
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's ALT Leadership monthly call on Wednesday, the 26th of November, at 18:00 UTC.

We have Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Leon Sanchez, Alan Greenberg, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Apologies noted from Tijani Ben Jemaa.

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

Ron Sherwood has also just joined us on the call.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Gisella. I apologize in advance, I've seem to have contracted a cough in the last half hour. So if I start gasping or something, just me not the phone line.

I hope this will be a relatively short meeting. We're going to spend the majority of our time going over the ALAC meeting and seeing whether there is any follow-up we need to take. I don't think there is in most cases, but that's about what we're going to be doing.

In terms of policy development, we have only one item on the books, and we have a number of volunteers. More volunteers than I've seen in

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.

quite a while for anything. I don't know whether... Has anyone on this call actually looked at the operating plan yet?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Okay. So we don't really know whether we're going to be really happy with it, or very unhappy with it. I'm going to suggest to the drafters, and Leon is on the call right now so he can react so he choose, that this looks like an interesting opportunity to use some staff support to help draft a response, if indeed, we end up having something substantive to talk about.

If you're familiar with the, you know, how GNSO PDPs and other major working groups work, you tend to have good conversations on the teleconferences, and a staff person takes the responsibility of trying to draft and summarize everything that was said. I think that's something we want to move towards when we have drafting groups that are more than one or two people. And this looks like a good opportunity, but I do want to pass it by the people first.

From a history point of view, many, many years ago, there were comments and statements that we could not have staff drafting anything because they would say what they wanted, not what we wanted to say. I don't think there is any evidence of that happening in many recent years, certainly not on AC or SO owned documents, and I think it's something that we want to try.

So, we have two hands. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Sorry, I have a full mouth. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Just with regards to what we mentioned on the finance. I have actually received a link to the call which took place a couple of days ago, which unfortunately I don't think any of us could follow because we were on other calls. It was a webinar on the five year upgrade plan, and FY 15 operating plan and budget.

It would be helpful for people to review this. There was an announcement of the recording just today. I'm just about to forward it to the finance and budget subcommittee. Would you like me to forward it to others, or are you also on this mailing list?

ALAN GREENBERG: [CROSSTALK] I do not remember if I'm on it. That should be forwarded to the ALAC, though, in general.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I'll forward that to the ALAC in general then. And the...

ALAN GREENBERG: The incoming finance and budget committee may not be the existing one, so ALAC certainly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent. Will do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl. Cheryl, we don't hear you.

[CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My unmute is not as fast as other unmuters, apparently. Cheryl for the record. My [inaudible] is new business on policy, so do you want to wait to review this line item?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry Cheryl. I could not understand what you said. You were just muffled. Try again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll unmute my microphone, is that better?

ALAN GREENBERG: I could hear that. Let's try it with the substance.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Mine is a piece of new policy business. Do you want to come to that after you finish with this line item?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. And I think we are finished, unless someone else has a comment on the only one that I knew is open. So please go ahead with the new policy item.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. Okay, well based on what was now my last night, use of country and territory names in TLD meeting, I wanted to find out what the current state of play is in terms of an ALAC response to the current GAC work that is going on. Because we find that there is a current disconnect, but hopefully something that will be repaired between now the Singapore meeting, between the long standing cross-community working group, chartered by GNSO and ccNSO.

And that of the very new approach that GAC has taken to a similar study. Because of the nature of the time of the year, and because of the fact that I won't actually have a draft of what the cross-community working group will be hopefully putting in, provided the GNSO and the ccNSO proves on the image in [inaudible] 11th of December, it will come to the ALT to consider whether or not the ALAC would like to come along as some sort of support for the approach that the cross-community working group is taking on this.

It's not an impasse, but it's an opportunity to make sure that we get a better outcome, and certainly that we don't have two relatively new processes coming at loggerhead. As we're all aware, cross-community working groups are pretty much just in their infancy anyway, and this is the very third time that the GAC has decided to have a small

subcommittee do something and take it out for public comment at all, but they have done it in isolation and without any reference for any interaction with a preexisting study that was done primarily by the 15th or so, but in an open and cross-community way.

And that is currently being undertaken by the cross-community working group. So we have spent some time carefully drafting what we hope will be a welcomed input to the GAC, but we would like wider community support. If the ALAC wants to do that at all, the subcommittee to do that rather than probably take it before ALAC because of the timing. It all has to be done before 31 December this year, and the meetings of the GNSO and ccNSO are on the 11th. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I must admit, I'm drawing a blank on what the GAC is doing, and I've not been involved what the CCWG on Internet governance is doing. Sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sorry. It's not Internet governance, it's use of country...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Oh, I'm sorry, sorry. My mind is getting the CCWGs confused. You said that the ccNSO and GNSO would be approving it, round about, or maybe approving it round about the 11th of December?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is the statement in a form now that we can distribute it as an early draft so the people can see it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm hoping that it will be distributed sometime in the next 24 hours to the working group, and at that point, I would want to distribute [inaudible] the ALAC, depending on what [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Well certainly, I see no reason to restrict it to the ALT as long as you put whatever caveat words you want as to what level of draft it is. Clearly we are in a position to have the ALAC comment on it, and perhaps ratify, or not, in the same timeframe. We won't have an ALAC meeting, but we can certainly take an offline, either a vote or a consensus call on it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I would be seeking support for the approach of the cross-community working group, and that support would specifically be following up particularly with the GAC to encourage them to take up the opportunity of a joint meeting between this specific subcommittee, and the existing cross-community working group, because of the considerable overlap on what we're doing.

[CROSSTALK] The GAC is looking at use of names across a wider area, but the CTWG is specific to TLDs. That doesn't mean we should not be involved in it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do recall now reading the GAC description [CROSSTALK]...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...last meeting, at the last face to face meeting, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem. Certainly distribute what we have, you can certainly in a... In whichever form you feel it is best done, either the ALT or the ALAC, I would suggest the ALT first, propose what you think we should be doing with it, and how we should be going forward. And I have no problem with any of that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ron, I'm sorry. Olivier first and then Ron.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much Alan, it's Olivier speaking. On this specific topic, the discussion that we had [inaudible]... like three weeks ago, was

that we already had a statement on this. We had a statement on this topic. At-Large draft document from GAC [inaudible] geographic...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, there is a lot of noise and we can't quite make out what you're saying.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not sure, does it come from my line?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so. It only came on when you started talking. It's gone now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Has it stopped now?

[CROSSTALK]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Gisella do you want to say what it was? Well, I have the line, let me just tell you. Ron, it's your mic that's doing that, so if you could close your, turn your mic off until you're ready to speak please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. He apparently has. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Thank you. Alan, yeah, we had corresponded on this because there is an At-Large statement on the GAC subgroups on geographic names. And I don't know, well, asking Cheryl actually, how does this fit? Because we did have quite an extensive statement on this. Have we not caught this in our statement? Or is there another angle to it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. It is another angle. It is specifically making sure that this is more about process, because we have two entirely different new processes running in ALAC, and they are about to run in [inaudible], with the GAC doing what we all haven't told them to do, which is reaching out to the community earlier, but in [their?] isolation and ignorance of what is going on in a parallel cross-community working group, and more importantly, based on any of the results from a study group, that took certainly several years of my life, as well as that of other people's before.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Now it's all coming back. Thank you Olivier, and thank you Cheryl. There is a comment period open that was extended to the end of December, if I remember correctly. We had submitted something in time for the original deadline. There was a drafting group that we formed to do that. Somebody drafted something, and Leon, you were one of them, I know, but someone else drafted something and then essentially disappeared.

And [CROSSTALK] were left to try to make some sense out of it, if I remember correctly.

LEON SANCHEZ: That is correct Alan. This is Leon Sanchez for the record. Raf and I drafted the statement. There was a final paragraph contributed by Raf, which we didn't really know how it fit into the statement, so we had a couple of back and forth discussions on the paragraph. In the end, it was decided that we should take out the paragraph, as far as I can control. That's how it happened.

ALAN GREENBERG: Given that there was no one involved from the cross-community working group, and Cheryl if I'm wrong speak up, but I don't think there was anyone... Who is on the cross-community working group from At-Large other than you Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And good question. I'm the only one who turns up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And you weren't involved in drafting that statement, for whatever reason. Please take a look at what we submitted. If it makes no sense, then you need to privately tell us, and if necessary, based on the new thing coming out of the CCWG, if indeed, we need to retract our statement and make a new one, then please provide some guidance for us.

Is that a reasonable way forward?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes it is. Cheryl for the record. And [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I was going to pick up on the chat. This seems to be a process thing, where the GAC has started something whilst there was a CCWG already working on this, and one might end up with some results which don't agree with each other. It's not, I don't think it requires any additional response from us to the GAC request for input.

In fact, what it looks like is there is going to be some kind of letter that will be drafted by the existing cross-community working group, and Cheryl correct me if I'm wrong, or shout out if I'm wrong. And what Cheryl is asking for is our support, whether the ALAC would be able to do the support. And I've already said there is approval from me, and I'm sure we all would be doing that if we see an impending collision about to happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you Olivier. I did understand. And clearly, at the very least, our statement should have made mention of the fact that there is a

parallel activity if any of the people drafted it had realized there was a parallel activity. For better or worse, we didn't. So that at least can be covered in the kind of statement you're talking about.

I am asking you Cheryl, however, to look at the content, and from the perspective of someone who has been deeply involved in this for a long time, if she has any sage advice on what we explicitly said, that would be appreciated. But yes, I understand that the process issue, and we can rectify that by modifying our statement or signing onto something else, as has been described. So I do look to Cheryl for guidance on all of those aspects.

May we go on? We have taken far more than the estimated five minutes for this item, but hopefully the next one will be much shorter. I would like to go through the ALAC call at this point, if I can find it on my screen.

And I think in most cases, there will be very little to say here, but if I'm wrong, then we will have to say it. Okay, item five we've already covered. Item six, the various aspects of ALS revamping. Part one was just making sure our rules make some sense, can be parsed, and are something we can follow. We'll be starting on that relatively soon and hopefully finished on that relatively soon. Any comments on that?
Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Actually, my comment is not about item five or six, it goes rolling back actually from item one to four. I've noticed that the announcement of the new ALSs joining, and also

the reading to the record a summary of the GNSO and the ccNSO liaisons have been a minimum, and also sometimes yes, actually is on Wednesday where there is time available.

That wasn't done on the call, and I wasn't quite sure whether that was done purposefully and what was the thinking behind it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That was not done purposefully. I didn't think of it, it didn't show up on the draft agenda that staff put together. I asked staff to make sure in the future we do that one. The announcement of new ALSs, we certainly could do that. It shouldn't be any more than an announcement. I have no problem making sure that's included as well. Neither were deliberate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you. Thank you. It's Olivier. The reason why I'm asking is because I was little concerned about this. That not having the ALS announcement might seem to be just a mundane thing, but I think we are, we risk then losing the link between the RALOs, you know, the regions and the ALAC. And I must say, I was a bit surprised now of course, that I'm move of a passenger on the call, on the monthly ALAC call.

How few members from the RALOs were actually there. In fact, some chairs of the RALOs were missing, some secretaries of the RALOs were missing, and now I understand why there is this somehow disconnect between the two. I'll try to think of ways to do this...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, on both the agenda items and the people, I think this is one of those places where we shouldn't assume deliberate conspiracy when the simple, the answer is either we forgot, or in the case of several chairs, they explicitly said they couldn't make that meeting. And we scheduled that time because we believed all of the available ALAC people could, and we did that at the expense of a few chairs in this case.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, I'll be checking that, or monitoring that, in the future to [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps you can suggest these before the meeting and not only afterwards, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Well, I wasn't aware... Sorry. It's Olivier again for the transcript. I hadn't actually read the, I'll admit, I haven't actually fully studied this. It didn't just strike me that it was missing, it was just that when we went through it during the meeting, that I found it was missing and thought it was a bit strange. Anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted, and we will make sure it sticks next time. Back on the ALS approval, ALS certification, decertification issues. Does anyone have a

comment on the first one, that is, making sure our rules make sense?
Olivier, your hand is still up. I'm presuming it's an old hand then.

The next item which is...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry. Old hand, and my real hands are used at the moment for something else...

ALAN GREENBERG: I will forthwith ignore your hand from now...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure we want to know what Olivier is doing with his hands, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm eating and I've got food over my hands at the moment, that's the problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for sharing that with us.

On the review of ALS criteria, and I skipped over the voting. We've already decided on that, that will be put in place. On the ALS criteria and expectations, that's a longer term project but we will, I will be soliciting people to participate in that process. I'm not at all sure how

that is going to play out given the very diverse comments that were made by various people, but we'll see.

I'm optimistic we'll hand over something better than what we have right now, and we'll see how that works. Any other comments we have? Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks Alan. This is Leon. [Inaudible] rated, but when calling for people to reviews these ALS criteria, maybe one thing they should look at, or we should look at, is the fact that there are people jumping from one ALS to another, or even going out some ALS and having their own ALS founded. So this might be a problem at some point because I think that some people are more into creating ALSs for diverse reasons, other than really contributing to the At-Large structures.

So maybe that's something if we just keep in case.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If that's an issue, then it should be brought up when we actually have the discussion. And we need to formulate some way of preventing something if indeed, it can be prevented.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Excellent. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next item is on the CCWG selection process that Olivier is running. Olivier, is there anything that you need to raise with this group or report here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I was going to just speak briefly about the previous ALS criteria as well. I think we also need to maybe look at the individual, well what the RALOs are doing for their individual members as well, because obviously ALS criteria will not work as far as these ALSs that work specifically for individual members, and we also have to track these one way or another.

But coming back now to the CCWG selection...

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may interrupt Olivier, you'll note there is a bullet there on individual members. I didn't talk about it yesterday, but it is one of the issues that we must address. And I personally would like to see us pushing individual members more than telling every person who gets involved, that if you want to be permanently involved, you need to go find an ALS.

I think that's one of the reasons we have a lot of ALSs with one person in them, or one active person. That will be the substance of the discussion, not today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll move that discussion some other time. I don't know if Cheryl wants to speak about that, or CCWG selection.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, are you still on ALSs or on the CCWG?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm actually on ALSs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I wanted to raise the point, and I have another call it's going to come in at the top of the hour, so I apologize [inaudible] I don't know why they're calling me now. That particularly related to what Leon raised, about also based on individual members, in particular, we need to look at some harmonization of the requirements for harmonization between the individual membership rules that should come out of each of the RALOs.

Obviously, North America has theirs, and that's clearly established. RALOs only recently put their [inaudible] into the documentation. But what APRALO specifically does, because it was an almost as soon as we announced that we were open for individual members, we did have one or two applications, but at least one of those applicants, and they're still being considered and worked through, how at least one of those applicants was from out of region, in inverted commas, in other words, they fell outside of the criteria that our new operating principles had established.

So, I think we need to look very carefully as we're taking this ALAC approach to this, to look at what maybe is happening in review of regional rules, to make sure we don't, to try and solve problems before they become problems. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. And one of the problems that I see, at this point, is at least some regions have adopted rules regarding voting, that are different from each other. NARALO treats all individual members as a single virtual ALS, and that ALS has a vote. AFRALO has decided, after a very heated discussion, to do just the opposite, at least for the moment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And in APRALO has been silent on that, because we work on consensus and try to avoid those like the plague.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Understand. But in any case, yes, there, we will have to look at that and see to what extent we can make rules consistent. There is also an issue which needs to be investigated, to what extent can ALS criteria be applied retroactively? And we've had a few non-lawyer answers to that, that are not necessarily the same, but that it is something we'll be looking at as part of that process. And now back to you Olivier, for the third time, I think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So, as far as the selection for the cross-community working group on accountability is concerned, we have another few hours until the time closes for the application window, and then the group will be sent a survey, which will have the names of all of the candidates, and will...

So the selection committee will have to do that. And so, it will effectively will be voting and marking the candidates. Everyone does that independently, so that there is no way to be influenced by other people on the selection committee. And then in about a weeks' time, just less than a weeks' time, I think five or six days' time, I've asked staff to send a Doodle to the subcommittee members.

We'll then have a conference call and make our final selection based on the marks that we have given to the candidates. The update has been that great so far, but I know that there are sometimes some last minute applications coming in, so we've done our best to publicize this. I think that some people have inquired, and they have certainly inquired to me as to how much work it is, and I didn't want to lie to them and say, "Well, it is a significant amount of work, and it's going to have to be... It's [inaudible] amount of work."

In other words, there might be some periods where you're just going to have to work and you'll have four days to produce a document as a group, and it's going to be hard. And I would rather have a person not apply if they don't think that they can commit to this, rather than someone applying and then giving us an empty slot and not making the At-Large community look committed to this process altogether.

In fact, I've looked at the attendance figures so far for the cross-community working group, sorry for the community working group on IANA stewardship transition, and the ALAC doesn't have that great a track record on this, although for various reasons. I think many of us were travelling around and so on. Whilst our involvement has been actually better than the average, on the face to face meeting, as far as the mailing list is concerned and our activity there.

There have been a lot of silent voices on the call if you just count the number of people that are on the call. So, that's enough. Back to the accountability thread. We should have someone ready, or a list of people, five people ready for that working group as soon as it starts. I have no idea though, when that working group will start. I haven't been given any details as to any first calls or anything like that.

And with regards to the selection, I think we've got a process that runs itself. Probably now it's oiled. The committee has already selected people for the previous processes, so that's no problem. The only thing of concern still, at the moment, is that NARALO is not missing one, but now two people from that committee. And I have repeatedly asked the NARALO leadership to provide me with actual, with an official selection, you know, an official note saying, "These are the people that we're putting on this committee."

All I've received back are personal notes, which are not, emails to the NARALO mailing list, back to one of the notes that I did receive was, "Oh, I'm resigning and here is the person who is going to replace me." And I said, "I'm sorry. It doesn't work like that." So I would appreciate if there is anyone who is contact with NARALO leadership on this, to

please and help this one out because the work of the group is about to start, and we're speaking about the start in less than 24 hours.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, I can speak to that. For all intense purposes, it's not clear there is any active NARALO leadership at the moment, but there will be a discussion later on today, and you will have an answer. From a personal point of view, just finding out what the surnames of the people are who have been identified as possible candidates, was like pulling hen's teeth, the ones that don't exist.

So, we have a bit of a problem but hopefully we will get you some names.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this feedback Alan. It's Olivier speaking. That's really helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG:

For what it's worth, the two names that have been identified, even though we had a hard time finding out what they're real names were, seem to be very qualified people.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Oh dear.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. Next item is finance and budget subcommittee. Olivier, I know you had a lot to say yesterday. I don't think we need to have it repeated. One of the things I will be doing, or asked to be done, is an analysis of what kinds of requests were made in this last year, or possibly the last two years, to identify which of them are indeed travel ones, which may be sort of out of favor, and whether, what other kinds of requests do we have that we consider ICANN made a mistake on.

So there will be some review of that past. We're not trying to wipe out the history, but we would like to increase our success rate. Comments? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. No, I'm not going to repeat what I said yesterday, you were all on the call. Just on the issue of membership on the subcommittee of finance and budget, the current membership includes at least one member of the ALAC from each one of the regions, and then there were one, in fact I think, in all the regions, at least two people from each ones of the RALOs.

But they were not from the RALO leadership. And I think I heard you yesterday say that you wanted someone from each one of the RALO leadership, which meant either the chair of the RALO, or the secretariat, or one of the vice-chairs of that region. Could you expand on that? Because I'm not sure whether that was what you meant. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. What I propose to the ALAC, to the ALT, which is somewhat different than what I proposed yesterday, is that the second voting member, as it were, if there are actually ever votes, should be someone from the RALO management leadership, chair, vice-chair, secretariat. I modified that yesterday to say it could be another person, that person must be empowered to speak on behalf of the RALO.

In at least one case, and I'm speaking of NARALO, the people who were on the committee were volunteers who said, "I'm willing to be on the finance and budget committee," but had no authority, discretion, to really speak on behalf of the RALO, or make value judgments on behalf of the RALO, or were, to my knowledge, involved actively in, might not have been involved actively in the proposals that in, and looked at them before they went into the RALO.

So I want to make sure that on the finance and budget subcommittee, we have someone who can speak from their RALO's perspective, and who has done some level of triage before it even gets to the committee. Is that any clearer?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. That's very clear, and I think that's an excellent idea actually. I fully support it. The concerns now is, I guess, is really how quickly movement has to take place. A couple of things are related to the finance and budget subcommittee, the main one is... Well, if you look at the wiki page on the finance and budget subcommittee, you'll find out that the list of members is not correctly drafted.

So for example, Dev Anand Teelucksingh is not an ALAC member anymore, and therefore that takes away any ALAC member, at the moment, on that subcommittee. You might think that's not a big problem, but that actually is when you link this over to the community regional outreach pilot program, where the members of the CROPP are picked, an even number, from the finance and budget subcommittee on the one side, and from the outreach subcommittee on the other side.

And of course, as we speak, CROPP requests are being filed, are moving through, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh is the chair of the CROPP, at the moment, I would recommend keeping him as the chair of the CROPP. He does an amazing job on this, but obviously we need to rearrange things and make sure that we actually fall within the settings that we decided to have, because the CROPP is operational, and as we speak, is agreeing and allowing travel requests, etc.

And obviously, you want to make sure our T's are crossed, was it P's and Q's? I can't remember. Whichever. I couldn't find the right letter to do something with. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let's try to stay on focus. The alphabet is not part of that. A couple of things Olivier, with regard to CROPP I explicitly said that's not covered in today's announcement, in yesterday's announcement. That needs to be considered. I would not presume that just because the wiki site has people there, that that is going to be the committee going forward.

I understand, however, the work has to continue, certainly with regard to CROPP, and my perspective is to say, whoever is there, can continue

working until we formally reform the group. So, I don't want to try to stop the world because we're concerned with a lot of other things and haven't gotten to committee membership yet, but I'm not presuming that it will stay the same as it is, which is why I suggested we may not want to link to the current finance and budget committee, to give the impression that that is the current membership, or that is the membership going forward.

Anything else on that particular item?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl, just following if you may indulge me for a moment. Thanks Alan. I obviously was prattling on about this particular, with reference to the CROPP from a very selfish point of view, because without, with the new lineup for finance and budget subcommittee, I certainly have had [inaudible] to continue as a CROPP participant. And I would like to think that, as I was from the [inaudible] finance and budget subcommittee, and coming from the ALAC perspective on the finance and budget subcommittee, that was a role continuing, or wanting to continue with CROPP.

That link, and I made it very clear about not having CROPP continued, but it's caused different no man's land, if [inaudible]. Olivier was particularly coming from, where we now don't have members from the ALAC who are holding positions anymore, because they're no longer on the ALAC, in the finance and budget subcommittee. These people have not been used to be reappointed in some regional sense, either in general or to fit in with the new rules, that's by design or post design.

But we need to have a call for finance and budget subcommittee to be properly constituted as soon as possible. And if you at least make it clear that participants with a capital P, are welcome, we can then use that rule to have the continuation in things like CROPP, because [inaudible] and I would like to think me, would be very unhealthy, at least in terms of CROPP, maybe not in terms of finance and budget subcommittee. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. Yes, your comment on CROPP and your involvement was certainly noted. And I would have no problem with you continuing. A call for participation in finance and budget, should have gone out last night. I apologize, it hasn't. It will go out soon, and we will constitute that committee as soon as possible, and again, you're note about CROPP is noted.

Anything else on finance and budget before we go on to the next item? Hearing nothing, ALAC meeting schedule. We didn't actually talk much about that yesterday. At this point, Cheryl by the way, thank you for your intervention. It needed to be said and it was much better said from someone who regularly gets up at 3:00 in the morning than by me. Who had ALAC meetings for my entire career at completely convenient times, which I consider, I'm quite happy with it, but I'm not sure that's fair.

And I'd like to try to be fair if nothing else. I understand we have had problems trying to find other slots before, and we're going to try again, because we haven't done it in a good number of years, and I suspect

we're going to try locating, and we'll see how it works. In any case, we'll be following up on that later this week, not today, not tomorrow, however.

Next item, ICANN 52. Is Heidi, or Leon, is there anything we need to highlight here that wasn't said yesterday already?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, if I... Go ahead Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Heidi. Not so far Allan. I've received a couple of files from Heidi and Gisella, I'm working on them. As I said yesterday, I will be playing with many options and then I'll get back to Gisella and Heidi, and of course, the ALT, to see how it fits into our agenda for Singapore. And from there we can go forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Alan, just really quickly. A little off the scheduling topic, but I'm just wondering if any of you have actually now received your welcome letters from constituency travel? I know Alan, you have not, but again, just let me know if you have actually.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier says no. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I was just going to reply to Leon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, okay, we'll go back to that in a minute. So, we have no, no one has received their travel letters from the ALT.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you. I'll follow up, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just for the record, for those of you who are wondering why. The travel letters for regular ALAC members were sent out several days ago. The issue of when the ALT arrives and can leave was still up for grabs at that point, so we were delayed. That is supposedly being resolved at this point, so you will have an arrival date on Friday to allow you to participate in the afternoon on Saturday for an ALT meeting.

That means, should your schedule allow, you could arrive Saturday morning, if you choose to do that, but you're allowed to arrive Friday, and departures for the ALT will be Saturday. Again, you could leave Friday, late on Friday if you choose to, but you're not required to. At least that's what I believe the letters will say, if the letters will ever go out. Holly, you have a question for Leon.

HOLLY RAICHE: I do. Leon, where is the scheduling up to, and in particular, will there be space for some kind of multistakeholder folder? The stuff that we've been doing previously, sort of an hour and half slot somewhere to address cross-community issues? Is that being discussed yet? Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Not so far Holly, but it will be an issue that will be, of course, considered, since [inaudible] one of the central topics in Singapore, I guess. So we're looking at the [inaudible] for planning our schedule for Singapore. We will definitely look into first community meetings, and first community working group meetings. So we can fit them into our schedule.

I don't know if that answers your question.

HOLLY RAICHE: It does. And we can work offline on the details of this.

LEON SANCHEZ: Excellent. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm presuming that sometime in the very near future, we will be asking ALAC people if they have any session requests, other than the regular ALAC sessions, for either working sessions or working group. Do recall that we are going to be cutting back, so some things that may have

some merit, may not get allocated at this meeting. This is a work in progress. Anything else on the ICANN 52 meeting?

Hello Evan, you're welcome to lurk. You can even speak if you wish.

IANA stewardship meeting, I think we've talked that to exhaustion between yesterday and today. Olivier, I assume we don't have anything else we need to add today. I will give you four seconds to unmute and say so if you do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's one second, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. ALAC review, and I don't think anything has happened between yesterday and today. It's going to be an interesting endeavor, but it's going to take a while to start unfolding. Any other business? [Inaudible] Columbia, we are still waiting for the definitive answer from a lawyer, we thought we had but it's not clear that we understood it properly. And there are two other items.

One item we were supposed to have on the agenda yesterday, which I forgot and perhaps was ill advised anyway, was we had a discussion on the last ALT meeting on Jean-Jacques's request for us to endorse him as a civil society rep on the NetMundial initiative, coordination committee. And we decided at that point, that it was not appropriate for us to speak on behalf of civil society or recommend a civil society rep.

He has asked in that case, would we simply recommend him based on his past history, and not specifically for civil society? I don't think that changes the perspective at all. If someone wants to speak up and say otherwise, then you're free to do so now. And my intent is to, on the internal ALAC list, since it is essentially a personal issue, to let the rest of the ALAC know what the recommendation of the ALT is, and see whether there is any disagreement on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just restating for the record, in this discussion, as I did in the last discussion, I certainly am of the view that the ALAC, as an entity, the ALT as a management sub-unit, should in none of these circumstances, be acting as an endorsement or referee for any individuals for any of these types of things.

So not just to speak on behalf of civil society, I think it is inappropriate for us as an entity to act as an endorser. It would open up a Pandora's Box of who to endorse, how to endorse them, how it could be regionally balanced. I mean, it would just become an absolute disaster. You know, why not your Great Aunt Mary from Lithuania?

It's just not worth going down the pathway, and I spoke to that when we had the conversation last time, and I just want to make sure it's back on the record again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Given that, I will send out draft of what I'll send to the ALAC internal list to the individual members of this group, and if you have any words of wisdom on how I should change the wording, please let me know. I tend to agree, and as ICANN is one of the organizers of the overall thing, whatever it is, I would tend to say that a part of ICANN should not act as a referee.

And the current ISOC position, I think just reinforces that. That the community is not of one mind, and best to stay out of it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I agree totally.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And Heidi, we had one more thing for any other business, and I can't recall what it is.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, Alan. This is Heidi. It was the issue of the current NARALO leadership issues.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, for those who have not been following, we have a bit of a problem, in that the current chair has been largely unavailable. Through a process that is not completely clear, he identified a vice-chair, a position that doesn't officially exist within NARALO, to act on his behalf in Singapore, and with words that were not completely clear.

It was primarily to chair a meeting, and that certainly we have no problem with. There will be a discussion later on among a number of NARALO people to try to move forward and get some clarity as to what is going on. So just to alert you, there is an issue, it's not at all clear just what the status is, but hopefully it will be within a little while.

And I would prefer no actual conversation on that, other than receiving my report. Is there anything else on this agenda that we need to talk about? We're an hour into an hour and a half meeting, and I would personally be absolutely delighted to stop very soon. And Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Just coming back to the finance discussion that we had earlier, I just wanted to ask whether staff have already sent notes out to the ALAC asking for the input on this financing, or was the only discussion of it during the call yesterday?

ALAN GREENBERG:

What do you mean on the finance thing? Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The feedback on the finance, the plan, the operational plan. A draft operating plan and budget.

ALAN GREENBERG: I ask for volunteers...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...where she is. Was there a public call volunteers being sent out to the list as well? Or not yet?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, there has not been a public call. That probably should be done. Sorry, I didn't think of that, and no one else did that either. We probably should make a public call for anyone else who wants to be involved, because there were a number of people who were not on the ALAC call.

Could I ask that to be an AI please? To be done by the weekend at the latest, allowing you to have turkey tomorrow, for those partake.

ARIEL LIANG: Alan, this is Ariel.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This is Olivier speaking. Ariel, I just found the message. Over to you Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. I actually send out the public call for this public comment, when the public comment came out. [Inaudible] from anyone from the At-Large community wanted to be the pen holder, please contact staff. But I don't think it's very effective. I then sent out another call for penholders through the ALAC list, and also as you instructed, I send out another call for comments just for the operating plan, and asking for input.

I sent all three messages so far, and also on Twitter too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Ariel. Olivier, I stand corrected. Yes we have sent out public calls.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. It's Olivier speaking. Thank you for this. I'll be following up on that, and responding to that, and providing the details of the webinar that took place a few days ago. I realized, whilst I was just about to hit the send key, there was other information on that email that wasn't information that would need to be sent to the ALAC, but more just to our people who have been following the financing.

So I'll send two separate emails. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I think one of the things that this reminds me of, that we need to reinforce with RALO leadership and the ALT, the ALAC members from RALOs, that if there is something that's going on that

they believe other people should be involved in, that they need to beat the bushes, and to raise awareness within their RALOs.

And I think, to a large extent, we may want to start being proactive. That is, not wait for volunteers, but ask people who we believe would be a good candidate to actually start doing this. Clearly waiting for volunteers is not going to be sufficient in all cases. Evan, you said you had one other item you wanted for any other business.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks a lot Alan. I don't think this has been covered earlier in the call. I apologize for coming late. This is a follow up on the GTLD work that has to do with the public interest commitment. As everybody knows, the statement was passed, and it was made at ICANN 51. A follow up comment, an explanation has been drafted and sent to the Board, at the request of some folks.

And I guess what I'm here to ask is from the ALT, is a little bit of direction going forward. So the motion that was passed in ICANN 51, in addition to calling for the freeze head, a couple of other things. Number one, it had to do with the appointing of a liaison to work with the compliance department in terms of making sure that we had communication about follow ups.

And the other one is the creation of a group to sort of come up with the, well if not fixing their current form, then what? I have an open invitation from the GAC to make a solicitation to them, in regard to filing a committee to try and determine how picks either need to be fixed or replaced. I have not sent out a message pending my

conversations here, and so now that the dust has settled, we've seen some of the reactions from the registry stakeholders.

So without having to take this to formal vote to ALAC, I'm looking for a little bit of direction, of the best way to proceed in terms of how to best follow up with this. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you Evan. Two things. The letter did go out, the new statement did go out to the Board, it has been received. There will be a new gTLD policy committee meeting sometime in the near future, early December, I don't remember exactly when. Just for the record, and Heidi can note this, if anyone cares, ICANN seems particularly poor these days of announcing ahead of time meetings, you know, meetings of the Board and meetings of the various Board committees.

So we're somewhat in the dark as to when they are, but I was told that it is in early December. I'm not hoping, to be honest, I'm rather dubious that we're going to see any action. The best action we can get out of that meeting is no decision, which implies to the registrars that, the registries rather, that the Board is agonizing over it if nothing else. I don't know what's going to happen, and I would not even try to predict, and I certainly have no inside information.

In terms of a follow on activity, staff, someone could you put an AI for me to come to contact Thomas, the new chair of the GAC, and ask whether he believes there is any interest in the GAC formally taking any further action on this? Because a GAC subcommittee which is not likely

to be active on by something the GAC does, has, I don't know if it has any impact.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry, Alan. As a matter of clarification, this is Evan. This is a follow up on specifically, from the meeting that was held between the ALAC and the GAC during ICANN 51. At which point, the issue was raised, and we were invited to, and in fact, I was given authorization to contact the GAC secretariat, that once I had an invitation letter drafted, not to create a GAC subcommittee, but to invite individual country participants from the GAC to be involved with the group that we would put together.

We were invited, in fact, to make that solicitation. I'm not sure it has to be asked for all over again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If you have anything in writing, can you forward it to me? We have a new GAC leadership, and it may be a very different stance than previously? Forward to me what you have in writing, and we'll talk privately about this.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. I'll have to go back to the transcripts from the GAC ALAC meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please do, and do it moderately quickly.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: There is nothing specifically in writing that is outside of the transcripts from that meeting, so I have to go through that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Anything else?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. Just a quick question related to that point. Should we add that analysis, that statement to the public comment template? You know the response that is up on the ICANN website? Because currently the analysis part, it says to be provided by the future challenges working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we had already asked for that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry, I didn't catch that. We'll follow that up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes please. Olivier, you have your hand up I believe. And Evan still has his hand up, I presume an old one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I wanted to touch on one small thing. With regards to the accountability track, that's now slowly edging forward after numerous different proposals which were rejected, etc., and so as we are about to select the members of the community working group, or cross-community working group on ICANN accountability, as you know, there are two tracks within ICANN accountability. One of them is the one that deals specifically with IANA issues.

Now, so far, we have allocated the work within the At-Large community. The job of getting all of the input from our community and so on, to the future challenges working group, and specifically to a, I think, a subset of the future challenges, where Holly was appointed to lead a group on this. And I wanted to find out what the progress was on that, whether this is ready to go, and whether we can, we take this as being the de facto way forward?

Bearing in mind, in the meantime, some of the accountability discussions, or at least some of the accountability announcements have been sent over to the IANA stewardship transition group as a backup, or as a process leading to this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no update. Does Holly have anything to say on this?

HOLLY RAICHE: Could I just, one brief statement? What happened from the accountability, going back to the ATLAS 2. The suggestion from ATLAS 2

that accountability goes to the future challenges working group with a subgroup, however, in the face to face Singapore meeting, it was decided that we don't have working groups, it wasn't accepted by the future challenges, Tijani was very upset as to where it fit.

And in the end I said, "Look, I don't know where this fits." And it turns out it didn't fit. So the whole thing was dropped because it just didn't fit into our structures. Now, if we want to have another discussion about where it fits, and whether it fits in our rules, I'd be happy to do so, but that died in Singapore, because...

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. So the message is, we need to formulate some backup group for whoever end us being on the accountability track. My suggestion, if I remember correctly, and I'm not sure that I do, is that we create, pardon me?

HOLLY RAICHE:

[Laughter] Keep going.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My recollection was the suggestion was that we take a subset of people who have said they were interested in accountability by actually signing up for the group, and that will constitute the subcommittee that will be looking at this. I cannot imagine that people who have input on the process, will not sign up to participate. Participation is not a commitment to go to every meeting even, so I see no reason not to simply take that group and make it the ad hoc committee.

If anyone has a different position, I'm willing to entertain it, but I don't see why we need to agonize over this to any greater extent. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. That's an old hand. It was just a question, so thanks for the clarification on this. Just it's important that we know where we're going to move. I think this accountability, once it gets going, is going to go really fast, because it has got an enormous amount of work waiting for it to fall on it. So we need to be absolutely sure about how we're going to treat it on this, but your suggestion that the people who become participants that committee working group, form the basis for a group is fine by me.

ALAN GREENBERG: And anyone who wants to join, it's not closed on a certain date. So if someone puts up their hand and says, "Me too, me too." Let them join, and they are part of the group. You know, there is a minor bit of work that we have to extract the email addresses so that we know who they are, but other than that, I don't see any reason to create yet another parallel group with somewhat different subset of people on it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else? Going, going, gone. Thank you very much. Talk to you later, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]