anything that the ALAC needs to [inaudible], then please [inaudible]. But in the interest of time, let's go directly to the ALAC work part one, hot topic number two, ICANN accountability and globalization.

And on this, we have several action items, the first one being Holly, Alan, and Chester Soong. The ATLAS II TG 4 to draft an ALAC statement on the Enhancing ICANN Accountability public comments. Has this been done? Holly Raiche? |

**EN**

HOLLY RAICHE:                This is where I looked at, and I'm not sure what this refers to. As part of the ATLAS Group 4, we actually did a statement and it was incorporated in the final statement [inaudible]. I'm questioning what this is. Is this what we have already done or something different, and is this part of another project? I really don't understand this action item. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much, Holly. There is an entry, which is dated the 6th of June 2014 in our policy development page, which speaks about enhancing ICANN accountability. It's a workspace, deliver a response for public comment period, which opened on the 6th of May and reply closing date 18th of June 2014. I think that's going to be a very quick feedback a few days after that date. Obviously the date is long past now. This is one that was dropped I think through the cracks, unfortunately. That should've been done during that week when we were meeting face to face. So I think we'll just put this one on the side, as unfortunate. I believe that the ALAC as a result did not file any [inaudible] on this. Of course there will be a lot more that will be possible and there's been a lot of input from many different people around ICANN, and as we know, Enhancing ICANN Accountability Working Group will be starting hopefully pretty soon on this. Evan, take the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:           Olivier, I would say absolutely not only has this not fallen through the cracks, exactly the opposite. As Holly told us, one of the thematic groups was dealing with that exclusively. We have had to deal with this

**EN**

on many different levels. The fact that we haven't answered one bloody PCP does not mean that we have not addressed this. If there's an absolute need to answer something, we can literally just take the work of the thematic group and send that through the public comment process. There's a work group – a major work group – about to be started.

I really don't know how you can say this has fallen through the cracks. We have had all sorts of people do all sorts of work on this, and the fact that one particular process that has been out of synch with what we've done has had a deadline come and pass does not mean we have dropped the ball with this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. I'm just saying that this action item was not done. Are we ticking it off as having been done? I think we'll just have to take it off the list, because that wasn't done. Holly, your hand is still up.

HOLLY RAICHE:     I'm just wondering, my other question was how does this particular – first of all, I'm not sure that this did not refer to the statement on the wiki for the thematic groups, because [there are] actually one of the statements there, but it was drafted by Avri and Hong.

The other thing is how does this relate to the larger [inaudible] an Accountability Working Group? I think it's a separate thing, so maybe just go separately. I'm just wondering whether this relates to having a

statement that was put on the wiki for the thematic group because that actually was done and there was a statement. That's why I look at this and thought I think this was done if that's what it refers to. I just don't know.

One way or the other, it's no longer relevant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much, Holly. It actually is [with and there] effectively, draft an ALAC statement on the Enhancing ICANN Accountability public comments. But that's obviously now the time has passed, so I think we shouldn't waste any more time on it and move on the list of action items, otherwise we'll be spending most of the time discussing this.

I would say the next one is At-Large staff to work with [GSE] staff to ensure collaboration and information exchange on At-Large and [GSE] activities. Any update on this, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH:     That's actually an ongoing activity that I have been working with [Mandy] and having weekly communication with her for some time now. That can either be completed or marked as ongoing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much. Next one is the [GSE] [inaudible] web admin to look into the page that seems to have redirect loop and [inaudible] results. [inaudible] tried that page and it loops [inaudible] so that obviously hasn't been done.

**EN**

HEIDI ULLRICH:              Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Yes, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:              Would you like the one about the [GSE] and policy staff one to be marked as completed, and would you like the action item on the accountability issue to be closed as well?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Yeah, let's close the one about the accountability issue and the [GSE] staff with At-Large staff and ensure collaboration information exchange on At-Large and [GSE], since things are moving let's close that as well.

HEIDI ULLRICH:              Okay. Thanks very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you, Heidi. And please get on to the [GSE] team and web admin on that page which can't resolve.

                           Next, At-Large to make a request to the relevant [GSE] staff that the Next Gen Program should be extended to other regions. Any update on this, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH:           Well, I'm having my regular meeting with [Mandy] this afternoon, so I will mention not only the [GSE] page but also the Next Gen which her overall group is handling.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   That's great, thank you. So that's ongoing. Next, ask the Speaker's Bureau a list of potential speakers be expanded to include a database of well-known and vetted community members that would be able to address communities in the local language or local cultures or by topics rather than having it restricted currently to only staff and Board speakers. Would that be a topic that you would be addressing this afternoon, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:           No. That is a topic that the ALT is discussing on today's call. It's on the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Okay. So we'll discuss that in a moment. But I was going there because I think we've got an action item here, but okay. We'll discuss this later on today and probably put this as an action item of our call today. ALAC work part two I'm eager to get moving. We're already half-an-hour into this call.

                         Proposal to make the Academy Working Group motion passed, no opposition. That's on the way. There was a question to Sandra

Hoferichter about this as a follow-up on what this actually [inaudible]. But I think that we'll put this onto the side.

Next, the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group, At-Large staff to – so these are a working group of At-Large, but we just need to look if anything needs to be done by the ALAC [inaudible].

At-Large staff to collect the data regarding the Pre-ATLAS II Capacity Building webinars and At-Large staff to ask IT to check the number of downloads in the Pre-ATLAS II Capacity Building webinars. Has there been any follow-up on this? Yes, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH:          I don't believe so. Regarding the first one about the collect the data, are you talking just about the numbers on that one?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:          Any data that is available.

HEIDI ULLRICH:          Okay. Could I ask Ariel to follow-up with IT staff on those two action items, please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:          Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Thank you, Olivier. I have discussed with Gisella in London about those two action items and she informed the list to work with the IT staff and to give the working group the information about the attendance of the webinars and also the downloads. Thank you.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much, Tijani, for this. That's in progress. Let's move on. Incorporation of ATLAS II Thematic Working Groups into existing At-Large working groups, and we will be discussing this later on today as well as a follow-up. I think we will be discussing this later on today. Do we have this in there? No. Probably has a follow-up to the ATLAS II feedback and debrief, the next steps, etc.

But in any case, of the three action items, I think some of them are already done. The first one, staff to send a reminder to all ATLAS II Thematic Groups to join existing At-Large working groups. In fact, I've sent an e-mail out to all of the chairs of the Thematic Working Groups asking them to identify the standing subcommittees and working groups that the ALAC runs and that At-Large runs so as to see which ones would be most suitable for their Thematic Working Group membership. I haven't checked on the feedback yet. Hopefully that table will fill itself very soon. The next step will be to effectively send more personalized invites to each one of the participants on the Thematic Working Groups, thus enticing them to join the working groups themselves.

ATLAS II participants to have discussion with the 2014 NomCom leadership. That's the second thing. We'll probably have a webinar or something on that.

Then for At-Large standing groups based on the results of their [inaudible] message personalization needed for better results. That's all [inaudible] there.

Wednesday APRALO General Assembly and the AFRALO General Assembly and the ALAC RALO General Assemblies. We want to be going over these detailed action items.

And then on Friday we had our ALT face-to-face meeting, and here a number of action items remain open. The first one being the ATLAS II Organizing Committee call is to be organized in order to hold a debrief on the organization of the ATLAS II and to develop best practice for future [inaudible]. Heidi, could you give us an update on this, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH:              Yes. At-Large staff have had an initial call on that and we're moving forward on this to ensure that we have a record of best practice for the future for the next summit. So we're probably going to give them something like a template and we can get back to you when that progresses more.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay, thank you. And of course then we'll go through a process of writing down all of the things that went well and all the things that went less well and to hold a call on that with all of the chairs at the [inaudible] committee—

**EN**

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. The plan is to have a call next week – an ALAC call – on a debrief. But that's going to be discussed later on in today's call as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Heidi. Let's go back to our list of action items. Gisella is to work with the ATLAS II Return on Investment Working Group in creating a survey on ATLAS II to get feedback from Summit participants on the various ATLAS II activities. That's going to be discussed later on in this call as well.

ATLAS staff in consultation with the ALT and ATLAS II Organizing Committee leaders will organize a post-ATLAS II debrief community webinar. Still to be discussed.

Next [inaudible] include an item on ATLAS II feedback and debrief. Hooray! We've done that one, because that's what we're doing at the moment.

Next, the ALT to discuss the issue of the ALAC liaison to the GAC prior to the ICANN 51 meeting in Los Angeles. We're not going to discuss this on this call, but possibly on the call afterwards. Just a question to everyone here, should it be an ALT discussion or should we have an ALAC discussion on this? Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Where did this come from?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     That came from the Friday, June 27, 2014—


ALAN GREENBERG:     I believe that but where did the AC come from? This is being discussed as if the GAC had said they are willing to or want to have a liaison from the ALAC.

The GAC has approved on a one year interim basis a liaison from the GNSO. Maybe someone is assuming that that means we get one automatically, but I don't think you should presume that – certainly not without discussions with the GAC.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much, Alan, but that's not what the action item says. The action item says the ALT to discuss the issue, so I guess we're already starting to discuss it. I don't think anything should be presumed at all.


ALAN GREENBERG:     All right, sorry. [inaudible].


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     The ALT is to discuss the issue of an ALAC liaison to the GAC, and I gather what you've just told us there is what you all tell us when the ALT had the discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG:          And we finally discuss it. Okay. I will not say [it until] then.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  You've already said it, Alan.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Too late. I'm taking it back.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  All right. We'll have to scratch that from the record. Forget about it. That's fine. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.


TIJANI BEN JEMAA:        Hello, Olivier. I think that we can perhaps discuss it in the ALT call, but the final decision cannot be done except by the ALAC. We can start discussing the issue, but it [inaudible]. Thank you.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  Thanks very much, Tijani. So a quick question to you all. Should we have this right away on the ALAC call, the next ALAC call next week? Any thoughts on this?


ALAN GREENBERG:          Okay, it sounds like we're discussing it now, in which case, I'll ask the question. What would you be discussing? Should we approach GAC leadership to discuss the possibility of? Because that's all we can – there's not much else that we could do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     I gather the question would be exactly be saying, well, let's discuss the issue of a GAC liaison to the GAC prior to the ICANN 51 meeting in Los Angeles as being an action item, and of saying that there have been some calls within our community to ask the GAC for having a GAC liaison since there appears to be a liaison with the GNSO, and then you will probably come into it having put your hand up rather fast, since you are very quick on the trigger, and you will be able to let us know what the facts are with regards to the GNSO I guess test reverse liaison, whatever it is, would be [inaudible]. And then a discussion will take place afterwards. That's how I would imagine it to be.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I would just caution about setting expectations in the ALAC. This is being done with the GNSO on a test basis to address some real operational problems, which we're not experiencing, and I would suspect that they would want to wait and see how that goes before widening it any.

So putting it on the ALAC agenda has something which could happen before Los Angeles or at Los Angeles I think may set expectations a bit high, but that's your call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. And I repeat again: discuss the issue. It's not a case of asking for an ALAC liaison to the GAC prior to the ICANN 51 meeting in L.A. This really is a case of putting it on the record during the ALAC call so that anyone who has raised the question – and I know who

has raised the question – will have it from the horse's mouth that this might not be a good idea at the moment. And I guess that needs to be on the record, so let me know how we're proceeding or not proceeding forward with that.

Holly Raiche, you had put your hand up a bit earlier.

HOLLY RAICHE:             Hopefully the whole thing has been resolved. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Okay, thanks. All right, let's move on. Finally staff to send a call for membership of the IDN Working Group.

HEIDI ULLRICH:            In progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thanks very much, Heidi. I don't see the action item or have you taken notes on the next ALAC call agenda, then, to have that?  Five minutes.

HEIDI ULLRICH:            I have, but also there's an agenda item on today's ALT call about the agenda for the next ALAC call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay, well, I'll take it as an advanced action item on the other one and we don't need to repeat it again afterwards.

HEIDI ULLRICH:    Okay, I [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Let's move on. Thanks very much, Heidi. Any comments on any of these action items? Dev Anand Teelucksingh, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Thanks. Just a reminder that the action item that was supposed to have been typed during the Thursday wrap-up session, I put the text in the chat. It's [inaudible] the text on Thomas Lowenhaupt's submission in the Thematic Group [5] regarding end user organization involvement in city TLD applications. And this is supposed to be put on the wiki page for new gTLD recommendations [inaudible] adjustments or recommendations for the new gTLD second round, whenever that happens. So I just wanted that action item to be captured somewhere, because otherwise we'll forget it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much, Dev. That's an action that you just refreshed indeed. Staff, have you recorded this, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH:             Yes, we'll go ahead and add that to the AI page for the ATLAS in At-Large under Thursday, the wrap-up session.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Correct, yes. Fantastic. Thanks very much. All right, let's move on to our next agenda item, and now of course as we've agreed earlier, that makes us jump down to Agenda Item #8, review of arrangements of working groups on NTIA, IANA topic, and the ICANN Accountability.

You've all got that diagram, which is my own rendition of my understanding of how things relate to each other, because it's not an information flow. It's just a diagram where – it effectively shows us how many groups there are out there or how many groups are expected to be out there, what should we do with them and how are they to be able to work so that everyone is synchronized and we work effectively and efficiently?

Just as we discuss this, I don't know how many of you have followed today's discussions that took place in London. The Coordinating Group ran a Function Stewardship Transition Coordinating Group which has got two representatives from the ALAC and that's Mohamed El Bashir and Jean-Jaques Subrenat has met during the holiday. They were delegate primarily with organizational matters.

The first discussion was to do with the GAC asking for five members of the GAC to be on that Coordination Group. Some to and fro pushing back and forth, and it appears that, for political reasons, there was an agreement that the GAC could probably have up to five members. But of course that would need to be confirmed. And the request for the five

members was according to Heather Dryden, the Chair of the GAC. Due to geographical balance as far as the members are concerned and a number of problems – internal GAC problems – which needed basically more people on that Coordinating Committee.

It was made clear by participants that this was a Coordinating Committee. It's not a committee that's going to make final choices and decisions on things. So according to what's been said, there's not going to be votes, which therefore means that as long as you got at least one person on that Coordinating Committee, your community's input will be considered and taken in.

There's been I think a very good show of many At-Large members following remotely, and both Jean-Jaques and Mohamed have made some very valid points. I think they know many of the participants that are there, so it's all quite encouraging.

There's been a discussion with regards to the ad hoc – how these groups work together. There was a question regarding the [inaudible] on ICANN accountability. There was also in parallel going on with this a call of SO, AC, and SG chairs that took place and I'll be briefing you about it in a moment.

But all in all, what we have in front of us now appears to be what is going to be an operation. So there's the IANA Function Stewardship Transition Coordinating Group that will just have a coordination side to it, and the work will take place within the communities that are taking part in this Coordination Group.

There is still a question mark as to what that means, and tomorrow I think will be some of the discussion taking place. Because when one says the work will take place within the communities, then of course the IETF is arguing that the work regarding the protocol side of the IANA function, the discussion on the stewardship of that should be taking place within the IETF.

Some [inaudible] saying that the Cross Community Working Group on IANA Function Stewardship Transition, which is the working group that's been currently created by the ccNSO, the GNSO, and has invited of course all of the other SOs and ACs and which we have supported as well. There are some cause for that to be dealing then only with the domains and the names side of the IANA function, and with the stewardship of the names side of the IANA function.

Clearly the Coordinating Group hasn't gone deep enough into the discussions on these yet, and tomorrow we'll probably see the first day of discussions on that and see how that's going to be arranged.

There was a question from Fadi Chehadé separately to the SOs, ACs and SG chairs which showed that he was a bit confused as to what working groups the community was creating, and so that also showed that it looks as if some senior staff were also confused about that. ICANN has been queried, and so the Cross Community Working Group is likely to move forward.

On our side, we have the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group, our IANA Function Stewardship Transition. That has got both a mailing list but also a Skype chat which has been feeding both Jean-Jacques and

Mohamed all of today. We had a very interesting discussion with many taking part. I think it would be important to put on the front page of [inaudible] working group a reference to the fact that there's a Skype chat, and of course the mailing list. We've had an uptake of people going onto our mailing list, and as far as the At-Large Working Group and ICANN Accountability is concerned, that's still a question mark at the moment and this is probably something we will be discussing now.

With regards to the ad hoc joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group on NTIA Topic Coordination, which is at the bottom of that page, this is an action item that has been affected after or during our last NCSG and At-Large meeting. And the action item or what has been decided was to create an ad hoc joint working group on this. The mailing list is created. The group is created. There's been very little traffic on it, if at all. I really don't know what we're going to do with this. I guess if we were to say that this is not needed, then we would need to officially ask and liaise with the NCSG on this.

If, on the other hand, as many or some believe that there is a need for civil society to coordinate, because primarily this would be civil society, civil society to coordinate on the topics or possibly end user part of the NCSG, then we would also need to perhaps instill some life into this working group.

That's the current status. I think the diagram is pretty much self-explanatory.

Just one last thing. Back to the Cross Community Working Group IANA Function Stewardship Transition, Julie Hammer, Tijani Ben Jemaa and

Leon Sanchez have been working on this, on the charter. Basically, putting the charter together. In fact, I've seen Tijani and Julie with their hands up, and perhaps it's the right time for me to hand over the floor to Tijani, and then Julie, and then Holly afterwards. So Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:       Thank you, Olivier. I apologize that I didn't attend the first call of the drafting committee team, because I was flying in the sky. But I read everything written on it and I hope I would be useful for the next call.

What I wanted to say here, you said that the Cross Community Working Group will deal only with the issues related to the name from the IANA functions. I am wondering where we will discuss that. Where will we deal with the issues related to [inaudible] function of the IANA?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       Yes. Thank you very much, Tijani. Now, I didn't say this was going to be the case. I said this is a proposal, which has been put forward to the Coordinating Group today and there are discussions about this thinking, well, is this [inaudible].

VOICE:       This conference has exceeded the time allowed for a single participant. You will now be disconnected. Goodbye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    What is going on?

TERRI AGNEW:    This is Terri from staff. Apologies for the message. We are looking into it on our side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much. We had one bug, now we have two. Next one we'll have three and we can start an orchestra on this.

Back to the thing. I'm certainly troubled by that now. So they give their proposal which is on the table, so it appears that the RIRs – the SO and the RIRs – would be the right location to discuss the numbers. The protocols would be discussed in the IETF. The names would be discussed in that Cross Community Working Group on IANA Function Stewardship Transition within the ICANN context.

In any proposal, there's no guarantee that this is going to be the case. Certainly At-Large I have questions as to how our community is going to take part in those things. Does it mean that we have to go and join the IETF discussions? Does it mean that we have to go and join the RIR discussions? Is there going to be a separate mailing list as well on that? I'm not sure about that, and this seems to be a highly [inaudible] thing as well, since as you know some are pushing for all of these functions to be divided among the different organizations, and therefore taken away from ICANN's remit, and some organizations are saying that this should all be staying under the same house, effectively.

The question being, as well, we're dealing here with just the stewardship. We're not dealing with the functions themselves. And we've also heard some [calls] from some proposals for the functions to be transferred to other organizations. It's just a very early [day] at the moment. And Tijani, don't take it that this is a consensus that the TCWG will be dealing only with the names. This is just a proposal which has been heard today in the discussion.

Next is Julie Hammer. Julie, you have the floor.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Olivier. Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Julie. We're just being annoyed by computers. That's fine.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you. I think where the consideration that perhaps the TCWG might have difficulty in proposing a complete view is that, at this stage, the only organizations that have put up their hands to participate – basically, the ccNSO, the GNSO, the SSAC and the ALAC. And of course that Cross Community Working Group is hoping that other organizations like the ASO will actually participate in that. But as yet, they have not agreed to do so.

So without the participation of those parts of the community, there was discussion in our first working group meeting as to whether it is feasible to represent views and feed views up to the Coordinating Group other

than the naming, which is what these organizations are primarily concerned with.

So that still gets an item under discussion in the Chartering Working Group and has not yet been resolved. But obviously that discussion has flown through into the Coordinating Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks for this, Julie. I can also add to this that the GAC has apparently not responded either to the invite.

JULIE HAMMER:     No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     So that's also a question, which having spoken earlier today to Jonathan Robinson and to Byron Holland about this, they're actively pursuing. Jonathan Robinson is chair of the GNSO and Byron Holland the chair of the ccNSO. They are both going to pursue this and find out if the GAC will indeed send a preventative to this Cross Community Working Group, because of course the GAC is very welcome and encouraged to take part in this.  Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER:     I think if there ends up being broader participation, then it will be far more logical for the remit of that group to be much broader and encompassed numbering, whether the IETF and the IAB join and that

**EN**

can then be extended to including protocols I'm not yet sure whether that's likely to happen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much, Julie, for this. I'm just wondering with the IAB could join, because that's an ICANN Cross Community Working Group. Does the IAB actually have a liaison to the Board? Has the IAB [linked to] this?

JULIE HAMMER:     I'm not sure to be honest. I'm pretty sure the IETF has a liaison to the Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     The IETF does, yeah. The IETF is seen differently on the Coordinating Group, for example, than the IAB is. I guess we'll leave this over to the chartering team and I'm sure you'll be discussing this.

Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE:     Just a question about the At-Large Working Group on Accountability. Is that where the work should be going on? Who is – am I heading that or are we who did the group [forward] just on accountability? That seems to me that's a core group. I've been following the discussion on the list as well with Evan and others about accountability.

Now, I don't think that fits in any other working group. Is there a separate working group that's been established on accountability?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much for this question, Holly. So of the two At-Large working groups, the first one, the ad hoc working group on IANA Function Stewardship Transition has gone through that full process of creation, consensus call for creation, etc.

The working group on ICANN Accountability is marked on this diagram but does not actually exist, hasn't been chartered yet, hasn't been created yet. And this is one thing we need to discuss here. There's a question as to whether it could fit in an already existing working group, and basically tasks that already exist in working groups to basically expand its work and put its work on that. So that's what I will open for discussions.

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE:               Thank you for clarifying that. My suggestion would be that it be a separate group, that it be chartered only as a group that contributes to the ICANN working group. And it was Rinalia who actually sent out all of the information on the ICANN working group. It seems to me that would be a really good basis on which to say there should be a separate group established just to feed into the ICANN accountability, and then use as its membership starting with Thematic Group 4 membership, but call for membership other interested parties. That would be my suggestion, because I think it is so specific to the task.

Now, it could fit elsewhere, but I think it ought to be called – at least the task should be called something very separate and have a meeting soon [inaudible] and so forth. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay, thanks for this, Holly. Any other thoughts on this point? Any counter-arguments? Anyone who has identified a working group in which – an already existing working group? Because we would have to do then is to create one more working group at that point, if that is okay. I see support from Evan. Okay. Nothing more from me. Great discussion.

Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Thank you, Olivier. There was a thematic group about the ICANN accountability, and I think that this is the base of the new working group that we want to create. As you said earlier and as you sent by e-mail, we have to find a way to make those thematic groups working and standing working groups so we continue the dynamic of the summit.

And I think this is the best way to do it. We have to create a working group on ICANN accountability, and already the basis of this working group in the thematic group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much for this, Tijani. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE:             Actually, I'm watching the chat. I'm picking up on Evan's suggestion that either the Regulatory or the Futures Working Group would be a place where there would be a specific task created, because there are already some tasks in the Regulatory [inaudible]. But have a specific task charged to that group would be another way just to stop creating working groups. I think either way would work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thank you, Holly. I didn't quite hear fully what you said. Are you saying that the registrant issues could be taking care of [this]?

HOLLY RAICHE:             Well, either the registrant or it would be WC Working Group as well that did the forward-looking paper. That could also be rejuvenated and charged with a specific task of responding to the ICANN Working Group on ICANN accountability. Either way would work. And if we used one of the existing working groups to do that, then we already have a mailing list and we could just go out to that mailing list saying there's a specific task. "This is the specific task. Here's your draft terms of reference. What do you think? Work on that."

I think it was the Regulatory Working Group. Or, Evan, what was the other one? Either one. We've already got a mailing list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thanks for this, Holly. Evan has got his hand up. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:   Okay. And since Holly just asked for me to answer, essentially Future Challenges, as Holly points out, has already produced the R3 paper which talks about ICANN accountability. So in other words, that's already the part of At-Large that has come closest to touching on this issue. The fact that one of its vice chairs is on the Coordinating Group is a happy coincidence, but I think also very relevant.

I'm just saying right now that rather than the bloat of making another working group while other ones go relatively dormant, this is exactly the kind of thing, for instance, that Future Challenges was designed to do – take things that were forward-looking and take on challenges and do something with them. So arguably, the Future Challenges group has been looking for work to do. This would seem to be highly appropriate. So I would suggest that.

We have a situation in which we had all those thematic groups at the ATLAS. Very few of them actually translate directly into functions of existing working groups, so that ends up being a challenge. We had a thing on the future of multi-stakeholder models and things like that.

If we want to engage people, unless we want to create working groups out of each of the thematic groups, we're going to have to figure a way of how to do this.

But I do want to make a pitch for tasking Future Challenges to do this. It has already made moves in this direction, so if not claimed authority, at least it's claimed some kind of an interest in that particular issue already. So that's why I would make the pitch for that. And as co-chair, I'd be perfectly happy to take that on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much for this, Evan. Any other comments on this? I see Tijani has put his hand up. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Thank you, Olivier. I 100% agree with Evan with only one condition. It must be the main subject dealt with now, a current subject. We need to discuss it now. So the Future Challenges Working Group or Taskforce must discuss – should give priority to this subject and should discuss it now, because it is now to be discussed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay, thanks very much for this, Tijani. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I don't much care which group discusses it as long as it does it properly. I do note, however, the name has probably become somewhat inappropriate. This is not a future challenge that's going to bite us. This is one that we've been ignoring. Just a comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Any other comments on this? First, I would say I've looked at the spreadsheet, which I sent out to the chairs of the thematic groups. I just looked at it now and there doesn't appear to have been any kind of feedback on it. The link to the Google spreadsheet is now on your screen. And there's been no follow-up at all, so it doesn't even show that the TG4 is suitable for the Future Challenges Working Group [inaudible] listed there.

That was one first point, that this is where I'm hoping that we can have some kind of cross-mention [inaudible].


TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     [speaking another language]


[HOLLY RAICHE]:     Tijani, could you mute yourself, please?


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     I've muted Tijani. So that's one thing. I have one concern about the Future Challenges Working Group and that is it's also going to be having to do a follow-up to the R3, I believe. Well, yeah, follow-up to the R3. And I think it's also taken on the task of follow-up to the PAG, hasn't it? Policy Advisory Group?

So does it have enough manpower and is it going to be able to engage in three things at the same time? I'm not convinced and not sure. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Two different things. With regard to your last question, I think the population of this group, if it decides to – and we are announcing that it has ownership of the accountability and transparency issue, then its membership may well change significantly.

If it indeed wants to continue on the PAG and other issues, that's going to have to be a subset of the people, not necessarily the same group. I don't much care whether it's the tail or the dog, which is the major group and which is the minor. But taking on a function which will have a different life than the Future Challenges group as such up until today.

With regard to TG4, I'll just note that one of the members of that group – and it wasn't a very large group – has written a long paper disavowing the results that were published claiming that he was – what he worked hard to put in was completely changed and we didn't understand anything. So be a little bit careful.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:    Can I ask who?

ALAN GREENBERG:    Garth Graham.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:    Oh, okay. No surprise. Sorry, but I know Garth.

**EN**

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Next is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:    Essentially I just want to say, again as co-chair of FC, first of all, Olivier, I want to ask you, you seem to think that we were working on a follow-up to R3. If that was going to happen, that certainly isn't something that Jean-Jacques and I have spoken much about. And if anything, I would think that would immediately take a backseat to the future work ongoing.

As far as I'm concerned, the R3 paper as well as the other thing that was submitted by a number of us, including a few of us on this call to the ATRT-2 about ICANN embracing its [inter-regulator], both that and R3 go to the issue of accountability. I believe they are significant input papers into the ongoing work on accountability. I really hadn't envisioned it that the working group was tasked with doing a follow-up on it short-term. I think right now the work that it could do in providing inputs to the existing ICANN work is probably more important than anything it could do in refreshing R3. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thank you for this. Now, with regards to the PAG?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:    That's in the gTLD group, not in Future Challenges.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for making that clear. Fantastic. So I see that people have written on the chat as well and are supporting the use of the Future Challenges Working Group for the At-Large Working Group on ICANN Accountability. So that function could definitely be taken on by the Future Challenges Working Group.

The TG4 membership would then be folded into the Future Challenges Working Group, but that said, because there are more members of TG4 than the current members of the Future Challenges – I think. I haven't checked, but I think that's the case – the nature of the Future Challenges Working Group would be changing quite dramatically.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I don't mean to butt in, but personally, as co-chair of Future Challenges, I would ask for something approaching – if not a charter, then a very, very specific action task. So I would like either the [ALT] or the ALAC to task specifically Future Challenges sort of as a friendly request, but being specific of exactly what it is that we're being asked to do.

In terms of the membership, of course there's a lot of people that attended as ATLAS participants that may not have even known about the existence of the Future Challenges Working Group and that's fine. Obviously at some point somebody is going to send them an e-mail asking them to opt in and they'll be welcomed. I don't think it's really going to change the tone or the character of the group, because as we've already said, this group has already been focusing on accountability issues. It's already been outputting things on accountability issues. So I don't think we're talking about a major shift.

**EN**

If it takes on new blood, that's absolutely fantastic. Couldn't ask for more.

Olivier, this isn't a matter of be careful what you ask for. Having some new blood in the group, having some new opinions, new perspectives on the group would be absolutely welcomed.

In terms of changing the focus of the group, I think it's far less than you think it would be. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much for this, Evan. I see Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you. I'd be a little leery of the term fold the TG4 into it. I would send out e-mails to the small number of people who are on it saying the Future Challenges is being tasked with supporting the accountability work that's going to be going on, and do you want to become a member?

There were people in that group who were simply put in that group because they were put in that group. It wasn't because they had a glowing interest in it. I just think in terms of give people the option, don't just presume that they're there. That only loads groups with people who don't have a real interest. They may all say yes, but in that case, that's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. As we know, the obvious people will be given an invite to join whatever group it is. That works [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:    Evan used words that I'm happy with, given an opt in. But the fold in sounded automatic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. So with regards to the nature of the Future Challenges Working Group, the reason why I'm saying it will change quite dramatically is that its primary work for the next 16 months is going to be feeding the ICANN Working Group on ICANN accountability. That will mean probably biweekly calls or weekly calls. A very active schedule.

And this working group will also need to work very closely with the ad hoc working group on IANA Function Stewardship Transition, probably also supporting it to produce – because effectively, the accountability work [design] systems of accountability will need to be proposed and coordinated with all of the other groups via the At-Large Ad Hoc Working Group on IANA Function Stewardship Transition.

This is why there is quite a number of [inaudible] that we're going to have to have here, and we need to have a very active working group. So if the ALAC decides that this is the right way forward, then this obviously needs to be understood. But I think we've had a good discussion on this now and we can then propose this to the ALAC during next week's call.

An update on the ICANN working group on ICANN accountability, which is a staff-led working group. So far there has been a question asked on the SO, AC, SG chairs call today. A question asked to Theresa Swinehart who is in charge of this process and the answer was that they're working on it. It's still not ready yet. So we don't know how many people per SO, AC, SG, whatever. We don't know exactly the forum or anything like that and we should wait for an announcement very soon.

But we definitely need to have our own structures ready on our side when this other working group goes live, and obviously we're going to have to have people go on that ICANN working group on ICANN accountability and be prepared to have to make a selection again if this is the way that working group will work, or be prepared to have many of our members or several of our members go on there without a specific selection as such. But of course we'd just be waiting time if we're discussing this before we actually know what the name of the game is.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you. I have two suggestions or three suggestions if you're going to present this to the ALAC. Number one, I have a real aversion to arrows that only go in one direction between groups. That sends a message which I don't like and probably isn't true.

I would tend to remove the double lines where there's one in both directions and simply remove all the arrowheads, simply put connections between the various groups. The only arrowhead that probably needs to remain is the one at the top from Julie, Tijani, and

Leon as members working on the charter. The communications between groups, I would just link them together and say there is communication, there is some sort of linkage. Because otherwise, you're either going to have to have double arrows everywhere or you're implying messages going in one direction and no feedback. And I think that's an incorrect message.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much. I'm just trying to look at the arrows and see if there is no feedback.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Well, there is indirectly through other groups, but it shows I'm not allowed to speak to – you're allowed to speak to me, but I'm not allowed to speak to you. I have to speak to Heidi and Heidi will send you the message.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Yeah. We're looking at process [inaudible] here. This is just to show relations between groups. But I understand it. We'll see if we can take all the arrows out then and just show the relationships between them.

ALAN GREENBERG:     It makes the case that you have two lines. I just say make all the lines single and take most of the arrowheads out. And I think if you want to simplify it more, the three green diamonds on the left you could

probably leave out altogether, because obviously these groups talk to other people also.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    And these groups will be – I [inaudible] the arrows, but with regards to the green diamond, the reason for them being there is to show that they actually cater for different communities. If we take them out, I'm concerned that people will say, "Hang on, why do we have three groups that do the same thing?"

ALAN GREENBERG:    Okay. Then I have no problem with that. That was a topic for discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    So AI on the issue from Heidi. Let's have an action item to discuss the matter of an At-Large working group on ICANN Accountability with a proposal that would include TG4 and the Future Challenges Working Group. I think that's a good title. I'll introduce the topic and then we can build it from there and try and make it as clear and straightforward on this and see what feedback we get from the ALAC. Any comments? No, okay.

And what I'll also do with the other action item I guess, that's for myself, is to remove the arrowheads and just make them as links between the different places, except that one arrowhead from Julie, Tijani, and Leon as the drafting of the charter. That's something that will take me a minute to do. Straightforward.

Thanks for me on this. I realize it's already quite late and we haven't really done very much else but discuss this item. At least we're very clear on that now.

Let's go back now to items for discussion – the ALAC policy development activities. And on this we've got statements or endorsement currently being developed, reviewed, or voted on by the ALAC. The FY15 operating plan and budget is currently being voted on. The universal acceptance of TLDs draft roadmap, the ALAC is currently commenting on a statement, which has been drafted thankfully by Satish Babu. I invite you all to have a look at it. We have yet a number of days until – oh no, the call for comments closed yesterday. Goodness. Time goes fast.

If you have any last comments, please make them today and let Satish know. The vote opens actually in 24 hours. I've given Satish, since it is his first statement, I've given him 24 hours to collect all the latest notes to produce a final statement. So just a call for you to contact him if it is important and you see that there's something that needs to be amended.

Enhancing ICANN accountability. It says here Holly, Alan, and Chester drafting a statement. I think that we've discussed this a little bit earlier and it's really way past the deadline for this statement here, so this one will probably be put as no statement. Any comments on this?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:     Olivier, this is Evan. Sorry to put my hand up. Is it possible perhaps just to put in a note since this is about work that was done at this summit?

Can we not simply put in a pointer to the relevant information that we've already done? I mean, we've effectively created a statement. We just haven't put it in through the proper process, but we had probably as good an ALAC policy development system as one could think of taking place at the Summit. Why not just make use of that for this purpose?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. So if I understand correctly, Evan, you wish to put a pointer to that statement on the PC page. Is that correct?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:    Yes. The work on that has effectively been done by a very significant amount of At-Large members.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Any comments on this from anyone? I see no comments. So I think that's probably something we can do, definitely. If we can have a link as an action item. A link from the statement page – the PC page. Probably we'll have to change status from drafting to I don't know really – we need to invent a new status on this.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:    I think a status of question mark works just fine.

[laughter]

**EN**

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     That's a good point. No, this is not a statement [inaudible] send it up as being just a comment. So we'll have to have another status for it. I'll work with Ariel afterwards to see what we're going to call it. It's not even a correspondence because we didn't send it out. Or it was part of a larger – it's folded into the larger, of course, [inaudible] that the ATLAS has put together. So overall declaration.

Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Yes, thank you, Olivier. I think that the link to the statement of the summit has to be made tomorrow as the last time because tomorrow is the deadline for the public comment. If you want it to be taken into account, we have to do it tomorrow at the maximum. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you, Tijani. Am I hearing you correctly? You're saying tomorrow is the deadline. I thought it was the 18th of June. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Yeah, yeah. I thought it was the 18th of July; I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     No, not at all. One month later.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:          So it will not be taken into account in the public comment process. The best is to send it as an advice. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you, Tijani. The idea was just to mark it on the public comment page that we have. It was not to send anything. We've arrived. The train has gone a month ago, and if it arrives now we'll do more harm than good, because staff has already said they've already taken everything that was in the public comment period and they're designing now the group. There was a question as to whether we had more to say and the answer was, well, no, we're not looking at any of that now because we're designing what will be next. So we really have to – and I know that the ship has gone, basically.

Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:          Oliver, I guess I'm a little irritated by the way I'm hearing the process gone. In London at the end of ICANN week, the At-Large community – not just ALAC, the At-Large community – voted on and endorsed unanimously the declaration. In that declaration was a significant chunk that related to this issue.

So this is not just a matter of – this is something that has been constructed, edited, and endorsed by the At-Large community. Is it in the form of an ALAC statement to the Board? No. However, that declaration was presented to the chair of the Board. That declaration was presented to the president of ICANN.

And if they believed that this was appropriate to go to those channels, they had the option of doing so. All we are doing is reminding the PCP that this has already been in existence.

So forgive me for getting – I'm getting a little cross with the way this is going. This is a significant statement that was made by the At-Large community on this. It has been presented to the Chair of the Board. It's been presented to the CEO, and if they did not delegate this properly to the channels that were collecting this information, that shouldn't be something that we have to be sorry for. We're simply right now reminding the public comment process that this statement was already created. It was already approved. And it was already presented. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much for this, Evan. I think what you're saying, if I can translate this, is that we send that declaration to Theresa Swinehart who is the staff member in charge of that public comment, and that process of course. Is that what you're saying, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:    I'm saying send it to whoever's relevant. This is not as if we are just making something now after the deadline has passed. We did something at the ICANN meeting that involved probably a bigger proportion of the At-Large community than ALAC has been able to claim to represent in a long time. If anything, that is a broader statement than one that just had ALAC approval.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks for this, Evan. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:    To be honest, I wouldn't emphasize that last part all that much. We know how much focus people had on those issues on the night of the gala. How much the other parts of the At-Large Summit really focused on it and says, "Yes, we endorse it," I'm not going to go into it and I don't think we need to.

It's quite reasonable to say this was a statement made by At-Large – and I'm talking about the accountability part, not the whole thing – was made and presented at the London meeting. And would you please take this into account also? That's all. Period. We're simply pointing out to a fact of history. And that may or may not be useful to them, but they should factor it into their deliberations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. So the action item is for staff to send the declaration to Theresa Swinehart. I think tomorrow is the time when this will be done, because the formatting still needs to be finalized. There's a couple of little points that need to be finalized. And send that over to – yeah, send that over to Theresa with a note basically explaining that this declaration contains the ALAC [inaudible] into the process that would be helpful for her creation of the ICANN accountability [track]. Or something to that effect.

Is that clear, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:              Yes. I see Ariel taking that note. Just a comment. I'm pretty sure Theresa is going to be welcoming this regardless of the closure of the PC, given that the work on accountability is an ongoing process and a key item for ICANN at the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay, that's great. Thank you. Let's move on to the next thing. Back to the main agenda. Introduction of two-character domain names for a number of names and [inaudible] extensions in there. And [inaudible] also introduction of two-character domain names in the new gTLD namespace, and that's for another set of extensions.

Dev is drafting a statement on this. There was an original thought that there should be a statement. Dev, can you bring us a bit up to date whether you found consensus on this and how the statement is looking?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Yes, thank you. There seems to be very [rough] consensus that what's in Specification 2 regarding two characters, that specification not allowing for two-character domains to happen at the same level for new gTLDs. That should be removed completely. I think there's been I'll have to say nobody really disagreeing on it.

In my mind, though, it's still a separate issue to watch what is being promised [inaudible] public comment is asking for. I put the logic in what I posted in the wiki. I don't see anybody totally disagreeing with it,

but I think some of the concerns have been that if we say something now, we haven't really said anything regarding previous registry requests to open this up, to open up the two-character domains to other registries, so why do it now? I think that's one of the key concerns that's been expressed.

I see Alan has his hand raised. Go ahead, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks for this, Dev. We have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Yeah. As I see it, and this is one of the very rare times where we have real disagreement within the ALAC and At-Large, that some people feel strongly that these names and other ones that are not currently country codes should be protected. We have other people saying they should all be released including the country code ones, as they are in some gTLDs and many ccTLDs. So we're really divided on this one.

I'm almost looking forward to a statement that doesn't get unanimous votes because I think that's a healthy sign that we're not agreeing on everything simply because one person says it and everyone nods "yes".

But I think on the substance, there's some real disagreement between people on whether the original recommendation on Specification 5 Section 2 has merit at all and whether it should be maintained. I don't know whether that means we should proceed with a statement and some people will vote against it and some people for it or this means we're not unified enough to have a statement on it. It's an interesting

**EN**

case. I don't think we've ever had a discussion like this before. I think it's marvelous.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks for this, Alan. Certainly the discussion is very interesting [inaudible] the matter. I definitely have concerns on whether this would pass in a vote since, as Alan said, the community is pretty much divided. In the past, what we have said is if we can find a rough consensus with a minority point of view, then we would present both points of view. We've done that I think on one or two occasions during the time that I've been chair. I have received some responses from the Board telling me, "Hang on, you're telling us yes and no. What do you mean by this?" That's [inaudible] a bit of an unhelpful type of commenting.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Olivier, may I comment on that please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:    I think the answer to that – in a statement like that, first of all, most of the time we're not making these statements to the Board. We're putting something into a public comment which is going to be factored in by staff or volunteers, depending on what kind of public comment it is.

But even if we were to make that kind of statement to the Board, I think the answer is we are not giving you advice. We are telling you what the feelings of the community is, and if the feelings are divided, that's information that's important.

So if we said half of us feel yes, half of us feel no and this is advice, yeah we should be shot. But I don't think we've ever done that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    So I guess at that point it means that if we were to have a statement, it would basically be a reflection of what the discussions in our community have been about, and definitely saying – perhaps even explicitly saying – this is not advice. Because ALAC statements are, in most cases, taken as advice. And when they are not advice, we need to clearly tag them as not advice at that point.

ALAN GREENBERG:    I disagree. ALAC statements submitted to public comments are statements. They are taken at face value from who it came from and for what it says. I don't believe they are advice. I think advice is a word we reserve for—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    They're a consensus of the ALAC, so they're not just a statement from the one person who has drafted the statement.

ALAN GREENBERG:      And that means they have more weight than they would from someone else, hopefully, and that's a point we've made time and time again that we have not gotten written in stone. But personally, I would not call it advice if we're making a statement, because that loads the equation in a way that I don't think is appropriate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Thanks for this, Alan. We've got Evan Leibovitch next.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:      Thanks, Olivier. First of all, we have a president for this. We have something where the At-Large community was somewhat divided, yet we were capable of putting together a statement that both reflected this, but emphasized the areas where we did have common ground and essentially did put forward a [position]. And if you recall, that wasn't even that long ago. It was on the issue of closed generics. We had widespread disagreement between the community. We brought everyone together. We found that on most issues, there wasn't as much disagreement as we thought. And while a lot of other communities within ICANN were really sorely split along this, we actually were able to have one document everyone could agree on. So it is not impossible.

Now, there's a couple of different ways to go about doing this, one of which is essentially to take what Dev had said at the beginning was, "This is what we believed rough consensus to be, and if there's a significant minority that oppose, then either welcomes the minority [descent] or we have a vote on it, we record, we have this many yes, we have this many no and either it passes or fails and that's how it works."

I would suggest before going that route to try what I'll call the NARALO process which is throw everyone together in a single purpose call, see if we can't thresh out a common position that people with diverse views can agree on, try and see if we can do it at that meeting where the interested people that have an interest in this thing can come together, see if we can come out with a consensus position. If not, we take it to a vote.

So we have gone through this route before. We have dealt with contentious issues. It doesn't mean that we're breaking any ground here by having something on which people disagree. And whether or not we're splitting hairs between whether this is a statement or whether this is advice to the Board, since this is being put in reference to – this is in specific reference to a public comment process, right Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Yes, it is.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:    Okay. So this is input to that. It's not advice to the Board in the sense that it is not being sent to Steve Crocker. This is being sent to the PCP. So we can split hairs whether this is a statement or this is advice. This is something that ultimately the ALAC will vote on, agree on or not agree on, and appropriately get sent to where it was destined. Thanks.

**EN**

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks for this, Evan. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa, and then Alan Greenberg and I think we'll have to close this topic, otherwise we'll be here forever. It's already a long way into our call. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Thank you, Olivier. Evan said a part of what I wanted to say. I propose that Dev write a statement and put it to the [inaudible] of the ALAC members, be modified according to the comments. And if we finally manage to have a real statement with a position we can put it to the Board. And if we have consensus, if we have a significant consensus on this statement, we will use it to send it to the public comment. If we don't have, we don't send it. That's all, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much, Tijani. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:    First, I'll say that was a good contribution. Thank you, Tijani. That goes along with one of the questions I was going to ask. Is this an issue of enough import to warrant the kind of process that Evan was talking about? We have a lot of things on our plate and I'm just not at all sure it is.

But just as a matter of process, these are all generated by RSEP, our registry requests for changes. They are normally subject to a 15-day comment period, but they're not normally a public comment. In other words, they solicit input but it's not a formal public comment. This time, because of the number of them, they pulled them together into two

public comments for the two groups of them that they're looking at right now.

So it's a staff issue to look at these and pass judgment on whether or not ICANN is agreeing or disagreeing with these kinds of things. So it's not a Board issue at this point at all. Just that comment on the process, and I like what Tijani said.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Dev, back to you.


DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Thanks. I'll read through the comments again and try to come up with a statement and see if there's hopefully some rough consensus on that and see where that takes us.

I think it is important. I think what probably has happened was that when people saw RSEP request and they didn't really understand what it was and probably ignored it. And I would say probably even the GAC ignored it even. And this might raise some issues with the GAC in terms of – especially if it's dealing with country and territory names at the second level, which I know it's of extreme importance, especially [inaudible] gTLDs. So, yeah.

But I'll try to write a statement and see if it could be – yeah, I'll try and write a statement. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Just one that question for you, Dev, before we close on this one, is a name like Germany.extension allowed in the AG or not?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:   No, it's not. Country and territory names, as well as certain – how should I put it? – modifications to those country names are blocked at the second level. So Germany-dot whatever the TLD is would be blocked. You would have to get permission from the government that you want to use [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Germany [inaudible]. Okay. All right, thanks. Just a question, because certainly that's not the case under dot-com and under the existing TLDs. That would be the question. And certainly two-character names under the existing TLDs are also pretty much allowed everywhere.

One concern of course is the fact that you are going to get some two-character names, dot-coms that will want something under dot-something else and they won't be able to get it if that gives a blockage. But anyway, we're going into that discussion.

Let's just get you to draft a first draft, and then if you can do that within the next week because then you'll have a week afterwards to discuss that, we'll probably be late into submitting the end of that public comment period. The response time is the end of the month, and it being the end of the month we're really leaving a five-day vote on this, and a vote that is going to be tight if we have a vote on that. We can't

**EN**

even submit a statement and then say that this will be ratified, because we don't know if it's going to be ratified. That's the thing.

I would just say, in the past when there was such a big question, I would usually not take it all the way down to the vote and risk that it would fail. But I see that we're not particularly concerned here on this type of statement. So it would pass or would fail or would have a mild consensus that we can't predict on that prior to the vote.

Alan, and then Dev and then we close on this topic. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:        Just a very quick comment. Your question about Germany was a good one and Germany and .DE are currently not allowed and would not be allowed under any of these RSEPs. They're only looking for the ones that are not currently allocated.

One of the points that someone made is "but we all know that there's a good probability that Kurdistan will be a county soon, and then they will be allocated "ku" or whatever. And if we allow "ku" to be used, then they won't have the same privilege, which is an interesting comment, but of course right now you can register Kurdistan-dot any TLD and that would be allowed because it's not a blocked country name. That's one of the little bits of humor in this whole process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much, Alan. It's humorous but it's actually quite real. Dev, back to you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, indeed. And that's something perhaps the comments could also mention. [inaudible] country names, especially new territories, or country or territory names, that are introduced [inaudible] be protected. And maybe not necessarily make a particular comment, but just point this out for observation because I think it is an issue.

Again, in my mind, to me it's the logic of it, have principles established. The way the logic for the exceptions seems to be [inaudible] the principle by which it was established. I understand that most people feel that our principles [shouldn't be] – is not a valid principle anymore. But I think – I'll try to incorporate something like that, [inaudible] actual country names themselves.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Dev. Let's move on and go to – that was the last one in the whole list that we had here. Then currently open, public comments. We have a whole list of them where we have no statements. Introduction of two-character – sorry, that one should be taken out, the introduction of two-character domain names because that's been jumping one line up.

Dot-paris introduction of approved launch program, [dot-wed], dot-ngo, dot-ong. Study to evaluate solutions to these submissions and [display] of internationalized contact data and proposed implementation of GNSO PDP recommendations on blocking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings, revise UDRP rules. No statements on any of these. So if any of you think that there should be a statement on any of these,

please put your hand up. I'll of course be going through the whole list during the ALAC call next week.

ATLAS II feedback and debrief. My goodness, I thought we'd never reach that point. We've already spoken a fair amount on this. With regards to the ATLAS II declaration status and next steps, I will ask Dev Anand Teelucksingh to give us a couple of words. In fact, he's put his hand up already. Dev, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:     Actually, there was something going back to the public comment. There was one of the public comments that was actually not captured in the wiki page and it was regarding the supporting the domain name industry in underserved regions. I just put the link there.

We should probably, I don't know, forward it to everyone just to see if there's any particular issue that we want to comment on. So that was going to be my comment on that one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay, thank you. Tijani Ben Jemaa next. Tijani, we can't hear you at the moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Sorry, I was muted. Thank you very much, Dev, for bringing this point to the discussion. I think this is a very important issue that we have to submit a statement on because it is with something that we worked already on in the JAS Working Group if you remember very well. So I

don't think that for this public comment we will say a statement – it must be a statement.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much for this, Tijani. Which one are you speaking about? I can't…


TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Yes. It is about encouraging or something like this. The domain name industry and the underserved regions.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    The underserved regions one, yes, correct. I don't see it on the agenda. Has this actually been tasked already or is that one that has already gone in the past? Ariel, please.


ARIEL LIANG:    I have a comment and a question. So actually, two public comments fell through the cracks because of the website revamp and I discovered that last week. Actually, I sent an e-mail to Olivier. I asked about what to do with these two comments. One is supporting the domain name industry underserved regions. That was closed on the 13th of June.

Also there's another one. ICANN seeks public comment on 2013 RAA data retention specification. I will paste that link on the chat shortly. That was closed actually in April. I checked and these aren't the only two that fell through the cracks because of the website revamp.

VOICE:                          This conference has exceeded the time allowed for a single participant conference. You will now be disconnected. Goodbye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:          That's great. So someone is going to be disconnected. I don't know who.

ARIEL LIANG:                     So that's all the update I had.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:          Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:                  [inaudible] over a month ago. It hadn't been summarized yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:          Okay, thanks very much for this, Alan. Let's do two things, then. We have two public comments that are missing, basically, due to the change in the website. What basically happened is one of the pages on the website was updated and one of the pages on the website was not updated or they were not updated with the same information, so it wasn't Ariel's fault. It was actually the website transfer fault.

So RAA data retention is one. DNS underserved is the other one. Alan, RAA data retention, does this require the ALAC to…

ALAN GREENBERG:         I do not believe so. We have made a number of comments in the past saying registrars should not be required to violate national law. If we have a situation here where some are about to get approval to not violate national law, I don't think we need to say anything. No one else is going to fight it. It's going to happen. It doesn't need our support. [inaudible] we don't need to talk about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks for this, Alan. Now, with regards to the DNS underserved, I understand from Tijani that there is a need for the ALAC to comment on this. We therefore need to act fast.

ALAN GREENBERG:         Olivier, I note in one place on the ICANN website it said it closed on June 16$^{th}$. Somewhere else it said it closed on June 30$^{th}$. They're clearly somewhat confused among themselves. It hasn't been summarized yet. I would suggest that – I'll be glad to work with Tijani and put together a very short quick statement that we could submit. I agree with Tijani strongly that this is something with should comment on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much, Alan. Tijani, are you okay with this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:       Yes. Very good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Excellent. Thank you, Tijani. So please, two things then. Alan and Tijani to work together on that putting a short statement together on this, and then we have to get [inaudible] to e-mail the people in charge of that [PC] explaining that this fell through the cracks due to a fault on the ICANN website having various deadlines and having not been updated evenly, and therefore the ALAC will – there is a statement that will be coming from the ALAC.


VOICE:    Thank you.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Great, [inaudible]. That's the new Ariel answering automatically. Very good. Thanks very much for this. So these are the two things, and if we can have that statement, that first draft put up, as soon as possible, then Ariel and I will work to get the vote launched as soon as possible as well and we'll send that statement over to the person in charge of that public comment.

All clear, Ariel?


ARIEL LIANG:    Yes, all clear. You're referring to the comment on the underserved regions one, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Correct, yes.

ARIEL LIANG:                Okay. And no we're not going to do anything with the RAA one?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     We're not. Negative. Yeah. And on the underserved region, of course, I think we need to create that page because that hasn't been created either. So we need to create that policy page on our policy calendar.

ARIEL LIANG:                Okay, will do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thanks very much for this. Let's move on. Let's go to our next agenda item. Some people have noticed that we've missed Agenda Item #4. That's because there isn't any. So we can quickly swiftly go through this and move to 5, ATLAS II feedback and debrief. We've spoken a lot about it. The ATLAS II declaration, current statuses. There are a few more formatting questions on this. Included in the declaration in the appendixes will be a list of the participants in each one of the working groups, and we're just finalizing the list. There were a few typos and a few names that appeared where people were not actually there, etc. That declaration should be ready by I think tomorrow. And as we said, there's an action item for it to be sent over to Theresa Swinehart.

And in fact, the finalized declaration will be sent to the Board, the Board secretariat. But I'm also planning to send it to each one of the chairs of the SOs, ACs of ICANN highlighting the points which pertain or which could be of help to their community of which their community might be interested in. so this is one of the ways to make this declaration more widespread – distributed in the more widespread way and getting other communities to see the work that we have done, and perhaps even to act on it or even see it as a [inaudible] that we wish to engage with them on.

Moving up to the debrief community webinar. This is one thing that we need to put together with the chairs of the Organizing Committee. Find out what went well, what didn't go so well, what we can improve on and put all of this on a page for our successes or some of us who [inaudible] around then in the next ATLAS. Any lessons learned, things that have worked particularly well and so on, things that need improvement. One of the problems we had in this Organizing Committee was difficult to know sometimes how things were done in the first ATLAS and it sometimes felt – certainly I feel like it felt a bit like reinventing the wheel. It's always good to have some institutional memory actually put there on paper.

Any questions or comments on this? No questions or comments, okay. So that's one thing. There's going to be also obviously an ATLAS II return on investment working group on this. I guess the next steps are going to be for that ROI group to look at the attendance records and look at the output that came out of the different [TDs], etc.

I'm not savvy to all of what the ROI group is working on, but we obviously have to follow-up on this. And this will also have to be [folded] with the status of the – sorry, with the debrief for our future participants and our future organizers.

One of the things that we've been told is – certainly we've delighted some parts of the community and one thing that we have heard from Fadi, I remind you all, is that we might not have to wait as many as five years. It might indeed be a short amount of time until the next ATLAS. So ATLAS III being just around the corner. As we know, it takes a couple of years to get it together. We might have to start work very soon on ATLAS III, certainly taking down the lessons learned and designing something for the future.

On the follow-up, as you know, as I've said earlier, the folding of the thematic groups into the current At-Large groups, I told you all that I will be or we will be writing to each on one of the working group chairs – sorry, the thematic group chairs has already received a note. I'm hoping that they're going to respond. I see a couple of them being on this call, so please respond to this and fill in that Google doc which I quoted earlier on the chat. And if you don't see any correspondence between the thematic groups and our current working groups, then we definitely need to create more groups to be able to hold the work of those thematic groups or [inaudible] membership and offer membership of those current working groups to the people that took part in the thematic groups.

The next thing I was going to suggest also is that then the working groups who have received a significant influx of new participants should

be putting together – well, first, updating their front page and making sure that they're all using the same format and enough information for newcomers, but also have a webinar that will explain what the working group has done so far, what types of things it does, what types of topics it's going to – forecasting it's going to have to look at. Generally, basically, welcome those people and bring them up-to-date with what the working group is doing.

I think we have gone past the time of saying, "Oh, come in. The door is open." Now that we've actually gotten people through the door we need to make sure they stay there. Our customers – here we go, here's the world. Our customers are our ALSes and we need to make sure the offering for our customers is good enough. And I can sense that Evan is boiling with the use of that word. And I'm kidding, of course.

Any questions or comments on this? Any suggestions? Because this is the sort of thing that I will be presenting to the ALAC next week. I wonder if there's anything that I've forgotten and maybe you wish to add also next week or prepare [inaudible] add next week as a suggestion. I don't see anyone putting their hand up now, so I've either put you all to sleep or you're all okay with the current follow-up activities that will take place.

The other thing I think that we need to do is to certainly push on the return on investment, and certainly return on investment of our ALAC members. I think we're going to move forward with the Return on Investment Working Group that we've been working on. I'd like to certainly have some propositions for this before the next face-to-face meeting that will take place in Los Angeles.

Next, Agenda Item #6. Being that there's no life at the moment. Board member selection evaluation update and next steps. We have got the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee and Board Member Selection Process Committee. As you know, the elections went and actually had a result, but it was a bit more chaotic than we forecasted to start with. And we definitely need to put down on paper the lessons learned and have a debrief of everything.

So I would ask Tijani to please let us know what the process is and what our next steps are on that. I'm hoping that we can do this earlier rather than later before anyone forgets about this. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Indeed, you are right. We planned at the – I forgot the name – BMSBC to hold the common or joint meeting with the BCEC to discuss the process and to see what to be improved because we placed a lot of things that we need to fix. Not to fix, but we need to make clear for the future so that the people who will be in charge of the process in the future will not face problems as we face.

So we wanted to have this joint meeting much earlier, but unfortunately it is a crazy year this year and the activities were very continuous activities and needing a lot of bandwidth so we couldn't make this evaluation earlier. With Roberto Gaetano, we wanted to make more meeting in London but we didn't manage to do so.

The program is to have the next few weeks a call – a joint call – to discuss about what was the problems faced and later then to prepare a report, a general report, that will be used to rethink the rule of

procedure, to complete the rule of procedure, so that you will not face any confusion or any problem in the future. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks so much, Tijani. You mentioned within the next few weeks. Can we hone in on next week or the week after or send a Doodle out perhaps as a next step?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    I think that the next week will be busy. Perhaps the week after it is possible. But I have to see with Roberto Gaetano. It depends also on his availability. I think he is on vacation now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thank you for this, Tijani. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you. Tijani and I have already talked about this to some extent, whether it's appropriate for me to participate because I clearly wasn't a member of those committees, or not. I think both Cheryl and I have some input into the process in things that were not done the way we thought the rules were written when they were redrafted but obviously not clear enough.

So I guess clearly Tijani and Roberto's call, whether we would participate in the call, but I think I and I think Cheryl – I can speak on

behalf of Cheryl – would like an opportunity to submit some comments before that happens.


TIJANI BEN JEMAA:       Yes, thank you. May I follow-up?


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Yes. Go ahead, Tijani.


TIJANI BEN JEMAA:       Thank you, Alan. Sure, any input from your side is very helpful. After if you want a response, after listing the problems and listing the points that we want to raise, we will sure come back to you to [Sharon] who has a lot of experience in this matter and we will discuss with you before making the final report. But before that, if you have any comments already, please provide it.


ALAN GREENBERG:       Like everyone else, it's on my list that I haven't done. So this is the reminder that I better get to it soon.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. I will actually suggest, Tijani, that perhaps you might consider not only speaking to Alan because he was one of the penholders – or *the* penholder – for the rules of procedure when it was drafted, but perhaps you should be looking at interviewing

all of the candidates and get their point of view as well of how the process went from their point of view.

It would be good. I would certainly be interested in seeing the different facets, effectively, of the election. So you could certainly speak to Alan, as Alan a candidate and also Alan as Alan the penholder of the rules of procedure, which of course is not the rule specific to voting but all of the ALAC rules of procedure.

Alan Greenberg?


ALAN GREENBERG:          [inaudible]


TIJANI BEN JEMAA:        Olivier, I was speaking to the expert. I wasn't talking about Alan the candidate. But you are right. We have to also talk to the candidates to have their point of view. Thank you.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:  Excellent. Thank you, Tijani. Alan Greenberg?


ALAN GREENBERG:          No, no. I was trying to take down a checkmark that I put up about interviewing the candidates, but I put my hand up by mistake.

**EN**

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay, excellent. Any other points on this from anyone regarding the Board member selection evaluation update and next steps? I see none in there. Tijani, we'll leave this off the ALAC call next week except if you manage to speak to Roberto. And if you have and you've got a definite time for moving forward, then please get back to staff and have that item added on the ALAC call agenda, which therefore allows us to provide advanced notice to everyone to be able to take part in that process in the forthcoming weeks afterwards.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Okay. I will do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay, thanks very much. Next, seven. Seven is our ultimate – oh no, we've still got more agenda items. Speaker's Bureau. ALAC requests. There's been an action item that came out of the face-to-face meeting in London that – actually, it was one of the things that was discussed in one of the thematic group and it ended up as an action item on the ALT.

The ALAC should ask the Speaker's Bureau a list of potential speakers be expanded to include a database of well-known and vetted community experts that will be able to address communities in their local language, their local cultures or by topics rather than having it restricted solely or only to staff and Board speakers. What should we do about this? Does this warrant an ALAC statement? Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Thank you, Olivier. It is only an information that I want to share with you. The Speaker's Bureau has already sent me to events as an ICANN representative. They already use the community  members. It was on the request of the organizers, but it was done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thank you, Tijani. The way I understand it, this was a [runoff exception].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Can you hear us?

HEIDI ULLRICH:     Tijani, we hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     We can hear you. Can you hear me?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:     I can hear both of you.

**EN**

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    [inaudible] answering me. Tijani, this is a [runoff exception] as far as I understand it. And when we asked the question, there was no real answer. Maybe we should clarify that whether that's the case first. Alan Greenberg, you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:    I would suggest the first thing is for staff to talk to staff and find out if we can make this a more generalized case or not before we draft a statement. If they say, "No, sorry, we don't do that kind of thing unless someone demands, we don't want the riffraff talking," then we could write a statement. But investigate it quietly among friends first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Any other points or questions or comments for this? All right, I think we'll just have staff then get in touch with the Speaker's Bureau and obtain clarification on this, please. As a first step, depending on the answer, I could write a note to the Speaker's Bureau as far as an answer as Alan has described just a moment ago at that point. We would be stepping up the pressure by having a statement sent [inaudible].

And in fact, I also ask as a result that if we are going to be looking at the ATLAS II action item, if we could make sure that this action item is kept as such but as a reminder that we've already taken a step towards resolving this without needing to go to a full statement.

Okay. Now we have already gone through Agenda Item #8. We've got Agenda Item #9, the items for the next ALAC meeting. Are there any

items that you would like to add in addition to our usual agenda items that we have? Has Heidi come back from her lunch or is she available?

HEIDI ULLRICH:            I was away five minutes. This is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Five minutes, okay. It was just to turn the gas off, wasn't it? sorry about that.

HEIDI ULLRICH:            Microwave.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Microwave, goodness. That's even more. The one minute that you left. So just a quick one, is this agenda that is linked to our current agenda, is that updated?

HEIDI ULLRICH:            Correct. Yes, it has been updated. So all of the items that—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    So I invite you all to have a look at that agenda. What else do we need to add on this? Back to you, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Again, everything that I've heard and what I've captured for the ALAC agenda has been put on to this, including those items that have been discussed today. So if you have any additional items, please do let me know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Heidi. I admit this is a very long call we're already having here and we're going to have a long ALAC call as well. As you know, it will be the first ALAC call after our London meeting, so that's going to be quite a busy one. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. It's only to tell you that I have to leave now. So I'm sorry not to continue with you. I have to go. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you, Tijani. Any other comments on the ALAC call agenda? Going once, going twice. Just the items for discussion. ATLAS II debrief, Coordination Group update with Jean-Jacques and Mohamed. Of course that will be after London. At-Large Working Group update, I felt that there was only a need for two updates, the first one being the Academy Working Groups since there's going to be a follow-up to the action item that was ratified over when we met face-to-face in London. And then there is obviously an update on the Ad Hoc Working Group and the Transition of U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA function. They [inaudible] call for membership, for anyone who is interested in this.

And then of course we've got the information discussion, endorsement of ALAC delegates to the NomCom and any other business afterwards.

If you feel that there are any other topics that we need to add to this, please e-mail Heidi and copy me on it and I will add to it.

HEIDI ULLRICH:    Olivier, just to highlight very quickly that item 7 and 11 are the ones that I captured from today's ALT call. So please let me know if the wording on those are correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Sorry, can you say that again?

HEIDI ULLRICH:    Yes. The items 7 and 11 are the ones that I captured from today's call. That is on the [inaudible]. So please let me know if those items are correct, if the wording is correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    You've added those, basically. 7, 11. Okay, that's have a look if this is open. So 7, establish an At-Large Working Group on Accountability. And 11 is ALAC liaison to the GAC. I think that's five minutes on the ALAC liaison to the GAC, and establishment of At-Large Working Group and Accountability is ten minutes. That will be our discussion regarding the Future Challenges Working Group possible or a new whichever.

Okay, I see no one put their hands up. I think it's been a long enough call for everyone. We'll go to our last agenda item, and that's any other business. Seeing no one put their hand up, it looks like we have no more other business. I thank you all for having lasted that long on this call. Certainly we didn't think it was going to be that long, but I hope that this was helpful to you.

I've noted that not everyone has followed the IANA Function Stewardship Transition Coordination Group. We'll have a good update next week on it. I don't think at this stage it's that important to follow that early on, and certainly I can tell you we've got good people who are representing the ALAC out there in London. So I'm very glad that we had nothing to fear today. We might have something to fear tomorrow. But until then, thank you for this call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and goodnight! Take care [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:          Goodnight.

TERRI AGNEW:             Once again, the meeting has adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines at this time.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**