
TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the ALAC Monthly Meeting on Tuesday, November 25th 2014 at 20:00 UTC. On the English channel for ALAC we have Alan Greenberg, Vanda Scartezini, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Eduardo Diaz, Holly Raiche, Raf Fatani, Glenn McKnight, Beran Gillen and Leon Sanchez. We're missing from EURALO Sandra Hoferichter and Jimmy Schulz. On the English channel, non-ALAC, we have Ron Sherwood, Garth Graham, Roosevelt King, Wolf Ludwig and Allan Skuce.

On the Spanish channel for ALAC we have Fatima Cambroner. On the Spanish channel, non-ALAC, we have Alberto Soto. On the French channel for ALAC we have Hadja Ouattara. Jimmy Schulz has just joined the call as well. Our Liaison today is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We have apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Julie Hammer, Maureen Hilyard and Barrack Otieno. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Ariel Liang, Nathalie Peregrine and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreters will be Veronica and David. Our French interpreters are Camila and Claire. Our Russian interpreter is Galina.

I would also like to remind you to please state your name before speaking not only for transcription purposes but also for our interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Are there any additions or changes to the Agenda? Hearing none, we'll adopt the Agenda as shown on the Wiki. A couple of very quick remarks. The Agenda, we've put a lot of effort into,

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.

and it's detailed and hopefully will have given people an opportunity ahead of time to look at what we're talking about and come forward with any ideas.

As indicated in the email I sent earlier today, my ability and staff's ability is to make sure agenda are distributed early so you have an opportunity to prepare for them and that meetings will start, to the extent possible, right on the hour or very soon afterwards, so we do ask people to show up prior to the start to allow us to cover that. We have a process in At-Large for proxies, for when you cannot attend a meeting. We've not used those to any great extent, and one of the reasons is we've never put together a formal description of how one exercises a proxy.

That will be done in the very near future and we hope for future meetings, to a large extent, we'll have everyone attending either in person or through a proxy, so that when we make decisions they can be viewed as decisions of the ALAC, not as a sub-set of the ALAC. I don't think there's anything else I want to go into in detail at this point, but I will take any questions on the overall of how we're conducting meetings? I see a note from Glenn to say the Agenda looks good. Thank you. Heidi can attest we put a fair amount of work into this. Seeing no hands we'll go onto the next Item, Action Items.

This is one of the changes we're implementing. The AIs will be reviewed ahead of time of the meeting and we'll do our best possible to either make sure that AIs that require anything new substantive discussions will be put on the Agenda as Items and we'll raise things under AIs when and if there are things that don't require substantive discussion but the ALAC needs to be alerted to.

In this particular case there's only one Item and it's regarding the ALAC reviewing some IDN issues. Heidi, do you have anything to say on that? I know when we talked earlier you weren't quite sure what the Item meant.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. I was able to speak with Ariel and either she can update you or it may be that [Fid Fish 00:05:29] is on the call. I don't see him. Ariel, can you update us on that please?

ARIEL LIANG: Hello everyone. There are three AIs for the IDN Working Group. Two have been completed. First is to share with the group a list of the Generation Panels and update the group about their status. That's completed. The main idea is to know which GPs still need volunteers and which are inactive. We're aware of that status – both Satish and Edmun know about that. Second is Sarmad to write a call for volunteers message for GPs and the IDN Working Group was distributed among the At-Large community to solicit more volunteers.

This AI was completed last week and we sent out the call for volunteers email with detailed information in it. The third one, the open one, is for Satish to draft a proposal to form a CCWG on the IDN subject, and he's in the process of doing that. That's in progress.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Ariel. One other issue is we'll be instituting a change in how we record AIs. Specifically we'll make sure that when an Action is

written we'll take additional time during the meeting, if necessary, to make sure it's clear and will be understandable when we look at it some time after that. We'll also be implementing a practice that all AIs either have a target completion date or an indication it's ongoing. Olivier, I see you put something in the chat. Would you like an opportunity to speak?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I just wanted to add in the AOB if I can have a couple of minutes at the end of the call to speak about the ICANN accountability track?

ALAN GREENBERG: You can. Would you like to do it now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just note we do have an Item on the accountability track in terms of the selection of people, so that will be covered, but if you have anything else you want to say please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine then. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. The first Item on the Agenda is ALAC policy development. We'll not be going over what has been completed and what we're not

drafting a statement on. There are two comment periods open now that we've not discussed, and we need to. The first one is on the ICANN Draft Five-Year Operating Plan. I can't see how we could not provide a comment on the OP. Either I or Ariel asked for volunteers. I don't think we've had any, is that correct Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Not yet. We don't have any volunteers yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know Tijani has been involved in previous ICANN documents before. He's not on the call unfortunately. I have had a check with him and I think it's something we need to take responsibility for and work on. If there's anyone who'd like further discussion on it now please raise your hand. It's something I think is an important issue.

It may be we say we support everything and are happy with it and if that's so that's a very short, easy statement to write, but I think we need a good number of people who'll at least read through the plan, and if not be willing to draft something then work with anyone who will draft, to identify any problems they have with it. I think this is a significant responsibility of At-Large to the overall ICANN. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Alan. I'd be happy to hold the pen for any statement on this. I see that [Barrack/Garth 00:11:02] has also stated on the comments that he'd be happy to work with others, and Glenn McKnight has said

he'll comment too. If you want to have me as the penholder for this I'm happy to do so.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Consider it done. Please consult with Tijani. I'm sure he'll have more than a passing interest in this but I won't commit him myself. Please check with him. I thank everyone who's volunteered, and also Holly I see. If there's anyone else, please get in touch with Leon. I look forward to seeing a substantive comment either agreeing or disagreeing, but knowing we've done our due diligence and reviewed the plan carefully. I thank you for that. The other Item is ICANN has posted auction rules for new gTLDs with indirect contention. I trust everyone understands what that is! There's a diagram linked in the Agenda. That gives a good example.

There's only a few TLDs with indirect contention. This is the indirection contention for .game and .games. You'll see that there are five applicants for .game, one applicant for .games. The five .game applicants are obviously in direct contention with each other. The story, if you read the little bits at the top, it says that the second applicant for .game claimed that their name was in contention with .games, that it was confusingly similar. The adjudicator agreed, so the second .game is in contention with .games. The other .game did not complain and therefore they're not in contention.

What that means is we could end up delegating the first .game and .games. They're not in contention with each other. But we couldn't delegate the second .game and .games, because they are considered in

contention. Is everyone crystal clear on that? Okay. Does anyone care enough about this to read through the process of how the auctions will be conducted and comment on it? I will go on record saying I don't care. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think the larger issue is this points to the absolute absurdity of the decisions on whether or not something is similar or not. REMEMEbr the list we looked at, where singular and plural are too much alike and sometimes they aren't. This says to me there's a larger issue, and that is this is absolutely bizarre. I don't want to touch it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

There are many bizarre issues associated with the new gTLD process. This is just one of them. It's one we'll hopefully look at with some care if we ever have a second round. That's not the question on the table today. I hear no one saying we want to make a statement on this. Ariel, can you mark this as no statement? It's off the books. We only have one statement we're working on, and that's on the Five-Year OP. Thank you very much. We'll go to the next Agenda Item.

It's a bit one, and there's a number of different components in it. I completely guess that 30 minutes would be sufficient. I don't know if that's going to be the case. We're ahead of time by two minutes currently. The first of them was if any of you who were on the ALAC before LA will recall that we had a very long email discussion. The question was should votes for ALS certification and decertification be open – by open we mean when the votes are announced we announce

who voted which way. There were very strong arguments in both directions – for open and completely closed.

We eventually came to closure on a result saying that all ALS certifications and de-certifications will be completely open with the results viewable, with the exception of cases where the RALO could not provide advice, in which case we'd have a closed vote. If the system allows however, we'll be able to retrieve how people voted – that is staff and Chair will – so that if we have a situation where we need to understand why an ALS was refused certification we can talk to people privately and try to put together a rationale.

One of the issues is many years ago there was an Ombudsman case over ALS certification and one of the recommendations that came out of this, and not an unreasonable one, is when we reject someone we tell them why they're rejected. With a completely secret vote we have no way of doing that, so this was a compromise to try to enable us to put together a rationale without identifying who voted which way. I'm proposing that we adopt that but with one modification, and specifically if any ALAC Member request that a vote be secret, that that be honored.

Any Member who feels that for one reason or another they'd be in an awkward position if their vote was known, they can request that a secret vote be held. I'm asking if the ALAC supports this proposal going forward? For those not involved in the original discussion, the background is originally all votes were open. There's been significant discussion in the past whether they should be, because there are some people because of cultural or political issues felt it would be better for them if votes weren't open, but nevertheless they were, until about two

years ago when due to a specific situation Olivier decided that they probably should be closed, and we've operated in that mode ever since.

We never took a formal decision to implement that, and this is an attempt to implement it. The question is, do we have the support of the ALAC to say all votes are open unless there's no recommendation from the RALO or an ALAC Member explicitly requests that it not be open. We'd not announce which ALAC Member it was. That would defeat the purpose obviously. I see a number of ticks. Anyone objecting? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think the discussion that took place on the mailing list pretty much beat the topic to death, and we've got consensus on this. The concern I have, and that's reflecting on the concern we've heard in the EURALO region, is that of the confidentiality of the information that's supplied in the due diligence. The information is sent on the internal list but I understand some of this information is also shared on the regional mailing lists, which are not closed and therefore leak this into Google and they go through the lists and so on.

Wolf will probably know more about this, because he's Chair of EURALO, but we certainly had one potential ALS that pulled out when they found out their information would be shared in such a manner. I don't know what to do about this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. The item you raised is very relevant and we'll be getting to it after this Item. That's not the only issue related to ALS

certifications. Back onto the question of the voting primary proposal – is there anyone who’s objecting? I see no hands. I see some tick marks, which I presume are not objections. Jimmy says he doesn’t know enough about it but it sounds reasonable. Jimmy, this is the kind of case where I think an abstention is a reasonable answer if you’re unsure. People coming into it in the middle of the issue often have a difficult problem.

We have a bunch of tick marks. Is there anyone who disagrees with this proposal? Raf in the chat is asking who will be privy to the information. The staff and people involved with Big Pulse and the ALAC Chair. That is all. We’re not even 100 per cent sure we can do it, but if we can, that will be the sense. Fatima, if you agree with this procedure you’re voting for it. I see no one disagreeing. I consider this passed by consensus. Thank you.

The next Item is an issue that, as I was reviewing the Internauta Columbia decision, I read some of our rules and it turns out that although we were following the intent of many of our rules, we’re following the exact rules almost nowhere, and in some cases, as Olivier pointed out, we’re not following them and going almost opposed to the rules – specifically things like due diligence. They’re supposed to be kept secret. They should be available to the ALAC Members, possibly to others in the RALO, but certainly not on a public list. In many cases they are many publicly available on the Wiki. The rules specifically say that the discussions in the RALO, once the certification is complete, they should be erased and no longer available. We certainly don’t do that. If you read the section in the Agenda carefully, it says a number of interesting things. First it says if the RALO provides advice, the question

we should be asking is shall the advice of the region, in respect to accreditation, be overturned? That means if the region recommended certification and you recommend certification, you vote no. If you say yes you vote to overturn the RALO. It's a double negative. We actually used that question for a few votes, it confused everybody and in one case we had to re-run the vote because enough ALAC Members said they were confused. So we changed the wording we use in the poll but we never changed the rules. It does get a little better if you read that paragraph completely. It says we don't even need to take a vote. If everybody is silent for a little while after the due diligence is completed, the ALS is accredited. It also says that if no one says anything, then within a certain number of days we'll certify the ALS. Does anyone see anything wrong with that? There's a little problem. If the RALO recommends not to certify, these rules say after a certain amount of days we certify it. There's a whole bunch of things wrong with it. Pretty much every word or sentence in our rules is either not being followed or wrong. I recommend we put together a small group to fix these problems, and that will include rules specifying whether due diligence can be made available publicly, how we carry out the discussions on whether to certify or not, whether it's private or public. I'll solicit, privately after this meeting, some volunteers to work in this group. I'll lead it. We'll try to put together some rules we can actually follow.

Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG:

I just want to recall a case we had I think about two years ago at EURALO when we had an applicant from Switzerland with privacy issues. They submitted their application. There was a due diligence procedure done

by At-Large staff, and as far as I understand, the due diligence procedure was meant to be confidential. Then suddenly the procedure was done and we were informed that it was done. I got an email from the applicant, "Listen, I made a simple Google search and in that the PDF document came up. So this is not confidential."

They withdrew the application. I think if we say the DD procedure is confidential, we must and should do everything to keep it confidential, to avoid similar cases to that two years ago, where we lost an applicant. I'd very much like this ALS to be part of EURALO, but due to this mistake at the time we lost them, and I think there should be something done. I suggested it already two years ago. We must find a way to keep this procedure and the outcome confidential. It's not enough if there's an email from At-Large sent indicating, "Please be aware documents are kept confidential."

This is not enough. It's on a mailing list and if there's an attachment it can be found easily by a Google search. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Wolf. I don't disagree at all. I believe we've just decided to make sure all our rules make sense and that we then follow them, so yes, certainly. Olivier in the chat, I see, says that we don't follow the rules because they didn't make sense. Correct. Certainly any new rules we put in should be done in such a way that we are not violating privacy. If we post something publicly we need to tell people ahead of time. If we say it's going to be secret then we need to keep it that way. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

I'm trying to figure out a solution for this problem. Maybe we could add some kind of privacy policy in the application to become an ALS, to which the applicant should agree in order to even file their application – there we can fix the problem about stating in advance that some of the information will be shared and to whom it will be shared, and that we can comply with laws not only in Europe but with in different Latin American countries that have the same issues. That might be something we'd want to look at. Of course, I offer my legal advice on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'd prefer it if we don't do the brainstorming here. There's some work to be done and I appreciate everyone's contribution on it. The next Item is not nearly as mundane. That last one is very emotional because we put in place rules that did make some sense, some of them, and then the rules didn't make sense and we ignored them, and then we also ignored the rules that did make sense.

We're going to try to get our purely process-related rules back in order now. The next Item is somewhat more complex however, and that is what should the criteria be for ALSes and what are the expectations once they became ALSes. If you look at the five points under "minimal ALS criteria" they're all pretty vague. We commit to supporting end individual users in participating in ICANN. Clearly there are ways people can do that. It's not very specific and we never follow up on it – nor do we actually ask them necessarily to commit to that in their application.

We focus a lot on #2, that is run by individual users, self-supporting, meaning they can't presume they're getting any money from ICANN out

of this. They make available things about their ALS, and then an exceedingly vague statement, “They assist the RALO in performing its functions.” This set of rules was created about seven years ago, and I think it’s time to relook at them. We may well keep them the same although I’d hope not. We may change them substantially. We’ve asked the Metrics Sub-Group to come up with metrics for ALS performance, when we’ve never actually said what it is we expect from them.

I think this is an opportunity for the ALAC to look at what we want and expect out of ALSes, and then we can talk it back to the metrics group to try to put together a process to be able to monitor that. Now, I’ll note that it’s unclear to what extent any new rules would apply to existing ALSes. That’s something we have to investigate with ICANN Legal Counsel. At this point we’re looking at just going forward, but it may well apply retroactively depending on what we’re allowed and not allowed to do. Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thank you Alan. This is a longstanding issue and discussion we had at least over three years ago at the Secretariat meeting, before an ICANN Meeting itself, and it was a very controversial discussion on how to define an activity of an ALS. Do I define it as what an ALS is doing on the ground, at a local level? And as long as an ALS is active at the local level and is not too active on the At-Large level? I always argued this is very difficult to say, “okay, he’s not participating in monthly calls, this is not an active ALS therefore we have to punish them.” I always said the most important is activity on the local level – to do work at the local level in the interest of Internet users.

The secondary level, for my judgment, always was their activity at EURALO or being involved in At-Large. Therefore we came up with a sort of conclusion at the Secretariat meeting to have the minimum criteria for ALSes or some metrics. It's an orientation, some sort of criteria, but finally at the end it should be in the authority of the RALO Leadership. They know their ALSes pretty well and it should be on them to decide about what can be considered as active and inactive. Therefore my recommendation is to go ahead with the minimum criteria, but the final decision should be in the authority of the RALO itself. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Wolf. A couple of brief comments – right now, RALOs have the ability to essentially add rules of participation. Up until now, as you can see from that minimum criteria, the ALAC has not put any overall rules and that's what we're looking at right now. Certainly if you or others feel passionately what we should or should not do, then I suggest you participate in the group and we'll decide going forward what, if any, minimal rules the ALAC does impose on all future and possibly existing ALSes. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I do believe we need to rethink about the minimum criteria, and we can listen to the RALOs about that, but just remember that inside RALOs we've been, for a long time, discussing those criteria. It's important to add some specific issues that raise a lot of discussion inside the RALOs.

We should contact the RALOs, get information from them, but set up review on that minimum criteria.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think you're supporting exactly what I'm suggesting, which is we look at the issues. We may not make any decision. We may make a decision that's substantively different from what we're talking about, but we should consciously do it – not just let whatever was done seven years ago rise. Thank you very much. Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thank you Alan. First of all, just to answer your question regarding who would apply the rules, the new rules would apply for the future; for new ALSes coming into ALAC, and not previous ALSes or those already certified. Then I'd like to say that I do agree with Vanda that from my point of view those minimum criteria should stop being minimum criteria and we should increase those criteria because that's something we're working on in the RALOs. In my RALO that didn't work that well, but these are criteria that are important, and the organizations applying to become an ALS should be legally constituted in their origin country and/or by the laws of their country.

This would provide more seriousness somehow to these organizations. Also, from my point of view, the due diligence carried out by staff should be stricter. It shouldn't be just a review of the webpage or the Facebook page or whatever. There should be a stricter review. I agree with the fact that those minimum criteria should be reviewed and we should raise the bar. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Fatima. Two things on what you said, regarding whether we could make these rules retroactive or not. You may well be right, but I think we need to talk to ICANN Legal Counsel and understand what we're allowed to do within our discretion and what we're not. With regards to things like incorporations, when we set the current rules there were few people around at that point who'll remember them.

There were very significant discussions about things like that and things like can there be any commercial involvement or government involvement, and it quickly became apparent that the environment in different regions is very different and we have to make sure any minimum requirements we set do not dis-enfranchise parts of the community, and so it's something we need to think about very carefully. Eduardo? I'd like to not have much substantive discussion. It will be done in the group that does the review and then when it gets back to the ALAC.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Just a quick thing to say for now is that some of this criteria might be specific to different regions because in AFRALO we accept individuals that are not really a corporation. We accept them as an ALS. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. Certainly we have to make sure that we're not hurting some regions by putting in rules, and there's nothing... in general, a RALO can add additional rules, but we'll have to do this in conjunction with ICANN

Legal Counsel to make sure we're not violating any of the basic core premises that are given to ALAC and At-Large because of the ICANN bylaws. Any further discussion on this? If not, we'll send out a call for participation, and I welcome putting together a group and we can have some of the substantive discussion to come to closure on this.

It's going to take a few months I'm sure, but hopefully we'll be able to come up with something that will satisfy what we perceive is [unclear 00:45:32] and some of the problems we've had to date. Anything else on the overall issue of ALSes and RALO certification? No? Okay. Thank you.

I'll introduce this one and then we'll turn it over to Olivier. The first part of this is looking at the CCWG on accountability. We approved the Charter and it's being approved by the other ACs and SOs and I'm expecting it will be kicked off in the next couple of weeks. A call for EOIs has gone out. The deadline is tomorrow. Can we have a very brief report from staff – have we gotten in a substantive number of EOIs? We're going to have to pick up to five Members, preferably one from each region. Do we have a good number of EOIs so far? Staff?

ARIEL LIANG:

We have received three EOIs so far, and two of them are from one RALO, so we definitely need more EOIs.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll let Olivier address how he's going to handle that. I do have one question – and I'm going to take them in the opposite order to

the way they were listed in the Agenda. I'd like a sense of the ALAC how much freedom we want to give the Selection Committee in making the selections. Specifically, we have five Members on the CCWG. The intent was that corresponds to our five regions. Under CCWG rules we're not bound to that. on the other hand, if we populate the CCWG with people from fewer regions, we have much less credibility next time we ask for five seats on something, because we have five regions.

If the Committee does not have sufficient people to meet all the regions, I'd guess they have two choices. They can even leave the seat open and reopen the call for EOIs, or they can fill it with someone from another region, if there are surplus, really good people from the other region. I'd just like a sense of the ALAC which way we'd recommend the Selection Committee go. Obviously the Selection Committee decisions are going to be up to the Selection Committee. Anyone with comments? Do we want to do our best to honor the five regions or do we want to give them some flexibility if they choose to exercise it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Isn't that the same thing?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Either we tell the SC, "You must select them from five different regions," or we say, "You have your discretion to violate that and lessen our credibility in the future."

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood Alan. You said in the first question "try".

ALAN GREENBERG:

The question is do they leave the seat open and try to fill it later, or are they allowed to fill it with someone from another region? Olivier, let me introduce the second question and then I'll turn it over to you completely. The second question was the Charter was unclear. We're allowed to select a Co Chair and the ALAC overwhelmingly indicated on the email list that they want to select a Co Chair. It's not specified whether the Co Chair must be a Member or not, and we've received an indication that if the Co Chair is not a Member, and if there is a face-to-face meeting, there's a high probability that the Co Chair would be funded to go.

I think that allows us to select a Co Chair, either a member or a participant, and I'm suggesting that the Selection Committee, also in addition to naming the five Members, identify who they believe should be the Co Chair. With that I turn it over to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. I hear your question with regards to having more than one Member from one region if we can't fill the positions for all five regions. I have equal concerns for the ones you mentioned there, on not being afforded five seats next time. We've always been given the five seats to have this diversity part, and I think that's a really vital, important part of this. I wanted to ask Leon, as Leon and Tijani are people who worked on the Charter – when the decision was made to have five seats for the ALAC, how was that number arrived at?

I know this was the case for both this Working Group but also the CCWG on IANA Stewardship Transition. I wonder how significant that geographic thing is? How did you come to that number?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Olivier. I really don't recall arriving at the number specifically for the ALAC. There was of course the discussion on how many Members we should designate for the Working Group from each of the constituencies and groups, and it was assumed the ALAC should designate five Members, assuming there was going to be one per region, but that was all that was discussed.

There was no specific discussion as to why or how the ALAC should designate its representatives, as it was understood that of course the ALAC was in charge of designating those Members. The Charter of the Working Group didn't really go that deep into a discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Leon is saying ALAC wasn't considered as an exception. I believe every AC and SO was given a minimum of two and a maximum of five seats, and I think that was inherited from the previous CCWG Charter.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Exactly. That's correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. The previous CCWG Charter, Leon was also on. The question was how that number was arrived at.

LEON SANCHEZ: I recall being on the group, and as I told you I remember the discussion about this and it was a discussion that arrived at five representatives, assuming one per region. That's how we arrived at the previous Working Group, but not in this Chartering group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, in the previous one the gNSO was arguing strongly for seven, because they wanted to be able to have one for constituencies. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I put my hand up to put some depth and color into this conversation from a gNSO perspective, in my role in Liaison, and to make sure that something in my Liaison report is actually for you all. This is verbatim from the call for Members to be identified to become part of the CCWG on enhanced ICANN accountability: "Each gNSO stakeholder group should identify one Member for the CCWG by 20th November, taking into account the Charter requirements." I've not had any further updates beyond that, and I don't know whether the intention is to [unclear 00:56:45] or to stem from those seven, select five in some shape or form.

I'll keep you all updated on that. But what it does to is show clear precedent on keeping to the diversity argument. While gNSO has

stakeholder diversity, we of course have geographic diversity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this information. I think that ultimately in the selection process we'll try and uphold the overall regional diversity, which is something we've done in the first process. It looks as though the process is kept the same as such, and the origination of this number five has been in the origination of our five regions. Now, there is another 24 hours until the application period closes, and with this sort of application it requires a significant amount of work and it might well be that a number of people will be applying later in the process rather than earlier and we'll have a surge of applications.

With that said, I'm a bit concerned that when there is maybe one applicant in the region, or none, then that gives very little choice for the Selection Committee to find the best people out there, because with one applicant is great, fantastic. If that applicant has never shown any significant amount of work in the past or never shown any commitment and is just there because it's an opportunity to travel or whatever, then that really puts the Committee in a poor position.

I'd really appreciate some guidance on this – if we did have someone in the region, or candidates that were not suitable for the process – that either didn't have the needs based on what we put out in the request for EOIS, or if they're unsuitable in any way, it would certainly help for us to have that flexibility of having from another region two candidates that have great knowledge and have done an enormous amount of work

in this thing. In addition to this, I'd also like to have some guidance as to whether there is a limit to the number to the number of Members from the same region to be selected.

Also, I'd like some guidance on if there is any guideline with regards to even if we had good candidates in all the regions, we could effectively forget about the regions and just select the best candidates out of all of the candidates we have, regardless of the regions – bearing in mind we might then end up with five candidates from the same region. Who knows? It would be helpful to have some guidance on this from the ALAC now, because the selection process will start as soon as the applications are closed. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, allow me to give you a combination of my personal positions and what I sense has been said in the chat and by a number of speakers. I sense a strong desire to represent regions, which would imply to me that if you cannot find suitable candidates in the first round that you open another round if necessary, and perhaps more proactively invite people to apply, or use whatever methodology you choose.

I also seem to be sensing that if the extreme you cannot find a good person from a region, perhaps after a second outreach, that you be allowed to have multiple – to violate the regional rule – because we don't want to leave seats unfilled on these committees. As we have seen, for better or worse voices count, and if you have five voices that can act in unison on a group, it has more power than one person acting on a group. That's the sense I get. The person comment I'll make, which

hasn't been expressed, is I would suggest that under no condition the committee selects someone purely because they're the only one from a region to apply.

We're looking for good people who have some understanding of the issues or who are willing to get the understanding and commit the time it's going to take. I would not be happy if you select people just because they're the only ones you have. I'd prefer to see places left blank, or ultimately, after another pass, filled with someone from another region. I see a couple of tick marks that may or may not be talking about what I'm saying right now. I welcome any other comments.

We're getting a little over time but at this point this is an important issue and we don't want to do it wrong. Anyone else with other comments? Either to agree with me briefly or to come up with another position? I haven't been following the chat. I see a number of people agreeing. Olivier, are you finished?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see people agreeing with what you've said on the chat. That's fine. I think we're pretty clear on this, and I'll be able to convey this to my colleagues on the Selection Committee when we convene our first call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Perhaps we can note for future reference that maybe we need to have more outreach than just sending out an email in the future. I think we've beaten that item to death. The next item is the Finance and Budget Sub Committee. For those who don't follow these

things, last year we submitted a significant number of budget requests. We ended up getting one of them funded, and that was to give a workshop at the IGF, which was not accepted by the MAG and therefore we didn't do it and didn't get any funding.

I'll point out if you look at the various documents, other organizations don't necessarily get their requests accepted either, but they've done significantly better than we have. I'm recommending a change in the FBSC, specifically that the two formal Members from each region be an ALAC Member, and the ALAC Members can select from among themselves for each region, and one of the RALO Leaders, and specifically Chair, Vice Chair or Secretariat. A region could appoint someone else to act in this capacity, but it would have to be someone they give some reasonable authority to.

I would expect the reformed FBSC to not only be moving pieces of paper but making value judgments, and therefore it makes a lot of sense that RALOs do not submit something unless it passes some level of review with the RALO, and the person that the RALO names to the Committee should be someone who's involved in that process. There will of course be other people allowed on the Committee and may actively participate. Should the Committee ever come to a need for a formal vote, it would be done by the regionally-balanced group.

I've talked to the ALT about this and have received pretty well unanimous support for it. There was some concern raised about the Chair or Secretariat may not be the perfect person, and I've modified it slightly by saying there could be another person allowed. There's also the issue of CROPP approval, which is currently tied to the FBSC and I'm

explicitly saying we're not discussing that at the moment. I simply haven't had time to review it. My intent is to Chair the Committee, but my preference is that I not be the NARALO Member but be acting as an impartial Chair.

Tijani has played a very leading role in the FBSC in the past years and has agreed to stay on in that capacity. Do we have any discussions? One of the things this means is we will be looking at RALO requests and deciding which ones we pass onto ICANN, finance which ones we don't. The intent is to try to increase significantly the success rate. In the past, most requests from the ALAC have been RALO requests. I'm also suggesting we put ALAC requests in, in addition to any that may be submitted by the RALO.

An example of that – and I give one, but it's not the only one – is that we're all pressed in our workweek. I'm suggesting that we expand the workweek by an extra day. That's a significant budget commitment from ICANN, and I'm suggesting that subject to the FBSC's approval, that might be one thing we put forward. Comments, questions?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We have a question from Beran and we have Holly with her hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Beran says, "When will this be constituted?" I will be putting out a call for Members immediately after this meeting, or within a short time after this meeting. I'd expect it to be constituted, depending how fast the RALOs work. It could be within days. Heidi, do you have any input on

when the actual process will be happening within ICANN? At this point they've not asked for budget commissions.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Correct. What I'm hearing is it's likely to be mid-December, when it's going to be announced. Keep in mind we have the holidays for some of us, over the winter. Then we have January to start discussing this and we're into Singapore. The good news is that we'll be able to have face-to-face meetings on this in Singapore, perhaps with the RALOs, ALAC and Xavier. Again, that is right after Singapore, early March is when the deadline is. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Heidi. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

It may be really useful to draw together some suggestions or hints so that when we say, "Is it a good or bad submission for funding?" we know what you mean – and then the SC or Tijani or whoever we give them some hints so that what goes up to it, following the guideline, are pretty good anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Holly. So we should do something like set guidelines for the request, so the RALOs know what we're asking for?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. That would be my suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which I will point out is bullet #3 in the proposal. But to the point of Beran's question, we'd like to get the group together quickly so that the first thing they do is set those criteria. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just want to remind everyone that what's described in this formal approach has in recent times been done in the existing or previous FBSCs. There has been considerable joint discussion and it's always been a joint deliberation on what does or doesn't make the cut, with what comes in from regions or indeed from the ALSes [unclear 01:12:02] more direct applications. The FBSC has all this responsibility and undertakes it very seriously, and as respectfully as it possibly could. With the new design and formalization of it, we're really just crystalizing and making more clear and transparent what I think is already a relatively good practice.

That said, I did want to make sure Alan my point in the chat, which asked were you going to call just for your Membership, as described, or Membership and participants? As we're seeing the role of participants more formalized in these Working Groups. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: In answer to that Cheryl, yes, we'll be calling for both, and in general any of our Committees are open, so even if there's not an explicit call, I hope it's implied, but we'll try to be explicit. I do understand that what we're

talking about is not a radical shift, but the formalization I think puts a more formal responsibility on the RALO Members, speaking on behalf of the RALO, which has not always been the case of all RALOs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed. It saddens me to say that from my own RALO, even when I was Chair of the ALAC, it was often I was the only voice from Asia Pacific, and that was absolutely and unholy unsatisfactory, which is why we moved to asking for RALO representatives in addition to the ALAC Members.

ALAN GREENBERG: I note in the case of other RALOs it was just the opposite. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm a little concerned about the discussion here because what we're potentially introducing is an additional barrier to RALO requests. It's not like we're having too many RALO requests, in fact it's the contrary. We're seeing the requests that have been made over the years on many occasions have been constantly denied by ICANN Finance and therefore there's been a lack of interest in putting together RALO requests because ultimately the chance of not getting a request approved is way higher than the chance of having it approved.

I don't see how we're going to be able to have any more chance of having requests going through, or even generating more requests, if we're putting in another barrier. I understand it might be that the FBSC might have to help the RALO build their request and put it in a form that will make it more palatable of have more chance to succeed when sent

to ICANN Finance, but so far I've seen very poor success to the request, and I just wanted to note my concern on that, because that's really not the way you're going to get RALOs to want to do more. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think the concern you're raising is exactly the one I had when I started, but I'm taking a slightly different take to it than you are. If ICANN Finance is sending us very clear messages that they're not accepting certain kinds of applications, and in discussions with them privately, it becomes clear that they're not likely to accept them this year either, there's no point in us hitting our heads against the wall and submitting those applications over and over again. We need to get in line with what they're likely to fund, and that's what I hope to try to do by setting the guidelines.

I may be completely wrong, and I accept the fact I'm doing this for the first time and don't have the scars you have, but I think we need to work together with Finance to find out what the kinds of things they're likely to be funding and what not, and don't abuse ourselves by requesting ones we know are going to be rejected. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I will unfortunately disagree with you on this process, because this organization runs as a bottom-up organization and ICANN Finance has no way to tell us top-down what requests we should be making. It's really wrong if we start saying we'll work with Finance to start doing what Finance wants us to do. We have to make the requests of what we want to do, and it's for Finance to provide the proper details of why

we're not able to do those things. It's not for us to start doing what ICANN Finance wants us to do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I agree and disagree. It's only practical to say it's a bottom-up organization. In terms of Finance it's not. The approvals come from higher up than the volunteer part of the organization. We either need to make a case in such a way that it's successful so it does get funded, or understand their case of why they're not funding it. There's certainly a significant amount of discussion that has to take place in this process. I don't think there's any point in going forward and making requests that routinely have not gotten accepted and we don't believe are going to get accepted again.

If that process hasn't worked, we need to fix the process - not necessarily pretend it's going to work differently this time but hasn't in the past. I agree with your overall intent, but I think the process has to be different. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this Alan. The concern I have effectively is we're being told one thing and another is being done, and we're just about to do a third thing now. What we're being told is the requests need to follow the general views of the SP and to fall into the categories and so on of the SP. I totally agree with requests being refused when they are for travel funding that can be done in a different way for the CROPP for example.

When it comes down to some requests that are clearly aligned with ICANN and that are then refused for whatever reason it is – and I’m afraid there were several times when the reasons that were given were simply not convincing me – and I’m sure it didn’t convince many others in here – then I’m really concerned that we’re then going to be doing things where we’ll ask before we even make the request if we’re allowed to make the request we want to make. That just doesn’t send the right message to people in the At-Large community.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Certainly in the past, a fair number of the ones rejected have been travel ones, and maybe that’s part of the problem. I would suggest we have this discussion in the FBSC. I welcome you to participate, whether you’re the formally designated Member for your RALO or not, and to come to closure on this. I don’t want to waste our time in putting together requests that we know are going to get rejected, and if we believe they are in fact in line with the ICANN plans and with the ICANN overall strategy, then we need to make the case better as to why they are there.

If we need to appeal cases where they were rejected first time around then we’ll do that. I just think we need to make sure that we’re doing this as a unified group and not a bunch of disjoint requests we can’t justify. I’m not saying it’s always been that in the past, but clearly we want success, we want our share of this, and I think we need to do some thinking about how to do that. We’re way over time at this point. Do we have any other comments on the issue? It’s an important one but I think we need to have it in a smaller group where we can put forward

these considerations and come to closure on how we're going to provide guidance to the RALOs. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Just briefly, I've been listening to this and I would really stress that the proposals that are submitted are reviewed, do follow a set of criteria and have no overlap with the CROPP or other normal ICANN support of the ACs and SOs. I think those are the areas where previous requests have not been accepted – that they were seen to have other areas where they could get that kind of support. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Heidi. The next Item is on ICANN 52. I'd like to try to keep this short to make up time. I've asked Leon to take the lead with staff on putting together the Agenda. I've given him some overall guidelines – that is to the extent possible we avoid having meetings from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, at least not every day, and that we try to schedule meetings such that we have enough time to talk about the things we want to talk about.

That means given that we can't extend the workweek immediately that we'll have fewer meetings with staff probably, fewer Working Group meetings, and that the ones we pick are ones we believe are going to have a high expectation of being a useful meeting. That means judgment calls. It's not clear how we'll do that, but the intent is to try to end up with a useful, productive meeting that doesn't kill everyone. Heidi and Leon?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Did you want me to mention the indigenous pilot for that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, you can.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I wanted to let everyone know that there is a suggestion for one of the FY 16 special requests for a pilot program for global indigenous members. Just a bit of background for the newer ALAC Members – NARALO has been asking for a means to bring in indigenous peoples to At-Large. A bit of background on that in terms of why that can't go to the Fellowship is that only applications from developing countries are accepted in the Fellowship Program.

One way we got around that this year was to have an At-Large Mentoring Program in the run-up to the Summit in London, so there were three mentors brought in. One was reserved for an indigenous person, and that was Anthony Niigani, a fantastic volunteer from NARALO. What we were hoping to suggest was a pilot that would be for global indigenous Members – so not just NARALO but perhaps other regions – would be part of the FY 16 special requests for this year. That pilot would need to be developed by the RALOs involved so it would definitely need to be bottom-up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Heidi. Back on ICANN 52. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. So far we've been working with Gisella and Heidi with the draft schedule. I think it's still early to have a version for this draft to be circulated among the ALT, but yes, the guidelines are that we should be looking at hot topics that will really come to some kind of fruition if a meaning is identified, and we'll try to avoid the meetings from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, all-day. We'll try to make it shorter, and of course this means we'll apply some judgment calls and I think we'll find a way to manage them.

This new draft schedule will imply also that some of us will have to arrive earlier i.e. there will be two ALT meetings. The first one is the coordination meeting and will happen the day before, and then the final ALT meeting, and that's what we're working on at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Gisella, anything to add?

GISELLA GRUBER: Nothing at the moment. I'll be working with Leon on the schedule.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I realize I accidentally skipped over Item #9, which is a moderately critical one, but we'll do it in a short version. This meeting is being held at a time that in theory was accessible to all people. It turns out it's not. One or two couldn't make the call for other reasons, but there doesn't appear to be any time at this point that everyone in the

ALAC is able to meet at a single time that does not significantly inconvenience them by having to get up at 2:00, 3:00 or 4:00 am to attend the meeting. Cheryl notwithstanding, most people find this more difficult.

We have a decision to make. Either we can continue doing what we've done in the past, and some people always have to attend in the middle of the night, or we find a time that's acceptable to everyone, and it would appear we can't. Or lastly we rotate meetings. I'm going to propose a different sort of Doodle to try to understand the dynamics of this group so we can do something better. My personal preference is I don't believe we should single out certain people who must always work in the middle of the night, but I'll be following this up with email and we'll go with it as we can. We're always proud of the fact we're reasonably diverse but there's a price to pay for it. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

This is a question for Gisella or Heidi. I know we had this discussion on one of the Working Groups, and there were a few times, I think it was 22:00 or something, that was good for most of the regions. Can you share those timeframes with us?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, in fact this time, one hour before or one hour after, is what is referred to as the "sweet spot" times, where no one is up in the middle of the night, but there were a number of ALAC people who for one reason or another said they could not attend. There are some that prefer to attend at 2:00 am instead of 9:00 pm for instance. I'm not

going to question their personal desires. Everyone has their own situation that they have to adapt to.

There are no times, it would appear, where everyone does not have to meet between midnight and 6:00 am, where everyone says they can attend. Yes, there are times when no one has to meet in the blackout window, but not everyone wants to or is capable of meeting in those slots. We'll try again and try to find something that has the minimum amount of pain, but if there is pain then we'll spread it around somewhat. Any other comments? We'll try to find something before the next meeting that's more satisfactory than this one way.

The next Item is the ten minutes Olivier has asked for on reviewing the IANA face-to-face, and anything else regarding the IANA stewardship process that you'd like to discuss. Olivier? I'll just point out that one of the issues for some people is that they don't have sufficient Internet connectivity at home, so meetings that are very outside of office hours are very inconvenient for them. There are others who find that because of their day jobs they can't meet during office hours. In any case, we'll continue that on the email. Raf?

RAF FATANI:

My feeling was if we can apply this to the ALAC Meeting, can we apply this firstly to the RALO Meeting? I mentioned in the chat I've never been able to attend any of my RALO Meetings because it's at 4:00 am. The other thing I would raise with regard to this matter is, is it not possible to hold a meeting on a monthly basis? I know [unclear 01:33:44] change and some people [unclear] so maybe that's an option?

ALAN GREENBERG: Raf, I'm afraid your voice was garbled. You might need to type it. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As someone who has a reputation for attending meetings whenever they occur, 24/7, I'd like you to listen to my following statement with that in mind. We people apply or are appointed to roles. It [conders 01:34:13] what you should be doing as far as homework. When does this operation meet? What will I have to sacrifice? If it means once a month getting up at 4:00 am, I'm sorry, you just do it. It's part of what the role is requesting you to do. Now, should we try to spread the pain? Absolutely.

Should we try and minimize the inconvenience? Absolutely. But it's just part of the job description people. Suck it up and get on with it. If you don't have enough bandwidth to join the meeting to effectively do your role, guess what? You shouldn't be appointed to the role. Thank you!

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. I may ask you to do an attachment to the email I sent out. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Now, I'm not going to go into great detail into the discussions that took place in Frankfurt last week on the IANA Stewardship CCWG on Naming Issues. It's the group that's developing a

proposal specifically for the names part of the three component parts of the IANA contract. The reason why one is to have a few minutes here was to give you a heads-up on what is about to happen, because the schedule for the next few weeks is going to be very busy indeed, and very tight indeed for the Working Group to produce its proposal and the pass the PCP that will take place, and that will be short at 21 days in length.

Why? As you know we're reaching the end of the year with a holiday period, and the final proposal of the operational communities, and the ICANN names community is one of those, the final proposal has to be in the hands of an organization that will put the three proposals together at the end of January. Moving backwards there needs to be a PCP that is going to be launched, and then the Working Group on the Naming Issues part of the IANA contract will have to be discussing any amendments it has to make to its proposal, etcetera, and that's not likely to happen in a matter of days. It will probably take several days, if not weeks, to be able to make amendments and so on.

I understand that for many the IANA issues might seem to be a little bit remote and not something of particular importance to them, but I'd say it's currently the most significant process currently in ICANN, and even perhaps on the Internet, as it's showing a multistakeholder group of people to come up with a plan to replace one of the vital functions out there, and that's the oversight of running the root. As you know, if the root doesn't work on the Internet, and the processes of adding and removing things, i.e. TLDs, then we have an Internet that becomes dysfunctional and that's definitely a huge problem.

I've spoke to Tijani about this and I think there's been some discussion in the past about the IANA stewardship transition. There hasn't been a clear explanation of what is at stake and where we are going, and certainly there hasn't been a regular update of the ALAC into what's been taking place. I think it would be futile to try to explain to you in two minutes what happened in the past few months, and therefore having spoke to Tijani about the capacity building webinars, he's accepted to change the schedule a bit.

As you might know, there has been some pushing and shoving of when the capacity building webinars should take place – how many per month, etcetera – and as far as the topics were concerned, some of the ones dealing with IANA stewardship transition were taking place much later on in the year – I think around May or June – when really the battle [unclear 01:39:56] and we would have required the input from our community way before that. In fact, we're going to require the first input from our community from the 1st to the 21st of December. That's only few days away.

Therefore with Tijani we're going to have two webinars that will deal with this specific topic. The proposal is to have a first webinar on December 3rd, and it would be Patrick Fältström from the SSAC, who would be providing us with the details of what the IANA functions are, and hopefully a very clear summary, explanation, of what IANA does, how things work, with perhaps an emphasis on the naming issues, since in ICANN we're primarily dealing with the names part of those functions.

Then one week later on the 10th of December there would be another webinar specifically on the IANA naming issues, that would be explaining

the proposal that the CWG has put together so far, and that would be aimed specifically at generating the interest and knowledge within the At-Large community to be able to put together a statement to respond to the CWG's proposal. That would give us about 11 days after the webinar to be able to file that proposal in. Hopefully we could use the full 11 days, because if we have to use a five-day vote then that gives us five days to draft it, but at least we'd have some input.

I just wanted to let you know about this in advance, and I wondered whether there were any questions on the process and on this. The heads-up is really important. I know that December 3rd is the MAG meeting. Fatima, thank you for mentioning this in the chat. At the same time I think you're probably very well aware of what the IANA issues are, so I'm not sure you're going to miss much on this, as long as you're around on the 10th because that will be the one where there are five representatives on the CWG, plus of course the other participants of our IANA Issues Working Group will be listening.

We'll be first explaining what the situation is and also listening to your input. That's all for the time being. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I just wanted to note that as you know, I attended the Frankfurt meeting, replacing Fouad, and I along with all the other ALAC representatives, I think, were not particularly happy with the outcome. I plan to send out something to the various mailing lists, and I'll copy the ALAC list on what I'm saying. I have no illusions at this point that everyone's going to say, "You're wrong, we'll follow your advice," but I

think I want to go on record as saying why I disagree with what's being proposed, and why I believe what's being proposed is unrealistic. Just to let you know it will be coming in the next day or so.

I hope to have it ready today, but it will be ready shortly. Anybody else with comments on the IANA stewardship transition? Eduardo, you have a comment in the chat. Is it relevant to this? Eduardo's asking, "Will you be able to comment on the proposal during the comment period?" Certainly. No one stops anyone from making a comment. The ALAC may choose to make a comment, and certainly individuals are welcome to comment, even if the ALAC itself doesn't comment.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

My comment comes from the fact that Fatima mentioned there was a MAG Meeting at the same time as the webinar. I'm just commenting that the webinar will mostly be for those involved in the IANA stewardship. That was really my comment. Anybody can comment on the proposal.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Except we can't ask her to speak if she's at another meeting. Thank you all. I see Olivier's hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. The 3rd December meeting is actually just going to be general information about IANA stewardship transition, and as far as I understand I think it's Patrick Fältström and maybe a couple of other people that will be speaking to us about the functions themselves. The

discussion itself, and the explaining from our own At-Large IANA Issues Working Group to the ALAC, and to everyone in the At-Large community, will take place on the 10th, and I believe that doesn't clash with the MAG and I hope it doesn't clash with anything else on that date. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Olivier. The next Item is just a very brief heads-up that as you've heard before, there will be an ALAC review starting moderately soon. We'd expect it to kick off probably some time in the early New Year. I've asked Holly to take the lead on behalf of ALAC, and I've asked Cheryl, in light of her extensive involvement in the previous review and in the implementation of the review recommendation, and of course her extensive knowledge of everything related to At-Large, to be an active participant in that process.

I'd expect that there's been a very brief discussion between the Chair of the Structural Improvement Committee, myself, Holly and Cheryl, that was very informal because as yet the Committee hasn't met to discuss a review. Once they do that, I'd expect an initial call between the Structural Improvements Committee and the ALT and soon after that involvement of the ALAC, generally trying to gear up. It's not clear what the subject of the review is. It's very much an At-Large review, not just the ALAC.

We have agreement that whatever we do, the intent is not to create an enormous amount of disruptive work, as the last reviews have done in several cases, for both ACs and SOs, but on the other hand, it's an

opportunity to look carefully at our organization and decide how we want it to evolve, if evolution is necessary. It may well involve a significant review of the RALO and ALS structure, which may overlap with the work we talked about earlier on, but I think the intent on all parties, from the Board and from my position, is to end up with a stronger position with ICANN and become a better organization with processes in place to allow that to happen. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Very briefly then, the thing I think the ALAC and At-Large community needs to be aware of is that the new process that the Structural Improvements Committee has been using for the sub-part or entities with ICANN review has changed. It's changed with the currently, still not completed gNSO second review. It's a system whereby we, as a community, and the ALAC physically, will need to be engaged in the formulation of the questions in the first place, and those questions, or a sub-set of them, will then be the basis for the request for proposals for the external consultant.

There is an external consultant arrangement expected in the design. If the community and ALAC is interested in looking at the nuances and specificities of the design, I think it's a fairly good idea, but I think how we should do it, because it has been reviewed in a number of our face-to-face meetings, with a small number of community, was we might set up a Wiki page in advance of our ALAC and At-Large review, and perhaps put this background information up there. then people can bring themselves up to speed and we can be prepared with the SIC asks us to come to the table. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to say I'm getting my head around what was said in the last review, what the recommendations are and what's been achieved or not, and also around what the SIC is saying. I think there probably needs to be a small mixed group meet in Singapore just to get our heads around what the timetable is, what's required, and actually set the process in place. I think there's work to be done before we actually talk progress, because I'm just getting my head around the process. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Holly. Yes, there's going to be a lot of work involved. We are going to have to start thinking, as Cheryl said, where we believe our problems sit, and identify them. Clearly from the discussion we've had today, the whole issue of ALSes and RALOs is something that we probably want to revisit. I said it in the chat in response to a question, but I'll say it out loud. At the last review it was explicitly decided not to look at ALSes and RALOs. That review was starting just as the RALOs had been formed.

We had a few ALSes for years before but there weren't very many of them, and we were actively gearing up to have ALSes that were an active part of the organization. It was decided we couldn't review them when they hadn't really started yet. Now it's a bunch of years later – six and a half years or so – and it's a significant part of our organization and when

you think about it, it's a part we've discussed no end. It's not necessarily working as optimally as we want it to, so clearly it's likely to be a focus of this review, but that needs to be formally decided.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Agreed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm a little concerned about the mentioning of yet another review for At-Large. Of course I understand the process and so on, but I would like to echo some of the points that were made elsewhere in ICANN, that sometimes we tend to suffer from "reviewitis". We just finish one review and we start another one, and that takes considerable amount of time and resources to be able to proceed forward with it. Certainly one of the thing I'd hope we could do before a review even starts is to start looking at what recommendations we had in our last review and do a light review of our last review, but more informally.

In other words, finding out where we are today with regards to all of the improvements that we had in our improvements report. Heidi has put the link on the page. Clearly a lot of the work was passed on to Working Groups and RALOs and we might need to give a little nudge for a few of these things to be complete and done. That's one thing. The other thing I wanted to link with was the ATLAS II recommendations and I'm not sure how that would fit with this – whether it would run in parallel or

not. This is again another process that's yet again looking at our own belly-button and trying to find out whether it's doing well or not.

There are several self-improvement parts in those recommendations and these also have to be implemented and they're also going to take many resources. At the moment there hasn't been very much progress with this because we've had so many other things to deal with at such short notice. I just wanted to flag this as well, before we even think about having another review process start with all the bells and whistles, etcetera.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A couple of comments for those who weren't around – the last review was done by an external reviewer, as this one is planned to be done – on the other hand, when the formal recommendations came back, the Board decided to strike a completely different internal review committee and redo the review effectively. That took another year and a huge amount of manpower and that report was finally the one that was implemented. That was not very different from what happened on the first gNSO review when there was an external followed by an internal. We've been assured that this SIP will not do that.

It's up to us to make sure that when the external reviewer comes back that if we have any problems with what they're recommending, that we make it known ahead of time so there's no surprises, and that they will in fact be obliged to at least listen to what we're saying, if not honor it. That's good news. The implementation was done in such a way that it was exceedingly disruptive, and to the extent possible we hope that will

not be the case this time. We have enough real work that we don't want to stop doing all the other work and just work on a reorganization again. So hopefully it will be lighter work than it was before. It remains to be seen exactly what's happening.

My recollection – and Cheryl and Holly will need to confirm this online – is that we pretty well did everything we were tasked with doing. Clearly we only have one Board Member, not two, that the recommendations made, and I believe the only other item we're weak on is individual Members within RALOs, which most RALOs are working on at this point. We pretty well did everything last time, but it took an undue amount of work, and hopefully it won't in the future. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I just want to say one of the reasons I'm proposing that we put the new mechanism for reviews up, is for everyone who's concerned about the old versus the new method to have a look at what's proposed and hopefully relax some of their fears somewhat. I think we should copy it to a Wiki page.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I will point out when the last review started, they weren't planning to do a second internal one, it just happened. So be it. The last Item is AOB. We have two Items under AOB. I believe Heidi has one and then I'll do mine.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Two points from At-Large staff. For US-based staff, starting Thursday there will be the Thanksgiving Day holiday, so our emails will be limited during that time for the US-based staff. Also the next week, of the 1st through the 5th, there will be the annual policy staff workshop in LA, so all ICANN policy staff will be there doing days of workshop meetings, so again during that time there will be very limited email response, so please, if we can ask for your patience with that. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The last Item is, you will recall many weeks ago we did a vote on whether to accept the application for Internauta Columbia. That vote, although we've not formally announced it yet, did not pass, and we're in the process of formulating the reply letter. It's the first time we've done a failure reply in a very long time. It's taken some time to get the letter together and to get legal approval over exactly what we're saying in it. We're now over the official time period that we have to respond, so we're under some pressure to get that out very quickly within the next day or so, and I hope you'll see that formally.

With that, I see no more hands, no more comments. I thank you for attending the meeting. I apologize for the slight overrun. You'll see a bunch of emails from me and staff. Let's carry on the work.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]