
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team, ALT, monthly meeting on Monday the 2nd of March 2015 at 20:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Glenn McKnight, Leon Sanchez, and Alan Greenberg.

Our liaisons are Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, and Julie Hammer.

We have no apologies for today's conference.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco, Nathalie Peregrine, and myself, Terri Agnew.

If I can please remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The first item on the agenda is review of the policy documents. We haven't done that in a little while, so I allocated a bit more time to it than normal. And who do we have on the call? Ariel is on the call. What time is it for you?

ARIEL LIANG: Hello everyone, this is Ariel. It's 4 AM in China.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Then you have our thanks.

ARIEL LIANG: I didn't sleep so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you have the list in front of you? If you could review it please?

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, okay. So we have the four public comment requests that we are working on. So the first one, as Heidi pulled out, it's in the Wiki page, the draft report rights protection mechanism review. That is the one where you're seeking penholders, and Alan sent a message to the ALAC working list. So if you want to write a drafted statement for that, just contact me.

So that's the one we're seeking a penholder. And on the second one, it's the GNSO policy implementation working group, the initial recommendation report. And that one, Holly already submitted a first draft, and already published in the Wiki workspace, so I just need, Alan you need to tell me when the call for comments should end, and then I can send out the call for comments message.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will do that. That period was to be extended until the middle of March, so we have a bit more time than we thought on that one. But I will send you a note.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you. And on the third public comment request is the IDN TLDs, LGR procedure implementation maximum starting repertoire version two. And that one, [Satish] already wrote a first draft, and already, are also uploaded to the Wiki, and I need a date for, close date for the call for comments. So Alan you'll get back to me on that too.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's on the IDN one.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. A couple of points I want to raise. We received, typically exceedingly few comments on these things. Does that mean that, at least for the people on this call, the ALT and the liaisons, that you read them all carefully and don't have any comments? Or, in general, do people ignore them unless it's a pet project of yours? I'm looking for honest answers, because we end up getting really little involvement in creating these statements, which we then say are attributable to ALAC and At-Large.

Anyone care to volunteer how they treat them? I know certainly, when I wasn't Chair, I would often not read some until the very last moment, often until they were actually coming up for vote, and that clearly was not a particularly wise way to go about it. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I do read them, but like you, I tend to kind of put them off until days or two, but sometimes, somebody has done really a lot of really impressive research, and I just think, well, I don't have anything to add. So I don't. Maybe I should just tick like or something.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Or just put a line or two. You're right, sometimes people do an awful lot of work, unfortunately, at times, people do an awful bad job, and we don't realize it until sometimes after it goes out to vote, or just before it goes out to vote, and I know Olivier, in the past, has, I won't say complained, but commented that sometimes he had some substantial work to do to make it something that was not too embarrassing.

And, you know, without naming any particular office, but we end up getting both ranges of the spectrum. Julie.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks Alan. If I guess, to date, I haven't read them, unless I see that they have the security and stability aspect to them, but I guess that's probably an assumption I shouldn't make, and you've made me think about that a little bit more and perhaps I should take more attention and make that judgment after I've read them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, I'll say, you have more of an excuse for limiting your range than those of us who are on the ALAC, and ultimately going to be voting for them.

JULIE HAMMER: Anyway, you've made me think, so thank you for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is a good thing. Any other thoughts? Because I really think we need to make sure that these are statements of the ALAC that everyone can support, not just because they voted for them, but because they actually have some level of belief that this is a good statement. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani. I generally read all the statements before I vote, but I don't go deeply into the statement, where I [inaudible]... Generally, I [inaudible] it's okay [inaudible]... But I don't do a [inaudible]... Just to see if I am okay with it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Your voice is breaking up by the way. But I'll ask you a question back, requiring just a simple answer, what happens when you read it just before you're voting, and you find you disagree? Or you don't disagree, but, I'll be blunt, but you're embarrassed by what

they're saying? Do you choose not to vote, do you abstain, or do you vote for it anyway?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Alan, you remember, it happened one time [inaudible]... I had disagreement about the statement, and I told you that since I'm on the ALT, on the [inaudible] at the time, is not [inaudible] I put it public that I disagreed. And you said, "No, you must do that." So the only statement that I had a big disagreement on, I didn't vote at the time.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Anyone else want to chime in on this? No? I think it's a really important subject. Let's think about it and perhaps get back to it sometime. It's one of these issues that small number of people who comment, I think is indicative of the fact, sometimes, that it's a very specialized area, and sometimes that people are really feeling that once someone volunteers the pen, they no longer have to be involved.

And if that's the case, I think it's somewhat problematic. All right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Alan? It's Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I put my hand up. My Internet is very slow. Olivier speaking. I think, a couple of things really. One is indeed that many of the topics that we have were producing statements for very specialized topics, and people obviously have problems in either understanding them, or have concerns about making a contribution which might not be 100% accurate.

So it might make them look foolish in their contribution. That said, you know, there certainly is a certain degree of work that we need to do with the RALOs, and actually having more than just the usual suspects commenting on those statements. And this is really why, and EURALO in the past in many RALO calls as I could make, I would try and explain the current public comments being worked on, and try to explain them in ways to make it worth it for the end user. So of, you know, how it relates to the end user, and worth it for the end user to comment on.

It's a little difficult, and I know we've said in the past, we need to put some kind of introduction, perhaps to those Wiki pages, so as to explain how this affects end users, but it's a lot of work to do it, and I still haven't worked out how we could actually have that introduction added on soliciting more responses, and making this more in line with the interests of end users. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Holly I note your suggestion to raise it to the ALAC meeting, and yes, that's a good idea. Olivier, I have a question coming back at you. You say the difficulty is to get comments from the ALSs, I'm commenting on the fact that there are so little comment from the ALAC.

And I think if we can't bridge that gap, we're not going to jump all the way to the ALSs. But Cheryl, you're next. Olivier, if you want to answer...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Alan. Olivier speaking. Well I think one thing we have to recognize is that volunteers in the ALAC are of two different kinds. You have some who are interested in policy, and some who are interested in process and capacity building. And so you shouldn't expect to have feedback on statements from the whole of the ALAC.

Of course, your concerns would be, I guess, those who are neither involved in capacity building, nor involved in policy, that certainly is a concern. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I guess I have a problem with the way you are formulating that, given that we're then asking everyone to vote on them. But Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi. Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record. I wasn't going to put my hand up, particularly with respect to Olivier, I wanted to come in, and coming behind a lot of what he said, also noting, of course, that APRALO have a long and exciting tradition of making sure that at its monthly meetings, the, anything open for public comment and how the drafting is going is discussed.

And at least then, the penholder, would be an ALAC representative who come in [inaudible] to the penholder, can come some rest assurance that what they're voting on, and indeed what is being said, doesn't have the objection or concern of the rank and file, the ALSs and those reps. So that kind of [inaudible] I suspect the APRALO reps at least, and I would suggest a similar model could work across the other RALOs.

So when they vote, they're voting not only in good conscious that they understand and agree with what is being said, but also they are unaware of any particular objection, or if they are aware of it, that they understand such objections and concerns, and it's either being dealt with or has been decided to put to the side, at this time.

Regarding the embarrassment part though that you mentioned Alan, I've wondered for some time, and I guess it's a product now that you've put this on the table, and I'm using that in the Australian not the American term, in other words, now it is on the table, we will discuss it, and in the future discuss it with the full ALAC, etc. There may be, as people are getting more and more able and willing to use Wikis, some benefit in doing something slightly more formulaic with how we do our fully formal public comments.

In other words, those things are going to be fully ratified and voted upon. And it might be worthwhile thinking, not necessary as a matter of urgency, but sort of between now and BA, and perhaps socialize some concepts in BA, and put it to bed by Dublin. Some form of fairly formulaic but still flexible enough, template, I guess I'm trying for, that when it comes to being voted on, the preambles is pretty much boiler plate, but the problem statements are specific, the issues relating to the

problem statements, and the analysis of discussion and debate, if and when it is held, are put in some sort of either tabular report form.

It would also have the benefit, and this is just a rush of blood to my head, of perhaps ticking some of the boxes that we heard from some of the Board members in the past. So I think it's probably worthwhile doing some work on it, but I think you probably need an approach in two ways, mechanisms to assist and ensure that the ALAC, who are voting on it, are voting on it in all good conscious and that's enough background and understanding of what their region want.

And also that by allowing enough flexibility, still having something fairly pro-formic, and that means restrictive there, but at least the ALAC can get to the meaty bits and perhaps that would mean that some of the [inaudible] there, individual variability on the authorship that may lead to embarrassment. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Could I ask for an action item from staff, when the transcript is done, to extract Cheryl's little opus there, that about 20 minutes into the call, although I know we don't have timestamps on our transcripts, sadly, and distribute it to the ALT, so we can all look at that and try... I think it's a good idea, but I think it probably needs some refinement. Just get the text so we can work on it further. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Just following up on what I said earlier, I note that some of the RALOs are a lot more active on

statements, and so on, and others, in LACRALO, for example, most of the statements that are under discussion, are actually discussed on the LACRALO mailing list.

And so when there is actually a vote that takes place, it might well be that there is no actual input as far as the drafting is concerned, from the ALAC members of LACRALO, but when there is a vote, those members are able to vote based on the discussions that have taken place on the ALAC RALO mailing list. Maybe not on all of the topics, but on some of the topics I've seen that happen.

In some other RALOs, I've seen absolutely no discussion happen at all, and I think that it should really be the work of the ALAC members of that region to bring those discussions on a local level, at RALO level, because otherwise, I'm not quite sure how we're going to be able to really be the voice of Internet end users. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. And I tend to agree. Yes, LACRALO does, excuse me, does have some of these discussions. I know at least some of the other RALOs, in their monthly meeting, list the issues, but virtually never talk about them, other than to read out what the words are in the description. So I think it needs further work. Let's, I'm going to put it onto the ALAC agenda and we'll further discuss it then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, just a quick follow-up. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl for the record. Just beware that in some RALOs, of course, [inaudible], and for example, on the quite specific and often ill understood topic, such as we have in IDN and IDN variance, rest assured, if there was an issue, our ALSs would get back to us real fast. But the fact that the penholders in most of these cases are ours, for want of a better term, in other words, our regional representatives, or trusted individuals from the region, and that what they are saying, is in concert, if not in strong agreement, with the mood, means that a lack of discussion does not mean a lack of knowledge or interest.

And that you are always going to get variability in the regions on that, because, you know, in places particularly throughout our region, in Asia-Pacific, working on the list is very different to talking around the fire. So just always remember that. In this, I think, taking it to the next step would solve problems, perhaps not in a totally harmonized way, but in a way that would give you greater trust. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. So I tend to agree. And certainly, we're not looking for a lock step process that's the same in all regions, but I think we have to move towards when we are voting on something, that we can really say, that this is the belief of the ALAC, not just the ratification of what one or two people said. I understand, sometimes that is the case, and sometimes it isn't, but I think we need to push it somewhat more.

Anyway, let's go on to the next topic. I see no more hands at this point. Next topic is, I have a lot of substantial amount of time to look at the Singapore meeting and try to do an effectively, specific, and then a detailed, rather a specific and general debriefing. There are two issues that I have sent draft messages to the ALT, and I'd like to make sure that I have... Yes Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I'm sorry. I have to say one word about the statement that is waiting for comment from the ALAC members, and that will be sent on 13th, because that's the 13th of March. So to be sent on the 13th of March to the public comment people. So please go and try to comment on it. It is about the DNS industry and the underserved regions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you. That is one of the ones that is currently under comment, and that does mean that we would like people to comment. As we've just been saying for the last 15, 20 minutes, so here is today's actual incarnation. Thank you Tijani for reminding me.

Okay. There are two issues that came out of the wrap-up meeting, I have drafted statements to the ALAC, but I would like this group to review them first. The first one, and it's a somewhat complex one, is the process that we're going to enter into for a revision of ALS criteria and expectations.

We decided, at the wrap-up meeting, that what should be proposed for formal adoption by the ALAC is a process whereby both ALAC and

regional people in the group, we said there should be at least one ALAC person. We also said there should be two appointed by the RALO, and I interpreted that to be a sum of three. I may have gotten that wrong. We didn't explicitly say that. And Chaired by me, that would start putting together what we expect from ALSs, what the criteria are that we're going to use for judging them when they are coming in for admission, and a way that we can come up with essentially a mission statement for RALOs, which we've never had, which links all of that together.

So I sent it out late last night, I'm sure some of you haven't had a chance to look at it yet. If we can take a minute or so and have people read it, it's on the screen, and in your email box, then I would like to open a discussion for what, did I get this right? And if not, what needs to be changed, or what did I omit? So I'll give you a minute or so to scan it first.

And I see someone's hand up, I'll assume someone has something to say.

Okay. I see one change, in the second paragraph it says, "Two people selected by the region." I'm going to say regional leadership, and parenthetically, that means they may consult, or they may not, depending on the style of their leadership.

Anything else? Okay, I now see some hands. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perhaps Holly, it's Cheryl for the record. Perhaps Holly is going to say the same thing. Perhaps I'm a little fuzzy, but I thought some of the regions, at least, had put forward people for this grouping, and that the ALAC members had been identified during the Singapore meeting. Holly, I guess, over to you for that one, but I thought, I certainly went around the room and gathered [inaudible], and I thought Africa and APRALO had certainly, become at least fully constituted. Just checking it's the same thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know Siranush did identify two names. At that point, we had not set an ALAC person explicitly. I don't think anyone else did, but I have no problem with the person already being known at this point.
[CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll check with staff because I'm fairly sure we had an almost fully constituted group for this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I would ask staff to comment. I listened to the recording again, and I didn't catch that. So if someone can identify the names, I'm happy to list them as the ones we already have.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe it will be in a Skype chat Heidi.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, I think it was not as formal as you think. And I think that it was very, as you know, the last day of the last day, always, we get through things, and things are quite as formal as we think they are. I think we thought we got there, but Alan, I have a little bit of fuzziness as well as to what was decided.

I think it probably makes sense to, in a more formal way, confirm the discussion that we had.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just for clarity. I know Siranush gave two names. I do not recall anyone else identifying anyone. And she gave two names [CROSSTALK] ...if I may finish Cheryl. She gave two names, at which point we were only looking for two and now it's three. So that may change.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

What I'm saying is then, Cheryl for the record, that if we should have names that is in a Skype chat, certainly between at least me, Heidi, because it was not an over the microphone discussion, and I've just dropped out of the Adobe Connect room, sorry. It wasn't so much an over the microphone discussion, because we were against agenda time pressures, but I literally walked around the room and collected names from people to at least constitute you can.

So I think you'll find, it's fine to go with those minor edits, but you'll probably have a list of at least two-thirds what you need, remembering

of course, that Holly and I are also both involved there because of our relationship between this and the ALAC review. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: And of course, the membership is not limited to those 15. Staff, can I ask staff to review the chat then, and if there are names, get them to me moderately quickly please? Like, by the end of today.

HOLLY RAICHE: Before your holidays right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I want to send this out so people can start acting on it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have the transcript yet for this session? I haven't seen it posted anywhere.

TERRI AGNEW: Alan, this is Terri. I don't believe they're available, but we can check into that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

In which case, you should have moderately accurate timing on the, from the agenda. If you can go back into the MP3 or the Adobe Connect one, and identify who it is, unless someone knows, who did Siranush name? I think it was Satish and Maureen, but I'm not 100%.

I know I made a big fuss about Siranush being organized after she provided those without being asked. So it should be easy to find. In any case, to whatever extent, we have names, if I could be provided with them by the end of the day, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

If anyone sees any other typos or omissions, particularly in the mission of the taskforce, I would appreciate having comments on that as quickly as possible also. That mission is not necessarily locked in stone at this point, but I would like to try to make it as clear as possible when I send out the message.

All right. The next one is the CROPP statement. This one we had a lot of to and fro discussion on, so I want to make sure that I got it correct before I sent it out. And it's being posted.

And could we have magnification so we can adjust the size? Thank you.

We don't need scrolling, but I do need to be able to read it.

All right. Essentially we're saying we're reconstituting the group. It's going to have 10 people on it. This is not a group where other people can volunteer. One person from each region, representing the finance and budget subcommittee, from among the FBFC members and participants, will be selected by the FBFC members and Chair. Selection must be ratified by regional leadership, and obviously, as in all of our

volunteers, the person must agree to serve. I think that goes without saying.

Now originally we had said that the person would be selected by the regional leadership. This implies that the Finance and Budget members may override regional leadership, should they choose. Everyone still happy with that? That was at Cheryl's request, and I didn't think we had any objections at the time.

And the second is, one person from each region representing the outreach and engagement subcommittee, which means we cannot fill these spots until that committee is reconstituted, from among the members or participants of outreach and outreach and engagement, and selected by regional leadership. Everyone happy with that?

Now that implies the Finance and Budget Subcommittee members must actually have opinions, otherwise we're defaulting to regional leadership making the selection. So just a comment.

No comments? No voices? A tick mark, consider it done. It will go out as written there.

Next item, more general. Debriefing on the ICANN meeting in Singapore overall, not the ICANN meeting, but the ALAC portion of it. Comments? Did we do better than we normally do? Where there problems where things didn't work as well? I did send out an attendance roster today. I didn't ask staff to have it ready to post, but you can all look at it.

It indicates that with a few exceptions, we had really good attendance at all of our meetings. There were about three people who, perhaps one can question if there is an issue or not. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a couple of things. One is, it would be helpful if we could see the other meetings that people went to, because yes, we should all be attending ALAC and RALO stuff, but hopefully, some of us get out to other meetings. And if you don't write a meeting report, we've got no way of knowing what happened in that meeting, other than reading the transcript. So it would be, I think, in terms of even metrics, it would be useful to know if people are going elsewhere.

And the other thing, because we've been, everybody has been beaten up by the whole IANA stuff, I really would like to sort of reintroduce the idea of a multistakeholder forum, and just pick an issue, and then plan it properly so that when IANA isn't eating everybody's time, we do have the possibility of exploring in-depth an issue or issues that are important to ALAC. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, Holly, I think you made that point already. And it really is a matter of someone taking the lead, identifying it, and trying to organize something like that. I don't think there is any objection to it in principle.

On the issue of what people are doing in other meetings, certainly we could ask for everyone to fill in a grid thing, where were you? To what extent that's going to be worth the effort or not, I'm not 100% sure. We

used to spend a lot of time allocating who will give reports on what. And we've now basically said, "Visit the page and fill it in yourself."

I really don't know to what extent we're getting... Well, let me phrase it another way. I'm not sure which of those has been more successful at really getting usable output. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks. This is Cheryl. It took me a moment to come off mute, I apologize. I've been part of the party when all of those various things have been tried, including quite prescriptive role taking and checking on who is where, etc. etc., and through the variations of allocations that you've outlined, as well as meeting reports. And I think, I'm less concerned about it as some of you may be, but I still think there is something else we can do, probably as it comes out of the metrics.

And that's part of the, as Maureen as put, and which I believe will come, as an outcome, hopefully ratified by the ALAC, and that's for at least your ALAC members. And I guess what we could do as a result of the next generation of looking at regional ALS aspects through our review, is at least put it to the regional leaderships, and I guess when we have travel supported, or even just supported, ALS reps something, it could go as far as them.

And that's more that self-reporting model that I think the community will come in behind to some extent at least from the design that Maureen has been socializing. I think that would help Alan, so I'm not quite so concerned about this being a time critical issue. But things as

simple as, you know, in our shared Skype chat, where people are. I mean, you can, in fact, track them down fairly well.

Remember what the, at the last summit in London, however, we did try a more passive mechanism of finding out who was in what room, and indeed, we could even have extended to work out for how long, by the cue card and scanning. And a simple scan, it could be, you know, at the front of every single room. And believe me, meetings would be delighted to have that.

I've spoken to a couple of the people in meetings, and for a whole bunch of reasons, it would be great to have better knowledge and control of who is in not just our rooms, but every single meeting room in a meeting. And I could talk about that at some other time, but the pushback that you get on people concerned about, you know, about being trapped in privacy and all of that sort of thing, is also significant. So it's a fine balance here.

At this stage, I don't think it's, you know, all that traumatic. I think we do need to give some trust to otherwise intelligent adults. And a self-reporting model, which will become more common and in fact, will be, as it becomes socialized and part of metrics at least, for our supported, travel supported members, will start to set some standards. And I think that will probably shift enough of your tide there.

That's a very different thing to specific report writing etc., etc., because it's much more, and I have penned this, this, this, and this, and I spoke at this that and the other. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, I think I support pretty much everything you said. And no, I don't think we can ask people to log in and out of every room. I don't want to part of the flak that comes from that. I tend to agree on the reports issue. I'm sure when we assigned reports, we got more reports. I'm not sure we got more useful information, and there is a significant difference between the two.

I like the idea of, I don't want to call it a trip report, but just sort of a stream of consciousness report of what people did at the meeting, I think may well be useful, and I'll look forward to something like that coming out of metrics, if indeed it does. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. It happened at the beginning when it was assigned for each one to go to this sort of meeting, that some reports were done. And I did some for some meetings, but I didn't do after that. It is because during the week, you don't have time to write reports. But if we ask people to tell us every day what meetings they will attend, so that the staff, after the meeting, can do the follow-up and ask those people to give two words about each meeting they attended.

This will give two results. First, you'll know where people were. And second, to have more reports. Even if the report is not that lengthy and that deep, but at least the main things discussed, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I think there is some merit in just knowing who to ask what happened at a meeting, even if they don't actually give the explicit report. Any other comments? We have a comment in the chat. I see Holly saying, "Julie, that will be useful." But I don't...

Julie says, "ALAC does SSAC reports." Thank you. Yes, liaisons are the only ones that we actually do ask for real reports from. Any other comments? I wasn't really trying to focus this on attendance, but just overall, how did this meeting go? And what do we need note now to change? Because if we don't note it now, we won't remember for the next time around.

Leon, I think you nominally volunteered to play the role again as the chief ALAC organizer on the scheduling process. I would presume that no one wants to take that job away from him. [Laughter] Anyone else want to do an awful lot of work and not get a lot of thanks? Olivier is putting his hand up, I see. Thank you Olivier. Leon, you've been replaced. [Laughter] Somehow, I don't think that is what Olivier's hand was up for. So Leon, you're still it. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I have so much time on my hands [laughter]. I was just going to mention one question which I was asked, actually, by a person from one of the RALOs. We have ALAC work part one, part two, etc. And the question I was asked was whether the regional leaders were needed in those meetings as well?

Will they need to be part of the discussions? And was it compulsory for them to attend? And my response was that yeah, surely we need to regional leaders there, but I'm not quite sure what the official line was, and I wondered whether you could please shed some light over this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My recollection is that the subject were of particular interest to regions also. And yes, we should have set a title to make that clear. And I ask Leon and staff to make a mental note that we make sure that's done correctly next time.

Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. This precise question was asked to me every time from the AFRALO leadership, and I always said it was compulsory for each RALO leader, because first of all, you are supported for the whole period. So you have to commit to all the meetings of ALAC. Second, everything discussed in ALAC meetings is, I would say, as important for the ALAC leaders, for the RALO leaders, as for the ALAC members.

So I wanted it to be an official policy, if you want, that each ALAC leader has to attend, compulsory, all the ALAC meetings. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Certainly, I don't disagree. Excuse me. I just think we need to make sure that our titles are set so that any expectations are correct.

Anything we, any other comments? I personally thought it was a very productive meetings. We made decisions. We had some significant time to discuss. I believe in pretty much all cases, when we had visitors come in, they were useful discussions. I don't think we are, at this point, having any of the pro forma, we need to meet with such and such, but not really getting a lot out of the meeting other than repeating things that were said in previous meetings.

So I thought that we're doing pretty well. And given how short time was, I think we packed a fair amount into it.

No other comments? Then we go on to the next item. A very short one, although there will be a second part of it on the, continue on the next item. As I think all of you know, I will be away generally from next Wednesday through the following Monday, inclusive. I will have email connectivity most of the time, but not all day. And I may or may not have Adobe Connectivity, it remains to be seen, whether the Internet is robust enough to do that.

Probably it will not be enough to be, high enough speed uplink to be able to talk, but probably I'll be able to listen. And depending on the times, I will be attending some conference calls. I've asked Olivier, to the extent that there are any meetings to chair, and there aren't any at this point, or that are on my agenda, but if any come up, that the Chair will have to Chair, I've asked Olivier to take my place.

And should there be any emergency decisions that cannot wait a few hours for me, I ask Olivier to take responsibility in conjunction with Tijani and the rest of the ALT. Any questions or comments? No? Okay.

CWG and CCWG, a little bit of just update on where we are, and what do we have to do. As you know, we have replaced, [inaudible] resigned, and he's formally been replaced with Cheryl. And thereby, not increasing Cheryl's work load, but adding another line to her CV. So I think we are charging Cheryl for CV lines.

Again, that's a joke for anyone who is listening to this after the fact. I will be missing some of the CWG and CCWG meetings while I'm away. I will try to cover them as best I can. If their agenda is published ahead of time, I will try to make any particular thoughts known, with the rest of the participants in those groups, but agendas tend to be announced minutes, or a couple of hours, ahead of time, so there may not be much opportunity for doing that.

There is the face to face meetings in Istanbul at the end of March. Some of you know I've made my dissatisfaction well known at this point. Probably to my detriment, in that I'm being funded, as are many of the people on the ALAC and ALT, to go to one or the other of the meetings. And I think it's rather shameful that they're paying for us to fly potentially half way around the world, or a significant distance, and then saying they can't pay the hotel if we are actually an active participant in the other group.

I just cannot see the economy in doing that. We're talking a total of several thousands of dollars, not tens of thousands, and I think it's a

waste of ICANN resources to move people around the world, and then tell them they cannot participate in some of the meetings. And all the more so, in my case, I probably will not to even be a remote participant in some of the meetings, because of the time it takes me to fly back home and then when the meeting is being held, because of time zones.

So I think ICANN has really messed up on this. But not much else I can say about it. Anyone have any other thoughts, comments, on where the CCWG and CWGs are going? And is there anything we need to be doing coordinating the action of the ALAC representatives on these groups? Olivier, I can't believe you don't have an opinion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks Alan, it's Olivier. I've written something in the chat, I don't know whether that's come out already or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. You made a comment on those who are acting as participants. I note that those who are acting as participants on the CWG who are not funded, with one exception, are all registries or Board members.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yeah. It's Olivier speaking. There is that. So obviously, Board members appear to be funded to attend the whole week there. And when it comes down to contracted parties, companies, or those with external funding, so there are some participants funded from Civil Society through their organization, they have also decided to remain there the whole week, and to stay there.

But I do find it really bizarre that there is no option for others to remain the additional three days, or two days, or something. This transition and accountability thread is just so important, I am just amazed that ICANN is, and I'm going to say it on the record again, is penny pinching. And it's just unbelievable, but there you go. I don't think we can change that. I've said that for many years, and it seems to be the case again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's interesting, Olivier, it's not so much penny pinching, but they are afraid of setting a precedent. And I think the precedent of two cross community working groups sponsored by, or done under the instigation of ICANN strategic initiatives, which are holding face to face meetings in the same city on adjacent days, I think that's a dandy precedent to set. You know, why wouldn't you want to set that precedent for next time? Especially when the total amount of money we're talking about is so small?

I really do not understand the thought processes that have led to this. And I...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Penny pinching.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I don't think it's actually penny pinching. I think it's something more substantive than that. It's not understanding the benefits of a face to face meeting. I'll put something in the chat, see if it works.

This is a verbatim recommendation out of ATRT 2, which has been accepted by the Board.

And that plays exactly to the statement that virtually the only people who are paying on their own dime, are industry players or ICANN Board members who are funded.

Olivier, setting a precedent for the next time these two, CWG and CCWG, sponsored by strategic initiatives, working in parallel.

And there is some sarcasm in that comment because it probably will never happen again.

Anyway, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Thank you Alan. I see that you are leaving on four, and I don't know if the IANA issue stewardship and accountability will be held before you leave, but I think that, and I hope that the next time, the part dedicated to the CCWG will not be a presentation like we did the first time. It was perhaps helpful for the first time, but now I think we are producing [inaudible] now, and we need to agree together, to have an ALAC position, so that our representatives in the CWG will discuss the various possibilities, that is now we are reaching a phase where we have disagreement, where we have two points of view.

So, it is good to have a discussion so that when we go to the meeting, we will speak one voice. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG;

Tijani, I don't disagree. The first one was the first time we had the IANA issues ad hoc group was widened to accountability. And I thought it was important to do a level set. I agree with you. Olivier has been responsible for setting the IANA issues agendas essentially related to the CWG, and I would ask if you can do the same on the CCWG.

And that gives you full control to try to organize what it is you're talking about. I agree completely. Whether I'll be a participate in that call, will depend on when it's scheduled. I may or may not be able to...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

It's tomorrow. There is an option for tomorrow. I hope it will be tomorrow so that you will be there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I could also be there, I think, on the Thursday. So I filled in the Doodle. I said don't schedule it based on my availability, but I did say what it would be.

But I would ask you to take responsibility with Olivier to set that, each of you to set the respective halves of that meeting. And to the extent that it should not be half, we should be publicizing, we should have publicized in the Doodle, how the time would be allocated, because we did say we would do that. Not right now, but certainly when the date comes out, we should be telling people where the division would be.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other comments on this? So I will regret that I will not be participating in some of the CWG meetings when I'm gone, and I probably will not be participating, or at least not very well, in at least the first day of the onsite meeting, because that will come, essentially, a couple of hours after I have just gotten home, and I'm not quite sure I can do a nine hour teleconference at that point.

Any other comments? Nope? Then what do we have next on the agenda? The Finance and Budget subcommittee. We have submitted all of the requests. Could we have a list of them on the Adobe pod?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Did we submit a request for the indigenous people?

ALAN GREENBERG: We submitted all of them. The requests... There was a request that we received at the last moment from Anthony. Essentially, it was formulated as a new request, but was really a subpart of the indigenous people request, asking for four of the then 15 people to be from Canada, and being very specific as to which groups to be represented.

That request, although it had, it actually had some good content in it, and if we had been able to integrate it back into the other one, I think the overall request would have been better, but it came in just far too late to do anything with it. So we basically had to set it aside. And on top of that, since we fully expect the 15 to be cut down significantly, four requests from Canada would have been rather disproportionate.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And did put all that we decided Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: We identified essentially the ALAC-centric ones as being strategic to the ALAC for its continued success, which I believe is the case. We did not try to order them other than that.

I think Heidi, correct me if I'm wrong, we also included the IGF town hall in that last as being a focal point, but I'm not sure if we did or not. Do you remember?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi for the record. I do believe that we added that in as one of the core.

ALAN GREENBERG: And of course, the regional assemblies. And we explicitly said that given the overall desire to have another summit within the next few years, it was imperative that we have at least two general assemblies in this coming fiscal year. So we thought it was unrealistic to say there should be three in a single year, which would then almost imply none in the following years.

But certainly, if they would fund all three, that is fine, but we said that if we don't have at least two, we're going to have a hard time being at least one general assembly in every region before the next possible

summit. We don't know when it would be, of course, but it could be within three years of the last one, which puts it moderately close.

Any other questions? There is a lot of clean-up work that was done on them, more than, I think, probably should have been, and I think next year around, we need to figure out a process by which the clean-up can be done a lot earlier than it was done this time. We were really scrambling at the last most, certainly Heidi put in an unbelievable amount of effort on Friday and Saturday.

And I think, my personal thanks to her. And hopefully the thanks of all of us, because if we end up getting anything approved, it's going to be largely due to the effort she put in to make sure that they were in a form that would be viewed well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I already thanked her.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because you're a gentlemen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Because we work together on the requests.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Any other comments on the finance budget? Nope? All right. Items for the March meeting. And let's talk about the timing of the March meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for the 24th of March.

That is a date when a significant number of ALAC people are either at the Istanbul meeting, potentially in transit to it, or just about to leave for the meeting, for those going to the CWG.

I have asked Gisella to put out quickly a Doodle for both the 24th and the 31st, that is deferring it one week, both at the same time, 20:00 hours UTC. And to see if there is any major objection to deferring it a week. So we don't have to have people who are either cramming it into it close to midnight of the day that they've been working at the CCWG, or aligned with travel, or possibly overlapping with travel.

So hopefully that Doodle will be going out soon, if it hasn't already. And we should know within a couple of days whether the meeting is going to be on the 24th or the 30th. The time, however, we don't have much choice. We were not given a lot of flexibility by some of the people completing the overall scheduling Doodle, and we're pretty well stuck with that single time, which is a good time for most people, with the exception of those in Europe who are working very close to, or Europe and Africa, very close to or just after midnight.

Now what I had hoped, but that's what we ended up with. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you. Alan, I would like to ask you, very friendly, to void this week of Istanbul, because it will not be as productive as if we do it out of this week. And I think it is possible, why we don't postpone it one week, it's not a problem.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani, that's exactly what we're looking at. We're looking at what the impact is. Remember, we've already told people that it will be on the fourth Thursday of the month, so it's quite possible there may be people who are travelling, or who have arranged their schedule so they aren't available on the 31st, so we just need to double check to make sure that we don't lose a lot of people by moving it, in which case, we will move it.

I haven't actually thought of that, and Gisella suggested it this morning, and that is what we're doing. So if at all possible, we will move it.

Anything else on that? In terms of subject, we have one that is a discussion on lack of ALAC comments, or what we should be doing to encourage more comments. If there is anything else that people would like to see on the agenda, get it to us in the next week or two, and we'll do our best to do it.

I'm trying hard to try to take things off the agenda which are routine and don't really add to it, or aren't added value. So anyone who has comments on what you'd like to see discussed, then please make sure to let staff and me know.

That's all I have, other than any other business. We are in a position to leave 20 minutes early. Anyone have anything to raise? Heidi, may I assume the transition items will be on the agenda? Transition items, remind me what you're talking about.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. This is Heidi. On the ALAC agenda, do we assume that we'll have an update on the IANA transition and accountability issues?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh yes, certainly.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And anything on the new meeting strategy?

ALAN GREENBERG: The way we left it... If you remember, we had many discussion on it in Singapore. At one point, there was a suggestion that we hold a, that we charter a committee to start talking about it now, then we were told that staff is supposed to be giving us something, then Cheryl suggested that we charter a committee, and then Tijani pointed out that staff was supposed to be working on a survey.

And that was in Nick's domain, and David Olive took it away as a reminder that to check with Nick, I think, on the status of that, or someone would. So I believe the current status is, ICANN is supposed to be doing a survey asking people what they want. Then would be coming out with something, then we would put together a group to talk about an ALAC perspective. That was the summary, which I would like to pretend I remembered, but I actually got that after listening to three hours of transcripts, or three hours of MP3's the other day.
[CROSSTALK]

...if I'm wrong, I think the item in the critical path is ICANN is supposed to be doing a survey really quick, so that we have something to base our next discussions on. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah. Just about the ALAC review, and it's just very brief. Heidi, I think, offline we can start to think about it. But Alan, I think there should be an item on the full ALAC meeting to go through the process of ALAC review, next steps, and to try to get some brainstorming for about five minutes, questions to be asked, and stuff before I start to talk to all of the individuals, if that can be done.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. If you put the item on the agenda and speak to it, then it's done. And have you fully constituted your review party? Or working party, sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE:

No. I haven't. That's an action item. Heidi, will you remind me of that? And probably... And the question is, should that be done before or during the calls that I will be on for each RALO?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would think that if you have the work party people from each RALO identify it, that would be to your advantage.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Then I'll just, I will ask for names, then prior to be a participant in the phone calls.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think it's really important to have work party people being people who have been around for a while, and know what's going on, and know what the problems are. This is not really a place you want for people who are going to get involved for the first time.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I would think anyone in your review party has already, should have already heard about it, and shouldn't need to wait...

HOLLY RAICHE: I think everybody has. I think they were bored to death actually.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I would suggest, we don't want to bore them to death on yet another discussion of the same issues, but I trust you not to do that.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, but I would like to progress the discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's good. But I think you would want to constitute your working party, of which I am a charter member, I presume you know.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, Ariel has sent a link to the working party so far, so I'll just make a note.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. If I had advice to give you Holly, I would ask you to send an email to all of the RALOs, reminding them that they committed to discuss the issue with their members, so that they give you the names. So you have to, I think this may be used also to remind people that we don't need people who don't know about what is the ALAC review.

You need people who have at least already worked on something related to that, or at least [inaudible]. So this will be a very helpful email for the quality of persons, and also to remind them that because we will start our teleconferences very soon, the monthly one.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yup.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out the link that Ariel gave us, shows a membership that we already have at least two people from each RALO. So maybe your working party is already constituted at this point. I don't think you need to have it much bigger than that.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that's settled.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I think we can take off our to-do list, soliciting membership.

HOLLY RAICHE: But I think it changes. I think it's an email that goes to these people, reminding them and saying, start conversations in your RALOs so that I can be of use in the next couple of ones...

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem, and I presume that we will have a mailing list set up for the working party?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Yes. There should be one.

ALAN GREENBERG: That didn't need an answer.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that would be an admin thing to take offline.

ALAN GREENBERG: It doesn't need discussion. It's just a tickler [CROSSTALK]. Okay. And there is a note. To subscribe to the mailing list for the working party, please visit to be determined. Okay.

[Laughter]

Any other business? If nobody has any other business, we still have a whole 13 minutes to give back.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Going, going, gone. Thank you very much for the meeting. We'll be in touch. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]