
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the ALAC Leadership Team’s monthly teleconference on Thursday, 28th of August 2014 at 21:00 UTC. On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Evan Leibovitch and Tijani Ben Jemaa. Our Liaisons are Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg and Julie Hammer. We have apologies from Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber, Kathy Schnitt and myself, Terri Agnew. I’d 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. Do we have anyone on the line whose name we haven’t mentioned? No. Okay. Here we are. We’ve got the ALT call, which is of the standard five. We’ve got a lot to discuss today, especially after the ALAC call that we had a couple of days ago. Let’s go immediately to the review of the AIs from the ALT meeting on 18th of August. we also have some from the ALAC meeting on the 26th of August.

First, the 18th of August ALT, we have three AIs that are remaining. They are longstanding ones – for Ariel to work with Dev and me on the development of a workspace for At-Large AIs. The monitoring of the use of additional languages, and the Speaker’s Bureau. I don’t know whether we have a follow up on the Speaker’s Bureau. Heidi?

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.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I've heard back from Jim Trengrove and a few others, and basically the process for including community members in the Speaker's Bureau list will be in a process, but right now they don't know when that process will begin. I see in the AI that it lists that Olivier would write a note, and I think that might actually help, for an official note from the ALAC Chair saying that this is something that's being requested. As they gather those notes from other AC/SO Chairs the process might begin faster.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's transform this AI now then into a, "Olivier should write a note," and I guess you'll be providing me with the relevant ICANN staff details. I'll officially ask for this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perfect. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: With regards to the use of the additional languages over a few months I know that Russian was provided on the ALAC call of the 26th of August. do you have any knowledge of whether there was anyone on the Russian channel at the time?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think Oksana was there and she was on the channel.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's great that we have some people on the Russian channel. Super. These are the AIs from the last ALT, and then we've got, as you noticed, all of the other AIs have been completed. Are there any questions or comments on these AIs from the last ALT? No. Then we have to look at the AIs from the ALAC call a couple of days ago. We have a few that are yet to be done. The first one, open AIs – the one with the development of an overall workspace for the collection of AIs.

Staff to monitor use of additional languages... Then the third one here is Olivier to take up the issue of volunteer recognition in consideration with other AC and SO Chairs, as an ICANN-wide issue. I've had some discussions with other AC/SO Chairs and the response hasn't been that great on this. Yes, there appears to be an issue of volunteer recognition or consideration.

It might be something we wish to bring forward in the accountability discussions, but SO and AC Chairs are primarily busier at the moment, with the IANA topic on one side and with the cross-community working groups that are being created on the other, and thirdly on the accountability issue. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a very brief comment, which is we uniquely have volunteers. If you think about it, Members of GAC are paid by the governments or the [whoever 00:05:20] organization. It's in the interests of gNSO people to be there, as in the ccNSO, as in the SSAC. If you think about it, the one place where you've got almost 100 per cent volunteerism is us, and it just doesn't exist in most of the other organizations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you for this Holly. You're quite correct. Of course, in the gNSO there are a lot of volunteers in there as well, but a portion of the gNSO are volunteers that are paid for by their companies, etcetera, to be there. Alan, you have something to add?

ALAN GREENBERG: Something else to take into consideration, and I don't know how to capitalize on it, is there are also a number of staff people who feel that ICANN is doing a really bad job at recognizing and rewarding volunteers. Most of them are in an awkward position and can't strictly speak out, but it's not a non-existent position among a number of certain staff members. I'm not going to mention them in a recorded call, but we can talk about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, without going into details and opening a whole debate about this, what is your feeling on the Ethos Award recognition?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a one-off, and it's really nice to recognize the absolute superstars, but to recognize one superstar a year, or a meeting or whatever the pattern's going to be, I don't think really addresses the issue. It's a nice thing but it's not going to address the complete issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As a follow up, how do you all feel about the ALAC taking on the task of convening a small group and writing a two-page paper about this to

explain what we mean by “volunteer recognition”? Think of ways of explaining, detailing, what we mean by “volunteer consideration and recognition” and so on, and then being able to pass this on over to the Board afterwards. Or are we too busy at the moment? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. I’m just wondering if a quick phone call, perhaps from you to Fadi, or from you to Steve, or in a regular course of conversations, this need not be overthought. One of the nicest things that I’ve received from ICANN was the certificate that I got during the formation of NARALO, which was a document that was signed by the Board and the President and essentially thanking for participation.

By that I don’t just mean a thank you for showing up at ATLAS II, which is what people got and which was useful. I hope this doesn’t sound too frivolous, but the idea of having something signed by someone like Vint Cerf, “Thank you for your service to the Internet,” or something like that, that kind of thing goes a long way. I really think it does, especially to someone who’s known in the tech world, like Vint or Tim Berners-Lee or something like that.

Just certificates that go to either ALS leaders. Or even if it’s a discretionary thing where the Board Chair and a small group within ALAC gets together and says, “We need to recognize the contributions of various people.” I don’t necessarily know if we need to escalate this and get the buy-in from every other stakeholder group. We can go ahead with something on our own with or without having to go through the process of consulting everyone else. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Evan. Just to let you all know, I'm going to the IGF next week in Istanbul and I will be meeting with Fadi and with Theresa Swineheart as well. I think part of the mission of me being there will be for me to have a quiet chat with them on specific topics. If you do have some specific topics you want me to touch on as well, let me know, either here, or by direct email, or on the mailing list. In order of appearance I have Heidi, Alan and Tijani. Let's start with Heidi please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. Just a quick reminder that the policy department, with the stakeholder engagement division, they handle the stakeholder recognition. They've just started doing that. I believe it was two meetings ago. They've just taken over because in the past it was in another department. They get all departing leaders, whether it's an ALS RALO position or a Board Member, they will get a certificate of recognition.

It's signed by Fadi, and maybe Steve Crocker, I'm not sure. They go up and are recognized on stage at the beginning of the Board meeting on the Thursday at an ICANN meeting. Are you looking for more than that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. I'm not sure how to interpret that question. I might say jokingly, "I want Vint Cerf's signature. It goes for more on EBay." I'm kidding. I don't think it's just down to certificate. It goes down to a lot more than that. Alan's already said it in the past, but I'd like to have

it some way that's it's recorded, or maybe we can take it off the transcript of this call so that I actually have script when I speak to Fadi and the relevant people and explain it to them in a way that's clear.

I think we have said that a number of times over the table when meeting with senior staff, and somehow the message hasn't quite gotten through. Maybe it's misunderstanding or something. It's not only just recognition through certificates, but humane treatment, this sort of stuff. I'm saying this by also hearing from other SO/AC Chairs that they've also had some strange instances on how they were treated by, say, Constituency Travel, and this sort of thing.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

If I might just come in again, on the recognition aspect it might be a good idea to start with Rob Hogarth and perhaps David Olive on that, since they're really the ones who are doing that. Then if need be, bring that up the chain. That's just a suggestion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Heidi. Alan Greenberg is next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. As some of you know, I have some strong opinions on this. In case we haven't said it in this forum, Tijani and I are working on a letter and the next draft should be out today, I hope. It's a letter on travel issues. A lot of possible ways of recognition have to do with travel issues. That's one thing. I'm of two minds on certificates. To be quite

candid, the certificates that we get in ICANN when you leave a position have close to zero value, on my mind.

On the other hand, I've participated in other organizations where certificates are given out, often selected by their peers, and not necessarily associated with people leaving, which have great value, because it really is a form of recognition as opposed to a box to tick off, where no matter how good or bad a job you did, if you were in a position and you did nothing and didn't show up, you'd still get a certificate when leaving, under the current ICANN rules.

That devalues it, whereas a certificate that has meaning, or perhaps for someone who's brand new in the organization is a different thing altogether. I think a lot can be done. Some will cost money, some of it doesn't cost money. A lot of it is attitude.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Most of what I wanted to say has been said by Alan. I think the recognition is related to the travel. Also, I don't think that certificates have any value. If you want to highlight the important jobs done by someone, you don't give him a certificate. You can give him a certificate about a special issue he did, but give it to him when he leaves and there's no value. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Tijani. I'm concerned we're spending too much time on this. We'll wait for the next version of your letter that you're drafting. In the meantime I'll be meeting with David Olive next week. Obviously he's based in Istanbul, so we will be meeting. I'll have a chat with him.

I don't know if Rob Hogarth will be there or not, but I will transmit those concerns that we have, and maybe we could engage on a constructive dialogue to try and find ways to reward volunteers to actually do work on a performance basis, rather than just by saying, "You turned up, blah, there you go." David will be there but Rob will not be there. Find. Let's move on, because we're just on the Als.

Next on this we have staff to perform the initial analysis on the PAB, the public forum contributions in the new gTLD Working Groups to take up the follow up work on this. Heidi, where are we with the PAB summary?

HEIDI ULLRICH: As I mentioned on the ALAC call it will be finished this week, so go ahead and start a Doodle for next week. I'm not sure if that Doodle has gone out yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Gisella, is the Doodle ready? The next question would be, would a Doodle be better for next week or the week after next week? I'll leave Evan to answer this, whether he's okay, bearing in mind there is the IGF next week. For me it would be difficult, but of course I'm not the main component of this Working Group. Evan, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. I'll keep it quick. I agree with you for putting it off for one week, not only because of the IGF but also to give people some time to digest. If the material has taken this long to go over then I really hope that people who are participating in the gTLD Working Group will have a time to read this over and come into the meeting, ready to talk about it. I'd want to give a week from when it's distributed to when we meet. So having something for, as you say, not next week, but some time of the week of September 8th is probably preferable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Let's do this. If the Doodle hasn't been sent out yet, and I gather it hasn't because I haven't seen it, then let's have that Doodle sent for the week of the 8th, but sent ASAP so people can already see a target date when they can attend that call. Are we okay with this? Okay, let's move to the next thing then. Staff to investigate with the web admin if and when we can move the ATLAS II website off Eduardo Diaz's server.

How are we doing on this? I'm feeling a bit bad that we're piggybacking on Eduardo's server like this and we're in a stuck position. How hard is it to get an answer from these guys? Heidi?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. I have contacted web admin and IT staff and they will get back to me about this. This is in progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We're not exactly transferring the Pentagon's website. It's just a few pages, so I can't imagine it to be such a struggle. Let's keep this open for the time being. Finally at the bottom of the page, Terri Agnew to follow up on the listing reports from the ATLAS II Working Group Chairs. Terri, how are we doing on your chase after the missing reports?

TERRI AGNEW: I am down to one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. That's a good follow up. As you know, the ATLAS II Follow Up Working Group is coming a step closer to being formed, and in fact we probably will be discussing this shortly. Any comments on the AIs? Seeing no hands up, let's go to the next thing. Agenda Item #3 – policy development. We had a motion that was launched by... Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: There is a newly assigned AI that you missed. The very last one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes? Terri Agnew to follow up on the missing reports from ATLAS II Working Group Chairs?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is there another one after this?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. Did you speak about that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, done! You're in another time warp. You've missed that one I'm afraid. It's in progress. There's one more Working Group Chair to provide details. On the policy development side of thing we have two character domain names. Let's first go through that. There was one that was voted on. There was one where we'd already opened the vote by the ALAC call, so that vote is closing and we'll have a result for it. Once that result is found, the statement will be sent to the public comment process.

Then we've got two more – the .luxury one and the [.sohu 00:22:04] ones, where the ALAC is currently commenting on the statement. The motion that Evan proposed and which was voted on, and which passed during the ALAC call, came up with an accelerated procedure and therefore we don't need to vote on each one of statements anymore. However, we do need to keep a comment period for At-Large for people to be able to comment on whether there is any change from the previous statement.

The way it will work is for any of these types of statements Ariel will open up the Wiki page for it, which we always do, for any type of public comment. We'll then put the standard text that we've had so far, and we'll issue a call for comments. That will usually last about five to ten

days. If we don't receive comments, and in the majority of cases we probably won't receive comments, I'll still remind us all to review if the statement is correct for the statement that's being asked.

Then if there are no changes, no vote is necessary and the statement will be sent over to the public comment, with a different staff intro, that will refer to our initial vote and to the motion, which Evan has proposed. Ariel is supposed to provide me with the right text for this intro. Ariel, did you send it or are you working on it?

ARIEL LIANG:

I sent you the revised text, but not a long time ago.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. If it was just a few minutes ago then I wouldn't have received it. Okay. I'll follow up with Ariel on this, but that's the process and I thought I would explain it to you. I think it certainly saves on the votes, and the rest of it still provides us with a way to comment. If, at the same time, there are changes that are needed, because of specifics that are being asked in the public comment, at that point you would have to for a full vote.

Hopefully all of the future requests will be very similar, if not identical, to the first request that we received. Now, regarding the proposed bylaw changes regarding consideration of GAC advice, the ALAC is currently commenting on a statement. There are two points of view on this, and I invite you all to have a look at that statement. There's a first draft that's been submitted, and comments from Carlton, from Alan and

from myself. I'm not quite sure how we can bring the two sides together on this.

Basically, the question is whether there should be a higher threshold on the Board for rejecting GAC advice. Some believe there should, some believe there should not. Please have a look at that statement being drafted. Then on the Board Working Group Report on Nominating Committee, I think Eduardo has not yet submitted a first draft. Alan has had a look at it and added some comments on it. Carlton also has, but Eduardo hasn't drafted a first draft so we'll have to just wait on this. Any questions or comments on the policy development? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. I'll try and keep it short, because I'd like to maybe follow this up on chat, or elsewhere. The issue of the changes to the response to GAC advice, when I first saw this I didn't think it was a big deal, but as NCSG Liaison I've been subscribing to some of their mailing lists, and the civil society component of ICANN has gone simply incendiary over this. I'd just like to get some advice from other people here on whether or not this is something I should care more about than I do.

Perhaps it's worth starting a discussion on this issue. I didn't think it was a big deal. Clearly there are people in civil society that think this is a massively big deal and I'm really interested myself to know where that gap exists. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. I think Alan Greenberg might be able to provide some enlightenment on this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Presumably what you're seeing, Evan, and certainly what Fatima and Leon have put into the comment, is there's a fear that governments are trying to take control of Internet governance, and this is yet another opportunity where governments can exercise too much control or perceived as. The counter-side is that ICANN is under threat. The largest threat is from governments. If this is a way to solidify ICANN support and to justify the fact that the GAC can be effective, that's one of the things that's going to keep ICANN in existence, and with the responsibilities it has.

An ICANN, which is resistant to any government suggestions, unless the Board overwhelmingly supports that, doesn't help at all if ICANN no longer exists. Therefore I think the two sides have to be balanced. It's not just, "Governments are taking control everywhere and here's another example." ICANN literally is in a fight for its life, potentially, over the next little while, and I think we have to look at that aspect. How you balance them and what the right answer is I'm not sure.

I'm not trying to say the statement is wrong, but any statement from the ALAC I think should consider both of those aspects. In practice I think it's moot. I would be very surprised if, at any time, the Board rejected GAC advice. It wasn't virtually unanimous.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I was just going to thank Alan for that comment. I'm fully in agreement with that take on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I don't often comment on things rather than waiting until the end, but I also felt it was important to make that point. There certainly is a concern from the GAC Chair that way too many times governments act completely outside the GAC and directly between governments and other organizations without going through the GAC. The GAC is going through this – it's not a crisis – but it's a case of always needing to justify the fact that they exist and engage people to engage in ICANN issues through the GAC and not directly outside the GAC. I'll leave this over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, Julie's comment... Julie, we're talking about what it takes for the Board to reject GAC advice, not what it takes for the GAC to give advice. Julie's comment is relevant, but in a way backwards from the way I think it was meant. In theory, the GAC can only give advice if it's unanimous. In practice we know that very often the GAC will go along with a position taken by one or two members.

The fact that a GAC position can be put forward, for camaraderie or whatever other reason the GAC endorses it fully, even though it's of specific interest to a relatively small number of GAC Members, does strengthen the position that was put forward by civil society and the people who drafted the statement. That is, it should be easier to

overturn a GAC position if it's perceived as really not being a position of all governments, but one out in the left field.

They don't differentiate between these two. Once it's a GAC position, it's a GAC position. I think the GAC strengthening their processes would make the Board's reaction to them a lot better, a lot easier to handle. We do have some problems. My hand was up for something else altogether, by the way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just closing up on this topic then, I'll say one more thing. It seems that the proposal that was on the table there was triggered by a follow up of the ATRT 2 recommendations. Is that correct, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. This is a Board GAC Committee that has been working diligently for the last several years, and this is one of the recommendations that they've agreed on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a concern that if the ALAC comes out with a one-sided answer and absolutely rejects this, in effect the ALAC would be going against an ATRT 2 recommendation and against the GAC Board Working Group, where it appears that both the Board and the GAC are happy with it, where we know they're on opposite sides of the fence. Really we might be ignored altogether.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think in the current dynamic it's essentially throwing a bone to the GAC, because I don't think it makes any real difference. Board votes are rarely evenly split.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ultimately the vote is in the Board's hands. They could just say, "Look, we need at least nine people. Who's going to go in favor? Who's going to go against?"

ALAN GREENBERG: There are occasionally cases where the Board is split.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, let's move on. The next thing you wanted to talk about, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. You had finished off the policy discussion and there was one more we hadn't talked about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, there's one more that we haven't spoke about, and that's the Internet and rights protection mechanisms and the name collision mitigation framework. It's marked as "no statement" at the moment, because I remembered vaguely from memory that you had said, as our gNSO Liaison, that we did not need to file a statement. You might have some more thoughts on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: The gNSO Liaison has not been asked on this one, and I certainly didn't issue a comment. I'm not even sure I know fully what it's about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe I'm having these dreams about ALAC calls and I patched you in there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have a strong opinion at this point. I haven't read enough about it. I don't know if anyone else does either. Name collision sounds like an SSAC issue, but I'm just trying to push it onto someone else.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Actually, Julie, I wondered if you've managed to look at this, since there was name collision mentioned on there – the magic name collision word. Is that something outside your remit? Julie Hammer?

JULIE HAMMER: Olivier, I must admit I haven't looked at it in detail. As you probably know, I'm in the process of about to depart for overseas, but I'll see if I can have a quick look at it in the next couple of days.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll do the same.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we're finished with the policy. The next thing is the review of the ALAC monthly call that we had. It was a very long monthly call and I think we covered an enormous amount of ground. Looking at the different lists in there, one thing I had mentioned during the review of the current ALS applications was the fact that a couple of ALSes were decertified and a number of RALOs had notified me of their intent to look more into their current ALS list and actually think about decertifying some nearly inactive ALSes – in other words, the ALS still exists.

It's not a case of the email bouncing back, but it's a case of being a dead horse in that the ALS basically does nothing at all. That has to do with the performance metrics of the RALOs themselves. I understand several of the RALOs are revising their Rules of Procedure and are including some kind of performance metrics for their ALSes. I also realize that this is not ALAC Members. It's not performance of ALAC Members; it's performance of At-Large structures and it's a controversial subject and topic.

I was going to ask here whether there was support here from all of you for us, as in the ALAC, to engage with the RALOs or even perhaps me to engage with the RALO Chairs in finding out where we are with regards to these performance metrics. Perhaps we could even launch a process, try and find out a timetable that they'd like to follow, etcetera, etcetera.

We have a very significant growth in At-Large structures, but the more ALSes we have I'm concerned it certainly puts more pressure on quorum and having within those ALSes a significant block that doesn't take part in anything will certainly cause problem in the future, as far as quorum is concerned. Floor is open. Alan first.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. My recollection is that there are some requirements for what ALSes must do once they are ALSes. I don't believe we've ever really policed any of those. They're not particularly onerous but they do exist. Things like the ALS web presence has to acknowledge its existence of it being an ALS, and they need to communicate with their members about ICANN type things. Number one, we have some rules that we're not necessarily enforcing.

Certainly for NARALO, which is the one I'm most familiar with, we do have some performance criteria, but they're pretty meager. They're voting once every two years or something like that, and that's pretty much the only one we enforce, because the one thing you contribute to policy discussions would probably decertify most ALSes.

So we have some rules that we're not necessarily using, and my personal position is – and I've said this to a number of people so it's not going to be a surprise – after seven years it's probably time to look at them again and decide what the criteria is for becoming an ALS and what the criteria is for remaining an ALS. I think we're going to start that kind of discussion. Olivier, if you would like to start it, while you're still here, that would be delightful. Then I can blame it on you, assuming I become Chair, or someone else can, if they become Chair.

I think it's time. I think you're right. The large number of ALSes is a double-edged sword, and I think we're going to have to be able to demonstrate that these organizations do have an interest in ICANN, and that interest extends as far as actually doing something.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. One quick question for you, regarding the ALAC Rules of Procedures, are ALSes mentioned in any way in there, as far as their performance is concerned?

ALAN GREENBERG: None whatsoever. That's not quite true. The rules for certifying and decertifying ALSes are an integral part of the Rules of Procedure. They're in another document but they are an integral part and that's required by the bylaws. The [unclear 00:40:27] documents and processes associated with ALSes do talk about what the requirements are. We didn't write new rules when we wrote the Rules of Procedure, but there are things pointed to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that makes sense. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. This is a very important point. For your information, AFRALO is doing a review of its Operating Principles, and one of the points raised is the metrics and the performance criteria. Yes Alan, there are rules, but there are no metrics to measure the performance of the ALSes. I think we need a minimum of harmonization. That's why, Olivier, you're right. You have to do something with the RALOs, first of all to see if there is something being done now about the metrics of performance for each RALO, and second to try to find it coming around for all the RALOs.

You all remember when we discussed it inside the Secretary Meeting – I don't know which meeting – it was a very controversial issue because according to some leaders of RALOs they absolutely refuse to speak about [unclear 00:42:15]. They say ALSes are volunteers and we don't have to ask them for anything. They do what they can. Someone said they are active elsewhere and so, "They're good. I don't have to speak about their performance."

This is something we have to harmonize. We have to find a common ground and find a minimum that every RALO has to consider; for the metrics and for the performance criteria. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. It's interesting that you mention this. I'm thinking specifically of some of the work that the Internet Society has done with regards to their Chapters and what constitutes minimum Chapter participation and ongoing Chapter development. There again, the discussion that took place was very heated, with some ISOCs going against the remote idea of being classified as being a good, a bad, or a significant Chapter, or being delisted or put into redetermination because they weren't moving.

I'll take Maureen Hilyard and then I'll come up with a suggested Action Item. Maureen, go ahead. You have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Olivier. Just going back to the earlier comment that was made about whether ALAC should become involved in this stage in what

RALOs are doing, I think what's actually happened is that when we were doing the ALAC metrics we were definitely asking RALOs to consult with their ALSes and get feedback from them. I think what's happened is that RALOs are now looking more inwardly at the performance of their ALSes, because it may appear that some ALSes are participating more than others that we're not hearing from.

I know that in APRALO we've just reviewed our Rules of Procedure. I'm not quite sure off the top of my head if we want to look more at ALS performance standards. As has been raised by Tijani there needs to be minimum standards, but I think it's really important that the ALSes know what these are and that they know what they risk if they don't participate as well as we believe they should in order to gain recognition for their accreditation with us.

My point being that we've got to allow RALOs some time to sort out within themselves about how they see ALS performance as a measurement. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Maureen. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that as an Action Item we have to state that a common meeting with all the Secretariat, all the RALO Leadership, has to be done regarding the performance criteria and metrics, so that we can try to find the minimum criteria and metrics we have to have for each ALS in each region. I know there is differences between RALOs, there are

different cultures, and I understand the differences, but there is a minimum that we really need to have for each ALS to know the performance of each ALS. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Tijani. I'm asking staff via chat a question. I know there is a meeting, a breakfast meeting I think, with the ALT and the RALO Leaders that is going to take place. I was going to ask whether this is ALT plus RALO Leadership? I wonder whether this is the time when we, as the ALT, could speak to the RALO Leaders about that. I like your Action Item Tijani on trying to find common ground between the RALOs for ALS performance metrics.

I'm aware that several RALOs are rewriting the Rules of Procedure and are therefore introducing performance metrics. I have concerns that we have different performance metrics for different parts of the world, which would certainly introduce a problem, because I would hope that all ALSes are treated in the same way. If some ALSes are treated in a different way because they're in a different part of the world and are therefore constrained to a different set of performance metrics, I'd be very concerned on this.

Barring the fact that I am understanding that the ALS performance may be hindered by their geographical location as well, due to some locations being treated less fairly than others, as far as time of calls, etcetera, is concerned. Back to you Tijani, and then we'll have Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Just to confirm that the meeting in Los Angeles will be between the ALT and the RALO Leaders.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Maybe that's our way forward, to push this forward. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to reiterate that there are rules that span all RALOs. We might want to revise those rules and we may actually want to follow them. In addition to that, some RALOs have added additional rules. Your issue of, "Should we have differentiated rules between different RALOs?" is an interesting discussion that we need to have. There certainly are common ones across the RALOs, and it's within the power of the ALAC to change those, add more, take them away, whatever.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Tijani, your hand is still up? That's it? Okay. If I hear correctly, are you all okay with a breakfast between the ALT plus the RALO Leaders? That will be in a separate room and we'll just explain this to them. It will probably be better than doing this via conference call or email.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do need to do our homework ahead of time and make sure we know what the rules are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: First step then, shall we ask the RALOs to provide us with details of what their rules are with regards to performance metrics? Step number two, we have to find the relevant Rules of Procedure on the ALAC so we've got that at hand as well and know what those metrics are and how it relates to the performance of ALSes. Step three, staging the breakfast meeting in the restaurant. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, I think that the breakfast will be a very good introduction of the subject for the RALO Leadership, but we have to have a follow up call to discuss [each 00:51:47] the point and to try to come up with a common ground that we cannot go lower than; a minimum criteria.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. That's a good point. I don't know... I will not be ALAC Chair after that week, and so I'll have to leave it to the next Chair to decide on whether there will be a conference call. I might just leave instructions and say I hope that there will be a conference call following up afterwards. Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The next Chair is here, so the transition will be very smooth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not sure where the next Chair is. Just to say of course that hopefully the next Chair is with us, so he's well aware that this is coming up. I'm just seeing numbers for the breakfast in LA. There will be 18 people for the breakfast. That's a lot of people, but I'm a bit reticent of just having myself and the Vice Chairs in front of all of the RALO Leaders. I think it should be a coordinated thing, especially if we have to be on more than one table.

Maybe each one of us could take our region's table to explain the view behind it and so on, and then have an overall discussion among ourselves. Okay, let's continue and have a look at the next thing. Staff, do we have all that written down? Gisella to figure out the logistics of an 18-person breakfast. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani, it's the worst thing we can do if each Member of the ALT takes its region and discusses it then. We don't need them to be divided by region, because we need to find a common ground between regions. I don't think it would be a good thing to discuss this issue while we're divided into regions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You correct me very well. Thank you Tijani. You're quite right, and so I take that idea out of the pool. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. Just to comment that you might raise the issue at the breakfast and then that afternoon there's also a working lunch for all the RALO Secretariats. They might go into further discussion at that lunch.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. As a follow up discussion that would be fine. Let them digest the morning thing and then come back afterwards for more. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I would think that this is an issue that is going to take a fair amount of time to come to closure. It's not going to be resolved in the meeting in LA. I think we're going to have to have some substantive debate in ALAC and in At-Large as to what we want from our ALSes and what we need from ALSes, to be able to do our job effectively, and justify to ICANN that we are representing user interests. I don't think it's going to happen in an hour discussion.

I think we're going to go through a process of people making proposals and discussing them, and coming up with a set of values that we can all accept at the end, or most of us can accept.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Alan. I see agreement from Tijani on this. Let's move on now. I'm getting concerned we're drilling too deep into the hole and therefore we're not going to be able to finish on time for this call. We've already spent an hour going through the ALAC call Agenda that we had. Further down, we've got the Charter Design Team Cross-

Community Working Group. I'll provide a quick update on this in a moment.

The update on the post-ATLAS II implementation activities, this is proceeding as I mentioned during the ALAC call. Do you have any comment on this? We've had another call since. We still have 20 recommendations to go through. Allocate to either standing At-Large Working Groups or to our own Follow Up team. Our Follow Up Team is going to need to be created and I wonder where we are on that. Heidi, do we have progress on this?

I think there was a request to create the mailing list – and the Wiki page is already there – and to get the Chairs of the Working Groups to subscribe to it, and then send out a call for any more people who wish to be part of that Team. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry Olivier, which group are you referring to?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The ATLAS II Follow Up Working Group, the ATLAS II Implementation Task Force. We need to create this. We've already got the Chairs of ATLAS II Working Groups and TGs that are part of it. We need to have a mailing list for those, and all the AIs...

HEIDI ULLRICH: That was from yesterday, so it's in progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was expecting that it would be done in a flash. You've had 24 hours!

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. We'll get it done in the next 24 hours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. I take your word on that. That's all proceeding forward. Then we had a review of the At-Large meeting at the ICANN 51 Meeting. We've got that during this call as well so we don't need to go through that. Working Group updates went, I think, quite well. We had another call on the transition of US Government stewardship of the IANA function. That took place yesterday, I think. The progress in there is slow on this, and we are somehow in a bit of a tight spot, having had the Charter of the ICG out there now and pretty much frozen.

We've had to work on a request for proposals, which definitely restricts the input from any non-operational communities. We've tried to put some language in there. The feedback was to water down the language even more, and I'm not comfortable with where we are, but I have a feeling we can't get any more than what we have at the moment, because of the fact that we're not getting any help from any of the other communities on the ICG that are not operational communities.

The operational communities are plowing forward at great speeds, pushing for things, and everyone else is silent. We're basically then seen as being the stumbling block, the ones that want to delay everything.

I'm a bit concerned, but I don't know how we can play this without really burning our bridges in that group. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. ALAC, At-Large and ICANN is a large body. If we're going to be consultative, if we're even going to be nominally bottom-up, this takes time. The fact that the technical communities, the operational communities, they know what they're doing. They basically have an interest in keeping things as stable and as unchanging as possible. I saw that myself in person at the IETF Conference in Toronto that was held recently. Overwhelmingly, the interest is not political. The technical interest is in minimizing disruption and minimizing change.

When you don't want to advocate change then there's not much to architect in terms of what you want to do differently. They have an interest in not making change, and the fact that they're not proposing change makes their method of proceeding very easy to do. This is what we're up against. You can say we may irritate people by saying, "No, there's something more to this." I don't know if there's an easy answer, but the approach from the technical communities is pretty clear, it's pretty transparent.

They know what they want. They know the rationale behind it. It's up to us to say, "We have confidence in the technical community or there's something more to it that we need to address." I really don't know how we can do this differently, and if it means we're the only voice in the room saying, "Slow down," then maybe so be it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Evan. Any other thoughts or comments on this? I think many of you were on the call as well, so we've already had plenty of discussion and follow up on it. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've heard an awful lot of angst, but I haven't heard a lot of where do we think we're going to say something different than what other people are saying. I really think we have to start hypothesizing on what some of those things are. If we don't want to be purely reactive and wait until the de facto proposals are in and then try to tear them apart – if indeed there's anything to tear apart – I think we need to start thinking out of the box a little bit and coming up with situations where we think our positions may differ from others.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Maybe a first step then would be to ask questions of our Working Group looking forward at what our point of view is on several topics. For example, how does the Working Group feel about splitting of the IANA functions? How does the Working Group feel about an overall accountability review, or about the accountability replacement of the US Government in there?

I think you also touched on a couple in the call earlier today as well, regarding the fact that ICANN is a component part of the IANA topic, and yet with regards to numbers and specifically protocols, that could be outside. Then, who pays for this? Christopher Wilkinson brought the question forward. Who pays for the IANA functions in the future? If

today they are provided on a cost-free basis, what happens after that, if you start thinking about the split of the functions, etcetera?

We definitely need to define what our consensus positions are on that, and be ready for any kind of proposal that's out there. Is that how you saw it, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess that's part of it. We're hearing different messages. We're hearing discussion that people want to separate the functions, and at the same time we're hearing from Evan that the technical communities don't want change. Well, those two are in opposite directions. Either we're going to change how everything is done and is done by different people, which is going to change, or we have stability, which implies that we're going to keep the overall model, and how the contract gets signed and that kind of stuff is certainly a question.

I'm not sure where we're going on this. I think this kind of discussion, but it's got to be wider than the ALT... We need people to put a hypothesis down and see if we have any consensus, any strong feeling on some of these things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I think firing off an email... As the Chair of that Working Group I could fire off an email and start us down that road. I think that was one of the AIs, or at least one of the consensus that we found today on our Working Group, which was there is a need for us to now start building

things forward and working on the future rather than just working reactively. You need to be proactive. That was one topic.

Then further down the list, Future Challenges Working Group. I think Evan and Jean-Jacques are just waiting for the accountability process to go. I can just let you know that we're going to launch the accountability, the selection of the person that will go on that accountability group. This is going to be launched very soon. I'm still just waiting for a confirmation for a Working Group Member to fill a vacant spot from NARALO, I think. I can't remember which RALO it was. Then we can start moving forward on this.

Certainly we have time at the moment. There was a letter that was co-signed by all the Chairs of SOs, ACs and SGs, that was asking for more time for the community to be able to review the proposal that I shared with you all during the ALAC call, and come back with some questions or amendments or things we wanted done differently. Although I mentioned that on the ALAC call I haven't had any feedback from anyone so far, and I wondered whether anybody on the ALT had some feedback on some points we should make on there.

Certainly the writing, the drafting of the Charter for the Accountability and Coordination Group... Why would this Charter be drafted by the Board? That's a question. Why would a Charter for the overall Cross-Community Working Group also be drafted by the Board? These are two points that other Chairs of SOs and ACs have already conveyed as well. Anyway, the floor is open. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. First of all I wanted to ask you, you sent out a follow up email saying that because the deadline's involved, the same leaders that have written that letter were also considering a follow up with a formal request for reconsideration. You sent that out to the ALT. I responded. Obviously people are really upset to the point of going to this step. I wanted to ask what your thoughts are on conveying this and moving ahead with it.

Also, since you and Alan, and some others on this call, were involved in the Future Challenges call – and Holly unfortunately was missed, she couldn't be there – I wanted to get the feedback from the people that were in on the Future Challenges call, whether or not you believe that the direction that we were going was tackling this as an issue of trust, rather than as accountability as a path towards trust. Are you folks happy or satisfied with the path that the Future Challenges Working Group is taking in that direction?

It's a novel one. It's in keeping with what the Committee was set up to do, but it may not be answering the original question. Any feedback would be appreciated at this point. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Evan. Next is Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. You are speaking about the proposal of ICANN's decisions and proposals. They have already decided on who will select the seven experts, and they have already decided that there will be

seven experts, so they are deciding and they are implementing. I understand that the SO and AC Chairs have sent a letter speaking about proposals, but I don't think that ICANN staff proposed something. They decided on some things. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. Actually, what appears to have happened is there was an answer from Steve Crocker about this. Receiving such a letter from the SO and AC Chairs is a significant thing. It stops the process in its tracks, at least momentarily. There hasn't been any further follow ups behind that point. It looks as though staff is ready to do something; maybe some amendment or so one, but they obviously have to first discuss it with the first.

Of course, we all understand the concern of the delay that this is bringing to the accountability process, but in effect the ALAC seems to be the least upset from all of the SOs, ACs and SGs. In fact, some in the SGs are extremely upset. I don't know whether that stems from something deeper than just this specific process, but the gNSO has been at heads with staff and the Board on several matters. We'll just have to see on this. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll point out two things. First of all, on the fact that the Board is writing Charters, when we raised that question when it first came out Rinalia's answer was, "We didn't ask for it, that's staff said that." That may be well changeable. Something to think about.

Regarding the advisors – I don't know what the total number of AC/SOs are; nine or something, eight? – having seven advisors is interesting in that it allows the advisors – and I'm presuming they are going to be advisors and not Committee Members in full right, and the call for applicants for advisors has gone out and so you can look at the words – that allows them to cover a wide range of subjects, but it might be overkill. I note that the documents say, "Up to seven."

The four people who are doing the selection are well known to us, and there's nothing stopping us from lobbying them and suggesting that seven would be a bit much. Just a thought.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. I'll respond with regards to lobbying those selectors. I think that having been in the seat it's quite irritating to get lobbied like this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, maybe "lobbying" is the wrong word. Stating an opinion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, informally.

ALAN GREENBERG: Formally or informally, we can make our words known. They're acting as extensions of us, doing the work for us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So far, if the ALAC was to draft a letter in response or put some points forward to the group of SO and AC Chairs saying, “The feeling, at least on the ALT, is seven advisors with nine members of the Working Group appears to be an overkill. The second thing is we some real concern about the Charters being drafted by the Board, when it appears that the Board might have not really asked for that to start with.” Maybe we shouldn’t even expand. We should just say, “We have concerns about the Charters drafted by the Board.”

Tijani, you have your hand up. I was going to touch on one thing. Evan mentioned the second letter, and the second letter is of concern as well at the moment. It’s a letter that the NCSG wishes to send, and Rafik send this to me and said, “Can you give us an answer within 48 hours whether you want to co-sign this?” I have concerns that the letter asking for reconsideration is a significant thing and we probably require – and tell me if I’m wrong – but I thought this might require an ALAC vote, or at least endorsement by the ALAC.

I don’t think that the ALT has the ability to engage the ALAC into a reconsideration request, which is a significant step, rather than just a letter of SO and AC Chairs. First Tijani, then Alan, then Evan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. First of all, as an answer to your question, yes, I do think that it needs an ALAC endorsement, because it’s speaking about the [unclear 01:16:14]. I would like to highlight the fact that it is about the accountability of ICANN – [unclear 01:16:20] the accountability of the Board of ICANN and the staff of ICANN. I can’t understand how the

Board of ICANN can write the Charter of this group. I don't understand how the staff of ICANN can decide on the process. It's just unacceptable. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Tijani. Next is Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are three things. With regards to what Tijani just said, obviously someone has to draft some words. The question is, who decides on what those words are and who passes judgment that they can't be changed? The reality is, you actually have to have people doing the work. You can't have a nebulous bottom-up organization. I'm not worried that the words got written. I'm worried that they're unchangeable because they got written. That's a real concern.

I don't remember what my point number two was. My point number three is that Item #6 is of minor importance to me and we may want to get to it before we leave.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Alan. I will probably need reminding of that as well. Evan Leibovitch next.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: All right. I'll try and keep my comment short. The request for reconsideration, if I read the letter correctly, was of timely nature,

because of the short deadline necessary to request reconsideration. That's why I thought the pressure was on. Secondly, this seems to be a signature of the community leaders making the request as opposed to the constituencies themselves. My guess is that the NCSG itself has not had the ability to take a consensus on this either.

This has all been happening very quickly. The original letter was simply from the leaders. The follow up letter, as I saw the draft, was also from the leaders. They don't imply a vote taken by the constituency either. Having said that, the whole deadline of how fast the reconsideration request must come in is of concern. On the other hand – on the third hand! – Olivier, it sounds like having a letter come in from all of the constituencies together appears to have gotten the attention of the Board sufficiently, to try and calm things down a bit.

That may be enough, but in terms of the request for reconsideration this, like so many things in ICANN, just happens in such a way as to really, really conclude useful bottom-up. Having said that, I must leave the call within about three minutes. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Evan. Can you just tell me now then, would you recommend that we go along with the request for reconsideration?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Personally I'm okay with that, but that's me personally.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: You asked the question. The point I forgot was the ALT only has the rights that the Chair has and delegates to the ALT. The Chair does not have the right to speak on behalf of ALAC on something like this. The Chair can speak on behalf of the Chair, but certainly not on behalf of the ALAC, without ALAC taking formal action. My personal position is we need to get – and perhaps already have gotten – the attention of the Board.

We do not want to go through a formal reconsideration process. If nothing else we don't have the stamina, the expertise or the time to draft the document that a reconsideration request would require.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. My understanding, I think, from the letter, was that the NCSG was going to draft a reconsideration request themselves, and they just wondered whether we could sign on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: If the "we" is ALAC then you'd have to go to ALAC for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: To a full vote on it? Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. I will respond to Rafik Dammak about this. In the meantime, regarding the letter that was sent by the SO, AC and SG Chairs, and which received a response from Steve Crocker, basically saying, “We’re looking at this and we might be ready to listen to you for further input,” the next stage is for our input to move forward. The two that I’ve got so far – and I’m repeating them: “Seven advisors with nine Members of the Working Group is an overkill,” and also, “We ask that the Charters not be drafted by the Board.”

Okay. I’ve certainly got a direction for this. Thank you. That was very helpful. Now I think the rest of it, IGF activities in Istanbul, we don’t really have much to say on that. Let’s proceed forward. Let’s go back to our Agenda. On there, the second part was the Cross Community Working Group Charter Design Team. The next steps for this. We talked about this today on the IANA Issues Working Group and the processes that follow. We’re going to have a 24-hour last call for comments within our own IANA Issues Working Group.

If nobody has any amendments that we might wish to have on that Cross-Community Working Group Charter then the IANA Issues Working Group will be sending a note to the ALAC recommending that this Charter will be adopted. A vote will be taken on this. If a vote passes I think we have to act quite quickly. It might be a three-day vote, or maybe a five-day vote. Not all the SOs, ACs and SGs have signed up on that.

We can do a five-day vote starting, I think, on Monday next week. Throughout all of next week ALAC would vote on the Charter and that Charter would be ratified and we could basically send it back to the gNSO and ccNSO. If, on the other hand, any Member of the IANA Issues Working Group has a specific comment or worry about something, or recommendation, then we might have to go through a longer process and consider first the comment, before moving forward. That's the process on this. Any questions on that?

Incidentally, could I ask staff, as a follow up – and I might be wrong, because I didn't check the mailing list – I noted that there was no email on the IANA Issues mailing list, and there should be an email asking for last comments on that Cross-Community Working Group Charter? The deadline for comments, I think I said on the call, was going to be 16:00 UTC or 14:00 UTC tomorrow. I see Heidi has dropped. I will resort to other staff taking a note to that and being able to follow up. Is it Terri who's supporting the IANA Issues Working Group?

TERRI AGNEW: I am.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Are you clear with things? Is it okay?

TERRI AGNEW: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Thanks. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Also for this process it was decided that I will send the email sent by Patrick to approve the Charter from the [unclear 01:25:31] and propose an amendment about [unclear]. I have it now and because [unclear] I can tell you that it is a very... It's only to improve clarity. He's proposing that we add the following words for the root zone, and this appears at the end of Item #4 of [unclear 01:26:02] scope. It's only to improve the clarity. I will send it to the list and ask them if they want to second this proposal. That's it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Tijani. I'm concerned we're now drilling into the topic, whilst we should have just done the helicopter view a little more. Julie Hammer?

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, just to add to what Tijani said, the person on SSAC who suggested that very minor amendment, we recognize that many earlier opportunities had been available to provide that suggestion. As many of us do, people leave it to the last minute to provide that. Because it was in some ways quite a trivial amendment, what the SSAC didn't want to do was hold up approval and moving forward of this Charter by making a very hard suggestion that that change be made.

Really, what we didn't want to have to do is force other communities, who've already approved the Charter, to have to go back and reassess

their approval. Basically we said, “If you don’t want to incorporate this change, don’t worry about it. It’s not critical.” I was very clear with the SSAC that at this late stage, when we sent it for final approval, that really only issues of major substance should be brought up, and this wasn’t one of them. Thanks Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Julie. Tijani, please follow up with our mailing list on this as well, to let us know. Julie, are you on the IANA Issues mailing list?

JULIE HAMMER: No I’m not. Actually, I’m not sure. Staff would have to check.

TERRI AGNEW: I will check, Julie.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let’s move on. I note with disappointment that we’ve lost Alan for Item #6, but that might just shorten the call a little more. I think the process is moving forward on that. Item #5 – the review of the At-Large meetings in ICANN. We’ve had already a full review, a quick review of those meetings. What else do we need to speak about on this, Heidi? Or should I say Gisella, since it’s Gisella who’s dealing with the scheduling?

I know there’s been some back and forth movement, and there’s certainly been some discussions because of the GAC meeting with the

Board having been moved to Tuesday, and our meeting having been moved to the Wednesday. David Olive published the movement of those community meetings, and there's been some pushback from the BC and from other people. It's the usual tug of war that happens in the creation of these meetings. Gisella, you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Hi Olivier. We're still working on the schedule. With regards to our meeting with the GAC we'll know tomorrow hopefully, as they'll be discussing their schedule. I don't believe it's been confirmed yet whether the GAC are meeting with the Board on the Tuesday morning. I saw that that would possibly be implemented for ICANN 52, or that was the request.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Any other updates that we're needing on this?

GISELLA GRUBER:

With regards to our schedule, further to the call that we had yesterday with you and then continued with the staff call, we'll send out a schedule tomorrow, possibly to the [all 01:30:23] to give them an idea of the draft schedule that we have so far. We have until next Wednesday to submit meeting forms, and I think we'll have the final schedule – well, the final schedule until the May schedule is published – by early next week. I'll send this around to the ALT mailing list, as soon as I've consulted with Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Are we going to have a meeting with the NCSG as well on there?

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, yes, we will be meeting with the NCSG. The time of it at the moment is the time that we have previously had, which was the Thursday lunchtime. I am working with Glenn on this to make sure that there's nothing that will clash. So far so good. She's also having a few issues with scheduling their meeting. I'll keep everyone posted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's all we have regarding the LA meeting. Are there any questions or comments on this? I don't see anyone. Okay, so let's move on. Heidi, you asked whether the meeting should be the ALAC plus NCSG, or the ALT and NCSG Leadership. I think this time full ALAC with NCSG, for two reasons. The first one is because we're arranging this a lot earlier, so we're more likely to get a proper room for this.

Secondly, it's important at the moment, with those topics about accountability and the topics of IANA stewardship transition, that there certainly is some alignment between the ALAC and the NCSG on these topics, and it would be very good to discuss those. I know there is a real interest for this with the NCSG. Okay, let's move on. Anything else on the ICANN 51 Meeting, Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Nothing for the time being, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Now, a quick update from Ariel Liang on the remote hub for ICANN 51.

ARIEL LIANG: So far we have [unclear 01:33:22] ALSes apply to be the remote hub. Three are from LACRALO, one's from AFRALO and one's from NARALO. Also, we just had communication with the IT staff. They wanted to have this venture be a joint venture between ICANN, At-Large and also ISOC. I have revised the application form, including awarding of ISOC, and give them the option to show whether they are ISOC Chapters. That's the update so far.

We have sent out applications to our mailing list and also on social media. On Facebook at least 800 people have seen the application, so hopefully there will be more applications coming in. We will keep reminding our members about this opportunity. The deadline is September 12th, so we do have a little time. Hopefully more people will apply. That's the update for now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Ariel. To close off on Item #5 we have those spaces. Global stakeholder engagement question, ICANN Board questions, GAC questions and topics for the Public Forum. We need to fill those please. There's one more also, and I did send an email out to the ALT and I think to the ALAC too, asking for topics on the public sessions for Monday. I

haven't received any answer from anyone. If you could please let us know, that would be of help.

Otherwise we might end up with some topics that are not of great interest to us, or that are not that much of a great interest because they might be on a very specific gNSO process of some sort that isn't really relevant to Internet end users.

Now we'll go to Agenda Item #6, which is the ALT and Liaison selections. Unfortunately Alan had to leave us. I should have given him 45 seconds earlier for him to provide us with an update, but he did say that he was going to let us know by email on the process. The way I understand it is first the selection of the Chair, and then afterwards the selection of the ALT Members. We're probably reaching a point where nominations open.

It's interesting because of course we've got, for the Chair, nominations open on the 20th. Nominations close on the 3rd of September. Nomination acceptance deadline is 10th of September. Alan, I believe, has already sent his acceptance to the list. It's not updated on there. I don't know why, but you can see a lot of support from a lot of people. That's fine.

Afterwards, the ALT, there's a timeline that hasn't been set yet, but the ALT gets chosen after the closing of the acceptance deadline, or even the closing is the nomination deadline for the Chair. It would be from the 3rd of September onwards. Heidi, you might have more knowledge on the timetable?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, the reason I put that in is just to nudge the ALT towards the final process for approving the next Chair. Just to highlight that, in the next week or so I'll start suggesting the election schedule timetable for the rest of the ALT and the Liaisons. That was why I put that in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, great. That's fine. Any comments or questions on this? It looks like we're all fine with that. Finally we move into Any Other Business, and whether anybody wanted to touch on anything we haven't touched on yet? Seeing no one put their hand up it looks like we're finished with this call.

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry Olivier, you forgot to talk about the gNSO feedback request.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ha, thank you very much for this Ariel. That's a very good point, and thank goodness you've made a note of that. The gNSO has sent me an email on the process of policy versus implementation. There is a follow up on this. What I've done was ask Ariel to open up a public comment page for the At-Large community. We have until mid-September to be able to come with some feedback on this. I just wanted to raise the point on this and get you to read through this.

Of course, Alan will probably be the first person to be able to give us some feedback on that. I don't know whether any of you... I see Holly has got her hand up. I think she was involved in this. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I was a Chair of the original group that set up the Charter for this group. I can't believe this is still going on. However, since it seems to be part of the ATRT 2 accountability stuff I suppose we've still got to revisit it. Honestly though, there's a lot of stuff I can simply recycle on this one, that was said two years ago.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Well, there you go. It's still here for a final set of comments. We've been asked by the gNSO who said, "That's where we are now. What do you think about it?" What I'll do is, Ariel is going to be sending a note out to the ALAC list asking for a comment. I don't know if anybody wishes to pick up the pen on his? Whether we have any comments... Maybe we don't have any comments at such a late stage.

It might just be a case of saying, "This is the last [unclear 01:40:28] that we have, and this is just about to go into implementation, so let us know what you think." Holly again?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm happy to have a look for final comment, but I can't imagine we'd say anything more than we've said over the past two years. If you just want to send it my way that's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Holly. I think we'll also let Alan know about this please, because he's unfortunately not on the call. Let Alan know about it. He

will have also been surprised that we still have that. Thanks for this Ariel. I was about to miss that altogether. Any other Any Other Business? I think that's all we have. We therefore have to end this call now. I thank you all for having lasted the whole length of the call.

We are only 15 minutes behind the official end time, but it's been very, very helpful. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, good night. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]