

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone on today's ALAC Leadership Team call on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> of May, at 13:00 UTC. We have Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Leon Sanchez, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Julie Hammer. No apologies noted. Everyone is here today. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I missed the Doodle for a call following this one, and Olivier wasn't sufficient to get it changed, so we do have an overlap. I'm going to do my best to try and keep this to one hour. We'll see if I'm successful or not. Any changes to the Agenda or comments before we go ahead? Seeing none, the first substantive Item on the Agenda is the IANA stewardship and accountability update and next steps. I don't think we need an update at this point. There hasn't been a substantive amount of change since our last discussion of it. If anyone disagrees, let's see.

In terms of next steps, I think the challenge is going to be to get comments from other people. ON the CWG I should have my hopefully substantive comments posted by the end of the day and maybe that will attract a bit of input. I guess I'm requesting others on the ALT to do the same thing as soon as possible on both reports, and hopefully that will trigger either comments agreeing, disagreeing, or at least we'll start to

---

*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.*

---

form the basis for what the ALAC will be saying on these things. Any other thoughts on how we get people to wake up?

The reports are long, complex, and the issues, sadly, but I think we have to accept the reality, are not simple ones. People who haven't been involved, it's questionable to what extent they're going to make really substantive comments that fit within the framework of what we're talking about. It's easy to start from scratch and come up with new things that just don't fit because they're already been beaten to death or something. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a comment. A webinar today, which was a really good update - because I've sort of been following but not completely - it was a good update, and for those who haven't followed and haven't participated every single day, Alan, if we can have a webinar - and can we please have a webinar not at 1:00 Sydney time? This one was at 16:00 and it was terrific. For the APAC region, and those who haven't, even just making the slides available - just sending out a link to everybody saying, "For goodness sake, this stuff is easy to read if you haven't been following." It's just a suggestion but I know I found the webinar really helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Holly. There's certainly no reason we can't continue to remind people about the existence of the webinars, there as a resource. It may be too late for them to participate but there's no reason we can't

---

point to them. That should be on the RALO lists as well as on our general At-Large list. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. I think that, as I proposed before, the first draft that will be done by you for the CWG, it will be you and for CCWG, I don't know whom - they'll help people that didn't follow to understand at least the key points, because we raise the key points that are of concern to the At-Large community. It's right that the issue is very complicated for both tracks, but we have concerns on some points. So if we make them clear, the others can comment on them. I think that it's our duty, more or less.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't disagree at all. Certainly on the comments I'm working on, I'm trying to identify ones that are substantive from ones that in my mind need to be made but are not the ones that we really are focusing on. More specifically, what are the issues that if they don't change, or if the decisions don't get made essentially in our favor, that there's a potential that we will not accept the report because of it. Those I think are the really crucial ones. I think we owe it to our community to not just say no but to propose alternatives, and alternatives that we hope can be acceptable.

That's going to be the difficulty. Any other thoughts? No. Then we'll get a couple of minutes back and go onto the next Item. But I do encourage everyone, if you haven't read the reports, to read them, and

---

to the extent that you can summarize comments, or at least identify the key points that we, or you have problems with, let's do it. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to say just that - even just pointing a few things, what you think is important, it will actually give us a bit more fodder or at least support to what we're saying. I must share with you, when on the CWG calls, recently I did ask about the issue of jurisdiction within our own community. There hasn't been much feedback on it so I didn't pursue and ask that question on the wider CWG discussions, because I didn't feel there was enough support behind to actually make an issue out of this that would have to be debated by the whole CWG.

This is probably what we're looking for, to get more support, I guess. As you know, we're not just speaking as Alan, Olivier, Eduardo, Fatima, and just as ourselves, and Tijani, and all the people that are involved in the CWG and CCWG, but we actually have the support of our community. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you Olivier. One point I'll make - and I think it's an important one, we all have blinders on, to some extent, and we all have things that are important. I'll give an example from the side chat that was going on today during the CWG meeting. Olivier had mentioned that the post-transition ICANN Board must be multistakeholder, but the presumption was if it isn't multistakeholder it is registry.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Post-transition IANA Board. I think you said ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, post-transition IANA Board. That may well be the way some people are pushing - and it is; that it be registry-centric - but the opposite of multistakeholder is not registry. So we have to make sure we're not being too focused on a solution to make sure we're asking the right questions. Olivier and then Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think it's me now. Olivier, permit me to disagree with you, because even if you didn't feel there was support to the issue of jurisdiction, I think you have to put it since you think that it's an issue, and during this period, when we collect a comment on what we write or what we say, at the end, if there is no support to it we won't put it. But I don't think that we have to eliminate it from the beginning like this. Because yes, you spoke about it, but who was present? This is a problem. Who participated in it? This was the problem.

I don't think it was on the mailing list. It was on the Skye chat, I think. This is perhaps why there wasn't a lot of support. I think the people who reacted are all in support of you, so I don't know. I think that we need to put everything we think is an issue, is a concern for us, down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. I will add however flag these things as what the level of import is. If we, for instance, raise the issue of where companies are incorporated and say it's a "go to the wall" issue, we're likely to lose that

---

one. That doesn't mean we shouldn't raise it, but we need to consider, "Is this one that we consider a no-go decision? Or is this something we'd like to push to the extent we can?" Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I'll ask, as an individual, since we are individually also able to speak on this Working Group, I will ask on the mailing list and say if someone could remind me what our resolve was with regards to the issue of jurisdiction, why we settled for a US-based firm, and whether Sidley was ever asked to consider other jurisdictions. I'm not sure exactly how the process was at the time. I remember it was a little rushed, and I hope it will help in being able to shed some light over this. Then the discussion will take place on the mailing list rather than taking valuable time on the call. That's all I'll say on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Anything else? Seeing nothing else we'll go onto the next Item - the review of ICANN 53. I'll turn it over to Leon or Gisella - any comments from Leon that he can make to review any particular changes? Things that need the focus of the ALT? And we need to look at joint meetings to some extent, but I will let Gisella review any issues that are on the table right now before we go onto the joint meeting one. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan. I'm not sure if Leon is on already. We are dialing out to him.

LEON SANCHEZ: I am, Gisella, but I still have a bad throat.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry to hear that Leon. I'll just get back to the meetings. There has been a couple of changes since we last saw this table on the ALAC call. On Saturday we have added the RALO Chairs Meeting, which will take place from 10:00 to 12:00. From 12:00 to 13:00 we have the ALT Meeting with Rinalia. This time needs to be confirmed as she doesn't yet have the Board schedule, so there may be some last-minute change to that. Then that afternoon there won't be a meeting with David Olive, as he's coming to the ALT Meeting on the Friday morning, at the end of the BA Meeting.

So we'll have a RALO Chairs and ALT Meeting from 14:00 to 15:15, and then the usual ALT Closed Meeting from 16:00 to 18:00, followed by dinner. The RALO Chairs will be joining us for the dinner as well, as decided last time. The change here is on Wednesday. On Wednesday we have the Capacity Building Working Group Meeting, which will be from 9:00 to 10:00, at the same time as the Board and GAC Meeting. This is Tijani's request, and we have planned space for that. We've added the Technology Taskforce on Monday afternoon from 14:00 to 15:00.

Otherwise, no further changes. As Alan says, we've got some joint meetings that need to be decided on, and that will also have a knock-on effect on the schedule you're seeing now. That's all update from me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We have a request from Holly to allocate some time to look at the proxy/privacy service PDP, that is currently out for comment. It has an extensive comment period, until July, so there's no great rush. The issues are complex and there are some relatively split positions within the Working Group. We will allocate some time hopefully during one of our regular meetings. Holly, I know you want a lot of time for that, and we're not likely to get it. I certainly can't see putting more than half an hour into that, and even that is going to be tight.

We're going to need offline input from you as to whether you're going to be able to manage with that, or whether we need to set up something for the ALAC that's outside of the regular meetings, to try to give a little bit more time. I don't want to discuss it here, but it's something we're going to have to work on quickly, because if we need an out-of-bounds meeting then it's going to be hard to find the time for it. The ones we do need to discuss, I think I sent something out.

We had yet another request from the CSG to join them for breakfast on Tuesday morning, and again, it conflicts with the Board Meeting, plus we can't do it earlier because we already have an existing meeting with the ccNSO earlier, which is unfortunate, because the CSG would provide us with breakfast. Nevertheless, those meetings have been useful in the past, and I regret we're not doing them anymore, because the schedule has been locked in to not allow it.



---

Number one, I want to make sure I have the support of the ALT in saying we'd prefer to have those meetings, and then we're going to have to figure out how to do it. The changes are we won't be able to do that for BA, but we may want to think about not locking in the ccNSO Meeting on Tuesday morning and leaving that open for the CSG if they're interested in scheduling one for the Dublin Meeting. Clearly we have to do this ahead of time. Coming in with a request this late is a little bit too late for our scheduling.

If there are any thoughts on that, or anyone disagreeing with me, then we'll all go ahead and try to start talking about the next meeting. We've had a request from the NCSG, from Rafik, to meet with them. We haven't met for a while. He didn't have any real topics to suggest. He did suggest the PIC issue, but I'm not sure that would be a productive meeting with the entire ALAC. Clearly a few of us who've been focusing on that could meet with the NCSG to see if we could convince them to move, but doing that in BA, to be honest, is coming into this game a little late.

Again, I'm not sure it's an ALAC Meeting overall. I think Rafik is more worried about the optics of us not meeting rather than having specific things to talk about. I know from my perspective that meetings with the NCSG have not always been all that productive, because people come into it with particular stances and all we seem to do is talk at each other. I think I'd like some input. Do we want to really try to do something at this meeting? Am I reading the tea leaves wrong and we do have something that can be used productively? Or is it politically astute to do it even if we have nothing to say? I'd like some input on that first. Anyone care?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. The issue of meetings with the NCSG is a complex one, exactly as you said. There doesn't seem to have been very much progress happening. The only thing that I would think though, there is some definite push from some quarters to have some kind of collaboration of civil society at ICANN, and I think there certainly is some ability to have collaboration in this matter. I'm still quite amazed that the points of view of some Members of the NCSG are diametrically opposed to the points of view of ourselves, and of the people that we are trying to promote the views of.

I can't understand how the interests of end users could be diametrically opposed to the interests of civil society! I thought that it was one and the same. So that's why I think we are having problems, and perhaps we should be discussing this. I wonder whether we should hit the nail on the head, and [unclear 20:03] it that there is a concern here. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll push the point slightly more than that. There's a concerted push in ICANN to have "civil society" represented, and the NCSG is in a strong position for a number of reasons, to claim that they are the civil society

---

voice in ICANN. You're right - very often their positions are exactly opposite to ours, and that's a concern. They may get the territory by us ceding it, essentially. I think that's something we have to worry about. Heidi, in the chat you said that we could have a 45-minute session with the NCSG on Sunday or Tuesday?

Sunday, the GNSO meets, so I don't think that's a possibility. Are you suggesting we cut out 45 minutes of the ALAC time to meet with the NCSG?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi Alan, yes, that was just a suggestion, and exactly for the reason Olivier noted - that there is now movement internally and within some of the civil society groups to work together, and that might be a good way to move forward on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

As I suggested, they're asking for a meeting. I'm not sure what the topics on the agenda are. Going into meetings with nothing particularly on the agenda does usually not end up with decent results. So we can try to carve out a meeting. Gisella, I don't know if there's any opportunity for a slot that we haven't used at this point. It doesn't have to have translation, so it might not have to be in our room if our room is being used for other things. Do you think there might be opportunities for slots we currently aren't using?

GISELLA GRUBER:

The slot on Sunday from 8:00 to 9:00?

ALAN GREENBERG: When does the GNSO start?

GISELLA GRUBER: I think they start at 9:00.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a possibility then. Why don't we suggest it to them? We're going to have to put the onus on both sides to come up with some topics. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I do agree with you, Olivier, that for some of the Members of the NCSG we have opposite positions, but in the CCWG we have that, and I think in the CWG also we have this same problem. Also, I'm opposed to having a meeting without a subject, without something to discuss. If we want to have a meeting with them we need to establish an Agenda to be effective, because we are using our very precious time in BA and you are speaking about Sunday.

Sunday, as you know, is the first day for the ALAC and some people arrive late, so perhaps beginning at 8:00 will be difficult, but if there is no other solution it is possible. But we need to have an agenda. We need to know what we'll discuss.

Coming back to the civil society, I don't think that someone is more representative of the civil society than the other. We, as end users, as

---

ALAC, most of our ALSes are ISOCs, for example, so they are civil society. I am civil society, I have an organization, and so on and so forth. I think that in ICANN, I know that George Sadowsky pushed a lot, very strongly, to have a civil society voice heard in ICANN. If we want this to happen, we have to go for that without complaints, without... We need to go there fairly, really to try to express the voice of civil society.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier, I'll give the floor to you, but try to be brief.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to suggest an agenda. We could have a very mundane agenda where we waste an hour of our time by saying, "Further collaboration between NCSG and ALAC." I think that will be totally sterile. Or we can hit the nail on the head. I would suggest a couple of topics. First, IANA stewardship and ICANN accountability; a comparison of our positions between the Members of NCSG and the Members of the ALAC. Topic one. Topic two, I was going to say other matters where we might have differences. Let's identify the differences first, so at least we put this out of the way, rather than just patting each other on the back and wasting time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was going to point out we don't need to set the agenda now. We need to be convinced we can set an agenda. You've just identified a few things. Gisella, I think we should go ahead. I'll send a note to Rafik and copy you in, and see if we can schedule it from 8:00 to

---

9:00 on Sunday. If that doesn't work, I'm not sure what we're going to do, but we will need to work on the Agenda. Thank you. The next Item is SSAC. SSAC has sent us a note saying do we want a meeting. We've normally met with SSAC. Is Julie on the call?

JULIE HAMMER: I am, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. Again, at a meeting where we're exceedingly pressed for time, are there substantive issues? Or is this a, "We can fill the time if we allocate it"?

JULIE HAMMER: I'd say if it's of interest to get an update on SSAC advisory, I'm not sure, but there may be a new advisory out before this meeting, but I'm not sure that that will happen. It's in the final stages at the moment, and it's on public [suffix 27:05] lists. Other than that, it would just be a normal update on the work that SSAC is doing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did you say what the topic is? I couldn't quite make it out.

JULIE HAMMER: It's on public [suffix] lists. But whether it is actually issued before the meeting or not, I don't think anyone really knows yet. But it is heading towards completion.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, then I'd suggest we allocate some time, and we can always adjust the schedule near the end. No one ever complains about having a meeting cancelled. 30 minutes should be sufficient? I can't see doing a lot more than that.

JULIE HAMMER: No. I think given the ALAC's tight schedule, that would be fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'll ask Gisella to try and arrange that. Any other issues we need to talk about regarding ICANN 53? I put a couple of things on the Board Agenda list. You might want to look at those. Essentially, the first one is the substantive issue of the ATRT Recommendation that parts of ICANN not funded by industry should be allowed to, or facilitated, to participate equitably. A linked one to that is a problem we have had and will continue to have if we continue to say it's difficult to get new people involved, but we're also in a position where when we have an experienced person for whom we cannot get a travel slot, they tend to disappear.

That's a real issue for us. It's not as much an issue for those who have private funding. So I think I'd like to discuss that with the Board. I suspect we may get some belligerent comments out of it, but I think we need to raise the issue. The other issue I've suggested as a smaller one is first of all, have we discussed here in the ALAC Meeting the potential postponement of the At-Large Review? Am I correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, you are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. When we had the meeting with Larisa Gurnick, one of the things that struck me is all of the people on the Working Party, the reaction was essentially, "Thank goodness. There was no way we could have done it according to the schedule that we were on." Yet all of us were like nice, little obedient people going ahead and pretending we could try. The question is, why? Is it simply because we're so used to having outrageous demands put on us?

Did we believe - and this is the answer for me - that if we had said we wanted to delay it we'd have been told, "Sorry, that's the schedule. We can't delay it. It's in the bylaws. Tough"? I'm really concerned that we go through processes like that without waving red flags. I think that's an issue worthy of bringing up at the Board Meeting. Anyway, take a look at the workspace please. If anyone has any comments either for or against those items, let's bring them out in the open so we can decide what it is we're presenting to the Board. Those are just my ideas. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: When you mentioned the inability of us to use experts or people of specific knowledge and bring them to an ICANN Meeting, I would like to remind you of one of the ATLAS II Recommendations that actually leads to asking for funding for those experts on specific topics, starting of



---

course with the RALO work that's taking place, in finding out what talent is out there within our Membership. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I didn't actually mention that topic, but it certainly can be included. I was looking more at the, as we're going into election and selection time, we tend to move people around, and then we get accused of simply shutting positions among our friends and not bringing new people in. At the same time, if we can't do that then we tend to lose the people who have been heavy contributors in the past. Anyway, I don't want to have the discussion right now, but if anyone else would like to add something to the pot on what we should talk to the Board about instead of those, or in addition to those, let's try to get that settled early. Anything else on the meeting?

All right, we have a zero-minute slot on the election/selection process. Anyone on staff, are there any issues that need to be brought to the ALT that need our attention? As far as I can tell, things are progressing as they should at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Everything seems to be going okay. The only RALO where we don't seem to have any candidates yet is EURALO, and I have been in touch with Wolf and he's aware that the deadline for nominations is this Friday, and he said he would try to get some very good ALAC Members to be nominated, as well as a NomCom candidate.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Does that presume the current ALAC Member is not seeking a reappointment? That's a question for the current ALAC Member, but if the current ALAC Member has not decided, he doesn't have to answer right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. In fact, there has been some discussions among EURALO Leadership as to whether we keep the status quo and everyone stays in their positions, or we start moving things around. There are discussions among a number of individuals. Unfortunately, no new faces. There has been several calls on the EURALO list for people to stand forward. There's been very little feedback on that, so you'll probably end up with the usual suspects proposing themselves at various positions.

At this moment, I could be going for ALAC slot for EURALO Chair slot or for Secretarial slot. That leaves it pretty open. I think it's pretty much the same with all of the others who are currently in positions in EURALO and on the ALAC, selected by the region. I'm sorry. It just takes time to do that, but as I said there's been very little feedback from others. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out, if there are no nominees by the close of the period, there is nothing to stop us from reopening another period. There is no real time constraint on the ALAC position or the other ones, other than early enough to make sure we have travel arrangements for Dublin. I would not feel pressured to meet that deadline, if indeed substantive

---

discussions need to be held first. Olivier, if you're not going to be the ALAC Member, we really need someone who's going to be able to participate heavily, so we take that into account.

No other hands? Then we go onto the next issue. The next Item on the Agenda is policy development. There are obviously the two comments on the CCWG, CWG, that are pending. There's a privacy/proxy one, which we're essentially putting on hold and will discuss in BA. I don't believe there are any other public comments open right now that we need to discuss. Ariel, have I missed anything?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks Alan. You didn't miss anything.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll thank Olivier for putting together that rushed one on the budget. A superb piece of drafting, and it made life a lot easier. Heidi, was there any reaction to that from your side? Do we get a thank you letter from David?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Not yet.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Maybe he doesn't want more staff. I don't know.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, I'm going to be on the FY16 call with ALAC on Friday, when that Item might be discussed.

ALAN GREENBERG: That conflicts with something else, doesn't it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, it does, in NARALO, but Silvia will be the lead on the NARALO candidate call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I will not be on the FY16 one, I guess. All right, anything else on public comments? If not, we're still a little behind but we're getting close. FY16 special requests, next steps. It has my name on it but I don't have anything to say. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, today there will be a call of the FBSC with Rob Hogarth and there will be discussions on details of the FY16 special requests that have been approved, and a long session for Q&A. I expect that to be a very interesting session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else on this topic? If not, we're back on time. Thank you. The next Item is the CCWG on gTLD Auctions.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, sorry, I just wanted to raise the plate of the one FY request that was approved for on GA. We have created a page of all the GAs that are in staff's collective memory as a guide to the ALT or ALAC in selecting whether EURALO or NARALO will get the GA.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, that is an item we have to think about. I guess that will be discussed on today's FBSC call. I'm presuming it will be. CCWG on gTLD Auctions. I missed the request to... Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, I had my hand up for the previous one. Just quickly to remind you, there's a call tomorrow to discuss with Members of the Board Finance Committee the statement that the ALAC has drafted with regards to the FY16 budget.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's the meeting Heidi mentioned.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, that's not. The meeting she mentioned was the one tonight, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we said tomorrow - the one that conflicts with NARALO.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, sorry. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to say that today, for the FBSC, we can also discuss or prepare our contribution to the finance call that will be done for ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not sure what the contribution is supposed to be, but we'll let you talk about that at the meeting. Anything else, before I try and go onto the next Item for the third time? Okay, going, going, gone. That Item is now closed. CCWG on the use of gTLD auction proceeds. I missed the call for the ALAC to name one of two people for the Drafting Group for the Charter for that Group. It was supposed to be kicked off this week. Gisella, I haven't actually seen an Agenda Item. Has a Doodle gone out? Or what's the exact status of that right now? Is anyone with us who knows the status of that?

GISELLA GRUBER: Was that for the new gTLD auction proceeds?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. What's the status? I see there's no meeting scheduled. Is there a Doodle out if we have named people who could have been answering this?

GISELLA GRUBER: I believe not, but I'll get confirmation from Glenn. We're still waiting for a name or max a couple of names from the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so the question is for the ALT do we put out a general call? Do we name someone? What are your thoughts on this? We don't have a lot of time, if we don't want to miss a substantive part of the Drafting Team, but at this point apparently we're not too late. My suggestion would be to put out a call to the ALAC for names they can forward. But have people either volunteer or make suggestions, but the ALT make the selection, because we don't have a lot of time to play games on this one. I think it is an important issue.

Does that sound like an acceptable way? Of course, if there's anyone on the ALT who wants to put time into this then clearly there is an opportunity to put your own name up. All right, seeing two ticks, no negative marks, we'll all put an Action Item for myself to do that. We'll go onto the next Item - the review of the ALAC monthly call. I only have two Items I want to focus on. One is the budget statement. I was going to thank Olivier but I already did. That got done. The other one is next step on the PICs.

I had an AI to find out what happened at the Board Retreat on that one, and the answer is nothing - at least no decisions were made. We're not likely to see a decision before BA, so the question is what do we want to do next? There have been calls for us to put out yet another strong statement demanding a freeze. My personal position is I don't see a lot

---

of merit in that. We still have something on the table that's not been addressed. I do think it's reasonable for us to send out triage document out for wider distribution, and I believe I already have an AI to clean up that document and get that sent out.

I guess we need to send something formally in response to Cherine's message, which essentially said, "Thanks for the good conversation, it's over now," but I'm not quite sure what the content of that should be. I guess I'd value input from people as to how strong we should take this at this point. We know that there is moderately little the Board can do. On the other hand, they seem to be taking unilateral action outside of formal process on generic TLDs. There seem to be some that de facto are being held up, even though it's not clear how or why.

There is some discussion going on within the Board on what should be done with generic privately owned TLDs, some of which have already been delegated. It's not quite clear what the feeling is on the Board, but whether they can take any unilateral action. We know to-date they've not chosen to take any on this particular issue, and to be honest I don't think they're going to, but what else is it we can ask for? Anyone have any thoughts? Olivier? Cheryl? You're the two people who've been most involved with this. Holly and then Olivier?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a question - do we know what the GAC things? Because that's the other part that's been really involved, and for that matter, is there a possibility of some joint questions that possibly would carry more weight? Just a thought. Thank you.



ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, what the GAC thinks of course is a difficult issue, because the GAC doesn't necessarily think in a unified mind. It's an open issue with the GAC, and I'm sure it's going to be discussed in BA. How strong they stick to their guns on this one, and they have not been particularly strong in the past, because there have been a number of voices - partly the US and, to a lesser extent, the European Commission - who've basically said, "It's important, but we don't want to go to the wall on this, and we don't' really want to be seen as stopping the progress and commerce."

The person in the European Commission on the GAC who is pushing the issue is a little bit more strident than her predecessors now, and we may see a bit of difference in this meeting than we have in the past. So the answer is it's not clear. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

There's been so much going on this week on so many topics, it's been difficult to keep everyone updated. I've had a couple of calls, or some correspondence with a few people since we last spoke about this, which was a couple of weeks ago. First, I had a talk with Ron Andruff on this. AS you know, Ron Andruff is from the BC, and has been one of the flag-bearers of this whole process.

I have explained to him the proposal that I made to the ALAC during our last call, which was to clean up that triage document, which we have, and then share it with the ALAC and get everyone on the ALAC, and then At-Large should contribute and comment, and perhaps make amendments to that document. At least that document would be

---

actually out in the open. I was also going to share the full account of the meeting. I can't remember whether we've sent that to the ALAC list or not, but I haven't heard any opposition or mention of this document not being able to be shared.

I think if we were given the green light to share it, with the preamble explaining that the Board New gTLD Committee was just there as a facilitator and was not there as a participant to make any decision, as such. That was the step forward. I told Ron that this was the way that I would be pushing the ALAC to go forward with, so as to really start showing that we're not just dealing with a large group of registries that are not wishing to speak - in fact, some of them are actually within a line that we think is actually quite defensible, or implementing a number of safeguards, which we think are pretty good.

We just don't understand why the others are not, and are effectively trying to divide the overall position at the moment. In fact, I'm not even sure if those registries that are concerned, that are in the green, are actually aware of what's going on in the discussions that we had - those side discussions - in Singapore, and that we followed up on a conference call. So that's one thing. I'm certainly very disappointed with the process, and you've heard about this before, but I think we need to be constructive in this.

The status quo is just not going to lead us anywhere, because time is actually going against us. The longer this goes, the more likely there will be an incident that will take place, as more and more new gTLDs are being used and are being not only rolled out, but actually embraced by

---

end users, but also embraced by fraudsters out there. We need to try and go around this and work quickly. First thing.

Second thing, yes, you are correct - the new lady in the European Commission has taken that on. She's now mandated one of her colleagues to prepare an in-depth document for the GAC, and putting the points and the views of the ALAC in that document as well. So we need to work with that person, and collaborate with them to help them put together a document that's both punchy enough, but also clear enough for GAC Members to understand what the stakes are, what the danger is. Something that is clear for them to be able to say, "Hang on, we need to do something about that."

From what I've heard, I think one of the key governments in that, being the US, has not been very vocal at all in this topic recently. We are nearing an election year very soon, and I think that it would be very dangerous for a US representative to actually not at least object to something that would serve the public interest, rather than commercial interest. Just speculation on my part.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, do you know who it is that's drafting the document?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, it's a chap called [Matierge Tomajeski 52:02] from Poland. [Matierge] works at the European Commission with Megan Richards, the lady that you alluded to earlier.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Just very briefly - one of the things that we did discuss at the ALAC Meeting was that this is matter that probably should be on the Agenda for the ALAC/GAC discussion. I'm assuming it still is on the Agenda, or will be, for the [days 52:31] Holly was raising. I think, to somebody's point as to whether the greener of those out of the triage list are aware, I think that's a very important point that needs to be followed up on. But we could of course make that clear in the Agenda, if such part of that meeting between the GAC and the ALAC was not a closed meeting but a public one.

I'm quite sure... For example, I know the .pharmacy people are watching fairly closely. But [trying 53:10] to get one or two of those wrong, and they will very quickly spread the word to the like-minded others, and I think it's important that we do get that out there. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. We haven't set a specific agenda, but I can't imagine this item not being on the agenda for our joint meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You said that on the ALAC Meeting, but clearly it wasn't clear enough for Holly to have raised it as quickly in this conversation. So perhaps we do need to be clearer, Alan.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

I am making it very clear. There is no way that will not be on the agenda for the GAC Meeting. I'll ask staff to prompt me, because I don't know the formal process for setting the agenda for the GAC Meeting, but to the extent we need to do it, we should be doing that. I'll comment on something Olivier said: if we're not careful and we don't do something quickly there will be an incident. I'll be blunt - until we have an incident we're not likely to get a lot of action. I think an incident is what we want to happen, and presumably it will at some point.

But that's' what we need to counter the argument of, "We're not seeing any problems yet!" So that's perhaps not the elegant way of addressing this kind of problem, but it tends to be very effective. Real disasters do generate action. Any other points on our Agenda? We've finished the last Item, other than Any Other Business, and I've had no requests for Any Other Business. Is there anything anyone wants to raise quickly? Oliver and I might actually get to our meeting on time.

Seeing no hands, thank you all. It's been compressed, but I think we covered most of the Items we needed to cover. Let's try and follow up. We have a fair number of follow up items for this. Thank you. Olivier, I'll see you on another call.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**