TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the ALAC Leadership Team, ALT, monthly call on Thursday, 31st of July 2014 at 18:00 UTC. On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Evan Leibovitch… I apologize, Dev plans on joining later today. Liaisons, we have Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg and Julie Hammer.
	We have apologies from Murray McKercher. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Kathy Schnitt and myself, Terri Agnew. I would also like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you Terri. Have we missed anyone? It doesn't look like it. Let's get going, immediately. Welcome everybody to this call. We've got a pretty full Agenda. We'll try and get through it efficiently. We'll start with a review of the AIs from the ATLAS II. The ALT Meeting was the 17th of July and the ALAC Meeting the 22nd of July.
	Just before we jump to this page, I'm on a phone that automatically cuts me off after an hour. You'll get a warning. I don't get a warning. If you do hear, "You'll be disconnected in one minute," then please let me know and I'll swap over to my computer.
	ATLAS II AIs. We're going to go through them just to see where we are. The first meeting on the Monday, 23rd of June, was At-Large staff to

follow up with ICANN security staff on the possibility of preparing a Beginner's Guide on domain name security. That's in process, and ICANN security staff have come back and are currently looking into drafting it.

The SSAC is to be given more than 30 minutes at the next ICANN Meeting. I think we should tick this box and say it's been taken into account, and just put it in the organizing part of our LA Meeting. Discussion with the Communications Team and staff to ensure that Chris get us all the previous At-Large community survey work on the At-Large website needs. We've seen last time that this was done.

Moving further down – ALAC work part one, hot topics number two – ICANN accountability and globalization. All of the AIs here are done. I'll quickly read through them and ask if there are any comments to that. I've got a small update on this. I think we've got something on ICANN accountability? No, we don't. We'll be able to touch on that then during that AI.

Holly Raiche, Alan Greenberg and Chester Soong, and Thematic Group 4, are to draft an ALAC statement on enhancing ICANN accountability in public comment. At-Large staff to work with GSE staff to ensure collaboration and information exchange on At-Large and GSE activities. That's also ongoing, or done.

The GSE Team with web admin staff to look into a page that has a redirect loop and can't resolve. That was a page that was on the previous website, so that's done as well. [unclear 00:03:49] to make a request to the relevant GSE staff that the Next Gen Program should be

EN

extended to other regions. We had [unclear 00:03:58] of this during the last call.

[unclear] Speaker Bureau, a list of potential speakers be expanded to include a database of well-known and vetted community experts that would be able to address communities in their local language, or local cultures, or by topic, rather than having it restricted currently to only staff and Board speakers. That was also dealt with in our last call.

On the topic of ICANN accountability and globalization, you'll have remembered on our last call and on the email list that there was a discussion as to what was going on – what was the current status of the ICANN accountability track. There was supposed to be a meeting in London and then it didn't take place. The fact there's been a blog post from Theresa Swineheart on the ICANN blog, which I've forwarded to the ALT list, that blog post explains that the process is moving forward and staff has been very busy with analyzing all the comments that have been received.

At the same time, the SO, AC and SG Chairs are invited to be on a call on Monday, 4th of August, where Fadi Chehadé will explain what the next steps and plans are. There hasn't been any leak as to what the plans are, so I'll be able to report back to you after the call and let you know what the next steps are at that point. Any questions or comments?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's Evan. Sorry, I'm in transit. I won't be on the AC for a couple of minutes. Why is this something that we're waiting for staff to tell us what is going to be done? Why is this something that's being [dropped

down 00:06:03]? We have been waiting for staff to do something that was supposed to be a high level group assembled before London. Clearly this is not an ICANN priority.

Can the community not just do something, with or without Fadi telling us what we're going to do? Thank you. I'm getting very irritated by the way this is all being handled, and I really think that the accountability track is a total afterthought. I'm really concerned at the treatment it's being given. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Evan. I can't answer you. I don't know whether anyone else has a thought on this, but I think having discussed this with other people that are at the [NICE 00:06:48] Summer School, other people in ICANN, your frustration is shared. That's why we're eagerly hoping to find out what's going on on Monday. It's probably going to be quite an interesting call, with the community expressing this and asking why it's taking so much time.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, my question wasn't simply rhetorical, because I'd like to put on the plate of the ALT the idea coming up with some contingency of how ALAC, potentially in concert with other constituencies, is going to move forward with or without staff doing what needs to be done.

I'm hoping there's some AI that will come out of here, of having a couple of people that will at least be concerning themselves with the way that

EN

this is panning out, and potentially recommending to ALAC the course of action, depending on what happens in your next call. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Evan. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Although I share the frustration, I don't think we're in a position to do anything ourselves, that will have the same level of authority to make recommendations to ICANN. That being said, I do not understand why we're not already putting a process in place, so that as soon as the announcement is made we're off and running.

We know we're going to be asked to name at least one person; either recommend or name one person, to work on this group, possibly more. I really would like to come out of this meeting knowing how we're going to do that, so we don't have to start inventing something new, after the announcement is made. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. We can probably discuss this right now. We've made a move to start inviting people from TG 4 over to the Future Challenges Working Group. As I understand it, at the moment the Future Challenges is shepherding the work that we're going to do, as far as the discussions on accountability are concerned within our community. With regards to selecting people to go on that Working Group, which ICANN is very likely to create, I totally agree with you.

EN

Certainly my suggestion was going to make use of the same Selection Committee as we did for the IANA topic, but if you have a different idea or if we should issue a call for a call for a new Selection Committee I'm open for this as well. There's time for us to decide if we need to move quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm fine with nominally the same group being formed. You do want to make sure that there aren't people in that group who may want to apply. You have to do the same level of making sure you're not having applicants in the group to the extent that that's appropriate, but other than that I don't much care. That group wasn't a balanced one, and you may want to consider whether it should have been. I think you just took anyone who basically put their hand up.

I don't much care either way. In the past we've agonized over the fact that we have to have exactly the same number of people from each region. I'm not particularly upset either way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Any other thoughts on this? With regards to the group that did the selection for the IANA, I think the group worked well apart from a couple of people. I'll probably contact the RALOs concerned and ask them for a replacement person, because their region was underrepresented. That might be the easiest way. Then I'll ask the Members of the Selection Committee whether, if they want to apply for the position, then they have to resign from the group.

Perhaps first step: send an email to the Selection Committee. Ask them if they want to apply for this new group, then they're going to have to resign from the Selection Committee. Second step, once we know which positions we need to fill in the Selection Committee, then we'll fill those positions. That can be done within a week. We can be operational by the end of the week, of next week. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: From a point of view of confidentiality, I would ask all the people on the group if they want to be on the group and let them say yes or no, reminding them that if they plan to apply they can't be on the group. I don't think you want people to be declaring openly they're applying. I think the wording should be different.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Noted. Heidi, I think we need to do an AI on this. I hear nobody saying this is the wrong way to do it. I gather first AI is to email the Members of the IANA Selection Committee, letting them know that the Selection Committee will also be selecting Members of the Accountability Working Group that ICANN is bound to create.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if there are people you don't want on that group you may want to finesse that before asking them if they want to be on it again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a good point. Tijani?

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with the procedure. I think it's a good way. I have a question. Has ICANN announced the creation of this group? We are trying to select people for a group that's not yet created. We don't know how many people we need from ALAC to be on this group. I don't know. I think the first thing is to know the nature of the group and the consideration of the group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What we're looking at is to fill up our Selection Committee, regardless of how many Members of At-Large will be in the actual Accountability Working Group. I don't think it influences the nature of the group itself. It's just that it's going to take us a week to refresh the Selection Committee. The other way would be to ask the RALOs to appoint people to this new Selection Committee.

We could have said that the previous Selection Committee is now dissolved, so the new Selection Committee, the RALOs could re-appoint the same people if they wanted to. I have provided feedback to the Chairs of the different RALOs, regarding the performance of their delegate in the Selection Committee.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I prefer the first procedure; it means that we ask the Members of the Selection Committee if they want to be on the new Committee. Also, doing this with the RALO Leadership regarding the performance of those

EN

people during the first selection. Other than beginning something new, we can build on what we have, but with the small corrections.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Tijani. What I suggest then… We have the guideline on how to do it. I'll follow up by email with respective RALOs with regards to the performance of their Members, and let them know of the next steps for the Selection Committee. Olivier to email the [unclear 00:15:34] IANA Selection Committee Working Group, letting them know that the Members will also select Members of the likely ICANN Accountability Working Group. That's a good enough AI.

Let's move on and go to the next thing – ALAC work part 2. A proposal to make the Academy Working Group. That whole process is moving forward and Sandra gave an update during the last ALAC call. At-Large Capacity Building Working Group. These are all Working Groups of the ALAC. Staff to collate the data regarding the pre-ATLAS II Capacity Building Webinars, and At-Large staff to ask IT to check the number of downloads of the pre-ATLAS II Capacity Building Webinars.

Of course, all of this is a follow up to the ATLAS II, and I'd like to have all of this information prior to the ATLAS II follow up call that we're going to have; the ATLAS II debrief call. Speaking about this, this is currently awaiting further information from the ROI Working Group, so that we can debrief on everything regarding ATLAS II. I suppose those items are somehow related. Tijani, then Heidi.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I have already received the attendance of the webinars. The first part was done by staff. The second part is not yet done, and they're working with IT to check the number of downloads. The work is partly done, but there's anther part that has to be done. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Tijani. As soon as you receive that information, please let staff and me know about it. We've got another piece of the [unclear 00:17:59] ready for the follow up ATLAS II debrief. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. Two points. On the first point, Tijani, I have seen emails between Gisella and IT staff working on that. That is in progress and we should have it shortly. It's a very complicated system to get the time marks into the proper format so that we'll be able to see the information.

Coming back to the Leadership Training Program, just to let you know that we've sent a note to Olivier and it's an invitation for five ALAC Members, new and incoming Leaders, for this Program this year. Olivier's going to be forwarding it shortly to the RALO Officers. We encourage you to select one person from each RALO. The deadline for that is the 15th of August, and the location of that is going to be the ICANN offices in Los Angeles, and then they'll be transferred over to the venue over here in Los Angeles, in Century City. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Heidi. The third AI was the incorporation of ATLAS II Thematic Groups into existing At-Large Working Groups. Staff to send a reminder to all ATLAS II Thematic Groups to join an existing At-Large Working Group. ATLAS II participants to have discussion with the 2015 NomCom Leadership for At-Large standing groups, based on the result of their analysis [unclear 00:19:45] for better results for the three [unclear].

[unclear] Action Item on my desk, and I'll be performing this early next week. We have a full table, that was filled by all the Thematic Group Chairs, indicating what At-Large Standing Working Groups and Task Forces, etcetera, would be suitable for the participants. I'll be sending an invitation to each one of the Thematic Groups and letting them know they're hereby invited to join the Standing Working Groups.

Let's continue. We're now on Wednesday, where we have several General Assemblies that we're not going to go through. We'll go directly to Thursday. There's an ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Meeting, where staff is to incorporate the text from Thomas Lowenhaupt's submission in TG 5, in our Wiki page for At-Large recommendations for the second round of new gTLDs. The page has now been created and we're starting to fill that page up.

I wonder whether any of you were interested in also putting bullet points on that page, in order to remind ourselves of the other issues that we have with the new gTLD process. That basically just banks our ideas so we don't drop them or forget about them. Staff, if you have a link for that page please put it in the chat, to let everyone be able to bookmark this. Alan?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: I just wanted to remind the group that the gNSO was starting a discussion group on a very similar topic and is actively looking for At-Large participation in it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I haven't seen an invitation for this. Have we been sent an invitation for this?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know. I'll have to double-check on that, unless someone on staff knows? It may not have come out yet. I thought it would have, but I'll double-check and get back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. If it hasn't come through then please find out with gNSO Leadership, and perhaps you can act and relay this over.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will look at my Liaison report and see what it says.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great! Friday, 27th June. An ATLAS II Organizing Committee call is to be organized in order to hold a debrief. That's firmly in hand at the moment, as I said earlier. We're delaying it until we have all information. Gisella to work with the ATLAS II ROI Working Group in

creating a survey on the ATLAS II to get feedback from [some 00:22:42] participants in the various ATLAS II activities. I think that's pretty important. How is that coming along?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella's taking two days of very well-earned time off. I know she and Cheryl have been in contact and that they're planning on moving forward on this pretty quickly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next, At-Large staff, in consultation with the ALT and ATLAS II OC Leaders, to organize the debrief. That's in hand. Next, the ALT Agenda to have an item on ATLAS II feedback and debrief. Well, it's not on there yet, because we were waiting for the debrief. We did discuss this during the last ALT Agenda. ALT to discuss the issue of an ALAC Liaison to the GAC. We also touched on that during the last ALAC call. Staff to set up a call for membership of the IDN Working Group. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I've been in contact with Sarmad Hussain, who's working with the IDN Variants Program, upon request by Olivier. I now have all the information about the new scripts, and there are a lot of scripts. I've never even heard of many of them. We'll get that moving. Just to confirm, Olivier, did you want us to also send the PowerPoint that they gave at the ALT Meeting? Secondly, did you need a confirmation from Edmon? I've not heard back from him yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Regarding your first question, I think the [unclear 00:24:41] will indeed be great. It had a lot of information in there and would certainly refresh people's minds. Secondly, regarding Edmon, the IDN discussion I think was not during an IDN Working Group discussion; it took place during an ALAC…
	I think the ALAC could take the initiative and get things moving on this, even though the IDN Working Group doesn't seem to be working currently on it. I think send it, as long as we keep Edmon in the loop. It's great to have heard from you that Sarmad has come back to you on that. Sarmad Hussain.
	Next we go over to the 17th of July AIs from our ALAC call. We'll look at the open AIs in here. We go directly to Ariel Liang working with Olivier and Dev on an overall workspace for At-Large AIs. Still in progress. Staff to monitor the use of additional languages over the course of a few months. Any update on this, Heidi?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	One moment.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Let me just answer this then. The additional languages, there are obviously Russian and Chinese. We had the last ALAC call, which had Russian. I'm not sure whether that was particularly used, but at least it's now being offered. The next ALAC call will have Chinese offered as well. For the APRALO and LACRALO calls, we haven't seen any movement on that yet.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Movement is being made internally. APRALO is going to have Chinese, and LACRALO will include Portuguese very shortly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Super. Next, once a standard ALS decertification motion is received from Alan, staff can launch the process of ALS decertification and finish the process before London. That is a moot string, that we still need to tie. I think we can take this open AI as something that's done, and perhaps open a new one, and go back to NARALO and ask about the two or three potential ALSes for decertification, where the information is incomplete.

The AI is for staff to contact NARALO and ask them to complete their ALS decertification process by furnishing this information. The AI that's currently on the page should be ticked as done. Next, staff to set up the next CROPP call and send a note to the RALO Chairs and Secretariats to confirm the CROPP Members' membership. Any update on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Dev is late, so I'll need to follow up on this. I am not following this one, so I'll make a note to follow Dev and Gisella on this one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Heidi. Next is the newly assigned AIs, with Ariel and Gisella to follow up on the following two AIs. The first one is the ATLAS II Capacity Building webinars, and the second one is to ask IT to check the number

of downloads. We spoke about this earlier, so we'll keep that unchecked. The Working Group on Accountability is to be discussed on the ALAC call of the 22nd of July, with a proposal that includes TG 4 and the FCWG. That can be ticked as being done.

Next, Olivier to remove [unclear 00:29:34] regarding the drafters of the Charter. That's the diagram I put on the Wiki. I will do that. it's just a five-minute thing that has been very low on my priority list so far. Apologies for this. Then before the ALAC call, Dev Anand Teelucksingh to finish drafting the ALAC statements on the dozen or so names, two character domain names, that have submitted RSSAC requests. I think this is still in process. We'll find out by looking at the Wiki pages, and perhaps when Dev comes back to us.

Olivier to send the finalized ATLAS II declaration to the Board and Chairs of SO/ACs, highlighting the points that may be relevant to other communities. That's also something I plan to do next week. Tijani to speak to Roberto Gaetano regarding the following AI: Board Member selection evaluation update and next steps. If Tijani manages to get updates, he then needs to inform At-Large staff, to add this item to the ALAC call Agenda. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This is done. I've already spoke to Roberto and he agreed that we have a call next week. I told staff to initiate a call for next week, and I'm still waiting on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Heidi has a call set up for next week, for this Working
                            Group.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm not aware of that. I'll follow up with the Secretariat on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I've got Evan and then Alan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I just wanted to call attention to something I've put into the chat room.
                            This particular topic seems to be… The timing of it was very good,
                            considering when I typed in what I did. Given the process that we went
                            through of just having selected someone for the IANA group, and given
                            the fact we're going to be called upon to appoint one or more people for
                            the Accountability Group, and given the fact that we've already gone
                            through a long and fairly arduous process to pick the slate for the Board
                            15 people, perhaps At-Large should consider having its own Standing
                            Committee.

                            It would be a group that would be involved specifically to appoint
                            individuals in any case where ALAC is being called upon to present a
                            representative, in a formal manner. This could conceivably come up
                            again if we're being asked to send a Liaison to the GAC. This kind of
                            thing is going to crop up from time to time.

                            I'm wondering, rather than constantly reinventing the wheel –
                             reinventing a process and then tearing it down – we went through a lot

of agony to create the process, to create the Board Seat 15 Selection Committee – and Roberto and Tijani are going to have that conversation on how well that worked and what lessons are to be learned.

The same process used to do that could also be used to pick the IANA person, to pick the accountability person, to pick the people that we're going to be asked to supply on the gTLD Review Panel when it comes up shortly, the GAC Liaison and so on. I'm simply suggesting, as a matter of a combination of efficiency and relevance is the idea of perhaps creating a Standing Committee that's permanently part of ALAC.

It would be populated when the ALAC turns over – meaning on our case in LA – and we populate this group. It will sit for the year, being called upon to help appoint people to various positions and then disbanding itself until the call comes in again. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. We have Alan and Tijani. Alan, were you going to respond to this specifically?

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't going to, but now that it's there I will.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you could just stick to responding to this, and then I'll get back to you afterwards on…

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will. The rules in the Rules of Procedure on picking people were deliberately quite vague. It's completely within the auspices and the authority of the Chair to do something like what Evan just suggested for picking people for various roles. I would not want to see it mandated that it be used for every role, because I think there are times when handpicking is a far better way, depending on what the specifics are.

I certainly would not want to use the Board Selection Process, which is about as convoluted and cumbersome as one could imagine, for picking roles of lesser importance. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I do agree with Alan and I think that the Board Selection Committee, we can say it's a Standing Committee, but we need to appoint the people in this Committee for each election. That's all. All the rules are set and set, and we need to improve it, and we want to do it. That's why we call for the call next week.

I don't think that the other selections have to have the same restrictions, the same rules, as the Board Selection Committee, because sometimes I think it's very heavy to follow those rules. Perhaps it would not be very efficient to do so. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Tijani. I note from Julie that she's put in the chat, "Would the Members of this Committee need to be excluded from nomination to any of these other groups and committee?" That's a very fair question. I see an answer from Evan, probably. This is not something we're going

EN

to resolve today. It's an interesting suggestion. Does anyone object to having a Standing Selection Committee created, irrespective of what process that Committee would be using? Any objections from anyone?

ALAN GREENBERG: It would depend on what you say its role is. If you say its role is to make any selection ALAC makes, I would object.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Me too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you say [unclear 00:37:01] when it's appropriate, or the Chair in consultation with the ALAC, I have no problem with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. I was going to suggest that the Chair could call upon that Selection Committee when needed, or when the Chair decides it is needed – or the ALT or ALAC could call on that Selection Committee, if people are nervous about the Chair taking such decisions. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'll answer briefly. Number one, this is simply the idea right now. I understand obviously that picking a Liaison to a small community group does not have the same gravitas as picking a slate for the Board. My goal here is to not have to keep going back to the RALOs every time saying, "We need you to appoint people to bring back new people, to go

EN

through the process." The idea of having similar people, perhaps with fallbacks in case there are people that need to step back because they want the positions themselves.

Obviously this needs a little bit of thinking through. I'm just trying to bounce around the idea of having a Standing Group that would have the concept of a lightweight process and a more in-depth process, depending on the importance of the position being selected, that normally the…

My original idea is that the Chair could call upon it when necessary and if the ALAC as a whole believes that a particular appointment was of sufficient gravitas that they wanted a better process than just having a single-person appointment, then the ALAC could request it. Normally that would be the role of the Chair. Anyway, that was my idea. Obviously this needs to be fleshed out a bit.

As I'm hearing the fact that Tijani and Roberto are going to be going through a review of the process, something that has been… This is the second go around of this Selection Committee process. It's been very heavily thought out. It's a very heavy process, as you say. It doesn't need to be used for all instances.

I'm just suggesting the idea of rather than totally reconstituting it every three years, we have a Standing Committee that's permanently in place, that's also used for lesser appointments. It needs more thinking out. I'm just bouncing around the idea of a Standing Committee. The details are yet to follow. Thanks.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. I'd like to move on and not spend too much time on this. As you say, it's not fully fleshed out yet. What I'd ask is that you email the ALAC with such a suggestion, and we can start the discussion on the mailing list. Certainly we'd be able to hear the pros and cons. I certainly have my own views on this, and do understand that we'll need to separate the selection process for a Board Director, with the selection process for someone that we had on the Working Group.

It just doesn't make sense, the heaviness of this process. I think we all understand that. If you could please flesh this out a little bit, and put it on the ALAC mailing list, we can follow up and perhaps discuss it on the next ALAC call, if the discussion has reached far enough.

Now I have Alan and Tijani. Alan, I'll come back to you. I think Tijani may have wanted to just close off on this topic. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. I'd like only to ask a question to Evan. Do you mean that we need to appoint people to a Standing Committee for selection, that are always the same people to do so? You said rather than doing it every three years, but every three years we need to appoint new people. I think this is the best way. We don't have to stay with the same people. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Tijani. Evan, if you could flesh out the idea and take into account Tijani's comment here, so as to quote that and make it understandable…

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You're right. That's a detail that I need to take forth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Super. Back to you, Alan, hopefully on another topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll add one sentence, but I think it goes along with what we are saying. I would strongly suggest that we not [complete 00:41:47] – I think that's the right word – the issue of the Board Selection and other selection, and not try to merge the two together. I think that's just going to end up causing more problems than it's worth.

My hand was originally up on Tijani's review of the Board selection process. He has asked Cheryl and I, and we're starting to work on something I hope will be ready by early next week, but I'm not 100% sure.

The main focus will be on essentials to the implementation for things that were done for the first time this year. This was the first time we had more than three candidates, and therefore a whole set of rules kicked in for the first time. Hindsight tells us the rules were not specified with enough clarity.

The main focus – although there may be a few other things – will be on the issues where this year's BMSPC had to interpret rules that were never used before, and there were a number of lessons learnt from it. That would be the main focus for Cheryl and I, based on the original drafting work that was done five years ago. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan, for this. We'll move on with the last one of those Action Items regarding the Agenda Item on the Speakers' Bureau. Should the ALAC ask that the Speakers' Bureau list of potential speakers be expanded to include a database of well-known and vetted community experts? Staff is going to get in touch with the Speakers' Bureau to get details of who is included in that, as far as speakers. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I contacted Violet, who's working on the Speaker's Bureau. She responded that they'd need to look into that, particularly the process on how they would vet their community members. The process now is with her, with Jim Trengrove and with Janice Douma-Lange. I will keep following up on them with that AI.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. Without any further delay, let's go to the third set of AIs, and hopefully we're going to be able to make these shorter. I realize with 49 minutes into the call we're still going through our Action Items at the moment. The third one, open AIs, Nathalie Peregrine to post the online ALS application onto a Wiki page, viewable to the public, and to publicize the Wiki space. That is still unchecked, Heidi. What is the status?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We are still in communication with Legal and we're very close to getting that resolved. I really expect this to be up in the next week or so. I admit it's been a very long process, but I assure you it's nearly finished.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. I must put, for the record, that I hope I'll be absolutely awed by this online ALS application, because I can't think of any process that's been slower than this. Actually, I can, but still – incredibly slow. Ariel Liang to work with Dev and Olivier on the development of an overall workspace for the collection of AIs has been equally as slow. I guess I'm to blame for this as well.

Staff to monitor the use of additional languages. Olivier to take up the issue of volunteer repetition in consideration with other AC and SO Chairs, as an ICANN-wide issue. In fact, I have actually discussed this with other SO and AC Chairs, and I've also discussed it with some SG Chairs. There's definitely some problem at the moment, and we might wish to work towards either some kind of statement or something.

I think it's not so high on the priority list this week. I'd suggest we move this another couple of weeks down the line and then get a better view of how things are going. Certainly the issue of volunteer recognition or consideration is one that is not only an At-Large issue.

Staff to perform the initial [languages 00:46:08] of the [unclear] public comment contributions, and the New gTLD Working Group to take up the follow up work on this. Staff is to send an email to Evan Leibovitch to remind him about this. Well, the first email that needs to be sent is to staff. In fact… I have one minute remaining so I'll be dropped off in a

EN

second. If you could answer the [PAB 00:46:30] public forum analysis, Heidi? I'll redial whilst you explain this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. This is being worked on and I hope to have this completed by tomorrow, or early next week, at the latest. Then we can go ahead and move to a call, Evan, if you'd like to do that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm happy to do that. I was practically ready to move on, with or without it, but this would be very helpful.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm definitely post-ATLAS-actioned to get to it, so it's being worked on and will be done very shortly.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Heidi, let me go offline with you. if you want to start scheduling a call on the knowledge of when this is going to be out, we can work on it offline.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I'll make an AI out of that. Olivier, are you back?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Great coordination.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Do you want to move on? I'm speaking to the next one. It's the newly assigned AIs. I've just updated you on that one. That's about the Speakers' Bureau. That was to be completed, because I have followed up, so I'll check that one. Just moving down, staff to investigate with web admin if and when we can move the ATLAS II website off Eduardo's server. Ariel's working on that. She'll be back from China next week, and we can hopefully move that forward pretty quickly.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you. Hopefully that doesn't take a couple of years. Next, each one of the ATLAS II Working Group Chairs to provide ATLAS II OC Chairs with a specific piece of reporting, which should be 300 to 500 words. Summary with a focus on metrics, measures, attendance and engagement counts, reportable outcomes, etcetera. Has this been done? I saw the email go out. I haven't seen many answers to this so far. Heidi?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	I have not seen anything come in.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Could I ask that you send us a reminder please? That would be helpful. I know that many people are on holiday, so that would make it function a little slow, but we certainly need this as well, if we're going to go for the debrief. That would be very helpful information for the debrief.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, just on that, if I could just note that also Susie has prepared a document of all the recommendations and observations, that is similar to the ALAC improvements list. She will get that to you for review, and then we can use that during that call as well. It lists each item, the status, who it's assigned to, as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. Thank you very much Heidi. Next we have a consensus call – that's interesting – discussion on ICANN accountability to take place within the FCWG. Passed with no objections. That's an interesting AI. Is that just a follow up then? We have to go on with FCWG, etcetera? That's already been done, I guess. Ariel Liang and Nathalie Peregrine to follow up on the pending ALS de-certifications. I understand that hasn't taken place yet.

Heidi to add ATLAS II ROI follow up work into the ALAC monthly call standing AIs. That's going to be for the next ALAC call. Tijani to organize a meeting of the Capacity Building Working Group during the second half of August. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, yes, it is already initiated and the staff will initiate a Doodle for a call for the second half of August.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for the update Tijani. Finally, Sandra Hoferichter and staff to work together to explain the different status of the Academy Working

EN

Groups and make a proposal for the next ALAC call. There is still plenty of time for this. Any comments on any of those AIs? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a clarification on that last AI – what does she explain on that? Is that the Academy versus the Expanded Academy?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I think I'll expand on that AI and forward that to her. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Academy, Expanded Academy, and whether… I think we do need to have another call for members, because some people have moved on.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's go back to our main Agenda. Yippee. We've finished the AIs finally, after a nearly an hour of call. We're now into the Items for discussion. I'm not going through the recently adopted ALAC statements, except if anybody really insists on discussing any of the statements we've filed? I note that there were five of them, which is great.

Statements or endorsement currently being developed. Introduction of two-character domain names. You'll see that there are three requests for a huge number of domain names, including some in IDNs. I think they're in Chinese. Dev is dealing with this, and he's not on the call, as far as I understand. I suggest we save this until later, until Dev comes back. I've certainly not seen the statement on the page yet.

I think there was supposed to be a statement on there. There could be a statement there, but it's not actually there as "first draft submitted" so let's just leave it at that and wait for Dev. The last one here is Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel, the RSTEP Report on "Public Interest Registry Requests to Implement Technical Bundling in .ngo and .ong." Alan, is there any answer from you about this?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the same answer as it was last time. You might remember that the original RSEP was made in June. There was some concern raised at that time that it might involve or create some instability or other problems with the DNS. The RSTEP Group was convened – that's the Technical Evaluation Panel – in preparation for that. A comment was put out, which we already decided we didn't want to comment on.

The RSTEP has issued their Report saying they do not believe there will be any instability or other issues related to security issues introduced, and therefore we are now going out for another public comment on the actual RSEP, as opposed to the technical concept of the RSEP. I still don't think we have any comment to make. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. I was going to ask us for any issue of security and stability, or Julie Hammer to let us know whether the SSAC had been looking at this as well, or whether there was no comment from the SSAC. Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: Good morning. I don't believe there's any comment on this from the SSAC, Olivier. I'm not aware that they're looking at this specifically.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I should give a little history on this. There has been a lot of discussion over the process of gTLDs on whether it's possible to have two TLDs that are in lock step with each other, because officially the DNS does not support this. Every time the issue has been raised, and this has to do with words meaning the same thing, or words in two different languages, there's been a whole number of examples over the last five or six years where people have said, "It would be desirable to have multiple TLDs that are in lock step."

It's always been cited as, "The DNS can't do it. There's a stability issue. There's a security issue. It's a horrible thing. The world will collapse if we do it." PIR has now said they want to do it with the English and French versions of NGO, and it's given a plan on how to do it. It's been vetted six ways to Sunday, but it would appear that given the will to do this it doesn't appear there's any real problem. Thank you.

It does bring into question the effective stonewalling that's gone on for five years when others wanted to see this be introduced, but we'll ignore that for the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. What I was going to suggest was that for the time being we'll leave it as such, because the initial comment and closing time is 5th of August. We might wish, depending on what the comments are, as submitted by other participants, to lean in one direction or another. It really depends. We have seen in the past some participants argue that dotless domains were not dangerous, and that name collisions were a non-issue. We might wish to keep an eye over this one and perhaps check on our next ALT call.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll post the list of people who are on the RSEP, which may influence your thinking, but in any case, yes, it is open for a while. There is an opportunity. There were no comments filed on the first round.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Alan. Let's move on. Currently open public comments, where there's no statement at the moment. We did not comment on .paris. We did not comment on the bundling, as you mentioned just now, and we did not comment on .web. I don't see anyone who wants to comment on these, so let's move to the next one on our Agenda. That's Item #4, review of the ALAC monthly conference call.

EN

I invite you to have a look at the meeting Agenda, and I ask you whether there is any comment on the post-ATLAS II debrief… Sorry, the establishment of an At-Large Working Group on Accountability. I think we've touched on it. Is there anything else we need to discuss on this, or are we okay? Are we all set? There was a question on whether there should be a sub-group within the FCWG and it is not my understanding that there should be a sub-group, because it makes it evermore complicated.

If one is a member of the sub-group, is one then a member of the FCWG? It doesn't make sense to have sub-groups with a group that I don't think we've ever had sub-groups within groups, except in the ATLAS II activities, but that was actually a set of Working Groups without sub-groups being used. Evan and then Tijani.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I just wanted to reiterate I agree with your perception of things. It wasn't my intention or understanding that there was going to be a sub-group, that this was going to be one of the things, perhaps for a while the predominant thing on the plate of the FCWG. At this point I just want to get instructions from the ALT on how to go forward as one of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group.

It's my understanding that there's going to be a message sent out to the people of the appropriate Thematic Groups that were in ATLAS, to invite them to join the FCWG. If you want my involvement in a welcome message or anything like that, I'm happy to do that. Essentially I'm

looking for a bit of direction on how you'd like me to proceed. It's my understanding we're going to get a lot more people.

We can start the ball rolling on a general conversation about accountability, but are there some specific goals and deliverables in the short-term that you'd like me to propose to the Committee? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'll let Tijani speak and then respond. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I don't think that we need to form sub-groups, as you said, but as I said before, I think I'm okay with the FCWG taking this task. It must be the highest priority task, and the FCWG shouldn't address any other topic during this period, until the accountability task is finished. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I'm not sure whether that can be promised or done, because the accountability track might actually last a year. Does that mean the FCWG will work exclusively on the accountability track? I don't know. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Tijani, as Co-Chair you have my assurance that it will be top of list for at least the short-term and at least until there's an ICANN-wide accountability group. On a long-term basis we'll maintain not only our Liaison with that group, but also hope to [unclear 01:01:58] ALAC

EN

positions on accountability with FCWG. Can I commit that that will be the only thing that we will do until the Accountability Group is disbanded? As Olivier says, that may be a bit much.

Hopefully, especially with all the new people coming in from the new TGs, we're going to have enough people within the FCWG so that we've got enough people to go around with dealing with perhaps more than one thing at once. Having said that, like I mentioned Tijani, I'm quite sure this thing is going to have our undivided attention, at least until the dust settles from the high-level Accountability Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. I also remind every one that should there be several tasks and tracks, it's also possible at some point further down the line, if there's a need for it, that the group could be split, effectively. We've done grouping of groups together, but I think we've also split work in the past. If the FCWG has something else landing on its plate that requires a lot of work, we might just create an additional mailing list and at that point create a dedicated Accountability Working Group.

Our first choice was to put it with the FCWG until we see what the workload is. In response to your question, Evan, on what should be the first tasks of that accountability track, I think we have to wait until Monday. I'm pretty much unable… I have no idea, frankly. What we're going to see on Monday is likely to set the scene as to what ICANN is planning regarding this. There is no cross-community working group on accountability that is currently planned between the different SOs and ACs.

During the last SO, AC and SG Chairs call, Fadi Chehadé had misunderstood a briefing of some sort that was given to him, and asked why the SOs, ACs and SGs were creating a new cross-community working group on accountability, when one was coming from ICANN and it was just going to be double-duty. The response was that the community was creating a cross-community working group on the IANA issues, not on the accountability track.

The question is, the IANA issues are likely to be linked somehow to the accountability track, and until we know what the proposal is from ICANN staff on the accountability track, the CCWG on the IANA track doesn't quite know what to do. I know there's been a call this week with our members. I'm aware that… I don't know whether Tijani was on that call, but I know that Leon Sanchez was on the call.

The CCWG on the IANA track is still drafting the Charter and it's advancing at a good pace. Tijani, were you able to make it as well? I think we've lost Tijani. Okay. Let's move on. We now… Tijani, you're back. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I wasn't able to attend this call, but I sent my contribution by email. I received a lot of support in my proposals. I don't know what the output of the calls was, as I've not listened to the MP3 yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I must say, although this CCWG on the IANA issue was led as the principle invitees by the ccNSO and the gNSO, I've had very

good feedback on the performance of our Members on the Drafting Team, so it's a good case of collaboration. Of course we look forward to having that Charter done. I think as soon as we receive the Charter in final form, we have to put it on the ALAC call Agenda and we'll have to pass this as to get this thing moving, ASAP.

Let's move on and go through the ALAC call one more time. After that we had the IANA stewardship transition update. I think we've talked on that now. The At-Large Working Group update. The Academy Working Group. Are there any follow-ups or questions on that? Okay. I spoke to Sandra just a few minute ago with regards to the people that will be coming to Los Angeles. I've also asked her for a status on all the rest of the ICANN Academy thread, such as the Online Learning Platform.

I've been told that the feedback from our participants on the version one of the Online Learning Platform were forwarded a few weeks after Buenos Aires to Nora. I'll be following up with Nora now and asking her whether version two of the OLP has taken into account the feedback that was given. I'm a little concerned that we haven't had any feedback so far on the progress of the OLP website on whether this has been improved.

I would be quite upset if nothing has been done, since it has been a year since the first version of the Leadership Training Program. Hopefully we'll get some good feedback on this. Let's move on. Next we have the BMSPC update on the Board Director selection next steps that we just spoke about. ALAC Liaison to the GAC – that's also something that doesn't need further discussion. I don't see any of you raising your hand on the review of the ALAC call. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I just want closure on the Item on the gNSO discussion group on new gTLD second round. I re-forwarded the message to the ALT and I put a link in the chat. My understanding was that the liaison distribution list that the gNSO Secretariat sends out goes to our staff. Is that not correct?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi? Would you be able to answer this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Could you repeat that?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is a mailing list that has the title "Liaison 6C". My understanding is I get it at the gNSO Liaison. My understanding is it also goes to staff, because it's where they make a lot of… Do you not get that one?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Could you say that one again? I've never heard of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Liaison 6C.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I've never heard of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I re-forwarded it to the ALT, the announcement. If you could forward it to our various groups? You may want to talk to someone on the gNSO Secretariat and verify that ALAC staff, At-Large staff, get the announcements for call and stuff like that. You've gotten them in the past, so I assume you get them from somewhere, but you might want to verify.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Who should I forward this mail to? You said various groups. Which groups?

ALAN GREENBERG: At-Large? ALAC Announce? I don't know, wherever you do calls for participation. Certainly the ALAC list if nothing else, but I'd think we'd want wider than that. There's probably just a few people who are interested in the second round.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a few. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Let's move on, back to our main Agenda. We're no on Agenda Item #5, the ICANN 51 hubs. I've put 15 minutes on there, but I think we can probably do it faster. The next meeting of ICANN is in Los Angeles, and there are going to be hubs that

will be implemented for people to be able to take part remotely. The suggestion was that some of our ALSes would be able to implement hubs.

Of course, it's a voluntary thing. Some might wish to volunteer and bring parts of their community to run a hub. I was going to ask Heidi for a little more information on this, because I'm afraid I'm quite dry on that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, you have the information in your Skype chat, but I'm happy to explain a little bit about this, if you'd like?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [unclear 01:12:11] asked whether the ALSes might be interested in applying to be hubs for ICANN 51. Olivier and I responded that we thought they'd be very interested. What we'd like to find out is whether you'd be okay with us sending a note to the RALOs, either the RALO Officers first and then they can forward it onto their list, or just straight to the list? This is some of the information that we can provide.

ICANN will fund up to $1,200 for IT, AV, food and beverage and meeting room rental, if they're selected. Best practices will be determined by IT and I can follow up on what those best practices will be. There will be a

EN

video file on how these interactive hubs work, so they'll understand how to set this up. The ALSes will self-select using an online form.

Again, it's up to you to determine the best candidates, based on expected attendance, IT capability, time zones, geographic diversity, etcetera. Olivier, I think that's all I really have to offer at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Are there any questions or comments on this? I know that several of you are ALS representatives. Do you think that this is something that might be interesting for your community? I think this is all a little bit fast. I see Dev has put his hand up. Dev, welcome. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hi. A question, Heidi, is there an upper limit as to the number of these hubs that could be operated by At-Large? Or is it being given to different communities…?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's a very good question. I can take that back to Nick. Please ask any more questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this question Dev, and thanks for this, Heidi. I think what we should do, perhaps… I haven't seen anybody jump up and down or say, "Oh no, we don't want that here," but this might be something to

share with the RALOs and find out as far as the RALOs are concerned what their feeling is with their region.

HEIDI ULLRICH: While my phone is unmuted, Silvia has suggested the idea of preparing a Wiki page for this, which I think is an excellent idea. We can then send out more general information to the RALOs. Would you like that to be an AI? Staff can get going on that right away.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see no objection to this, so let's go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, and Dev, I'll ask Nick your question right away.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO: I just wanted to say that I'll take that AI and we'll create a Wiki page and provide all the information required and send it around so that all the RALOs know the details.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Silvia. Please note also the note from Dev in the chat, suggesting that this opportunity should be mentioned on the RALOs calls. Maureen also mentions it would be a good follow-up to ATLAS II to

EN

invite ALSes to maintain their connection to the ICANN Meeting. Let's move on. Thank you for this Heidi.

Now that Dev is back on the call we're going to jump back to policy development activities, and the three statements that you are about to draft or that you have drafted on the international two-character domain names. Is there any update on this please?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: What I've decided to do is consolidate… Because all these various requests are very similar, I think one statement should be issued regarding all three of them. I've almost finished the draft of it. I've just put a link to the Google Docs with this. I'm trying to think of whether to strengthen the last paragraph on it. I hope I've taken into account all the concerns, and I'll post this to the Wiki later today, very soon after this call, when I get back to the office.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Dev. Now we've got the update on this. We look forward to that first draft. Ariel is not reachable by phone but she's working in the background by email, so she'll probably follow up with me on the timing issue, etcetera.

Now, #6, Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group's LA Meeting. There is an invitation that I've received from the gNSO that mentions there will be a face-to-face meeting in LA for Members of this Working Group. That will take place one day before the ICANN Meeting, but it only would include people who are already

funded to go to LA. The current At-Large Members of this Working Group are Bob [Berling 01:19:06], Carlton Samuels and Holly Raiche.

Of the three, I'm only aware of Holly currently being funded to go to Los Angeles. I wanted to follow up on this, first to check with Holly whether she's available to come in a day earlier. Then I'll open the floor and get Evan after that. Holly first?

HOLLY RAICHE: I've already put my hand up to attend this day, so I'll be there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I don't know what the rest of this group's opinion is of this, but this is exactly the kind of disenfranchisement that ALAC gets, because our members are not financially incentivized to attend, therefore generally only those that are funded by ICANN can come. If we have a situation where they say, "We want to have everyone face-to-face but only if you're funded to come," then this immediately knocks out two of our three participants in the group.

If anyone else thinks this is fair, please raise your hand. Anyone else who thinks that this maintains the presence of At-Large within the community to the numbers it needs to, let me know. I think this is frankly outrageous. Thanks.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. I really don't know what to say. It's just one of these things.   I welcome the fact that they do have some face-to-face meetings. Of course, one of the suggestions that was made in the ATLAS II declaration was that we could make up some travel slots for topic matter leaders, both for At-Large Working Groups that would need to meet face-to-face on specific topics, or in cases such as the one that we're faced with here, where a CCWG is given an extra day to meet face-to-face.

It's interesting, because that looks like it's the first time that this is taking place, on a gNSO Working Group. Obviously, if non-gNSO people are on the Working Group, they are not able to participate. Of course, there will be remote participation, but as we know, it's not the same thing. Alan, you might have the solution or a suggestion?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have several comments. First of all, regarding Carlton, we may want to double-check. I think the Expert Working Group is still convening, so he may be there because of that, but on the other hand he may be busy that day because of that. Before we raise too much of a ruckus we may want to find out if this applies to him or not.

However, in terms of addressing the issue, the ATRT 2 made a recommendation that specifically talks about this kind of thing, that it's disadvantaging people in policy discussions because they don't have private funding.   The Board has accepted in totality the ATRT 2 recommendations. We've of course not seen any details yet, to which

one could ask the question of, "When are we going to see some details and plans?" I would say, as Chair, this is something you could raise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. I'll take two things. First, I will ask staff to find out from Carlton if he's able to go. This is an invitation for two people, by the way. Staff are to check if Carlton is able to go, since he's one of the two.

ALAN GREENBERG: He may already be completely funded for that time, or not available.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, that's the point. Check regarding him. Then I could comment back over regarding the invitation and say that this is an unfair position, as such, although you could say… Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was going to say I could give you a specific chapter and verse from the ATRT 2 recommendation if you wish?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would be great. If you could just drop that in my mailbox then I can pick it up on Monday. Thank you. Let's move on. When I said Friday I meant the Friday before the ICANN Meeting. I have to find the invitation. I thought I'd forwarded it. No. Heidi? I've got it.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: I will find that and I'll let you know the details of that meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's an all-day meeting on Friday, 10th of October in LA, just prior to the ICANN Meeting. That's what it is. Now, let's go back and go to… Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Reading Glenn's note on this – and there will be full remote participation. Even if [Bob Bruen 01:24:51] and Carlton will not be able to come, they'll be able to participate remotely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. I have said that, but yes. It's not the same thing, as we know. Agenda Item #7 – update on the transition of US Government stewardship of the IANA function. There are of course several things going on. As you know, the Coordination Group has been meeting in London. There has been some discussion post-London. Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed El Bashir have been following the discussion.

There are also several other mailing lists that have sprung up in the other parts of the ICANN and non-ICANN world – perhaps in the Internet governance world. That's rather interesting. We've got two Working Groups, basically, that are in place. The first one is a joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group on NTIA topic coordination. The second one is an At-Large ad hoc Working Group on the transition of US Government stewardship of the IANA function.

The ad hoc joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group comprises a number of people of a group. There hasn't been very much happening. I have spoken to Avri about this, since she is on that Working Group, and there is still an interest in being able to coordinate things. I note that Avri Doria has been busy on many mailing lists, including the IETF mailing list, and also the ISOC mailing list, and ICANN's own IANA transition mailing list, which everyone is able to subscribe to.

The points that she's put across are actually very similar to the points that the At-Large community have been pushing forward with, and certainly our own At-Large Working Group on IANA issues has been resonating the same views. There is some coordination that might be fruitful and helpful for this. What I suggest is we just let it go for another few weeks. I'll try myself to kick-start a few more discussions on there.

It's a small group at the moment. You're welcome, if you wish, to join the mailing list on there. Sorry, there's no mailing list, it's just an ad hoc thing. There is a Skype chat that I've created, hoping there would be some discussion on there. So far there's very little, but then out of the three Members of the NCSG only one person has been alive in the past few weeks. Both [Raf 01:27:52] and Rudi Vansnick have not been with their Skype on. That's one thing.

The second group is our own Working Group on the transition of government stewardship of the IANA function. I think it's worked pretty well so far. We've spent some time responding to some of the issues that were brought up on the Coordinating Group. The issue on the Coordinating Group was the issue of who was going to chair this. The

Coordinating Group has decided on three Chairs, three Co-Chairs, when they met in London.

Then some discussion suddenly changed the group's view, and some pressed for one Chair and one Co-Chair. We're in a bit of a question mark at the moment, as to how this chairing is going to be orchestrated. Both Jean-Jacques and Mohamed have pushed for the three Co-Chairs' position, due to the fact that the Coordination Group itself is made up of 12 North Americans, including 11 from the same country.

This is a group of 30 or 31 people, so that makes nearly half the group North American. It's a group that's supposed to coordinate the work to divest US Government interest in the IANA functions. The [optics 01:29:25] aren't great on this, and what the ALAC is pushing for is at least the Co-Chairs to be regionally diverse. This is an ongoing matter, so hopefully in a few days time we will find out what will be the final solution.

I have spoken with some Members of the Coordinating Group, who are present here at the Summer School in [Misin 01:29:48]. They've had various points of view. I've not managed to convince anyone so far, although a couple of people have said they totally understand the politics and [optics 01:30:00] of it, and they wouldn't object to the three Co-Chairs idea. Another person has told me that he thinks it doesn't matter.

It's quite incredible to hear people who think that this whole IANA stewardship transition matter is not a political matter, and think that it's

just going to be technical things that need to be done to streamline it. I don't know where they get that information from. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The more I listen to what's going on, not only through ICANN channels but also in fact having listened to the session last week, during the IETF Conference in Toronto, there are two components of this to me. One is technical and one is political. The two continue to be conflated. The one thing that I find is that everybody seems to have their own view of this. Is it purely political? Is it purely technical?

I can't talk to five people and get less than three different view of what's going on, in terms of whether or not this is a technical transition, a political transition, whether it's a transfer of a rubber stamp from the NTIA to some other body who do a similar rubber stamp…

I think part of the problem and part of why this continues to be such a mess is that nobody is even on the same page when it comes to knowing what's going on. Even the lingo – when people talk about the "IANA transfer" as if IANA itself is moving. I think there's a massive problem going on, even in knowing what's being talked about, even in knowing what's being done. It's unavoidable that some of this is technical.

When I sat and listened to the discussion of this in the IETF Group it was not political at all. Basically, the consensus within the IETF Group was, "Keep it as technical as possible. Don't make it political, because making it political is what threatens the technical stability of the system." You've literally got a room full of people with very little dissent agreeing on that, and IETF is a big part of this.

There is a massive, massive disconnect between the various parties that have a stake in what's happening. A massive disconnect between what everyone believes is actually happening. When you don't agree on the problem, then coming up with a joint solution is even harder. The more time I spend on this the more I think it's a massive mess that cannot end well, unless something is done about these differences in expectations. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for your comments Evan. Of course, you were privileged to be in the IETF meeting and you saw that firsthand. At the most, I think that this is going to be top job for the Coordinating Group. No one ever said this was going to be easy. We have to be very diligent about this, and be very reactive as well in our own Working Group, to be able to feed our Members of the Coordinating Group with the right information. Perhaps even have more people in our own Working Group.

I'm a little concerned that not many people in At-Large are currently actively involved in this. The worst-case scenario means that we might have to send people into the IETF Working Group and send people in the ISOC Working Group, and send people into any of the RIR Working Groups that are dealing with this matter.

That's if there is a decision by the Coordinating Group to have the issues discussed in parallel, in all of those various communities. Having wondered about this – because many have been saying, "Well, the functions themselves are run by the directly respective parties" – I had a

EN

read of the original 65 pages of the contract that IANA has with the US Government.

It's interesting that in one of the early paragraphs it mentions that the directly affected parties are the RIRs, the IETF, etcetera, and not limited to those. It also mentions the Internet users in there as well. We are directly affected by this ultimately, because if the IANA function doesn't work well, or is captured politically by anyone, even though this is a rubber-stamping thing, a rubber stamp can sometimes not stamp.

For strange reasons, as we might know, we have to be vigilant and be prepared for this. I frankly don't have an answer for you at the moment. All the people I've spoken to here in [Micin 01:35:25], since this is a really hot topic, from registry, to people in the NCSG, to other people around – and people who are on the Coordinating Group; there are several people here in [Micin] who are on the CG – they are all still waiting and thinking, "Well, we have to organize something."

We are still in very early days though, and that's the problem. A little bit of chaos to start with, and hopefully things will sort themselves out shortly. I realize that, as you've said, there are some deeply entrenched people there. Having seen some of the discussions I've had, with some long-time IETF-ers, they have emailed me and said, "Ultimately, if we don't like it, we'll just not have a contract with IANA and we'll take our business elsewhere."

What's particularly interesting is that yes, they could actually not even have to deal with IANA with regards to the protocols, for example, to a database to the protocols, or a database. The RIRs could actually go

EN

elsewhere, if they wanted to deal with a database of the IP addresses. It's just one of these interesting, very minefield-infested terrains. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Pretty much any of the groups could go elsewhere, should they choose to organize. That's the reality. Part of the problem with this, as Evan described, is different people have different views of what it is we're discussing. If you take a simple view, last time NTIA went out for a contract for IANA, let's say it hadn't been awarded to ICANN, but is awarded to someone else. Make it the ITU, make it some group operating out of [Micin]. It doesn't matter.

The whole operation would have disappeared in Los Angeles. The new group might have stolen some of the people, just because of their knowledge, but it would have been a completely different group. It's only IANA as we know it because of the heritage, the continuities [in 01:37:48] Jon Postel on [unclear]. We're talking about potentially awarding the contract, whomever it is who's doing the awarding, to someone else.

At the same time we're talking about who's doing the awarding, which is potentially someone else. Then you get the third aspect of who's overseeing the process once it's actually operational. It is a complex problem, and different people on the Coordinating Committee have very different views of how they want it to come out. I think we shouldn't just be sitting back. I think we should be coming up with a small rump group.

I don't care how formally or informally it's done. I think we should be coming up with what we think are viable alternatives, to feed into it. They may not be the perfect ones, but let's start putting pen to paper. That's what I think we should be doing. We made a big fuss about who we picked for this Committee.

It's not because this Committee was just going to be doing administrative trivia – "bookkeeping", to use the word that's being used for IANA now – this Committee's going to have decisions to make. Why people are surprised at that, I don't know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Just to let you know, on the homepage of our ad hoc Working Group there is a list of resources at the bottom of the homepage, which include various links, including one to the actual guidelines, the ICANN website and various other points. I think most of the Members of our Working Group have had time to read through those, although it is pretty taxing for someone who starts from scratch.

Strangely enough, now I'm also seeing discussions in the other mailing lists – not our mailing lists, but the other mailing lists – that call into question the actual information. There's also a great deal of misinformation. Some are saying that ICANN is trying to frame the issue in a specific way. The feeling is that ICANN wishes to keep the IANA function attached to ICANN, whilst others are saying they wish to break off the IANA function from ICANN and introduce a clear separation of tasks.

EN

There is a second big question, looking way further than where the CG is so far. They haven't reached anywhere yet, but the second thought is whether there should be an oversight body created, to either do oversight of ICANN's part, or oversight of the IANA part, whether IANA is attached or not attached to ICANN. Then again, at that point others are saying, "Then you're creating a new ICANN, and you've got two ICANNs rather than one, which gives you double the headache."

Clearly, it's still very far from any type of consensus. Evan and then Tijani.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I have a question of both Alan and Olivier, and also my own comment on what you just said now Olivier. I'll give the comment first, and that is that I think some of the comments about ICANN having too deep its own fingers into things. It's not totally without justification. ICANN is clearly a self-interested party in this. As such, it's no way near as hands-off the process as it could be or should be.

People have inadvertently said things in interviews and speeches, where they've talked about, "This is ours." There seems to be a feeling within ICANN that this is just a natural progression that should just be totally without change, or totally without an opportunity to do anything.

My question to both Alan and Olivier, given what you've both said, is at least you have a sense, when you're talking about the challenges of coming up with solutions – do you have a sense that at least people are on the same page with what the problem is that needs to be solved? That's not a rhetorical question, because one of the biggest problems

EN

I'm running into is that people can't even agree on a question, let alone the answer.

Until we've got a grasp of exactly what the problem is that we're trying to solve – is this a technical problem? Is this a political problem? Is it both that has some kind of tie-in together? – Until that happens, are we really going to get anywhere, within the coordinating body or elsewhere? Have they even really nailed down what the problem is that needs to be solved? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Evan. I have in my possession a diagram that was done by VeriSign, that shows the current process for a change of TLD details in the root, and it shows clearly where the US Government comes in and what it does. I will scan it the moment I get home tomorrow night, and I'll then email it over to our Working Group on IANA Issues.

With regards to your question, my sense from speaking with various parties and seeing what's happened on the emails, and on the various lists that treat the issue – and trust me, there are 100 emails a day at the moment, with people's insights and things. My sense is that the only document that's the really important document in there is the actual request from the NTIA – the original release of the NTIA [unclear 01:43:53].

The second one is the actual contract that the NTIA has with IANA. The rest of it is all open to interpretation. Any FAQ produced by ICANN is currently under question. Any FAQ produced by any other body is also

EN

under question, by different people, of course. Everyone is questioning everyone else.

There's definitely some [unclear 01:44:23] and some distrust too as well on this, as several main players – and I'm not saying here on the CG; the CG is working very well – in their own communities have been playing very heavy-handed. That's my personal feeling about it at the moment. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I do agree that it's a big mess. I agree that people don't agree even on the problem. I also agree that a lot of people think it's a technical matter, not a political one. For example, in the CCWG there is only the ccNSO, gNSO, ALAC and SSAC. That means that the other functions of the IANA will not be discussed in this group – the protocol function and the IP function will not be discussed in this CCWG.

Even if I manage to change the scope of the CCWG to be not exclusive to the naming function, in the other parts of the Draft Charter you can still feel that it's only the naming function that will be addressed in this Working Group. I made this remark and I hope it will be corrected. I am sure we need to go to the RIR Groups, and to the IETF Group, and to be there, to bring our point of view for end users, into the discussion there.

We'll not be able to give our point of view elsewhere. They are working alone, and they think it's a technical issue that they have to address alone. If we don't go with them, we'll not be able to give any input. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I'm going to be dropped in a second, so please forgive me as I get a dial-out again. We'll be very fast. In the meantime, I totally agree with you on this, Tijani, so thank you for this. I am back on. Thank you for this Tijani. I have also seen the huge push from many of the communities to separate the issues into the IETF on the one side, the RIRs on the other, for the IP addresses, and for the ICANN CCWG to only deal with the named part of the issue.

I know that certainly several Members of the NCSG are thinking they should not be separated, but we are in front of some huge push at the moment. What I was going to do was try and obtain further information from Fiona Alexander, who is the person from NTIA, that sent this whole request out. Fiona is in [Micin], so I might be able to catch her just after this call. I'll try and seek clarification.

I have these similar concerns of having to go into all of these groups separately and… Anyway, we're still far from a solution. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, I really have no problem with the ICANN CCWG not looking at addressing and things. I have a problem if they're not looking at the accountability aspects and the oversight aspects, but I don't really think there's an issue of if the protocol numbers are not being discussed within ICANN. I really don't think that's a problem. Those are going to get looked after well enough. To get back to Evan's original question of do people understand what the questions are, I don't think all the questions are understandable until we know what the answer is.

For instance, if we end up with the final solution being ICANN still has responsibility for the IANA function, and it's being carried out by roughly the same group of people as it is right now in LA, then all this discussion of technical problems, I think, is rather moot. It's working today. It's going to continue to be working tomorrow, because it's being done by the same people and they know what they're doing, and the communication [taps 01:50:02] are all in place.

If, on the other hand, the premise is not true, and it can be [unclear 01:50:08] by someone else, then we may have huge technical problems. Part of what the question is, depends on what the answer is. It's that circular part of the discussion that makes it so bloody confusing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. If I could just comment on this, you're absolutely right on that. It's still a bit hard to get clarity, and I think everyone doesn't have clarity on this. On the accountability side, there have already been statements made by individuals on the IETF mailing list, that the IETF process, which is effectively the protocols, does not need any external accountability mechanism, because the IETF already has its own accountability mechanism.

When asked about the accountability mechanism the response was that there was an appeals process that involves the ISOC Board, where the ISOC Board is asked to make a decision. I don't know how that's called accountability. It's not how I understand accountability, being a case of

a review process that usually is external to the organization. This is the level of disconnect we currently have.

With regards to coming up with an accountability process for the IANA function – perhaps an external accountability for the functions IANA perform… I remind you all this is just 12 people currently working to run this function, and one person from NTIA being in the office to rubber-stamp things that are taking place. It's effectively having that one person out and seeing who else should be in there, or what else should take place to replace that one person not being in there.

The problem that one is faced with is definitely much posturing going on from several people, and I expect that hopefully the CG is going to start being able to make a bit of sense and slow things down. We'll just work something out. I wanted to add that the Fellows here in [Micin] have been asked to take part in some kind of experiment. They were given all the details possible about the IANA stewardship transition, and they were asked to try and find a solution.

They were divided into a group of governmentals and a group of non-governmentals. They've spent, in three days, I think a total of 12-15 hours on the topic. As we speak they are finalizing their proposal and presenting it to the rest of the group. I'll find out in a few minutes, after this call, how they've fared and what the final solution was, according to them.

I must say, I was very impressed with the solutions I've seen so far, and it might well be that this was something we'd wish to study, if we were to decide on proposing our own solution to the overall topic. I must say,

I've spent the last week speaking for at least six hours about the IANA topic with Avri, with Keith, with Bill Drake, with pretty much everyone that was here.

We had an equally terrible headache as you're probably having now, since the call has now been two hours long. I just note that Dev has found the location of the diagram, which shows the function. Perhaps that would be a good picture to add to the Wiki page that works with our Working Group, and to publicize it.

If I could ask staff to please publicize this diagram? That would certainly help in their understanding as to how the process works for changing a root zone allocation and where the IANA stamp thing comes in.

I think that's all we can talk about regarding this topic. We've pretty much exhausted it. The next one is Agenda Item #8, the update on the 2014 ALAC and At-Large election, selection and appointments. I'm going to ask staff to keep us up-to-date on this one. I must admit, looking at the page, I think most people are appointed so far. ALAC Members selected by the RALOs – I don't even know if this has been updated. It doesn't look like it has been.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, I didn't catch the very last point that you said. It is being updated. It should be. Most of the RALOs have selected their incoming ALAC, or those that have not only have one nominee, one candidate – that's Tijani in AFRALO. Except for LACRALO, they still have one person to select there.

EN

The NomCom delegates – again, all RALOs have except for one, selected their candidate that they'll send to ALAC for endorsement. In LACRALO we have a few candidates that have been selected. I think that is it, unless there are any questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. Of course, the selection of ALT Members and ALAC Liaisons take place later, so the current timeline is not on the page so far.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, yes. Just as a reminder, the ALAC will need to vote on the endorsement of all of those voting delegates to the NomCom, by the 15th. The vote will be carried out online between 11th and 15th of August. That will be coming out shortly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Heidi. Any questions or comments on this? I don't see anyone having put their hand up, so we're now in Any Other Business. I was going to just give you one minute more about the [Micin] School. We've had a lot of different lectures here by a lot of different people. There certainly was a good introduction with Nigel Hickson and myself speaking about ICANN and all of the different component parts of ICANN, including At-Large.

We might actually have some new Members – some ALSes, potentially some ALSes applying, or some people applying in an individual capacity and joining our ranks. Some this year are extremely impressive. They

EN

range from people who are currently studying at university, to others who are seasoned professionals, lawyers, engineers, etcetera. There was certainly a great amount of involvement from them.

The whole program of the Summer School, including the people who are here in the Faculty Body, is on the [unclear 01:58:20] website. I'm also really thinking that this is something we need to promote – to get ICANN to do some kind of capacity building program, not only for the leadership, but also in addition to leadership training.

It would go deeper and start looking at getting programs for our volunteers, and in fact the volunteers in the gNSO and volunteers that do the heavy lifting in ICANN. We're still very far from a plan for that. I have spoken to Sandra about it, so there's much to do. Alan and then Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I understand that we have a number of people whose attendance at the Los Angeles meeting is unknown at this point, but for those who are known, do we know when the travel process will be starting? I sent a note out the other day saying that the US State Department has been having some very significant technology problems with the visa-issuing system.

Even if that's resolved, and presumably it will be soon, the delay from some countries seems to be as long as a month and a half, maybe longer. Other countries in the same region, in Africa, they turnaround in the same day. Some countries take 45 days or more. Do we know when the process will be starting?

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, I don't have an exact day of when that will be started, from the Constituency Travel side. However, the travel database for those slots that we do know has been sent, about a week and a half ago now. The first step should already have been taking place, and that's an internal step. The next step will be they'll start contacting you. In terms of visa issues, we're well aware and particularly concerned for AFRALO Members and possible incoming members.

I've been in touch with Aziz, that the two candidates for the Secretariat position should already start requesting the letter from ICANN, etcetera, just so that they'll have their visas ready to go. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I was quite amazed at the range, from same-day turnaround to 45 days in neighboring countries, but it may well have to do with political situations.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this update. We can't do anything about this, unfortunately. We also have to be aware in launching the process too early, since the

EN

people that will be selected for leadership training will need to arrive earlier, so it would be silly to look at flights and then have to change the flights after that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, if I may just continue, the deadline for the identification of those people for the leadership training is the 15ᵗʰ of August. We're hoping that deadline will be met, so the process of getting visas and everything else can start ASAP after that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, but that also means we've got another 15 days before the Constituency Travel requests are sent out.

ALAN GREENBERG: It means we'd better not waste those 15 days.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next, Tijani. I think we're reaching the end of our call soon. We are at the two-hour mark. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. You said that ICANN should have capacity building training not only for the leadership people. I want to remind you that the ICANN Academy started with the idea of having capacity building for all people – not only for the leadership people. This idea of the

Leadership Program came from the ICANN staff, and that's how we started working on this project, this subset of the ICANN Academy duty.

It's not the ICANN Academy strategy to make capacity building for the leadership only, it's the staff that made us do it like this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I don't recall it the same way. I think that originally there was an idea for capacity building, and then a political way for a first step, it was agreed that we could start with leadership training. You're very correct in saying that this was a start, and this is why I'd certainly now like to see the next phase move forward.

We should push for the next phase. It has been three years, maybe four years, since the beginning of the work. Since ICANN is in a new season and has changed leadership since that date, I would definitely expect that the response to this next step of ICANN Academy will be better received, than the reception it originally had three or four years ago.

In any case, this has been a very long call. Is there any other Any Other Business? Otherwise… I don't see anybody with their hand up, so I thank you all for having lasted these two hours on the call. It's been very helpful and we've made some good progress. With this, good morning, good afternoon and good night everybody. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]