
GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. On today's ALAC monthly meeting on Tuesday, the 31st of March at 19:00 UTC. We have Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Glenn McKnight, Maureen Hilyard, Beran Gillen, Jimmy Schulz, Eduardo Diaz, Sandra Hoferichter, Siranush Vardanyan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Mikhail Medrish, Sébastien Bachollet, Judith Hellerstein.

On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambronero.

On the French channel we have Hadja Ouattara.

We also have Julie Hammer with us today.

Apologies noted from Vanda Scartezini, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Rafid Fatani, and Leon Sanchez.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Natalie Peregrine, and Gisella Gruber.

Today we have French, Spanish, and Russian interpretation. Our French interpreters are Isabelle and Claire. On the Spanish channel we have Veronica and David. And on the Russian channel we have Ekaterina.

If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but also to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel. And to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

Thank you very much and over to you Alan.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Gisella. It's Alan Greenberg speaking for the interpreters and for the transcript record. And I hope people will soon recognize my voice so I don't have to do this every time I interject.

Are there any items that anyone would like to add to the agenda, either, or to change the agenda, or add under any other business? Hearing no voices, seeing no hands, I will presume the agenda is accepted as shown and we will proceed.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Heidi. Now we suddenly have hands after [CROSSTALK]...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Sébastien and Olivier have raised their hands, but you've seen that now.

ALAN GREENBERG: They had. They hadn't when I was... If you'll excuse me, I still have a cough, and occasionally I'll go into coughing fits. Sébastien.

Sébastien, are you there?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Isabella, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thank you very much Alan. Yeah, just to be sure that in the course of this meeting, we will discuss about the organization of the next face to face meeting for the CCWG, at one point. If we can have that in the any other business, that would be great. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: There will be a discussion of the CCWG, and if... I'm not quite sure what you're referring to, but you're free to bring it up when we finish that section. Olivier.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Alan, okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I'm just putting my hand up because I asked for the agenda to be scroll unlocked, and then it was scroll unlocked, and then locked, and then unlocked again. So you really have to make sure that this is unlocked, because at the moment, it is locked, the scrolling. Okay, now it's unlocked. So nobody else touch it. Thanks very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And if I can ask someone to not make me a presenter, make me just a normal person, so then when I touch the various things, they don't move around in other people's screens. I don't think I need presenter status for anything. Thank you.

A couple of remarks. First of all, in Singapore, we made, excuse me, a lot of plans to revamp committees and start some work on a number of activities, and that hasn't happened. I'm afraid the CCWG, CWG activities have just taken over for the last couple of weeks. The good news is that, although as Cheryl points out, we're not past the heavy work yet, as you'll see when we get onto this section on the two working groups, we have past a critical point in them, I hope, or I believe, and that should free up a fair amount of my time to go back to being chair.

So I will give you my word of honor to try to revive the things that have sort of died an unnatural death over the last few weeks. The other comment is, for the first time in my memory, on a number of votes recently, not all of them, but on a number of votes, we have had 15 out of 15 ALAC members voting. That's where we should always be, but I'm really delighted to see it happening now, and I hope it will continue.

I have no real other comments. We have a moderately agenda. The time allocated to some of the items, we go well under, or we may go well over. So I'm not 100% sure exactly how long the meeting will be. I, of course, will do my best to make sure it doesn't go over two hours.

And with that, the next item is review of any outstanding action items that are of particular interest to the ALAC.

I don't think there are many, but I'll turn it over to Heidi to bring up anything that is still on the list.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Alan. This is Heidi for the record. We did a review of the ALAC meeting from January, as well as the Singapore ALAC related action items, and the only one that we found that is still requiring ALAC action was actually over to you Alan. And that was, I was to work with, [inaudible] or [Ian] to work with you on the review of the ALS criteria and expectations with the aim to form a small working group consisting of at least two persons from each RALO.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And as I pointed out, those have been advanced. They will be revived, hopefully, not too late next week, or not too late this week, I hope, rather. And so I hope we'll go through with that, plus the other several committees that we're revamping. So again, my apologies on that, but if that's the only action item that we have an issue with, I guess we're not doing too bad.

Okay. The next item is the policy development page. There is a lot of issues listed on the agenda, most of them are either things that we have approved recently, and... I guess if we look at the statements approved by the ALAC, I'll guess we'll see an example of a 15 vote one, which was

delightful to see. And I'm not considering whether people are voting for or against anything, but the people who are actually voting.

On the other hand, it's actually followed by one with only 10 people voting, which is just barely quorum. So let's hope that we can maintain the first number and not more of the second. There are currently three items on the agenda that we need to discuss, and decide whether we're doing anything on. There are a number of statements that are currently under, or are in the process of drafting.

And I need to look at this carefully because when I did the agenda, very late last night, there were only two items. So we have a new one. The first one is the fiscal year 16 operating budget, operating plan and budget. I've asked Tijani, as the lead person, to make a recommendation on whether we need to say anything or not. However, I would like to think that everyone on the ALAC, at least takes a cursory view thorough the operating plan and budget.

This is the document that describes what ICANN is supposed to be doing. And although a lot of the ALAC work is driven by an immediate event, you know, statements coming up for comment or other things, everyone should be aware of where ICANN is heading. And I really would appreciate if everyone take at least a brief view, if not a careful view, of the plan and budget.

The comment closes on May 1st, but there is a Wiki space on it now, and please, take a look at the budget, take a look at the operating plan. If you have any comments, plus or minus, make them. Make sure you're getting involved in all of ICANN, not just the ALAC.

So that's technically in Tijani's hands, but I would appreciate if everyone would take a look at it. Protecting the rights, the draft report and the rights protection mechanisms, is being looked at by Leon. Again, if anyone has a particular interest in that one, then please, take a look at the documents, and don't feel afraid to make any comments. And lastly, we have the internationalized registration data working group. And I don't believe we have assigned that to anyone.

It's not clear we need to make a statement. I know Carlton, I believe, said, I think he said we probably don't. But we should have, we should be looking at this from an internationalized perspective, and trying to make sure that there is nothing that is bothering people. Again, we should be out of the mode of making a comment to be seen. But if we have something substantive to say, then we really do need to say it.

Any comments on either these three statements or any of the other ones that are currently open or just recently closed? Yes Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you Alan. This is Ariel for the record. There is one public comment request that just came out yesterday, and I will paste it in the chat. It's about the proposed implementation of GNSO PDP recommendations on intra-register transfer policies, IRTP part C. And that one we haven't decided whether to draft a statement, and who to approach regarding this public comment request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Could you...? When you open up the Wiki page, could you put a comment in, telling us what our past record on this is? That report has, was open for comment, as a final report. It is open for comment before the Board approved it, and now we're looking at the implementation.

So if you could point us to our history, that would be quite useful in knowing, did we say anything on the previous times it was open for comment? And if so, can you point us to where the statements are?

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: That will stop everyone from having to do that work in parallel. Any other comments or thoughts on the policy development activities? A crucial part of what we're doing, but right now, hasn't been a particularly heavy load. Okay. We'll go on to the next issue, which is the review of ALS applications. We have a number of ALSs that have recently been approved, specifically ISOC Delhi and ISOC Palestine.

And I welcome them. I don't think we have anyone on this call from those groups, but you should try really to get people who are new to At-Large to participate in some of these calls. We have none currently out for voting. We have a number that are in various states of due diligence, and a few waiting for RALOs to give us advice.

Is there anyone from any of the RALOs who wants to raise an issue on any of these? And in particular, there is one from AFRALO which is currently suspended, a status which actually, I don't think we have, but

we'll ignore that for the moment. And if there is anyone who can comment on it, I'd appreciate it. Olivier, you have your hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I was a little slow in putting my hand up for the policy development. I have a question on that, if that's still okay with you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right, thanks. I note that there are quite a few requests for commenting regarding the release of country and territory names, under various TLDs. Last year, there were several instances of requests for the introduction of two character domain names, that are all TLDs. And we developed a standard ALAC response that was drafted by Dev Anand Tellucksingh, and that could be filed in response to each one of these. That was in broad agreement, broad support.

Now, has it been considered, perhaps, do you have a standard response? I do note that in the recent past, in February for example, there was no statement for the release of country and territory names within dot [D bag] dot [DUI] dot [inaudible], etc. So has it effectively, the stance that there will be no statement on any of these, including the current ones?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I think that it has been, what we de facto decided, there are two different cases. One is the release of two character names, and the other is the release of actual territory names, within closed domains, certain closed domains. Either brand domains or geographic ones. And the general feeling from the ALAC and from At-Large has been, we see no problem with that. They have been released in other TLDs for ages, and we don't see any real problem.

We know some GAC members, some countries have a problem with it, but we have not seen any problem with it. And in fact, when we did make statements, we advocated even wider release of names than is currently approved. And I think we pretty well decided that since all we're doing is saying yes, and the record, in general, has been, other than comments implicitly from the GAC on a negative side, nobody is voting against these, excuse me.

All of the requests for release of these names have effectively been approved, as far as I know. That there is no real merit, and that's going through the process of churning out statements for each one, one by one. And unless that situation changes, I think we'll continue that, that we'll just have to approve these, but without any explicit work on voting, on issuing statements or voting for them.

If anyone has a problem with that, then certainly it should be raised because we could reconsider. Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi Olivier, Alan, this is Heidi. My point was actually for the ALSs, to talk about the Gambia one.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I was going to comment on that, but you can go ahead Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: If anyone has anything more to say on policy development, Cheryl, are you policy development or ALSs?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was being polite for Heidi [inaudible]...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead, please Cheryl. I'll come back when we get to that topic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And it was in response to the discussion Olivier had taken us through then on the country code release names, in two characters. I'm absolutely supported, I make that statement to begin with. Of the way the ALAC is managing this, and what Alan has just outlined as a mechanism of what to say or when, or indeed, what not to bother saying and when.

What is important, however, is that we capture that overview current opinion that Alan and Olivier has just discussed and [inaudible], and remind the current ALAC of that. My reasoning for wanting that to be highlighted formally is that during this coming calendar year, through the remaining of this calendar year, we are likely to see work coming out for public comment from the PDP process, which is the cross

community working group that is looking at country, the use of country and territory names.

And that is going to be a somewhat different exercise, but it would be very helpful, if when we do, and we do need to comment on those more substantively, which works. We are well and truly remembering what the current flavor of opinion is. Of course, I've been presenting the current flavor of opinion as the current opinion, whenever I've put forward an ALAC view, because I act as a liaison to the working group.

So just to remind people, that this is not a topic that can be ignored. It does need to be well managed, and I think ALAC is managing it. But we will have to somewhat more substantive discussion a little later on. So it's just a heads up, and please, capture you guys are saying, formally. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. Can I suggest that we ask staff to do an action item, for let us say, the two of us to create a motion for ALAC to approve, not in response to a statement, but just a motion to have, so it goes into our records, of our current policy with respect to the release of country names and country codes? I presume you're agreeable on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Country and territory...

ALAN GREENBERG: Country and territory, sorry, and territory names and codes. And staff, can I ask you to put a deadline of a month from now on that? We'll try to get it done before, but as Cheryl has pointed out, times are busy right now. So just a motion documenting the At-Large and ALAC position on the release of such names.

Anything else on policy development? Yes.

BERAN GILLEN: This is Beran. I just wanted to... Did Heidi explain about the ISOC Gambia chapter?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but we're going back to that in a moment. We're trying to close out number five first, which people keep on wanting to reopen.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So if I just wanted to point out Evan's comment in the chat. I don't know if you want to raise that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Regarding policy development. I need to indicate my immediate resignation as chair of the new gTLD working group, and co-chair of future challenges working group. Thank you Evan. Noted. And we will be soliciting, I'll talk to you and ask you for some thoughts on it, and then we'll be soliciting replacements.

So noted, and staff could you put an action item on that for me?

And now, on to ALS applications. Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just very briefly. This is Heidi for the record. Staff have informed me that they have contacted the ISOC headquarters to find out the status of the suspended ALS application from Gambia. What their status is currently, so that's where we are from the status side. I'm not sure if Beran has an update on that.

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, this is Beran. I do actually, there isn't actually a president, or vice-president, or any form of head in place right now. So they've called an AGM, they called one last week, so that should be held sometime in April. And when that is done, they will then select a president and a vice-president, a secretary and so on. And hopefully, when that is in place, they'll be able to reapply.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll point out that we've tended to use this term suspended on the request of RALO leadership a number of times. That's not actually in our process, so I think we need to make sure we're following the official rules. There are other ways of doing what was required in that case, and I guess RALO leadership, before taking that kind of a decision, should be talking to me and/or Nathalie, who I think is aware of our various options, perhaps painfully aware now.

You do a number of things. And make sure that we are following process. We are in the process of changing the process, but until it's

changed, we really need to be careful to follow it. And Heidi, your hand is still up. Is that a new hand or an old hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's an old hand. I'll put it down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So I think, other than ISOC Gambia, everything is within the process. I don't think it needs any other comments, at least none that I need to make. Is there anyone else who wants to make any comment on the ALS application, on number six of the agenda?

And Heidi your hand is up. Perhaps still up. Okay, we'll pretend Heidi's hand is not up. And Olivier's pointing out that someone has locked the agenda again, and he is very upset. And it's unlocked, magically.

Item number seven, reports from the liaisons, RALOs, and working groups. Before I ask is there anyone who has any particular comments, I guess I will highlight the fact, and Olivier may have some comments on this also, that a number of these reports don't show up. These reports are really important. Just to belabor the point, when the reports show up, some of them are very minimalistic and don't show anything, or hardly anything, and others are very complete.

Just to embarrass Siranush again, I'll point out that the APRALO reports are a nice, interesting one to look at, that they are in exhausting detail. Olivier, you have your hand up. Would you like to go further into what I've just said?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And you're very kind by the way you're saying this. You're being very gentle, and I'm not going to be that gentle.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't finished yet. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, the APRALO reports are fantastic. Recommendation number, I think it's 29, one of the ATLAS 2 recommendations from our ALSs is that there needs to be a page with all of the links to what's going on, not only in the ALAC, but also what is going on in the RALOs. And we have that page. The very fact that our ALSs are asking for this, and it has been more than six months, in fact, it's going to be a year beyond that, and the RALOs don't appear to be taking this seriously, is a real concern to me.

As you said, APRALO has got a fantastic page, updates on the reports. And the ALAC reports are... The screen is locked again. Scroll locking is locked again, right. So the APRALO monthly reports are fantastic. But some of the others haven't had a report in 2015. Some have had just a cut and paste of the agenda, and that effectively means that the secretary of that RALO has spent a maximum of two minutes in order to do cut and paste.

And I'm sorry, that's just not good enough. It's crazy. You know, do you expect anyone to actually become involved in your RALO if you just have

four lines explaining what happened this month? So I really hope that something will be done about this. And I'm not sure how, I don't know whether the ALAC can impose anything on the RALOs, or if the RALO chairs can wake up to the fact that they're not doing their job correctly, and something needs to be done, because otherwise, we're basically just trying to extract mud out of a stone.

And that's not going to be helpful, or easy at all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I'll be a bit pointed also. Either we have an issue that the RALO leadership is not bothering to report on what's going on, or nothing is going on. Either of those situations are far from optimal. And we are pushing very hard to get commitments from ICANN to support what we're doing, and supported just travel support to meetings, but we're looking for support in a lot of different areas for continued engagement from the global stakeholder team.

And if we can't demonstrate what's going on, or what we're trying to do, then we're in a very bad position. I'll be blunt. Our existence is going to be questioned if we cannot demonstrate what it is we're doing. And these reports are a strong part of how we can demonstrate that. So I am not going to belabor the point a lot. I'm not sure if Olivier, if that is a new hand or an old hand, and I'm not going to call people to task, you know, for why you haven't done anything, in this meeting format.

But it's something we're going to have to fix, or we have a real problem. So I'll leave that hanging at this point, and if anyone wants to contact

me personally, or Olivier who has a lot of experience in this, please do. But we really need to get our act together. Olivier, that is a new hand now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I was just going to add, we have a metrics working group that has worked on metrics, and this is exactly the reason why metrics are needed. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And if you were listening in at the start of the call, you would have noted that the metrics working group has had some trouble actually finding the time to do their work, but we are somewhat committed to getting things better. I'll also point out that part of the ALS expectations and criteria process that we're going to go through includes RALO expectations, because they are closely linked together.

So we'll be attacking it from several different points of view. But the bottom is, I think, it comes down to individuals committed to doing something, and rules only go so far. So please focus on this, it's really important.

Next item. Oh sorry, I didn't ask, do any of the RALO chairs, or liaisons, or anyone of the working group chairs, have any specific comments they would like to make to highlight anything in their reports? Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Alan. This is Maureen for the record. I would just like to highlight that I will be contacting Ron Sherwood, we're actually sort of like starting to look at discussion topics for our joint meeting. I did mention that in my report. It's something that we should all be thinking about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Maureen. Anyone else? Julie had said that she doesn't have any comments, and I misspelled her name in the chat. And Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking for the record. I am not a chair or a secretary of the RALO, but I would like to make a brief comment on this issue that we are discussing, based on the commitment of the different individuals that are a part of the RALOs. In our RALO, it would be necessary to remind us that part of the commitment, I would assume, to be chair and secretary, is to facilitate these ALAC meetings, and also to participate in the At-Large group.

Perhaps we need to remind this. I don't know as an obligation, perhaps as a commitment. This needs to be clear for the officers in each of the RALO, because this is not happening in my RALO. This is not very clear. I mean, this commitment that we need to assume, is not really very clear. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a good point Fatima, thank you. And staff, can we have an AI for me to send out a note to RALO leadership pointing out that we do

appreciate if they can participate in these meetings. Olivier, you have your hand up, and I'm presuming it's the hand up of our new GNSO liaison this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And it feels very weird to be sitting where I'm sitting, when I used to ask you about what's happening in the GNSO. [Laughter] It's just weird.

Anyway, right, well several things. We had the council conference call that took place in the last week, I believe, or it was two weeks ago, two weeks ago. And several things came on the agenda. First, the motion regarding the GAC GNSO consultation group. This is the one that was formed to develop proposals to facilitate the GAC's ability to engage more productively, and effectively with the GNSO.

The motion was to implement the recommendations of the GAC GNSO consultation group, in relation to issue scoping on a trial basis. There were concerns about what trial meant, whether, how long that would last for. But the motion was carried. And so the GNSO will proceed forward with implementing the recommendations of the GAC GNSO consultation group.

The other matter worth noticing is there were two updates regarding CWG IANA and CCWG, so the cross community working groups on accountability. The concerns there were similar to the concerns in At-Large, especially with regards to the time, and timeline, and time being taken, and the time taken for the legal advice to reach those groups. Of course that GNSO council meeting takes place before the face to face

meetings in Istanbul. So it might well be that they have moved since that time.

Another item to notice specifically, the GNSO review. That proceeding forward, there were a lot of questions being asked from various parties, and so the independent examiner commissioned the Board to conduct the GNSO review, and therefore, the process moving forward, but with a small delay to collect more input from various parties. What they're doing is to have interviews with both staff, but also community members.

And I think that some people in our community might have been asked questions. Alan, perhaps you were interviewed. I can't quite remember by heart the whole list, but there was a long list of people that were. And so comments are still welcomed today, and should be sent directly to the person in charge of this process, Jennifer Wolf, or through a constituency or stakeholder group represented on the GNSO review working party.

The link, all of the links are, of course, in my report. And then finally, another matter that is of particular interest perhaps to the ALAC, is in regards to the recommendations on GTLD auction proceeds. There has been a lot of question, as you know, there have been many auctions that have now been conducted with significant sum being collected, and currently not being allocated to any budget whatsoever.

And it has been felt now in the GNSO that in front of the, lots of questions that were asked, there should be a call for participants to form a drafting team to develop a charter for a working group, to

develop recommendations on new gTLD auction proceeds. That's a GNSO working group. The question though, and in fact, I think it has been put forward actually, is that it should be a cross community working group, CWG on auction proceeds.

And I'm not sure whether Alan Greenberg has been contacted already, but he should be expected to be contacted very soon. And be asked to have someone sent to develop the charter, and then of course, to have people to go on that cross community working group. It was understood that, of course, with the current number of cross community working groups, both IANA and the accountability thread. The community is already really very much at exhausting point, but it was at the same time felt that it was important to get that process started.

Perhaps not as a huge priority, but certainly get things prepared, so that by the time we are through with the stewardship, and with the accountability threads, that this group would be in order, and we would be moving forward. That's all the main points. I've got a few more points that I've made in my report, and of course, that report is available on the link provided.

And that's it. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I do want to go on with the agenda, because we're trying not to make these major sessions, but I have one comment and I see Sébastien's hand is up. So I'll go to Sébastien first.

Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, sorry. Yeah, I have one question. Why is it just a working group on auction and not on all of the money left by this fund of the gTLD?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this Sébastien. I don't know. It's Olivier speaking. I don't know. Very good point and I could raise it if you wish to. I think that's probably quite a question to ask. I think the overall thing though is that as far as auction proceeds are concerned, the magnitude of the proceeds is way larger than the whatever remaining there is, at the moment, on the applicant. But it's a fair point.

[CROSSTALK] ...the ALAC wishes me to raise this question, I can certainly raise it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I think the issue is, and Sébastien, that the auction money has been explicitly segregated, pending a decision. And therefore, it's in a different category than the funds that went into the new gTLD process itself. My recollection is that the fiscal year 16 budget, operating plan and budget, does go into some depth as to what the status is of the funds that were collected, and I think how much is left.

But I think it's a different subject altogether. I really would like not to delve into that in any great detail. If it's something we need to discuss, then I would remand it to the mailing list, and perhaps a future meeting.

Olivier, I just have one other comment though. The comment about the GAC accepting the results of the joint GAC GNSO working group, I did listen to much of that call.

And I heard a reaction, a negative reaction, of the kind I haven't heard from in the GNSO for a while, and I was very glad when I think it was the chair, but it may have been someone else, who pointed out that these were the results of a group that they had chartered, and we were trying to encourage more GAC interaction, and we really should not be too afraid to try new things.

So I was glad it was passed, and glad a comment was made. But I'll point out to anyone else who was moderately intrigued by the GNSO, and wants to learn a little bit more about it, and although only GNSO members can participate in the Adobe Connect room, and that the direct call in line, there is a, not a MP3, but a live audio feed for GNSO meetings.

And anyone can call into it. It's published on the agenda for every GNSO meeting, and it may give you a perspective of the GNSO that you don't have from before. Olivier, one last comment, we're rather late at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I was just going to respond quickly to the mixing of the issue of auction funds, and the issue of application fees. I think one needs to be very careful with mixing those two, or dealing with those two together. And the auction funds, as you've said, have always been put aside. The application fees,

some are saying, some of the applicants are saying, because these were cost recovery basis, these fees should be returned to the applicant.

And so we definitely do not want to mix the two issues together, because one might raise a real battle as to whether these should be returned or not, whilst the others definitely need to be shared among the community, or done something with. That's all, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I do recall that the application fee was set at a point when ICANN thought it was ready to release the new gTLDs. The implementation process went on for another two plus years, accumulating additional expenses, which in theory, have to be repaid at this point. Repaid into the reserve fund, but repaid for the last... So, I think that's an interesting issue, but I don't think it's one we can delve into, in any great depth, on this meeting.

All right. The next item on the agenda is the CWG on Internet governance. A quick summary of that. The CWG on Internet governance, I believe, started, or the concept was created after or just before Olivier can remind me, when I turn the mic over to him, just after or just before NetMundial.

And it took, it was originally an ALAC NCSG effort, which has widened. A charter was created, most of the charter, excuse me, the chartering bodies have approved it. For reasons that are perhaps lost in history, it never went on to our agenda. So we need to fix that. The issue that brought it up today was that the definition of participants and members

that is being used in the CWG and CCWG, IANA and accountability, is different from the one that was used when that charter was created.

And it's felt that we should normalize the model and use the same procedures for all participants, and since no one really has a desire to go back and have votes over again, the decision was made to simply ask the groups if they will, if they do not object to using the current definitions of participant and the process of selecting participants, that is self-selection. And so the original charter, and the waiver of the definition, is going to be put to the ALAC with an electronic vote shortly.

And you'll have a bit of time to look at the document there, I pointed to in the agenda, and I sent, an email was sent out yesterday on the same subject. Olivier, who, by the way, is one of the co-chairs of this group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And thanks for the summary. That's actually a very correct, just a bit of history. As a staffer, this group was just a joint working group between the NCSG, and the ALAC. We chartered this, we started this, sorry, when meeting face to face in Buenos Aires in 2013, at the AGM in 2013.

Very quickly, others heard about this joint effort. And the aim of the working group was to start preparing ourselves jointly for the NetMundial meeting that took place in March 2014. Fairly quickly, other groups wanted to join, and this suddenly became a cross community working group, but it was a little bit of a messy genesis, due to the fact that we had a lot of members, looking at the different members and different GNSO constituencies.

So the charter was put together and things were tightened up a little bit. The SSAC, in addition to the ccNSO and the gNSO have passed the charter. We, for some reason, I think, probably maybe to ATLAS 2 did not.

And I was already under the impression that we had, but we hadn't, not at least in a formal way. The reason for relaxing the membership criteria, at the moment, the charter mentioned the membership criteria of members and observers, that since that time, other cross community working groups, such as the one on accountability, and the one on IANA stewardship transition, have had much looser type of membership criteria. And instead of having observers that can just observe and not say anything, they've got full participants.

The difference between members and participants being that if a vote is needed, only the members will vote and participants will not have the ability to vote. But when discussions take place, everybody has the same voice. And that's, effectively, where we are today. The deliverables we've had so far with the group are a statement that was sent to NetMundial. Since that time, we have also held weekly conference calls.

And I guess I can also use this to invite all of those of you who are interested in Internet governance to join that working group, since we should have this wider membership now. And the topics which we're going to discuss, and which we have discussed actually today, and will discuss in the next few months, are all related to WSIS plus 10, the World Summit of Information Summit plus 10, and other issues related to the ITU and the CSCD.

The whole other world of Internet governance outside of ICANN. So that's the point at the moment, and I hope that the ALAC will be able to support this. As I've said, Alan said, sorry, one of the co-chairs, I think I can't even be a chair if we have ratified it, a co-moderators I guess. The other two are Rafi [inaudible] for the GNSO, and Jordon Carter for the ccNSO.

And although Patrik Fälström for the SSAC has been [inaudible] one of the co-chairs, he has way too many other things to do then to actually activate this. So they have just ratified it without having an actual official chair for this. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. And the next item on our agenda is a little minor thing about the IANA stewardship transition and accountability. Could we have the first presentation up on accountability?

Heidi is asking should there be an AI for the start of the ratification? You can, if you wish.

All right. As everyone, I presume knows, there were meetings in Istanbul last week, two days on accountability and two days on the IANA transition. Both of the meetings were, I would say, certainly from my perspective, imminently successful, although the work is certainly far from done. I think the place we got to exceeded most people's expectations of what is going to come out of, you know, where we would be at the end of the meetings, at the end of those meetings.

The accountability measures, the accountability CCWG has close to finalize the first draft of what measures we are looking at in work stream one. Now, I'll remind you, work stream one is, are the things that we believe must be either done or committed to by ICANN, prior to any transition by IANA.

I'll review them very quickly, and then we'll turn it over to any of the other people at the meeting to make comments, or perhaps if anyone has any questions. I hope there will be some. There is a lot of documentation associated with this, and we're not trying to go over it in all detail, but there are really five major components, one of them very significant, that are part of this proposal.

And this would be going out for public comment, I think, somewhere around the middle of April, if I remember correctly. The first part is a revision of ICANN mission, commitments, and core values. That's the leading in sections of the bylaws. And essentially this is partly a cleanup, partly putting in things that people, some people that believe should have always been there, and other things that effectively give the community more power by making the core values then they have right now.

So again, this requires a fair amount of detail, but we'll be looking at it, we'll be making sure the ALAC has this well in advance of the report being published, so that we can make sure that everyone has a chance to look at this and add their comments, if necessary. The second part is the concept of golden bylaws. There are also called entrenched bylaws. These are bylaws that cannot easily be changed.

The current rules are that, I believe, a super majority of the Board can, at-will, change any bylaws. Now the practice is that they go off to public comment first, and the Board acts on those comments and makes the decisions, and you'll note a few months ago, there was a proposed bylaw change that changed, that would have changed the threshold in following GAC advice.

And there was a lot of negative community comment on it. And the bylaw changes were withdrawn at that point. But there is nothing in the bylaws that requires the Board to take that kind of action. They could meet, in private, and change all the bylaws, and we would have no recourse at this point. So the first part is the concept that there be certain bylaws that have to be a much more complex procedure to change.

And that procedure wouldn't, as you'll see, will imply approval of the majority of the community. The second one is enhanced ability to review decisions, or review other actions, not just whether the policy and process has been followed, but actually on the merits of the case. The next major point, number four, is community empowerment.

Sorry? Someone trying to say something? Nope. Okay. There are a number of aspects to that. The first is that the community will have essentially an ability to challenge the budget. So if the community has strong problem with a budget, then that budget cannot go forward. That's a very strong mechanism for sending a message to the Board, that we don't think the Board is doing what we believe they should be doing.

The next one is an ability to challenge a dialogue change. The third aspect is for the entrenched bylaws, a process by which the community must approve prior to the bylaw being approved. And the last one is the community's ability to dismiss the entire Board. All of the issues regarding challenging or dismissal, it is certainly hoped we would never have to exercise those, but the fact that they could be exercised, we hope, will encourage, we can talk about it like children, encourage better behavior.

Now as an example, currently there is a loss of consultation on the budget, a lot of community consultation on the budget. And the budget iterates and changes based on the results of that consultation, but there is nothing in the rules that say that consultation must be done. The next budget could come out with no consultation whatsoever, and be approved by the Board.

And the ability of the community to challenge the budget, we hope, will make sure that there is not only nominal consultation, but effective consultation that actually is used, is used to allow the community to impact what happens at a budget level. The last part of the changes that we're proposing, is that currently the affirmation of commitments, the document which is sort of the overriding document governing our relationship with the US government, has a number of reviews in it.

It requires us to look at things periodically. The affirmation of commitment is cancelable by either party, on essentially very short notice. And it is believed that if we are to empower the community, we must continue the reviews. And the intent is to put the reviews,

something similar to the current reviews, perhaps a little bit more flexibility in the bylaws, so that they are part of what defines ICANN.

And can we have the next slide, since we don't have scrolling abilities ourselves?

Thank you. The other issues that the accountability working group is looking at are jurisdiction. Now, jurisdiction means different things to different people. To some people it means the laws under which contracts are governed. That's not really a formal issue, that's a business decision that ICANN takes. And that's not really what we're talking about here.

What we're talking about is where is ICANN incorporated? And under whose corporation laws are we subject to? This is a difficult issue, because it's quite clear the US would like to see ICANN remain in the US, and it's equally clear that other countries would like to see us remain perhaps anywhere but the US. And clearly we can't do both at once.

So it's going to be a thorny issue, but we are looking at it. The next thing, when I've been talking in the previous discussion of what the community does, who is the community? We've pretty well narrowed it down to say it is the ACs and SOs. And with some SOs, or some ACs, having less, perhaps less voting power than others, particularly RSAC and SSAC.

And there is an agreement, at this point, that the GAC and the ALAC will have similar voting powers, same voting power to the GNSO and the ccNSO. Exactly how we effect that empowerment is not clear, and there is a lot of work to be done, and the CCWG has just contracted

with two firms of attorneys. One acting as the primary firm, and the second one, in fact the same one that the CWG is using, acting as a secondary for second opinions. So that's going to be going ahead.

And the last slide please. Can we scroll to the last slide please? Thank you. As I mentioned, there will be a public comment coming, where these processes I've just talked about will be discussed in great detail. We are awaiting legal advice. There is a lot of work going on, partially led by, or led by, jointly led, I think, by Cheryl, on stress tests.

Stress tests are essentially scenarios of something going wrong, and looking at whether the accountability measures we've put in place are sufficient to fix them. And lastly, we'll be looking at work stream two, which is, once we've done work stream one, associated with the transition, other accountability measures do we need to make ICANN really robust.

And that's about it, and I like to hope there is some questions or clarification or comments from the other participants in the CCWG, to mention what I left out. I really don't want this all to be the Alan show.

And we have Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Just briefly, I just wanted to take a tiny bit beyond your presentation, which certainly covered the high points and holidays. The [inaudible] the matter that in the CCWG meeting that we held, however many hours ago it was now, it is a blur to me, that we received legal advice, reviews, documents,

from those of the law firms that have been gathered to give us our legal advice for CCWG. And whilst it is early days for both those firms, in particular, the homework done by one of those firms, and in fact, it's the firm that's primarily the firm for the California law based stuff, just gave me enormous pause and concern.

And anyone looking at the transcript from the chat will have me typing things like, this is me keeping [time]. And for those of you who know me, know that that is a very meaningful statement. So I think we need to make sure that as an ALAC view, who are not directly involved here, in those meetings, keep an eye on the proceedings. And particularly take note that the very important matters of legal advice, that the legal advice calls are going to be open for anyone to join.

And I believe the next, trying to look for the time of it, the next call is later today. I'm sorry, the third call is later today. And it might behoove some of us to make sure that we're on those calls. Just to keep an eye on things to... I was not amused at some parts of that, well the nativity of the advice being given. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I unfortunately had to miss that call. Could you, in a minute or two, outline what kind of concerns you had? And I will be reading the documents and listening to the what happened.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It's not a problem, Alan. It's Cheryl for the transcript record. My description of the beginning of entering the 12 questions from the firm,

which I admit was not able to join us in Istanbul, and that may be part of the problem, indicated to me very little, if any, attention to detail is being paid to the history of ICANN, or how we were currently structured, or how we are being structured in pre-2000.

And their suggestions, all be it as hypothetically fascinating, of things like membership, or not exclusive of things like universal suffrage. It even, at one point, mentioned a super Board of some 200 people, or more, and a smaller Board.

I mean, it was a train wreck. Does that cover it for you?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not their advice as such, but their lack of understanding.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At this stage. But you know what happens when legal advice uses words that other people grab onto?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I do indeed. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sébastien for the transcript. I agree with you Cheryl and Alan. A great summary of the work of the CCWG. It's, I am concerned also that the words put by the legal firm can be taken by other, and using the, but I will say, wrong direction for my and [inaudible] point of view. And it will be, it's something we need to [inaudible].

Fortunately, Leon is very, he is leading for them, even if he is not with us today, I am sure that we can rely on him. [Inaudible] I also want to share the working group, or this part of the working group, and could be useful. I think maybe when you talk about the legal advice, it's not just legal advice outside of what we have done. We have asked question all the topics, A, B, C, D, E, well, it will be confronted with legal advice to see what we can do, how we can do it in the correct legal framework.

I think it's very important topic, and once again, if we can find some time to have, in the working group specifically, an in-depth discussion, on all that will be very useful. But thank you for the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Sébastien. Yeah, you, both of you raised one of the issues that is a constant thing. Transparency and openness is really good, and it's something we ought to work to, but there are, on occasion, negative aspects of airing all of your details in public where anyone can extract words and use them however they want. Such is the world. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Alan. This is Eduardo. I just want to give you [inaudible] my impressions [inaudible] in Istanbul. And I think having legal advice in the meeting for today, helped the group to reduce... I mean, we started this, [inaudible] the seven proposals, and we ended basically...

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo, can I interrupt? We're not on the CWG yet.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry. We're on the CCWG...

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I will say it when we go to the CWG.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Anything else on the CCWG accountability before we go onto the CWG? Which at some level, was perhaps a more interesting meeting. Sébastien, is that a new hand?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Just, Alan, to ask you when you want me. I have a housekeeping issue about the next meeting, maybe it's better at the end of the discussion, about the CWG, and not now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's do it right now. Olivier, is that on the CWG or CCWG?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: CWG.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then hold on to it. One or two C's?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A double C.

ALAN GREENBERG: Double C. Then Olivier, you go first, and then we'll go on to Sébastien's issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And you just mentioned here that perhaps the CWG was more interesting than the CCWG, and I would actually defer a bit on this. I was, I followed the discussions remotely, not all of them, but some of the discussions remotely. The progress made by the CCWG was quite astounding, and I know that there were concerns that, of course, work stream one was going to take so much time that it wasn't going to be ready in time for the CWG to make use of.

And in fact, I think that time has been made up, and that there have been some real catching up done, so I'm feeling a lot more confident now that the work of work stream one will be ready in time, and will have made enough progress for the CWG on IANA to be able to make use of it, in its own timeline. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. And I didn't say they didn't make progress, I said more interesting, but perhaps we have different views on interesting, but nevertheless, Sébastien, can you please go ahead?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you. First, before I go to my point, I want to give you, where I write in the chat, that public comment will start, or is supposed to start, the 21st of April for 30 days, for the CCWG report on accountability. And then we will have to see what we do after this 30 days of discussion, but currently the plan is to have a face to face meeting just prior, the meeting in Buenos Aires, the meeting on Friday, 19 June.

And as you know, ICANN staff decide not to sponsor the participants of those working groups for the ICANN meeting. The fact that there is a full day meeting before, may change their view, I don't know. But I would like to request that you look with [French] as we say in French, the fact that you've done, take care of me to come to Buenos Aires for this important meeting. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Sébastien, noted. As you well know, we have made a number of attempts prior to this, to get the powers that be in ICANN to change their interpretation of the travel policy for the CWG and CCWG, as some of us are painfully aware. But we'll try again. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Alan, I'm sure you will try again. And I hope you succeed this time, one way or the other. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are running very late at this point, and the CWG, as I pointed out, is going to be an interesting thing to discuss. Could we have the slides up for the CWG please? First of all, the design team one.

While it's coming up, the decision was made in Singapore, or after Singapore, that we would put a lot of focus not into the overall model of the design, of the transition, internal, external, but start working away at some of the individual issues that are common to any type of implementation. And the concept of design teams was created. You would see on this slide, and if we could scroll it, you can see to the next page, there are a whole bunch of design teams.

They were... I thought there was a lot more on the second page, I was wrong. They were assigned a priority, essentially, which ones need to be done now, and which ones can wait a little while. That is the priority one or two. The progress on the ones that are important in the short-term, are pretty well all going well, at this point. Some of them are just

starting, but they never, have a delivery date of April 10th, which is not very far away.

And although some people question this concept of design teams, ignoring the overriding consideration of which model to use, and focusing on the details, I think it has ended up being very successful. I'm not going to talk about them a lot. You can get some idea of what they are, if you can interpret the acronyms. Design team A was service level expectation. That is, what do we expect IANA and how do we decide what we expect IANA to deliver to the registries and their other customers?

Should there be an external appeal process for ccTLD delegations, re-delegations? How do we put together a customer service committee? I think, I'm not quite sure what the S is. That is, the group that will, on a month by month basis, monitor what IANA is doing. Design team D is authorization. Currently, the NTIA is in the loop. Any changes that are made in the root, go through the NTIA, with the NTIA no longer there, what do we need to do instead if anything?

And so forth. So there is a lot of work going on there. And if anyone is involved in the CWG and has not volunteered for one of these working groups, you should perhaps think about it. No more on that. Could we have up the other slides on the CWG please?

Okay. So, as Cheryl mentioned, the legal advice from the team, primary team engaged by the CCWG accountability, has just barely started. The legal team engaged by the CWG had a few weeks lead on them. And I will say, if you look at the credentials of the people on the team,

exceedingly impressive, particularly with regard to experience with the US Department of Commerce, with the US Congress, certainly with California law, and overall corporate governance.

I think we have a pretty impressive team. And the initial answers they provided were very useful, as you'll see in a moment. They seem to have, perhaps unlike what Cheryl has described with the other team, have understood what ICANN is about, and have a pretty good grasp of what the alternatives are. And their attitude is very much what I appreciate in legal counsel. They've essentially told us to tell them what we want to achieve, and they will do our best to tell us it's impossible, or it's possible and here are the ways you can go about doing it, and to identify the pros and cons of the various aspects.

For anyone who has dealt with legal counsel, you really want people, you don't want your legal counsel to tell you what to do, you want them to make sure they give you options and explain the implications and the results of taking various paths. And I think this team, so far, in the very little interaction we had with them has demonstrated that, you know, that they will do a good job for this.

Now many of the answers they gave us, because some of the questions are common between the CWG and CCWG, are common answers. It will be interesting to look at the similar answers from the two groups on the same questions. Next slide please.

All right. We started off going into the meeting with what was generally viewed as seven different possible ways that we could do the transition. One is the original one that was proposed by the CWG in December, and

that is contract co. There was another version that was similar to contract co, but using a trust instead of an actual company.

A trust is a mechanism by which some property can be held on behalf of someone else, and some entity, or group, or person, makes the decisions on what to do with the property. There were the internal solutions. Essentially the one that we proposed, saying we don't need a lot of complex structure, all we need is accountability to make sure the Board and the corporate officers do what the community wants with regard to IANA. There was another version that was similar to that, but again, where the IANA was held in the trust, but the trustee was ICANN.

There were a number of models that were proposed by Avri and another of other people in NCSG, and these essentially were sort of internal models. One of them was an internal model, that is, IANA was a subsidiary of ICANN. In another one, it was essentially a subsidiary of ICANN, the IETF, and the RIRs. And there is a third one where it was a standalone entity.

You know, somehow ICANN instructing it what to do, or at least the multistakeholder community. If we can go to the next slide.

As a result of both discussion within the group, and the legal advice, three of the options were taking off the board, pretty well completely. The trust solutions were taking off for an interesting reason. Although the lawyers agree that a trust can pretty well do what we wanted, it turns out that trusts are not recognized legal entities in some jurisdictions.

And therefore, if a suit is brought within those jurisdictions, we might be in a very awkward position. So those were essentially removed from the roster of possible solutions. The standalone IANA entity, I'm having trouble recalling it, and maybe some else will correct me, but my belief is, it was taken off because really there was not a lot of interest in having a completely standalone entity.

That somehow was controlled with ICANN, but separate. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I believe the standalone IANA entity was taken out because we were imposing the other, the IETF, the RIRs, to have a [inaudible] in that style alone. It was like MOUs with ICANN and the rest, and at least that conversation went there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So that was the one that required them to do something, and to take part, and we believe there was not a lot of interest in the short term on that. Thank you Eduardo. We then into some further discussion, and if we can go to the next slide.

Next slide please.

Thank you. You'll see, contract co now has a different color. Essentially there was agreement, by this time, a large part of the CCWG, of the CWG rather, were homing in on internal solutions in one form or another. There was not a lot of support for contract co, but it wasn't zero either. And by somewhere into the second day of the meetings, there was general consensus that we should not put a lot of effort into contract co at this point.

It was already a relatively well fleshed out model, and this wasn't where we should be putting our investigative processes right now, and it was technically not shelved, but put on the back burner. That is, we're not actively working on it right now. That, for all intense purposes, took the external solutions off the list. So, we ended up with an internal solution, that is the one with pure accountability, and you'll notice the hybrid integrated model title is gone, because we realized among other things, in Singapore, there was a lot of criticism that we had too many models and we weren't coming to closure.

So we changed the words, essentially, to say that we are looking at an internal solution, but with a number of variations. That is, just pure accountability, or subsidiary type thing, that is essentially a corporate stature to IANA, but within ICANN, and perhaps partly owned by, or supported by, the IETF and the RIRs. Now, the term subsidiary was no longer being used, because it turns out that a non-profit company cannot have a non-profit subsidiary.

Non-profits are not owned, so ICANN cannot own a non-profit subsidiary. But the term affiliate is used, and that is a separate non-profit but with a linkage between the two. It turns out that the affiliate

status may also have another benefit, that is it might protect IANA in a bankruptcy of ICANN. Not clear, the lawyers need to do some homework on that.

If we can go to the next slide.

And so what we end up with is an internal solution, and various options that the lawyers will do some homework on, and at this point, we are now waiting for them to do some homework. There was two days of meetings originally scheduled for later this week, and they have been cancelled at this point, pending legal advice that will come in, hopefully relatively soon.

I don't remember if there is one more slide. Is there or is there not?

Anybody?

I guess there isn't one more slide. Eduardo, I'll turn it over to you and anyone who has questions or further comments on the meetings. I will point out that I don't believe anyone was really expecting such a clean output to come out of this meeting. There was a strong belief that we will see, still significant differences between the parties, and we did not know how we were going to resolve those.

At this point, at least for the interim, we seem to have resolved those issues. Yes Eduardo, please go ahead. And then we have a speaker after this.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you Alan. I just want to give an impression of the meeting. I went to that meeting very optimistic that we were going to come up with a result, internal, external, or whatever, in this case, it was internal solutions, because, you know, we needed to come up at that meeting with some concrete, that will give us a direction. Otherwise we will never have a proposal out there for public comment before the end of April.

So, I think everybody was tuning in and getting this review somehow, and getting some specific direction. And I was saying before, that having legal advice there, helped us answer many, many questions that were speculations before. So, you know, overall I was very optimistic that we will have some kind of result.

It was very useful to me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Eduardo. All of us were hopeful we would have something good, but not all of us really saw a path on how that was going to happen. So, good output. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And indeed, I can agree totally with what Eduardo has mentioned. In addition to this, there have been some criticism of the working group in the early day, that it has had a number of holes in its proposal. Things that were missing, parts that were missing, and I think it's very good that we use the face to face meeting on the one hand, to focus on one proposed

structure at the end of the day, whilst at the same time, also have those design teams continue their work in parallel, so as to fill in the little gap in the proposal.

As a result, I really believe that the proposal for the naming community is likely to be a lot fuller than the proposals from the RIRs, the regional Internet registries, that's the number, and the IETF, that's the protocols. And so, the concern that I had admitted during the meeting was that the numbers and the protocols might have a proposal that would be 10, 15 pages in length, and the naming one that would have 100 pages or more in length.

Perhaps it's mindful of mentioning that there will actually be more than one report coming out of this working group, that will be short summaries of the main points being developed. There, of course, will be a full input report that will be sent to the IANA coordination group. But there will also be some additional, I would call it, marketing material to make it more understandable to people that are not really directly related with the name community.

As we know, ICANN can be a very complex environment, and those issues can become very complex. So, without going into details as to how many reports will be coming out of this group, there are several of them, and I'm particularly pleased that [Fiddley Austin] would be the legal firm that has been retained to help the group, is actually also going to be helping with some of the drafting, and some of the maybe more contentious, or more difficult to discern issues, so as to make them understandable.

Bearing in mind that our audience, at the end of the day, is not going to be the IANA coordination group, but is going to be the national telecommunications infrastructure administration, that then has to turn it over to the US Congress, and also explain what's going on, and of course, are likely to be several people that will read those proposals, and try to influence things way or another.

And we're now looking at political influence rather than actually having people going for the correct answer to the task that is at hand. So I'm very glad to see that this support, in order to be able to gain the political support, is also going to be at hand, and accompanying us in our task. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Sébastien, and yes, as I think...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Sorry. As I think I mentioned earlier, several people on the [Fiddley] team are, in fact, have experience in a variety ways with the US Department of Commerce, and with Congress, and those, I think, will be very helpful in doing some of the drafting to get us through the maze we have to go through.

I think Sébastien was next, but his hand is down. Do you still want to speak?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Alan, you answer to me... Thank you, it's Sébastien speaking. But you answered to me in the chat. But, I wanted to just to raise one point. It's important, it is that we can try in those group, even if we are talking about the Congress, it's two of them involved in one way or the other, as actors, as stakeholders in the discussion of what we are doing.

And I hope doing so, we will decrease [inaudible] at the end, not sure, but it must be tried. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we certainly have a number of people involved in this process, who are moderately skilled at aspects. Within the CWG and CCWG world, we have several Washington lobbyists, and you know, who will no doubt provide their insight into how we can try to work our way through this process.

Although we're not the ones directly interacting with them, because we have the ICG in between us. Yes Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. I think I'm off mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am, otherwise you would have said you couldn't hear me by now. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And the reason I was confused [inaudible], I'm actually in two Adobe Connect rooms, and having two telephone conversations, simultaneously while I'm trying to talk to you. So forgive me if I stumble just a tiny bit. I haven't had too much coffee yet this morning.

I just wanted to get you to scroll back, if you could, to the slide on the DTs please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, that's not scrolling back, that's the previous document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I didn't know how many documents there were. Anyway, while the magic is bringing up that list, patterns in front of you, and as someone who was an integral part of getting the whole concept of these small agile design teams getting going. I really was concerned that people understand what they are all on about.

These are, with very few exceptions, extraordinarily short list and intensely working themes. We need to have community input. It's a lot easier and a long ways, all sorts of work groups get involved with, to get people who, through every day work, and vested interest are involved in the topics that these are looking for.

But in my plea to have you look at what each of these are interested in, competition, dot INT, escalation processes, or whatever, if something fascinates you and you believe you would like to contribute your

opinion, get in soon, get working soon, but realize that the whole thing may only last a week or two. All right? Without exception, I believe Alan, correct me if I'm wrong, all of these will need to be finished by the 10th or 16th of April.

So we are talking every one of these things have to be populated and run, those that are priority one, obviously not the ones that are priority two and are not going to be started, by the 10th of April. And so they're going to be extraordinarily busy but very, very short termed things, and then they end.

That should free people up for the priority two ones, and if you can't find time to be engaged in the priority one, then please do look seriously at the priority two ones. And some of those, such as competition, conflicts of interest, I think will have a great deal of interest to the ALAC and the At-Large community. So I just wanted to be really clear of what they're meant to be and what they're meant to [inaudible].

This is not like joining any other work group that you've ever been involved with. I started group D, and within 11 days, no. It was 10 days, and that included travel time, it was finished. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. Any other final comments or questions on this issue before we close it? Give people a few seconds to give their late hands up.

Seeing nothing. Then we will go on to the next item. No visual for this one. The next item is number 10, talking about the 2015 ALAC/RALO elections, selections, and appointments. There is a document, a webpage that's linked to in the agenda item, which it looks like we're getting up, even though I said we didn't need it.

The timetable you see there, what is up there, is a slightly obsolete version, because the current one has a bright red banner just above the dates saying they're preliminary. This is a work in progress right now, and there are a number of things to be refined before we finish the date, finish the process. Someone is trying to make us dizzy.

The only hard deadline that we have that is soon, is that we must select the ALAC members from AFRALO, APRALO, and LACRALO, prior to the Buenos Aries meeting. We must tell the NomCom who we are appointing, so that in their appointments from the same regions, they can ensure some level of diversity, should they choose.

The other positions all need to be named well in advance of the Dublin meeting, the annual general meeting. Our intent however, is to the extent possible, to try to do everything in synch. At least one RALO so far has asked that we un-synchronize their ALAC appointments from their RALO appointments. For internal reasons, they would like to delay one and not the other.

So we will be making these decisions within the next couple of days, or very early in April, we will be deciding on the exact schedule and starting calls for nominations in the various regions. NARALO has a 30

day requirement, which is longer than the other regions, so we'll be doing a call for nominations earlier in NARALO.

But essentially the whole process will be kicked off within the next week or so. Are there any questions on this? As I said, the document that you're looking at on the screen is linked to the title of agenda item number 10, you can look at it yourself and see if we've made any mistakes. We probably did, but hopefully not too many.

Any comments, questions?

Seeing none, we'll go on to the next item, item 11. Now, as you're aware, the ALAC in Los Angeles, I believe, made a recommendation to the Board that all TLDs that are classed as category one, that is sensitive strings, highly regulated strings, that were identified by the GAC, all processes should be frozen. That is, no contract signed, no new delegations.

The new gTLD committee did not reject the advice, but chose not to act on it. And there have been a number of other interactions with the business constituency and other parts of ICANN, and as a result, a short meeting was called, I believe in December, with a few representatives of the ALAC, and a few representatives of the new gTLD process committee.

That was a short teleconference. It was followed up in Singapore by a very late night meeting, which included some of those people, additional Board members, registry representatives, and registrar representatives, and GAC representatives, to discuss how to go forward.

As one would expect, the registries did not see any problem and wanted to continue going forward. The ALAC and the GAC had strong reservations with some of these TLDs. There are certainly some of the TLDs that are sensitive, but are not necessarily, is not necessarily a problem because registries have put in place strong controls.

And one of the decisions coming out of that, is the new gTLD, the gTLD division would put together a list of exactly what the TLDs were that were in question, who was supplying for them, and identifying the current status, and identifying what specific public interest commitments were made by the registry.

And we, the ALAC people who are in this group, and as well business constituencies and others, were asked to review this list, and whether we thought there was a problem or not. And we are trying to, with a deadline later today, to finish this list. What you're going to see in a moment, or what you're seeing now if you scroll properly, is a subset of these TLDs that Olivier, Evan, and I have evaluated to try to understand whether there is a problem or not.

And I have now been trying to consolidate our three views. So if you scroll this, rather, set the size of this so you can see all the columns, and you'll get a flavor for what kind of things we're talking about. We've color coded them, the results, green, orange, and red. Now, if you look at the first one, for instance, it is the name for a lawyer. It's a TLD aimed at identifying lawyers, which has a high possibility for abuse, because we don't want people claiming they are lawyers and giving their advice, if they are not indeed lawyers.

However, the company, the registry has said they will restrict registration to people who can produce credentials that says that they are a lawyer in that jurisdiction. So we've rated that green. That is, yes, there are high concerns, but there are reasonable restrictions made on it. The next one, as an example, is attorney, which is the English word for the same thing.

The registry has not made that kind of commitment. They basically said it's open registration. Anyone can register. They will periodically monitor WHOIS, and if there is some sort of abuse, they will take action, but the details are not specified. And we said there, we believe there is high concern. There are some controls, but we don't really know the details of what the other actions are.

If the registry is willing to put more controls in place, or be more specific about what they're doing, maybe this one could become more acceptable. If you scroll down to the line item five, is an interesting one. That's bet. Now, it's a generic word. It's not clear who you would go to if you wanted approval, you know, who is it that approves using the term bet?

It could be used, if you want to place bets, it all could be used for education on how to place bets, and it's not clear there is any authority who regulates the term. So although we have some concerns, it's not clear how you can fix it. Bingo is a good one. It's a generic word. That's the next one, number six. It's a generic word. It's open. Bingo is a game of chance.

It's pretty low-stakes. And in some jurisdictions, it's regulated, in others it's not. So we figured okay, there is not a lot of harm done. Next one is casino. That is a term which is regulated in most every jurisdiction. There are rules about how you can run casinos, typically rules about what percentage a casino is allowed to make, in terms of profits. And having that as a completely open domain, with no real restrictions, we felt was quite problematic, and made that one a red.

You can scroll down through other ones. If you look, for instance, number nine, the second one under number nine. Number nine is CPA, that stands for Certified Public Accountant. It's a term used in some countries to regulate people who claim they're accountants. Typically highly regulated. We have an example, for instance, in the first one, is the application by Doughnut saying they wanted it to be completely open and anyone can register.

If anyone reports a problem, we'll do something. We rated that an orange. The next one is applied for by the certification group in the US. And saying they are only going to allow US applications. It's a community TLD, which means it's essentially managed by the group of accountants. And we said that one is okay.

Now the interesting thing is, if you look at CPA, there is various different colors. That's going to be settled, at this point, by auction. We can't say give it to someone green, that's not in the rules. So it's going to be won by somebody who is willing to put the most money into it. It's not at all obvious which one it's going to be, it could be a green one, it could be an orange one, and if you look at later ones, you'll see that in some of the auctions, they range from green to red.

The next one, number 10, is the last one I'm going to talk about. It's credit card. Well, the largest amount of phishing is related to credit cards. Certainly the three of us who looked at it, cannot count on something that has a TLD of credit cards. Olivier has done some research on our behalf, and demonstrating that on phishing, although not everyone uses a domain name which applies to what we're looking at, it adds creditability.

It is included in a significant number of phishing attempts, and therefore, something called credit card, the largest phishing opportunity around on the Internet, needs, in our view, some more regulation. I'm going to stop talking now. I think that gives you a flavor for the kinds of things we're doing.

So the list you see on the screen right now, or you can download, is not the complete list. There is still some work to be done before the night is over. But if anyone has any questions about this process or have I said anything which you think is really stupid, and we're going in the wrong direction? I would really like to hear.

Or see.

Is anyone still out there? Have I put everyone to sleep? Okay. We have a live voice. Well, if anyone has any thoughts you would like to pass on to me in the next hour or two, please do so. Olivier, you have your hand up. What have I missed?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I just, I was waiting for others to comment, but it seems everybody is digesting some of this. I can just confirm that I am close to finishing a report on the actual amount of abuse that takes place. It's a working paper on the misuse of new gTLDs. It looks at two main sources of data. One being data from the anti-phishing working group, and one piece of data, or set of reports from a company called [inaudible].

They both do reports, regular reports about the amount of phishing that takes place. [Inaudible] publishes the state of abuse report, and anti-phishing working group has got a report there. I think that I will be sharing this paper with the ALAC once it's sent over to the process by which we're going to be discussing this. The reason for this paper was because, when we had the meeting with the different people, and the NGPC, we were told, "Oh, but there is no abuse in all of the new gTLDs. There is no such thing going on. And you guys are just making things up."

I'm paraphrasing here, but that was the sort of intent. And what we were told was, "Oh, we've not seen any abuse so far." And that's not quite the reality of things, where abuse in new gTLDs is following the same pattern of growth as in the legacy top level domains. And that is based on research that is being collaborated and peer reviewed. I'm going maybe one step further to also looking at another report that makes an estimation as to the total cost of the abuse.

And there are figures of \$5.9 billion, as the estimated yearly cost of all phishing. That might be inflated. These are figures which have just been thrown out there by various groups, including consumer groups,

but what is sure that this is inflicting damage with regards to end users, and so it's a really important thing that we need to tackle.

Secondly, I've also listed spam. The amount of spam that is being used. And there, it's much more simple, give and take, system where as soon as there is a promotion to sell domains cheaply, spammers start using these domains, because it just makes spamming very cheap from some of the domains. So there is always a spike using that top level domain where there are cheap domains to be purchased. And so we might see some spikes in spam, making use of some new top level domains that are being sold at promotional prices.

So in conclusion, we've got those sources that we will be sharing with the group. And hopefully, that will show that effectively we are not just making up the fact that new gTLDs have a potential to promote phishing and spam. It's a reality. And cat one TLDs, the one that we have a list of on our screen at the moment, are particularly vulnerable to this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. There is a lot of interesting work going on. I know my former employer, McGill University, we are as prone to phishing as anyone is, and it is startling at the number of highly educated, computer literate people, who click on phishing requests. And it's disturbing, but it's the reality we're living with. And anything that we can do within the scope of ICANN, in my mind, that can minimize it, it's not our problem uniquely, but anything we can do to not facilitate it, I think, is important work.

Any other comments? Olivier is that a new or an old hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's a new hand. And I realize, we haven't discussed what phishing is. Of course, we're not speaking about the great outdoors, going to a river, or on a boat, catching fish in the sea. We're thinking about something much more terrible, which is the fact that some fraudsters, and organized crimes, and others, try and obtain personal details of yours, perhaps your credit card details, or account numbers, by making themselves somehow what they are not.

So they send you an email, say that they are your bank, and there have been a security breach at the bank, and you need to send them your password and account details, so as for them to fix it. And by the law of averages, because there are able to send maybe millions, tens of millions of emails out in a few seconds, there will be some people that will be caught by this.

And in fact, sometimes the fraud is so well done, that it's very, very difficult indeed, to notice that the email does not actually come from your bank. Does not actually have anything to do with your bank. And I must say, after 30 years on the Internet, 25 years or so, I've been nearly caught on a number of occasions. So the idea out there is if you do suspect something strange about an email you're receiving, just don't act on it.

And if it's your bank, then call your bank and find out if they really did send you something. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. I suspect most people on this call are well aware of it, and I also suspect all of us have, on occasion, clicked on those links, I hope not given them your passwords and your pin numbers, however.
[CROSSTALK]

Pardon me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There was a spear phishing that took place on ICANN, just a month and a half ago. So it's quite recently.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if you don't know what spear fishing is, look it up. That's what Google is for. I think we're complete with this item, I don't see any other hands. And the last item is any other business. No one volunteered any. One last call for any other business.

And you're standing between us and finishing on time. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Again, and I was just going to mention that for those people who are interested in IANA stewardship transition, both with regards to the naming issues, but also looking at what happens next with the IANA coordination group, there is a capacity building program, webinar taking

place tomorrow. And the time and date for this should, I haven't told staff that it should appear automatically.

It's from 13:00 to 14:30 UTC. And you can find all details about this program on this Wiki page, which I'm putting in the chat. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. Last call for any other comments. I thank you all for a good meeting, and we are finishing one and a half minutes early. Thank you all for a great meeting, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]