
GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's Monthly ALAC Meeting on Tuesday, 23rd of September at 14:00 UTC. On today's call, on the English channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Evan Leibovitch, Alan Greenberg, Leon Sanchez, Rafid Fatani and Beran Gillen. We also have Roosevelt King, Siranush Vardanyan, Allan Skuce, Ron Sherwood, Rinalia Abdul Rahim and Jahangir Hossain.

On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambroner, Carlos Vera, Alberto Soto and Antonio Medina Gomez. On the French channel we have Hadja Ouattara. We also have Julie Hammer. From staff today we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang and myself, Gisella Gruber. Our interpreters on the French channel are Camila. On the Spanish channel we have Veronica and David. Russian channel we have Galina and Ekaterina.

Apologies today noted from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Ali AlMeshal, Ellen Strickland and Maureen Hilyard. I remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes and to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels and please speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. I'll also remind those who are on the audio bridge and the AC to please mute your microphones. Thank you and over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. We should be adopting the Agenda. We have a standard ALAC Monthly Call Agenda with our policy development activities. We'll

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.

be making a vote on the ALS accreditation voting – Item #7 – and then we'll have our Items for discussion, including a review of the At-Large meetings coming up in LA, an update on the post-ATLAS II activities, and a quick update on two At-Large Working Groups; one being the Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship for the IANA Function, and one being the Future Challenges Working Group. That's basically our call today. Any amendments to the Agenda or additions? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just a reminder that I also want to do something on #10, so make it #10.c for the New gTLD Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. #10.c we will add the New gTLD Working Group. Are you okay with five minutes?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm hoping I can do it in five. There's a possibility it may take more, but we'll see when we get there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Any other changes or additions? None. Okay. Let's proceed forward then. The Agenda is adopted and I now invite you to have a look at the last call's AIs, the call of the 26th of August. We're going to review the open AIs. There are some that are open standing AIs, for example. Ariel Liang to work with Dev and Olivier on the development

of an overall workspace for the collection of At-Large AIs. That's ongoing. Staff to monitor the use of additional languages over the course of a few months, as ALAC, APRALO and LACRALO calls will be offered additional languages via the language services. I'd be interested in a quick update from staff on this. How are we doing on the interpretation?

GISELLA GRUBER:

We will be providing the list with an update on the attendance on the various language channels that we've added; mainly the Chinese on the APRALO and Portuguese on LACRALO. We don't have the figures today. We're working on this with Adigo so I'd prefer to send it by email. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That's great. Thank you Gisella. Let's go to the next one – Olivier to take up the issue of volunteer recognition and consideration with other SO and AC Chairs as an ICANN-wide issue. Let's keep this one open. I have taken up the issue but there hasn't been much traction on this. AC and SO Chairs are busy primarily on the IANA stewardship transition issues, on the ICANN accountability issues, and on other issues happening in their own constituencies and communities, so at the moment this is pretty much on the side, on the backburner.

Next, staff to investigate with web admin if and when we can move the ATLAS II website of Eduardo Diaz's server. That's a high importance AI. Let me ask for an update from Heidi Ullrich. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. an update is that it will be moved over to the ICANN website but in static format. Again, no changes can be moved once it's moved over. That should be happening relatively quickly now. I'll give a date for that today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Heidi. Let's make sure all the items are transferred over and working correctly before making it live. Static format is because I understand the ICANN website is not using WordPress, so effectively what we are now doing is taking an archive copy of the website and that will remain as such. Correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Heidi. I'll let you continue with that and work with Eduardo on this. Let's go to the bottom of the page – the newly assigned AI. Terri Agnew to follow up on the missing reports from ATLAS II Working Group Chairs. Of course, there is this and there's also a small ad-hoc group that's come together to summarize all the ATLAS II Working Group Chair reports into one larger report. I believe that's also on its way. Could I have a quick status update on this? I note Terri's not with us, so maybe we could pass on that and leave it open for the time being.

No movement on this. Let's then go... I don't see anybody putting their hands up, so that's the AIs done. Let's go back to our Agenda. We're now going to review the current ALS applications. I'm not sure who in staff will be speaking on this. I think usually it's Nathalie, but she's not on the call. Who's willing to move forward on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm going to try. If any of my staff have any updates, please let me know. Currently we have 180. The most recently certified was [R RIPE 00:09:19] and we have several applications pending. It looks like we have six applications pending, with one being suspended currently. I think that's where we are right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Heidi. I count five applications pending. I count five applications recently certified and five pending.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You're correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is early morning. Thank you Heidi. I would like to extend a warm welcome to the recently certified ALSes – [R RIPE], Open Sour Foundation for Nigeria, Internet Society Chad Chapter, Online News Association and the Instituto Panameño de Derecho y Nuevas Tecnologías (PANDETEC). Great to see the ALAC and the At-Large community growing. 180 ALSes. We are 20 short of reaching 200 and of

course I remind you that we are now going to go through a period of cleaning up some of the ALSes that are defunct, have disappeared or are simply not reachable or active at all.

That's a process that's already started with some former At-Large Structures being decertified. That's certainly great news to see it growing while at the same time better ALSes and good quality involvement. Any comments or questions on any of these applications? I don't see anyone with their hand up. Let's continue. The next part of our call is the reports. Now, we're not going to be looking through... Antonio Medina, you have the floor.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: Good morning everyone. I would like to ask about the application of Internauta Colombia, because it was not mentioned and I have an objection about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Antonio, at the moment the applications are pending and we're awaiting regional advice. This is not in the ALAC's hands yet, it's in the LACRALO's hands. In fact, we have both Internauta Colombia and also ISOC South Africa Gauteng Chapter that are awaiting regional advice. You'd have to discuss this first with your region and then the ALAC would await advice and response from LACRALO.

Of course, if you disagree with the response from LACRALO you're very welcome to email the ALAC and provide the details of why you think it should be different from LACRALO advice, but at the moment it's not

something the ALAC would be discussion. Is that okay with you Antonio?

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: Anyway Olivier, I'd like to state for the record something that's taking place there. May I take the floor to explain that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: The thing is that Internauta Colombia [sends the bylaws 00:13:34] and it's also including the name of the Association of Internet Users. That's part of the name and that's included in the bylaws. I don't understand why the application of Internauta Colombia includes our name, which is the Internet Users Association from Colombia. We have [unclear] documentation before the Chamber of Commerce, and I would like to say that this name, the Internet Users Association, is part of our value and is a trademark registered recorded by us.

I think this is the right time to call your attention for them not to use our name within their registration or within their bylaws. There should be a procedure established before the Chamber of Commerce. We've been asking for information about that and they're not registered in the Chamber of Commerce. The Colombian authorities are taking care of this and this is one of my concerns that I'd like to mention. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Antonio. Alberto Soto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you Olivier. Just a clarification for Antonio – we have two or three reminders in LACRALO to show the approvals or objections with respect to these organizations that want to get certified. I would ask that what you just said, write it on the Wiki, since this is available and there is little time for your recommendation. Please write all these on the Wiki because we haven't really received this and we have nothing to say.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: Thank you Alberto.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you gentlemen. I note in the chat that Leon Sanchez mentioned that if Internauta Colombia is not legally registered to operate in Colombia then that will show up in the due diligence that's performed by At-Large staff and then the regional advice of course will take that into account. This is really all part of the due diligence and regional approval process, but thank you for alerting to this. I gather LACRALO will be able to take this into account and provide us advice accordingly.

Let's them move to Item #5 – the monthly reports. As usual I invite you to look at the reports page. I'd like to thank all those that have filed reports. We have both the RALO reports but we also have the Liaison reports. On this occasion we will start with the SSAC Liaison Report. We

usually listen to the SSAC, the ccNSO and the gNSO Liaisons. Julie Hammer?

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you Olivier. The SSAC this month held its annual workshop in Washington last week. Regrettably I was not able to attend, but I did look into one of the sessions, which was discussing future work parties. Having just completed a couple of work parties and SSAC reports, there are two proposed new work parties that are still formulating their exact scope. One is going to be related to the new gTLDs and having a look at how the implementation is going and any security and stability implications of that.

Another is related to registrant protection and credential management – again, the exact scope is still being determined. I’ve indicated my interest in serving on both of those work parties, because I know both topics are of great interest to the ALAC. I’ll try and keep up to date with where they’re going, and hopefully eventually they’ll provide SSAC reports that are useful to the community. Also, subsequent to me being the SSAC representative on the drafting team to produce the Charter for the IANA Stewardship Transfer Cross-Community Working Group, I just kept an eye on where that is.

The SSAC is currently calling for volunteers to serve on that Cross-Community Working Group and I’m not aware of whether anyone has volunteered or not, as yet. That completes my report. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julie. Questions or comments? No? Okay. Thank you. Are we going to have the ccNSO Liaison Report? I believe Maureen is at PACINET, so she's unable to join us. Will anyone else on the call be able to speak with regards to the ccNSO? Ron, would you be able to say a few words?

RON SHERWOOD: I do not have Maureen's report in front of me, although I know she posted it. I referred to it. I had a message from her this morning that she has updated it, so it is only on the ALAC ccNSO Liaison Report page. You can find that on your Wiki. I don't have it in front of me so I can't read it to you, but we are now all set for the ccNSO and ALAC between 7:30 - 8:15 am on Thursday 16th in October. The Agenda has been agreed and it is, as I say, in Maureen's report.

Unfortunately, I have a conflicting meeting with that time. I'm not quite sure what I'm going to do about it, but I'm going to try and spend as much of my time during that 45 minutes as I can, at that meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Ron. Could I ask At-Large staff to please update the Agenda page for the Thursday? I was just looking at the ccNSO activity. The Agenda is there. ALAC and ccNSO Council Meeting on Thursday 16th of October. It's all there. If I could ask At-Large staff to update this on our meeting pages, that would be great. Thank you for this Ron. Thanks for pointing us to this, and bravo for having put an Agenda together.

This is going to be very early on Thursday morning. We will have coffee and light pastries provided so at least we'll be able to function somehow. This of course had to be changed due to the added sessions on the Thursday. It's a bit unfortunate because I think we do have a lot to discuss with the ccNSO, since we are the two more geographically diverse parts of ICANN, but let's make the best of it.

Of course, we will be speaking about the ATLAS II declaration and then the huge discussion of the IANA and accountability issues. Let's go then to our next Liaison. We now have Alan Greenberg for the gNSO Liaison Report. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Not too much to report of any urgency. The gNSO and ALAC meetings are out of synch these days and the next gNSO meeting is later this week. The report is up on the Wiki. A couple of small things to report. First of all, there was a substantive discussion with Chris Disspain on the New gTLD Process Committee's request for clarification regarding IGO and Red Cross and Red Crescent protections.

That was that there were a number of items that the Board did not approve out of the gNSO recommendations and were looking for the gNSO to perhaps change their recommendations to be in line with what the gTLD Committee was prepared to offer the GAC – which was significantly less than the GAC was asking. The bottom line is that there were multiple interpretations of the letter the Board Committee sent to the gNSO. The current recommendation is that the gNSO at sometime –

but not clear when – asked the Committee exactly what they meant and go forward from there.

The implication is that this item is not something that's exceedingly high priority and that we need to address before we get to LA, for instance. The gNSO did approve their Interim Liaison with the GAC, and that was Mason Cole. The position is until the end of this fiscal year and is to be reviewed by the GAC and the gNSO at that point. The main reason for doing so is not so much to report to the gNSO on what's going on in the GAC, but vice versa. That is, make sure the GAC is up to date with what's going on in the gNSO.

Lastly, the gNSO did approve the Cross-Working Group on the IANA Stewardship Transfer. As I reported in email there was some unhappiness that we had added an amendment and hadn't given them a heads up that we were discussing that – to at least give them the possibility of discussing the amendment itself and perhaps approving it. At this stage they've approved the base charter and the change from the SSAC.

They've not approved the ALAC amendment and to be honest I think it unlikely that it will rise to a high enough priority that they go back and do it. That's somewhat unfortunate but not particularly unexpected. I think that's about all that I have to report. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Are there any questions or comments on the gNSO Liaison Report? Seeing no one put their hand up I believe there are no questions. Thanks to all our Liaisons. Of course you have a whole

afternoon, day or morning to be able to go through the Working Group Reports as well and the RALO Reports. Now, let's go onto our next part in the Agenda, and that's going to be the new business items for decision. Several recently adopted ALAC statements that you can see linked to our Agenda. We're not going to go through those except if anybody has some specific points to make on these. The statements we currently developed or reviewed are as follows:

First, we have enhancing ICANN accountability, 2.0. Alan is considering drafting a statement. That's an interesting one. Alan, do you have some feedback on enhancing ICANN accountability, 2.0, bearing in mind this is the 21-day comment period that was asked for by SO, AC and SG Chairs – so ICANN community leaders – when they met in Istanbul, not all of them, but when some of them met over with the Board and with our senior staff in Istanbul. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I just got back late last night and I haven't looked at it yet. I understand the deadline is looming. Really it's an issue of comparing what was said in the letter complaining about the process and comparing it to what Fadi had said and seeing if there's anything that we still need to say at this point. I certainly welcome input from anybody else; either privately or on the Wiki. The real issue is, do we believe they have addressed our concerns, all the concerns of the community, and particularly the ones that are of interest to ALAC, or do we believe there are still outstanding things that need to be said in the public comment?

At the very least, if we believe that Fadi's letter has addressed everything and we think everything is going to be agreeable to us then we should say that. If that's not the case then we really need to identify what the issues are. Olivier, since you were one of the authors and were participating in the discussion that led to that letter, I think we need some input from you at the very least, but certainly anyone else that has strong feelings on it, speak up very quickly. We don't have a lot of days left. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Should I just add that there has also been some follow up discussions between SO, AC and SG Chairs, by email. There's actually another letter with the suggestion from Keith Drazek on behalf of the registries. What I'll be doing, immediately after this call, is forwarding this letter to the ALAC. I just obtained authorization an hour ago that one could forward the letter to our respective communities. I will be forwarding this over to the ALAC for discussion, and hopefully that will be able to help you out Alan, in drafting a response, or even in us, the ALAC, being able to join into that response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier, but I'll stress, any of the issues that you were most concerned about and that went into the letter because of the ALAC and you, I think those we need to comment on ourselves, not just piggyback on the registries. If the issues are all the same then fine, say so, but again, I think we need to show if this is of particular value to the ALAC

participating in this we need to say what it is and not just be a checkmark for the registries. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this Alan. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, a quick question. You're already part of the FCWG and we've been starting to debate this. Is there any linkage at all between what you're planning to do here and the ongoing work that FCWG is going to be doing on the issue?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think so. I may be missing something. The real issue here is, is the process that's being set up by ICANN something that we believe will yield a good result, or have they rigged things so that we can't say what we want to be able to say, or whatever? The real question is, is the process that's being set up globally something that we feel we can productively participate in. I think that's the substance of the question, and come up with an answer that's going to satisfy the world community, because that's in fact our target, and of course the NTIA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you gentlemen. Let's move onto the next one. On our list it's the release of country and territory names within the .nustar TLD. This is not the same type of request introduction of two-character domain names for a whole list of things. This is somehow a bit different. The

New gTLD Working Group has been asked to consider whether they would be drafting a statement on this or not. Should I ask Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

This issue has come up since the last meeting, of the New gTLD Working Group, so I'm happy to take it up. I don't know what the timing is. I guess right now, when we discussed the issue of two-letter second-level domains, we spent some time addressing the overlap with the ISO codes for country codes. I think we already have a general position on it; whether that takes the form of a specific statement we can discuss in the next meeting. The next meeting of the group is actually scheduled to take place in LA. If there's a need to deal with that ahead of time we need to know. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Evan. The reply period closes on the 8th of November, so you would have time to meet in LA, discuss this point and perhaps even produce a statement then. The initial comment period closes on 10th October so that's a little too fast and too early. This really is a case of the ability to have the full name in the second level. That's somehow very different from having the two characters there. I'm not quite sure how that relates to any existing TLD.

There have been some cases where it's been frowned upon that the second-level name, being a country or territory name, was owned by anyone else in the actual country or territory itself. It's a bit more of a complicated thing. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. With regards to the two-letter codes we've already said unconditionally that we believe there should be no limitations, so I can't see how we would want to go back on that and say but for Nustar there should be limitations. On that aspect of it I think it's pretty clear. It should be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let me say this again. This is not to do with two-character codes, this is to do with the full name of the country.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, part of it I believe is the two-character codes, in addition to the name of the country. I think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We would have to have a look at that. There's clearly some work needed. Okay. Any other comments or questions on this? Seeing no one else put their hand up, let's go to the next one in our list. That's the Board Working Group Report on the NomCom. Eduardo Diaz, I believe, has put together a first draft on the Wiki. There are a number of comments underneath. There are a number of disagreements between commenters and being one of them I shall shut my mouth and let everyone have a look at this. How are we proceeding forwards with this? The question is as follows: the Board Working Group has made some recommendations that would alter the size of the NomCom and

that contains some inaccuracies that one would only know if one was part of the NomCom.

Of course, that's only five At-Large people per year, some of whom have gone two years. It would be a bit difficult for the ALAC to supply a statement that would only be drafted by those who were the insiders inside the NomCom, but not the outsiders, or pretty much anyone else. Are there any suggestions to be made here? Do you believe the ALAC should make a statement, or should it just make a bog-standard statement and those Members of the NomCom could make their own independent statement that they disagree with the main statement? I see both Evan and Alan in the queue. Let's start with Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thank you Olivier. A question based on what you just said – when you said that the existing Members that are inside the NomCom have noticed some inaccuracies in the commentary, is that based on confidential information; the feedback that you have that indicates the inaccuracies? Would talking about that reveal any confidential information? Your answer to that will dictate what I say next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Evan. The information that's there, the confidentiality of the NomCom, doesn't stem from the confidentiality of its processes but the confidentiality to protect the candidates from being known, so that people who apply don't end up, when they're not taken, in the dark corner of the ICANN room. The processes by which the NomCom reaches its decisions are as transparent as possible and in fact it has

been share don many occasions by NomCom Members and also during the NomCom's own reports.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Based on what you're saying now, this commentary that you have on this NomCom material that speaks of potential inaccuracies that you can identify because you're within the NomCom, it sounds like this falls within the realm of the transparent and open [material 00:40:14] so the disclosure of these inaccuracies isn't violating any confidence. If that's the case then I would suggest that you tell the ALAC about that and allow the ALAC to make a statement on that, just as if we were any other Liaison or Committee Chair that was coming and making a request for a statement of all the ALAC based on experiences within their group.

I don't see any particular difference with that. If it's in your view, based on your participation in the NomCom, that there are some inaccuracies that need to be addressed, I don't think it's out of line to ask the ALAC to deal with it, based on the expertize of yourself and the others within At-Large who've been on the NomCom. I don't see how that's a problem, how it's out of process. If it doesn't violate any confidences I don't see any problem proceeding that way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Evan. Yes, the points are on the Wiki page itself. They are all laid out, including one of the ex NomCom Chairs having shared the information. Alan is next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm the one who started this discussion of should certain things be in the ALAC statement or not, when Yrjö posted his comments. I don't see a lot of merit in people who've been on the NomCom telling the ALAC and the ALAC putting it in its statement. I think the comments that come from people who've sat on the NomCom and believe that there are inaccuracies either in reporting what's happening now, or things that they believe are really dumb in the recommendations, should be saying that under their own name and with the power of saying, "I was a NomCom Chair or delegate and I think the following..."

I think that goes for you Olivier, as a past NomCom Member, not on behalf of the ALAC but on behalf of yourself, based on your knowledge, and Yrjö, and other people. Surely the ALAC can echo those things but I really think that has a lot less merit than the people who participated in the NomCom saying it on their own behalf. There is only one area that I'm aware of that what Yrjö said and what you supported on the Wiki conflicts with what's in the draft statement.

That's something I originally said in my comment and Eduardo put into the statement; and that is that I thought the concepts of delegations found it good. Yrjö disagreed. You disagreed and gave a rationale and I changed my opinion. I tend to agree with you now, and I think that's what these discussions, pre-statement, should be all about; of people listening and coming to an overall conclusion for the ALAC.

I don't much care if we take what's in Yrjö's or your own personal position and put it in the ALAC statement, but I really think that each individual with NomCom experience should be saying what they believe

in direct answer to the public comment, regardless of whether they're participating in another statement or not. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Next is Raf Fatani.

RAF FATANI: Hello. Just to build on what Alan was saying, I certainly think that there's merit in actually going down [unclear 00:44:05], so for previous NomCom Members to come out and speak and say what they feel the issue is. I do think there's maybe space for the ALAC as a whole to release a statement and suggest that this is an issue that we feel we need to raise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Raf. Just to focus on this – and very briefly, because I don't want to take up the rest of the call on this issue – but the issue with saying, "We're going to readjust the number of votes between NomCom Members," is really something that shows complete misunderstanding of how the NomCom works. That's where I'm very concerned, because of the fact that the NomCom doesn't vote, or rather it's voted only on one occasion in the past six or seven years, and that could have been just because there might have been a deadlock.

Ultimately though, the concept of having delegations is ridiculous as well, and I'm not using soft words for that because the people on the NomCom are looking for the best candidate. They're not looking at putting someone from their own community. The politics of ICANN are

completely out of the window in the NomCom, and I really have concerns that this will introduce politics in the NomCom, when this is probably the only location where there shouldn't be any politics. In fact, I should say there should be more locations where there shouldn't be any politics, but the rest of it is pretty much a dead duck.

Anyway, that's my personal thoughts. Discussion will continue on this. You're all invited to comment on the Wiki. Have a look at the different proposals. Comment on the Wiki. I especially ask those of you who have been on the NomCom to make use of your experience, to say what you think about it. Ultimately, if you could submit your own – as was said by Alan and Raf – statement as well to that comment period, that would be of help. Let's move on.

Next one – introduction of two-character domain names for [.yes, 00:46:24] .global, .nustar, .kiwi, .berlin. Again, this is the same type of RSTEP Request as the previous ones that we have adopted by default. It's now up for comment. If nobody comments against it then we will be following the same procedure and adopt and ratify that statement by default. We can continue. There's one public comment that the ALAC has decided so far not to comment on, and that's the proposed changes to the gNSO Operating Procedures – a very technical, internal gNSO thing.

Alan Greenberg, our gNSO Liaison, suggested that this might not be something that the ALAC would want to write about. Dev, you have your hand up? Perhaps for the previous statement?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Indeed, it was regarding the previous statement regarding two-character domain names for .global, .nustar, .kiwi, .berlin – there’s a slight difference in what .global and .nustar have asked for. What .global and .nustar have asked for is for the release of all characters at the second-level, not just those not on the ISO 3166 list. I don’t think there needs to be a change to the statement, because even though there might be concerns about visual similarity, I don’t think it’s a pressing concern for the At-Large. That’s it, but it is a slight difference.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev for this quick update and for the precision. Let’s go now then to Agenda Item #7, that is still part of our Items for decision. That’s to do with the ALS accreditation voting. I’m hoping we can go through this quite swiftly. The background to this is that recently Alan Greenberg, paying specific attention to votes and so on, due to his forthcoming duties, has noticed that the ALS accreditation vote has been recently set as being anonymous, whilst in the past it was not anonymous. He inquired about this, and why was the vote set as anonymous? This is the vote that the ALAC makes to accredit an At-Large Structure.

Remembering very faintly in my memory from a few years ago, we had a complaint from a European organization that looked at the process and felt that there were some privacy issues with regard to having some of the information displayed or shared openly on the lists, such as the some of the due diligence for example, and also with regards to votes and so on. They alerted us to that and I think this is when we changed from having an open vote to having a closed vote; pretty much in the

same line as whenever we have a vote involving individuals, such as elections, selections, etcetera, then we also have an anonymous vote.

The decision today that we should make is whether we should have an anonymous vote or whether we should revert back to an open vote on this. The rationale for having it anonymous, as I mentioned, is that it might introduce bad blood later on if an ALS that has been accredited finds out who in the ALAC has voted against them being accredited, or the other way. Here I think we're looking at both accreditation but also de-accreditation votes; whether they should be also anonymous or transparent.

The floor is open for comments. The default that we were going to go forward with here would be to have a motion to make the vote officially anonymous and therefore we'd need a vote on that, to be able to pass the motion. First I open the floor for questions or comments or a full discussion. The elections, selections and appointments are one thing, but we are not going to be discussions election, selection appointments. Today we're discussing the accreditation of an At-Large Structure – the vote that takes place after the RALO has provided a recommendation to the ALAC, which is either a recommendation to certify or a recommendation not to certify the ALS. Raf?

RAF FATANI:

What are the pros and cons, other than the fact that we'd be upsetting people if it isn't anonymous?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you say that again?

RAF FATANI: What are the pros and cons of being anonymous, other than upsetting people in the process?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, on the one hand one could say if you make it open then that helps with transparency of votes and certainly goes with the full transparency. On the other hand, yes, the only thing was to upset the people. That's the only thing I can see, but I see others with their hands up. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think it's the upsetting people that was the issue – it's the feeling of bad blood and retribution or whatever. If you are voting against someone in your country or your region to become an ALS, that was the reason that there was some concern. Plus, Olivier, if I remember correctly – and I wasn't part of it – I think part of the objection that you had from some ALS or potential ALS in Europe, that I think decided not to apply because of it, said they don't want to be in a position of being rejected and that being public knowledge. That was the rationale.

All of that being said, the way we currently do anonymous polls I think has a problem in it, and that's something we don't have to discuss today but can look at. That is when we make a poll anonymous – that is you can't see how someone voted – we also don't track online who has voted yet. That I think is somewhat problematic, but that's not really

something we should talk about today. The two should be separate issues. Thank you.

One more thing while I have the floor, I'll remind the ALAC that we did decide another vote as anonymous a couple of years ago, and that was the vote on whether ALAC should file objections on certain TLDs during the new gTLD process. We made that decision because we really didn't want ALAC people to be subject to harassment from a TLD applicant who has money at stake at this, and to have a clear who it was that voted against them or filing an objection against them. The ALAC made that decision at that point, so there is some what of a precedent. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this reminder Alan. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: I've been discussing this issue with Fatima on Skype at the moment and we think that the votes should be open based on that when you cast a negative vote or an abstention, you either way need to give an explanation or a rationale on why you cast your vote in that way. Either way, you would be anonymized by submitting a negative vote and then having to provide an explanation on why you voted that way. Maybe in other times it was important to have an anonymous vote on ALS accreditation, but I feel that to act to the transparency process of ICANN itself, we should do this via an open vote. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Leon. That's a good counter argument. Raf?

RAF FATANI: Having listened to some of my colleagues I completely agree and I see merit in becoming open and transparent in this, rather than try and close the door behind the vote. Just my thoughts. I understand there might be retribution and bad blood, as has been mentioned, but I think the value is in being open and transparent.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Raf. It appears that we don't have consensus at the moment. Any other comments? I think comments are pretty important. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm going to suggest if we can send this back to an operational working group or something like that, because as you said, we did not have consensus here. Also, I personally think there's a bigger issue at play. Having been an individual that in the past has voted to go against regional advice, that action, because I explained myself, actually led to a reconsideration and a reevaluation by the region of the issue. I think there's a larger issue at hand, rather than just the individual accountability on the vote so much.

If the ALAC is going to reject the regional advice, it needs to provide a rationale for doing so. I think that goes beyond individuals that vote yes or no, but if the ALAC is going to make a decision to reject the regional advice, somebody from those that voted to do the rejection needs to provide to that region a rationale for why that happened. That's my

own take. I don't think we're going to settle it on this call. I think we need to refer it to a working group, let them thrash on this issue and bring it back to the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. I'm starting to edge in that direction as well. I'll close the queue after Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I certainly don't believe we want to have a vote right now. The issue was just brought up minutes ago and I think when you brought it up you presumed it was going to be an open and shut case. It clearly isn't. There's not agreement, so I think we need substantive discussion on it. I'm not sure we need a committee on it. I think [inaudible 00:59:18] and we can use the internal one, if people feel that they want to say something that shouldn't be made public. I believe it's an ALAC issue and I don't think we should punt it to a committee at this point.

However, that being said, I'll point out that there is an alternative that we may want to discuss, and that is not making public who voted which way, at least not initially anyway, but having an open record for the ALAC so that we can know who it is that disagreed, let them present their case and so that will allow us, as Evan says, to present to the ALS a rationale for why they were rejected. Maybe that would be something they can adjust or fix. It may well be that we need a hybrid in this case, and I'd suggest some substantive discussion on the mailing list.

Since we have people who are voicing both sides of it, I think this is a good place to try to revive our mailing list and actually have them talk about policy. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Indeed we will be following this up on the ALAC mailing list. We could have an AI here. We can take away the motion, backtrack, and have an AI for Olivier to follow up on the ALAC mailing list and stimulate the discussion there. Alan, maybe you could also contribute to that, since you are the person who raised that point to start with?

ALAN GREENBERG: Try and stop me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No comment. Let's move on. Now we're going into the items for discussion, with a final review of the At-Large meetings and agendas at our next meeting in LA. It's important to go through these because before meeting everyone says, "We're going to LA and let's hope we don't have too much of a busy agenda," and then when it actually happens and we're face-to-face with the day's agenda it's terrible. It's so busy. This year, on this meeting, we've had a few last minute problems. We were originally going to have quite enough time to be able to address all the issues we needed to address.

Unfortunately, two last-minute changes took place. First on Monday there were changes to the agenda to effectively stop us from being able

to have a very full agenda on the Monday, due to the fact that there are quite a few big public sessions taking place; high interest topic sessions, that's what they're called. On Thursday – and this was more disruptive – a session on the IANA stewardship transition and also a session on ICANN accountability were added.

These were large public sessions of the same guise as the ones that were done in London, with remote participation, remote hubs, but also therefore clashing with our ALAC wrap-up meeting, which on this occasion, since there was the AGM, it was going to allow three and a half hours. We've had to therefore move things around, and you'll see that reflected in the agenda. Usually Heidi takes us through the agenda but this time it's Gisella that's been the main architect of the agenda. I'm going to ask her to take us... Gisella, do you wish to do this page-by-page?

GISELLA GRUBER:

I think it might be easier to do day-by-day. In the chat I've given the link to the full ICANN schedule, which is published on the ICANN 51 webpage, as well as a link to the At-Large schedule where you can find the agenda, where you can also find the pages where we will be posting the reports, as well as the AIs, the NARALO outreach event workspace is also linked to this page. Please do take a look. It also has the hubs for the ICANN 51, a venue map, etcetera. All useful information will be posted here so please do bookmark it. If I may, we're going to start with Sunday. Now, Heidi's not with us to run through the agenda, but if you'd like to take...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe I could go through the details of this?

GISELLA GRUBER: Please do Olivier. Sorry about the PDF. The English is on the second page. Before you start Olivier, please remember that the French and Spanish have not been translated, so if you could tell the French and Spanish speakers on this call to not pay any attention to the French and Spanish. They haven't been translated...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We seem to have lost Gisella completely because she's dropped off the AC. What Gisella was trying to say was that the Spanish and French sections on this agenda are not translated properly. This is from the old meetings. Please translate from the first column on the left, which is the English column. On the Sunday we're starting with a meeting with Fadi Chehadé for half an hour, then with Sally Costerton, GSE, and then with Theresa Swineheart, who as you know is the key person with regards to ICANN accountability and transparency activities, and also the IANA stewardship transition.

That's most of our morning. We're finishing with the status of the website. As some of you might know, our ALAC website, finally after seven years or something, is being redone, revamped. We'll have a quick update on that in a moment, but obviously in LA some work will have been done, so Chris Gift will be able to speak to us on this. Then we have an update on the gNSO review. That's something that's just

started, so it was a good idea to have Larisa Gurnick and also Matt Ashtiani to let us know how this gNSO review was looking. We'll have a long lunch break, for once.

In the afternoon, Academy Working Group. As you should know, the Leadership Training Program is taking place again this year. We'll have news hot off the press about the previous few days in the week and finding out how well that LTP went and perhaps what the next steps are. After that we'll have Ashwin Rangan, the Chief Innovation and Information Officer, and this is the chance for us to speak to him for half an hour about the ATLAS II recommendation that's asking for some kind of overall policy tracking system, knowledge management system, which ICANN so lacks at the moment.

After the coffee break we'll have a meeting with the SSAC, with Patrick Fältström and Jim Galvin. We have one hour this time. During our last meeting we had a shorter amount of time with them, and it looked as though this was not enough. There was an AI. We now have one hour with Patrick and Jim. Julie Hammer will be moderating that. Then we have our hot topic one, ICANN accountability and transparency and hot topic two, NTIA IANA function stewardship transition. These are just sessions where we will be discussing those two issues as the prelude to late on in the week.

We definitely have to formulate what our positions are, and so we'll have the time to do so at that point. Finally we'll have the usual wrap-up, reminding everyone of the reporting. Monday night, worth knowing, there will not be a gala at this meeting, so we do have Monday night free to do as we please. What am I saying? Sunday night sorry. I gather

most people will be absolutely exhausted after that day. Gisella, are you back with us?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes. Sorry about that. We will be going through to Monday where we have a 7:15 am start with the ALAC Meeting with the NCSG, finishing at 8:15 am, which will allow us to get to the welcome ceremony at 8:30 am. We're working on the agenda for the ALAC and NCSG meeting with Olivier and Raf. I need to get an update on that. Please note that the meetings in green on the Wiki pages are the main schedule meetings. These aren't organized by At-Large staff. These will be updated.

We have got a revised schedule through, so I'll be working on these over the next 24 hours to put all the details in. I'll quickly run through them. Welcome ceremony 8:30 - 10:00 am. 10:30 - 12:00 pm we've got the SO/AC-led high interest topics. Then we have the meeting of the Cross-Working Group to develop an IANA stewardship transition proposal on naming related functions. That's during the lunch break, 12:15 - 1:45 pm. We have high-interest topics two and three in the afternoon.

We have decided that afternoon to organize three Working Group meetings, due to the fact that this will allow us to not have overlapping meetings, because that is the issue that we've been faced with, because we don't have the Monday and the Thursday morning, so we've decided to use the Monday afternoon, starting with the At-Large Metrics Working Group from 3:00 - 4:00 pm, then the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group from 4:00 - 5:00 pm, and then from 5:00 - 6:00 pm we have the ATLAS II Implementation Task Force Meeting. That does run

parallel to the high-interest topic three. We have the At-Large New gTLD Working Group from 6:00 - 7:00 pm as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Gisella. Coming back to this, it's a long day. No gala at the end of the day. However, in response to Rinalia's question, is there time allocated for the ALAC to discuss and prepare for its meeting with the Board, the main topic for the meeting with the Board? It's going to be discussion on the ATLAS II recommendations and observations. We have also asked for the Board to submit to us a topic they might wish to discuss. If they don't send us anything then we'll have an hour to discuss the follow up to ATLAS II.

You'll see on the Monday, from 5:00 - 6:00 pm the At-Large ATLAS II Implementation Task Force is the Working Group that is tasked with coming up with the follow up; reviewing the current status of the ATLAS II recommendations and observations, feedback on the implementation process, discussion of future ATLAS timelines. I invite you all to be part of that meeting. This group will then be able to be ready with answer for the Board and be able to take part fully in the discussion with the Board on the next morning. Any other questions or comments on the Monday?

Obviously Rinalia, if you wish to speak you're absolutely welcome to do so. Hopefully there will be material sent to the Board before the meeting, indeed there should be. I'm not sure how much material will be sent to the Board, but certainly a status update I think will be the important thing. The group has done some work to follow up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. I've been listening but now I'm able to speak a little bit. I do recall that Steve Crocker asked from us one to three pages on an update of the ATLAS II implementation. I'm wondering if that is something that the Working Group for ATLAS II IT can produce prior to the Board Meeting; so they can review that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Heidi. Let's have this as an AI please so that we don't lose it. For the ATLAS II IT to provide a three-page summary of post-ATLAS II activities. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, this is for Steve Crocker to pass onto the Board. That's what that one- to three-pager is for – for discussion at that meeting with the Board on Tuesday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. To be passed to the Board. Is there a deadline for this Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I would need to look. It was a note that Steve wrote to you, so I'll have to review that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. I don't think he put any deadline on there. Let's do it as soon as possible. I know that the ATLAS II IT will be working later on this week or early next week. Back to you Gisella for Tuesday. We might have to go a little faster.

GISELLA GRUBER: We will speed up. We start at 7:00 am again on Tuesday with the At-Large Accessibility Working Group. We then move onto the ALAC Meeting with the Board from 8:30 - 9:30 am. We then have our ALAC Working Group Working Session Part 1 from 10:00 - 12:00 pm. Olivier, do you wish to comment on that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. 10:00 - 12:00 pm, ALAC Work Part 1. We're starting with a Working Group update, first on the NTIA stewardship transition, who will have met earlier in the week. Also the Working Group on Future Challenges with Evan and Jean-Jacques. These are just updates. They're not Working Group meetings. They just tell the ALAC what they've been up to. Thirdly, the New gTLD Working Group will provide a quick update.

Then we have our usual time with Maguy Serad, the Vice President of Contractual Compliance Services. I gather a time will be added there. I believe it's between 11:15 and 11:35 am. That gives us 20 minutes with Maguy. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, that has to be updated. I believe it's 20-25 minutes. It's not the full 30 minutes and that's because the NomCom Chair has a full agenda, as I hope that you can see on that Wiki page.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I certainly can. Thirdly we a discussion with the NomCom Leadership, and that includes Stephane Van Gelder, who is the NomCom Chair for this year, with a full description on what the NomCom is looking for. Back to you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: We then swiftly move onto the LACRALO Monthly Meeting, which is planned for 90 minutes, from 12:15 - 1:45 pm, bearing in mind that we will remind everyone the day before on logistics for the meetings and also when you pick up your lunch, so that people don't forget that they've actually got back-to-back meetings. We've done our best to avoid back-to-back meetings, but there certainly are some. We'll move onto the ALAC meeting with the GAC, from 2:00 - 3:00 pm. Do you wish to comment on that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not at the time. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: We then have ALAC Working Session Part 2, from 3:15 - 5:00 pm. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Here, a highlight of the afternoon is going to be the update from the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group. I have received from the ICG Chair, Elisa Cooper, the confirmation that the ICG will be meeting with us – maybe not the full ICG but a majority of the Members of the ICG. That’s of course the Coordinated Group that will be putting together the different proposals from the Operational Community for the plan that the NTIA is looking to receive, in order to transit those responsibilities that they have. I didn’t know how to get out of that sentence, but there we go. Back to you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. We’ll then end off with the At-Large Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of IANA Functions, from 5:00 - 6:30 pm. Tuesday night we do have music night. Timing is to be confirmed, 8:30 pm onwards, and all details will be posted on the Wiki page.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let me jump in with one quick thing. The Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship will obviously be able to follow up from the discussions that it had with the ICG. That’s the location where it will define its strategy for the future and whether the ALAC will or will not be submitting its own proposals. Coming back on the same day with the ALAC Meeting with the GAC, we do need questions and topics to be discussed with the GAC. I’m not going to put you on the spot now, but please follow up after this call – and I hope

that people are not sleeping when I say this – but please follow up after this call to make suggestions as to what topics we'll be discussing with the GAC. Back to you Gisella, Wednesday?

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Olivier. Wednesday, [unclear 01:21:35]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Gisella, I can't hear you very well. You're going to have to redial. We can't hear you. In the meantime I'll put Alan Greenberg on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just note Rinalia's comment in the chat, talking about new GAC Leadership.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: GAC is getting new leadership, says Rinalia Abdul Rahim: "Will the ALT be meeting with the new leadership of the GAC?" Currently no. There wasn't any plan for doing so. On this occasion we have a full meeting of the GAC with the ALAC. Now, that said, it could be arranged to have an informal meeting with the new GAC Leadership, if that would help. I'm not quite sure when the new leadership is going to be sitting.

ALAN GREENBERG: When will the new leadership be selected?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I didn't care about the selection, I think it's when will they be sitting?

ALAN GREENBERG: They are two different questions perhaps. I don't know the answer to either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Rinalia? You have the floor if you have the answer to this. No answer. Let's do an AI for staff to find out when the new GAC Leadership will be selected. An important thing to do. Continue. Back to you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: I'm back on the AC. We will start again at a 7:00 am bright and perky on Wednesday morning with the RALO Leadership and ALT and Liaisons' working breakfast with David Olive. Would you like to comment on that Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very briefly. This is going to happen in addition to a meeting of Fadi Chehadé and David Olive, with the RALO Chairs. That takes place the night before. The night before is just an informal meeting so that Fadi can get to know the Chairs themselves. That's why it's kept very small. The breakfast is going to be a larger issue, and that's going to really be discussing the whole issue of the metrics, which are being designed to go from the Chair, all the way to the ALT, to the ALAC, to the RALOs, to

the ALSes, and to basically have a good discussion with David Olive about what the RALOs are doing.

That will include the Vice Chairs of the RALOs and the Secretaries of the RALOs that are present. Back to you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you. We then have our APRALO Monthly Meeting from 8:45 09:45 am. From 10:00 - 11:30 am we have the At-Large Policy Roundtable, which will have two panels of 45 minutes each, the first one being privacy and proxy, moderated by Holly Raiche, and the second one ultimate and innovative DNS, moderated by Garth Bruen. We then have a NARALO Monthly Meeting from 11:30 - 12:30 pm. Running parallel to that we have the At-Large IDN Policy Working Group, 11:30 - 12:30 pm. We have our At-Large Regional Leadership Meeting, from 12:30 - 2:00 pm. I don't know if Olivier or someone would like to comment on that meeting?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Gisella. Very briefly, that will obviously follow up from the breakfast, and then we'll also look at the cross-RALO items, such as the update of the Rules of Procedure. Many of the RALOs have been updating their rules. I will try my best to attend the whole length of the meeting, but I have a few clashes that take place simultaneously unfortunately. It's great to see a very packed agenda there for a long meeting. Back to you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Olivier. We will have our AFRALO AfrICANN Joint Meeting from 2:00 - 3:30 pm. We then have the ICANN Academy from 4:00 - 5:30 pm, running parallel to the Future Challenges Working Group. We have the At-Large CROPP Meeting from 5:30 - 6:30 pm, and to finish off the day we have the NARALO Outreach Event, which is the Showcase, from 6:30 - 8:30 pm. The draft agenda has been updated on the Wiki page for you all to see. Any comments before we move onto Thursday?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Gisella. Alan has put his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On the NARALO Showcase, last time there was a report several weeks ago there was still significant funding missing. Can we have a brief statement from Glenn as to what the current prognosis is?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is Glenn McKnight able to speak? He might not be able to do so. I can provide an update quickly. There has been indeed a problem of funding and finding sponsors. At the end of the year it's much harder to find sponsors than at the beginning of the fiscal year. We were looking for \$4,500 to be able to offer the usual things we offer, such as a few drinks, food and to have a good keynote speaker. Thanks to some very good action from Loris Taylor, who is on the call, we've managed to obtain a public speaker who is topnotch and comes from the native community in North America.

At the same time, the alternative to having an inclusive bar would be to have a cash bar. However, Afillias has moved forward, after being asked, and they would be ready to contribute \$1,500. I'm now in discussion with VeriSign, who might be able to fill the rest, so we would be able to offer drinks. That's not firmed up yet, but within the next few days I would expect we'll be able to firm something up, or I hope so at least. No grave concern about this at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. All I was really asking for was is there a reasonable chance this will happen, and the answer seems to be yes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Yes. I would hope that it's yes. Until this morning we weren't sure, but it looks like it will move forward. Let's move on and go to Thursday. Gisella, I do realize we are spending a lot of time on this, but let's go through this quickly then.

GISELLA GRUBER: Not long to go. It's just important that everyone does give their input if there is any input, as we are only two and a half weeks from LA. We'll start with another 7:00 am meeting for the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Part 1. It's a very early start, due to the issues that Olivier did mention earlier on, with the general meetings. Olivier, I'm not sure if you wish to comment on this 7:00 am meeting?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much. All I can say is it will be half an hour of... Well, we are going to get breakfast, so it's not absolute hell, but it's a very early start and unfortunately we have no choice about it. We'll just be reviewing the AIs. The second part of our wrap-up will then take place at lunchtime between 12:00 - 1:30 pm where we would be going forward with the actions; any action that needs to be done. This is the passing of functions from the ALAC Chair and the ALT, etcetera.

Then we'll have some time with Sebastian Bachollet, our 2011-2014 Board Director selected by At-Large, and asking him on his reflections of his tenure as a Board Member. I guess at that point he'll be able to tell us all. Then of course this is sandwiched between the community discussion with the ICG and the Public Forum, which means that the ALAC will be supplied with a lunch. This has been granted, just like it was in London, due to the fact that we had to move our meetings around.

I very much thank Sally Costerton and Xavier Calvez, who have agreed to this, and made sure that we will be catered for and therefore will not lose too much weight on that day. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just really a question – normally for breakfast meetings it typically takes close to half an hour before people get their breakfast and settle down. Given that this is just a half-hour meeting I'm hoping that the food in fact will be there and ready before 7:00 am, or it's going to be a waste of time, from the point of view of any work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you for this Alan. Indeed, I suppose the breakfast will start being served before 7:00 am and I will try and get us to start at 7:00 sharp and people will just have to step in and out. This is taking place not in a restaurant – this will take place in our ALAC room, which certainly helps.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I understand, but on occasion there are guards guarding the food until the right time, or they don't bring in the hot dishes until the official starting time, so just a thought. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. We will send Gisella to go and soften the guards and get them to move away from the food – either that or she'll beat them. Glenn McKnight?

GLENN MCKNIGHT Sorry Olivier, I was on a cellphone at exactly the same time but I'm back in. I think you gave a bit of a report about the outreach. Like you stated, we're a shortfall of a couple of thousand dollars still, but Loris of Native Media has come up with sponsorship for the hoop dancers for the performance, as well as the speaker. We're still working on sponsorship but as far as everything goes, we're on track. We have another call on Monday, so if anyone wants to join our call on Monday to add their comments they can do so. I'm hearing lots of music.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Glenn. We are already in the mood for that showcase, since the music has started. Let's move on, and back to you, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Olivier. The ccNSO Council will be joining us from 7:30 - 8:15 am. We've reduced the meeting to 45 minutes to allow us to get to the 8:30 am session on enhancing ICANN accountability. As Olivier mentioned, the Wrap Up Part 2 will be between 12:00 and 1:30 pm and lunch will be served there. As usual, in the afternoon the Public Forum, ending up the day with the ICANN Wrap Up Cocktail. Unless there are any other comments we'll swiftly move to the Friday morning, which is just the ALT Meeting from 8:00 - 11:00 am. That's all from me. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Gisella. I realize this has taken a little too much time to go through. I invite you to have a look at the different pages that have been set up for the questions and the topics to be discussed. Antonio Medina, please go ahead.

ANTONIO MEDINA GOMEZ: Thank you Olivier. I would like to ask a question in relation to the participation of the remote hubs in the LA agenda. The Colombian Association of Internet Users has applied and it is working in this regard. We want to have more details on the meetings in which we will be able to have a direct connection from the hub to the meeting – specifically

because we are interested in designing an agenda for our guests, and we want to include a university in the city of Bogotá. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Antonio Medina. That's a very good point. I was going to ask Heidi to provide us with an update on this, if she is able to speak, since she has been our link with the organizers of the system of remote hubs. Heidi, are you on the call?

ARIEL LIANG: I can answer that question about remote hubs.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Olivier. Regarding remote hubs, the IT Team at ICANN will reach out to each individual applicant. So far we have about 20 applicants. They will reach out to you in a very short period of time. Please wait patiently for that. They will also chat with you about the technical requirements. All those technical requirements are posted on the remote hub Wiki page, and I'll post it in a link. As soon as you meet all these requirements then they will proceed to the next step about which hubs to select for becoming the remote hub for ICANN 51. Please wait for the feedback and to be contacted by the IT Team in ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this update Ariel. Next then we have the questions for the meeting with senior staff and Board. I was going to ask you to really consider those. We don't have to look at questions for the ICANN Board, now that we are going to be discussing the ATLAS II follow up and implementation, but we still need to be putting questions for the Global Stakeholder Engagement – Sally Costerton – for the GAC, and for the Public Forum and suggestion of topics for the Public Forum, which is on the Thursday afternoon.

The Wiki pages are desperately empty at the moment. Consider putting some points forward. If you don't then it's probably likely that Members of the ALT will do so and you'll wonder where those questions are coming from. Now you know, they're not coming from you. I'm not going to go on my knees but I'm just going to tell you – look at these and suggest some questions. Let's move on because time is ticking.

#9 on the Agenda – the update on the post-ATLAS II implementation activities. We're going to fly through this quite quickly. Two parts have taken place – two parallel activities. On the one side, the ATLAS Working Group Chairs and Thematic Group Chairs have put together some reports on their activities, and basically lessons learnt from having run those Working Groups. These are lessons learnt, which should be helpful to the organizers of the next At-Large Summit. That would be ATLAS III.

You can see here a link to the page that's got all of the different feedback from each one of the groups. As you know, earlier, Terri Agnew had to chase up some of the Chairs to try and get an update on this. In addition to this there is a small group of people that have come

together to put all of these reports into one larger report, so as to avoid having duplication, etcetera. That's one process. That's not time-dependent, because it needs to be done by the next ATLAS.

The second activity is one of the post-ATLAS II activities, and that one is one where each one of the recommendations that came out in the ATLAS II Declaration are now in a process of being expanded. You can see on the Wiki page that the two things to do was first to find out who the recipients for that recommendation were, and then afterwards assigning it to people to either expand or for Working Groups to either expand or act on. That whole table is providing you with the work.

All 43 recommendations, the observations, are not going to be followed up for the time being. If you scroll further down the page you'll find recommendations that are meant for the Board. On there you can find who they are going to... I've produced some other details, which I've so far forwarded to a Working Group that's been created – it's the ATLAS II Implementation Task Force. There has been a call for Members for that Implementation Task Force on the list, in the past 24 hours I believe.

So far, the Members of that Task Force are the Chairs of the Thematic Groups and the Chairs of the ATLAS II Organizing Committees, but we're asking for everyone to join. It's important that we get many people involved in that post-ATLAS II setup. The next steps will be for me to, probably in the next 12-24 hours, email each one of the Chairs of our At-Large Working Group, so for example the Outreach Working Group. If you look at Recommendation (2): "ICANN should increase support, [budget staff to program 01:43:28] having brought valuable members to the community."

The [unclear] for that are the Outreach Working Group, the Capacity Building Working Group, and the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee. I will be writing to each one of those three Working Groups, letting them know of that task and asking for them to come back to me with a timeline on how soon they could have an answer for us, or have performed the work. We do have one deadline, which is the deadline of the LA Meeting with the Board.

We will focus first on the recommendations for the Board, the only problem being that at the moment we have a very busy set of weeks and we have very little time until we meet in LA. Later on this week we will find out on timetables and see if the Working Groups are able to proceed forward with expanding on these recommendations. I think there are five or six Working Groups involved all together, so that hopefully should share the load and let everyone be able to respond quickly. Any comments or questions on this?

No. Let's move on then. We have the At-Large Working Group update for the Working Group Chairs. If you reload the Agenda you'll see that 10.c has been added, the At-Large New gTLD Working Group, and update from Evan. Let's start first with 10.a: At-Large Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function. Do we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat or Mohamed El Bashir on the line? I don't see either of them. Perhaps they are on the call?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Olivier, neither of them are on the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's bloody marvelous. Let me go on the record for saying that's bloody marvelous, thank you, so it looks like I'm probably going to have to provide a quick update on this. There has been another call of the ICG that has taken place with the IANA Coordinating Group. Another call took place last week where there's been small progress with regards to the Charter, with regards to the overall Charter of things and with regards to the request for proposals.

Now the Group is looking at the working methods, how to find consensus, etcetera, and this sort of thing. We've got our own Working Group that is looking at feeding both Jean-Jacques and Mohamed with all of the information that they require. As I've mentioned to you, the Working Group will be meeting in Los Angeles to define its own strategy on where to go.

Parallel to this, the Cross-Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition, which will be dealing primarily with putting together a proposal for the named part of the IANA stewardship transition, that Working Group is very close to being activated and proceeding forward. The Charter has been agreed, has been ratified by the ALAC, during the last few weeks. We have provided details of this to others. I understand the gNSO is in the process of having that also chartered. The ccNSO is also likely to ratify it.

This is very close to moving forward. I might be wrong. It might have actually already happened that this Charter was ratified by the other SO and ACs. I understand that the Cross-Community Working Group will meet in LA, so that's when the action will start taking place. Any questions or comments. No? The next Working Group update is for the

Future Challenges Working Group, and for this we have Evan Leibovitch and Jean-Jacques Subrenat, who's not here, so Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thank you very much Olivier. I'll keep this relatively short. We've already had a first meeting of the Future Challenges Working Group. Based on previous activities, we've been charged with trying to deal with the overall issue of ICANN accountability. Members of the Summit Thematic Group 4 were directed to come into the Future Challenges Group if they wanted to continue the discussion that it started at the Summit. We had a very successful first meeting.

One of the themes that came up was given the fact that this particular group is trying to come up with a high-level approach to things, the issue was brought up that accountability and transparency are really means to an end, rather than ends in themselves. The actual objective is trust. We perceived that there is a significant trust gap between ICANN and the public that it's trying to serve out there. Ongoing, Future Challenges is going to be working to try and address issues to do with trust and how accountability and transparency and governance fit into that.

I have been starting to work on a possible position paper to be used as a starting point. That's still under development. We will be meeting at the London meeting to see where we want to take this further. We may choose to come up with a number of different solutions that may come into ALAC advice. The Future Challenges Group has produced Whitepapers before. We may decide to go that road. Right now, things

are still very much under discussion. I invite anyone here to get involved in that. We will be meeting in London on the Wednesday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Evan. Are there any questions or comments on Evan's report of the Future Challenges Working Group? No? Okay, so I trust Evan that this is proceeding forwards quite well. Let's move to 10.c, the At-Large New gTLD Working Group. Back again to Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. I also want to welcome Ron Andruff on the call to deal with the specific issue that I want to talk about. The New gTLD Working Group has already had meetings previously. The two issues being discussed were first of all how we want to address the fact that the ICANN community is already starting to make noises about creating future and subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, when in the eyes of some we really haven't seen the fallout and consequences from the current round that's going through.

One part of the gTLD Committee is going to be looking at that. The other one is why Ron's on the call – it's to follow up on the issue of the public comment period that ALAC put out regarding the PIC – public interest commitment – regime that ICANN has in place. We took a stand against that. We took out a public comment period. The staff summary of the responses to that PCP have now been produced and are published.

They effectively show that the domain industry as a whole does not like the idea of revisiting the public interest commitments, but basically everybody else was in favor of the position we took; that the current PIC regime is really, really badly flawed, does not serve the public interest, and that we need to pressure ICANN to come up with a replacement. The domain industry has been taking two approaches – number one, that the PIC stuff is good enough, that it's too late to do any changes and has been defending it. This is the situation we find ourselves in.

Ron and some others within the community have been suggesting that we cannot wait for the London meeting, and that we in fact need to send a message to At-Large, to the broader ICANN community, reminding them that the PIC system is simply not sufficient, it is not serving the public interest. The problem we also have is with timing. ICANN has already started to sign contracts with some of the so-called “category one” TLDs, which were the ones that were singled out by the GAC as being sensitive to public interest.

These things, with the current insufficient PIC system, ICANN has started to create those contracts, even though we have asked that they hold off on this – even though the GAC has asked for clarification. That's the position we find ourselves in right now. The reason I asked for this to go onto the call at this point, and to add this to the Agenda, is because this has become rather severe. The question is, what action do we want to take, going forward, and are we capable of doing something before the LA Meeting? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Evan. It's good to see that this is proceeding forward, slowly but surely. Are there any comments or questions from anyone on the call? I see Ron Andruff. Ron, you have the floor.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you Olivier. Thank you very much for the [unclear 01:54:07] statement, Evan, regarding the Policy Advisory Board Model. I think one of the critical elements that I'm realizing now, as time goes by, is that basically staff go about their merry way doing what they want, and they allow the things to hang out there for a long time with the community, and therefore as time goes by they say, "This has been out there for so long, I'm sorry, we can't do anything now."

This is exactly why Evan's comment about sending a letter to the Board, and the [NGPT 01:54:41] and staff, the CEO, making it very clear that this is an accountability issue – that the issue of trust between the Board, staff and the community is lacking, and there's a big void there because of these types of things. Whilst the ALAC has a public comment period out on the Policy Advisory Board, even before the London Meeting began, staff were signing contracts with potential applicants for regulative industry strings.

This is the issue that needs to be brought forward. It's an accountability issue. I feel very strongly about it, and we'd be very happy to work with the New gTLD Committee or with the Chair of the ALAC – however you would choose – to help draft that letter. I'm happy to contribute to the drafting of that letter, sending them a very clear message that it's about accountability, and this is just not right. We need these kinds of

safeguards, and if they're not willing to put them in they certainly cannot be treating users as they are now, so cavalierly, that they don't even wait for the public comment period to come to a close.

I'll stop with that and I thank you very much for giving me a moment to say a few words.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Ron Andruff. Are there any more questions or comments? Okay. I think we can move forward then with the rest of our Agenda. We will see the follow up of all of these Working Groups in LA, as I believe they're all meeting over there. That will be more work for everyone. Items for information – we've got three items left at the end of this call. I understand it's the top of the hour, and thankfully the interpreters have let us know that they are able to stay a little while longer. Let's not make it too hard for them, as it's been two hours so far.

The first of our items for information is the update on the At-Large website revamp. For this I ask Ariel Liang to take the floor.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Olivier. Just to give you a quick update about the At-Large website revamp – recently we've formed a small team that consists of Olivier, Dev and Anthony from the community side, and me and Heidi from the staff side, the ICANN Product Team, namely Chris Gift and his staff, Steve Allison and an outside vendor called Column Five Media.

This is a small team that started to kick off the project about two weeks ago. We've had three meetings so far.

What we have done so far is to review the Project Charter, which details the objectives of the revamp, the target audience of the new site, and what is integral and what is out of scope for this project. In another two meetings we did a deep-dive into our current site and looked at all the problems we have been facing for different pages – for example the information architecture, the search capability and also the way you communicate messages. We then saw what we could do better.

This week, the Column Five Media, the outside vendor, was finally contracted. They've formed a small team and will work very closely with the staff from ICANN and also Olivier, Dev and Anthony on this project. In our LA Meeting we'll be able to present some initial design ideas. It won't be 100 per cent done, but we aim to get the design 75 per cent done. You will be able to see several pages, showing how the homepage will look, or the correspondence page. They will show you all those draft ideas and possibly some design guides as well.

After the LA Meeting, IT will bring in development vendors. They will be in charge of coding for the website, based on the design that Column Five will produce. In Morocco we will aim to show the data prototypes for this website, and some time in April we aim to launch the website. That's the timeline and the goal. If you want to learn more information about this revamp project, I'm going to post a link in the chat, which is the Wiki page created for this small Website Revamp Task Force.

There you will see all the chat and the Adobe recordings for this team. If you want to see the Project Charter, I also pasted into the chat the PowerPoint that Steve Allison and I made, to give you an overview of what the goal of this project is. So for more information you can look at that. Also, another additional point is why we have Dev and Anthony in the team. Dev is the Chair of the Technology Taskforce and Anthony is appointed by Cheryl as the representative for the Accessibility Working Group.

These two groups are very relevant to the website revamp effort, and they will serve as the representatives for this group. At the same time they will communicate the progress made on the website to their respective Working Groups, so that the broader At-Large community can be involved in this project as well. That's all the update I have.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Ariel. We should go back to you for an update on the At-Large social media activities.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Olivier. I'm going to show you a quick PowerPoint. It's very small and short. I'm going to show you some basic statistics of our social media performance after ATLAS II. These graphs you see is the data collected from July 1st to today. The first page you'll see is our growth of Twitter followers. The good news is that after ATLAS II our social media didn't become obsolete and in fact our followers are growing every day. So far, since ATLAS II, we have grown 247 new followers until today, so it's very encouraging.

I did a quick calculation and on average we have two new followers per day. That's a pretty good trend. The second page you'll see is the frequency of our Tweets, on a daily basis, as well as re-Tweets – when I Tweet out and somebody else re-Tweets it on their handle. You can see we never stop Tweeting. On average we Tweet two or three times a day. Also we have a healthy interaction with the other Twitter followers. The blue bars you see are the re-Tweets from other people. It's also continuing and that's very good.

We did a very small project on hashtags for our social media channels. We wanted to create this brand for the At-Large community, but we didn't have consensus on which hashtag would be used for At-Large. We did a survey on both Facebook and Twitter and we got 32 responses. These are the results of our hashtag brand. The most popular one is #icannatlarge. Because of that survey, we have started using this hashtag more and more in our Tweets and in our Facebook posts. It's also an experimenting process, since we'll also use #atlarge or #at_large, just to test which one has the most response. It's an ongoing process, but we will aim to have the brand generated for branding our community. These are our quick updates on Twitter now.

On Facebook you can see from post-ATLAS II we also have a continued growth of the fan base. So far we have 1,063 likes on our Facebook page. That's more than 100 new likes since July 1st. On the second page I listed several top Facebook posts during July and August. For some of the posts, more than 2,000 people have seen them, so you can see our reach on Facebook is pretty big, but of course it depends on the content of the post. Not every post has a reach of 2,000, but we have a few that have a really good response.

Here you can see our reach trend on a daily basis. Right now it's a little quieter than before, but we're hoping in LA to see our reach spike again just like what we had during ATLAS II. These are some quick updates of our Facebook and Twitter performance. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Ariel. Thanks for all of these statistics. I gather that as long as you can keep up the rise in the number of Twitter numbers and the number of likes at the same rate as the French national debt, you're probably doing pretty well. We'll now move onto the last part of our Agenda, and that's Any Other Business, ladies and gentlemen. I don't see anyone with their hand up. I should have guessed that Alan Greenberg was going to put his hand up at the 11th hour. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Just a reminder to the ALAC Members, at least those that are on this call, that we will be having an election starting in a few days for the incoming ALT position from the Asia, Australasia and Pacific Islands region, and the gNSO Liaison position. Please, when they're all posted, look at the answers to the questions we've asked. Engage the individuals directly and make a considered vote. This is an opportunity the ALAC rarely has, to actually vote on leadership. Let's do it right. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. Any other business? Seeing no one put their hand up, I have to thank the interpreters for having exceeded their two-

hour allocation, especially the French interpreter who I understand is by herself today in doing the interpretation, so thank you to all of you and a very warm welcome to our second ALAC call to our Russian interpreter. I believe that is the second one. Thank you to them.

I'd also like to thank the men and women who do the transcript, because we often forget them. I have spent a significant amount of time in those four years reading transcripts, and it's very helpful indeed to remember what I have said in those two and a half hours of these calls. This is now my last ALAC call, ladies and gentlemen. For this I really thank you for your patience.

It was a pleasure to Chair those calls for the past four years, and I can therefore say for the last time on an ALAC call – good morning, good afternoon, good evening and good night. Also, perhaps goodbye ladies and gentlemen. We'll see you all in Los Angeles. This call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]