
GISELLA GRUBER:

And we will start interpretation. Thank you.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's ALAC monthly call on Tuesday, the 26th of May at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, León Sanchez, Vanda Scartezini, Jimmy Schultz, Beran Gillen, Eduardo Diaz, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Otunte Otuneh, Allan Skuce, Howard Deane, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Siranush Vardanyan, Sébastien Bachollet, Judith Hellerstein, Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

On the French channel we have Hadja Ouattara.

On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambroner.

We also have our liaisons Julie Hammer, Ron Sherwood, and Murray McKercher.

Apologies noted from Barrack Otieno and Rafid Fatani.

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

We have interpretation in French, Spanish, and in Russian.

If I could please also remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, as well as for the interpreters, to allow them to identify you on the other language channels. And also to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

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.

Thank you and over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Gisella.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Wolf is waiting for a dial out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Wolf is waiting for a dial out, and I hope someone will dial out to him quickly. Thank you.

The first item is action items. There are a number of undone action items at this point. All of them are attributable to either me or Olivier, having to do with setting up committees, working on ATLAS 2 recommendations, and a summary statement on ALAC position on country codes and territory names, which I don't really remember, but I'm willing to believe I said I will do that.

Unless anyone has any comments, I think both Olivier and I acknowledge that we're behind on some of these things. And I hope to get it covered well before Buenos Aires.

Other than that, I'm not sure we can make any more progress on them today. And Heidi, those are the only items that are outstanding. All of the new ones, I believe, have been done.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. This is Heidi. Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The next item is the policy development page. There are a number of items there. First one is a statement being voted on. The draft on the cross community work on IANA transition. That one is closing in five hours, if I remember correctly, or a little under five hours. There are still, as the last time I checked a few minutes ago, three people, all of whom are on this call, who haven't voted yet.

Ariel will send you all private messages reminding you. So please do vote. It will be nice on something as important as this, that we have all 15 ALAC members voting. And hopefully supporting it, but regardless of what side you're on, please vote.

There is a cross community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability. Sorry, that statement is being drafted. That's the statement on the CCWG, that we have a Wiki open. As of the last time I looked, there have been no comments on it yet. I will do my part, very shortly, probably not today, but probably tomorrow. And we need to have a statement drafted there pretty quickly.

The public comment closes in about a week, if I remember correctly. It closes on the 3rd. Is that correct? Can anyone confirm? Somewhere around the 3rd or the 4th of June, which is just a little bit over a week from now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The 4th, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The 4th. Thank you very much. I'm looking at the calendar for May, which is why I couldn't understand why today was a Sunday. All right.

I fully admit to being somewhat confused at this point. So that one will be proceeding. We're going to be doing that one just as we did the CWG one, that is we expect active contribution as it's being drafted, and we will submit it and then vote after the fact. Hopefully, anyone who had any comments will make sure that they are factored in before we close out the statement.

There are a number of statements which are currently open, not being drafted. Perhaps we can come to closure on them here. The gTLD registry stakeholder group is requesting their charter being amended. I don't know whether anyone else in the group has read that charter. From my perspective, they are suggesting that everything, everything they're suggesting is quite reasonable, as internal changes to basically how they're operating.

I have no reason to put a comment in. And I think we would have to have a pretty strong reason for putting a comment in that effects another group's charter, unless we really believe that it would be inappropriate for ICANN to allow this to happen. I'm going to presume, that if no one raises any strong points in the next day, that we will consider that one no comment.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah, may I Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, just I read carefully this. And I have nothing against, just the opposite. I believe that considering [inaudible] instead of participants, should be something that we inside the ALAC must think about ourselves. It's just this comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. For those who haven't read the statement, that's in reference to their charter being changed to say if someone doesn't participate, they stop being counted as valid voters. So essentially, for those who choose to be members of the registry stakeholder group, but never vote or actually do anything, that they don't, they're no longer counted as part of the required minimum to vote.

And I think that's quite reasonable. Several of our RALOs have similar rules in place. The next item is on dot travel. Now again, this is one that I have not read. Dot travel is a registry that came out as one of the first rounds of new gTLDs quite a few years ago. It has had an interesting life, in that it hasn't been particularly successful and has had several changes in how it operates. And I suspect this is one that does warrant someone reading, but I haven't done it yet.

Do we have any volunteers of someone who would like to take it on and...

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I can do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you Vanda. The next one is, again, more territory names. I think we have decided that although we will come up with a generic statement, that we are not commenting on these. So Ariel, I think you can mark that one as no comment.

The proposed changes to AOC and organizational reviews. Given how much that effects us, and how much relief was expressed when we were told, we're going to slow down the schedule, I don't see how we cannot comment on that. But it has a long timeframe, and I suspect we will not be doing that until, perhaps we'll do something in person, in Buenos Aries.

I note that closes just a few days after Buenos Aries. So that's about as late as we can do it. Holly, have you taken a look at that statement yet?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just briefly. I haven't taken a really hard look at it, but I thought we would actually be discussing it in Buenos Aries, along with the privacy proxy things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps you can make a few notes on the Wiki of things you think may warrant comments.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, happy to.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. And the 2013 RAA WHOIS accuracy program specification review. Again, I haven't done anything on that one. Holly, you're probably are the person on this call who is closest to that. Have you thought about that one at all? If there is anyone else who wants to, please speak up also.

HOLLY RAICHE: I have. Because Carlton was the one who actually sent email on this, I've asked him for comment, to jog his memory, but have a look anyway. I just remember, I thought it was terrific at the time, so I'll revisit that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I mean, it is a review of the specification, it's not necessarily the results. So it may not [CROSSTALK]. And lastly, GNSO privacy and proxy, you have indicated we should be commenting. And you have a short briefing session scheduled for Buenos Aries. So I don't think that needs any discussion at this point.

Any comments before we go on to the next session?

Seeing no hands, hearing no comments. And we are slightly ahead of schedule. Review of ALS applications and new ALSs. Heidi, can you handle that please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi everyone. This is Heidi. We now have another milestone. We now have 190 At-Large structures. That's 10 more, it's 200. That's going to be another reason to celebrate, I think.

So recently we have a certified the High Tech Center for Nigerian Women and Youth and ISOC Zimbabwe. Both are going to be in AFRALO. We, right now, have openings today. The applications for IEEE Nicaragua that is based in LACRALO. Pending applications, right now staff are processing the due diligence for ISOC Uganda.

And I think that is it. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: It says ISOC Gambia also.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think that one has been suspended, actually until April 2015, which we're now in May. So I'll follow up with where we are on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Heidi. All right. Next session is reports. Our normal practice is that people are giving an opportunity... Is someone trying to speak?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Tijani. I wanted to say, I want to say about ISOC Gambia that this application has now still ISOC words, will answer our email and tell us if

the ISOC Gambia is already, if you want, really at the center. The advice as to have it, because at the beginning they said, “We don’t know yet. There is a change and things are not clear. So please don’t go ahead and do it.” That’s why we held it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. No other comments? The next session is on reports. Our normal practice is not to review all of the reports. If any of the groups have anything specifically they want to bring our attention to, this is an opportunity. First of all from work groups. Anybody on a work group that has something definitive they want to present?

Seeing nothing. RALOs and liaisons. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Greetings everyone. It’s Maureen for the record. I just wanted to remind the [inaudible] for some agenda items for the ccNSO meeting that we have in Buenos Aries, just a reminder. We’ll have a chat later.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Would you like to do the reminder now? [CROSSTALK] Or are you reminding us that you’re going to remind us?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I’m reminding you. And I know that there were some suggestions and they were, I think, Olivier sort of like mentioned earlier about CWG and CCWG issues, common interests. And also Ron mentioned some in-

reach, because we've been looking at ccTLD liaison. But something to think about anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other comments? I'll point out to staff doing the agenda for the next time, we have three see lines, but they only point to two different pages. I think the first one can go, or at least be merged together with the first two lines.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Making a lot of noise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I know. I need [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: No? I guess he doesn't want to speak.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think he was blown away.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Siranush is sharing with us that Maureen will continue on as an ALAC member. Congratulations Maureen. Maureen, is that a new hand?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No sorry. It's just my tardiness in removing the old one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then maybe they will have to reconsider keeping you on as an ALAC member.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you.

[LAUGHTER]

ALAN GREENBERG: Not a serious comment. All right. The next item is something that we've never talked about in these meetings before. IANA stewardship and accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier speaking. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Sorry about that. I'm in a windy location. I was just going to ask, with regards to what Maureen mentioned, could she please liaise with me, because we're going to be discussing this future transition, as far as I understand. The stewardship transition and ICANN accountability with the ccNSO. If she could please, you know, sort of get in touch and then we'll... Because I think we need a little bit more as a start up then just say, well that's on the table. What do we talk about?

We just need to get the most out of the meeting, we would need to prepare it somehow and perhaps share it a point of view prior to that. So just a heads up, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. You said what I was going to say to her in private, but now you said it in public so I don't need to say it. Consider yourself advised, Maureen. If you want clarification, you can come back to Olivier or me.

And back on stewardship and accountability. All right. The situation right now is that we have submitted the, our statement on the accountability, on the transition proposal. As have something like 47 other people or groups. There is a document that will be reviewed by the CWG IANA on intensive meetings this Thursday and Friday.

I believe there are something like 12 hours of meetings scheduled. The document, when I last looked at it, is 249 pages long. I have no believe whatsoever that we're going to be able to get through that, and not

only read it during the meetings, but actually make decisions based on some of the issues raised.

Based on a meeting that was just finished a few minutes before this one, talking about the form and content of the post-transition IANA Board, I'm not sure this group is capable of making any decisions, but we will cross our fingers and hope. There is an intent to come up with a revised report and bring it to the ACs and SOs, the chartering organizations for ratification in Buenos Aires.

We'll see where that goes. The IANA issues group met earlier this week, or late last week, I've lost track. And one of the critical issues right now is the PTI Board format. There have been a number of different opinions. I think we've come up with a way, an acceptable way forward that will likely be accepted, but to be quite honest, as I've said, there are so much division in the CWG right now, that I'm not predicting which way it goes forward.

We made one very controversial recommendation in the report, over and above the PTI structure issue. And that is the escalation process. It is the one item, I think, that we've really identified as a show stopper for us. That is we need a multistakeholder component, in the escalation process. Not only in the review, but actually in the run of the mill escalation process.

The report currently says that issues go directly to policy bodies, which I find rather curious given our desire to keep policy bodies out of this process. So it remains to be seen how it's going to become, go ahead. We may be put in a position where we have to either decide to change

our position, or reject the report, if there is no change made in that area.

So that maybe interesting times ahead. Are there any other questions? I know Eduardo has done a fair amount of work on analyzing the comments. And I don't know, Eduardo, if you want to say anything in particular, or if anyone has any comments on the CWG before we go ahead on the CCWG, where I think the issues are perhaps a bit more pointed.

Eduardo, do you want to say anything or not? Or are you not able to speak?

I guess he has nothing to say. Anybody else have any questions regarding the CWG or the process going forward?

No. Okay. Then we will go onto the CCWG accountability. There are a number of issues on the CCWG that are in flux. There was a very productive, I thought anyway, a very productive meeting earlier today, talking about whether we really need unincorporated associations, if we need them, how will they be managed? There was some discussion of an issue that Chris [Disdain] has brought up, and that was specifically, if we become legal entities and therefore we have the right to go to court to demand that the ICANN Board do something or other, there is a situation where ultimately, the courts could well make decisions on how ICANN's mission is interpreted.

And these are then legally binding decisions. And the question is, do we really want California courts to make those decisions on our behalf? And it transformed into a general discussion of, do we really want to

resort to the courts? Now, the proponents of the enforceability aspects of accountability, are that unless you can go to court, you don't have any real muscle behind you, but you don't intend to go to court.

The reality, however, is that, in fact, once you have the ability, someone could use that right. And there has been some concern over that. The idea has been proposed today, which I think had a bit of a traction but I'm not sure, to say that although any individual ICANN member could go to court over their own rights or something like that, that we could not use the enforceability mechanisms the courts to enforce accountability mechanism, unless there is a consensus among the ACs and SOs that they were to do so.

So that sort of says, we'll never be in a position where the courts can pass judgment over ICANN, unless, in fact, there is a strong will in the community to resort to that mechanism. And that, from my point of view anyway, makes, puts me in a more comfortable situation. In terms of whether the ACs and SOs have to form these unincorporated associations, I don't think we have closure on that.

There may well be a stronger conviction that they are useful. And if so, I don't think the ALAC should have any problem doing it. It will add a significant level of confusion as to explaining to people how ICANN works, but other than that, I think it is something that is manageable. And again, if people disagree with that position, then they should certainly speak up.

It's not my optimal position, but I think it's something that's acceptable. And I haven't heard too much against that. What else am I missing

people? Anyone else who is on this group, the critical issues that we need to pass judgment on. Yes León.

León, can't hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Use the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: León, are you there or not? Your hand is up, but we cannot hear you.

Sorry León. We cannot hear you. If you're speaking, we may need to call out. He says he doesn't know why we can't hear him. We don't know either. Try again now please.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, now we can.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay, then I know why I was needed, since I was not muted on my line. I think there was some kind of mysterious mute on my line, somewhere. But yeah, I think you just explained things very well. I would just like to stress that the, I mean, what we need to pay very close attention when discussing whether we want to go with either unincorporated

associations or maybe designating the people that aren't [inaudible], including many SOs and ACs as members of ICANN.

Is that if we don't do this, then it won't have the enforceability that we are trying to achieve with the proposal. So that would leave us, [inaudible] put it on the list, as some enhanced advisory committees, which would materially take us to the level of being able to, of course, providing the same advice we are able to provide at this point, but then the Board and staff, again, would be able to either take action on the advice, or they could just throw it away under the, to resolve this question.

And this is, of course, something that I believe that is not what we're trying to achieve through this process. So I just want to stress that we have to keep that in mind. If we choose, or we chose not to incorporate or form any unincorporated associations, or otherwise put some wording in the bylaws that would enable the chair to become this legal entity to enforce the AC or SO rights, or exercise the powers, well the tradeoff is that we would be lacking this capability of enforcing our rights.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you León. Yes, that's a good issue. And it is worthy of some discussion. I'll give my personal point, and then I'll give you my pragmatic one. My personal position is that if we do not have the ability to enforce, ultimately to go to court, over the various accountability issues, but do have the ability to remove individual directors or the whole Board, then that is sufficient.

You know, I'm not sure I need to be able to go to court over the budget, or over a bylaw, as long as we can remove the whole Board if they do something which the community, now remember, this is going to require an overwhelming majority of the total community to take any action, if we disagree.

So I personally am willing to wave total enforceability on everything except the removal of directors. To do that, however, I believe, to make that one enforceable, we do need a legal status. So I don't think anyone at this point, or not many people, are arguing with that. And even if we were, to be honest, from a pragmatic point of view, I think that ship has sailed and we're going past that already.

I don't think there is a way to change that. That being said, the difference between unincorporated associations and the ALAC, or the GNSO naming people who are members, and León said the Chair, but it doesn't necessarily mean the Chair. It could be five regional people from the ALAC or the chairs of the stakeholder groups for the GNSO. I don't think there is a big difference between naming five individual people with certain titles as the members, or naming them as the unincorporated association, which then has the power.

In terms of the rules we would have to write to make sure that they are accountable to us, they're almost the same wording. I think there is a difference in terms of how we present it to people, and I think the unincorporated association will add a level of obscurity, which will make ICANN even harder to understand.

But in terms of operationally, I don't think there is a huge difference. And I can push for one or the other, but I don't think ultimately it's something that we're going to reject because of it. I think ultimately, if we have the power to remove the Board, and specifically selective members of the Board, since removing the whole Board is far more traumatic than removing half of the Board, then I think we have a mechanism that can provide all of the accountability we need.

I've spoken enough. We have a speaker queue. León first.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. I was just typing that, let's not forget that in order for us to be able to remove or recall the Board, either fully or individual members, we still need legal standing. And that we go back to square one, and need to either establish an unincorporated association or designate it may be such that the Chair maybe could see a group of people that are officers.

For example, in the case of the At-Large community, let's say the ALAC, we can appoint one member per region. And those members will of course, be members within the ICANN bylaws, and be recognized as that. And another important point here is to, as I said during our CCWG call today, is to not confuse or make the personhood of the position with the personhood of the individual or the natural person.

This would of course be different, and the one being the member would be the position itself, of course, through the natural person that moment is the designator officer. But it would not be a matter of

designator, for example, Alan Greenberg, or León Sanchez, or whatever individual has any position within the ALAC.

So this is something I think is worth clarifying, or just pointing out. That individuals and positions should not be mistaken of single entities.

ALAN GREENBERG:

So if I can summarize León. I think that the first part of what you said, that we need a legal status for the enforceability of removal of Board members, I think that's what I said. So I hope you weren't disagreeing with me. In terms of the, once you name an individual by name, or implicitly, that individual is empowered in their own right.

However, we in ALAC already have accountability measures saying, if we don't like what someone is doing, we can remove them. And obviously, we would have terms such as that regarding the member position. So yes, in theory, people can go do what they want for a really short time, until someone takes action against them. And I don't think there is much more we can do over that. Sébastien, you're next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. I hope that it's clear enough. Sébastien Bachollet for the recording. Thank you. And sorry for Alan and León, but as you know, I disagree. And I disagree strongly. I think we are building a very complicated solution, where we can do something lighter. First, and the second point is that it seems we are in an organization where we want to fight.

We have to remember that we, or you as ALAC member and chair of the RALOs, you are one Board member. It's three years, and to see a CNSO too, and so on and so forth. And we the community, we are building the Board. Okay, it will take three years to observe the Board change, maybe we can start now if we are very unhappy with the Board.

And I disagree with you that we need to have legal standing, because it's too much, we are in US, where everything must answer the call, or you must be able to say that you will go to the call. And that's a wrong way to run this organization. And just to give you one idea, it's a small idea, but why not to ask the current Board to vote on some of the proposals for new bylaws?

And we will see if they accept. For example, they can write into the bylaws, they will not be able to change what we call the, I don't remember the word, but the golden bylaws, the important bylaws. They would not be able to change it anymore after this first [inaudible], without the consent of the community. And we will have to define the community.

And if they vote for that, then there will not be anymore able to change it. And we don't need to have all of this very difficult and [any] work to change this organization with members and so on and so forth. Just try to be at the level of simple solutions, and I am sure that all together, all together, we will be able to do it. I will stop here. But I think, I have other points in this situation, but I think this one is already quite important. And it's why I disagree with the way you are thinking or presenting the situation.

I remind you that the [inaudible], it's not an agreement of everybody. It's a [Swiss] solution. One with designees, one with members, and one with involving the current situation. And I am all for this solution, even if nobody talks about it. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I remember, I read legal advice saying that whether you decide to have designators or members, you will be obliged to form the unincorporated associations. I remember that. After when Alan proposed the [inaudible] people, I didn't see something written by the legal people, saying that this has the same, how to say, this will permit to have the powers for which we establish some mechanisms in our report.

So I would like to know if the legal advisors said that it would be exactly the same. There is not a difference between having an unincorporated association or having people named as persons. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani, on that point, I don't know if you were at the meeting today. The result was very clear. From a point of view of enforceability and legal status, the two are equivalent. There is no question. The only real difference they saw, and León you can correct me if I'm missing something, but I think the only real difference they saw is that if you form an unincorporated association under California law, the

unincorporated association has, can assume any liabilities as opposed to its members.

And therefore, it may be easier to indemnify the association than to indemnify the individuals, if they're acting in their own capacity. But in terms of carrying out the process, in terms of having the same legal clout, they are identical. That may not be the same in every jurisdiction, but certainly is the same in California.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And very helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And if, on a personal point, you should listen to the MP3, it was a really good meeting and a lot of things came out. But you also have to look at the chat at the same time. I guess, given Sébastien's comments, I think we need to figure out how we're going to go forward on this. And maybe we need a straw poll first, or something.

I don't quite know. Although I don't disagree with Sébastien that, in a perfect world, we could presume that if we're all acting as gentlemen and gentlewomen, we will hold sway, I believe there is an overwhelming feeling in the CCWG that if we want these things to be honored, we have to make them formally enforceable.

It may not be my culture, and it's certainly not Sébastien's, and I don't think it's Cheryl's, but, and I'm only naming the people who have spoken up in that area, not presuming how other people feel, but I don't see us changing us. And I don't believe, although we can keep on

pushing for a lighter structure, I don't believe that we're going end up with an endpoint we can accept if we veto it, if we say we're going to reject any proposal.

Cheryl, are you in a position to speak or not?

And Olivier has his hand, maybe Olivier you speak first, and Cheryl, I wouldn't mind hearing from you if you are able to speak. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. What you mentioned here resounded with me as well. I think that in the ALAC, we live in a culture of trust, and we base the volunteer involvement that we have in our community, based on trust in people, and trusting that they're all acting to further the public interest out there.

So there is a big measure of trust and goodwill. I have noticed in other parts of ICANN that there is actually much distrust as well. And I'm not sure whether that's a cultural thing, or whether it is historical. There certainly appears to have been some baggage from the past, which is resurfacing. So whilst I would absolutely hope that we would be able to build an accountability system with trust of the ICANN Board, I have real concerns that we will be able to, we can certainly hold that point and say yes, but I have real concerns if this would fly with the other communities.

And I know we have to stand for our ground and so on. But it seems to be we are up against some real distrust in many corners, in saying well, we're going to make ICANN accountable, the hard way, if you want. And we as the rest of the community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I will take a private email straw poll, and I'll try to make sure, unlike the last time, the wording is a little bit more carefully done than I did on the one on the CWG. My sense is that although everyone, not everyone, a large number of the people of this group would prefer one way, we're willing to accept the other way. That's my sense right now, but I'm certainly willing to change that.

Cheryl, are you in a position to talk a little bit? I see you're on the [CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

...hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

There we go. I don't know why you couldn't hear me before. Okay. And I'm just switching because my battery is about to run out. But that's all right, I'm in the other room twice. Look, I couldn't agree with what you and Olivier outlined more. I certainly have, and you have

listened to me on some of these calls, spoken strongly against the requirement to take everything to the courts.

But, and I do feel that it is, as Sébastien outlined, a highly regrettable Americanization of far too many things. But it is what it is. And I don't believe that we will be in a numbers position to carry that. I think far more elegant and intelligent point of view. So rather than packing one's game play and going off in a huff, or blocking things so they don't proceed, I believe we have to stay at the table to make the necessary improvements.

So I agree, we have to make some compromise and make everyone know, very clearly, that it's regrettable that those compromises have to be made. That said, having, I agree, having a very good call. I thought a lot of ground was gained in terms of understanding a conversation in today's call, but I do think making sure it is the main and wide ranging community that has to agree to critical issues, is the linchpin for us being more comfortable with what I think is regrettable.

Had ICANN managed to get its accountability in better order, right back from ATRT 1 days, and earned better trust, we wouldn't be in this situation. But that didn't happen either.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. You used the magic word trust. It's a word I started using a while ago, but everyone else, almost everyone else, seems to shy away from it. But it all does come down to trust in my mind, and the trust is not there. And thus, we are having people who say, "Unless we have the clout to go to court, which we don't plan to do, we may be ignored."

And it's hard to argue with a may be because it's true. It may happen. I think we're in a different world than we are in most of what we're living, the history of right now, but of course, we don't know what the future will bring. I think one of the, the only saving grace in building this structure, which will rely ultimately on the courts to enforce us, and I agree with Sébastien and with a number of other people have said, that if we ever get to a point where that's the resort that we're taking, we are in big trouble.

And simply having the courts decide... And by the way, in a civil action in the courts, it will probably take six years to make that decision. You know, I think we will have died by then. So it really doesn't matter. But the saving grace is the majority of the community that would have to act to cause this to happen, is almost never going to happen. There are very, very few things in ICANN's certainly recent history that I can think of, where we could have gotten such a critical mass together among the ACs and SOs to take action.

Between the people who agree with what the Board is doing in any given instance, and the people who say, "It's not my problem, I'm not going to get involved." I just don't see it happening. So at some level, we're building this whole pie in the sky, perhaps for no real use, except it's going to make people feel more comfortable with it.

I mean, if you look at any of the grievances that people have over past actions of the Board, in almost every case, there is another part of the community that was cheering it. So and you know, in some cases, we were the ones that were cheering it when other parts of the community

said was horrible, and I suppose there would be ones in the opposite direction too.

But I know there has been times in the opposite direction. So I think we are where we are. Let's keep on the queue. We're, of course, way over time at this point, but I think it's an important discussion. Jimmy.

JIMMY SCHULZ: Yes, thank you. I hope everyone can hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG; We can.

JIMMY SCHULZ: Great, thank you. Yeah, like you just said, that trust is the base of the whole thing, and we all hope that we don't have to use the rules that we're now implementing. It's better to have them, because well, [inaudible] is good, but the better thing is, you have to control the possibility. It's like always when politics come into play, you need backup rules if anything goes wrong. That's what I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Jimmy. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I just, having run a business in the States for awhile, I wanted to remind you that in the States, the threat of litigation is nearly as effective, if not actually even more effective, than the actual litigation itself. So out of court

settlements are the thing that usually happens, in most cases, because when you go into court, you never know which way things are going to turn around.

But the threat of litigation is used as a battering, in some way to negotiate and put pressure on the person more, or the company you are negotiating with. And I think that's probably here that systems are [inaudible], which are being proposed, are there to effectively have that threat present, so as to make sure there is the right pressure on the right thing to be done.

And that's probably something which I guess is difficult to understand outside of the US culture. And certainly, in some parts of the world, I think that the threat of litigation would be seen as such [inaudible], it would be dishonorable to go in such a direction and conduct business in such a way, but I guess we don't have very much to deal with here.

I do have to remind you that we have been told for now, quite a while, that there is a big pot of money in ICANN to push off the threat of litigation out there, regarding the new gTLD program, and yet, and yet we haven't seen any major lawsuits yet. Now of course, I'm not tempting the devil and asking that tomorrow we read the papers, that ICANN is being sued for billions of dollars because someone managed to electrocute themselves while using a domain name or something, but one of the things that one does is also by having that actual weight, you know.

You basically then push off the threat of litigation as well by saying, "Well, we have more money than you do, and we'll just take you to the

court for 20 years until you run out of money.” It’s a strange culture. Anyway, I thought I would mention it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Sébastien, you’re next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much Alan. I would like to try again. My suggestion. I really think that we can put the train on the right track, even now. And my suggestion is to have all the tools we want, except that we go to the court. And to have that, we need to have that included in bylaws, and in bylaws where they can’t be changed just by the Board.

And I think it’s feasible. It’s feasible because the Board, I guess will think that it’s maybe a better solution to have one part of the organization going against the other part of the organization to court. And maybe because they will help the community. And I think if we get the part where we want without creating all of those membership structure and the litigation possibility, we will be winning at the end.

That’s, again, my proposal today. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien, let me ask you a question. As I understand it, if we put in place the kind of bylaws you’re saying, that for instance, the Board cannot change a bylaw, you know, the Board has to accept members, the Board has to allow the member, not capital M members, but the

community rather, to recall Board members. If the Board chooses to ignore it, what is the recourse?

We do not have standing to take them to court. What recourse do we have? So we're looking at a situation where we put procedures in place, the Board says... For instance, I'll give you an example. We veto a specific bylaw the Board wants to change, the Board says, "We believe it is in our fiduciary duty, because of the articles of incorporation and the mission of ICANN, that we have to do this."

The Board must act in good faith, on its fiduciary duty, if the Board says, "We believe it is in the interests of ICANN to do X," and the community is diametrically opposed to it, how do you handle that in the world you're looking at? Because that is the question that is being discussed.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, Alan, thank you. It is Sébastien Bachollet. I understand this discussion. But just imagine that we are at this level between the community and the Board selected by the community, I feel that ICANN has died. It's not anymore a multistakeholder organization. And it will be taken by somebody else, somewhere else.

We are out of the game if we end up like that. If the Board, and the community, are so strong opposite opinion on one topic, it's really the end of this organization. Frankly, I don't care if we can go to court or not go to court. Because if we go to court, if we're able to go to court, yes, why not? But do what? Which money will be spent for that? How we will stand and lead this organization still doing the work if the

community act against the Board? Then we will leave the staff to do the things, run the organization on the day to day job?

It's, I can't imagine where to go there. Then if we end up there, just we to declare ICANN is not anymore, ICANN, and we need somebody else to take the lead to the next time to an IANA function and the rest of the organization, or the rest of the gTLD organization.

I am not sure that I answered your question directly, but I really feel that your question is a very good one, but I don't think the answer must be just the answer of your question, the broader answer of itself. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sébastien, I think you're looking at it, if this is a cataclysmic thing, but it's not necessarily a cataclysmic thing, it could be one specific item which is important to people, not enough to sacrifice ICANN over, but nevertheless important. And in the chat, I see Carlton saying, "Find someone who has standing." Or León saying, "Go to the State Attorney." You can only do that if indeed, you are finding the Board acting in bad faith, I believe.

In any case, I don't think we're going to end up agreeing on this. And we may well be split, but nevertheless, we're going to have to make a decision, and it's a yes/no decision, there can't be a middle ground as to whether this is an issue we're going to reject the report over. And so, I think that is the sense of the community that we're going to have to get.

Now remember, the CWG is trying to get closure in Buenos Aries. The accountability group is not. So we still have some time with this. Anything else anyone wants to go? We have a couple of hands up, Jimmy and Tijani, we are a fair amount over time at this point, and we still do have a number of substantive issues, including talking about the Buenos Aries meeting. And I think this is our last meeting before the Buenos Aries meeting, so we don't want to skip that. But I'll go through the queue. Tijani first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. Do you hear me first?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Recalling the Board, the whole Board, is [inaudible] action. And we said during our discussion, that is something that perhaps will never happen. And that everyone doesn't want it to happen. So it will be an ultimate situation. And if for this ultimate situation, we will have another ultimate situation that the Board will refuse to do what the community asks for, it will be the top of something that perhaps will never happen really.

There is two things. We want to be able to apply the powers that we are trying to have, on the other side, we are trying to avoid any action in the court in California, because the reasons you mentioned and for

perhaps other reasons. So what we have to do have something that everyone accept, I think that the trust is the most important point.

People are not trusting each other, which is a problem, and people are [inaudible] the really ultimate creation, the very, very situations that perhaps will never happen. So I think we will not find a middle ground for that, and I think that we have to minimize the harm. The main thing for me is to minimize the harm. We don't have to because locking the machine, will not be the right situation.

But minimizing the harm will be the good thing. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. And I will ask you privately, exactly how you would do that. But not in public, right now. Olivier, last call, please be brief.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And as you can be, we have consensus, even in At-Large, in all of these issues. I was just going to mention to you that this week, the world summit of information society, WSIS forum, is taking place in Geneva at the ITU. The cross community working group on Internet governance, which works with ICANN staff on all matters of Internet governance that relates somehow to ICANN, is staging a workshop on Thursday afternoon.

The workshop is actually described on this page, I believe, yeah. And there is remote participation that is possible. So it will be, so if you are

interested in these issues. What we're going to do, is to not actually discuss the proposal themselves, because these are still in discussion, proposals of course, both for the IANA stewardship transition, the ICANN accountability, and also the proposals from the IETF and from the regional Internet registry communities.

What we're going to look at is the multistakeholder process that was used, and that is still being used at the moment, to reach consensus. At this stage, we don't know whether it will succeed or not. We all have high hopes that it will succeed. And I guess that it is a work in progress. But this is a good way to show the processes, a bit of a showcase, because as you know, at the end of the year, the UN General Assembly is going to be discussing Internet governance, and specifically also, the multistakeholder model of Internet governance.

And we felt that maybe it was something to showcase as a multistakeholder system that is actually able to make decisions. And we're hoping, as I said, that this will work. There is a second link that I put into the chat there, which has got the draft presentation that there will be another draft up there in a few hours time.

That will give you an idea of what the process has been so far, and what the process will be in the near future. And that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I'll repeat something I've said before. We are multistakeholders because we don't [all say the] same thing. And sometimes we can compromise, sometimes we can agree to disagree.

But you know, we are going to have differences of opinion, and some of them are not going, we're not going to convince the other one to change.

And I think that's the world that we're advocating, so we better figure out how to make it work. All right. Next item on our agenda is At-Large planning for Buenos Aries. I'm going to turn this over to León and Gisella, in some order or the other. We have allocated 15 minutes for it. It's going to be really tight if we use all of the 15 minutes, so do what you can to keep it brief. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. I'll just hand it over to Gisella, who has all of the information on this. And I think she can be very brief with this. So Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you León. My voice has gone a bit funny. This is Gisella funny. We have pretty much come to the final scheduling for Buenos Aries. And all information can be found on the Wiki pages, day by day. This has been a little bit of reshuffling. As far as the agendas go, we are still have an outstanding agenda for the NCSG on the GAC meeting, as well as a couple of the working groups and regional meetings.

We have the EURALO who will be meeting in Buenos Aries again, who actually hasn't been meeting over the past few meetings. It will be nice to get together with EURALO on the Tuesday morning, bright and early

at 7:15. As for the rest of the social gatherings, there is no music night and there is no gala in Buenos Aires.

And you can see the draft schedule, I think you've all got scrolling powers, and if you have any questions, please go ahead. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't have a question, but I have a statement I'll make. When you look at the ALAC agendas, for our various meetings, you're going to find them to have less specificity than normal. Although we will be identifying meetings with other people, we're keeping our own agenda pretty flexible right now, because we believe we're going to have to be making some last minute additions.

That should be doable. It will impact the translations of these, because we will be doing changes at the last moment, despite staff telling me we're not allowed, but it will be happening. So I don't think there is any way forward other than that. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you Alan. I have that time, this conflict between the CCWG meeting, the Board, and our session on Sunday. And I was told that the agenda of the ALAC meeting will be arranged so that the absence of the CCWG members will not be a problem. Did we do something in this regard, or is it still pending?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think anyone said it won't be a problem. We will try to minimize the impact, number one, since we're talking about a third of the ALAC. And as I just said, we're keeping these agendas flexible right now. That's not the only thing we're going to have to work around. So we know it, but if you're asking me exactly how we're addressing it right now, and what am I going to schedule against that so there is a minimal impact, I can't tell you today.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you have any good suggestions, however, you're welcome to work with us on scheduling the meetings.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, it's just an hour. Alan, we can think about it, it's just an hour. So we may arrange, the lunchtime, for example, something like this, so that it will be at the same time as the CCWG meeting with the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not quite lunch hour, but yes, I understand. Based on Buenos Aires dinner time, you're right, it probably is lunch hour. Not when we normally schedule it, but we, Tijani, there is no way we can move that, and there are some of us who are going to be there whether we like it or not. So we will work around it. That's all I can promise you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella has put it in red, however. So there is a message there. Anyone else?

Heidi, you wanted to talk about agendas.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. So I wanted to first, okay, announce that staff are trying to make this Friday, the 29th, a deadline for all agendas for At-Large meetings. We need to send in to Language Services for translation. So we would really ask that you do finalize the agendas. ALAC, ALT, as well as RALO, working groups agendas by this Friday.

Gisella is working with you on the RALO and working group agendas, and I'm working with Alan on the ALAC and ALT agendas. I wanted to take just a few minutes to go over the Sunday and Tuesday and Thursday ALAC sessions. And Alan, I promise I'll be as brief as I can. Now again, these are draft.

I just heard from Gisella that one of these sessions that I've set out will not work. So again, we need to change. I put it into the chat Sunday, and wanted to just go through, very quickly, what those are going to be. We're going to start out with Alan setting some ground rules, then move quickly into a discussion with Fadi for 30 minutes, followed with a 10 minute session by Rinalia of Board selection criteria.

Then that continues with a GSE [inaudible] for a little less than an hour. And then followed by one hour of ALS criteria and expectations. And Alan, that one may change, you'll see in just a moment why that might be switched to the afternoon. Then following, there is a break. There will be an at lunch review working party meeting, I'm not going to go over that.

Then the ALAC original leadership working session continues in the afternoon, 13:30 to 17:30. Currently, we have a one hour discussion of ICANN accountability and transparency, followed by a one hour of IANA functions stewardship transition. I've been told that that won't work, that transition session. So likely, that's going to be moved up in the morning, and the ALS criteria will be moved there.

Then we have 30 minutes on the meeting strategy, ICANN's meeting staff will be there to listen to you and provide responses to hopefully draft plans, that the new At-Large meeting strategy working party will be able to present in draft form. Then we have a session for 45 minute session with the SSAC, with Patrik Fälström and Jim Galvin. Julie Hammer, you're going to be moderating that session.

And then we have a 45 minute session with the ccNSO, which is still being confirmed. Moving to Tuesday...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, before you move on, could you put your bullet proof vest on, and point out which sessions conflict with the Board CCWG meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I'm going to hand that one over to Gisella, because she is queen of conflict avoidance.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe it's 16:30 to 17:30, is it not Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here, yes correct Alan. I have pointed that out. Heidi is a big discussion, NTIA stewardship, so we will have to shuffle things around on Sunday afternoon. But as Heidi said, it will no doubt be quite a bit of shuffling around prior to the Buenos Aries meeting.

So please always bear in mind that the latest version will be here on the Wiki pages, and will update them as and when changes occur. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, Heidi may be asking for final versions on Friday. There will be a version on Friday, I can assure you it will not be the final. And Tijani, you don't mind being at two meetings at one place, do you? You only have to be in meeting strategy and the Board meeting, so maybe they won't be too far apart.

After my attempt at humor, go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So again, thank you Alan. This is Heidi. So yeah, I've just heard of that conflict. My initial thought is to just do some switches with the morning

and the afternoon session. So we'll see how that goes. So moving on to Tuesday, we have the ALAC meeting with the Board. We do now, Gisella if you could please put the Board questions in, we now have those finalized.

That session is 8:30 to 9:30 in the new format. I believe we've discussed that new format previously. Then following that, we have the ALAC meeting with the GAC, and then we have the two sessions of the ALAC. So again, just right now, we have a long session of working group updates, including the Academy, the ATLAS 2 implementation taskforce, capacity building working group, and the At-Large new meeting strategy working party.

Those have not been confirmed yet. So if Alan, you can consult and let me know if those are going to be the correct ones, that would be appreciated. Then we also have a 30 minute session with [inaudible], IDN staff, or At-Large, ICANN staff, talking about IDN updates. Then we have a 30 minute session operation update, from Xavier Calvaez, CFO, and Carole [Carnell] who is from the business intelligent program management session division.

We then, in ALAC policy part two, we have one hour with Chris Gift. And others on the status of the At-Large website. And then from, similar to what we had in Singapore, we have 30 minutes with [inaudible], chief innovation and information officer and Chris Gift.

On ICANN information management plans, and again, I have not had that confirmed from you Alan. And then we have 30 minutes on privacy and proxy services with Holly and Carlton. Thursday, due to various

meetings, during the morning we have had to split the Thursday sessions. So right now we have a very short early morning session. On Thursday, it's one hour, 7:30 to 8:30, and right now I have reports from the liaisons and the RALO chairs.

And then the afternoon session, 12 to 1:30, that is going to be ALAC discussion and review of action items. And that's it for the ALAC. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Any other issues? By the way, I just realize that I had carefully scheduled a 90 minute agenda, and this is in fact, 120 minute meeting. So we're not quite as tight as I've been implying. So people can start speaking slower. However, we are here we're we are, and I don't think we've cut anyone off too much in getting here.

Any other questions about the Buenos Aries schedule or anything else associated with the meeting? I'm presuming, since I have heard no problems, that everyone is okay in terms of travel, visas, and everything else. If there are any issues anyone wants to raise, not their specific issues here, but if there are issues that need attention, please contact me and/or Heidi.

Any other questions on the agenda? As I've said, several times now, it's going to be changing as we go forward. Every meeting we pull our respective hair out, and then find the next meeting has a tighter schedule than the last one. I don't think there is much choice but to somehow keep up.

Yes Cheryl, or we can finish early. I certainly hope we can. By accident, we might. Nothing else on agendas, then we go on to the next item which is related to the fiscal year 16 ALAC budget requests. And Heidi wanted to spend a few minutes talking on a number of our new initiatives for this meeting, for the upcoming meeting. Upcoming implying Dublin, not Buenos Aries.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Alan. Very briefly, I will definitely not take 10 minutes for this. Just wanted to bring your attention to a couple of ALAC fiscal year special requests that have been improved. The first one that will take place in both Dublin, ICANN 54 and ICANN 55 in Marrakesh, is an ALAC strategy session.

What that means is that the full ALAC will now be there for a full working day on the Saturday, on the first day of the meeting. And we wanted to know how you wanted to proceed in planning that. Not urgent, but we will be starting to plan for Dublin very quickly after Buenos Aries. So we needed to know about the meeting times, etc. if you needed to have any kind of trainers, or documents in addition to what you normally do.

And also then, the second item is the ALAC development session. That is new for Dublin. And that will be held on the Friday, the last Friday of the ICANN meeting. That will be for the incoming, the new ALAC members. That will be a full day of meetings for team work building, for planning the new ALAC, etc.

And again, in a similar vein, we needed to know whether you had any kind of documents you wish to have, or trainers, etc. One thing that At-Large staff will be planning for that session is sort of like a beginner's guide for new ALAC members. This is something that we have, we've had previously for the ALS starter kit, but for more advanced, and for something that the ALAC, the new ALAC members can read prior to session, and use as a resource following that session.

Those are the only two items that I wanted to highlight.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I notice Cheryl said excellent about the extra days. That does mean we will have seven solid days, plus other things added on for some of us. So it should be interesting. Any other comments regarding those budget items or other things?

I notice, a number of people are talking about the visa issue for Beran. No, I don't think I want to make a lot of public statements. You've seen the letter I have sent. We have not received a particularly useful answer at this point, and I'm not letting it drop is all I will say. I don't think I want to be specific at this point about who I'm going to corner and what I'm going to do about it.

I hope you'll trust me on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

We do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else on that item? Item number 10, we have ALS onboard proposed initiatives. And somebody from staff will be presenting this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, this is Heidi. On behalf of Natalie, and Ariel to some extent, this is, I'm very happy about this. This is a fantastic new initiative that has been used in the GNSO, but At-Large is going to be given the updated and more advanced version of this. So if I can just take a few minutes to walk through the proposals for ALS onboarding.

First off, the aim of this is basically to increase engagement from the start. And new ALSs are really the primary focus, but also current ALSs will hopefully be invited to this, quite quickly. And sorry. If you're hearing clicking and wheezing, I have a guest parrot that has decided to start talking right now.

The two webinars, will be really the main part. We have the first webinar, will be an informal introduction by staff, for all new ALSs. And again, this is going to be, we're going to be waiting for a critical mass of new At-Large structures. I'm in the middle, we will start the webinars at that point. So it's not going to be a one off webinar for one ALS or so. It will be maybe five or six on the call.

So the first webinar will be an informal introduction by staff. Staff will walk through, introduce themselves and explain what their roles are, and how At-Large staff can assist the ALSs. The ALSs will be asked to introduce themselves, and then there will be a question and answer session.

In fact, the first session of this format will begin the first week of June 4th, the last several ALSs have joined. The second webinar will include At-Large, the chair and the RALO chairs. It will be a little bit more formal than the initial one with staff. Alan will be briefing, providing a brief overview of At-Large, and the RALO chairs will be explaining how to engage in RALO activities for those particular ALSs.

And that second webinar will take place the second week of June. Now in addition to these webinars, there are going to be additional assistance offered by At-Large staff. The first is that we're going to be working with the RALO chairs, that during the first monthly meetings, there will be a standard 10 minute slot for new ALS members. And we'll be working with the chair as well as the new ALSs to ensure that they are all aware that they're supposed to be on that call, and to have some materials there.

Secondly, we'll be setting up a new Skype chat helpline. And that will be where staff and the new ALSs will be on a group chat, aimed at providing around the clock assistance to new ALSs and unaffiliated members, for a period of around three months. And that's going to be, where rather than having email, one off emails, there will be a source where we can provide any responses to questions that new ALSs might have on the technical parts.

So on Adobe Connect rooms, on [inaudible], etc. And at the end of those three months, there will be directed to the RALO Skype chat, if there are any, or there [inaudible] to be engaged directly with experienced members. Okay? And finally the third element, will be [inaudible] document. We've noted that the At-Large starter kit that

was developed three or four years ago is rather out of date, both for the content as well as in the look.

And Nathalie and Ariel will be developing a new beginner's guide, in a way, for the At-Large structure. We'll be doing a [inaudible] to Skype chat, we'll be including all of this new information about the webinars, that helpline, doing social media information as well. And I think that's it. And again, the long term of that is to have all the documentation ready for when the new At-Large website launches.

So I think that that is it. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We have a queue. Tijani.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Thank you Heidi and staff for those [inaudible]. And I really thank you for that. I think that we need more and more initiatives. But since all of those initiatives concern the RALOs, the ALSs, the regional community, did you discuss them with the RALOs or discuss with, or perhaps they had ideas? Perhaps they can improve them.

Perhaps they can give you other ideas that you can add or that you can modify so that it will be the best interest of the community.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, may I respond to that?

ALAN GREENBERG: You certainly may.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Tijani. The discussion today was really the first formal discussion we've had with the ALAC. We've talked about this with Alan already. And then, if the ALAC would like to move forward and support that, we would definitely want to talk to the RALO leaders, etc. to introduce this more formally with them and get their feedback.

Yes, very much. All of the RALO leaders are the ones that know their regions the best. So we would want to take that into account, definitely.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thank you Alan. It's Murray McKercher speaking for the record, wearing my NARALO hat. I just wanted a quick comment, I had spoken to Natalie about this initiative. I'm very impressed and happy that it's happening. I also had a conversation with a new Canadian ALS, and the feedback was that they were so totally overwhelmed with the pile of messages coming from ICANN. Not even sure where to start.

And the one thing that I took away from the long conversation with them was that they were saying, “Well, what can we do for ICANN as a representative of, in this case, the consumer’s council of... Consumers or users of the Internet. What can we provide to ICANN? As opposed to what can ICANN to provide to us.” And I thought that was great outreach from their perspective.

So looking forward to working with everyone on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Murray. Any other comments?

Then is there any other business anyone else has?

Seeing nothing, hearing nothing... Murray, you’re on.

MURRAY MCKERCHER:

Sorry Alan, another topic. Usually I mention this, the dot [mobi] liaison position, I’ll switch hats. I’ve published the report in the Wiki for the last meeting, so I just want everybody to know that they are there, if they’re interested in following that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Murray. Well, in that case, due to a scheduling error on my part, we are ending early. Thank you all for attending, and we’ll see you in Buenos Aries, if not before. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]