
GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Thursday, 30th of April at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Glenn McKnight, Maureen Hilyard, Beran Gillen, Eduardo Diaz, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Vanda Scartezini, León Sanchez, Fatima Cambroneró. We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Judith Hellerstein, Evan Leibovitch, Aida Noblia.

We don't currently have anyone on the French nor Russian channel.

Apologies noted from Holly Raiche, Hadja Ouattara, Sandra Hoferichter.

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

Julie Hammer has joined in the meantime, welcome Julie.

[CROSSTALK] ...are Isabelle and Claire. And on the Russian channel, Galina and Ekaterina.

If I could please remind everyone to say their names before speaking for transcript purposes, and also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other channel, which is very important, and to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

Thank you and over to you Alan.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. The agenda... If anyone looked at the agenda more than about 10 minutes ago, it has been updated since then, so you may want to pull a new copy if you have a local copy. Are there any items that need to be added to the agenda?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we will assume that the agenda is adopted as presented. We're omitting today, any chair's remarks and also action items in that, oops, the action items didn't get omitted. They should have been omitted. And that we're rather tight and there doesn't seem to be anything that needs to be said that isn't otherwise going to be brought up some time later.

The first item on the agenda, therefore, is the policy development activities. We are pretty clean in that most of the recent public comments, we decided that there does not need to be any comment, for one reason or another. And the only comment that we have outstanding is the one on the CWG IANA, and we will be talking about that later in the agenda.

So I don't think there is any further discussion needed here, unless I see a hand or hear a voice. Not... Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And as far as the budget is concerned, ICANN draft fiscal year 16 operating plan and budget, you will have noticed an email from ICANN finance that they were allocating someone to be able to speak to us about our statements regarding the budget.

Since there is not going to be any statement, are we still going to have that meeting with that person, or call with that person to discuss things with them?

ALAN GREENBERG: Good question. Do we have a need for such a meeting? Do we want to discuss anything more? Is Tijani in a position to talk? Tijani, go ahead.

Can't hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. The main objective was sent before he knows who have already [inaudible]. And I don't think they will have any call with us, so we don't have comment. The calls are meant to understand the comments, to not misunderstand the comments, to understand them well so that we can respond to them, they can answer the comments, or they can consider the comments, for the next version.

So, I don't think that we will have any call with them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Olivier, any further follow-up?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. No further follow-up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. All right. The next item on our agenda is the review of current ALS applications and status. Can I turn that over to Silvia, I guess? Or is it Natalie?

SIVLIA VIVANCO: [Inaudible] to review the application.

ALAN GREENBERG: But Natalie does not seem to be on the call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, correct. So we have... This is Heidi. So we have recently certified a few ALSs. We are now up to 188. So that 200 mark is in sight. We now have an ISOC chapter in India, [inaudible], ISOC Korea, and in LACRALO, in Haiti, the first one there. In EURALO, ISOC Russia. And currently no ALSs are being voted on. And we are processing a due diligence for AFRALO, ISOC Zimbabwe. And regional advice has been waiting for LACRALO, for Nicaragua, and AFRALO the high tech [inaudible]... And that is the update Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a question, is Maureen on the call?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes I am.

ALAN GREENBERG: When you have a chance, and it's not formally part of your job, can you check...? There was some discussion from our liaison from the ccNSO, about a chapter, a NARALO chapter in Latin America. And he talked about it, I think, in the Singapore meeting, but I never heard anything back on that.

If you are chatting with him at any point, in a meeting or something, perhaps ask him what the status is.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sure, will do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anything else on ALSs?

If not, then we're making up for, not lost time, but time we don't have. The next item is reports. The reports presumably have been filed. Can I have a report from staff just to what extent...? I didn't give you warning that I was asking you this. To what extent do we actually have reports this month? And is there anyone who has filed a report that wants to say just a couple of words on the issues that need particular focus?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. We will need just a few minutes to let you know the information, and we'll put it in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I'm going to provide you with a few details of the GNSO liaison report. The call, the monthly call, took place already a few weeks ago. And there were just a few things that took place, not that many that really require any movement on our behalf. There was an amendment to amend the chart, the IGO, INGO, access to curative rights protection mechanisms PDP working group.

Their just amending it so as to be able to work a little bit further than the initial charter then they had. And I don't it affects us specifically. One thing, though, that is of importance, that the GNSO Counsel is now putting together a template to be able to get feedback to GAC communiqués. And that's because much of the information on the GAC communiqués relate to generic top level domains, and it has been hard to respond to significant, to specific parts of the GAC communiqués.

So they're now putting together a template where they would then be able to then choose whether this is a GNSO related matter, whether this could be a PDP related matter, etc, etc. So they're organizing themselves to be able to respond to GAC communiqués. The rest of the meeting were to do with updates on the cross community working group on accountability and on IANA stewardship transition.

So there were updates from the various chairs on this. And then there was a discussion on the proposed ICANN fiscal year 16 budget. And in fact, today, the proposed statements of the GNSO council was presented. I expect that there will be some amendments to it before it

is filed. However, one of the points that is made in there is that about, when one looks at the draft fiscal year 16 budget by portfolio and projects, you'll find out that 20 second full-time equivalency people will support policy development, which is about 8% of the total staff of ICANN, of the total full-time equivalent for all of ICANN.

And there is a concern that there is a probably likely to be a lot more policy work to take place in the forthcoming years, and yet there has been absolutely no intake this year. In fact, all of the hires that are forecast for fiscal year 16 will not be in policy development. So since the ALAC is also under this same budget as far as policy development is concerned, there might be some interest in actually looking at this, and perhaps working on something in the same direction as that.

I don't know. I'll leave it to the ALAC to discuss and to see if it wants to actually engage, and to also be concerned about that. A part from that, not much else to report. There were a number of reports, very few decisions made in this month's GNSO council call. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you Olivier. That's an interesting issue, and of course, we have one day, in theory, to comment. Let's defer to that until a little bit later in the meeting, but let's put it back on and perhaps we'll stand up and make a decision at this meeting, to whether we want to take some action on that.

JULIE HAMMER:

Nothing from me Alan. Julie Hammer speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Julie. Nothing else? Olivier, that's an old hand I presume. And we are making moderately good time. And we'll go right ahead.

And I see we do have some reports and we are still awaiting others. Talking in terms of RALO reports.

All right. Next item is, we have 20 minutes allocated to the Buenos Aries meeting. I think, presume this one, we will turn over to Gisella and León, and Maureen, is that a new hand?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, sorry Alan. I just wanted to add that, to my report, just a reminder to the leadership team to help us with a, how fast was the formation of an agenda for the joint meetings. And [inaudible]? Sorry, I have somebody mowing the lawn right outside my door.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I didn't quite catch what you said, but it's something related to Buenos Aries, so I'm hoping that either León or Gisella heard you. Who is taking the...

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I didn't hear that. I didn't hear that, I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now that the lawnmower is gone, can you repeat that Maureen?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The lawnmower is still here. It's Olivier. I could jump in.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I heard correctly, it's just a reminder to the leadership team to put together an agenda for the meeting of the ALAC with the ccNSO. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. So if we can have the draft schedule so far in the Adobe Connect room, that will be very useful. And well, as you know, we have a couple of changes in our program for Buenos Aries. We have switched some of the traditional meetings into different timeslots on our week in Buenos Aries.

We were experimenting with this since Singapore, and we have some mixed results. I would say that some were positive, some were not positive. But I think this time, the program on the schedule looks far better than it did in Singapore, but that is mostly thanks to Gisella's involvement.

So, I want to thank Gisella for keeping us on track with this. And this version will be, of course, circulated to the list after this call. And I think it will be useful to check on whether those of you that will be attending

the Buenos Aries meeting, have already booked your travels. And if you haven't, or you have any kind of problems with booking your travel, this is the time for rating it and letting the staff, that you haven't concluded your travel plans.

So the staff will be able to assist you. So is there anyone at this point that has had any kind of problems booking your travels for Buenos Aries, or anyone that happens to see if maybe the [inaudible] emails from constituency travel, etc., I see Tijani Ben Jemaa's hand is up. So Tijani, can you please take the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you León. Yes, yes. León. As you know, we will have [inaudible] meeting on Friday. And the arriving day sent for me didn't consider that. I waited until the staff from the CCWG sent the information to the constituency travel. And then I reminded them of that and [inaudible] told me that your arrival date will be on Thursday.

I sent my travel request, and Dominique sent me, from constituency travel, sent me an email saying that I have to pay the night from Thursday to Friday, because normally I have to arrive on Friday. So I think it is only a mistake, and I will continue getting this done until they fix it. That's all. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much for pointing this out Tijani. This is something that has happened not only to you, but of course, other members that are part of the CCWG. And I, as soon as you do, [inaudible], but I would like

to, of course, kindly ask staff to coordinate with the CCWG staff in order to check whether we all have our correct arrival and departure dates, pass that along to constituency travel.

So we don't have any problems with hotel bookings or end up paying some nights that we wouldn't need to otherwise. Now I see Alan Greenberg's hand is up, so Alan could you please take the floor?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. Let's not spend time on the meeting with all of the ALAC and RALO leaders here, talking about travel issues. But if anyone does have travel issues, contact me, contact Heidi. Please, don't wait, don't presume it's going to get fixed, contact both of us and we'll make sure that it does get fixed, or that the issue is explained. But let's not spend time on our meetings here talking about the details. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. So, Gisella would you like to walk us through, in a really quick fashion, through our draft schedule for the Buenos Aries meeting?

GISELLA GRUBER:

León, Gisella here, thank you very much. As you can see, the schedule on the screen, I have put just for reference, starting on Thursday the 18th, with the various meetings, up to until we officially start our ALAC meetings. Please note that on Saturday, the agenda hasn't yet been finalized, but the ALT will be meeting. So we start our ALAC meetings on Sunday.

Unfortunately, due to the very heavy schedule yet again of the IANA transition and accountability meetings, we had tried to refrain from starting at 7 AM and going on until later in the evening, but unfortunately, yet again, it has been difficult and challenging to be able to get in the relevant working groups for this meeting.

So even over lunch, we will be meeting. On the Sunday, it's a very long day for all of those attending the accountability as well, and it finishes at 8 PM, but then we'll have our usual ALAC sessions with the At-Large review working party as well as metrics meeting. On Monday, we have one RALO meeting, which is the NARALO meeting, again at lunchtime.

And please note that all of the RALO meetings, as well as the working group meetings, I will send an email to the RALO chairs and to the working group chairs, with the time and the date prior to the [inaudible] meeting forms, but the schedule does need to be finalized by early next week latest.

We have, on the Monday we have avoided to schedule any other calls accept for the NARALO meeting, due to the scheduling of all of the other various meetings, as well as the Welcome Ceremony. On Tuesday we have our meetings with the ccNSO, with the Board, where we still need to get the agenda setup, sorry, with the ccNSO as well. Thank you Maureen for reminding us.

And we have the GAC meeting. Fortunately there, we have 15 minutes in between each meeting to make our way to the various rooms. Our usual ALAC work part one and part two, and the IANA issues working group. What you see after the IANA issues working group there is

basically just as a placeholder intending to extend the IANA issues working group meeting that day.

And that will depend on the progress made between now and then. You'll have the accessibility meeting group at lunchtime again. Wednesday, a pretty full schedule as well, starting with the 7 AM, bright and early, APRALO meeting, going on to the capacity meeting. We haven't scheduled anything opposite the Board and GAC meeting, as I'm sure many people will be interested in attending that.

We've got our LACRALO At-Large regional leadership meeting. AFRALO, African, which is usually always at the same time. And to end the day, an ICANN Academy, as well as the LACRALO showcase. So again, a very full day, running from 7 AM to 8:30 PM. And Thursday, we've got the CWG and the CCWG working sessions, which unfortunately, is made us to split our wrap-up session. So we'll have a bright and early wrap-up session part one, and then the usual 12 to 13:30, followed by the public forum.

And on Friday morning, the ALT session from 9 to 12. This is not yet set in stone. It has taken a long time to try and work every, all the meetings out and get all of the meetings scheduled in. We are fully aware that there are times when it will be a back to back meeting, but please do bear with us while we've had to deal with these challenging, scheduling again.

So if there is any feedback, please don't hesitate to email staff and León, and we will look into the, any feedback that you have on this. And that's all I have to say. Thank you León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much for this very clear explanation, Gisella. I see Tijani's hand is up. So Tijani, could you please take the floor?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, León. I would like to ask, what is the rationale behind having any meeting of a working group, while the Board and the GAC are meeting?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Gisella, would you like to comment on that? Or Alan maybe?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll comment. I've received feedback, at times, that people would like to be able to go to that. So we tried to keep it open. If anyone has a specific meeting they would like to hold in parallel with that, and don't believe there will be a real conflict, we certainly can do that.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much for this Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. Thank you very much Alan. This is very helpful because, as you see, the schedule is full, and the capacity building working group would like to have a meeting in Buenos Aires, and I don't see any other slot of time, where there is not a conflict with either our ALAC meetings or the CCWG meeting, and the other

commitment I have in other working groups, so thank you very much. If it is possible to have a capacity working group at the same time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just deal with León and Gisella.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. We'll definitely develop that. And we'll come back to the proposal.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I'll note one thing. Unfortunately, breakfast is included in the room, in Buenos Aires, which means, in general, for early meetings, there will not be an early breakfast provided in the meeting. So it means you've got to get up an extra 10 minutes early and find your breakfast in the breakfast room before the meeting start. So another slight inconvenience. Any other questions?

While the Adobe Connect room is disappearing. Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. This is Judith Hellerstein for the record. Glenn, and I, and Dev were talking. We don't see a session for the technology taskforce. And so I was wondering about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: León?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes Judith. Thank you. We didn't receive any requests for the technology taskforce, so far that I can remember. And I believe we could still fit that in, but I would definitely need to look into that with details, along with Gisella. But I think, we don't have any available slots at this time. So maybe there should be a need, or there would be a need to have your session parallel to another meeting, or maybe if fits, [inaudible] you are taking care of are not hot topics, or really urgent matters to take care of, maybe we can setup, as an alternative of course, remote meeting.

But we'll definitely need to look into that, so if you could please, Judith or Dev, drop me a line with the details, which kind of a meeting you would like to hold. That would be very useful. And we could see if we can accommodate, or if we would otherwise ask you to hold a remote meeting.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Find a spot, can we take that spot? I know that you want to leave with the Board and the GAC, but we can take that spot.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, it's Alan. If you see a spot you think is reasonable for, that is, the people you want at the meeting, would likely be available, then tell Gisella and León. It's not, it won't be obvious just because a spot in our agenda there is a room available. So if you see a spot that you think will

work, let them know. If we can accommodate it, we will. If we can't, we will say something.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you Judith. So any other comments or questions with regards to our schedule for Buenos Aries?

Good. So, this is the update we have for our Buenos Aries meeting. I'll now turn it back to Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of other items related to the Buenos Aries meeting. We do have a session with the Board. I believe we've sent out... I believe a message was sent out talking about the new Board format. Am I correct or did I imagine that? Nobody remembers.

I'll describe it. There will be a one on one between the ALAC and the Board. It will be a Board table, roundtable setup with approximately six Board members and six representatives from the ALAC or At-Large, that we select, and we specify the topic. We have to know ahead of time. You will recall, at the last meeting, we had what I consider to be the most successful Board ALAC meeting. And the topic ended up being, why aren't Board ALAC meetings more productive?

Partly as a result of this, and partly because other people were coming to the same conclusion, the format of these meetings have been changed quite a bit. And we will be trying this new format for the first time. We're looking for questions or issues to discuss. I do have one, or two of them actually, that are linked, that I will be sending out a note about, but essentially, it's the substantive issues that we have in At-Large.

How do we get people involved and get them to be active workers when they're not funded by other organizations? If a registry, for instance, has a really good worker, and that person is funded to come to the meeting to start with, someone else often mentors them, they're not expected to produce the first meeting or two, unlike someone who is now on the, suddenly on the ALAC.

And if they're no longer on a working group, there is a good chance their employer will keep on funding them. We're in a situation where that doesn't happen. So we're in an awkward position getting people in. We're in an awkward position keeping them around if they're no longer occupying a job. And that's a substantive issue that I think we need to look at.

And it's linked, essentially, to being users and not having employers that are interested in seeing us work in ICANN. So that's my subject. I'm going to flush it out a little bit and I'll be sending it around. If anyone has a competing subject, then certainly bring it forward, and we'll see where we go from there.

Yes Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So if I understand correctly, this is going to be the ALAC meeting with the Board then, or is this an additional session?

ALAN GREENBERG: [CROSSTALK] this is the new format of the ALAC meeting with the Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And I note this is a one hour meeting that we're having with the Board, as we usually have, from 8:30 to 9:30 on Tuesday. Is there space for a second topic, or are we going to have just a single topic to discuss with the Board? [CROSSTALK] and what Board members are we likely to have?

ALAN GREENBERG: The one I suggested is a link to, two topics that are linked, but I'm not trying to say that this is the topic we'll be discussing. We could have two unrelated topics if we want to divide the time. And I'm sorry, I didn't hear what your last question was.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Yes, thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So what I was going to suggest then is, because this sounds more like an organizational matter, and I think we do have one specific problem at the moment, which is

the pick. The public interest commitments. And I wondered it was again, time for the ALAC to put this in front of the Board. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Certainly we can have that discussion. I don't think we have the time today to have a substantive discussion on it, but we need to come to closure sometime in the next couple of weeks. So you're free to raise it and we'll see where we go.

Anything else? Then we will go on to the next item. We are a little bit ahead of schedule, so that's good. The next one is the establishment of an At-Large meeting strategy working party. We decided that we were likely to do that in Singapore. At that point, it was not clear what the next step was. There were some belief that ICANN was going to be doing a survey first before, feeding us information before we started our active work.

That appears not to be the case. So we will go ahead and form a group. Heidi, do you want to talk about it? But I know the call just went out, I think today.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. Hi everyone. This is Heidi. Very briefly, this is a new ad-hoc group. It is being requested that at least one member from each RALO be on the group, but besides that there is no limit to membership. The call for nominations for membership will be open until the 6th of May, and then the first call of the new group will be held the week of the 11th.

And they are going to be asked to look at the meeting B schedule, that is the middle meeting, which is a new only AC/SO meeting, under the new meeting strategy. And to provide feedback to the ALAC on the plans for that. And also to represent the ALAC in any meetings in BA and onwards with the meeting P, on this new meeting strategy. And I think that's it Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Any questions, comments?

Seeing no hands, hearing no one calling out, and we're done with that one then.

The next one is, again, a short item...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani has his hand up. Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. [Inaudible] Alan, to raise my hand [inaudible]. I think we had one member from RALO that represented ALAC in the meeting strategy working group. And I don't know if you want to form another group, it is okay, but I think that you have to run those people since they know better [inaudible], the content of this new strategy, how to [inaudible] the spirit behind it.

So I don't know, it seems to me to be more or less a new structure that you create, for the meeting strategy working group, why do you have people that are really involved in the meeting strategy working group? And designed those, the new strategy. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. A couple of thoughts on that. First of all, I think this is what we decided in Singapore, but certainly we can re-think it. We're not limiting the number of people on it, so there is certainly nothing stopping those people from participating in it. Some of them may choose not to, but that's, you know, a call on each of them. From my perspective, I think it is worthwhile getting some other people involved.

I'm not saying exclude the ones who are on the original group, but getting other people involved to make sure that that, you know, we're looking at all of the current issues, and not just focused on why the decision was made originally, but how is it going to be implemented within At-Large.

So I have no problem with the existing people participating, and I suspect most of them would. And I presume you would. But that doesn't say we can't have some other fresh blood and fresh ideas come into this, as we look at how we go forward and make it work for At-Large. So that was the concept. The original group, we were limited to one per RALO, one per region, and there doesn't seem to be any reason to limit it in this case.

Does that sound reasonable Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else? Last call. All right. The next item is the, just discussion of the various election, selections that are going on. NARALO already started, and each of the other regions is in a position where some of them are naming chair and RALO leadership. Everyone, I think, is in a position where they have to identify an ALAC member. And everyone is in a position where they have to identify a person to be recommended to the ALAC to be a NomCom delegate.

Heidi, do you want to go into the little details of the, in terms of the timing? NARALO, by the way, for those who are not aware, have a mandated 30 day nomination period. So it had to start earlier.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan. This is Heidi. We can see that the schedule is up on the screen, so you'll see that there, it starts today. The call will be going out very shortly, we're just translating it. And then there is going to be 10 working days for the nomination period, 30th of April through 9th of May. Deadline for nominations will be the 16th of May. Followed by, if required, elections between the 18th and 25th of May.

And then the new ALAC members will take their seats at the close of the ATM in Dublin. Just two points to remind everyone if you're thinking of running. Is that all nominees will need to have, to send in to staff an expression of interest. I will see a post, as well as update or create a

statement of interest. And the first expression of interest is primarily a note on why you believe you would make a good candidate, a good member of the ALAC.

And then the other position being announced today are the ALAC delegates of the NomCom. Scroll down just a little bit. They're going to be running on the same schedule, and they will, the new class, 2016, will start likely at the end of the AGM, in Dublin. And I think that's it Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. So whoever scrolled, scrolled past the section on the NomCom, but never mind. Any questions, comments? Good, we're making up more time. Last chance for hands...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, Cheryl here. Trying to raise my hand in time. Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Just to be clear, so no one is confused with what Heidi said regarding the NomCom delegates. It is in fact a requirement, if you are planning on serving as a NomCom delegate, that if the ALAC does appoint someone from a region, whether or not they have been put forward by the regional advice that is always asked for, that person does need to be available for the Dublin meeting, because the work of the new NomCom does actually begin formally at the close of the AGM.

But there will be meetings held both during the later part of the week in the Dublin planning, for both the outgoing members who are able to get

themselves there by other unsupported ways, and the new NomCom members who will have a transition meeting. And they will start their first two or three days, depending on how long it tends to run, of actual formal work, after the close of the Dublin meeting.

So we have had situations in the past, sadly, where people are appointed and then go, "Oh, sorry. Didn't realize we had to be here for a couple of days or had to make that meeting." It is important that anyone that the ALAC does appoint is available to attend all of the important face to face meetings that the NomCom runs, because we do have situations, luckily not from ALAC people at the moment, where their sitting in the seat, but not apparently available for some of the actual meetings. And that isn't good enough. So let's not have ALAC fall into that trap. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl for clarity, that is a funded position, but you must actually be available to travel.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, it's available.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, but as you started, it wasn't 100% clear that they just had to be there, or we would provide them with a mechanism for being there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But it is the new NomCom that are funded.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. This is just to make you know that the process has started in AFRALO today, and the nomination has already begun. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking for the transcript. And the question here, with regards to the listed ALAC member [inaudible] by the NomCom, just to make sure, the ones that are listed here are the ones who come up at the end of their term, I believe then. I see AFRALO, APRALO, and LACRALO having the ALAC member selected by the NomCom listed. Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: Will someone please put the screen, put the right part in the screen? That's not the right part right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. If you want...

ALAN GREENBERG: I will be glad to do it, but someone else is also moving it at the same time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They're all hyperlinked. You can click on the page itself, and look at the page separately.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The problem is if a presenter or host moves the screen, even though you have scrolling ability, it moves by themselves. Okay. Now what is the point you're making? Olivier, now that we seen the screen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks. The question is, further down the screen, under the regional selections, in the AFRALO table, the ALAC member listed, ALAC member as selected by the NomCom is listed, in the APRALO, the ALAC member as selected by the NomCom listed, and the LACRALO regional selection, the ALAC member as selected by the NomCom is given. Are these the three people whose term is ending this year, and...?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That was my question and I've got the answer. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Any other questions on this process? Going, going, gone.

Fiscal year 16 ALAC budget requests. As you may have heard, if you read your email, the decisions have been made and approved by the Board and were posted. The ALAC did moderately well compared to how we have done in some past years. And Heidi, would you like to take us through it briefly?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

All right. This is Heidi. First off, congratulations everyone. I think we've done, you've all done very well. And this year was a little bit different because we were able to actually have time to review them, and review them internally, which I think helped things along. So I put the link into the fiscal year 16 request page, and I just now added the full document, at the top of that.

On page 10 are the ALAC information. And I'm going to, very quickly, outline some of the activities. But just also to highlight next steps, will be first, this next week, there will be a call of the ALAC finance and budget subcommittee. And Rob Hogarth will be coming onto that call to review again all of these in a little bit more detail, talk about the reasoning for the results, and then the next steps.

So just a little bit of an update of where we are with that. But Alan, did you want me to go through the results?

ALAN GREENBERG: You can do it quickly, if you like, or you can just summarize the ones you think are noteworthy. Your call. We do have a few minutes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Then I will go through all of them. So first, just in order, from NARALO, Glenn, congratulations, the creation of e-books, of ALAC learner guides was approved. Now again, that's going to be within the larger bucket of funds that the communications department have. So you'll be working with the communications department on that one.

And then the next one is the ALAC development session. This is a fantastic activity. Alan these are the ones, [inaudible] this one, which is now going to take place for all incoming ALAC members at the end of the Dublin meeting, the AGM. And it will take place on that Friday. And it will be sort of a team building exercise and on boarding for new ALAC members.

So very clear about that one. Then, some General Assembly issues. So there were three General Assemblies proposed. Due to the significantly higher cost of an AFRALO General Assembly, as well as the high level meeting that was approved for that one, that one was unfortunately not approved. What was approved was one General Assembly, either the EURALO one at the AGM in Dublin, or the NARALO General Assembly on the sidelines of the R meeting.

And Alan, I think you might want to say a few words, a little bit about that, either now or later.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Well, essentially the ALAC now is in a position where either the RALOs among themselves, or the ALAC has to choose, which one do we go ahead and fund. The NARALO General Assembly or the EURALO General Assembly. I don't propose to have that discussion today, but it is a discussion that we're going to have, and relatively soon. I'm assuming if we make the decision by Buenos Aries, we're okay. Is that a reasonable statement, or is that too late? Should we have already planning by then?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry Alan. By when? This is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: By Buenos Aries. Do we have the luxury of making that decision face to face, or must it be made before Buenos Aries?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I think that Buenos Aries is just about right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So we have some time. Maybe we'll get it done beforehand, but we do have a decision to make. Go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. So moving on then, the Global Indigenous Person membership program, unfortunately that one was a no. The good news is that there was a note that it would be, strong interest will be devoted to that proposal for fiscal year 17, and there are plans internally for an ICANN wide mentorship program. Again, very, very initial right now, so I will hold off any details on that program.

One on the ALAC onsite At-Large capacity building and engagement training in underserved regions, unfortunately that one was a no. I have reached out to staff about that particular one, and I think that will still be something in collaboration with GSP. So Tijani and others who are interested in that, if we can work together on that, I think that the gist of the aim might still be able to be carried out on that.

Okay. There were several requests for the IGF. There was an ALAC request for a town hall at the IGF, and APRALO request for a workshop and outreach, and an AFRALO request for a workshop. The town hall was a no, but I think again, that we will be working with the government engagement and GSE staff on seeing if we can get some of the concepts that was involved in that proposal, as well as one or two people to, onto that type of town hall or roundtable discussion.

The APRALO proposal, again there were two parts, the outreach part was not approved, but the workshop was approved for two travelers. And the AFRALO one, request for, again, upon approval of the MAG, but first have to meet that standard. Then the AFRALO, again, if it's passed by the MAG, then three people will be supported for the IGF.

The ALAC real time captioning. Yes. To Judith's support of that and others, that one was approved. And that is approved on a pilot basis starting in October, with a review after three months. So it's going forward on that. Now the LACRALO, there was a request for outreach or a skills of engagement of, at a Telecon event. My understanding is that this one was approved, but it would be on the sidelines of the June 2016 ICANN meeting in Latin America.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, that one has me a bit confused. The wording they used is they would provide, I'm trying to find the exact wording. I thought they said they would provide for 25 additional days...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Nights, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: ...25 additional people. Sorry, an additional hotel night for 25 people. That sounds as if they are presuming there will be a General Assembly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I have seen that as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: It makes no sense to extend, by one night, the travel of people who aren't coming.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, correct. And again, that is the first meeting B, and again, in line with what they're saying, what I've heard, is that before the next summit, that all regions need to have one General Assembly.

ALAN GREENBERG: But as Olivier pointed out in the chat, if we're only getting one General Assembly this year, and everyone else, the other two of them are deferred, LACRALO is implied to be deferred, that's at least four General Assemblies next year. Are they really going to fund that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It might be, again, it might be the next... This is Heidi again. It might be that the summit has been four years or so, so there is a little bit of time. Yeah, we'll need to do the math on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you count the number, they're saying let's defer to year 17, it becomes rather interesting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, we'll have to look into that...

ALAN GREENBERG: If you haven't already, you need to follow-up by what they mean by the extra hotel for 25, extra night for 25 people.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I'll follow-up on that. And that, again, these questions are really for Rob, just next week with the FBFC. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, we can defer to that. Sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And then finally, the strategic working session, Alan that was the one that you proposed. That was to bring the full ALAC and the RALO leaders to the meeting in Dublin, the AGM and the Marrakesh meeting, ICANN meeting 54 and 55, yes, that was approved. So there will be, we can now start planning for a full ALAC session on that Saturday as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. There is, in my understanding, misunderstanding of RALO proposal for cross community and engagement in the underserved regions. And the response, they are speaking about [inaudible]. This is absolutely out of the scope. This is absolutely [inaudible]. And I think this is one of the very interesting projects, because it is about a [inaudible], people who don't have any chance to see ICANN in their region. They will see the At-Large going there, and having capacity building and engagement work in this, in their regions.

And this is also about capacity building. So I think that the capacity building is something that we have to take care of, we don't have to forget it. So this is the first point, and I am really sad that the project was refused.

Second point, as for our the AFRALO workshop, I submitted the workshop and unfortunately, [inaudible] I went to the secretaries of the IGF, I will find my workshop find there. So this is a big problem for me. I will try to fight in the IGF to [contribute], so that we try to find it, and to find it with other workshops, since we have the agreement of the staff of the ICANN to fund our workshop. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. Heidi, do you have anything else to add or is there anyone else who has any issues they want to raise?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi Alan, this is Heidi. I don't have anything to add. I hear you, Tijani, and I'm quite confident we can move the concept forward, perhaps not obviously to the special requests, but through other means. And then again, a lot more can be discussed during the next FBFC call, and then when we'll meet in Buenos Aries, I think there will be time for us to move forward on a lot of these projects.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Tijani, is that a new hand or an old one?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Old one.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. And we are doing well. The next issue is the future challenges working group. The future challenges working group has been around for a number of years. It has been chaired jointly by Evan and Jean-Jacques. Jean-Jacques is not participating very actively in At-Large right now, other than his activities with regard to the IGC. Sorry, the ICG. And Evan is, he's on the call, and if you would like to speak, you're welcome to, is going to be largely busy with other activities and has resigned, formally resigned from that position.

The question is at this point, do we want to continue the group? It was put together to look at sort of a future think tank type approach to what we do within At-Large, or ICANN for that matter. It produced one major paper, and that was quite a while ago. It has not been very active, although a number of tasks were potentially assigned to it. That didn't really come to any great, any fruition.

So the question at this point is, do we want to find chairs? Do we want to make it dormant? Do we want to abolish it? Where do we go from here? That's the question. Does anyone have any answers? Anyone care?

I'm going to take that as there is no great interest right now and, ah. Sébastien has his hand up, and Vanda would like to listen to Evan, but Evan hasn't volunteered to speak. Yeah, go ahead Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. Sébastien Bachollet. Thank you Alan. I think it's an important working group, but maybe now, with them occupied with the question of the accountability of the IANA transition, but it could be a group very useful after this part of the work. Maybe for the second, the second [inaudible] about the accountability to have some feedback from members.

Then, if I have any suggestion, it's not to close it, but maybe to put it dormant for the time being, and come back in nine months or one year, to see if it can be useful for the next phase for the [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have no real problem...

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: This was very clear...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I have no real problem with that. I'll point out that if we abolish something we can always restart it, or something similar in a year or whatever, but I have no problem saying it's dormant at the point, and we'll revisit it later on in this year.

If there are no negative comments to that, and no comments in the chat, then I think we've just made a decision. Tijani, we haven't made a decision yet.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Alan. I think that, as we are all very busy by this transition and this accountability, I think that this working group with this work, is designed, still the transition will happen. And we will put this working group as dormant, since [inaudible] will be less busy than now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I hear no disagreement. I believe we have made a decision. Next item on our agenda, picks. As you will recall, in Los Angeles the ALAC gave advice to the Board that, among other things, was to take the top level domain applications that were deemed to be associated with highly regulated industries by the GAC, and to freeze all action on them. That meant stop signing contracts and stop delegating.

At the point that we made that recommendation, or gave that advice rather, there were a small number of those TLDs actually delegated, and they, slightly more but not a large number of contracts signed. At this point, I believe the majority of the contracts are signed by a significant amount, and there are a very large number of them already in the root. The new gTLD process committee never rejected our advice.

They initiated in December a discussion with the ALAC. The first time the Board has requested to actually talk to us about something, instead of just replying in a document. We had a teleconference in December. There was a follow on face to face meeting in Singapore, which included registries and a number of other interested parties, including the GAC.

And following that, there was another teleconference a few weeks ago. The overall outcome is, well let me back out for a moment.

Although we had requested a freeze, it was not clear that the Board had a mechanism by which to freeze. But essentially, we were saying you have to do something to make sure that the GAC implementations are fully, the GAC recommendations are fully implemented, for the TLDs where it really matters. We had a general feeling at that time that some of the TLDs designated by the GAC, probably were not as sensitive as others.

But some of them certainly were. We have since received a list of those TLDs, and have evaluated them. And indeed, we found that a significant number of them are sensitive, but the registry has implemented very good, what we believe to be very good safeguards. There are some that are requesting whether more should be done, and there are others, in the minds of those who evaluated them, and it was Olivier, I, and Evan who did the main evaluation, that it was quite clear that they must have more controls on them.

An example of one of those is dot doctor, where the GAC has already specified, and the Board agreed, that it must be limited to medical doctors, but there is no restriction that says you actually have to be a medical doctor to get one of these domains. You must say that you have all the appropriate credentials to do it, but it's only a tick box. There is no checking, no verification of those credentials.

And so the question is, what do we do now? The registries, we were hoping, would at least be willing to talk. They were clearly not willing to

talk with us at all. And we're still sitting where we are right now. The Board new gTLD committee did meet last week. We do not have the outcome of that meeting yet. They may or may not have taken a decision on this issue, and we're still waiting for that.

And that's where we sit right now. Olivier, would you like to say a few words?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking for the transcript. I think that you've covered pretty much where we are today. There are several questions really. The first one is, what do we want to get out of this? And that's a question that I'm throwing out to everyone as in ultimately, my feeling out of that obviously, is that we would like to have those registries that are proposing strings which are particularly sensitive, to implement some kind of safeguards, to reduce the likelihood of these strings to be used for phishing purposes, or to commit fraud, or to harm end users.

And that's something which we proposed during the meeting that we had under Chatham rules, with several members of registries and the response was effectively that they were not interested to even discuss this, that the strings would remain open, and that the moment you put any kind of control on a string with regards to who is allowed to control a top level domain, with regards to who is allowed to register a domain underneath that, it effectively killed the business.

And that's a real concern for me, personally, in that we are now having a tradeoff between business, on the one hand, and the actual public

interest on the other. My understanding is that the new gTLD program committee would need a significant push, and a significant support from the community, not only from the ALAC, but also from the GAC and perhaps some parts of the GNSO that would be, would agree with our point of view, for it to be able to do anything.

And I'm saying doing anything, I'm not even using the word act because it's not even sure, this moment in time, whether they would be able to act specifically on this. But we are in a very pivotal year for ICANN. We have the accountability process that is out there, and ICANN has in its bylaws that it needs to act in the public interest, and this is definitely a public interest issue.

It's all public interest commitments. So once more, what's less public interest than that? My suggestion to the ALAC is that we have a, that we share that document which Alan, Evan, and I have worked on, which is a triage of all of those strings. So of the 29 or 39, I can't remember exactly the number of strings that were there, the large number of them. Some of them have actually implemented things, as Alan has said, and we have given them a green light and said, "Well, look. These seem to be actually doing what is needed to safeguard the public interest and to reduce the amount of fraud and malicious use of the string, that could harm end users."

But the ones that are in orange and that are in red, those ones will really need something to be done about those. And so we would have to reiterate our request for freeze, or for something strong enough that it will actually bring them back to the table. Because otherwise, I'm not

even sure why we would need any public interest commitment as such, if they're not going to do their job.

So, just simply said, as a suggestion that we would have a month for, until our next ALAC call, for ALAC members to be able to look at the triage document, and comment on it, and perhaps comment on whether our members believe that some of the ones that have been marked in green should be in orange rather in green, or any of them in orange should be in green, or whether there should be amendments to this document.

And admittedly, the document was drafted quickly in a very few days, this triage document was done in a couple of days, whilst Evan, Alan, and I were very busy elsewhere as well. So, there might definitely be some amendments on this. But obviously, the aim is that we would have then a statement comes out of that, that would support this triage document, and that would be making requests to the new gTLD program committee, reiterating our concerns.

And that something needs to be done, because at the moment, nothing is being done because the parties that are concerned are not doing anything, and are basically, I would say, refusing to move forward, and that's just not acceptable. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are you muted Alan? Alan?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think Alan might be muted.

ALAN GREENBERG:

So I was saying really good stuff. I'm sorry you didn't hear it. I think I'm not muted now. Ariel pointed out in the chat the document is downloadable from the agenda. Indeed it is, and it is now a public document whether anyone likes it or not. However, I would suggest you not download it at this point. The document really needs to have to be enhanced a little bit, to make it understandable. It was coached in a lot of shorthand, which was understandable to us and we explained it to, in a parallel document, to the Board people we were dealing with.

But to be useable, and for someone going into it and seeing whether they agree with our evaluation or not, it does need some more work done to it. So I would suggest, you can certainly download it, but I would suggest you not try to do any of your own evaluation until we have cleaned it up a little bit, and I will send it out again at that point.

Olivier says it's a working document. Yes, but it's not a working document that might be fully understandable by people who have not been living this for the last couple of months. You will recall that, there is one thing saying what picks they have implemented. Many of them have that blank, and it looks like they have not implemented any of the GAC requests, but in fact, they have. So there was a significant amount of shorthand done in creating that document. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And this is one of those times when it was such a busy time, that I certainly wasn't in a position, despite being invited to, to comment on that particular

document in such short order. I was, even with Alan reminding me, I was not going to make the deadline. So I wanted to thank Alan and Evan and Olivier for being able to pull up so much of this work in such a very timely manner, in a short while.

That said, I certainly see it's a great opportunity for us now to revisit and run it with a bit more, a little bit more time, and get some more wider community input, because I think this is an important issue, and one that has to be resuscitated is not quite the term, but the issue is on a bit of life support, certainly. It's not quite there yet. And we do need to do something about bringing this potential corpse back to life.

And yes, I am using those metaphors deliberately, because I think, for example, the dot doctor issue is a good one that we could and should make some carefully managed communication mileage out of, to inspire and encourage some of our potentially recalcitrant people into a greater understanding of what real harm could be, if not when, this all goes wrong.

And I'm saying that because in the meetings that were held around picks before this document was, by necessity, had to be put together in such a very short period of time, I felt that certainly that there were some leadership people, including team members of the ICANN Board, that had an a-ha moment, and were understanding the concerns that the ALAC and the At-Large community, and indeed the GAC, had brought forward much more carefully.

And it may very well be that not only as Olivier said, this might be a topic worthy of a short amount of time, if not a large block of allocation,

for the Board/ALAC roundtable, just to keep it alive. But also, a report on the patient, but also I would have suggested it's well worth a conversation between the ALAC and the GAC, because we do, I think, as the other advisory committee specifically focused on the public interest. And we are, the ALAC and the GAC, we are clearly in that field.

It would be remiss on us to not do so. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. Going over your points in reverse order, to the extent that I remember them, we are meeting with the GAC. The GAC explicitly requested a meeting with the full ALAC this time. It is scheduled. It's scheduled for immediately after the meeting with the Board, as it turns out. And I would say there is no way in the world that this item will not be on our agenda. So I don't think we need to worry about that.

I'm going to talk about this whole thing at a meta level, not the specifics of the picks and the new gTLDs, but the concept that the Board requested a meeting with us, and has followed that up in a number of different ways. This is as close to revolutionary as one can imagine. And regardless of how this particular issue comes out, I think we have demonstrated that we can provide valuable input to the Board, that that input should not come purely in a matter of documents that we send via electronic means to each other, but actually and discussing things face to face can have a significant impact.

And Cheryl is right, there are a number of Board members who understand our issue and agree with it. Now, that doesn't mean they

win any arguments, but that's an important situation to have, or landmark to have passed. In terms of the specifics, it's not clear that there are any tools that the Board has to effect real change. There is no practical mechanism by which they can change the contracts that are signed.

There is little practical mechanisms they have that can change the contracts that are not signed, without creating a very uneven playing field for all of the other applicants. And that is problematic because one of the principles of the new gTLD process is that it be fair and applied evenly to everyone. So, you know, there are some major problems, even if we change the contracts that are signed, that aren't signed. And there is very little way to slow down the process, because of the way the applicant guidebook was written.

So they're in a very difficult position. About the only tool we can have, and Cheryl alluded to that, is essentially embarrassment, or making it very awkward for the registries to not do something. And I think the onerous is on us to push that to the extent we can. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. So could we have then an action item on this? I mean, it's up to you, but to have this triage document cleaned up. As soon as it's cleaned up, shared with our community, close the time for comment thing before the next ALAC call. Then we can have a discussion during the next ALAC call. And then probably, I would suggest at that point, to make use of this then, in our discussions with the GAC, leading up to Buenos Aries, so as to be able to

work and already be aware of where we're going before we meet the GAC in Buenos Aires.

And the reason for the rush that I'm pushing at the moment for, is because it's only a matter of time before we actually have an actual incident that will take place with one of these new gTLDs. And by that time, it will be two days. And the question will then be, well what in the world did the ALAC and the GAC do at that time?

So that's why I'm suggesting the fast track on this one, and have some deadlines, if it's okay with everyone. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I'll point out that dot doctor, which is perhaps the most critical one, is still in a contention set with three different vendors. And we don't know exactly what some of the vendors are planning to do. There is a little bit of haze around it because of the Board action which say that they must only be medical doctors, which the original application did not allow for.

Olivier, I will take what you suggested as an action item, and I would presume that it was captured as you were speaking. With one caveat, that is we need to find out if the Board, new gTLD committee, took any action during their meeting last week, and if so, factor it in with the, whatever we do going forward. But subject to making sure that some other event hasn't happened which may change the details, I would take that on as an action item.

Any other comments? Thoughts? Okay. The next item is, we have an outreach document, and we'll be speaking to the outreach committee, the outreach subcommittee, which is being renamed outreach and engagement, but it's not yet reformulated yet. These are some documents that we've been working on for a long time, we have two different versions that we're looking at, and will be presented to the outreach committee, but we're given this group a sneak preview, and an opportunity to either comment on them, or make sure that your comments get fed into the outreach committee that I believe will be meeting next week, although I'm not sure of that. Heidi, I'll turn it over to you though.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Alan. This is Heidi. Gisella, could you please post those? The first one being the double sided one, if possible. For those of you who were in Singapore, you will recall that this was presented, the double-sided version was presented during the Secretariats and outreach. There was a joint session there, and we have now incorporated the changes that were made there, as well as provided a second document, which is in a tri-fold shape.

And we wanted to just give you a heads up to take a look at those. There we are. The double sided ones. You can take a look, you can scroll. Gisella, I don't have scrolling rights. So there we go. If you can scroll down, Gisella. So yeah basically, the font... There were a lot of changes that we incorporated, the font size increased. On the other side, there is more information on how you join much more prevalent among various other changes.

Now if we can take a look at the tri-fold. [Inaudible] the other one, Maureen, I believe you were the one who requested this. So this is something that looks more at what we had before, for all of the ALAC and all of the RALOs. Again, because of the size, the font, we tried to increase the size of the font but it's not going to be as big as the double-sided. So for next steps, basically, it will be, again, a joint call of the outreach and engagement subcommittee and the Secretariat's call.

Hopefully next week. And then a decision will need to be made. It is being requested that one format is chosen for all of them, so we have a consistency in the look. So it wouldn't be where the ALAC and one or two RALOs have a double sided, and then the other groups have the tri-fold. So that's a decision that we need to make relatively soon.

But then going forward, we will try to have the hard copy of the ALAC ones, the one that you're looking here, by Buenos Aries. And I think, at this point, Alan, that is what, all I have to say on that point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. I did suggest that we will be doing one more revision of this, and then we do, we put a little bit of focus on individual users as opposed to ALSs, because we are trying to ramp up that concept within most of the RALOs. Other than that, I guess the question of which format to pick, I will share that Heidi shared this with me and with Dave, and I picked the tri-fold and he picked the two sided one.

So which way we go remains to be seen, but if anyone has any strong feelings, please let us know, or let your, the folks on the outreach

committee know. So that can be passed one. Any comments? Questions, hands? Nothing.

The next item on our agenda is then, we may actually finish early. The next item is the IANA stewardship transition and accountability.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: How can you forget that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't, it was just on a new page. And I've been going since 1:00 yesterday morning, and it's not 4:30 PM, so. We have 15 minutes allocated, we have a bit more time than that. So I will turn it over to Olivier, who is our master of ceremonies on all things related to transition and accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan for this two second warning, forewarning of this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, Olivier, you've done it to me enough times.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Touché, touché, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have had two webinars on this, so it's not clear we need to spend a lot of time on this issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have indeed, yes. We have had two webinars, and there are two more webinars that are coming up regarding IANA stewardship transition. So the final draft, I think we can call it draft, of the working group, the cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition, has been handed out, and is now open for public comment. It's a 90 or so page, well nearly a 100 page document.

It has got large annexes. What is important, I think, in there are some specific chapters about the actual proposal of what's going to happen. And with the solution that is being brought forward, being a solution that is a hybrid, a kind of hybrid solution with a post transition IANA, which is a subsidiary of ICANN itself. Now, that is a solution which I think our own representatives in the working group are feeling much better about than the first solution, which was the contract co solution that was presented during the last public comment period.

There are still some significant questions that are being asked, such as the making up of the Board of the post transition IANA. Other questions with regards to how exactly any kind of rebidding, etc., would take place. There are still a few questions that are there, but I think for the great majority, we are in support, as in the members of the working group are in the support of the proposal that is out there on the table.

That said, I'm sure we do need to make some kind of a comment on this. One concern that I have heard from various quarters in Europe is

that of jurisdiction. That is not currently really addressed explicitly in the document, because the post transition IANA is being taken as being, going to be created in the States, in the United States anyway, due to the location of ICANN.

There are a couple of other small points which we might wish to make, and I'll let others comment on those. But certainly the concern of jurisdiction is one that I have heard from several people around me in Europe. And it's, of course, a catch-22 situation. Of course, there are some wishes from some corners of the globe that a post-transition IANA would be moved to Europe, and Geneva to be quite clear on this. This is very likely to be a non-starter, as far as the US government is concerned.

We are taking baby steps. The first step is really the fact that IANA, the actual stewardship, will not be under the US government's hand, and then perhaps a next step would be in the future, about the globalization of the function, and globalization of ICANN, I guess, is probably something else to put on the table. But I would not recommend that we engage deeply into this at this very moment yet.

But that's the part that I think I can speak about. I see others have now been added to the queue, so I'll hand back the floor to you Alan. Thank you. And of course, oh, just one thing. I will ask staff, because the specific contents of the report, of the proposal, are going to be discussed on an ICANN wide basis in the next two webinars, that will be repeated, they will be next week, I will perhaps ask if staff could actually put a link to the announcement of these webinars in the chat here. So

that members who are currently on the call are able to take note of these.

I was a bit concerned that we didn't have that many people from At-Large on this webinar, on these webinars earlier this week, including the one for, that was actually done specifically for the At-Large community. And I am concerned that this is one of the most significant, if not the most significant piece of news this year. And I hope that the ALAC will not pass by it without noticing it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I'll also note that the webinar should be on the At-Large calendar if they're not. I'll talk for just a couple of minutes on accountability, because that's the companion process, and the whole issue of accountability is to try to make sure that the community, whatever that is, is in full control, and not an ICANN Board who may choose things against the community.

Not something that this Board is doing too often, but as we see from the discussion of the picks, it does happen. We're getting close there. We have a big report that's coming also, but just as with the IANA transition, there are some big unknowns that are still in the accountability one. Specifically, there is the issue of just what mechanism do we use to make sure the community can control, or have some level of control, over what the Board is doing.

The lawyers who have analyzed our current bylaws came to the conclusion that what we're doing right now, doesn't really exist under California law. And although it's working, should we ever be in a

position where we have to take some action, we are not in a defensible position. That is, ACs and SOs may name directors, but it's not clear that they're really allowed to if the Board chooses to say, "No, you're not."

To fix that, the groups that appoint directors have to take on some other form of status. And the simplest form is an unincorporated association. There have been some concerns raised about us doing that, specifically associated with liabilities against the community, and you know, once you get, if you're creating an unincorporated association so that you can sue the Board, it's quite clear that that same legal entity that, legal existence that allows you to sue the Board, allows someone to sue you.

So you know, you might ask, "Who wants to do that?" But that doesn't alter the fact that it could happen. And the second part is, it's reasonably clear that some parts of the community, specifically some ccTLDs and some or maybe most GAC members, could not join an unaffiliated, unincorporated association. And so then you now have to have effectively leaders of this association, but we're not all of the members of the AC or the SO are members of the association.

And now you have an issue of accountability of those people. And how do you enforce that accountability? So now we switch the discussion from accountability of the Board to accountability of the community. And it comes to really hairy questions, and I'll be honest, I don't see how we're going to finesse this. There may be a way. But I'll stop talking and turn it over to first Tijani and then Cheryl.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. First of all, I would like to speak about the transition. I haven't read the current documents yet, but I don't believe there is any indication about the Board composition of the post transition IANA. And I don't understand how the CWG goes to the public comment, without giving, at least, indications about that. Because, as Olivier said, we are all in support of this format, the proposed format. But we are in support of this format if the governance of the post transition IANA is the reason multistakeholder.

It will be the [body governor?] only by [inaudible], only by conduct [inaudible], we are not in support of it. And we have to reject it. We are a chartering organization, and we have the right to reject it, and will not, we cannot pass if we don't agree on it. So...

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may interrupt. I'll talk a little bit about, because there has been a very significant discussion within the CCWG in the last day on that issue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. So I will not speak about that, okay. So, I'd like to ask a question. Why do you want to make more webinars? Is there new things? Since the public comment is already there, so are there new things that we need to make a webinar for it? Having in mind that people have not addressed it, the number of people attending the webinar wasn't even good.

So if there is a really need to make those webinars, it is good. But if there is not a real need, I don't think it is useful to make them. Coming back now to accountability, and I have now a problem with the issue of, rooted in the private sector. Even if the chair that will remove it, [inaudible] come back and said we can remove it from here, but we have to put it there.

So there is an instant [inaudible], and I certainly made explaining why we are against public sector, because it is... They said we don't need business people. I explained that it is this meeting that is in the definition of public sector, in the international forum. So we have to be clear, if we don't mean it, so let's, as we mean it. If we mean that it is a multistakeholder without being led by governments, yes we have to end the slightest, but if we want to say it is private sector, no, I don't agree on that, on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll try to quickly address the points you raised. With regard to the Board composition, the discussion has been refocused right now, not on the Board composition but what is the Board doing, because that has never been decided. And if the Board is doing nothing but making

sure the auditor is selected, and that budgets are rubber stamped that come down from ICANN, a very small Board can do.

If the Board is actually going to be responsible for making sure that IANA is working, you know, if for instance, the IETF signs an agreement with IANA and not with ICANN, then the IANA Board is going to have to be responsible for fixing problems. In which case, it becomes quite a different issue. So right now, we are having a discussion on what does the Board do? And how it populated will be a next step.

And why did we come out with a report without that? Well, we just ran out of time. We have a target which we're trying to meet, to meet the coordinating committee's new deadline, and we simply ran out of time. So not everything could be done. In terms of new webinars, these were planned by the CWG. These webinars are planned to be much more of a question and answer, after people have had a chance to actually read the report.

So that's why the extra set of webinars were scheduled. How well they succeed, will remain to be seen. And lastly, your comments on what Robin Gross was saying about the public sector, that comment was in defense of a suggestion she made that the waiting structure among ACs and SOs be four votes for each SO, and two votes for each AC. And that is so they, among other things, the ALAC and the GAC would get two votes, compared to four each for each of the three SOs.

And her rationale for that is because ICANN is private sector oriented and not government. To be honest, we will do our best to veto that waiting, even if it was likely to be approved, and I don't think it is likely

to be approved. So I'm not as concerned as you about some words she uses to rationalize the proposal, which I think is dead. If I may be blunt. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Let me try a little bit backwards as well. Tijani, I too am less concerned about what one protagonist says, and far more concerned about what actually makes it into the document at this stage. And I'm perfectly happy for the private sector led, just for the record, Alan inadvertently just said public sector led, which obviously we don't want government running the show, but there we are, as Tijani pointed out, private sector led language, which is now being removed from the document.

And I think that's a very good thing. In terms of what Alan said in his opinion on the rationale, for why Robin wished to reintroduce the language, I don't have any argument with that at all. I think he got that pretty well covered. But I also wanted to note in terms of the positive parts, that Robin in chat, in our meetings, did in fact agree that a voting structure, which I believe ALAC and the At-Large community would be more comfortable with. In other words, the five votes to the ACs and the SOs, could in fact work where mathematically, the additional vote, because part of her rationale was also splitting neatly for the way that GNSO is structured, that an additional vote could easily be split into quarters.

And therefore, I don't see that as a deal killer from her point of view anymore, where I believe, at one point, it was. In terms of the

additional webinars, we also need to realize that these are Q&A style webinars, which are coming up, and I do hope are better attended, certainly by our community. Also, in terms of Q&A, give the ICANN staff the opportunity to collect and collate some of that input as actual input to the policy, to the public comment process.

And we should probably make sure that we have clear and fairly unambiguous statements, should we wish to make any that have not, perhaps, been captured by our own recent public comments by then. But also, I wanted to point out in terms of both of the timeline, sorry. The timelines for both the CWG and the CCWG, is that our opportunity, of course, particularly to come to Buenos Aires well armed and well informed.

In other words, having gone through all of the homework and pre-reading requirements that needs to be done, and attending all of the meetings and webinars that we possibly can, but also making sure that those who will be face to face for attending the discussions remotely, that the ALAC and At-Large communities have in BA in these subjects, are well informed. And that means, if you are from Asia-Pacific, you really ought to come with a fairly well-founded set of opinions and guidelines from more than just yourself.

So don't turn up and say, "I know what I think." You should be able to turn up and say, "We have established, within our region, the following." So come to BA with the regional and local At-Large structure homework done as well. That would be a very, very positive contribution. Just going back briefly, because I skipped something I

wanted to say on the webinars that are coming up, new material is coming in.

For example, Tijani, which I think does need specific exploration in why the webinar mode, and that's being polite. The very recent, that is within the last 24 hours information and briefing notes from the legal team. So there is new material to be discussed. And finally, on the jurisdiction issue, and indeed, it's not just limited to the jurisdiction issue, I wanted to support what Olivier originally said, and that is we need to take very careful, very well measured, and very face designed baby steps on all of this.

First step is, is the transition. There is a whole lot that can be done after that. Don't try and drink the ocean. Take a few sips. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And perhaps get the salt out of it before you drink it. Olivier, your hand is up. We have nine minutes and two more items on the agenda, so if you could be brief.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes. Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I was just going to try and close off on this then, by just reminding everyone, there is a public comment period that is going on right now, that has started, about the IANA stewardship transition, as you know. And Gisella is actually loading the example, the page that templates that the working group has actually put together, to try and channel the input into the work of the working group.

Gisella, if you could just briefly scroll through it, I think. It's just to give you an overview of the kind of channeling that is performed here. So it's looking at each one of the different sections of the report, and it's asking for comment on that specific section. And that will really help the working group do its work. You are encouraged to both get your ALS and your user's to fill this, whilst also contributing to a consolidated ICANN, ICANN, what am I saying? A consolidated ALAC or At-Large response.

So it is important that you do help on this, because of course, the we, as in the many of us who have now been in the working group, and have spent so much time in those working groups, might have missed some of the points in the record. So it's important that perhaps you could point these ones out. That's one thing.

And thank you for scrolling through this Gisella. And the second point is one which I think León probably made. I don't know whether he's back on the call, but he was going to probably mention that another public comment is starting, and that's the one on accountability. And that is set to start, is it the fourth of May or eighth of May?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The fourth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The fourth. There we go, the fourth of May. I'm just doing this like that from memory, bad memory, on the fourth of May. So we also need to be absolutely clear and ready to comment on that. These are two very important reports. These are two reports that are connected together, and these are two that will affect end users a great deal once implemented. So I really hope that we will mobilize our forces here.

And I know it's a busy month, but we need to push on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. And I'll note, there is a standard Wiki page available for commenting on the CWG report. Don't feel, in your initial pass, when you're trying to identify things that you think we need to comment on, don't feel constrained filling out a form. Just put comments on the Wiki, let us get an idea of what people feel we need to be comment on.

And with that, Olivier, that is an old hand, I presume, correct? I presume it is, yes. Two more items. One of them is the subject that Olivier brought up during his GNSO report. And commenting on the... Now we had decided that we didn't see anything of major substance on the budget and operating plan that needed to comments on. Olivier mentioned that the GNSO has noted that there is no increase in policy staff over the coming year, although there is a significant, despite the budget constraint, there is a significant growth in staff forecast.

And he suggested that perhaps we wanted to make a statement to that effect also. The statement is due in tomorrow at about 28 hours from now. We don't have a lot of time to write something and get it formally

approved and modified. If the ALAC wishes, then you can delegate to the ALT to draft a statement and support it on behalf of the ALAC, with the overall intent to say that we believe that policy staff must be augmented to address the kind of work load that we are seeing coming in the future.

And certainly that is true on the GNSO side, they're talking about a major PDP related to directory services, and other major PDP or set of PDPs on the new gTLD process for a second round. That's going to require work on our part also, ignoring anything else that we're doing. And I would support us making a quick, a short statement to that effect. And I'd like to see either tick marks or comments from people very quickly, do you want the ALT to submit something on behalf of the ALAC to that extent? Yes, Olivier. And very briefly. We are almost out of time. There is one other item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. And just to alert you, that I have cut and pasted just a small segment of the GNSO's proposed text for their statement. That's just a draft at the moment, but it's to give you an idea of the kind of note that they are going to be sending over. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you can send that... On the assumption that the ALAC agrees, can you send that to the ALT please? Or send it to the whole ALAC actually.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The whole statement?

ALAN GREENBERG: The excerpt that you cut out, or whatever part that you think is appropriate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we see either... Does anyone else want to speak?

Seeing no hands, can we see indications of support from ALAC members on whether we should in fact do this?

All right. Is there anybody, and either put an X mark or speak up quickly, is there anyone who feels we should not do this?

I see no Xs, I hear no voices. I'll consider this a consensus decision of the ALAC to request that the ALT submit a statement to the public comment forum on the budget, saying that we should, that ICANN should support the policy staff to a better extent than they're planning to. Thank you.

The last item is not quite a specific, we can [inaudible] in details, but we have gotten, just before this meeting, an indication that the Board is reconsidering the rate at which AC, and SO, and operational reviews are done. And as you know, there is a review of At-Large scheduled. They are reacting to the community just being inundating with work. And the

belief that we have to slow down something, and since we cannot slow down things like IANA, accountability, or directory services, that reviews are something that we can slow down.

And they are considering whether we should do that. My understanding is that there may be a public comment on this. The At-Large review work party will be briefed on this tomorrow, but there is a good chance that the, our review process will be slowed down somewhat. Just a heads up. Tijani.

Can't hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now? Okay, thank you. I'm sorry I was muted. So it's just to propose that Olivier, who already know about the submission of the GNSO regarding the policy development staff, that Olivier hold the pen for this statement, since he's in on the [inaudible] also. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not to worry. I always delegate things to Olivier if he can. But we'll all work with Olivier to make sure that it comes out to something that we're happy with. Any other comments?

Seeing none, we are on the hour, and I thank you for all for attending this meeting, and for participating. And this meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]