
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the ALAC Leadership Team, ALT, mid-monthly meeting, on Monday the 15th of December at 17:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Ron Sherwood, Glenn McKnight, Leon Sanchez, Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, and Julie Hammer.

Apologies so far from Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber, and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. First an apology both for being late and I've got a family medical problem, I'm afraid, with my brother and there is a small chance that I may get a call in the middle of the meeting. And I will take it immediately, regardless of where we are.

All right. Do we have the first item on the agenda? Is there any changes in the agenda? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I'll presume it's going as is. I have added one small any other business item. And the first item is the IANA stewardship transition. There was a call this morning, which I was not on, and I suspect of some interest. And

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.

Olivier, could you give us a brief update on whether there is anything we need to take notice of right now and does it impact what we're doing?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. So indeed, there was a call just a couple of hours ago that took place for RFP 3, that's the sub working group that is working specifically with a proposal of the different entities that the working group is proposing. The group just went through a page with a number of questions and answers, or possible answers to those questions. What is the composition of the MRT? So the MRT being the multistakeholder review team. Is the multistakeholder review team a separate organization or company? And etc. etc.

The first question was to do with the MRT's legal standing. We learned that the proposal is that it would not be a company, it would just be a group like the ICG, for example. And then when there were questions with regards to who was liable, as far as that group was concerned, there was no follow-up, and this is something that would still need to be worked out one way or the other. And we didn't really get very far. There was a lot of discussion around that.

Then it went into the composition of the MRT. A lot of discussions between the registries and others as to the composition of the MRT, where registries believe that since they are the primary customers, they need to have, I wouldn't say a majority, would need to have more seats than other constituencies. There was a question as to whether people who are not part of the ICANN constituencies would also have seats on this MRT.

And as far as I understand, this was a two hour call, and we didn't get very much further than this. I know that Seun was on the call and also Fatima, and Eduardo Diaz as well. And the discussion really didn't go very far down the list. So we're still at this case. I understand this document will be shared with the RFP 3 mailing list, or maybe with the cross-community working group mailing list, and there is going to be a follow up on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I was just chewing. Was there any discussion at all? Did you get as far as what the relationship would be formal or informal between the MRT and contract [inaudible]? I mean, MRT is essentially the entity that is specified in its bylaws and maybe articles of incorporation, as maybe all of its activities. I would have thought there needs to be some level of paper documenting that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thanks very much for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So the MRT not having a legal standing as such, would mean that it would just have a charter, and there are details in that charter that would be providing

the mandate that it has. With regards to the CSC, so that the contract company, contract co-signer, not the CSC, the contract co, it would, its bylaws apparently would basically be saying that there are to take instructions from the MRT and POD from the MRT.

Now, I hesitated into going into the question of saying, "Well what if the contract co does not follow the MRT?" Since there are no contracts between the MRT and the contract co. But I didn't go into that because we still couldn't answer the liability question with regards to the MRT members. If I could just sort of let you know, when we all take part into ICANN working groups, whatever is discussed and said on the working groups, and whatever decisions are made by the working group, are covered as far as liability is concerned.

With regards to said party would disagree with that solution. And that third party were to sue, would be able to sue ICANN, but would in theory, and I don't think it has happened so far, but in theory, would not be suing individual people on that committee, because it's under ICANN. If a group like the MRT is created, and appears to be of the same legal standing as the ICG, which to me, at the moment, is a little bit unclear, because it looks as though the ICG is something that is built by ICANN, as it was mandated by the NTIA to build this group.

If a MRT is created that is even completely outside the realm of ICANN, I just don't know where the liability lies, and there was no answer to this. So there wasn't any interest in going further into that for the time being. We clearly need legal advice. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I'll share something that I discovered the other day, that I don't know quite the legal status of it, but I'll tell you what it says. And this is in regards to certifying ALSs. And it says that, and I'll try to quote as close to verbatim as possible, for the purposes of certification of ALSs, a decision of the ALAC is deemed to be a decision of the ICANN Board.

That does two things. That changes the liability issue completely, assuming that that statement, wherever it stands actually has legal status, which I don't know. It also says things are eligible for Board reconsideration, because it's deemed to be a decision of the Board, even though it was the decision of a volunteer committee.

So one can do all sorts of interesting things, but clearly it's a subject of some interest. I would suggest, however, that the relationship between contract co and the MRT is of even more interest, because if I was going to be derogatory, and I'm not trying to, but I'm trying to give an example as [inaudible] as possible. The bylaws of contract co are almost saying, take orders from your imaginary friend, the MRT, because it's not something that it exists.

And if the MRT doesn't have a legal basis, how does one enforce that you're taking orders from the right MRT for that matter? Assuming there could be multiple MRTs that someone could invent. So, I have an awful lot of problems with that part of the process. So I look forward to hopefully being involved in the discussion of that.

Is there anything else that we need to talk about at this point? Clearly things are in flux. I'm supposed to be revising our statement sometime

today. Olivier, is there anything there which is so settled and so cleared at this point, based on what Greg and the RFP 3 group has done, that there is something that needs to be changed in the statement as far as you know now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan, it's Olivier speaking. So as far as I see, I think there is only one matter of concern that we might need to explore further, and that's the issue of separation between ICANN and whatever system we're going to put in place here. What I mean by that is, we have to find out how would things happen if the, a RFP was sent out, and the contract was not allocated to ICANN, would the proposal that we make still fly with the MRT, in the guise that we see it as, be able to take that decision to allocate the contract to another entity than ICANN, and how would it play out.

I think that this is the big question I've heard from those people that oppose the ALAC's idea of keeping this somehow related within ICANN. Say yes, but how can you separate those functions if they need to be separated? The issue of separation between policy and implementation, and what is it? And roll out is something we might need to explore a little further.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Let me talk about that briefly. I don't want to spend the whole meeting on this subject though. The current contract with the NTIA says you have to have reasonable separation between policy and IANA. That was the reason that originally they were put on a

separate floor, and there is a [inaudible] issue on the staff. And that presumably satisfied the NTIA's need for that level of separation.

In terms of separation from IANA from ICANN, our proposal basically says there is none, except in certain very exceptional circumstances. But in what we're proposing, there is no RFP. There is no regular RFP, the issue should be addressed by the accountability, any difficulty should be addressed by accountability issues, with the exception that we are proposing, and this goes back to the accountability group to flesh out, that if things got so bad, the MRT could order the vestiture of ICANN.

In other words, of IANA rather, that is IANA is essentially a subsidiary. Companies sell subsidiaries all of the time. Companies transfer subsidiaries. And the MRT would have to have the ability to force that in the most extreme case. But other than that, there would not be an RFP on a regular basis.

That's a characteristic of contract co. So I think we're okay there, but there may be something that needs to be fleshed out, and at the very least, we need to put something in at the beginning of our comment saying, the CWG proposal is changing by the moment, and some of the things that we're raising may well be addressed by the time anyone reads that, and we can't change the rules.

Any other comments that need to be, maybe if we're going to the next item, because of my being late we are rather late in the meeting. So no hands?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier. Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I was just going to add one thing. Perhaps we have to focus on the idea of the IANA supporting organization, and the semi-independent IANA supporting organization. I'm going to think a little bit about this. Could be separated or whatever. Because I do acknowledge there is a weakness for this concern of saying well, if something... If ICANN goes rouge, how does this thing sort itself out?

So we do need to have this semi-independent IANA supporting organization part, and I would imagine that this could be something that is supported by the ISTAR organization. So it has got ICANN and the ISTAR in there, within the community.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, if our model were to win, so to speak, all of this becomes ICANN accountability issue, and rightfully fit in the second group. So whether the MRT is part of ICANN or external, whether there is an IANA supporting organization, and where it fits, it's something that we're deferring at this point, but the bottom line is, if the accountability group cannot come up with something that's categorically gives this group, or one of those groups, sufficient control over Board decisions, then it's not going to fly and it can't work.

And the NTIA has made it clear that without a suitable accountability, it's not going to fly. It's not going to be transferred. So the challenge is to fix that, but I'm not sure that we need to fix it right now. We need to make a case that it is fixable. But regardless, that doesn't sound like something we're going to be able to change in today's version. It may

be the version that we post next Monday, just before the comment period closes, may say something somewhat different.

All right, the next item we had 10 minutes on the accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's still Olivier...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead. I'm sorry, I didn't see your hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. So for adding this, but we had the discussion on the chat with Holly as well. SAC 59, the latest of the SSAC papers, does say and does talk about severability, and that's probably what we need to look at, severability. I understand we're not going to get a full answer, but if we don't have an element pointing to a possibility of severability, I have great concern that we will be faced with a lot of push back, and even from those people who are not happy with the contract co system at the moment, but are saying, well, there are no alternatives, so we'll go for the least worst option.

We don't want to end up with a least worst option. We want to end up with a best one. So.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is a section on that in the document right now. So we need to focus on enhancing it if it's not clear enough, or putting more details into it if we have to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything explicitly on the accountability group? There is a call, call, no sorry. There is a chair's call going on right now, which I have been sitting in on, and that's running in parallel with this discussion right now. There is a significant concern among the co-chairs that the group is looking to them to have sort of plan a way forward and they're trying to come up with some sort of document that makes some level of sense. I'm not part of that, I'm not on that call.

And we still need to have closure on selecting a co-chair for that group. There are some private conversations going on, which I really don't want to talk about in a public forum right now, and I'm hoping we'll come to closure with that in the next day or so. Anything else on the accountability issue? Olivier, you're one of the other leaders on that, or is there anyone else on this call who has any thoughts on it? Olivier, your hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier. I was just going to ask where are we on the ratification of our representatives on that accountability working group? Are they officially settled in there? And if they are, I

might recommend then, I notice there are a lot of sub working groups that are starting, obviously someone would have to make sure that they're all involved in both sub working groups. It's particularly important to be in there.

The last I saw, there was only one usual suspect that I found in some of these groups, Australian I think she was.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not particularly surprising. Yeah, that was the one point that I was going to add. In terms of the ratification, that's done. We set a deadline on the consensus call for the time when the meeting started, whenever it started last time, last Thursday or something? I've lost track. And so the team has ratified, the accountability group has been notified. And we have formally selected everyone except for a co-chair at this point.

So all of that is official. The next step from perspective is we need to coalesce the group of five people who are members, and anyone else on the accounting team, on the accountability group as participants who are affiliated with ALAC, to provide them some guidance. We made a strategic mistake on not formally trying to come up with an ALAC position prior to the Frankfurt meeting.

And I think we want to be a lot more coordinated than that, so I think we need to schedule a meeting very quickly, at least with the five members, and I would suggest Olivier, and if possible, I certainly invite anyone else on the accountability part, who is an accountability participants who also participants. Essentially a new ad-hoc group, and

I'm not worried about the name of it right now, but we do need to a discussion of it very quickly.

The next meeting of that group is tomorrow, is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It would be nice if we could try to meet before then, due to my family problems, I'm not sure I'll be available at any given time, but we should do our best to try to make sure everybody meets, even if I can't make it. So I ask for an action item from staff to try to pull together something as quickly as possible.

Olivier, is your hand up again or an old hand? Down. Okay. Let's go on with the next item, finance and budget subcommittee. I notice we got a couple of answers when we pushed for people to answer by last Friday. I presume we still have some RALOs that have not selected their people, and in some cases, ALAC members have not been selected. Is that correct?

Anyone on staff watching this?

TERRI AGNEW: This is Terri. That is correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which ALAC members are we missing?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. Basically we sent out a couple of reminders, or a call, and then a reminder with a deadline of last week, and so far we've just heard back from LACRALO and APRALO. And then one or two people for observers.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand the observers, and that's less relevant.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, so that's all we have.

ALAN GREENBERG: So APRALO is the only one that has contributed both their RALO person and their ALAC person. Is that correct? We are missing formally ALAC people from all the other four regions. I would suggest you're going to have to deal one by one with people, not public emails, and get commitments from them. So from NARALO we need either Glenn or Eduardo to step up, and we need the RALO to identify whether it's the acting chair or the acting secretariat who is going to take that role.

And I would suggest you put the question directly to the acting chair. For APRALO... For LACRALO, we don't have an ALAC member. We need to decide which of our ALAC members is the person. And for EURALO and AFRALO, EURALO we need both I think, and AFRALO we need a

RALO person, and there is the question of whether the formal, although Tijani is taking a lead role in the group, the question is, is the formal AFRALO ALAC member Tijani or Beran who expressed some interest.

So I leave it up to them to decide, but we really need to decide and schedule a meeting as quickly as possible. I worry about not being able to... If we can't even pick a few people, how are we ever going to be able to do our work? We have hands from Olivier and Glenn.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So EURALO has re-conducted their members to the group. So it's Olivier, myself, for ALAC, Wolf Ludwig for EURALO, and I believe [inaudible] for the person that also volunteered for this. I can't even remember... This is all from memory, I think there might be a fourth person. But we re-conducted essentially the members that were there.

If I might say, this is a committee that doesn't inspire that much excitement, although it is so important. And I think you're going to have a hard time finding new people to fill in that committee. I would suggest you go to the people, or to the RALOs, and remind them who their members were on that committee, and just ask them if they want to re-conduct them on that, those positions.

And it's going to be hard to find brand new people who are not involved in other things and who just want to be involved in that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. [CROSSTALK] ...but we are asking for something slightly different that is, then the RALO people, the RALO person who is formally designated, if they pick someone who is not a RALO officer, then the RALO officers have to agree that that person opinion count on behalf of the RALO. This is not something we've asked them for. Yes, Glenn.

Glenn, we can't hear you.

Glenn, your hand is up but we don't hear you speaking.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, twice actually. There was an echo.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Last week....

ALAN GREENBERG: Glenn, if you're on your phone, mute your computer speaker please.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: It's muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Last week on the...

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not hearing you Glenn.

TERRI AGNEW: And this is Terri. It looks like he's disconnected from the Adobe Connect side, we'll get him reconnected.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, I'm connected with [Adigo].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then please go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: The echo was coming through Adobe. Okay. Last week, Eduardo said he's too busy with other committees. So he asked me to step up to be on this committee. I haven't heard back from Darlene or Alan [Skuce], if they want to return on the committee. But I'm more than happy to volunteer, since Eduardo is tied up. I can follow up with Darlene and Alan and see if they still want to be on the committee.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. Glenn, if they want to be honest participants, that's up to them to say so. Right now, the RALO leadership needs to select someone, either from the leadership or someone else on their behalf to act on the committee.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. And as I said Alan, I volunteered. If you say that you want to protest of asking NARALO itself, if they want to select someone, I can post it to the discussion list.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I did not say that. I said we need to ask the NARALO leadership, which is Evan right now, to either identify someone among the leadership or to identify someone else who the leadership blesses as their spokesperson. Staff can we have someone contact Evan directly and put the question to him? If he doesn't understand, he may not have been focusing on the finance and budget emails that have gone out, you may want to forward something to him, but please make personal contact and let's get this resolved.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. I'm the staff lead for that group, so I can go ahead and do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And then, as soon as we know who is on the group, let's schedule a meeting as soon as we can please. One of the

things that we want to do with the meeting is that we want to meet with ICANN finance staff, and be given an overview of what the process and rules will be, and any other direction that they can provide. So we really need to do that well before Christmas. Christmas is, sadly, very close.

Tijani, you have your hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Thank you Alan. As I told you by email, the finance [inaudible] asked that we meet with them, that they present again the representation of the process of planning. And I asked you if you want this call to be done, but I didn't receive your answer. So I think that it is a very good opportunity to ask them to go ahead and schedule a meeting in coordination with Heidi, so that we can have this meeting as soon as possible. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you Tijani. I agree completely, and that's why I've been pushing to find out who the members are so we can schedule that meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah Alan, this is Heidi. Just really quickly, we've been waiting for finance and others within ICANN staff to be ready to take this to the community. So they should be ready this week, so we can do something, hopefully, later this week.

ALAN GREENBERG: So in other words, we haven't lost too much time in this process, but we need to get our part done quickly, and then schedule the meeting and we know how difficult it is to schedule meetings on our group. Anything else on finance and budget.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, just to tell you that I will work with Aziz so that the members from AFRALO will be appointed very, very soon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and you will talk to Beran also?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I will tell Aziz exactly the situation, and then we let him do what he wants to do, do what he thinks, or he has to do.

[CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: ...ALAC members, if you want to involve Aziz, that's clearly something I have no problem with.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're in a bit of an awkward situation, since I asked you to take a lead role in it before we came up with the formal allocation of people. And I, you know, both of us presumed that Beran would be too busy to do this at this point, but he has expressed an interest so we have to address it one way or the other. But I'm happy to have both of you there, and I don't much care who has the participant name and who has the member name, from the point of view of our discussions. And I'm still relying on you, Tijani, to help us make sure that we don't mess this up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I would do exactly what you wanted me to do. I mean that I will let Aziz know, and I will try to give him all of the situation, and help him also to take the right decision, and with consultation with Beran, if possible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the next item is ICANN 52. And I'm listed as the lead person. I'm not going to say very much. The only thing I'll say is something that I have said before, is the... I won't say the instructions, but certainly the

guidelines that I've given, both Leon and staff, is to the extent possible, we really do not want to meet every day from 7 AM to 7 PM. The meetings that are being scheduled by ICANN and by now the accountability and the stewardship, potentially, the stewardship groups are, to a large extent, out of our control.

But the general feeling seems to be, and I know that was going to be discussed on the SO, the chair's call that I missed today. There seems to be an indication that there is not going to be an awful lot of discussion going on at ICANN, other than related to the IANA transition, one way or the other. So, that is even more going to put some controls on, around us as to what other meetings we hold.

So I suspect a fair number of the meetings that we have scheduled in the past routinely, may not be happening at this meeting. And I'm sure some people are going to be unhappy with that, but I don't think we have much control, and I don't really want to go to 14 hour days for the ALAC, not on a regular basis. And I turn it over to, Gisella I guess and Leon, to take us through where we are and what decisions we have to make on the short term.

LEON SANCHEZ: [Inaudible] ...working on the second draft of the agenda. I have [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, your voice is breaking up badly. Are you on Adobe Connect or on the bridge?

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm on the bridge, I'm on my phone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's try for a minute, but I couldn't make out what you were saying a minute ago. I heard that answer more clearly, so let's try once more.

LEON SANCHEZ: Let's try it once more. So I'm going to have an updated agenda later today. I'm going to send it back to Gisella and you, and I'm collecting the suggestions made by Olivier and other people in the group. And well we have, so far, confirmed that we'll have, of course, a GAC, I'm sorry, an ALAC Board meeting. And this is going to be on Wednesday, if I'm not mistaken.

And...

GISELLA GRUBER: Tuesday.

LEON SANCHEZ: And that's all I have now for now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I didn't catch that.

LEON SANCHEZ: If I may, I can send an email later today, updating all of this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, okay. Leon, anything you send, send to the whole ALT at this point. Sending things to me for my approval, my access to email and my availability at times is going to be sketchy. So don't wait for me to approve anything before sending it to the ALT.

LEON SANCHEZ: All right, perfect. Excellent. And well, the one thing you said, the working groups will be only on the hot topics. Not every working group will be meeting, and that will keep us on schedule, not being, not having meetings all day. So just we're going to meet just for the working groups that have hot topics on their hands, and that's how we're going to manage to not meet at 7 AM all day.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Leon. And by hot topics, I'm presuming, you can define that two different ways. One is either things that are currently being discussed, and the other is issues that really need to be discussed and resolved in this timeframe. I'm a little bit concerned that we may end up with a lot of people saying that they have hot topics, but with not much attendance and allocation of space to all of those may be problematic.

So I'm going to let you interface with the people who are requesting meetings, and try to come to closure whether they meet in Singapore or

not. Feel free to escalate to the ALT however for a decision, if you cannot resolve it easily.

LEON SANCHEZ: Excellent, will do it that way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Alan. I would like to say that for this meeting, for the Singapore meeting, please don't schedule anything before we can take into account the CCWG meetings. We will have two meetings. And also the other, I think CWG will also have two meetings in Singapore. So, it is sure that members of ALAC who are involved in the CCWG or CWG will not attend any other event if they are at the same time as the CCWG or the CWG meetings.

So I think that this time, since we are leaving more or less a storm of this transition, we need to take it into account before any other planning. We can plan our activities if it is not now, or a conventional or normal times, we can find other times. But we will not have to let our members choosing between an ALAC meeting and a transition meeting or an accountability meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. I agree completely, and I guess I didn't say that clearly enough, but I will say it again clearly. We are going to have to work around the CCWG meetings, and as you say, there is probably going to be a CWG meeting, although I haven't heard any discussion of it yet, although maybe there is one somewhere on the agenda. I can't imagine it will not be meeting, but maybe its issues are completely put to bed by that point, and there won't need to be a meeting in Singapore.

Certainly the deadline will have passed at that point, I believe. That doesn't mean our work is completed. The CCWG on accountability, the overlap between the official members, the participants who are going to be very active, and the ALAC, and regional leadership, is very heavy overlap. So yes, I would not want to schedule meetings.

And I know staff is already working on that, we're looking at where the meetings are tentatively scheduled, to make sure that we don't have any overlap. Gisella, you had your hand up and I didn't notice before, so please.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Sorry. Yes, it's just, thank you Alan. Gisella here. It's just, if everyone else is finished, I'll just finish off with a few points. But I see that Maureen still has her hand raised, so I'm happy to go after Maureen. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you Gisella. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you Alan, and thank you Gisella. I've probably got the same thing. I have actually made a request to staff about a date and time for the joint meeting of the ALAC and ccNSO. Since it was rather delayed last time, and only a few members of the ccNSO were able to attend because they were certainly, I mean everything was really pushed at the last meeting.

But I do believe that we [inaudible] where we had, we were able to have a very timely and relevant [inaudible] relating to what was pretty hot at the time, and still is, of course the IANA transition and accountability issue. And I just feel like that it is important that we can make a [inaudible] as early as possible. Now so that we can discuss and share common ground about the issues of concern to both of our groups.

Then if we could just set the date and time, you know, sort of like considered as soon as possible that would be great. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Maureen. I'll come back to you in a moment. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you Alan. I am sorry I joined a little bit late, and I don't know if the issue of the co-chair of the CCWG was addressed, but I do think that we need to appoint someone before Frankfurt meeting, which is very soon. So I think we have to make a vote or to make a selection or to make... I don't know what is it you are planning, but

[inaudible] has to start very soon, so that we'll have the co-chair appointed very soon. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Yes, that was discussed. The extent that it was discussed, there are some discussions going on and I don't want to talk about them in a public meeting. I will share with you privately if you wish.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: But at this point, I would hope we would have someone selected by, probably not by the meeting tomorrow, but certainly sometime soon afterwards.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, you had some statements. Is there something that you really want to say in this meeting? Or you simply wanted to talk to Leon afterwards?

HOLLY RAICHE: Afterwards. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you very much. With regard to Maureen's comment, I think this is perhaps one of those issues that we're going to have to decide, and decide very quickly, is a ccNSO ALAC meeting on our critical tasks right now. Certainly the meeting last time was with regard to the IANA transition, but by the time we meet in Singapore, that's likely to be tied up with a ribbon on it, and I'm not sure that's going to be a hot topic anymore.

So I ask you to consider, are there issues there that really we need to resolve in this time frame? Or that will cause a significant problem if we don't resolve them before June? So I don't know if I want to discuss it right now, but think about that and get back to Leon and Gisella. And if you believe there is really a need for a meeting that we can't wait for, then both of them will do our best to try to make sure it happens. Olivier and then Gisella.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can, and I'm closing the queue after you so we can go to Gisella next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, thanks Alan. You just mentioned that the meeting in Singapore would mean that the proposal would have already been sent out, and

gone through the process. I'm not that 100% sure that we have to look at it this way. You do have to remember that the proposal will be sent, will be then given to the ICG and then passed on, etc. But it is likely that there will be some feedback and some more work into changing the proposal, if the NTIA does not like the proposal as it comes there.

And also, it might well be that the ICG will ask for amendments and changes to the proposal itself, if it cannot come to a consensus on an overall proposal. I'm not sure that whether it would be of help to meet the ccNSO or not. I would perhaps maybe then say, if not a full group, then maybe we could just look for a breakfast or something with the ccNSO leadership. And at least be able to exchange what their points of view are.

I have noted that some country code operators have similar concerns than what we have, and so even if we don't manage to get our solution, and I hope that we do, but if we don't manage to get our solution in the draft. The first draft that is going to be sent out to the ICG. It might be worth looking at the time when this draft will come back, and when some amendments might need to be made.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Let me make it clear, I'm not vetoing any meeting. If we think there is going to be something on the table that we need to allocate time for, whether it's between leadership or between the full group, I'm quite happy to do it. I have no doubt, I'm going to be meeting from 7 AM to 7 PM and later every day. I've been trying to make it easier on the overall group, and to the extent that we can, fine.

So Olivier, if you want to get involved in the discussion, do it with Maureen and Leon and Gisella, that's fine. You know, we're trying to make the right decisions, and we're so much in the dark as to what phase we're going to be at at that point. And at this point, we're still in the dark about what meetings we're going to be scheduled around us. And I have no doubt ICANN management will change things a week before the meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome ALAC chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. So, I'm just trying to provide some guidelines, but they really are only guidelines. I'm really not taking executive decisions, without the person actually knows what's going on in some of these cases. Gisella, I turn it over to you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan. Gisella here for the record. Just to say, Leon has been working on this schedule and he said he will be sending out the second draft and as per Alan's request, we will copy in the ALT on this. I have flagged up a few meetings to find out whether we require them or not. And I'll pick that up off line, possibly on the, whether we need to meet with the NCSG, the registrars, SSAC we usually have on Sunday during the main ALAC session, etc.

Just as an update, we don't have a gala in Singapore as of today, or we don't have any information on that, but I don't believe we're going to

have one. So we're likely to have the APRALO showcase on Wednesday evening. No session interaction with the Board. And with regards to the rest, we will update everyone on an email because now we're copying everyone into the email.

We will do a short summary on what we've already discussed, the working groups that will be meeting, those that have requested meetings, etc., so that everyone is in the loop. Thank you. And oh, sorry, just with regards to the CCWG and CWG, I am trying to follow up with relevant ICANN staff on when we're likely to get dates of these meetings in Singapore, because again, our schedule is going to have to be flexible according to these days.

The sooner we get them, the better it will be, and I think this goes to all groups.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Did you say there will not be an interaction with the Board and the ALAC?

GISELLA GRUBER: There will be, sorry Gisella here. There will be the ALAC Board meeting on the Tuesday meeting, but there won't be a social cocktail. That will be in Buenos Aires.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to make sure that they hadn't cancelled that meeting.

GISELLA GRUBER: No, no, no. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Although we will have a challenge regarding what we're going to be talking about, but again, it partially depends on how things evolve between now and then. So I'm not going to try to close that discussion. My computer is making sounds that people are talking on a prep ICANN 52 Skype session. Just to let you know that I'm not looking at it. If you're expecting me to take action because it's something someone is saying, you're wrong.

Gisella, anything else?

GISELLA GRUBER: No thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier, I thought I had closed the speaker list on the discussion but your hand is up again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I sneaked back in. It's Olivier speaking. Just note, no meeting with the GAC at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was highlighted, and I'm expecting that there are some discussions on staff. With staff going on in that, certainly at the very least, a meeting with GAC leadership is something that we really need to do. I don't care if it's over a lunch or a breakfast, but at the very least, the ALT or the full ALAC GAC leadership, if not the full GAC.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, on that, this is Heidi. I believe that that's what they have requested, even with the new leadership if we could have topics that you would like to discuss with them first, and then that will be asked. We'll bring that over to the leadership then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Well I think we can talk about at least one of them, that is picks and category one, perhaps category two restrictions. The world may have changed by then, it may no longer be relevant or it may still be relevant. That's certainly one major topic of interest. You know, what I believe is common interest right now. I ask everyone else on the ALT to quickly propose any other issues.

And I think if we have a meeting just between leaderships, the issue is how do we actually operationally get more cooperation? Because I think the mechanics of it are one of the things that's holding us up right now. Not sure that is something we would want to talk about in the full group, but certainly that's something that I think we need to address, at some level of formality or informality. The IANA stewardship again, we don't know where the world will be sitting by then, but that's certainly a likely topic of interest.

Anything else that I've missed people? Leon says accountability. I think at this point when we're talking about leadership transition, it's a merger of the detailed plan and the accountability that goes along with it. Accountability is less or more relevant, depending on which plan we're talking about. All right.

Let us go on to the next subject. And Olivier has his hand up again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: It must be frustrating, Olivier, to have to put your hand up now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well no, not at all, as long as you give me the floor every time I put my hand up, I'm delighted. It's great.

ALAN GREENBERG: You will recall the number of times... If you give me the floor for a minute. You will recall the number of times I put my hand up in meetings and you refused to let me speak. Wait until I fight back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm dreading the time when you remember this, and it looks like you're well on your way to remembering it. Olivier speaking. On the action items, I note here, to ask the GAC leadership could meet with the ALT.

Are we asking to have the ALT with leadership? Or full GAC with full ALAC? I just want to make sure we're clear on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have a really strong feeling. I believe strongly we need to have one or the other. I think it would be asking too much to have both. So it depends, to a large extent, what the GAC can fit into their schedule at this point. And I'm going to leave it to talk to staff and see what we can arrange.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So at the moment, it's Olivier speaking. At the moment, it's only the AI just asked with GAC leadership with ALT.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're reading the AIs, I haven't. They do get passed by me afterwards. I will presume it will be corrected in due time, to say that it is one or the other, depending on availability and options.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It has been fixed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for noticing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, I'm sorry. But it's not the ALAC with the full GAC, is it? It's the ALAC with, it's the full ALAC or the ALT with the GAC leadership.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have three options. We have the ALAC with the GAC. We have the ALAC, the ALT with GAC leadership. And we also have in the past done ALAC plus leadership of some group. I personally find that a little bit less productive, because we are over, typically overwhelming the leadership of the other group with a lot of people, and I find that dynamic doesn't work very well.

So my preference is ALAC with the GAC, ALT with GAC leadership, not necessarily in priority order, the other option is ALAC with the GAC leadership. If they really feel comfortable about that, then certainly we can do that. I tend to put that lower on priority. Tijani.

Tijani we can't hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. If it is the ALT who will meet with either the whole GAC or the leadership of the GAC, I propose that we propose such a day as a meeting day, since we are, the ALT is arriving on Friday, and we will have the whole Saturday to program any meeting we want. So I would be, I think that it would be a good use of our time, if we program the meeting on Saturday. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. I think that's an excellent idea. Olivier has said no. I wouldn't think the ALT would meet with the whole GAC for the same reason, I think the dynamic tends to be rather poor at that point. Olivier, do you want to explain why you said no?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Alan. It's Olivier. So the GAC, depending on what it has on its agenda, will be meeting on Saturday already. And if it doesn't, then GAC members would not be there yet. They usually arrive at the very last minute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but it is conceivable that staff may find that a lunch on Saturday with the ALT and GAC leadership is possible. Yes, of course, it means they actually have to be there...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If they're there, and they're able to, but in general, they're neither there or they're not able to.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you wasn't a bad idea, you were just saying it might not be possible to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, understand. That X was not understood properly. Anything else on ICANN 52? I don't have any clue how we are in terms of time. I think we're doing okay though, but I'm not sure.

Okay. ICANN 52 is done. The next item is the ALAC agenda. It says I'm going to speak for 10 minutes, I'm not going to. I haven't looked at the agenda at all yet. Heidi do you want to focus on anything that we need to make decisions on with this meeting?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Alan, this is Heidi. I have not updated the ALAC agenda. So if we quickly open to what the main topics you think will need to be discussed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I don't have the presence of mind to do that right now. I do ask for input from the ALT to, if there are any items you believe need to be discussed on this ALAC meeting, the one that's just immediately prior to many people going on Christmas break, then please send a message to the ALT, and identify what the topics are. Heidi and I will attempt to put the meeting plan together.

The meeting is next week, if I remember correctly, which means...

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's Tuesday, next Tuesday.

ALAN GREENBERG: We should put it together, the agenda together to the extent possible, by later this week. So you've got two days or so to make any comments. If you have anything, please let us know.

Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And just a kind reminder, not to forget the reports from the liaisons in the next call, and also not to forget the ALSs that have been ratified, or have been added, or currently in the process of being ratified. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do believe those have already been ratified as mistakes made last time, so I'm hoping someone has notes for them. We will not make that same mistake last time. I will go on record, I don't have notes on it, but I'm hoping somebody does.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. There are, that's an AI for me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I trusted that was the case. All right then. We will do that tentative item very quickly. If there is anything, you've got two days by sometime Thursday, please let us know if there, better by the end of Wednesday, let us know that there is anything that we need

to be focusing on, on the ALAC meeting, otherwise Heidi and I will make things up on our own.

Policy development activities. Ariel, I presume this page is updated so do I need to update it, to change it soon after the meeting has started? Or will we correct before?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel speaking. Yes, the page has been updated but I do need decisions from you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry I didn't catch it. You need sufficient...

ARIEL LIANG: No, I need the [inaudible]... I need some decisions from you....

ALAN GREENBERG: Decisions, yes, okay. I just wanted to make sure that what I had on my screen was current at this point. All right. We have not approved any formal policies recently. Statements solved or required decisions. The operating plan, Leon you are the lead person on that. Where are we at that point? Do you feel comfortable we're making progress and we'll make a reasonable deadline? We've already missed, I believe, the formal deadline for the first half.

But it's, ICANN has essentially formally announced that the decision of comment and replies is just waiting to be killed completely. I don't

think we need to honor that. So the question is, will we have a statement that we believe will be reflective of ALAC concerns in enough time? Or do we need to light some fires into people?

LEON SANCHEZ: The statement that's already, the wiki [inaudible] comments, we haven't received any so far. So I would ask Ariel to make the call for everyone to take a look at this draft statement, because there are no comments and given time is [inaudible]... and then call for voting [inaudible] or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is it a statement you feel proud of at this point, or do you want to take your name off of it in shame?

[LAUGHTER]

LEON SANCHEZ: [Inaudible] with my name on it. No, I mean, the statement is pretty simple. It's quite complete. And I think that all the members had enough time to comment on the program, so I believe that if no other members commented on the program, then that's what we are seeing. So those are the improvements we are discussing to have.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. I must have been, I haven't looked at it yet. If there is anyone else on the ALT who has not looked at it, please do so and make comments as appropriate. Thank you Leon. The statement on the cross-community working group, the transition. There have been some comments on it, I will do my best to incorporate things.

I haven't seen much that actually is a minor change that can be made in a quick small number of hours today. But I will look at all of the comments again, and that will be sent out for posting on the list, or I'll post it, I'm not sure which, before the, essentially before the end of today or early tomorrow. And so we can get it in a place where other people can see it. My hope is to get it out today so there is a daily report going out to the CWG on, are there any new posts.

And I would like to get it in enough time so it gets reported tomorrow. And I'll check with Bernie [inaudible] exactly when he does that verification. Seeing no hands, the IDN TLD program, the label generation rule set tool project. The comments have stalled. No follow up from the IDN group. At this point, the question that was asked of them is, do they have any reason to believe that the specifications to build a tool set, that have been sent out, are missing anything or have anything wrong.

I think indicative to the fact that we've got no comment, and they don't know what to do, says either no one has read it, which would be rather poor, or they don't really have any comments on it, which is just fine for us to make a decision that there are no comments. Ariel, or I'm not sure who is dealing with Satish.

I know he was put in the lead position without really having a full understanding of how he should be doing. But at this point, do you believe it's really stalled? Or have they really made a decision that they don't need to say anything?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks Alan. This is Ariel speaking. I have conveyed the information you gave me to Satish and [inaudible], but they never got back to me. And I will keep following up with them, and keep you updated [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG:

I trust you to be satisfyingly annoying that they won't ignore you. Okay. We have things we've decided not to submit on, we don't need to talk about them. And we have new public comments. There are two of them. One is the renewal to dot jobs registry agreement. Holly did I miss something? No, your hand is down.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, just on the IDN thing, and possibly it's an issue. I was talking with a person from [All] registry who was saying, once the IDN problem is a lot of stuff happens in English when it comes to names, but the people who want the names don't speak English. And what they're finding, particularly since the registry is operating in the Middle East, is an actual language problem with the implementation.

Now is that something that could be an issue? Or is that something that fits into an existing policy?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll try to answer, if anyone else has a comment, fine. If the people involved that we have involved in this project, and I would hope this message would go to them, feel that one of the reasons we're not getting comments in this particular thing, is the people who would say the rules, say the tools, specifications, are inadequate would only speak Arabic, and the tool specifications were not put out in Arabic, if they weren't, I don't know if they were or not, then that's a problem and we should be saying that.

If we're making a generic statement that if we're talking IDN, you should be translating every document. That's something that needs to be said in some form, but that's not the question they're asking in this case.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, but I'll check on that and get back to whomever.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much Holly. Okay dot jobs, this point the registry agreement is up for renewal. If I understand correctly what they are doing is they have taken the new generic registry renewal agreement, which there is a general understanding that they're going to be using the new agreement as the base. And retrofit it into the specific differences that are necessary because it is a sponsored TLD.

And in this case, I believe also because I think that job is the third level, which makes it a little different also. I have no particular interest in

looking at the details of this. Does anyone else in this group feel that we need to be focusing on this agreement and commenting on it?

Hearing hands, seeing no X's, seeing no checkmarks, presuming you're still awake, I think we made a decision that there is no comment on this one.

All right. Release the country territory names for dot BMW and dot mini. If you remember correctly, there was a comment that we did put in, I think on dot new star, which had a similar request. I asked staff to double check, but my recollection is that what we said at that point is, we have no objection, in fact we think there should have been fewer restrictions to begin with.

Given that, we have two choices, if my memory is correct. We have two choices. We can either put a similar statement in here, and this time say, and by the way, when it comes up next time, we want to say the same thing, which is what we did on release of CC names. Or we could just be silent on this.

Any strong feeling which way we should go?

I believe, but I'm not 100% sure that the new star request has gone through because there was essentially few reservations, other than from the GAC, and I believe they said they would deal with the GAC if necessary. Does anyone recall whether I'm correct and that's how it ended?

Is anyone still awake out there?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, we are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, someone is awake, okay. Does everyone want me to make an unilateral decision on this? Or do you have any comments? Okay, Olivier wants me to make an unilateral decision. Somebody said yes in the background, I think it was Holly. Could I ask staff to look at the new star decision, which was a few months ago, or a comment, and convey to me in a short form, what the outcome was, and I'll make a decision on this one.

Not on this call, but afterwards please. Okay. ATLAS 2 recommendations, five minutes, next steps. I have done nothing on this. I don't know if Olivier has put any time in on it, and I don't think we've had many committee meetings which have focused on this. Holly has her hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a thought. When we get to the next item, about which I have nothing to say, one of the things I was thinking about is if you were looking at an ALAC review, you ought to be folding into that, outcomes from ATLAS 2 as some of the things that it needs to be looked at in where they have... There should be some kind of place in the review to look at ATLAS 2.

So I actually think those two items go together, and that said, I haven't done anything on the review other than just read the past...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, we're not on the review yet, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, all right. Well I'm just thinking that ATLAS 2 should fold into the review, and then the next item, I'll talk about the review.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Let's talk about it on the next item. Olivier, you have your hand up on this one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan, it's Olivier speaking. So on this topic of ATLAS follow up, ATLAS 2 follow up. I have some serious work to do here and I admit having not focused much on it. As you know, as a quick recap, work has been sent to various working groups that the At-Large community is running. And so one of the first things that's going to need to take place is to take stock of where we are, where the different working groups are today with being able to provide input, and which ones of those recommendations we can produce a response that will, or a full recommendation that we can then send to the Board in Singapore.

We had told the Board that we would be having a full set of recommendations by Singapore, or by the time we were supposed to be in Marrakesh, by the next ICANN meeting. And I do have concerns that we probably are not going to have a full set of recommendations. That said, I know, and I am aware, that working groups, or at least those that

are meeting regularly, are moving forward with the work, and so there will be some output.

Similarly speaking, if you recall in Los Angeles, the ALAC did send some recommendations to the Board, and I have not had any feedback on those so far. And I'm not quite sure where we are on that either. That would obviously need to be a follow up as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I guess I'll point out that the vast majority of recommendations, either or not for the Board or were not ready for Board discussions in previous times, so I'm not sure how many are the ones that are quote sent to the Board, we're really in a position to ask them what they've done about it yet.

I thought they were largely all referred back to us for more specificity and detail. All of that has been said, I guess I'm obliged to say that, as important as it is to make sure that we don't forget the outcome of ATLAS, many of these things are just not the highest items in our priority list right now. And certainly in terms of allocating this in the time of the people who tend to run working groups and tend to put in the bulk of the work on them.

So if we miss a deadline for Singapore talking with the Board about this, to be honest, I think they have other things on their plate also, and I don't think anyone is going to be upset about it. That being said, at some point, we are going to have to get back to them. I don't think I would ask, you know, you Olivier right now, to stop working on

accountability and IANA, to go back and cleanup the ATLAS recommendations.

I just don't think that's where we need the focus to be, given how fast things are moving. Heidi you had your hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan, just very briefly. This is Heidi for the record. We had discussed earlier that one way, perhaps moving forward very quickly, by Singapore, is to form a very small group, and just to move ahead on a few of them so there would be something to report in Singapore, something that we did for the ALAC improvements was to get that small group together and just push through some of the recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for reminding me of that. Yes we have talked about that before. Are you looking for volunteers? Or do you, would you like to buttonhole a few people who you think are the key people to do this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm happy to buttonhole a few people, but you're going to be one of them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then you are so in charge, and good luck with that. You may write yourself an AI. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. Even if we will not our recommendation to the Board on Singapore meeting, we need to prepare a small report explaining that we are really busy by the IANA transition and accountability, so that we couldn't prepare and honor our commitment for Singapore. We need to give them something, we don't have to be silent. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted and thank you for that. Heidi you have another option on your menu of things you can do. [CROSSTALK] Sorry, what was that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, sorry. I'm incorporating that as my AI.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Anything else on that item? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices. Update on the ALAC review. Let me give you a bit of update, and then I'm going to turn it over to Heidi, who is not listed there, and then we'll go to Holly, and Cheryl is not on the call, I believe.

The intent last time we had a very brief and formal discussion with staff on this, and with Ray, who is leading the structural improvements committee, was that first the structural improvements committee had to meet and discuss this, which they have not done. The next step was going to be that the SIC meet with the ALT and Cheryl, who we asked to be involved because of the, among other things, for reasons of history.

Heidi, have you...? Last time I know, you've talked to Alissa. She didn't have that on her list as one of the tasks.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. This is Heidi. We've been in touch this past week, and she's speaking to Ray this week, and we'll have an update on whether the SIT will be in the position to meet with the ALT in a single issue call this month, but [inaudible] is going to be in January.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So first there was going to be a meeting with the ALT. Just making sure that we're all talking on the same ground before we made a formal presentation with incorporating some SIC members, but also staff through the ALAC will have a wider discussion.

My recollection is however, that this should not be, that the title we have on this thing is ALAC review and I thought it was At-Large.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. It is At-Large. Sorry, did I put ALAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: You did put ALAC.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You remember the last time, or you may not remember, but the last review was very specifically ALAC, and we explicitly did not look at anything outside of ALAC, because at that point the RALOs were just forming. And we didn't think it was appropriate to try and review something which had just been birthed to a large extent, and really hadn't done anything.

At this point, that may well be a large focus, if not the only focus of the review, to look at essentially effectiveness, and are we doing what we should be doing? And if not, how should we be changing? We already know some of the answers that that ourselves, because we have some level of dissatisfaction at this point, but that's the input to the process.

Holly, with regard to your suggestion of incorporating the ATLAS 2 recommendations, I would think that if and when there is an intersection, we certainly should do that. We shouldn't ignore them, but I wouldn't take the whole body of them and integrate them with the review in any way.

I think that's just going to confuse the issue. That's my personal take on it anyway. Tijani.

Can't hear you.

TERRI AGNEW:

And Alan, this is Terri from staff. Tijani just dropped his audio and we're trying to get him back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Anyone else, comments on the overall issue of the review?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I've been in touch with Cheryl about creating a new work space for the At-Large review and what we've thought that Ariel and I will work on something like an umbrella workspace, similar to the one we did for the Board director position. So we'll have one space with the previous review, and then another link to the new work space.

We'll go ahead and populate that as [inaudible] of it, and then we'll send that link to Holly and Cheryl for review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That's good. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you Alan. Since it is an At-Large review, I would like to answer to the fact that this review must be done in several steps, or several stages, several layers. We have to start by the review of the ALSs, of the RALOs, and then with the whole ALAC. IT is the way that can, from my point of view, can lead to a real review of the whole At-Large.

It is start reviewing all those structures at the same time. We made the, not a very good position because sometimes we will have contradiction between this and this other structure. So I think that we need to do it by layers, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you Tijani. Since there is going to be essentially one review, which is a single pass, I'm not sure we have the luxury of a consultant do one thing, report on it, and then go on to another one. We can certainly make some recommendations when the process is starting, and that's one of the reasons that I believe that we want the ALT and then the ALAC meeting with the structural improvements committee, is to make sure that they have the, without trying to sound too arrogant, the benefit of our wisdom before they, you know, commit to too much.

But you know, to what extent we will have the flexibility to do exactly as you're saying. I'm not sure that the process lends itself to that, but certainly to the extent possible, that's an interesting idea.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else? Okay. Next item is, ALAC and the next round of new gTLDs. And I have five minutes to speak on that. I don't have five minutes to speak. Tijani and I have been somewhat active, Tijani more than me, in the GNSO group that is putting together a list of stuff that work itself into a PDP, or into something else.

Tijani, do you feel that they have documented the issues that you have raised sufficiently well at this point? Or do we need to take out our hammers and hit people on the head?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. All points raised by me and by Evan, were taken into account, and were very well written in the list. And now, as Alan said, we are in discussion team, which is a discussion group, which is a discussion. There are no decisions, it is only discussion. We are trying to discuss those points, so that if there is any follow up on the upcoming rounds, we have already something done.

So I think that our concerns are very well taken into account, and our region. [Inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have just a little bit of concern that the Board is putting too much focus on this right now, when the new round cannot be launched until there are several, you know, there is at least one

ATRT, not ATRT, but affirmation of commitment review that has to be done. There is what inevitably will be a PDP that's likely to take a year or two. So, I think they're starting to get some of the business parts of this organization a little bit too eager to start a round, and I don't think we're anywhere near that.

So my personal perspective is let's put the brakes on as much as we can. We are still having very significant problems with the implementation of the first round. So I'm not at all eager to move too quickly, but we are participating at this point to the extent that things are going on. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I'm very surprised they would be looking at moving forward with this, bearing in mind the public discussion that took place in, I think it was in Los Angeles, I can't remember whether it was the last one or before that. LA, thank you Tijani.

Overall, the majority of the respondents were saying, let's just first find out what happens with the current one. And there was certainly no push to have a new round, except from a few commercial quarters that just wanted to cash in quickly on the next round. It seems to be pretty clear to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, and I think, a large part of the Board's focus has simply been to draw up the list of things that has to be done, and that's not unreasonable, because the list of things have to be some of it starts

soon. If you remember correctly, the affirmation of commitment, what is supposed to be starting a year after the first delegations are going live, and we're probably getting close to that soon.

So, it's proper to be doing the things that lead to the next round, but sometimes the messages, I think, get messed up a little bit and it sounds as if we're trying to rush, and you know, that I agree, that isn't where we want to be going. For instance, we were asked, Heidi you can put the right words onto this, but we were asked, what is the ALAC doing about preparing for the next round?

And I think the form of that question almost sends the wrong message. So I think we're all in complete agreement at this point.

Next item, feedback on the At-Large staff workshop. Alan Greenberg and Heidi. I have no feedback because I wasn't involved. I think it was an awful shame that you people hid yourself in a room and didn't talk to us for a week. That's the only feedback I have. [LAUGHTER] I hope it was productive, but I have no clue. Heidi, over to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, very briefly. Among other items that we discussed, we had a policy workshop for all staff for a few days. We also had about a half a day where we met just with At-Large staff. And we talked a little bit about staff sufficiency, well two items. One is that we agree that not all staff need to be on all the calls, except of course, the ALAC and some ALTs will have still full staff support for that.

But for the working group calls, we've identified working groups, staff support leads, and you'll see that, that we've done that on the, what we call working group portal, I'm going to put that link in to the AC. This is the working group portal. So for the most part, we've all identified ourselves as who are the staff support.

So only those people who are the staff support for the working groups, and one call manager will be on calls going forward, and that's going to help with allowing us to be more efficient. And I think that's really what we wanted to talk about there. And also, you'll notice there are a few changes when we meet in ICANN meetings.

We'll all announce what our roles are during that meeting, so whether that, again, means support, note taker, AI taker, or remote participant manager. So we'll all be stating those so everyone is aware of what we're doing. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. So we're going to get a bunch of badges and give you people hats, so by which hats you're wearing, we can tell what you're doing in any given meeting. We'll try to make sure that none of them look like clown hats, of course.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

[Laughter] I was just about to say that, please do respect for all of our roles.

ALAN GREENBERG: Respect has various different meanings, Heidi. I tend to support the intent of, you used the word more efficient, I refuse to ever have a discussion using the word efficient without [CROSSTALK]... So I'm quite happy to have fewer people on the call...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello? Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, someone is talking.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Tijani we're hearing you, this is Heidi.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, are you talking to the ALT?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I don't know if you hear me, but...

ALAN GREENBERG: We are hearing you say hello, and we're hearing you talk now. I hadn't seen your hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, Alan, I'm sorry. It's a problem of communication. My telephone don't work in the other direction, so you hear me, but I don't hear you. That's why I was asking you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Someone tell Tijani we did here him. But if he can't hear us, we will type a message. Anyone remember what item we're on? Oh yes, we're talking about efficiency and effectiveness of staff people. The only [inaudible], Heidi, may I say what I said to you directly to the rest of the group?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I said, I'm not unhappy to have only one key person, but that person actually has to be paying attention. When we have five people on the call, everyone feels that they're not the key person, and therefore they do other things at the same time. And we all know what kind of results that sometimes has. So if someone is allocated to a call, we should do our best to make sure we entertain them and keep them awake, but we do expect people to focus on us.

And with that, we will certainly give it a try.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much. I agree with that, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We're on any other business now. The only item I have is a note from Wolf Ludwig saying he's going to be working with Thomas [inaudible] for a period of time, and is there any concern with that? There have been a number of people from EURALO who have said, no, they think it's great.

Is there any concern on the ALT?

LEON SANCHEZ: I think it's great. This is Leon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then we have no objection. I'll formally respond to him. Is there anything else we need to discuss? We are a little bit over, but not a lot. No hands? I thank you folks, and we'll be talking to you whenever the next meetings are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, Alan, you were going to speak, Wolf, the extra thing you wanted to speak about.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I just did.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay. I thought that was, okay. I thought there was more discussion on that. All right.

ALAN GREENBERG: I asked if there was any discussion and there was not any. Do you want to discuss?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. I just made sure it was as a contractor and that it's not going to be as a representative and so on. As long as it comes, this is mentioned openly, then I don't have problems with it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I will make sure that is said in the response. And I believe he did do that openly, but I will make it quite clear. I mean, if it was any other assignment, other than working for another part of ICANN, there would be no question at all, but given that it is another part of ICANN, admittedly, a part that we have good relations with at the moment, I don't think I have any concerns other than to make sure that he's not representing himself as, you know, taking an ALAC or EURALO position if this is being done in a personal compacity.

And Tijani, hand up?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you Alan. I think that we need to ask him to update his SOI.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course. If there is nothing else, I thank you for being here, and we will be talking to you. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]