TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team – ALT – Mid Monthly Meeting on Tuesday, January 13th 2015 at 21:30 UTC. On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Leon Sanchez, Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Tijani Ben Jemaa. Our Liaisons are Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ron Sherwood and Maureen Hilyard. I show no apologies for today's conference. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber and myself, Terri Agnew.
	I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. Just for the record, I think in general the roll call precedes the review of any future agendas. Are there any changes to the Agenda or any other things people want to add? If you are all as sleepy as I am we may have to do that ad-hoc as we go along. No one has their hand up. We'll go up. Who's giggling in the background? Several people are. This is not a good sign. The first Item we have is the IANA stewardship transition. Does anyone know what that is? All right. We're setting the tone. I'll do a quick introduction and Olivier can fill in anything I miss.
	There was an intensive set of meetings this last weekend. I believe they were about nine hours in total, and an unknown other number of hours that the various Chairs and Work Group Chairs added on top of that.

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.

Cheryl can share that with us as we go along. We can largely focus on addressing the survey that had been done of Working Group Members and Participants, and going through the Items where there was a significant amount of agreement among the various participants, and trying to flesh out those items if they needed additional comments.

I think we did a moderately good job on that. The weekend did not focus on the differences, however, which still remain to be resolved. Along the way – and I cannot remember when this… I guess it was the previous week. Donna Austin had made the astute comment that there were a significant number of people who commented on the CCWG Report who did not agree with it. There were enough people of that mind, that perhaps we should not completely ignore the non-Contract Co – or also referred to as the "internal to ICANN model" and should try to flesh that out.

That was a comment that's been made a number of times before, but coming at that point in time from Donna it had more impact than it had before. The Chairs of the Working Group decided to convene another Sub Group to flesh out a non-Contract Co, internal to ICANN proposal. That will be starting this week, on Wednesday, I think. There are a number of people participating, some of whom are not generally supporters of the internal model, but already on the mailing list are having some interesting comments from people who were staunch Contact Co supporters, so it looks like it's going to be interesting.

That was the Working Group RFP 3B that I referred to before the meeting actually started. That will be going ahead, and we're going to try to come up with a model that at the very least is a sum total of

proposals, meeting the needs of the non-Contract Co supporters. Then of course the challenge is to somehow merge the two proposals, or convince almost everyone on one side to move to the other side, so we can make a recommendation to the ICG. The timing of that has moved from the middle of January to some time in the future.

Maybe Cheryl can provide us with some insight as to when that is. In my mind, it's not going to get done before Singapore, and there's no real opportunity to do it at Singapore. So we're talking about post-Singapore, as far as I can tell. That's my personal opinion. Oliver and then Cheryl, if you have anything to say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I've had the chance today to actually meet with Jonathon Robinson and a number of other people who participated in this weekend's work. The timetable that Jonathon alluded to was one where they would hope the proposal would be sent to the ICG by Singapore. The feedback we've had from some GAC representatives that were there at this Meeting; that by the way took place in London and was totally unrelated to ICANN; the Local and Multistakeholder Advisory Group on Internet Governance for UK-wide thing. We had the UK GAC Member who was there, and he indicated it would take more than a couple of weeks for the GAC to reach consensus on whether they would support the proposal.

So we're not looking at maybe even after Singapore. For some reason the ICG is not in discussions yet with the Chairs of the names component of the transition. They're still trying to work out an exact timetable for

this. As I said, provisionally by Singapore – realistically, probably not with regards to the other RFP 3B, it's clear that there is a real division between those who are proponents or supporters of the Contract Co model and those that are supporters of the internal to ICANN model. I'm not sure how we're going to go about bridging the gap.

I was hoping we would try and bridge the gap this weekend, but instead we've spent most time commenting on things that we were all in agreement with. So it was a feel-good weekend, but I have real concerns with regards to timing. It may well be that we need to have a lot more than just a matter of a few more weeks to find consensus – we're looking at a matter of months. That's all I can say for the time being. Of course, the situation is ongoing and the IANA Issues At-Large Working Group is having its call tomorrow.

I haven't built the Agenda for it yet, and I'd very much welcome some input on that to see where we go from here, because it's pretty difficult. I guess our focus and emphasis should be on RFP 3B at the moment. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. I do have some thoughts on that. I think we need to get the sense of the group as to how much flexibility we have and what we're reaching on. The proposal that we did submit put a number of principles, and I think we want to talk about a number of variations of that, to essentially give a mandate to the people who will be most active in RFP 3B, to try to come to closure on that; having looked at what the other proposals are. Having said that, it's going to take several meetings

for RFP 3B to come to closure. I don't see that happening before Singapore. There aren't enough weeks between now and then, and at this point we're only scheduling one meeting a week.

I think we're talking into Singapore, that we have two proposals, and there's still a lot of work to be done on the Contract co proposal as well, as anyone that's been watching knows. Without trying to merge proposals, convert people, come up with a proposal, we're talking past Singapore at this point. I think people are dreaming in Technicolor. Cheryl, why don't you comment please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Let me start. I've a number of different parts. I'm not in the AC. Is there anyone other than the ALAC Executive Leadership Team on the call? We don't have guests?

ALAN GREENBERG: Glenn and Ron are not technically on the Executive Team.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, then I'll temper what I'm going to say significantly. I was going to give you some provisional stuff, which without the rest of the Drafting Leaders Team's permission, I think it would be inappropriate to go beyond a tone of silence of the Leadership Team. I'll refrain a lot of what I was going to say. Look, the RFP 3B work can in fact progress, I think, relatively fast with the good preparatory plan before our two-hour call, at least once a week, but it may very well need to be more than once a week, so that we have something quite significant to socialize in

Singapore. I think that gives you an idea of where I'm heading in terms of my knowledge of probable time frame.

I think we will have to be doing socializing with all of the ACs and SOs, as well as communities in general, in Singapore, regarding all aspects of the proposal. That supports you, Alan, on your [unclear 00:12:45] Singapore. The GAC is a significant part of that, as you indicated that they certain [unclear] do our best [unclear] to socialize with GAC where we can, in Singapore, if we all know it will be late in Singapore, if not post-Singapore, before they could even consider supporting it one way or the other.

The other thing is, on a good [unclear 00:13:15] modern man, earlier today we had a scoping conversation – very initial – on the independent legal advice issue; not only that the accountability framework need, as we've already talked about in another call, but also obviously is important for not only RFP 3 but also RFP3B's work. Right now, there is no certainly that the Contract Co model is even viable from a legal perspective. I think that's an advantage to RFP 3B's work, because what we will ensure is that as we put a scope of work together, with ICANN Legal being involved, it will be a very much publicly-engaged exercise; so both the Stewardship and the Accountability CWG and CCWG will be closely involved in the process.

But what we'll be able to do is have the opportunity to know what is or is not viable from a legal perspective; both in existing jurisdictions within a Californian law point of view, and in other jurisdictions, but also – and this is why it's important for 3B – that we'll have the scope [unclear 00:15:06] probably the two-pronged approach, so that having

encountered any really good ideas with their research, that the Council, we think, will be able to give us expert advice on risks associated with any other approach, as well as mitigating risk. That will mean we will be able to look at – post-Singapore – an existing Contract Co model, a 3B, which we'll keep talking about as an internal to ICANN model, and an aspect of "the magic might happen somewhere else with some other good idea".

I think that's all good for 3B. I'll stop there, but I would suggest, Alan, this time that I could come back under Chatham House Rules with some background information on a couple of aspects. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. Noted. We've pretty well more than exhausted our time on that I think we've gotten everyone pretty well up-to-date. The next Item on the Agenda is the Accountability CCWG, of which we have several people on that group, including one Co Chair on the call. I'll give a very quick introduction with my very bias perspective. As you know, I'm a great supporter of trying to get good accountability in ICANN. I do have some worries in the way the group is going right now. The current intent is that Work Stream 1, which was deemed originally to be the things that were necessary prior to any IANA transition either committed or in place.

That now essentially has been changed, or at least been fleshed out, to say it is sufficient accountability such that any other accountability that the community may need in the future, we have the tools to do. In rough ways that translates to saying we can overrule the Board, if the

Board doesn't agree – and there's no indication it won't – in virtually any accountability issue, should it be necessary. There is also a discussion now that part of this transition must be to effectively replace the Affirmations of Commitment with something built into the internal ICANN document. I'm starting to have a real fear that we've put so much into Work Stream 1 that doing it in a reasonable time frame is going to be really problematic, and therefore potentially delaying the IANA transition because of that.

I'll stop there. I'm not unhappy with what it might accomplish, but whether we can really accomplish that in that time frame, I have a real question on. Olivier, if you really want the question now, go ahead. Otherwise I'll turn it over to either Leon or Cheryl. The hand is down. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: So far, as Alan said, Work Stream 1's mode of work has been growing a lot, and it seems to be coming into [amends 00:19:14] as to the number of issues that have been included into Work Stream 1. The latest, which I'm not sure if it has been mentioned, is related to the Affirmation of Commitments, and the AOC as it stands is a document that has been signed between the US Government and ICANN, and if that relationship ends, as it should be, that document should become void. Because one of the [unclear 00:19:5] then we wouldn't have any AOC.

As far as I can tell, or remember, there were two options on how to address this issue. One of the ways to go would be to include the AOC in the bylaws, which I have [serious doubts 00:20:20] going that way. Or

the other one, as far as I can tell – and correct me Cheryl or Alan – could be find a new mechanism or document that could be signed between the IANA functions manager and a community or Review Team that may come out of the proposal from the [Wiki Declaration 00:29:55]. You have your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. The problem I have with this is the AOC is not particularly related to IANA.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: The last RFP for IANA, the NTIA had awarded IANA to some other organization completely outside of ICANN. The AOC was still there, and the AOC is talking about all the policy work we do and the other [unclear 00:21:27] work we do. It's not just restricted to IANA. Although one could read the March announcement as implying that it has something to do with ICANN proper, it is not at all clear that the NTIA is prepared to give up the AOC right now. They have enough politics on their hands with IANA. It's not clear they want to walk away from everything or could even manage to do that out of the blue.

So although in theory we have the right to abrogate the Affirmation on short notice, no one has planned to do that, and it's not clear the NTIA would be particularly interested in us doing that. So I think we're going

down a path that we don't have to at this point, and I really have a problem with that. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Couldn't agree with you more, Alan. The AOC does not actually mention IANA at all. It does mention a great deal of policy and reviews and a whole lot of other things. Would can modify the AOC, and in fact there is a more than evil part of my mind that would suggest that a lot of our issues, in terms of accountability, the things that might take an awfully long time by other pathways, we could farm some of that work off to actually… Once we agree what the context should be, to simply renewing the AOC with additional terms in it, and thereby keep up a non-bylaw approach.

But [unclear 00:23:21] than people might realize, by leaving an AOC in place with NTIA and having an additional set or [unclear] produced for it, which gives the parts of accountability that our accountability [unclear 00:23:40] may desire and the community may desire. That's certainly something I want to talk more about at least in enclave, in the plotting and planning that happens in the corridors in Frankfurt. There is certainly no reason at all, in my reasoning, nor at least in the feedback I've had from other parts of the signatory world – in other words a couple of Board Members, legal advice, and someone who has something to do with NTIA – that this concerns the case.

I agree with Alan. I don't think this is a profitable pathway to go down. The AOC does not disappear with an oversight of IANA functions

transition. Far from it. We could use it as a tool, if [unclear 00:24:42].
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. One of the concerns I have, Cheryl – and I'll be very blunt – is I tend
to agree with many things Steve Del Bianco says, but the group as a
whole has essentially put him in charge completely of deciding what's in
Work Streams 1 and 2. There's not a lot of differing with him and if
there is, he rebuts it. I think we have a bit of a problem there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, there's a lot of ways that we can tug on Steve's choker chain. I
certainly have some dogs in Washington that could do that, if needs be,
but more importantly, Steve also works, in my view, better in changing
his course and direction when you're in a room for him than over a
teleconference.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't disagree at all, but the Chairs at this point have already
essentially reinforced his position that we must get 100 per cent
accountability capability as part of Work Stream 1. Although I think
that's a delightful way to go, I'm not convinced that… We may get that
one, but I'm a little worried. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I'm happy to be patient because I'd first like to hear from
our representatives on the Accountability Working Group. My concerns

are several, as regards to the [unclear 00:26:31] track. The first one is the fact that there are several disrupters in the accountability Working Group, and that certainly does not help with focusing on what matters, and certainly doesn't help with focusing on Work Stream 1 and restricting Work Stream 1 to exactly what you just said now: the IANA stewardship transition.

The second concern is one to do with the way that staff has organized the whole work, and how they've presented to the community how they solve the accountability thread and the IANA stewardship transition thread coming together, or rather not coming together, and just being sent to NTIA alongside each other by the Board, at the very end of the process. To this date, we still have this awkward relationship between the accountability thread and the NTIA stewardship transition thread. That's the second concern.

The third concern is to do with the fact that, from the discussions I've had today with people who are involved in the accountability thread and those involved in the NTIA stewardship transition thread, they don't quite grasp, today, the fact that NTIA will be rejecting a proposal that does not have a significant accountability mechanism for ICANN; a completely proposal that includes that. Therefore, the longer the accountability thread takes – and it doesn't look any close to even starting its work properly at the moment – the more likely it is that the whole process of stewardship transition is going to be delayed. This is not recognized by at least the people I spoke to today.

I have concerns about this. What this is then being viewed as is, "Oh, well, if you're going to go for RFP 3B, the internal to ICANN scenario, it

can't happen anyway because it's going to delay the whole transition. The only way to have the whole transition process run on-time is to go through this Contract Co thing," which I would say is absolute rubbish, but we are really in a tough position at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, Olivier, although the accountability necessary to do Contract Co, from the CWG's perspective, is not very large, the CCWG is taking the perspective that Work Stream 1 is larger than that, regardless of the model. I'm in charge of putting together a list, and we may well find some strong disagreements when I publish that list tomorrow. We're going to play that one through. We'll see where it goes. We're starting to run out of time, and Maureen has to leave in a little while. Is there anyone else that wants to say anything on accountability?

I will note, for anyone who made it all the way through yesterday's call, that at the end, when one of the Co Chairs gave a preliminary agenda for Frankfurt, I noticed one thing that was not there. It's something every Working Group always does early in its process, and that's lay out a timeline; when do we expect to be finished? What is our target? We don't even seem to have one, and I've suggested that is an important part of the discussion in Frankfurt, so hopefully we'll see something on that. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. There is a timeline that's been designed for the Working Group, and it will be reviewed for our meeting in Frankfurt. The other point I want to raise is that, as you are aware, independent legal advice

is a big issue and we haven't made any progress on that. I think that any comments and any pressure we can put on this side to make it happen will be very helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just specifically on the legal advice, it's back to what Leon has just said. This saves me updating Leon later. I specifically ensured in today's discussion about voting for independent legal advice for the CWG on stewardship transition, that they recognized – and remember we had ICANN Legal on that call – a nexus and a great deal of overlap and a cost benefit analysis of getting scoping done that takes care of the requirement for independent legal advice for both CWG and CCWG accountability, and they won't get back to you guys yet but will shortly.

This will be happening Leon, if you see something to engage in both communities and Working Group quite carefully, and most importantly I have managed [unclear 00:32:38] respected and loved greatly for the work she's done with At-Large and ALAC in the past. Sam will be in Frankfurt and will be able to take some worthwhile and productive time with Leon. I would suggest, Leon, you might want to take the lead on that, for the Co Chairs, if you can, and this is certainly something Sam and I have been back-channeling about. Regardless of what you've been told by [Sue 00:33:15], at this stage I'm very confident that this can be made to happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll add that both I and Cheryl have had very good relationships with Sam, so I think we can grease that process if necessary. Olivier, then Tijani, then me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: On the topic of external legal advice, I've heard today that the IANA stewardship transition has been granted; they are looking for someone. The accountability has not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl is saying don't worry about…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wrong. I don't know where you heard that from, but whomever you spoke to needs to speak to me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: These are just rumors, and frankly today I've heard so much crap that ultimately I think we should just wait for whatever is really happening.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I would suggest Cheryl is well connected into this. Let's leave it at that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We will look at this further in Frankfurt. I think that's important. Not necessarily as a formal Agenda Item, Leon, I'll hasten to add.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I find the pace of this Working Group very low, very slow, and this is because of a lot of things. One of them is some controversial paper on the Working Group that we are not always concentrating on the substance. There is a problem inside the group, even on the definition of some obvious things, such as community, such as stakeholders, et cetera. This is time consuming, and now we are still trying to find the right definition, which is for me something really disappointing. I think that we are not versed for some important things. We spent a lot of time [audio cuts out 00:36:02].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Have we lost Tijani?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so.

TERRI AGNEW: We're checking to get Tijani back.

ALAN GREENBERG:	All right. Maureen, are there any other Items that you want to be here for? I do want you here for #6.
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Hi everyone. No, I must admit… Yes, #6 is what I wanted to talk about.
TERRI AGNEW:	Adigo has tried a couple of times to reach Tijani and have been unsuccessful.
ALAN GREENBERG:	We can put a message in the chat so that he knows that. I'd like to skip over #5 for the moment and go to #6. As we're going to be spending a fair bit of time in a little while looking at ALS effectiveness, and that's going to be partly…
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I was disconnected. I'm back.
ALAN GREENBERG:	If you could finish please?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I don't know when it was cut, because I was speaking until the phone rang again. What I said is that one of the most important things is that in Work Stream 1, their definition has to be corrected. I will send an email about that tomorrow, because we have a Charter and we have to

comply to the content of the Charter. I said that if we have this low pace it's also because we have controversial persons on the call and this makes us not concentrate on the main substance. I will stop here. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure there's a lot we can do about the people who tend to derail conversations and go off on tangents, other than Chairs that exercise their controls, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: We will try and do that with a couple of persons.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good luck on that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Exactly. It's been quite difficult and there's been correspondence with many people that are shown to be complicit, and we're trying to manage that, but certainly we're not being as successful as we wish we were.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have some sympathy, in any case.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I hope the face-to-face meeting will solve some of those problems.

ALAN GREENBERG: They'll probably create a few more though, if you want my prediction. Thank you very much. We'll go back to Item #6 now and then go back in the Agenda. Given that we are looking at criteria and expectations for ALSes, because virtually every RALO says we really have a problem with lack of participation. Given that the At-Large review is also likely to be focusing on that, I really think that we need to pull back on the outreach and recruitment activities in terms of recruitment for ALSes. Recruitment for individual members, I think, is something we should be pushing on, but for ALSes, until we've established what it is we're looking for and able to tell prospective ALSes what we're expecting of them to do, I really think we should not necessarily cease all recruitment and acceptance of applications.

We should rather cut it back a significant level and focus, to a larger extent, on how we can engage ALSes that we already have, and what we need to do to change how we do our business to allow ALSes to participate more effectively. It can't all be just policy issues or – as we're focusing on right now – internal ICANN procedural issues. We have to look at engagement on a much wider level that we're doing right now, and it's not clear how to do that. But I think in the interim we should not be trying to increase our ALS numbers to any great extent, until we understand what it is we're looking for in ALSes, and to make sure that when we get a new ALS they're going to be a productive part of the community.

That's my position now. I'd like to hear from other people as to what extent they think I should shut up and not say this in public. It's not

going to be a popular thing to say in some circles. Or, to what extent is this something that we really want to pursue? I've put my stake in the ground and I'd like to hear from other people. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Alan. Within the APRALO for example, I know that we are also effectiveness of ALS engagement, and we've approached Glenn about how NARALO has a policy in place, and we are going to be looking at that, because we too feel that within APRALO itself we have several ALSes that probably haven't been as effective as they could be, and we plan to re-engage them. That's probably our first port of call. I think too that as a RALO what we've come across at the moment has been the opportunity of further engagement with our community through the CROPP. I think that what has concerned us has been the comment that community involvement in outreach situations that we are offered, from a grass roots, ALS level, isn't necessary, if the [unclear 00:44:42] are attending an event.

I think that we'd like to feel… It was confirmed by the comment that was made in the operating [fan 00:45:04] comment that ALAC made of the importance of stakeholder group [unclear 00:45:17] At-Large community should be given an opportunity to participate in those sorts of activities, as much as staff or the Board. The outreach is not only to engage with new members, but also to re-engage with others and reconfirm that regional engagement that we want to; the commitment to the region's activities.

I guess I feel that I'm commenting about quick statements, for example that I believe that ALS engagement is just as important in any regional opportunity that we have, and it's really important for regional leadership to be out there in engaging with other ALSes in their own context, rather than the ordinary "just waiting for them to a meeting", whether that be face-to-face or online. That's my two cents' worth anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Maureen. I guess I'll note something: that one can look at the word "outreach" and have a number of interpretations to it. Within the ICANN context, outreach seems to be synonymous with recruiting as opposed to engagement. From that perspective I think it's unfortunate that the CROPP has an "O" in it, because it implies that you shouldn't be using it for other parts of engagement but only to find new participants. I find that rather unfortunate because I think we're missing an important aspect of what we're talking about. Any other points? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I do think that in the near future we have to look more, as Alan said, more towards how to make our ALSes more engaged and participating more in our work and in the work of ICANN in general, than trying to recruit more ALSes. It's not to say that we don't want to recruit other ALSes, but it's very important that any ALS in the RALO has to be active and has to help, and has to have activities inside ICANN, inside ALAC and inside the region too. What are the means to do this? I think

that there is the problem that we have been trying to solve for a long time.

Now, if we concentrate on it, rather than try and also find other ALSes, perhaps we will find some solutions. I'm sure a solution will be money consuming, because the ALSes will not pay attention to anything about ICANN or about ALAC or about At-Large, if they are not coming to the meeting and physically present. If we find a way to go to them, to meet with them face-to-face, perhaps this will solve the problem. Perhaps we could try and make something regional or sub-regional so that those ALSes feel that they are really inside of the structure; inside ALAC and At-Large. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think it's really important that yes, we do want new ALSes as we go forward, but we want to make sure that when we bring them on board they know why they're there. As Chair, I was advised by the past Chair that I should welcome every new ALS, and I've tried to do that, but several times I've got back answers saying, "Okay, but now that we're here, exactly what are we going to do?" That's not the way they phrase it, but essentially they're coming in, they're signing on the dotted line, but they don't really have an expectation of what it is they're going to be doing when they get here. I really think we need to address that. Holly and then Cheryl.

HOLLY RAICHE: If we're going to have a different meaning of outreach, and I agree with your concept, then with things like CROPP, where in fact we may have

opportunities for our context of outreach, we want to make sure that we can have the metrics and the we can respond to the Board that we recognize what we're talking about.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can presume there will be a bit of an interaction in Singapore, trying to make sure that we will not be having different definitions than the people who are approving the requests, but it remains to be seen whether we're successful or not. First I want an opinion of the people here before I try to change the ground rules. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A couple of points. I'll go to the top one first and then come back to the ALS engagement one. I am finding [unclear 00:51:34] specific perspectives that the CROPP is increasingly irritating, increasingly dysfunctional, and there's an increasing need for the Leadership of ALAC and the Leadership of the regions to get together with the well-meaning, highly productively focused, but I would suggest disconnected, staff in the region, and have a deep talk. That's about as politely as I could put it. Let's try and come back to that at some point in time. It may be that that's a uniquely regional issue, to our area, and possibly [unclear 00:52:33] do about that, and I actually am not just bitching here.

I think there are a couple of highly likely to succeed ways we could go forward, working far more in-concert, with the regional staff, to make sub-regional outreach and support, like CROPP and other mechanisms, become very effective, because they are highly motivated, highly capable and suitably [unclear 00:53:09]. We've just got a disconnection

on some of the critical bits, [unclear 00:53:18] towards the bridge that's [unclear] survey [unclear], to make sure that they're going to align up so the bridge can actually connect. That seems to be, at some point, when we're less thinly-stretched, by other equally compelling, if not more compelling, issues in ICANN, dealt with, with some priority.

I'm now finishing up, moving back to the ALS engagement. I'm a [current 00:53:44] Member, and we need to look harder on engagement and probably at generic, high-level guidelines for engagement; not at a global level, but focused very specifically on regional and sub-regional activities. I don't think the RALOs are doing anywhere near an effective job, in any of the regions, and there are a lot of good reasons for that – they're human, they're volunteers, they're interacting and running their ALSes as well as taking on leadership roles in the region, and in most cases taking on key roles; policy development roles, leadership roles, either in the ALAC or ICANN.

So all of that needs to be measured by that recognition, so that you can see what they're doing. However, I'm sure we could do more [unclear 00:54:53] harder. That said, I don't believe that the only way forwards for bigger ALS engagement does need to [pale it 00:55:05] to be local, and therefore [unclear] sub-regions. What it needs is regular face-to-face meetings. If there's not a face-to-face meeting, we'll plan a traditional sub-regional or regional face-to-face meeting. I think that's important and will be a touchstone of sorts [unclear 00:55:26] Board for more active ALSes. I think what we need to do is look at some other ways of effective and actual mentoring.

I don't mean the BSF, as it was named in the ATLAS II, which was the most lower-case mentoring I've ever been engaged in, but we do need to do a whole bunch of stuff. I'm going to stop now. We've got to focus on engagement and bringing people up, rather than stopping getting more in, or getting rid of them for no reason at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, thank you. We really don't have to solve the problem now. I just wanted to find out if we have agreement. We seem to have violent agreement. Maureen, I see you're leaving. Thank you for joining us for an hour. I will be raising this on the ALAC call later this month. I would ask for short, concise interventions from anyone who agrees with me so that in addition to getting some pushback, which I'm expecting, we also get some support on it. Thank you. We're way over our time. We have a half-hour left and I'd like to try and keep to it at this point. We're going to go back to Item #5, which is on ICANN 52. I know we can't ignore this section, but I'd like to keep it as brief as we can.

Let me give a bit of an introduction. This probably, like most – but this on in particular - has been challenging. Squeezing everything in, in conjunction with what else has been going on, and handling the overlaps, has not been a lot of fun. So don't give these people too much flack please. Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. I can't wait for someone to give me some slack on the schedule. We're just going to run through it briefly. This is not set in stone. The official schedule has closed, but if there are any tweaks to

make to current meetings I'd need to submit them and we can take it from there. No promises. We've had quite a few challenges with regards to the accountability meetings that have been scheduled, and which take up quite a bit of time and involve some of our main key players as well.

On the screen we're going to quickly run through Saturday, which is the ALT Meeting in the afternoon. This will be a two-hour meeting. On the evening it will be followed by a dinner. As we're having the two-hour meeting in the afternoon we may or may not have a private room in the evening for our dinner. Dinner, I've sent a save the date. I'd be very appreciated if everyone could please confirm their attendance, as well as any dietary requirements. We'll then send you the venue that we've thought of, as well as the menu to make sure we all agree on where we're going.

Sunday is the usual ALAC Session, from 9:00 to 17:30, and Heidi has done the Agenda with Alan. The only issue I'd like to point out here at the moment is the Meeting with the GAC. This meeting has not yet been confirmed. What we're trying to do is have an ALT Meeting with the GAC as opposed to an entire ALAC Meeting with the GAC, but we haven't yet been given a slot. We have asked for a time on Sunday afternoon, as backup, which would mean it would be with the entire ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Before we go onto that, certainly my preference would be a meeting with GAC Leadership – a strategy meeting as opposed to an open

meeting, but that remains to be seen. I'm trying to arrange a talk with Thomas later today, to see what his feeling is on this.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. If you do hear anything, if you could please keep me posted, as this would mean an additional meeting form for me, but I'm sure I could wrangle that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, rather than going over the agendas, just give him a time. If we could just through the schedule? I've sent a note to Alan about the actual agendas and in due time he can get back to me.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, absolutely. I didn't want to go through the agendas, just if you have anything to add, I'm ready to go onto Monday. Monday we have the main sessions, which is the Welcome Ceremony. What we've had to do here is put the ICANN Academy Working Group at the lunch-hour and then in the afternoon we have the Accountability Working Session. That is all we currently have for Monday. There will be high-interest topic meetings as well.

Those haven't been made public yet, and as they seem to be changing on the main schedule, I'm not even going to go with what the options possibly are, because they've been changing while I've been working on the schedule over the past few hours. We won't go down that route because it will just confuse everyone. There will definitely be more meetings on that day, and they'll be part of the general ICANN Meetings.

Tuesday, we've got a very early start, which we've tried to avoid throughout the week, to give everyone a little bit of time to breath. We put the ALAC Meeting with the ccNSO on the Tuesday morning. We have our usual Meeting with the Board. Our usual two Working Session Meetings as well as the Accountability Working Group at lunchtime. APRALO Meeting. At-Large New gTLD Working Group. Alan, I sent you a message to see if we can please borrow some time from the ALAC Session Part Two to have the At-Large New gTLD Working Group at that time. I'll wait to hear back from you. We'll be finishing off with LACRALO and Music Night. As it stands right now, everything seems to slot quite well on that day.

We'll go onto Wednesday, which is yet a not-so-busy day, because we do not have access to our usual meeting room in the morning. I think we're very tight on meeting space on Wednesday in general, because I've had a look at the schedule that I've been able to see. It's internal and not yet to be sent out for public knowledge, and the meeting rooms are all completely chock-a-block. We've got the RALO Leadership Breakfast with the ALT on Wednesday morning. It's more a session at this stage. I'm not quite sure what we're going to be getting for breakfast but we'll definitely have a session.

We've got the Accountability Engagement Session that morning as well. So in the morning we've only got the RALO Leadership Meeting, and then in the afternoon lunchtime we'll have our usual At-Large Regional Leadership Meeting for an hour and a half, followed by the AFRALO AfrICANN Meeting. We've then got the IANA Issues Meeting, and a little change from previous years is we're starting the ALAC and Regional Leadership Wrap-Up Meeting on the Wednesday afternoon. We've got

one hour already to have the RALO Chair Update, so that's a slight variation from previous years. Then we'll be going onto the Showcase, which is a two-hour, possibly two and a half hour, event in the evening, which is going to be wonderful.

We've then got our Thursday session, which is again shortened by the meeting that we'll have in the main schedule – essentially accountability, I believe. We have the accountability Working Session. That's a very early start for whoever is involved in that. We've got the Technology Taskforce Meeting that morning, followed by the NARALO Monthly Meeting. Now, we went through this with Alan, and we have that an hour before the second part of the Regional Wrap-Up Meeting, and the only other meeting that seems to clash with at the moment, of interest, is the CWG Stewardship Question and Answer Session. Afternoon is the usual Public Forum followed by the Public Board Meeting. On Friday we have the ALT Session from 9:00 to 12:00, and that's where it ends.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, thank you very much for that excellent review. Just one added point for Thursday. I think it's at 18:00 right now, and that's another one of the RALO Chairs and I think it's the ALT who will be meeting with the global leaders, as you did in LA. Thank you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Heidi. I did see that meeting, and then because it was taken off from a schedule I've been working on I didn't mention it. Any questions? Thoughts? Comments? Feedback?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Gisella. May I ask you to perhaps change the format of posting the agenda of the At-Large activities and ICANN Meetings? Because it's very helpful to have it on a sheet, as it is for the global program, for example, and as it was when you started preparing this ICANN 52 Meeting with Leon. You had a sheet with multiple columns, et cetera. So if we have this sheet it will be helpful. When you have one sheet and you can see everything, you can understand better and you can react better.

GISELLA GRUBER: It would be my pleasure to send you a sheet. I have the sheet and I'm still working on it. I can send you already what I have, but I'm going to make it much clearer once I know what the conflicting meetings are. Definitely, you will have that document in a better format before Singapore.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. That's helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a question also, which I probably should have mentioned before but I forgot. There is a capability within Confluence, through one of the additional packages that I believe ICANN has, to hide columns. It would be really, really useful to be able to print out the ALAC Agenda with just the language you want showing. As we add languages, the Agenda gets longer, the columns get narrower, and they become less and less useful.

As I said, I believe there is that capability, that the IT people may be able to tell you how to use, to be able to have someone say, "I only want to see the English column," and not have to have all of the rest of them printed on the page. If someone could look into that I'd really appreciate it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think one of the ways to do that is to choose the language at first, and then you'll display only the page of the language you want. You will not display a page with the three languages.

ALAN GREENBERG: That means they have to manage four or whatever number of different pages for each day, which may be more challenging. I'm not trying to dictate the technology to use. I'm suggesting that if we can print something with only one language column for the details of the Agenda, that would be really useful. I'd suspect there is a way within Confluence… Obviously we could have multi-language pages, one page for the Agenda in each language, but I'm not trying to dictate that, and people have enough work to do at this point.

I'm suggesting that the IT people may be able to provide something on that without a lot of effort, because we're not really trying to multiply effort at this point. I really don't care which method people use, but it would be a lot easier if we could print something like that. Thank you. Any other questions? I have a tick from Cheryl and Olivier has his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I've noticed that unless I'm wrong, there doesn't appear to be any location for the Working Group on IANA Stewardship Issues? There is an overall discussion with the ALAC as hot topic #1 and #2.   Is this replacing the Working Group face-to-face? We were likely to be delayed or discussed earlier, or likely to be right in the middle of some significant work that needs to be done.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, sorry, are you referring to your Working Group?

ALAN GREENBERG: He's referring to what's now the Ad-Hoc Working Group.

GISELLA GRUBER: My apology. I abbreviated to "IANA Issues", which is the name of the mailing list, because it's so long to say. It's on Wednesday from 15:30 to 17:00.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I wasn't sure.

GISELLA GRUBER: We've given you 90 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's the maximum you're allowed without paying extra.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anything else we need to talk about at this point regarding the Agenda? We're 20 minutes away from the end of the meeting, and unlike all of the other meetings that I've run so far in my illustrious career as Chair, we are woefully over at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, in 5.b there is a number of the questions workspaces that are yet to be filled in. Again, those are the workspaces for questions to the Board, which I think are pretty clear at that point. The questions for the GSE session, that will be on Sunday, and then the questions for the GAC. Just a heads-up on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Anything else on Item #5? Olivier has his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Thank you for this interlude, which allowed me to remember my question. It was to do with the At-Large Summit follow-up. Unless I'm mistaken again, and I might be because it's been a long day, I don't see anything to do with the ATLAS II follow-up, and I believe there is a plan to present some more recommendations to the Board, since we have told them that we would be giving them more

recommendations. I'm not sure whether a face-to-face is required before, so as to rehearse our strategy when speaking to the Board, or whether this would have to be done ad-hoc.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we have no choice but to do it ad-hoc. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, do you think that you will get [unclear 01:15:09] to prepare something for the Board? Because the active persons are very, very busy with the transition and with the accountability. I don't know if we will mange to prepare something for Singapore.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I think we can only find out once we've got this week's call, and I plan to be going over maybe not 10 or 15 recommendations to the Board, but maybe focusing on less than a handful. There will be a proposal to that effect in a call that takes places either tomorrow or Thursday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's defer the discussion until after that call. I will give you a heads-up though that unless we have something to say to the Board that's really going to interest the Board, I'm going to suggest doing it on paper and not during the meeting. We'll discuss that when we meet. Any other item on #5? Going, going, gone. We are now on Item #7. It's budget special requests. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, Tijani and I had a call going over the criteria and some of the possible requests. The next step…

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Heidi?

TERRI AGNEW: We'll dial back out to Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess in LA they don't have phones that can dial out themselves! ALAC Agenda. We're going to do that right now. Take a look at what's there. If we're missing anything please, in the next four or five days, let us know. Everyone has a responsibility to look at that Agenda and get it up to date. I'm not 100 per cent sure that Heidi has actually done the first update of it yet, so I guess one of us will send a note to the ALT when that is updated, and you can then look at it and make your own comments.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm back. Very sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've covered Item #8 in your absence.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Did you mention going in with a heads-up from ALAC and from some of the RALOs?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. We went onto Item #8 when you disappeared.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Going back quickly to #7, again, once we get confirmation from Alan and Tijani on the criteria, staff will be sending a note out to all of the regions in multiple languages, mentioning the timeline and the new criteria that the FBSC will be setting up. Those criteria would be, number one, that they need to have a bottom-up process in their RALOs – so individuals or ALSes will not be able to submit a proposal to the FBSC without first getting approval through their RALO. Let's take a look at some of the others. I think that's really the key one. Again, they're not going to be focusing on outreach as much as they were on engagement.

As for the possible proposals coming in from the ALAC, one might be a high-level meeting at the IGF, with some Members of the ALAC, and inviting Members of the Board and others to speak. One might be an outreach and engagement series of meetings within the region, and that's something that we might be able to do with the GSE. One is going to be a first-nation mentoring program that will be developed, and then from the RALOs we have, from AFRALO and NARALO, submissions for requests for General Assemblies. I think those are the main points.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. Any quick comments? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Are any of these requests related to IGF dependent on one, the theme for IGF, and two, the approval of those sessions with the IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group?

ALAN GREENBERG: Our understanding is that if the meeting is on day zero it does not require approval. It does require coordination and room allocation of course.   Only one such meeting, I understand, is allowed, for organization. So if the Board, for instance, is planning something, then we also can't have any.   If it's during ICANN proper it does require approval.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Following up, if that was to take place, would participants be funded just for that day or for the length of the IGF?

ALAN GREENBERG: All very good questions. I would think it doesn't make a lot of sense to fly people to an IGF for one day. I would strenuously object to that, if that was what was going to be recommended.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You'd be surprised.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would not be surprised! I said I'd object. I didn't say I'd be surprised. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Very quickly, it might be useful if we can note who will be going or who might be at the IGF so we can let ICANN staff, who are planning other workshops throughout the week, know that you might be available and other groups, RALOs, ALSes, who are submitting workshops, who might be there as well, that could have ALAC Members on their workshop…

ALAN GREENBERG: You're saying people who have prior funding without ICANN?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Heidi, you'll be sending out a summary of what you just talked about on the budget, or sending it to me for my…

HEIDI ULLRICH: What I'll do is I'll draft a note and send it to you and Tijani, and then once you approve it in English that we'll translate it in various languages and send a note out to the ALSes.

ALAN GREENBERG: In terms of #8, which we sort of covered, have you done your first task of updating the ALAC Agenda yet?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I have not, but items that I have planned would be the ALS outreach engagement issue, IANA stewardship, ICANN accountability and transparency…

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't need to list them now. When do you think they'll be done? I'm not rushing you, I'm asking when you'd feel comfortable?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Probably Friday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Once that's done, we'll send a note out to the ALT to look at the Agenda where it is, make any suggestions. The target will be to get it updated by the end of Monday or so, with any comments from me and/or other ALT Members. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It is still on #7. Heidi, I saw on the Wiki page that you put the warning that the submission deadline is the 28th of February, which is not the case. If you look at the document submitted by Xavier it will finish on the 31st of January.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That is absolutely not what I've heard. The document I've seen, and I've spoken with Xavier, is that he fully intends to use Singapore as a time that we can speak with the ACs and SOs about their requests, and after that then the submissions would need to be in on the 28th of February, but I'll double-check that, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Please do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Policy development. There's a comment from Satish out there, on one of the IDN comments. Please take a look. He's drafting a statement so there may be two comments right now.   There are a number of statements on the release of country and territory names, which we've decided before we do not comment on.   We decided we're not commenting on the .jobs. The only thing we're looking at is the WHOIS Accuracy Pilot Study Report.   Does anyone have any feelings on that one? I've not looked at it yet at all. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a quick comment I'd like to have. I'll look and see if it impacts on anything else because we've said so much on WHOIS. I don't have time right now, but tomorrow or the next day I'll have a look at it and make a recommendation? Okay?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's look at what the deadlines are. Comment phase ends 27th of February. We have some time. go for it.

HOLLY RAICHE: I will do. Thank you. I've got to leave in about two minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right.   ATLAS recommendations we already talked about briefly. ALAC and next round of new gTLDs. The only activity we're explicitly working on right now is Tijani and to a lesser extent I and Evan are Members, and participants in the gNSO activity that's trying to scope out what the issues are. Tijani has raised the ones that I believe are of interest to At-Large, so they're on the list already. I do not believe that we are active in any other activity related to that, other than still trying to fix ground one, which is not insignificant. Related to that is, as I announced, there will be a small group meeting with some Members of the New gTLD Process Committee.

That meeting is now being held on January 22nd. Holly won't be able to make it unfortunately, and we've just found out that Marcus Kumar cannot make it, which is somewhat unfortunate because he's the Board Member selected on behalf of the Business Constituency, who's been the other vocal voice in the problems with the PICs. I'm not sure we have a choice. If we cancel that meeting we likely will not meet before Singapore, and I think it's important that we do meet before Singapore. So we're stuck with missing a key person on both sides, but so be it. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've just noted in my reply to that invitation, that's within an hour or so of my supposed landing in Sydney, so I'll do my best to join depending on where I am through customs, et cetera, but I'll just work with staff when I land. If it's still running, I'll get a call out, however.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. It looks like we're going to be a small group. Any other comments? Any Other Business? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is it possible for us to go in-camera for just a brief moment?

ALAN GREENBERG: yes, I think we can. I see Glenn has dropped off of the Adobe room. Ron is still on it. Ron, we'll need you to leave the room unfortunately, and we need confirmation from Adigo that they're off the bridge.

JULIE HAMMER: Do you want me to drop as well?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, Julie's fine.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]