

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone on today's ALT Mid Monthly Teleconference on Wednesday, 12<sup>th</sup> November at 22:00 UTC. We have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Julie Hammer, Leon Sanchez, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Glenn McKnight and Beran Gillen. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Terri Agnew and myself Gisella Gruber. Can I please just remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The first item, I think we're going to swap. Leon is here now and isn't sure exactly when he has to leave. Why don't we do item #10 first and then go back. I think I announced to the ALT that I've asked Leon to take the lead, responsibility in working with staff on meeting schedules. Essentially that means Leon's going to be tsar of meetings. We have a number of targets for upcoming meetings. The first target is that the 7:00 am to 7:00 pm meeting, we're going to try to minimize the number of days we do that. There's no guarantee we won't do it at all, but certainly we're going to try to reduce that.

That's without the ability to expand the meeting week, and we'll talk about that in a little while. In faith of what seems to be an ever-increasing number of ICANN-wide meetings, or meetings that are scheduled outside of our control, that's inevitably going to imply we have fewer sessions for the ALAC, fewer open sessions, fewer Working Group sessions. Exactly what that means is not 100 per cent clear at this point, but almost invariably we're going to have to say no to some

---

*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.*

---

people who'd like to have some time, and that means both people that we meet with, and internal meetings within At-Large.

There was an initial meeting between staff and Leon yesterday, which I unfortunately missed. Leon, would you like to get on and give us your perspective of what you think this is going to be? I must admit, I've asked Leon to do this without any real perspective of what's involved in the task, and he took it on without any real hesitation whatsoever.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Alan. Yes, we'll definitely try to [unclear 00:03:22] 7:00 am meeting. We'll change it to 6:00 am instead. No. What we spoke about yesterday in our meeting was that in order to achieve control we need to prioritize the meetings [unclear 00:03:43], so what we can do is begin working with staff to make a draft schedule in which we can have a list of hot topics for the ICANN Meeting in Singapore. We'll also have a list of Working Groups that have met regularly, including ICANN Meetings, and of course try to find out whether a face-to-face meeting is of the [unclear 00:04:21] work most. So [unclear 00:04:25]...

According to [currently] available and [unclear] feedback. [unclear 00:04:45] ALT Meetings [unclear] most of us arrived at the time that [unclear] and work, we would most likely want to rest because of the long journey. So [unclear 00:05:17]. Another point we spoke about yesterday is on support for the ALAC Meeting, which is scheduled to be on Wednesdays from 8:45 to 9:45 am. We wanted to get your feedback as to whether you're okay with this timeslot. Also we wanted to ask if we want a wrap-up session on Wednesday night. There are [unclear

---

00:05:56] factors that are not yet decided, that might affect us having our wrap-up session on Wednesday night. Of course [unclear] and we'll be able to confirm whether we'll have the wrap-up session on Wednesday night or whether we'll schedule it for another time.

The last topic we spoke about is [unclear 00:06:25] RALO Leadership. Of course, I would have hoped that [unclear] as Alan said, I haven't [unclear], and any help you can provide me will be really much appreciated.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Fantastic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Leon. On a couple of things that Leon said, we have requested that all ALT Members arrive on Friday, and the first meeting will take place, the ALT discussions or business meeting, which has been taking place over dinner, will take place in the afternoon on Saturday. Therefore if anyone chooses they could arrive Saturday morning and still be there on time, but we're giving you the convenience of arriving the night before and getting a good night's sleep, should you choose. In terms of departure, ALT people, we have asked and are expecting to be given a departure of Saturday for all ALT Members and a departure of Friday for the other ALAC Members.

So there's no reason for people not to attend all of the meeting, and I'll be sending out a note to that effect. Hopefully we've eliminated the problems of people having to leave early, on Thursday or something. I

---

don't think there's anything else specifically related to the scheduling that we know at this point. As Leon mentioned there are a number of variables that certainly need to be refined, but for better or worse, a lot of the things around us are being settled before we really get into the swing, so we have a lot less flexibility than we've had in some years passed. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Alan. I would ask of Leon if we can have a look at, in a draft schedule, and perhaps all of us could put our comments together to help Leon out to plan, I think Leon asked for input, and if there's either a Wiki or some way we could do that, I'd very much appreciate that and I think it would help Leon out as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Staff, are we able to do something like that? Either present the formal schedule in the normal way, or perhaps an abbreviated schedule showing what we know now?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Gisella, would you like to respond to that, or should I?

GISELLA GRUBER:

There's a skeleton schedule for now, but we're not aware of any of the other meetings at this stage. I'm sure we'll know in the next few weeks, but we can definitely work on the skeleton schedule, and as Leon said, we'll also be presenting a list of the [unclear 00:09:51] regularly. I'd say

---

at least [a year], not counting London [unclear], if we could possibly add [unclear 00:10:02], to show which Working Groups are meeting. Yes, we can work on that [unclear] Leon on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I do think that what Leon is doing now is very important. I want to say that it's always more or less done in this way. The skeleton is very helpful and very good, and we have to get it as a standing [unclear 00:10:44] if you want. What was [teaming 00:10:50] us in the past? It was the meeting that we had at the last moment. I think, Alan, if we can make guidelines in our ALAC that any meeting has to be announced or given early on to staff, at least one or two months before the meeting. This was the problem and it will remain the problem. I'm not talking about the meetings of the whole of ICANN, I'm talking about our own meetings.

Yes, the skeleton, we have to agree on it. For me, it must be something we use for every meeting, more or less, with small refinements, but any other meeting, any Working Group meeting, any informal meeting, has to be decided and put on the schedule sufficiently in advance, so we'll not be in the same situation, running from one meeting to another, missing a meeting, etcetera. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. A couple of comments. We will also – and I don't think Leon mentioned that, but I know I've talked to staff about it – to the extent possible, when we have meetings that are in different rooms, we'll do our best to make sure we have a little bit of transition time, and even for other meetings where some participants may be moving, we'll try and put a small gap between them – probably not as large as people want, but we'll try to have a little bit of free time. With regards to last-minute schedules, I can only agree in concept but sometimes situations change around us quickly, and if they do we'll have to make a decision whether the new meeting we want to schedule is worth the hassle that it will cause, because of the last-minute change.

I think that's a prioritization we have to do on the fly. It's simply not something where we say we can't allow it at all. We see what happens in the regular ICANN schedule, where we say there's no changes can be made in the last end weeks, and of course when the world changes, schedules change. We'll try and minimize that, hopefully.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. You've said what I wanted to say here in some ways. In the past, we have done what we're doing now, which is to have a certain number of meetings and define for each day, because we've had to furnish, to provide these details over to ICANN for it to be on the main schedule and to have room allocations – at least two months, or I don't know the exact number of weeks, but quite a large amount of time in advance. What's then happened is that ICANN Leadership, meaning the Board and senior staff, have moved everything around, have decided to add more meetings themselves that everyone should attend.

---

Then we've had to move our schedule around, thus ending up with 7:00 am meetings. I would provide you with an advance warning to have enough empty spaces left in your agenda for all of the stuff that's going to fall on us three weeks before an ICANN meeting, because that's what happens. It's terrible, and this is why it's made an absolute mess of our schedules. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. There's no question that LA was the worse that we've had, because of the additions and changing dynamic that was going on, because of ICANN, accountability and a bunch of other issues. We're going to have to live with part of that and try to minimize it. We'll go back to the original agenda now and back onto Item #3. Some new things perhaps, and revise a number of old things. As I said before I took this job that I was going to be delegating a fair amount of work – we've just talked with Leon about the meeting scheduling – there's a number of other assignments that have either exclusively been made, or in some cases inputs have been made.

I am both grateful of the people who've taken on these roles, and I hope everyone will feel comfortable with them. Olivier, as we know, has been playing a stolid role on leaving the IANA discussions, and the number of meetings continues to grow, and I'm very pleased that we've had someone who's taken the lead on those, without me having to Chair everything and sometimes keep up with the things, which I haven't been able to. Tijani has agreed to be the focal point on the finance and budget, and as we'll talk about in a little while, that's going to require a fair amount of work. Holly – I don't think we've announced this yet,

---

Holly – but Holly has agreed to take the lead on the upcoming ALAC Review.

Again, one of these assignments that I've not a clue what it means, but Holly has agreed to do it nevertheless. At that point, we're talking about organizing whatever it is we're going to do, ahead of time, for the review, and if you are at all aware of the current gNSO Review, they've put huge effort into doing what started off as a self-study but has become a larger animal than that. I think we may well want to do something like that.

Discussions will start with ICANN staff shortly on how this review is going to unfold. At this point we've no real clue as to what the targets are, if there are any from the Structural Improvements Committee, and it's going to be something that will certainly be a part of our life for the next year or two. I've taken a rather strong position that regardless of the outcome it will not disrupt our lives as much as the last one did, and as much as the last gNSO one did, where essentially it stopped many other activities for a good part of the year, for two years. We just have too many real things going on that we can't afford that.

That's one of the other items that are going on. Have I missed anyone? I don't think I have. There are other things that are going to be coming as we start looking at some of the tasks ahead of us, so there will be work that we'll be taking on, and I personally don't see any reason why assignments have to be made only to ALT Members, if there are other people in the community who are willing to take on specific assignments and work. I'm hoping people will not object to that. Olivier?



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I was just going to add, as far as the follow ups that I'm working on, the ATLAS II implementation and follow up is one of the things I'm keeping a close eye on. I've willingly at the moment not pushed forward with it, so as to allow for everyone to settle back and get into the rhythm of work, but obviously we need to do something with all of the work that we had our ALSes do, and obviously we've made some promises to the Board, so we need to honor those and follow up. I certainly see a number of real opportunities there to push for the Board to accept some things that they might have been, I wouldn't say, just pushing back or saying no to, but rather have been putting on the side and thinking, "Well, it's just a couple of people in At-Large that want this."

Having this document with all of the ALSes being present there and having contributed to this is giving us some great weight to push forward on things. So I'm really hoping that we can transform this try into a drop-goal afterwards. If you're a rugby player you would understand what I mean. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. We're going to have a rule of jumping ahead in the Agenda and discussing things that are later on, #12 in this case. We'll get to it. I didn't mention an assignment of things that people have been doing on an ongoing basis. Certainly Olivier has been working on ATLAS and recommendations and that won't stop. Tijani has been doing huge amounts of effort on training and webinars, and putting together a

---

whole program. So there are a lot of things that have been an ongoing effort, and I didn't particularly highlight those, but we're not forgetting anyone. Does anyone have any objections to my comment that some assignments may well be made outside of the ALT?

Hearing nothing, I'll presume that whomever we can attract into doing work, we'll take advantage of. Next, #4, is a whole set of issues relates to ALSes. First is the certification rules and investigating what we do with the voting, and looking at some of the issues relating to Internauta Colombia, I came to the realization that virtually all of the detailed rules of how we conduct discussions within the RALO, how we do the certification vote – we're following virtually none of the rules on the books. It's not that we're doing anything unreasonable, but the words were outdated a long time ago.

We'll be looking at that and I'll be putting together a small group to try to at least align the rules with what we do, if not change them. Related to that is the voting. You'll recall we had a long discussion on the list, prior to the ICANN Meeting. The conclusion we sort of came to was that we'd have open voting for everything, with the exception of a situation where a RALO has not provided advice to the ALAC. In that case we'd have some level of a secret ballot, perhaps if the voting mechanism can allow it; noting how people voted but not making it public, but allowing us to go forward and try to understand why someone is rejected, if they are.

We do have a requirement that when an applicant is rejected to tell them why they are rejected; something we cannot do with a true secret ballot. I'm going to suggest that when the ALAC meets that we modify

---

that slightly, and add that should any ALAC Member request that a particular ballot be secret, that then that would rule. I think that's a reasonable position. If someone is in a position where they know things are going to be awkward, we can arrange for a secret ballot, and I hope no one will object to that.

Lastly, we're going to start an exercise of looking at ALS criteria, and what we expect of an ALS. Currently there's very little in writing anywhere on what we expect of an ALS once certified, and there's particularly relatively little, other than they must be controlled by individual users in terms of criteria. I think we're going to do a review of that. What the outcome may be, I don't know. There may be no change, but I think we're going to have to look at what we're doing and make sure we're comfortable with the rules we have for adding ALSes, and for what we expect of ALSes.

It's not 100 per cent clear how we make those rules retroactive to the 180 ALSes we have now, but it's the first step. Any comments on any of the ALS issues? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. One of the questions that came up, or one of the suggestions that had come up on previous discussions on this, was to strengthen the due diligence process, which had been taking place and which I personally think is quite mundane in that it says, "Does it have a website?" "Does it have members?" and which I think 99 per cent of those things can be faked, one way or another. I have serious concerns that as time goes and with the scores of new ALSes coming in, we might

---

have some fake ALSes being created with a fake website, and a number of members that don't really exist and just have Gmail addresses and things like that.

I wonder whether there is any taste for being able to strengthen the due diligence one way or another. Of course, not going into detail, but that was one additional thing I wanted to put on the table. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Certainly there's a taste from the Chair to do that. I think that we want to have much stronger rules all around, in terms of what we're expecting. I think an ALS with ten people on the books and one active member is something that's not really helping us make the case that we're representing users. I think we need to look at the concept of individual users, for RALOs that will accept those, and try to make sure that if we have an ALS, which we are claiming is a substantive group within some city or country, that we can defend that. I don't know exactly how this will unfold, but I certainly support the kind of thing you're talking about. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I would like to say that this issue of ALS criteria, expectations, is really a problem now. Now we have grown enough in terms of number we have to grow in terms of quality. I am now chairing a group in AFRALO, addressing the review of our Operating Principles, and the issues we are discussing, every time I feel there is a pushback from the established ALSes, that by the way are more or less one-person ALSes, and they are really inactive in everything regarding the substance. They are only

---

there for procedure, for voting, for travelling, etcetera. Those people are pushing back any possibility of having individual members. They are pushing back any possibility of evolution.

Now we are facing a big problem I think. This problem is that we already have established ALSes, that are present, because every time you have something about procedure they are there, but they refuse any evolution. I am a little bit sad about that. We need to have, in the future at least, better criteria for the recruitment of ALSes. In fact, Olivier is right. Due diligence, any fake ALS can pass the due diligence, no problem. I think we have to review all the system. We need now to have perhaps less ALSes but better ALSes; real ALSes, real representatives of the end users. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. I put myself in the queue. If I had had to run for the position of Chair, my campaign would have been, "We have quantity, now we need quality." That's not saying we don't have some quality ALSes around, but we don't have enough of them. I agree with everything you said. I agree with everything that was said initially. I believe we're going to have to do some work here. One of the reasons that I'm raising this at this level and not just at the RALO level is that ALAC has a responsibility to create At-Large, and we're not going to shirk that. Not everything can be delegated to the RALOs.

I note Maureen's comment in the chat that the Metrics Group was looking at this, and some of that I think is going to come back to the ALAC, because if we do the kinds of things Olivier and Tijani has said,

---

there will be pushback. I think this is going to have to be done by the ALAC, as an ALAC effort, because ALAC is the group that has that control and has that responsibility. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I've been following the discussions on the AFRALO Rules of Procedure, quite silently actually – not being on the calls but certainly following the discussions on the mailing list. It's true, that there is pushback, and it's not only in AFRALO that this goes back for. Let's say for example having individual membership and so on, it's also present in other regions. One of the things Tijani might wish to quote is the actual At-Large Review which had many recommendations, and I'm a little concerned we might have dropped a few of these recommendations. We put them on a path saying, "They're implemented, because that's been tasked now to the RALO and it's the RALO now to drive it forward."

Yes, we're not managing to completely implement that recommendation, and I remember that just from memory that one of these recommendations was that the RALOs should start accepting individual membership and design a program for them. That was one thing. Perhaps that's something which then can be pushed onto the RALOs. The second thing is a bit of a half a question, being at the end of the day, it's the ALAC that accredits an organization that comes in and that applies as an ALS. The RALO only provides advice to the ALAC.

I wonder whether it's possible for the ALAC to effectively set the rules on these things, and not resort to the RALO's current membership to

---

agree to rule that they might wish to disagree with, for their own personal sake – completely disregarding the needs of the ALAC itself. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, I'm going to cut you off and I'm going to ask Cheryl to be very brief. We're running out of time and we're having the substantive discussions here that we need to be having in a wider group. I think we're all preaching to the converted here. There's no question that we need to be setting rules, I believe, and I hope that will be the outcome, and we'll be much more in control of the process than we have before. When we last set the rules in 2007 it was a very different environment than we're in now, and I think we're going to have to act accordingly because of that. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

In response to things that are still outstanding in terms of recommendations from the initial ALAC review, they're not negotiable. We undertook, as a community, to have them enacted, and the ALAC has every right and indeed must ensure that the RALO Rules of Procedure review, if they are an impediment to such things as individual membership, are solved, because there isn't a choice. It's mandatory. In answer to Olivier's question regarding ability to manage and massage the rules, absolutely 100 per cent, yes. In fact, we only brought the RALOs in as a matter of courtesy – notice a sneer in my voice, it's deliberate – so that they could feel more engaged and we could increase our likelihood of local due diligence being effective. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. If we can go onto the next item now, this will be a very short one. That is the selection of members for the CCWG, the Accountability and Governance CCWG. We did a consensus call where the ALAC has agreed to the process that was suggested by the ALT – that is Olivier is putting together his group, and I understand from Olivier that the group is largely unchanged at this point, so it's effectively put together, which will do the selection. I'll be sending out a call for EOIs. It should have gone out already, but it's running late because of other things. I'll try to get that out tonight. It looks like various groups may have people selected in about three weeks.

Some of them will probably take longer than that, but our target I think is about three weeks. Olivier, I answered an email to you yesterday. You can remind me what I said. I think I said we'd allow about ten days for the EOIs and then give you, in the order of two weeks, to be able to do the selection based on that. Is that what I said to you?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Indeed that's what you said. I'll also advise you that I've sent a note to the Selection Committee that performed the previous selection, asking for anyone who wanted to go for any of those positions that you've mentioned, that they should stand down of course, because they would be in conflict. So far no one has stood down from the Committee, so it looks as though we might be ready to perform the task without any changes to the Committee.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Three weeks I think is too long. I know the process will take time, but you know very well that as soon as the Charter is approved, the CCWG will start working, because time is very important. We're on a very tight timeline. Perhaps if you can shorten this period, it will be better.

ALAN GREENBERG: I talked to Byron yesterday. They're not considering it until the 21<sup>st</sup>, and he thinks it will take several weeks, at least three, for the ccNSO to select their Members. The gNSO is approving tomorrow and they'll then presumably start their process, roughly in parallel with ours. There's no way this can really get started sadly until the middle of December. We're going to try and make sure that we're not the impediment to doing this. We will also be asked to identify a Co Chair, and Tijani, quick question – the Co Chair presumably must be a Member?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we don't have another person in addition to the five, for the Co Chair, so we can't select our selection of Co Chair until we have the five people selected?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I think so.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We're going to proceed with that as quickly as possible. I do want to give a reasonable time for people to respond. What we are looking for is not anyone who wants to put up their hand and say they want to do the work. As the Charter says, this is likely to be a long-term and relatively intensive commitment. We are expecting people to go into this either with specific expertise related to accountability and governance, and/or knowledge of what's happened before in ICANN – the ATRTs, and knowledge of ICANN's bylaws and things like that.

We have very few people who have that knowledge ahead of time, but we're asking people to make a commitment to get up to speed very quickly. So the Selection Group is going to have a particular hard time I think, in finding good people. But we want to try to give them the benefit. Now, there's one question that I will be raising with the ALAC. I don't want to discuss it right now, but we'll be discussing it then. If you notice in my call for consensus, I said we're expecting Olivier's Selection Group to fill these positions, one per region. We, the ALAC, will need to give them guidance as to what happens if they cannot find a good candidate for a region.

There are two alternatives. One, we give them permission to fill it from some other region, and lose the regional representation in the name of a better candidate from the first group, or we keep positions open and do an extended secondary call, and try to fill that position as soon as possible, but probably after the group starts meeting. Think about that.

---

I'll be sending out a note to the ALAC ahead of time and we'll have that discussion during the ALAC Meeting.

The next Item is Olivier asked for ten minutes to talk about are we going to provide any guidance to the people going to Frankfurt – and he and I are among those people – in terms of what kind of structure to support for this new IANA embodiment. Olivier, I turn it over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I wanted to add one more thing on the previous Agenda Item. It's to do with the requirements for a Member of the Accountability Working Group. As you know, the Selection Committee asks specific questions in its request for EOIs, and of course the ones we've asked with regards to the IANA stewardship transition should probably be different for the ones we should be asking for the accountability process. I wondered whether you or the ALT thought that the Selection Committee could change those questions, or do you wish the ALT could change the questions, or the ALAC could change the questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't have the possibility of the ALAC changing them, because that EOI must go out soon, and to be honest I hadn't thought about that. If you have any suggestions that you'd like to send to the ALT soon after this meeting, then I certainly have some suggestions. A large span of it is going to focus on asking the people to what extent they already have knowledge, background, of the various aspects. If you have thoughts of

---

how you want to phrase the question then I'd suggest you do that as quickly as possible, after this meeting, to the ALT list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I'll probably do that, or I think it's probably great if all of you on the call could send a note to the ALT, with what you believe should be the needs for someone on this Accountability Group. Because if I was to say something, that would obviously have to come back to the Selection Committee and it would take a few days for them to come back and have a concerned idea...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's not you on the Selection Committee, it's me asking the ALT. I forgot. Thank you for the reminder. Because ultimately it's the ALAC. We've asked the Committee to do the dog-work, but it's the ALAC doing the selection. I think it's reasonable for us to come up with a short list, given the tight timeframe. I would have wanted to get the EIO request out today. Based on what we've just discussed it's not going to go today, but it needs to go soon. Olivier, back onto accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think we're back onto accountability, we're back onto the next, which is to do with IANA. The IANA stewardship transition, as you know, it's got a number of processes taking place. One of them is developing the naming issues side of the transition. That's the operational community that's ICANN. There's a CCWG that's been in place to start working on this, and it's structured its work in quite a nice way, with a

---

number of questions. It's started chopping the issues into smaller, bite-sized parts. One of the things we have coming up, there was a RFP Sub-Group that met earlier today, that had a number of documents to look at.

One was to do with basic questions, such as do we want the accountability process to be in-house or do we want it to be different? Do we want the IANA function to remain within ICANN or go outside of ICANN? This sort of thing. Altogether a document has been put together and tomorrow there is a call of the overall Working Group on the Naming Issues, and next week there's a face-to-face meeting of that Working Group in Frankfurt. I'm hoping that by then we can have some kind of concerted point of view within the At-Large, and certainly within the ALAC, and even more amongst the five Members that are Members of the Working Group and that will be traveling to Frankfurt.

In order to achieve this and in order to reflect the IANA Issues Working Group's work and consensus, we had a meeting earlier today that decided for a survey to be asked, using Survey Monkey, that would be sent both to the Members of the At-Large IANA Issues Working Group and also the ALAC. Alan, please correct me if I'm wrong on this. I believe it was to the ALAC that we asked for this to be sent, not the whole At-Large community?

ALAN GREENBERG:

We discussed both. I think the focus was on the ALAC. We were looking for people who have been either involved in this, or who have a mandate or responsibility to help make the decision.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. We started right after the call, Ariel and I worked together, and she's done wonders in putting together the survey. I wanted to just pass the first two or three questions to you all, as unsuspecting victims, for you to provide details and think, "Is this something that's self-explanatory? That can be answered?" I will ask Ariel to please share the link of the survey. It's in the chat at the moment. The first three pages quickly. The first page, asking for the name. Why do we ask for the name? Because the Working Group will weigh the answers from Working Group Members at a higher level than answers from the ALAC, from people that don't take part in the Working Group.

Obviously that's because people who take part in the Working Group are much more informed about these issues, which by the way are getting more and more complex by the day. So it's one of these things. That was the first thing. The first question was, "Do you support the creation of an oversight body for the naming related IANA functions?" That's a copy of a poll that we had during our conference call earlier today. It's either yes or there are three different types of no. "No, I would prefer a mechanism for oversight," "No, I would support a mechanism for oversight with the possible capability of separation," and the third one, "No, but I don't have other suggestions."

Then for each one of the questions we ask there is, "Undecided." I didn't want to put the, "None of the above," because that might make people think, "I'm actually against having an oversight body and so I'm just going to put, "None of the above," for all questions. That doesn't help us. What we're looking at here is if we're going to not have an

---

oversight body, then we're fine, but if we're going to have one because all of the other communities want an oversight body, we need to have a next guess and be aware of what our second choice is going to be after that. That's the first page.

On each page there's the ability for persons to comment, because some people might answer, "Undecided," and might provide the details of why they may be undecided on this. If we just click on this quickly... Yes, Ariel reminds me that all of the questions that are starred need to be answered. The example here is creation of an oversight body. We've got the different proposals that are picked up straight from a paper that was distributed to the Working Group, and that has a matrix of three different scenarios.

I'll be quiet here for a few seconds as you scope through this. I'm not asking you to read the question, just scope through it. Is this a good layout that will yield answers, or is it going to confuse people? Over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I know Holly's hand was up but it's now down. On this question I don't know what that separation question means, because I don't know who's going to be separated from what. I think you need to be clear – if you want people to answer the question and understand from their answer what it is they're saying, that's number one. Number two, an oversight body presumes that the responsibility for managing IANA will rest with ICANN. This is a body overseeing ICANN, and overseeing ICANN's handling of the matter. I think that needs a preamble, so that's well

---

understood by some people who'll be deeply engrossed in it, but it's not going to be understood by other people.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I think that what we will do then is either provide those details on the Survey Monkey, or in a separate message. Would you say providing a quick intro on the Survey Monkey's first page is a better alternative?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's mandatory.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. I'll work with Ariel and add this immediately after this call. The aim is to send this survey out as soon as possible. The time is just so tight these days. The closing time for the survey would be 00:00 UTC on Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: The real issue Olivier is to make sure that when we get some answers they have some meaning to us. That's why I worry about things. Are we going onto the next question yet?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I already have. I'm on question six I believe.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I'm not. On question three you need another option of some combination of them, because one of the things that came out in the discussions today was that those proposals were put together by one person in the middle of the night. They're not necessarily optimized.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. You would add an additional choice, which would be, "Some combination of the above."

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ariel, I hope you're talking notes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All the next questions up until six are tedious. You have to actually answer these things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just type any name and click 'yes', whatever and then click next.

ALAN GREENBERG: I did, but you have to keep on going from the top of the screen to the bottom.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Question three is the one we could look at. Question three has got the three different proposals. We've color-coded them into three columns, and the question here is whether this is understandable.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you're optimistic that you're going to get people to read all of these things, but go for it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They can't be summarized Alan, I'm sorry, because if we summarize them we change the dynamics of it. This is what's going to be presented to the wider Working Group, so it's a tough one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me try and summarize what I got from the tone of the meeting today – and I did put it in the chat at the end. I think the general perception of most people on that call – and we're talking about the At-Large ad-hoc call – is that they'd like to see the operations still maintained as a part of ICANN and that we would like some level of oversight, as simple as possible, preferably without new corporate structures, if it can be made effective. If that cannot be made effective then we may need some level of oversight over and above ICANN.

The bottom line is, as a Californian corporation, the Board is obliged to make its own decisions, and it's not clear what mechanisms will legally work to direct the Board to do something different. We're looking at the worst-case scenario that the Board has gone rogue and is not satisfying the community's need in running IANA. My sense was we're looking for

---

simplicity, if we can possibly achieve it, and short of that, we may need something akin to the later proposals that have to do with external corporate structures. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Instead of adding a combination of those options, I propose that we add 'other proposal' and we have the comment box to explain the other proposal. Because sometimes it's not a combination of those options, it's something else. If it's a combination we can say 'other' and say what is other.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. I'm happy to leave it to Olivier, now that he's heard both of those suggestions, to either take one, take the other, or take a combination of them, as he thinks fits. I think Olivier understands the issue that we've raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'd say we could add 'a combination' and we can add 'other'. That probably makes it easier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's go back to the Agenda. Next Item is Finance and Budget Sub Committee. I have made a proposal to the ALT, that you've all seen. I think I received nothing but agreement that the formal minimal FBSC will be made up of one ALAC Member from each region, and one RALO leader that is Chair, Vice Chair or Secretariat, be

---

selected, as with other groups, these meetings are not necessarily closed, and we rarely restrict speaking rights, but that core, I believe is a good combination, and I didn't receive any negative comments on it.

To make a formal decision I believe that group is going to have to set some criteria based on input from the ICANN Finance and based on the history of what kind of request is ICANN accepting. We're not going to get all of our requests accepted. No one ever does, but hopefully we'll have a better record than we did in the past. I think we need to provide some guidance for the kinds of things that we want them asking for, or that are likely to be accepted. I believe we need to be in a position where the FBSC actually takes decisions and doesn't just blindly pass everything on, or ask for something to be reworded and then passed on. So I think we need to prioritize it.

Lastly, I think that we, as the ALAC, want to be making some budget requests also. Certainly a prime one is to expand the work-week. That might not be the only thing we do. I'm not looking on a substantive discussion here on what we should be financing, or exactly what the criteria is, but is everyone comfortable with that step forward, so I can outline it to the ALAC and then have perhaps a more substantive discussion at the ALAC Meeting itself? A tick from Holly. I don't see any hands. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. I did actually respond to the email saying, "Alan, that's fine, but for example my expertise and contribution will be lost under that model, and you won't have someone who's been involved in the FBSC

---

since 2007, and I'm not a Regional Leader, so I won't be serving in any capacity then on the CROPP Review Team, and I doubt that my situation is unique.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I thought I addressed that, but maybe I didn't. I would personally welcome your participation and your sage advice, and the only restriction that we might make – and I certainly haven't made that decision but it needs to be made – is should there be formal voting? Like most of our things, I hope there is not formal voting. We may want to restrict that to be regionally balanced, but other than that...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

What about the CROPP Review Team? That's fine for FBSC, but the CROPP Review Team is specifically balanced to be a Member from the FBSC and a Member from the region. We need to make sure we don't have the same regional Members trying to occupy both spaces, or you won't have a balanced Review Team as well. Just need to watch that as well, that's all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My response was I haven't looked at the CROPP selection process at all, and I have no doubt that will be revised, as well as the FBSC is being revised. I'm completely open on that one, so I think we need good ideas. I certainly haven't looked at that at all at this point. So I'm not ruling out any of the kinds of things you're talking about, nor your involvement in the process. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Since you said you have no opposition from the ALAC Members about the FBSC, I think the first step is to review the composition of the group and send the necessary mail to the RALOs so they appoint their Members on that group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Unless I'm mistaken, I don't think I sent that to the ALAC yet. I sent it to the ALT. Now, that's not secret, our mailing lists are open, but I don't believe I've explicitly sent anything to the ALAC in preparation for the ALAC Meeting. It's something I want to have a discussion about at the ALAC Meeting. That will be going out in the next little while, I just wanted to have this discussion here first. Tijani, is your hand up again? I presume not. Next meeting, ALAC schedule and attendance. We went through a process of looking at are there any times where we can hold an ALAC Meeting, where there is nobody who has to attend in what I was calling a "blackout window".

I was trying to see if there were any windows where everyone who was mandated to attend – that is the 15 ALAC Members and the formal Liaisons – could attend with no one having to participate within the midnight to 6:00 am window. I found a few slots that work in this season, and one slot that works in the northern summer season. We've not gotten agreement from all ALAC Members that they can participate. There are several people who have said for one reason or another – and I'm not trying to judge those reasons – that they cannot participate in those windows.

---

So we are holding it at 20:00 UTC, a week from Tuesday. That is going to work because there are a number of people who said that regardless of when the meeting is they cannot attend, because they'll be out of the country, out of their country, and will be otherwise occupied. That time will not work for future meetings, so we're going to have to go through another exercise, and I need to talk to staff and try to figure out what it is.

We're essentially going to have a decision to make, and that is do we minimize the number of pained individuals, which invariably means people who live in Australia or the Pacific, or do we try to say if there's somebody who's going to have to participate in the middle of the night, that we rotate the meetings and other people will have to suffer for some of the meetings? That ends up maximizing the number of pained people but spreading the pain around at least, so there's nobody for whom every meeting is at 3:00 am.

I'd also like to try to minimize the number of people who say, "If a meeting is held at that time I'm simply not attending, don't count on my participation." I welcome input now for a few minutes, or in email afterwards, of what our target is. What are we trying to achieve? We are a group that has people literally around the world. We're lucky right now there's nobody in China, because if there was there would be no window that would allow us to have a blackout session. But apparently what I was trying is not likely to work, so where do we go from here? Thoughts? Or if you want to contribute later on by email, go for it.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: See how it goes is my suggestion. If there's a choice of sharing the pain, I think that is, nowadays, a more acceptable program forward, because there's a number of SOs having started to do that in their Working Groups. That said, it does make the whole finding slots for the plethora of meetings of Sub-Teams and Sub-Sub-Team meetings that go on, more and more complicated. We would have to recognize that, but you may find that there is two times the NomCom has managed to do that under my rule and it is continuing under Stephan's rule, through equally inconvenient times, I guess, for everybody, but where everyone can make it. It only mainly inconvenienced one. You might also have to shrink your blackout slightly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Would you share what those two times are Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The top of my head I think it's something like 20:00 and 13:00.

ALAN GREENBERG: What length of a meeting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 90 minutes minimum, two hours frequently, and often up to three.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. We'll look at all those options. My fear is that if our attempt is that we spread the pain, we may end up in a situation where some



---

people are not willing to sustain pain and we simply have some people who routinely drop off when the meeting is at 4:00 am in their part of the world. As fair as that is, it doesn't end up with something that's necessarily what we want. It's going to take a little bit more work. I don't know where we are right now. I have some ideas of what the next set of questions is to ask, and we'll see where it goes from now.

Clearly it's still a problem, and I'm not very happy with saying that for the ALAC Meeting, which is a mandatory meeting for that group of people, that we hold it such that some people always have to do it at 4:00 am or 3:00 am. That's certainly not where I would prefer to be. Okay, ALAC Agenda for the 25<sup>th</sup> of November... Sorry, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Just to say that for the webinars that we did for the pre-Summit, Gisella managed to find two slots of time where everybody in the world can attend without big pain, which are 13:00 and 21:00 UTC. If we take those times, I think those are something workable. I don't think it will be very hard to find an agreement or consensus about one of those two times. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can take it offline. I'll note that in summer and winter seasons the times change, because there's a two-hour difference in some parts of the world, because of daylight saving kicking in. What we found in the survey we did so far – and you can look at it yourself – is there are some people who basically are saying they will not work very late at night. That is problematic, if we have too many people doing that, and we have

---

a fair number of people in Europe and Africa where we're asking them to work quite late at night. I'm not trying to solve it on this call, I just wanted to let you know where we were at this point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Quick question. Did you get full ALAC participation in your Doodle, to sort these times out?

ALAN GREENBERG: We did. We had a lot of trouble, because we went through several versions of the Doodle, which were wrong in one way or another but had to be fixed, and plus the intention was to try to set an ongoing time and the time for the 25<sup>th</sup>. The title of the Doodle only said the 25<sup>th</sup> and therefore we got effectively incorrect answers from several people who were traveling that week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It may be worthwhile to do it again with some other extension.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. We're going to look at going forward, but yes, we did get full participation, and for those people that are travelling we now know what their schedule is that week and what it is in the general sense. Where are we? #9 – ALAC Meeting. You can click on what the Agenda is. Most of the Items on the Agenda are the Items that we have here, and that we're doing a very brief discussion on. Heidi, you're the one

---

who put this together. Are there any things on the ALAC schedule that are really different from what we're discussing here?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. The only addition is that there's this sub-point under #7, about the proposed pilot At-Large program. I think also there's an update for Olivier from an IANA Stewardship CWG face-to-face meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Why don't you talk about #7.a for a moment, because that hasn't been raised yet?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Silvia and I had a brief discussion with Christopher Mondini and Janice Douma-Langue yesterday about how we could get an extension or a new type of program to bring in indigenous members. That's worked so well for example with Anthony. The idea was to have an ALAC special request for FY 16 have a proposed pilot for a global program that would bring in indigenous members from, for example, North America, but also from New Zealand and Australia. That is just an idea and we'd like to get some input on that. If the ALAC were to be in support of that, it would be ask that indigenous current members be part of the development of that, or really be the main developers of that program.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Heidi. One question that comes to my mind is in all the regions where indigenous people exist – and I believe you told me that

---

your definition is indigenous people in developed countries, so people who are not eligible for the Fellowship Program?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Correct, that was the whole point, that the Fellowship Program is not able to bring in fellows from developed countries.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It would be interesting to know to what extent we will have individual membership in those regions. Are we making a pre-condition of continued involvement, that they somehow be able to cobble together an ALS? That goes back to our original earlier discussion of ALSes that are put together simply so one person can participate. It's something to think about as we go forward. Again, I'm not sure the discussion needs to be held right now. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. I was going to discuss another point, but now that we're speaking about this one specifically, is there a reason why this ended up being focused on indigenous communities rather than deprived communities, which I think was the original request? Saying that there were deprived communities in first world countries and that they couldn't be catered for.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That would be just because NARALO would be interested in having indigenous people from the first nations.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Olivier's question is, do we need to restrict it that way?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, this would be a program that would be open to the ALAC to develop.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Why 'indigenous' and not 'deprived'?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, if you would like to develop something like that, or the ALAC would, to have a combination of that, or just one side and include the first nations people, that would be okay as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, I think what you're hearing, at least from Olivier – and we also have Cheryl's hand up, and I'll go to here in a moment – is if there's a general agreement with that then the title of this section should be more general and the ALAC could have a discussion on the merits of focusing on one or the other or both. Cheryl?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just reminding you all that the term should be "disadvantaged communities within developed economies" or "emerging and developing economies", because I think you probably need to ensure it's emerging and developing economies, not just developed economies. I'm absolutely supportive of it, and indigenous communities in many, if not most cases, will fall into that category, but we will be able to focus on those. Just on the cobbling together an ALS point, certainly in the experience in Australia and New Zealand, we have highly-[assuasive 01:17:02] and primary lobby success, and very well established bona fide organizations operating in the Telco and communications world.

I'd think some of those would be able to very successfully transition across [having interest 01:17:21] in ICANN, via ALAC. I've dropped out of the AC room.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. I don't think I said that we'd forbid you from forming an ALS, just that it might perhaps be nice if it wasn't the only way that you could continue participating. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Moving on, on the same topic of the ALAC Agenda, could I please request that we have an update on the IANA Stewardship CWG face-to-face, slightly longer than five minutes? It's a very complex topic and we might need to take more than five minutes on this, especially if there are questions that arise. Bearing in mind that in the forthcoming month and a half or so we're going to have a PCP opening up on these issues.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Anyone else on the ALAC Agenda? If not, we'll go back to the ALT Agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: When is the deadline for adding or deleting things from the ALAC Agenda?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would say the beginning of next week, if at all possible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to be rigid and say we can make no changes whatsoever after a week, but I'd like to try to have the Agenda relatively clean. We have ten more minutes left in this call and we still have a substantial number of items. In terms of the policy development, are there any crucial issues that we need to discuss at this point? I'm asking Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Alan. We just received two new public comment requests, and it's on the Agenda. I don't know whether you got a chance to see them yet. We haven't decided whether we want to have a statement for these two new requests. Another thing is of course the CCWG Charter. I've heard from Heidi that ALAC wants to make amendments to it. I'm standing by and if you want to make any revisions or

---

amendments to it, let me know. Our vote it supposed to start tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The vote will start tomorrow. If we have any amendments we will vote, as we did with the IANA Charter. We'll vote on them separately. I do not believe, unless someone tells me otherwise, that we want to be the only ones approving a different Charter and then effectively find we're not part of the group anymore. The gNSO is meeting in a relatively small number of hours, and I believe the intent is they vote on the Charter tomorrow. Cheryl, is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If we have an amendment that we plan to vote on tomorrow night and we don't tell the gNSO about it at least an hour or two before their meeting, you can pretty well assume they're not going to approve it. They might very well not approve it anyway, because they won't have had time to consult with their communities. At this point I'd almost say it's too late to make an amendment, that we end up having approved by all of the groups. We've had this document posted for a week now. The comment period officially closes in 39 minutes. I personally think it's a bit late, but we may well have an amendment for our own vote. I think it's not going to end up being considered by anyone else, if that's the case. Any other comments? Olivier?



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: On the case of the draft document from GAC Sub Group on Geographic Names, the GAC has extended the comment period. I'm well aware we have filed a comment. the GAC has extended the comment period until the 31<sup>st</sup> of December and has now published its Report in Arabic, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Russian and Chinese. Does this group here believe that there is any need or interest in reopening the ability for further comments from At-Large, now that we have those translated documents?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was going to raise it with the ALAC itself and see whether there was any interest. I'm certainly not going to push for a reopening, but I wouldn't object to it if there was a strong belief that we need to say something else. The amount of participation we actually had in drafting that statement was not very large. I was going to mention it to the ALAC. Anything else on the two new statements? Ariel will consider them by email. ATLAS II Recommendations, I put a very short time on it. Olivier's already talked a little bit about it. My only comment was going to be as we go forward I don't want the ALAC to push heavily to take a recommendation that might not be something that we feel is very important, and push for ICANN to put lots of resources into it.

I think as we go forward we need to continue to look at the recommendations and make sure that this is something that we do want to push and push heavily on. We all know the mechanism by which these recommendations came about, and there may well be some that

---

are not ones that we need to push on. I think we're going to look at that carefully as we go ahead, but other than that the work is proceeding and Olivier, as he said, is taking the lead on that. ALAC Review. We talked a little bit on that earlier; that Holly will take the lead. Cheryl has agreed to work with us on that.

Cheryl of course was Chair during the last Review and has perhaps the largest single reserve of information about how the Review was conducted, how the implementation was done. I'm very pleased that Cheryl has agreed to work on that. I'm somewhat determined that we do not let it take over our lives, but hopefully we can use the review mechanism to enact changes in ALAC and At-Large, which will help us serve the community better in the future. Any other thoughts on the review? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not at this stage. I think it's early, but we do have one or two things to tidy up with the final implementation from the first Review. Of course the most obvious one is the individual membership in all RALOs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Something perhaps we can talk about a little bit later. Net Mundial. This is an issue I put on. The Net Mundial Initiative has a Coordinating Committee, which I sense was not looking for people from ICANN as such, but for representatives of the four overall bodies, which is government, business, civil society and the academia. Those four domains, in each of the five regions, comprising 20 people in total. Jean-Jacques sent a note saying he'd like to put an application in and have it

---

endorsed by ALAC. I don't actually see an ICANN ALAC slot in those positions, other than as one of the civil society representatives.

I personally don't think this is something that we should be getting involved in, but I welcome other thoughts. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I totally and absolutely recommend that the ALAC and ALT do not make any support of any candidate for this. I think you would be opening up a can of worms. I don't think it's just because one person asked you first, you just stick with them, you set up a process – it gets far too complicated. I think you should respectfully decline to act as a “supporter” for anyone who approaches you on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just for the sake of transparency, I'd like to notify you all that Jean-Jacques did email me before. He may have emailed other people for their point of view, but my point of view was I couldn't tell him whether to ask the ALAC or not, but that he should basically ask on the ALAC internal list whether this was something that could happen or not happen. That's why he emailed the internal list. I'm tired. You get what I said? Yes.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly if we were going to endorse, it would be as a civil society person, and I don't think we claim to be representing that segment of the world in a sufficient way that that's something we would want to be saying. Again, that's my personal opinion. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I do agree with you that ALAC or ALT shouldn't recommend anyone, because of the reasons Cheryl just mentioned, and also because we might have a lot of candidates and it will be very unbalancing to support one and not support another. For the record, I have to say that Jean-Jacques said that he's applying as civil society and not as an ICANN RALO or an ALAC or ALT entity.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that. My comment was I'm not sure whether ALAC is in a position to claim that we're advocating a particular civil society person or not. Holly, are you agreeing with what's going on, or are you disagreeing?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I agree. I've been quietly agreeing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Leon isn't here. We can't ask him. I just wanted to get the full tone of the ALT. Olivier, last comment?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Just to add, ICANN has a CCWG on Internet Governance, and I just wanted to remind you of the fact that the Working Group has not discussed endorsing any candidates, and indeed has not received any request to endorse any candidates so far, but I expect that there might be a discussion on this, especially just relating to the Net Mundial follow up. I just wanted to add also that the Working Group had started as a Joint Working Group between the NCSG and the ALAC, which then transformed itself and is now actually being ratified by the different SOs and ACs, and we now have a third Co Chair, I think.

The two other Co Chairs are myself and Rafik Damak, and the third Co Chair now is Jordan Carter from the ccNSO. That's great news. We expect to get more Co Chairs on this soon as well, in which case I would suggest that the ALAC, when it comes down to Internet governance issues, make use of that Working Group and maybe have more involvement on that Working Group, since it will definitely bring a lot more weight to the community on any matters external to ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Is there Any Other Business? I note we are two minutes over, so [unclear 01:32:00], but can we make it not more than two? Anyone with one last comment? Going, going, gone. Thank you all for joining us. We'll be in touch. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**