

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome on today's ALAC monthly meeting on Tuesday, 27<sup>th</sup> of January at 21:00 UTC. On the English channel we have Alan Greenberg, Vanda Scartezini, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Glenn McKnight, Leon Sanchez, Maureen Hilyard, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Siranush Vardanyan, Garth Graham, Eduardo Diaz, Ron Sherwood and Roosevelt King. On the French channel we have Hadja Ouattara. We do not currently have anyone on the Spanish or the Russian channel. We also have Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Julie Hammer. Apologies noted from Jimmy Shultz. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang and myself, Gisella Gruber.

Our interpreters today, on the French channel, are Camila, Spanish channel Veronica and Sabrina, and Russian channel Galina and Ikatarina. Can I please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes but to allow the interpreters to identify you on the language channels, and to speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. We also currently only have one interpreter on the French channel. Thank you and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Gisella. The Agenda has been shortened significantly this time due to a scheduling problem. The meeting was originally supposed to have started an hour earlier and we found we couldn't do that because of a conflict. The meeting was therefore moved up an hour, but also because a number of people had indicated they couldn't easily attend for the second hour, we've reduced the

---

*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.*

---

meeting to 90 minutes this time. That required omitting a number of Agenda Items. They're still currently on the Agenda but we'll be skipping over them either very quickly or completely.

We've also shortened the time for a number of the Items that have been left. When there are interventions I'm going to ask everyone to keep them relatively short, and hopefully we can get off within the 90 minutes or maybe a little bit less. Are there any Items for Any Other Business? Then we'll adopt the Agenda as on the Wiki. We're skipping over Chair remarks, skipping over AIs. There are none that have not been completed that need any discussion at this point. On ALSes we'll not have a discussion. There is one pending ALS vote that will be started relatively soon on the Cameroon League for Development.

It's a relatively unusual one in that there is regional advice to not accept the application. There will be an email going out talking about that shortly, so we won't discuss it. Reports from the Working Groups, RALOs and Liaisons. Are there any that need particular focus? We do have a few minutes for that Agenda Item. Seeing none, we'll skip over that one. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can't scroll through the Agenda so I don't know if we have anything on IANA stewardship transition?

ALAN GREENBERG: We do. Thank you. The next Item is policy development. The list is reasonably complete. There are relatively few Items that need our

---

attention. There is an Item on the WHOIS Accuracy Study that's in Holly's hands, and the classification is considering drafting a statement. Holly, do you have any input on that at this point?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Not at this point. I briefly read through it. It's done by the same people who did the WHOIS accuracy stuff for the Final Review Team. If you look at the results, it says in one instance that the WHOIS stuff is better because of the 2013... I've forgotten. One is the better for [unclear 00:05:48] post. I don't know if it makes much difference at all. I'm not sure. The only reason to make a comment would be to say it's good to have a benchmark, but I don't see anything that really stood out, so I don't think it's controversial.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. if you could put something on the Wiki as a comment or recommendation, we can see if there is any further discussion on that and then close that. The other Item is the GNSO Policy and Implementation Working Group's Initial Report. This, as you'll recall, is the project that came out of all of the discussions of what is policy and what is implementation. There's been a lot of work going on. A very brief summary is that the new definitions that are being proposed essentially is that if stakeholders are going to be significantly impacted by something, then it's policy, regardless of when it shows up in the timeline and when it's discovered.

There are a number of new policy development processes that are being proposed to allow the GNSO and the community to respond to those

---

kinds of things that come up later on in the discussion. It's a very significant piece of work, and if implemented will cause a very significant change in how ICANN does its business, and possibly there's a fear it could significantly elongate processes, if we discover a lot of policy later on in the overall process of what we now call implementation. I would suggest that people take a look at that, and I think it warrants a comment, even if we say we support it.

But if we're going to say we support it, I think we have to do that understanding what the implications of supporting it are, and if we have any problems of course we need to say that. It's a complex paper. It's not going to be trivial to read, but I really suggest people take a look at it. Cheryl, do you have any other thoughts on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I support what you're saying. Yes, I do think we need to say something, and I'm biased that [unclear 00:08:28] for years now, Alan, to say it's probably something we should be saying and generally supporting. It does need to be considered [unclear]. Because you and I [unclear 00:08:43] have had a particular handle in [unclear] about this, I'd suggest that in all circumstances we ask for one or two others to perhaps officially hold the pen for the ALAC input, but as you and I stand very much hand in glove with them to explain some of the nuances and [unclear 00:09:13]. I think it's a milestone [unclear], so we do need to take up [unclear] actually in it, but we can certainly hold the hands of [unclear].

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I think one of the issues is those of us who've been heavily involved in the drafting are in danger of not looking at the large picture. We've made very good proposals. We haven't at this point really analyzed what that will do to the overall flow of work in ICANN, and that's something we certainly have to do before the end of it. But I think again, the ALAC and the other groups commenting on it really have to look at it from the point of view of not having been the people who drafted it.

Certainly anyone who's been involved in GNSO policy development or implementation issues, I would strongly suggest you take a look at it. I don't think there's much else we can say at this point. The next issue is the update on the report I sent out yesterday on the meeting with the New gTLD Policy Committee and a number of ALAC/At-Large people on the PICs. As the report is laid out, it was a very useful meeting, I think. There was some fear at the beginning that it was called just to make it look good, that they were listening to us, and that is not the way it played out at all.

I believe that we significantly altered how at least the Members of the Policy Committee that attended that meeting are thinking about the overall issue, and perhaps provided some ways forward. As I noted in the Report, there are no golden bullets, there are no magic things that will simply fix the problem. The problem was caused by a whole bunch of what I believe are errors that were made along the way by a number of parties, and they're not going to be easy to fix. But it was a useful meeting. It certainly set an interesting precedent. I was quite surprised at just how candid and open everyone was, and I think it was a good exercise.

---

The meeting was transcribed. We've not been given a transcript, and I wouldn't be surprised if they decide not to release it. As I said, it was a very candid meeting, and perhaps more candid than it would be if it was going to be published. Any questions on that, or thoughts from those who attended? The next Item is outreach and engagement, and this links to some extent with the ALS vote that we talked about earlier. You'll recall that the ALS that's going to be voted on soon is the Cameroon League for Development.

The RALO, in a relatively unusual move, based on our past practices, has recommended that we not approve this group as an ALS, and the rationale, which I'm in the process of asking the region to provide, in case we reject it and must provide a rationale, essentially centers around the fact that this group, although they may be doing very interesting things with regard to development, poverty and employment, does not seem to be heavily involved in the Internet, and more specifically is not at all involved in things related to ICANN's remit. I support the rejection based on that, but we do have to go back and look at what the criteria is for ALSes.

That circles us around to looking at what business we should be in. We have focused a lot of energy in the last three years on outreach, and outreach, very often in ICANN terminology, translates to marketing – that is let's go find more people to join us as ALSes. I would like, at least for the next little while – and I've discussed this with the ALT, and I believe we also discussed this at the last ALAC Meeting – I think for the next while, at least until we identify exactly what we want from ALSes and can recognize a good one when we see one, I think we should be

---

moving our focus away from what ICANN calls outreach to perhaps inreach – a term used in some parts of ICANN.

That is focusing on the people who are already associated with ICANN and making sure that we make them effective volunteers and effective contributors. The other term that's used in ICANN is engagement, and to make sure that we are working effectively with all of the parts of our community. I see a number of hands up, so I'm going to stop talking at this point and let people make other comments, and I might put myself back in in a little bit. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

[00:15:22] Thank you. We need to pay a little attention on the fact that in poor areas people are just starting on Internet issues, and if you just consider that only people that already have done any issue related to the Internet and have results in that, are allowed to join us, we will be [expelling 00:16:05] everybody in the new [unclear] countries around. I do believe that we need to think a little bit about this, and have a [unclear 00:16:22] in Africa and talk with some of the groups that are doing something. They're eager to participate on the Internet, because the Internet is just touching them right now. If we don't allow them, I believe that we are not being fair around the world. That is my point. We need to think about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I gather it's my turn to speak. Two things: first, we have a CROPP at the moment, and perhaps we should also have a CRIPP, an inreach pilot program, and that might be something to discuss with the people

---

currently working with the CROPP. That was one thing. Now, the other thing is a concern I have, and I think I'll echo Vanda's concerns, and that's to do with the minimum criteria for an ALS. At the moment, as they are published on the ALAC website, there are five requirements.

They mention: committing to supporting individual users for participation in ICANN; being organized so participation or individual users, or citizens, or residents of the country within a geographic region; will predominate in the ALS operation; be self-supporting; posting on the Internet be publicly accessible, current information about the ALS's goal, and five; assisting the RALO in performing its functions. I gather that the questionable criteria is to do with posting on the Internet publicly accessible, current information about the ALS's goal. If they don't align with the ALAC [unclear 99:18:50]...

Then again, these all seem to be criteria once an ALS is accredited, so I'm not quite sure how one would be able to reject an ALS by saying, "We're not dealing with Internet issues enough." If the applicant was to dispute this, I'm not quite sure where we'd be able to point to say that they don't "fit" in the ALAC remit. I'd be interested in some clarification on this please. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Olivier spoke about the CRIPP instead of the CROPP. I don't like ALAC speaking about this, because the CROPP is not done for At-Large only –



---

it's done for the whole community. It is something [unclear 00:20:15] At-Large's efforts, and [unclear]. It says we will focus in the future on more engagement and more... [interpreter audio issues].

GISELLA GRUBER: I believe there are power issues in Buenos Aires today. We have Spanish interpretation back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I said that the CROPP wasn't only designed for At-Large. It is up to At-Large to continue to do some outreach, but we didn't say we'd come to any outreach effort. We said we will focus more on engagement than on outreach, so please don't speak about the CRIPP because this will prevent At-Large people having funding for some other outreach that they can do. As for the criteria of accreditation, ALAC has the ability to accredit each ALS if they wish, if they find it better to accredit it, but AFRALO tries to investigate on the ground.

We asked the Cameroon ALSes and they didn't find that this organization has any activity on the ground regarding anything regarding the Internet. That's why AFRALO gave this advice, and again, ALAC has the ability to accredit it, if they feel there's no reason to reject it.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. I really didn't want this to be focusing on the Cameroon ALS applicant. I'll point out that if someone were to put a cross application in for outreach to existing groups of participants I would strongly support it – whether it was technically the right word or not – to the extent that the Chair has any input into the process. I believe that was a reasonable thing to do. That is interpreting outreach in the most generic terms; not in a very restrictive one. In any case, I believe that we need to widen the number of people who are active participants.

The people who are involved in ALAC, and the relatively few other people who are active participants – not just to attend a monthly meeting, but active, it's a very small number and we need to work to increase that. I believe at this point that should be where our focus is. Certainly it's going to be a significant focus of the At-Large review, and we can't ignore that. Any other comments at this point? No hands, no voices. Is there anything going on in the chat that needs to be focused on? No. Okay. The next Agenda Item is a review of ICANN 52. I'll turn that over to Leon and Gisella to present that. We have 20 minutes allocated. We're okay at this point; we're a little over time but not a lot.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Alan. Well, as you maybe know, the general schedule has already been published on the Singapore Meeting website. The main objective deals with the At-Large schedule; first to avoid as many 7:00 am meetings as possible. I believe we were partially successful on that, but that led of course to other hassle, which complicate our schedule for Singapore. We have a couple of clashing meetings. It was difficult, while

---

setting up the schedule, to foresee modifications, as we were dependable on the general meetings, such as the CCWG on Accountability, the CWG, the ICG, and many Working Groups that will of course have a focus.

As you can see, I think you can see it's a work in progress. It's shared on the screen now. We will be having just two 7:00 am meetings; on Tuesday the ccNSO and ALAC Meeting, which is 7:15 am, so not 7:00 am.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can tell Leon's a lawyer.

LEON SANCHEZ: Then on Wednesday we have the RALO Leadership ALT Working Session with David Olive, which is a 7:00 am meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Leon, sorry to interrupt. We don't have any Spanish audio. It's dropped again due to the power outage. Apologies for the inconvenience.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. Cheryl has also dropped. Alan, if you'd like to continue without Spanish interpretation please do, bearing in mind it will not be on the recording either.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we'll need to continue, otherwise we're going to lose people who are dropping off after the first hour.

LEON SANCHEZ: Excellent. As you can see, this is a very different schedule to our usual schedules from past meetings. I switched some of the sessions from one day to another – for example, the ALAC and Regional Leadership Meeting [unclear 00:32:41] were switched onto different days than they were usually held. Also, we're only having Working Group Sessions for throw Working Groups that have a hot topic to address at the Singapore Meeting, and also those who requested a space for a meeting. We had to make some last-minute adjustments to the schedule, which Gisella put in place very nicely. I'd like to hand over to Gisella for further comment.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. I'll be adding the burning questions from everyone, I'm sure, on Tuesday and Wednesday's early morning meetings, starting at 7:15 and 7:00. We'll be confirming whether we're able to serve breakfast at these meetings. We haven't had 100 per cent confirmation yet, so I'm working on that and doing my best, but we will inform everyone to make you aware of what catering is offered. Please also do take a close look at the schedule to see when the meetings overlap over lunchtime, to allow you enough time to go and get food. As everyone remembers, who've already been to Singapore, there's a wonderful food outlet on the lower ground floor, so there are many options in Singapore.

---

As Leon said, we've tried to limit the 7:00 am starts, but with accountability and IANA it's been extremely difficult, and open to any questions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll point out that on Thursday there will be many people who'll have uninterrupted meetings from 7:00 am until 7:00 pm. Because of the number of last-minute changes we've had to schedule the ALAC Wrap-Up Session over lunch. We've requested hot lunch be served. I don't believe we've heard back yet?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, we've not had any response formally. We've been looking at it internally, and I think it looks pretty good, so I'll follow up on when they can make that announcement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll note first of all a thanks to Leon, because I essentially was not involved in any of these arrangements until quite late in the game, and that I appreciate. I did get involved at the last day or two, of juggling things back and forth. I do note that one of the reasons things are so tight, in addition to accountability and IANA is we lost our meeting on Wednesday morning. It was taken from us without giving us any replacement room, and that made our schedule much tighter. I'm suggesting we provide tour bus tickets for Singapore for everyone for Wednesday morning. That's barely a joke.

---

There are lots of other things going on that morning that you'll be able to attend, but it did make our scheduling somewhat of a challenge. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I note that the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap Up has moved to Thursday. Okay. I won't be able to attend some of it, because I'm actually Chairing another group. Would it be possible, at that point, if there are any votes or ratifications and so on, to go remotely?

ALAN GREENBERG: Our Rules of Procedure allow us to carry votes over for several days. I'm sure we'll be able to carry them over for several hours. I don't think you need to worry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For some of the things though we do write statements, which are then read in the Public Forum afterwards, so we don't have the ability to carry them on for a few days, if we need to get a green light?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are allowed to carry them on for several days. We can certainly carry them on for several minutes or hours, and we also have the ability to have proxies. I don't believe there will be a problem with regards to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Excellent. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:                Any other questions? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:                 I don't have access to a computer at the moment, or Internet, but could you please discuss the questions for the Board? Ariel, could you please put the Wiki page for the ALAC questions to the Board up? You'll note that there are four topics. Alan, I believe you wanted to have a discussion of the specific questions for those topics? I'll be with you on the Internet hopefully shortly.

ALAN GREENBERG:                I'm not sure we're going to have a discussion, but I do believe we owe any questions we want to ask the Board to Board staff by this Friday. If anyone has a pressing issue they'd like to tentatively put on the Agenda, then I'd suggest you include it. I'll certainly be putting the generic topic of the PICs for high-sensitivity domains; the issue that was discussed at the New gTLD Committee last week. Whether we actually have anything to talk about at that point will depend on what comes out of the New gTLD Process Committee Meeting, but I think we certainly want to have a placeholder for it. There will also be an opportunity to talk about the IANA transition and accountability, although I'm not sure the Board is really going to be in a position to either answer any questions or clarify

---

things any more than they are already doing in participating in those meetings.

Certainly if there's anything people would like to raise with regard to the Board, or at least tentatively raise, then I would suggest that that be put onto the Wiki as quickly as possible. The deadline is Friday. I see a lot of discussion going on about Raffles Hotel on the chat. I'm presuming that's not really on topic. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Just regarding the session with the Board, just to let you know there will be a presentation of some of the ATLAS II Recommendations, and in line with the discussion that you and I had, I think we can do that in about 15 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I believe that's scheduled for the beginning or the end of the meeting. I can't remember which, but we have allocated 15 minutes for that. Anything else anyone would like to raise on this meeting? It's going to be a challenging meeting. There's no question there. There are times when people are double- and triple-booked, and there's not much we can do about it. The schedule for some of the meetings has essentially been arbitrarily put, and there's very little we can do about it. There are still discussions on things, and I'll give you an example.

On the Monday afternoon there is an SO/AC important topic session, in parallel with WHOIS, which from my perspective is also an important topic. It will be interesting to see how those are going to play out.



---

Evan? No audio. Two questions. Evan's asking if the meeting with the New gTLD Committee has been scheduled. Okay. The question is: "Is there an arrival list?" I hope we'll be getting a list from staff very soon, of when people are arriving. Evan, I haven't seen that yet, but it was on my list to ask. I think the meeting that you're talking about being scheduled is a suggested meeting between various different stakeholders and the New gTLD Process Committee in Singapore.

That was the suggestion that I made. We've seen no indication that it's been acted upon at this point. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question in terms of will there be a list of when everybody arrives?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what Evan just asked. I said I'm expecting we'll have that from staff very shortly. Any other questions on the meeting?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Very quickly, Ariel is working with IT on getting the information to put up the travel database for everyone. The good news is that I think she's going to be putting in the information. That will be up in the next few days.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anything else? Leon?

---

LEON SANCHEZ: I'd like to thank you for your trust and confidence, Alan, and of course I'd also like to applaud staff for the inconveniences that might have come at the later time, and for answering the difficulties of supporting this session [unclear 00:44:47].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Leon. We will definitely be understanding, but we'll still blame you. Thank you for all the work you put into this. I know it's not an easy task.

LEON SANCHEZ: I wouldn't have done it without Gisella, so thanks Gisella.

ALAN GREENBERG: Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Just quickly, I threw something in the chat about the remote hubs, which I'm trying to figure out for doing for NARALO, but because of the time difference between Singapore and North America, it didn't look like it was something we may do. I just wondered whether anyone had any comments or desires or suggestions as to how we might use that as an outreach for NARALO? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: With, I believe, a 13-hour time zone change, I'm not sure that it's going to be one of the real great gifts for remote hubs.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Very quickly, Ariel reports that most of the applications, there are 17, are from AFRALO and APRALO.

ALAN GREENBERG: That makes complete sense. All right. Evan, you still have your hand up. I presume that's an anomaly, which we'll ignore. The next Item on the Agenda is the FBSC and the FY 16 AC/SO special requests. Do we have a list of the ones that the FBSC are planning to put up on behalf of the ALAC itself?

HEIDI ULLRICH: If you go to the FY 16 Budget Development Workspace, I thought we'd put those in there. Sorry, let me tell you what they are. From the ALAC, there's one for the IGF, and it would not be a normal panel, it would be a larger meeting, perhaps on day zero. There would also be one perhaps for some previous days prior to the start of the normal meetings for FY 16, for the first two.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, you just switched from IGF to ICANN Meetings, and specifically we're talking about ALAC and Regional Leaders Meeting on the Saturday, preceding the Meeting.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, but there was also the mention of ALAC proposing to submit a proposal to hold a session at the IGF. Then there's also the ALAC level for a mentoring program for first nation's people. Tijani would know more about the one for the cross-RALO activities that you might be submitting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right. The other Item we were talking about was the possibility of a post-ICANN session at the annual GA; essentially an opportunity for the new ALAC to get to know each other and to build effective working relationships before everyone disappears into their own worlds. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. As Heidi mentioned, it's also a capacity building and engagement activity for the regions, and on site. This is a program not for a specific region but for all the regions, and we'll make a pilot program that will be done in one of those regions. We'll try to find the most adequate one for this kind of activity.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It also strikes me that since we're putting in a significant number of Items we may want to decide whether we want to prioritize them or not. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Is this the special budget request timeline where things are being [unclear 00:50:23] for? If that's the case, Heidi and I were talking about

---

a special one for captioning, but she was still finding out details from staff on whether we want to send it as a special request or something else.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I'll leave it to you and Heidi to discuss that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Judith, we're still waiting. There's an active discussion internally and I'm just trying to get confirmation on whether we should have that proposal come in in addition to what's being planned already. The reason for the delay is that it's just several departments who are working together on this, and they're spread all over the world, so that's what's taking so long. It's on my list of things to do. I'll get back to you pretty quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Heidi. Anything else on the budget requests? Without mentioning the ones the ALAC will be doing on behalf of all of At-Large? There is an opportunity and we already asked the regions to submit regional specific requests, which will all be evaluated by the FBSC and then presumably either supported or sent back to the region for whatever clarification is needed. Any other comments? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: For the regions we're now looking at, EURALO, AFRALO and NARALO applications are proposals for GAs in this year, there might also be a need to put in requests for communications or documentation sorts of

---

proposals, depending on what's coming back internally. I'll provide you with some more information on that, but you might want to start thinking about that; about what your needs are, about what RALOs need for documents, et cetera. Also, in Singapore there's going to be a meeting of the FBSC. We're still looking for a time for that, so we will be in touch with you on that. We're looking where you could meet for one hour to review the proposals that have come in by that time.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. There will of course be a meeting with ICANN senior staff on the finance to talk about the overall process. Clearly this is a learning game right now. To some extent we're asking for proposals before we have the discussion on what is important, and from an ICANN senior staff position, and we need to get our act together better in future years. That's quite clear. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Alan. Heidi was absolutely right in saying NARALO will be putting forward a proposal for a GA. When is the deadline on that submission? How fast do you need it? The decision to go ahead with it and the consensus from the region just came fairly recently.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Again, we have sent out notices. The deadline for ALS applications is officially the 4<sup>th</sup>. We realize that's coming up, and there's a little bit of leeway for that submission but we would of course like as many applications to be in my that time – by the 4<sup>th</sup>. A concern is that if it's

---

considerably later than that then the FBSC will not have a time to review them by their meeting in Singapore.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you intend to do a formal one, get something in, at least a placeholder, with a reasonably good estimate of what you're talking about and the rationale for it. It's not necessarily something that's beautifully formatted, but you really need to get something in.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You're absolutely right. I just wanted to note the date for sure – February 4<sup>th</sup>. We do have the forms in hand. They will be there in hand, and it should be well more than a placeholder. We just wanted to nail that down. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. We recognize the timing is bad, and since some of the discussion will only be happening after the 4<sup>th</sup>, in terms of a discussion with Xavier, for instance, clearly there will be an opportunity to revise things, if necessary. Hopefully not everything will have to be revised, but we'll do our best to be flexible.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The reason why it's taking this long is I want to make sure I have full regional consensus and I'd say after asking, Alan, I think you've probably seen the responses too, and I think we have that. Okay. You'll have something.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I also posted a couple of reasons why it might be challenging, so try to address those. Next Item on our Agenda is an update on the face-to-face meeting of the Accountability CCWG. There was another meeting today. Is there anyone who'd like to take the lead on that? I can certainly do that if no one else would like to. Again, we did not get together ahead of time and prepare this.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Yes, I can do that. As you might know, we held a face-to-face meeting for the CCWG on ICANN Accountability in Frankfurt on January 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>. We had a very full meeting planned for us. There were some outcomes and important milestones, from my point of view. One of the outcomes was that we further [unclear 00:57:17] scoping and the commissions document [unclear] in the list for the CCWG. We also began working on defining the requirements that we should be looking for to put in place for Work Stream 1; for those who are not yet familiar with the [unclear 00:57:47] of Work Stream 1.

They can refer to those mechanisms or measures to be taking place or committed to before the transition takes place. Work Stream 2 [unclear 00:58:04] Focus Group. So that Working Group refers to those mechanisms or measures that are not [unclear 00:58:16] transitions take place, and that can take a longer timeline to get implemented. Of course, that will be done in the future. We also have the information of the legal sub-team to work on the questions that we should be asking



---

the external independent advisors, and of course we established a path to go with, which was how we should be engaging with legal advice.

First, we'd be scoping the questions we want to ask the legal experts. There have been many questions raised, with regards for example to California non-profit law. We are also working on a parallel track with the CWG, who've drafted a document regarding legal advice. What we are going to do now is we're having these two Working Parties. The first one will focus on the requirements for review and [re-dress 00:59:33], and the second one will focus on empowering the community for different issues; one of those issues could be overturning Board positions or calling the Board for action, when inaction happens. They will draft some legal questions, which will feed the work of the legal sub-team, and the legal sub-team as well will be looking into the CWG document and will draft their own questions.

The [unclear 01:00:13] in order to achieve the aggressive timelines that have been set, is to first go through ICANN Legal, with regards to the questions, and in a parallel track we'll be looking to engage with an independent legal council and general council for putting these questions forward as well. So far, that is the stage of the Working Group on Accountability. Alan, do you want to add something to this track?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you, a couple of things. Evan put in the chat that there's a discussion on whether ICANN should become a membership organization or not, and under Californian Law a not-for-profit can either have members or not. If they have members it makes it somewhat

---

easier for those members to essentially constrain or direct the Board to do certain things. Without members there are still mechanisms by which they can be done, but they may be more difficult, and that's one of the legal issues that need to be looked at in detail.

The challenge of being a membership organization is identifying just who those members are, and that's fraught with a whole bunch of potential land mines. The other thing I think is worth mentioning is that the track one versus track two of the Accountability Working Group has changed its focus from what was originally envisioned by some people and specifically track one was envisioned as the things that are absolutely necessary to physically do the IANA transfer, according to whatever the IANA transfer rules are. The tone has changed somewhat in that the Accountability CCWG is now looking at track one as what mechanisms need to be in place to make sure that the community does have a significant influence with the directions that ICANN takes on everything, including ICANN, but not restricted to ICANN.

It's a somewhat different tone. There are lots of Board Members that are interacting with the group. This is the first time that I can recall that Board Members are actually participating – not pontificating on what the Board will accept or not, but actually contributing to the discussion. So it's certainly been interesting. Anything else anyone wants to add on that? No? Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. As for the focus of Work Stream 1, [unclear 01:03:25] certain moment but now, by [unclear], we came back to the definition of the

---

Charter, saying that Work Stream 1 will be dealing with accountability issues that have to be done before the transition or by the transition. The other concerns are in the concerns text that is now used to work on the whole accountability definition, and not especially for the Work Stream. But they stress it especially with Work Stream 1, and this is understandable. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The next Item on the Agenda is the stewardship transition. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I was just going to summarize very quickly. Up to quite recently there was only one proposal that was on the table, and that was one that looked at creating a contract company to replace the US Government and the holding of the different contracts. There was going to be a Multistakeholder Review Team that would be effectively giving instructions to the contract company on the one side, but also receiving information from a Customer Standing Committee that would be made up of contracted parties – registrars, registries – that would be dealing with the day-to-day, looking at the service level agreements for the IANA functions.

It sounds complicated, and indeed it is complicated, and it's basically a [unclear 01:05:44] to the creation of quite a few different bodies. The second group has now started work. Maybe it's a little late, but it all started out with a survey that was sent to everyone – the participants of the Working Group but also the Members of the Working Group – and

---

whilst we were led to believe that the great majority of people who participate in there were of a contract company, it appeared that this was somehow more mitigated, and there was actually a significant number of people who responded to the survey and wanted to see past another system.

So a couple of proposals were made. Of course, there were ALAC proposals that Alan [unclear 01:06:32]. I think that Alan has already shared that with us on the previous call. There was also a proposal by AUDA, and these proposals were sent in during the PCP. They were refined a little bit, and from these there was a new proposal that was sent out and put together by a second Working Group, part of the RFP 3 Working Group, with the help of a staff member. It looks now as if though there might be two alternative proposals that do not require a contract company to be created.

One of the proposals would be looking at having an internal to ICANN solution with a trust being involved, the other one being 100 per cent internal to ICANN, with a “golden bylaw” where a bylaw would be put in the ICANN bylaws and the community should decide to reallocate the IANA function to another operator than to ICANN [unclear 01:07:59] bylaw, and that ICANN would absolutely have to follow those instructions. That’s a quick summary. Alan, you were on the call. Others here – Eduardo, Fatimata – were also on the call, so [unclear 01:08:18] add to it.

We are running late, but the only thing I can say is that the alternative proposals will be ready by Singapore, and are very likely to be discussed further in Singapore. At this moment there was a deadline of the 16<sup>th</sup> of

---

January to send the names community proposal to the IANA Coordination Group. I believe that the Chairs of the IANA Stewardship Transition CCWG will be advising the IANA Coordination Group of a delay and will be sending them a new calendar. I haven't seen the new calendar yet. That's the news for the moment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. One of the new proposals on the table was born during the Accountability Meeting in Frankfurt, and it was a coalescing of a number of different people's thoughts. The hope was that it would be somewhere in the middle and would attract some of the components of the contract co proposal to switch sides. It's not clear that that's been exceedingly effective, and it's still not clear how we're going to reach a single proposal that will go out to the chartering bodies for approval, but I guess it's one of those things that we'll say should be interesting. I'm not sure if we can say anything more positive than "interesting" at this point.

Any other questions, comments? Next Item is talking about ALAC scheduling and meetings. We had a challenging time, as you know, scheduling meetings. We've been trying to move away from meetings that are at bad times for everyone, or are for specific people always at those same bad times. The time we're holding it this time, or the time we would have held it, if it hadn't have been for an accountability meeting that overlapped was deemed to be acceptable to everyone, although marginally so for some people.

---

Gisella and I will, I suspect, spend some time in Singapore and look over the various Doodles that were done and try to find some level of meeting rotation where everyone gets at least a few meetings a year at good times for them. Hopefully the schedule where pretty much everyone can attend, even if it's at a less than optimal time. I thank those who were exceedingly flexible, and we had a fair number of people who said, "Any of the 24 hours is acceptable," under duress, and hopefully not very often. I think our hat needs to be taken off to Vanda, who indicated that she's completely happy with any time around the clock.

Many of the rest of us weren't all that happy but were willing to do it, and we'll see what we can do, and I hope we won't use another Doodle, but I'm not making any promises. What I would really like to make sure is that everyone's capable of attending every meeting. Of course, people will occasionally miss them due to scheduling changes they have no control over. We're very proud of the fact that we have people from around the world, but the downside of that is we have people from all time zones.

We're fortunate that we actually are missing a few time zones right now, if you don't count our Board Member, who's right in-between the largest single gap, but it's going to be difficult, and I ask people to continue to be flexible and willing to inconvenience themselves a little bit occasionally for the benefit of the overall group. Olivier – ATLAS recommendations?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now, ATLAS recommendations, we have several recommendations for the ICANN Board. In LA we presented a handful of recommendations and the At-Large Summit Implementation Task Force has held a meeting and followed up with more recommendations than we can send to the Board. I haven't got them all in front of me right now. I know Ariel has put together a few slides. I don't think we have time to look through those slides, but in effect she's done absolute wonders. We're just going to provide a status update on a handful of recommendations. One of them is Recommendation 16: ICANN needs to improve their direct communications, regardless of time zones. I guess that works very well with what we were just discussion.

Number 26: current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN implements a workable policy management process system, available for use across the SOs and ACs. Number 27: the Boars must implement ATRT 2 Recommendation 9.1 regarding formal advice from ACs. Number 40: ICANN should offer a process similar to the CROPP that is applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel. Number 41: the ALAC should work with ICANN staff in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities. Number 42: ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RALO Assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events.

I don't think we have time to go through the current status for each of these. At the moment, these look like the ones that are ear-marked for presenting to the Board with a listing of the assignees and the current status of these. In some cases, for instance the implementation of ATRT 2 Recommendation 9.1, we've marked in the status that the Board has accepted the recommendation, but these updates haven't been

---

communicated publicly yet. We're not planning to take so much time – 15 minutes – with our meeting with the Board, but it's primarily to let the Board know that the ATLAS II Recommendations are not just things on paper.

They have to be implemented and we're following up with them, and obviously we'd like the Board to follow up with the ones that we're sending their way. I think that's the update for this. Any questions? I'm happy to answer any. Ariel has listed a link over to the ATLAS II Recommendations for the Board. There are many more there than I've just provided you with. We did tell the Board we would follow up in Singapore and we'll be following up in the summer ICANN Meeting in Buenos Aires, and probably in Dublin at the end of the year as well. We've got so much other work to do. It's important that we don't just drop the ball and let this thing wither away. A significant amount of time and money was spent on these recommendations and it's good to see them slowly move forward.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Is there anyone else who has comments or questions for Olivier? My hope is that whatever we formally present to the Board will give them some indication that the outcomes of the Summit are useful and are something they should continue to fund. I'm hoping that the slant of anything we present will be from that perspective. We'll go onto the next Item, #16, the upcoming At-Large Review. Olivier?



---

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Rinalia had put in the chat a suggestion about preparing recommendations for staff direct to Fadi. They may be in a position to do something even without Board agreement or acceptance, because it would fall within their work. One of the recommendations I can think of now is the one of the policy management process system, which we have already engaged staff on. I know Dev has had discussion with Ashwin Rangen, and I have too, so this is also taking place. I'm not sure that we'll have recommendations aimed specifically at staff ready for Singapore. We've had very little time, unfortunately, but that's duly noted. Thank you Rinalia.

**ALAN GREENBERG:** Olivier, I tend to agree. A fair number of the things we normally assign to the Board are probably implementable below the Board level, with the Board's agreement, and clearly Fadi is a Member of the Board. Just re-labeling them as Board staff may make the whole thing more understandable. Back to the At-Large Review. As I noted, this will be very much an At-Large Review, therefore looking at the RALOs and ALSes in addition to the ALAC, and there will be a session with the Structural Improvements Committee and the ALAC in Singapore, that will essentially be formally kicking off this process.

We'll be looking for people to be the active movers and doers within At-Large, to join Holly and Cheryl on what has come to be called the Working Party, to oversee it. I'll turn the discussion over to Holly or Cheryl now.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. We had a really good first conference with Ray, who is in the Structural Improvements Committee, and Melissa, and went through a few slides, just outlining the process itself. As a consequence, Ariel kindly set up a little workspace for us, so that all of the documents that include, "Has to use recommendation..." are now in one place, which is very helpful. We're looking forward to a meeting in Singapore with Ray and Melissa and talking about furthering the discussion we had on the process. That's when I think it will really start. Cheryl and I have already been involved in discussions and we'll follow up. There is a workspace that's been created for this project, if people want to have a look at it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I don't have a great deal to add, other than I think those of you who can make the time to get engaged as early as possible in this process will be, I think, very pleased at the opportunity. Part of the starting up of this process is very much focused on the crafting of the question of what will be happening. So unlike the last time, and some of you will have gone through the last review with us, when we were a dog following a ball, we were very much involved with the setting up of the game and the game rules this time. So it's very important, particularly for the Regional Leadership and the ALS representatives to engage early. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I'll note that there was also supposed to be a meeting being scheduled with the people who have overseen the GNSO Review,

---

which was the first one of the new flavors of reviews. Gisella or Heidi, I don't know if that was set up or not yet?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I know that's being planned for Saturday prior to the number of meetings that the ALT is having on Saturday.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's going to clash with my GNSO, isn't it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perhaps Gisella could work with you to see if we can avoid that. There wasn't a set time yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: To the extent that I can be included, I'd appreciate it, but that's not mandatory. Any other comments on the Review?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a quick update. On Tuesday during the ALAC Part 1 Session, there will be a number of updates from Working Groups in the first part of that meeting, and Holly and Cheryl, that At-Large Review Working Group will have a few minutes to talk a little bit about that group and perhaps have a call for membership, if you'd like to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good idea. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hearing no other comments, the last Item is Any Other Business. There's no one who's submitted any. Last calls for that? Seeing no one, I'll end this meeting. It's three minutes early and we started three minutes late. Although I appreciate the fact that we made this one a 90-minute call, we left out a lot of stuff, so I hope we'll be able to schedule the future ones to be able to handle them at a little bit more of a leisurely pace. I wish everyone who's traveling to Singapore safe travels, and we'll see you there, and if not we'll see you on a teleconference somewhere, sometime. Thank you all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**