GISELLA GRUBER: On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Julie Hammer, Ron Sherwood, Maureen Hilyard.

Apologies noted from Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

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

And if I can 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. All right, we have a pretty packed agenda today, and would like to be able to do it without going over, so let us start. The first item is the policy development status. And I'll have some additional thoughts and proposals for the concept in general, but first let's go through the particular list of current issues.

Ariel, are you on the call? Yes you are. If you could take us through that list quickly.

ARIEL LIANG: Hello. This is Ariel Liang speaking. I'm just going to paste the agenda to the Adobe Connect Room, so that it would make it easier for everybody to look at the list. So the first part of the statement approved by the ALAC, I'm not going to talk about that, you already know which one has been voted on and adopted.

And on the next one, it's a statement…

ALAN GREENBERG:    Ariel, if I can interrupt.  We have the agenda in the Adobe room, but it's not movable.  If someone could just scroll to the right page, or give us control.

ARIEL LIANG:    I've changed it, so now everybody can scroll, and I've scrolled it to the second page.

Okay.  Is this better now?

ALAN GREENBERG:    It is.

ARIEL LIANG:    Okay, cool.  So about the statements that are in process, the ALAC is voting on two statements.  One is on the AOC and organizational reviews, the other is on the GNSO PPSA in a working group initial report.  So we've already submitted a statement and ALAC is voting on it.  And the vote will end tomorrow at 23:59 UTC.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Ariel, since both of these are after the fact, can you make sure to remind people.  We really do need full votes on these.

# EN

ARIEL LIANG:    Yes. I'll send a reminder. Next is the statement that seems to be stalled. I think there is one, it's the draft report, review of the generic names and supporting organizations. And I know that Alan has reached out to Cheryl [inaudible], and asking whether we're going to submit a statement or not.

And the comment close date is July 20th. So it's a little bit urgent. Alan, do you want to, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Yes, I would like to speak on that. I put some comments in last night. Olivier, I believe, has added some more extensive comments today. I really would like everyone on the ALT, at the very least, if not the ALAC, to, if you have had any contact with any GNSO activities, and I believe has to some extent, that you at least read the introduction to the report with the recommendations, and give any comments of either support, or issues that you find with them.

It's really important. This is a crucial report. It will make a number of very significant changes, and perhaps will not make sufficient changes. And I think we need to be vocal on this, and we unfortunately do not have nearly as much time left as we should. So it's important that we do this, so that those people participating in the CCWG, it's really got to be done before the CCWG meeting. So that means today and tomorrow.

Okay Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:              Alan, Olivier's hand is raised.


ALAN GREENBERG:           Okay, sorry, I didn't see that.  Olivier, go ahead.


OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:  Yes, thanks very much Alan.  Olivier speaking.  And as I mentioned in my comment, I'll be making further comments.  I'm currently filling the sheets of questions with the template.  It's a real pain to cut and paste from the template to the Wiki page, so I'll try to work something out to get that template onto the Wiki one way or another.


ALAN GREENBERG:           Olivier, what we've done before is fill out the template and just point to it.  I'll upload it as an attachment and point to it.


OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:  That's probably what I'm going to do.  [Inaudible] and point to it.  The only thing I wanted to mention to you all, and perhaps alert you to, is that it seems to me that the majority of the review was on outreach, on having more people take part in working groups, on this thing.  It seems to be a single track.  I'm not sure that this is enough for a GNSO review.

I keep on hearing stories of the GNSO not working, or being imbalanced, or being captured, etc. and here, I'm all seeing is a majority of the recommendations being about outreach.  In a way, they look as though

they're cut and pastes from our ALAC review, and from our, from the reviews that we had with At-Large summit, for example.

I note that Westlake are the same consultancy that did the ALAC review, so I just wonder, you know, I guess it's good that they reached the same conclusions in the GNSO and reach over elsewhere, but I do have concerns that there might be some pushback in the GNSO Council for significant sums to be spent on all of the programs that are suggested in there, and for things to become a tick box exercise.

I think you alluded to that, Alan, of many of the metrics just being a case of ah, we've got one guy from Asia, one lady from Africa, one chap from Latin America…

ALAN GREENBERG:        Olivier, let's keep the comments focused right now.  I agree with you that they are doing some things which I believe are correct, they have to be said.  How effective they're going to be.  And the question is, are there things that were omitted?  They do have a section saying, if there is structural change needed, and the GNSO wants to change, they have the ability to change.

The problem is, that if there is a perception among some that the GNSO is either captured or partially captured, then such change, to change that is not going to be possible.  And I think that is something which we may need to focus on.  As opposed to the specific changes, just point out that capture is a problem that is very hard to overcome, because it is captured.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:     You're quite right, Alan.  It's Olivier speaking.  Anyway, I put a few points on in my comments, and I invite everyone to comment on that.  Some further comments in the next 48 hours, I have to juggle a few things over.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay.  Thank you very much.  Ariel, as soon as Olivier indicates that he has done the bulk of what he plans to do, please try to get the attention of the ALAC and the larger community in this.

ARIEL LIANG:     Noted.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay.  Back to you, and I note the next item is empty, but in fact, the first one under B, I'm not quite sure why these things are labelled A, B, C, A, B, but the first one under the second B, in fact should be under the second A.

We do not respond to release of country code and territory names.

Go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG:      Okay.  We will fix that for our future agenda.  And then for the new public comment request requiring decisions, you said the first one, not going to drop a statement.  Correct?

ALAN GREENBERG:          Correct.


ARIEL LIANG:             Okay.  And on the second one, GNSO translation and transliteration of contact information, PDP recommendations for the Board consideration.  That will close on August 10th, and we haven't decided whether we're going to submit a statement or not.


ALAN GREENBERG:          I think first we need an evaluation of whether they followed our advice in the last comment.  So who drafted the last comment?  The one on translation and transliteration?

                         Was that Satish?


ARIEL LIANG:             This is Ariel.  Yes, that's correct, it was Satish.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Okay.  Then I would, as a first step, ask Satish to what extent does the final report correspond to what we ask for, or are there still problems that we believe are there?


ARIEL LIANG:             Okay.  Got it.  And there is one more new public comment that just came out yesterday.  I haven't got a chance to put it in the master table

yet, but I'm going to paste it in the chat.  It's a next generation gTLD registration director of services to be replaced, for the WHOIS preliminary issue report on, that's a new one that just came out, last night.

ALAN GREENBERG:         That's a pretty major one.  Can you please ask, as a first path, ask Carlton to make comments on it?  Not as a penholder, but to give his opinion on it.  With some urgency on that.

ARIEL LIANG:             Noted.  That's why, this comment isn't due until September 6th. So we still have good time.

ALAN GREENBERG:         I understand.  Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:  Yes Alan, it's Olivier speaking.  It is a new hand.  Just to note that, I think it's good that we finally get moving on this.  There was a discussion earlier this week, or was it last week?  I fail to have the exact timing, but it involved Christopher Wilkerson and a few other people, including Carlton, asking why in the world is the CWG report not moving forward when there is just so much discussion in the WHOIS issue at the moment?

And we all know that [fixing it] is not an easy task.  So, I think we welcome this.  I have had a very brief look at the work, and it seems to be implementation moving forward.  Obviously, Carlton, having been in

that expert working group would technically be the best person to pursue it.

I suggest, of course, the registrant issues working group, or registration issues working group being the right one to copy this request to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else?

All right. The next item on the agenda is in fact, policy development process. We seemed to have slipped into a mode where, to be blunt, we are not doing anything on comments until the very last moment, ratifying things after the fact, and giving the ALAC almost no time, or sometimes, no time at all, to do any comments on it.

And that's the ALAC and the RALOs. I'm not quite sure we can fully blame the CWG and CCWG on having gone into this mode, but it's just not acceptable. And I've talked to Ariel and done a fair amount of thinking on it, and have a number of proposals to make, and the document is attached and is now on the screen.

I think we need to be clear on what our targets are, and again, this is a proposal for discussion. So if people don't agree with it, then now is a good time to speak up, or certainly in the next week. The first item is, we need to set some targets for when comments have to be ready. And if we want to provide a reasonable amount of time, about a week for the ALAC and At-Large to comment, allow an opportunity for revisions, and allow an opportunity for a reasonable vote, we really need

comments ready no later than two weeks before the end date, earlier is better.

I'm also assuming that we will establish principles that say, if it is really a substantive comment with a lot of feedback, that the statement should be a work in progress, and should be updated on a regular basis, not wait for everything to be accumulated at the end. I think we also need, and I haven't attempted to put it here, some norms for how things get changed.

We seem to be working in a mode, sometimes, but not always, where if a single person says something, it implicitly goes into the document. And then other people have to say, no, no, no I didn't like that. And that's not really a very acceptable way to do this, where the last person gets their words in edgewise. I don't know who is moving that document, but we're going to be busy.

And now it shrunk down so I can't read it anymore.

So we're going to have to do some work on that. The next thing is, I suggested that if we are 15 days from the end, and there is no statement ready, then we're going into crisis mode. Ariel points out that maybe the word crisis is too strong. But I think we need something that says, it's not working, we need to focus on it.

And in fact, we need to track these as we're coming up to the 15 days, to see if we're going to have a problem coming out there. So that's the first part of it. I'm trying to put some guidelines in. I don't want to make them rules, but I think we need to flush out some guidelines for drafters of comments, so that they know what is expected of them.

Any comments on that section?

Nothing, hearing nothing. Let's move on a little bit. One of the bottlenecks right now is I'm the one who has to pass judgment on everything, and sometimes my life is busy and I can't do that. And I would like to suggest that certainly any of the vice-chairs, and perhaps anyone on the ALT, if it's an area that they have some knowledge on, can make the recommendation on how to proceed.

You know, I wouldn't mind if that's done with my agreement if I'm available, but if I'm not available, then I think we should ahead and not put me in the critical path of everything. We're supposed to be working a mode where the ALT has more decision making and responsibility, and I would like to use that in this case.

Tijani, you have your hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. This is about the previous [inaudible]. You are suggesting 15 days before the deadline, that the statement should be already more or less done. If it is not done, it is a crisis mode, you said. If the comment period is 21 days before, now it's 14 days, but if it is for 21 days and you take off 15 days, what is remaining?

I'd like to believe that this is possible, it is doable, but I doubt. That's my comment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    The official comment period now is, I believe, either 40 or 41 days.  I don't remember which.  I think it's 40.  So we're saying 25 days after it comes out, should be enough time for the person responsible to have been appointed, read the document, and come up with initial comments.

If we can't do that, then I think we have a real problem.  Am I missing some timing here?  You said something about 20 days, and I'm not quite sure what the 20 days is.  Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    No, I'm sorry.  It was before 21 days.  Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:    It was, it has now been changed to 40.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Yeah.  Now it changed to 40, but in the case of the CWG, CCWG, that's less than 40 days.  I hope it is doable.  I hope we can do it, but I am afraid it's a bit, very ambitious.  And if we can do it, it's better.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Yeah.    The CWG and CCWG were 30 days, I believe, and we acknowledged on that, that we're going to be working down to the wire.  Not only were they short periods, but they were comments, they were statements with a lot of contributions, which is rather, sadly is rather unusual.  So I think on those, we acknowledged that we would

not be finalizing the statement until the last moment, and we would ratify after the fact.

So, I think those, we took the shortened period, and the increased interest in them, and did adjust the norms. We didn't have the norms at that point, but you know, even if we had, I think they would have been adjusted. So I don't think we want to focus on those in particular, but on the more mundane comments, that at this point, we're still not doing very well.

But your point is well taken. And this is a proposal, if it doesn't work, then we're going to need to adjust it. You know, not God handing down the law.

All right. So, the part of the point of the first bullet, in the next section, is we need to get other people involved, and I'm presuming the ALT, or parts of the ALT, are aware that this is going to come from. One of the difficulties seem to be, how do we communicate with whoever is going to be making the decisions. That is a new public comment has just been posted, what do we do about it, who do we give control over it?

If we wait until the next ALT or ALAC meeting, chances are the majority of the comment period will have passed already. So we have to really work on a day by day basis, as comments come out. And I know email sometimes is not the best way to get people, because people are somewhat overwhelmed, Skype chats, various people use or do not use Skype, and if things roll off of the screen on Skype, or you're not logged on when the message comes out, you might not see it.

So this I'm asking for input. What's the best method to get a hold of people. Do we want a dedicated policy development Skype chat for the ALT? Which will not be used for other things, which will cause things to scroll off the screen. Any thoughts on that? Or am I the only one who has problems handling both the Skype and the email load? Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You're not the only one. And I think your proposal of a dedicated Skype is a good way, because frankly speaking, sometimes on the ALAC chat, people are saying their story, or very long stories, etc. So I don't read everything on the ALAC Skype. So if we have a dedicated Skype for the policy development, it would be a good way, I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, one of the ones we could use is the ALT Skype. But even that I find, you know, when people get involved, you can get a few screens going forward, and anything before that just disappears, unless you're very scrupulous and go back and read it.

Okay. Let's try a dedicated Skype chat and see how that goes. Next item, it's a small item, but it turns out, for reasons I'm not quite sure of, although we diligently review policy development issues on teleconferences, we don't during face to face meetings, and therefore we end up having a month go by where we don't notice things have come out.

So that was simply fixed by making sure it is in the agenda. One of the suggestions that Ariel had, and I like it, although I'm not quite sure I

know how to do it, is we ask people to hold pens and write things, but we really haven't given them any training, any guidelines as to how they're supposed to do that, how they're supposed to incorporate comments from other people, and what do people think about trying to put on a webinar and this kind of thing, or you know, whether it's a webinar or an online course, I'm not quite sure.

But I sort of like the idea. I'm not sure who is going to volunteer to put it together. But I sort of like the idea. Any other thoughts?

Dev is making comments in the chat, I haven't read any of them. Dev, is there something you actually want to say? Is it relevant to this particular discussion? You're free to speak.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Okay. This is Dev. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:    I can.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Lovely. Thank you. This is Dev. I just wanted to mention, I mean, I've gone through this document just seeing this for the first few minutes, [inaudible], you know the At-Large improvement implementation project. And when we finish the report in June 2012, I don't think we really ever fully implemented the actual report, especially as it dealt with public comment.

And one example was that, you know, we were supposed to establish a [inaudible] committee, and that would be responsible of advising the ALAC of actions needed regarding upcoming policy comments, as well as issues that are not on the public comment, but may be of At-Large interest.

So, and I mean, it went into detail as to how it was supposed to work in terms of timing and so forth. So I just wanted to know whether has this was this [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll be honest, I have…

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: So, and I think we should look at that, because…

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev, to be honest, I lived through the review, and I have absolutely no recollection of this item. So maybe I'm the only one and everyone else knows it was something, but it completely passed me by.

It seems like overkill to address this problem, to have a formal committee, but maybe I'm wrong. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you Alan. I think that perhaps we should start by [inaudible], asking people if they need knowledge about drafting statement or drafting a comment. Because perhaps all of the ALAC

members should be able to do so, should have the experience to do so. But we can ask them.

If we want to go to the ALS level, I think we need to make some capacity building about drafting comments, drafting statements.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. I would dare say, based on experience over the last number of months, that some of the people who currently drafted statements, need a little bit of help in terms of understanding the process. I won't go into any more details.

Do we have anyone who is interested in trying to put something like that together? Obviously, with staff and I just like to perhaps have a couple of people put together some bullet points and ideas on how to go on what we need to include in this.

I'll certainly participate. Olivier, is that a hand up to volunteer or to speak?

Olivier? Can't hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I was muted. Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: You and the horn.

**EN**

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:     Okay, excellent.  It's Olivier speaking.  Yeah, I'm outdoors.  It's Olivier speaking.  And I'm not putting my hand up to volunteer, just to mention though, that we have a presentation that's nearly okay, that deals with policy development.  That shows, you know, the way the policy is being developed in At-Large with a nice little diagram.

So just putting together a couple of more slides and doing a webinar, I don't think is a big deal, and it would be very, very good.  What I would suggest though, is we also have these very good beginner's guide, and these are staff projects, when staff has a bit of spare time, they will start drafting these beginner's guide.

And I wonder whether, we should ask if there would be any volunteers to try to put together a beginner's guide to policy development in At-Large.  In effect, a beginner's guide for penholders.  There is a number of things, a number of skills, that would be really helpful.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you Olivier.  I think that's exactly what we're talking about.  And I ask Ariel to collect any of the pointers people have to do some documents.  If anyone has that we have missed at this point, that you think would contribute, that we should review doing any going forward, please send them to Ariel.

And we'll do something going forward.  And Ariel, when you get everything put together, could you put an action item to talk to me to start with, and then we'll get some other people involved.

All right.  Next item is, in terms of…

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:    Ariel had her hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Go ahead Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:    Thanks Alan.  This is Ariel speaking.  Just to talk about the beginner's guide, Nathalie and I are reviewing the latest beginner's guide on ALSs, and there is a section, it's a policy development, policy advice develop in ALAC, and we're revising the text there, because a lot of the text are outdated.  And also, for the future website, we will have a dedicated page of get involved.

And one section is about policy.  And so this is in the plan that we're going to draft some text to explain how the ALAC develop statements.  But of course, we would need input from the community, but staff, I mean me and my team will work on the text for the community to review.

So this is something just as a FYI.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you very much.  Okay.  The next item is something that we talked about very early, after I became chair, and actually I think when Olivier was chair also, of using At-Large staff to, you know, our staff is called

policy staff, but they do very little policy work, unlike the policy staff in other organizations.

And I think it's reasonable that we get people more involved, now this might be creating briefing documents at the start of a policy statement development process, but at the very least, I think there is some perhaps some editing and cleanup that can be done towards the end of statement development, that takes some of the pressure off the individual drafter, or it may make it easier for people whose native language is not English to participate in this process.

I don't think that changes the responsibility of the penholder for making sure the statement says for what it should be saying, but I believe Ariel, and perhaps others in policy staff, if this grows to be a larger task, can certainly take on an editing role, as we go forward in drafting statements.

Now that's something I said we have discussed before. We haven't actually done it, but I think perhaps it's time to start.

And I think that's about all we need to focus on there. In terms of action items, there is a very long laundry list of expected comments. It's not necessarily exhaustive, in that other comments will surely come along that weren't predicted, but there is no reason that we cannot look at that list, and try to assign tentative pen holders, or make tentative decisions on whether we go ahead or not.

I've asked Ariel to create a spreadsheet, and in fact, there is one on the Wiki, but there is also one attached to this agenda. I would like all of the ALT members, and the liaisons, to go through it, complete the

matrix at least until the beginning of 2015, and if you have, if you know nothing about this subject, you can leave it blank.

If you know something about the subject, or have an opinion, give an indication of whether you think a statement would be warranted or not, this is not the final decision, but it would give us a good basis for going forward. And if you think you have an obvious penholder, please identify who that is.

And I ask Ariel to collect all of those documents and collate them together, so we can then discuss them as a group. And that is an action item. Any comments before we close off this item? I think this is the end of the item, but it disappeared from the list.


HEIDI ULLRICH:                     Alan, Dev has his hand up.


ALAN GREENBERG:              Yeah. Dev, go ahead.


DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:    Thanks. This is Dev Anand speaking. I put into the chat, the policy advice about process, which has some of the links we've got in this policy process. And which probably was not really properly implemented at all, since 2012, when it was finally submitted. So, Alan, if you want to go through it and make your comments on that, and see whether it could be implemented now.

My only concern is that the way the policy process is drafted, it kind of makes the ALAC being the ones to do the comments, and not necessarily pushing it to the At-Large working groups. So for example, the upcoming policy issues, what should be happening is that this should be fed to like, those related to new gTLDs fed to the new gTLD working group, anything WHOIS related fed to the, oh dear, I can't remember now. The rights and responsibilities working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev, if I can interrupt. That's one of the documents that Ariel should be collecting for our looking at overall. So we're not going to try to design the process here, and that is one of them. I do have a caution however. Sending things to a working group, which then has its own timeline of when it meets or doesn't meet, and I think it's going to add far too much time to a decision process.

I would like to think that in all working groups, there is someone in the ALT who is semi-active and knowledgeable of what's going on.

DEV ANAND TELLUCKING: This is Dev. I think, I would say that, obviously you have to communicate to the working group when the deadline is. So that the chairs of that working group will know the deadline and try to get the working group to respond in time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, we're going into the design of the process here, which I don't want to do on this group. I certainly have some concerns about how

effective our working groups have been, with the exception of one, with one exception lead by Dev. Our working groups have been closed to defunct.

And relying on them, at this point, has not been very effective. Maybe part of the revitalization of working groups will, can make them effective again. But let's not make assumptions on that part. In any case, we want to collect the input, so that we can make a decision and not necessarily say oh, we didn't know about something when we were considering it. Any other items? Olivier, you have your hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And I fully support what Dev is saying, and if you want to share the load, I don't think the load should be shared among the ALT. The ALT is already busy enough. It's got to be shared among the ALAC, and is going to be shared among the working group chairs.

And the one day, when one day hopefully we'll have metrics, if working group chairs do not drive, and actively drive their working groups, then there needs to be a metric that shows that they're not, and they need to be replaced. That's the only way we're going to have a vibrant community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, I wasn't suggesting the ALT write documents. I'm saying, make the triage decision, which should be made within a day of the public comment being announced, or two days of who is going to be

responsible for it. And that may well be the working group. To make the decision of who is responsible for even looking at it, a working group decision, I think, adds too many steps to the process.

But that's my opinion, and it's not necessarily the one that we're going to go through. Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:    Yeah, thank you. This is Heidi for the record. Just two points. One is in terms of capacity building webinar for drafting statements. That, to me, seems like a perfect one for one of Tijani's capacity building working groups series on webinars.

And another one, at that same point, might be to get the working group chairs who are not as strong in leading a group, or in facilitating drafting of a statement, might be to have another webinar on how to be a strong chair. And that's something that maybe we can get a facilitator in to help them.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Okay. Thank you. Any other comments before we go on? We're running a little bit late already. But I think it's been a productive discussion.

All right. The next item is the update on CCWG. Now, I presume most of the people here, but I may be wrong, participated in the IANA issues call yesterday. Can we have a show of hands, how many did not participate in it?

**EN**

Okay. We have several. So let's do this, but we'll try to keep it somewhat brief. Heidi, is that hand a new hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, sorry. I'll take it down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Currently, we are preparing for the face to face meeting in Paris that will happen on Friday and Saturday of this week. There has been a rather large amount of work being done by the working parties, looking at the public comments and the decisions that have been made, and issues that have rose out of the Buenos Aries meeting. We are in the interesting situation where the public comments were made on a document, which essentially by the beginning of the Buenos Aries meeting was, to some extent, invalid because we had already gone past a number of issues.

And specifically, the concept of formally unincorporated associations. So that work is going on. We are currently looking at three models, I believe, that is the empowered membership, empowered designator, and the term empowered means, an AC or SO does not have to formally create an unincorporated association, they simply can transform themselves into a sufficiently legal entity by making a declaration.

Whether those entities are, in fact, unincorporated associations, is not 100% clear to me. But in fact, ALAC is probably already an unincorporated association, in fact, because of the processes and rules we have. So I don't think it changes the environment. We're also

talking again about the concept of a single member or designator. This would be made up of the representatives of the other ACs and SOs.

And it was something that died a long time ago, but somehow was being brought back at this point. So I don't quite know where that is going. I'll let León speak a little bit about it. There is a third working party that is being formed, to address a number of issues that we have sort of not focused on before. Those are staff and accountability, staff and management accountability, SO AC accountability, how the SOs ACs are accountable to their constituencies, to the larger community, and how we make sure that all the ACs and SOs together are accountable to the ICANN community, enhancement of diversity, and a fourth item called Board duties, that I can't remember what it meant, but maybe León can.

And I suspect León would like to go into just a little bit more detail on other issues related to work party three, and then we'll open it up for questions if anyone has any. León, it's all yours.

LEON SANCHEZ:     Thank you very much Alan. This is León Sanchez. Yes, we opened a new working party within the CCWG. This is working party three, as Alan just explained. And we opened this working party a week and a half ago, with a target to produce three documents before our Paris meeting. And we are expected to deliver this final versions today in a couple of hours.

And I think we're right on track to deliver this documents, at least the one on staff and management accountability, the SO and AC

accountability and the enhancement of diversity document. The Board duties is, so far as I can tell, related to staff and management accountability. There is nothing specific being done to that end. But the three documents that have been so far on the work, try to address the comments received in the comment period, with regards to the proposal being mainly centered in accountability measures or mechanisms that target the Board, as the main person being accountable to the community, or willing to be held accountable to the community.

So what we did is to divide the work into three subgroups, and then we are reviewing documents that we have on hand, to revise the existing mechanisms already in place, that try to address or try to take care of the different issues raised in the public comments. We so far have received, of course, feedback not only from the subgroup, but from other members.

I remember receiving feedback from Olivier and others in our call yesterday, in the IANA issues call yesterday. This feedback has already been incorporated into the document. And one of the main concerns that was raised by Olivier, if I remember well, is that like, for example, we have already some mechanisms that are in the bylaws, that the problem is that this mechanisms are not being funneled in the panels.

So we need to find a way to have whatever mechanisms or measures we have already in the bylaws another documents, to actually be followed and implemented. And if they are not all implemented, then there should be some kind of consequence for not following those provisions. So the long story short on staff and management

accountability, is that we are proposing to have some kind of training and education to both staff and the Board, with regards to building a culture of transparency and accountability.

And there was also the comment on whether the community would be the one, or should be the one to hold staff accountable.  And my feeling was that it was widely supported that the community shouldn't be the one to hold staff accountable, but rather have, of course, the hierarchy within ICANN respected, and have the CEO be the one responsible for staff accountability, and only if the CEO wasn't carrying out this task properly, then the community should be able to go back to the CEO and of course, demand accountability from staff.

Another issue is that there has been some recommendations in the ATRT, that refer to staff but do not pose any direct tasks for the staff in regards to transparency and accountability.  And we were reminded by Avri that there was a recommendation on whistle blowing by staff, and then we should revisit that proposal.  And maybe include it as part of the work stream two task that we would be carrying in the CCWG.

So mainly, all of the mechanisms or solutions that are being proposed with regards to staff accountability would be pushed to being taken care of in work stream two.  And the only thing that we would be addressing in work stream one, would be this commitment to address this part of work stream two work.

Then with regards to the SO and AC accountability, we are proposing also to have periodical reviews by each SO and AC.  And we are trying, of course, to build also some kind of mechanism that will ensure that

this reviews are not only something formal or instrumental that the each SO or AC could take on their own and just say, we have had our review, and we are okay, and we are accountable, and we are transparent.

So we need to tie that to some kind of independent review. So we make sure that these reviews do address the issue on accountability and transparency within each SO and AC. And also taking that to the next level by having the SOs and ACs accountable to their constituents and to, for example, their ALSs or RALOs in the case of the ALAC.

And then with regards to that, we have a paper written by Sébastien Bachoulette, and this paper tries to address the issue of diversity, by suggesting not only periodical reviews on diversity as well, but also proposing that we take care of diversity within the work stream one mechanisms that are being proposed. For example, within the IRP or the community council, in which we should take into account different criteria in order to address diversity.

We have come up to, or come up with a list with non-exhaustive requirements. And what I mean by non-exhaustive is, or what I mean by non-exhaustive is this list should be looked at only as a reference, and not as an absolute list of requirements. And within this requirements, we have included, of course, region, origin, language, gender, and a couple of other criteria that would be necessary to take into account when trying to appoint or fill any positions within any group or any mechanism that we're proposing as part of the enhancing accountability solutions.

So with this, I think I'll turn the call back to Alan.  And, of course, I am open for any questions or comments.

ALAN GREENBERG:        And are there any questions or comments?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices…  Ah, we have Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much Alan.  It's Olivier speaking.  My question to León, and actually to all of the members or participants of the discussions that will take place in Paris, in your view, what will be the most controversial and the most decisive or important decision that will have to be taken in Paris?  And do you, you know, how much help do you need from the At-Large community to get the support, to fight the fight that is looming?

If there is such a fight.  Maybe there is not a fight.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Certainly the decision on which model to pick is not a done deal at this point.  There are those of us who believe there is only one possible alternative, although the new single member designator has confused that issue.  Many of us came out of Buenos Aries believing that the membership model was dead, and designator is it.

That is not agreed to by the group formally, and there are still people fighting tooth and nail for that, for the membership model.  I believe there are some fatal flaws, but you know, it's not clear how the group is

going to come to closure on that. So maybe León has some wisdom, if he's smart, maybe he doesn't want to share it with us.

But I think that single decision is the absolute crucial one. The second one that goes, I think, to the long-term health of the organization, is the voting structure, and whether ACs and SOs have equal status, and whether the SSAC, RSAC, and perhaps the ASO are treated equally or not.

There are strong arguments why they should not be. The RSSAC and to a lesser degree, the SSAC are Board appointed. The ASO really only is a vehicle for passing on RIR discussions, RIR issues, and is not an active group in its own right, as a separate group within ALAC, within ICANN. So there are strong reasons for not treating them equally. On the other hand, you know, their all advisory committees, and perhaps should be treated equally. And there are some very strong opinions.

There is another issue on whether the GAC, if they were to participate, whatever participate means, participate may just mean talking, not actually casting votes, should they lose their special status with regard to how their advice is considered and must be negotiated if the Board does not accept it.

There are a few people who feel very strongly that that is an issue. I think that one will die, but I really don't know for sure. And there is a pleather of other decisions that are going to have to be made along the way, where there is going to be, to some extent, winners and losers who get their way or don't. But I'm not sure that they are ones that are going to be die on the sword types of decisions. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Thank you Alan.  Tijani speaking.  [Inaudible] model, which will be the most important decision of the Paris meeting.  And I think that what we all agree on is that model of all the ACs and SOs, as being members of ICANN, is not acceptable at all.  So it is something, I think, something that is, all of us agree on.  [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG:    Tijani, when you say all of us, do you mean five ALAC members, or do you mean your working group?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    I am speaking about ALAC, ALAC members.  And we need more explanation about this [inaudible] number model.  But I think we need a model perhaps, but I think that all also agree that we [inaudible] is better than number.  In any case.

So it will be, in my point of view, either the same designator number, or a single designator, or a designator empowered designators.  And this will depend on the explanation of the legal team about the single designator model.  Coming back to the ALAC, to the GAC.

I read the comments of governments, and I saw that they all agree on one single point.  They all want to keep their status as advisor at the same way they are now.  And I think this is when, for everything, for everyone, we don't have to agree with that.  We don't have any interest to agree with that.

And this is less controversial then the other proposals for that. I think the [inaudible] raised among the community will be a problem, because I saw a lot of people come [inaudible], a lot of contracted parties people, to get that the SOs will have more votes than the others. And this must not be accepted by us, in my point of view.

Really for an equal footing, all SOs and ACs, but I can live with the proposal of the first public comment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you. Two other comments that I think need to be made. The concept of the GAC as an advisor only, is one of those things that, in its own right, is fine, but if it's a component of other groups saying they don't want to take part also, we could end up with only the GNSO or the GNSO and the ccNSO, taking active part. And that is really problematic in my mind.

The optics of these mechanisms being invoked only by those two SOs, I think would be a real problem. So, I'm not quite sure how we'll proceed on that, and it will remain to be seen how this goes forward. But concepts like the whole Board will be removed as a decision of, you know, largely one SO with the other SO not objecting, could be really problematic.

So that's something to consider. The other thing is Thomas Schneider made a long intervention at the meeting today, something that he hasn't done before, that went along with the submission that the GAC sent on positions of individual countries. Not a GAC position, but positions of individual countries.

However, what he ended with, was a statement saying if the CCWG goes ahead on its current plan, and puts all of the kinds of protections into work stream one as it is planning, there is a high chance that the GAC will not be able to approve it. Other people came back and explained why, in their minds, it was necessary to put it in, but I think they missed the point.

That he said, if all of that is there, there may not be sufficient time to approve it in Dublin. And that's a rather serious statement. If the governments wind up not ratifying the accountability plan, and it's not clear that his statement was really processed very well by some people, they certainly responded with the theory why they thought everything was necessary, but did not respond to the, I won't say threat, but the statement that the whole thing may go up in flames, if it's too complex and too much for the GAC to support.

So again, that remains to be seen how that is going to work out.

Anything else?

All right. Let us go on. The next item on the agenda is the AOS criteria and engagement next steps. It will be very short. I have asked Heidi to immediately start the process of making sure that we have all of the formal members, and to start scheduling meetings. And I'm looking to one meeting a week, possibly at rotating times, to make sure that we're not disenfranchising any region.

And we will then call for observers, not observers, but participants from the rest of At-Large, once we have formally decided on the times and things like that. And so that will be proceeding, hopefully, very quickly.

Any comments, questions on that?  The discussion paper that was sent out that we talked about in Buenos Aries, will certainly form a basis for the initial discussion, but everything is on the table at this point.  I would like to be able to come to closure and make some formal recommendations in time for approval before we act on that.

Last call on questions, comments.  All right.

Onto item number seven, which is a debrief of the ICANN 53 meeting.  I think this is something we're going to be doing a little more of to try to make sure we learn from what's going on.  And I will ask Gisella to lead this please.

Is Gisella with us?

GISELLA GRUBER:          Yes.  I'm here.  I believe Tijani has raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:        Thank you.  This is about the context of engagement.  And so the plan is to have a meeting with all regions or all ALSs?  I don't understand your point.

ALAN GREENBERG:         The agreement was, we would put a taskforce together, the taskforce is being chaired by me.  We'll include, as formal members, one ALAC member from each region to be selected by the ALAC members, and I believe, Heidi correct me, two RALO representatives selected by the RALO management, according to whatever process they choose.  So it could be someone named by the RALO chair, fi that is in line with how they work, or it could be a wider call for participation.

And in addition to that, it will be open to anyone else who also wants to participate, but those 15 plus chair are the core group.  That's something we proposed in Singapore and ratified soon after that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:       And you are proposing that you start the meeting of this group, of this efforts?

ALAN GREENBERG:         That is correct.  It should have been done before now, but we've been a little bit occupied.

Tijani, do you have a follow on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:       No, it's okay.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:         Thank you Tijani.  Back over to you Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:    Alan, thank you.  Gisella here.  Just for all of the ALT members and other people on this call.  We heard a debrief with Alan following the Buenos Aries meeting, and we just went through a few suggestions during the pre, during, and post meeting, just to make everyone's life easier.

Now one of the main points, of course, for all face to face meetings is the scheduling.  So what has made things much easier, is that we are now working with León and Alan on scheduling for the meetings.  A suggestion made as well was to work on all meetings, all the people who we're going to be meeting with during the face to face meeting, and if you just bear with me for a second, I'm going to bring up a list of the face to face meetings we had in Buenos Aries during our ALAC sessions.

And this was one of the main points that Alan brought up to work on this initial document on, during the sessions, who we were going to be meeting with, and the topics we were going to be discussing.  This is once we've already setup the schedule and define the times for the ALAC sessions on Sunday and on the Tuesday.

We work very closely with León on scheduling all the other meetings.  I think that in Dublin, unless I'm mistaken, we all have pretty much the same format as BA as in a large number of accountability and IANA issues, general meeting.  And we will have to sit in our meetings.  We also discussed the 7 AM meetings, to try and avoid those.

Unfortunately, as everyone knows, the timeslots are extremely limited.  My thinking behind that is that then we can prioritize the meetings that

we need to schedule and perhaps ask some of the working groups to possibly just have a conference call as opposed to having a face to face meeting.

Heidi, is there anything that you wish to add to that initial scheduling point?

HEIDI ULLRICH:     Thank you Gisella.  And this was an initiative that Gisella and I had right after Buenos Aries, just to ensure that everyone is getting the most out of these meetings.  So perhaps one thing is what we can do is go back, no need to do that now, but take that [inaudible] on presentation topic, and we might be able to add another column that says how useful you thought it was, or you could send that in emails, so it's not on the public list or public Wiki.

And that will help us to determine whether this is something that the people we're speaking with on a traditional basis, it's something that we want to go ahead and continue with.  So note that on these, in Buenos Aries, we had two newer speakers.  One was Jean-Jacques [inaudible], who spoke on Civil Society engagement.  And he's going to be leading the Civil Society engagement for the next, that meets in the next fiscal year.

Like, I'm sure, likely longer than that.  So that's someone you might want to think about having on a more regular basis.  And also Nora [inaudible], who is leading several points within ICANN.  One is, the development division on public responsibility.  So you might want to

think about having her speak to the ALAC more often, on a more regular basis.

And I think that's it for that point, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:          Thank you Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG:         Thank you.  A couple of comments.  Gisella said this list is tied to the, when the meetings will be held, but in fact, I think we want to start earlier than that, and start putting together a list of what we want, where it can fit it may vary, but one of the issues that's come up is there are lots of comments towards the end of the meeting and during the meeting of what we should have talked about, how much time we should have allowed for things, how people are cut off because we're trying to keep a schedule, why didn't do something or other, and yet, when we review the schedules both with the ALT and with the ALAC, we get virtually no feedback, with a few minor exceptions, or maybe major, but with few exceptions.

One of the things I've proposed is that instead of looking over detailed schedules, and saying, what is in what timeslot, and it's from 9:15 to 9:47, that we start off with something that can be presented essentially in one page, of who do we want to meet with?  What do we want to talk about?  Roughly how much time do we want to allow?

And that goes both for internal meetings within the ALAC, and subjects that we want to, ALAC and At-Large, that we want to focus on, external

meetings, meetings joined with other groups. So, try to put the information, without the clutter of what day it's on, and what time, exactly time it's in, as a first path, and just present something that people can easily focus on, and say, this is what we're going to be doing within ALAC and At-Large for the week, what are we missing, what are we focusing on incorrectly, and try to put it in the form that people can process it easily without having to flip through multiple Wiki pages and multiple documents.

So, we're going to give that a try, whether it will work or not remains to be seen. But, and this part of a trend you'll hear, I think we need to get more people involved. Having complaints after the fact, doesn't really address the problem. It's nice to have debriefings, but I think we need to work ahead of time.

Back over to you Gisella.


GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan. Yes, sorry can you hear me?


ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Heidi wants to say something.


HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I wanted to also note that one other suggestion we had was to have [inaudible] call prior to the next meeting, so we can all… Rather than having it fit into a very busy ALAC or ALT agenda, we'll have actually a single issue call on developing the agendas, going through the

overall meeting schedule. So we come into the meeting knowing exactly who is speaking, what we hope to get out of that presentation, etc. as we come into the meeting itself. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:      Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:      Yes, thank you Heidi. I don't have anything else to add with regards to the scheduling, nor for the preparations. What we came up with as well, which we thought would be useful for everyone on the ALT, is to have the staff responsibility during an ICANN face to face meeting public meeting, just to make sure that you're addressing the right person if you're having any concerns.

It doesn't mean that we are limited to these functions, [inaudible] as well with the multi-function, but multi-task as such, we thought that this might, as we read [inaudible] and not restricted to, if you would just like to run over there on who does what during the meeting, which will hopefully just make us all very efficient.

ALAN GREENBERG:      That document is attached to the agenda, so you can look at it on your own time.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                      And Alan, if I might, this is Heidi again.  Just very quickly, we've been doing this for the last several years, is that for each meeting on the Wiki page, right underneath the titles and the time, you will see who is leading that meeting.  Again that means the person normally sitting next to the chair, actually listening to what's going on, advising when possible, etc.

                                    Then there is also the note taker, that's for the most part, that's Silvia, who is actually listening for the action items and other main points.  And then finally, we have RP and that's a person who is doing the remote participation.  So for each meeting, you'll see who is leading and who is taking on those responsibilities, for that particular meeting.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:                     Okay.  Any other comments on this item?  Going, going, gone.  Dev.  Go ahead Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSING:              Hi.  This is Dev.  Just one suggestion here, I think in terms of the pre-planning for this, for face to face meetings, I think what needs to happen is that a lot of these sessions need to be, I would say tabbed, related to working group interest.  So for example, the Civil Society Engagement, that was presented, that was show on a Saturday.  What should have happened is that before the meeting, I will say ideally either a week or two before, the various working groups are notified.

                                    So okay, Civil Society engagement, that's At-Large outreach and engagement working group.  If there was a WHOIS related issue, then

the registrant rights and responsibilities working group. New gTLDs, that type of thing. Because I think what's the problem, what's happening here, is that the vast majority I would say of the working groups, and by extension, the At-Large community are in the dark as to what is happening in these face to face meetings.

So I think we have to, you know, have the type of communication as to what's happening for each of those sessions. So that's just one suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: So Dev, you're suggesting that we make sure that the community that is not attending the meeting, understands well ahead of time what sessions may be of particular interest so they can try and make sure to attend if their time allows.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. And also, if they would have a particular question or query, then, you know, a discussion happens beforehand that this needs to be brought at the face to face meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry. Alan, it's Maureen for the record. Just to, I just wanted to raise, because I didn't realize [inaudible] going to the appropriate place, but

just to raise the new meeting strategy working group, has got full [inaudible], the outreach in other, sorry, other types of meetings, and that are included in it.

And I just wanted to sort of like to highlight these, in relation to the fact that we're looking at a sort of like time for meetings, that's sort of that may [inaudible], and I think you've mentioned that before. So really we're actually looking at how, you know, how our meetings are constructed and the scheduling that we need to include, you know, like what is proposed for the new meetings that are going to start next year.

So, either this is going to involve a lot of discussion outside of the group that is already, that's working on at the moment, but it, yeah, it's sort of like, we're already identifying that there is, we had quite a number of issues that are going to come up in relation to our ordinary sort of like scheduling of meetings. I just thought I would highlight that now.


ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you Maureen. Heidi.

Heidi, you're on.


HEIDI ULLRICH:        Thank you. I just wanted to make a point regarding, in response to what Dev said, and that's, you know, we would like to have the working group chairs take a more pro-active position in developing the agenda, then in listening to what the other meetings are going to be about, and what they're going to be focused on.

So it's sort of a much more synchronized way of developing an At-Large agenda. So it really should not be a surprise to the working group chairs on who is speaking at what other meetings. So again, a single issue call where the ALT and the working group chairs and maybe the RALO chairs, are all on the call so they can understand and collaborate on what is being planned, might be useful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:            Thank you Heidi. Dev, your hand is still up. Is that a new hand?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:  This is Dev. Just a quick response. I think, indeed, I think that's what needs to happen. The working group chairs need to be, if it's not being dealt with, I at the ALAC level, then I think at the ALT level, then the working group chairs, of all of the working groups need to be invited, and be made well aware of what's happening for the, in preparation for these meetings, and meet the request.

But, I just point out that there does seem to be a lack of communication that's between the ALAC. I don't foresee the ALAC staff in combination with the working groups, because I see things, I'll give two examples. I saw the things for the Singapore meeting, for example, there was a discussion about the CROPP team, and the CROPP team was not even informed about this discussion that was about to take place.

That is just one example. And I think, yeah. That's just one example. I can site several others. The outreach brochures being presented at the

Singapore meeting, even though the outreach and engagement working group had gave input to the first draft of it, that type of thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Your point is taken. All right. I would like to essentially morph into the next item, because it's really a continuation of the same thing, but with more focus on teleconferences. At this point, it pretty well falls on Heidi, and other staff, and me, putting together the ALT and ALAC agendas, and I would like to make this a more communal responsibility, or at the very least, make sure that it is clear that we're welcoming input from other people.

To this end, number one on the ALT meetings, we typically know when they are ahead of time, and we're going to do a better job of scheduling them more than a few days out. And the ALAC meetings, we know very well when they are. So on the ALT meetings, I'm going to ask, on a regular basis, and you don't need to be asked each time, from ALT members, if you want something put on the agenda, let us know.

Let me know and let Heidi know, who does the main planning of agendas. And you know, it's not clear we can accommodate everything, but at least make your interest known. And I'm going to ask staff for the ALAC meetings, about two weeks out before the meeting, to send out a note to the ALAC list, the public ALAC list, that anyone who wants to see an item discussed on the agenda, or believe it needs to be discussed, please let us know.

Now again, there is no guarantee that we can fit everything into agendas, but if we don't let people know ahead of time, then there is a

good chance it may be missed. So just a heads up that I think we're going to try to get more involved within the planning process for the these meetings, both the face to faces that we've been talking about, and the teleconferences, so that we have fewer things that fall through the cracks.

Anything else on that item before we go on to the next one? We are getting towards the end of the meeting, and we should be ending somewhat early, I hope. No comments. Okay.

The next item is, we need to do an update of the rules of procedure. There are a number of things, certainly, related to the Board member selection that came up during the last process, that need to be clarified and cleaned up. There are a number of other items that we've noted over the last year and a half, that probably needs some cleaning up.

So just a heads up that this will be coming. Start putting together your lists and forwarding them to me and staff, so that we can put together a laundry list of… I don't think it's going to be a particularly difficult set of updates, nor a controversial one, but I think we need to do some cleanup on it.

Now related to that, there is, the item that León mentioned of work party three of accountability, looking at staff, rather SO AC accountability. And part of that, I believe, is going to look at the rules of procedure, the operating principles of the various groups, perhaps down to the RALOs, and looking into what extent accountability is built into the rules.

So that will be part of the focus of what we will be looking at on the ALAC rules as well.  Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Thank you Alan.  Tijani speaking.  [Inaudible] rule of procedure update, I have a document almost ready, but I need to make a call for the [inaudible] group.  And try to make them agree or adopt all of the points of the document that is [inaudible] ALAC [inaudible]…

…for adoption and then [inaudible]…  So I don't forget it, I told [inaudible]…  I cannot focus on this point now.  I hope will do during this summer, or perhaps later, but this year, everything will be done and the recommendation will be turned to the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you Tijani.  I wasn't implying that you were going to do that in the next two weeks.  I think it should be done before Dublin, or perhaps at Dublin, but somewhere in that timeframe.  So yeah, it would be appreciated if you can get it done, but clearly, we're not looking at it in the next two weeks.

Just one, not caution, but consideration.  When you go back to your committee, which I think you said you're going to, make it clear that this is the committee making recommendations and the ALAC adopts changes.  We don't want to set expectations into it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG:    I mean, the prerogative of that group was for that election, not necessarily how to go forward.  I don't expect that there will be radical differences.  So that's just a heads up.  I think we can start accumulating things.  I know that over the last year and a half, occasionally we have found a rule which wasn't quite what we expected it to be, or didn't quite meet some particular needs.

The last item is any other business.  I have one item.  Does anyone else have anything else to add?  We didn't call for any other business at the beginning, at the agenda.  So I'll ask now.  Olivier, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much Alan.  Olivier speaking.  I just wanted to alert you to the ATLAS 2 At-Large summit, second At-Large summit follow-up, as discussed face to face.  We were going to go through some of the recommendations, and get the working group itself, the ATLAS 2 working group to find out, do a sock take effectively, find out which recommendations are still working, which ones are not, which ones need to be amended, etc.

Shortly after the meeting, whilst we were still based in Buenos Aries, Ariel, Dev, and I spent some time together to kick start the process.  So you will soon be seeing some movement on this.  And it is my plan to have a lot more recommendations ready for consumption by the ALAC, or implementation by the ALAC, by staff, by the Board, etc. depending on where they need to be sent.

But we've made some very good progress on this. And I'm planning to launch some new conference calls to get the wider At-Large summit follow-up group to engage. I think it's important for two reasons. One, it actually involves those people that were there face to face. And we might be able to use this as a leverage for them to be involved more in our working groups, and secondly, it's also important that we show to the Board, and to others, that this summit has yielded recommendations that are to be implemented. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. I'll give the floor to Dev in a moment, but I'll take a question with your last statement. The issue is not to demonstrate we have recommendations be implemented, the issue is we have quality recommendations to be implemented. And I'm assuming that the triage work you're doing right now is looking at the recommendations and their merits, and making sure that when we present them, that we're in a position where we can defend them and not just simply say, this was an ATLAS recommendation, therefore it has to be done.

It's a year plus later at this point, and I think we have to make sure what we're talking about is still applicable. So just a caution. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. This is Dev Anand speaking. I posted a link in the chat. I posted up some immediate work items, objectives, for the ALAC subcommittee on outreach and engagement. And I hope, well, maybe either with you and/or staff, to take a look at these items. I note that one of the concerns that was picked up on the last, in the final day of the wrap-up

session, was that people seem to have misunderstanding or concerns about how outreach should be handled.

There seems to be two streams of thought, that it should be the RALOs doing it on their own, versus you know, having it done under this working group. And it's really creating, I think, a problem in terms of how they should be organized. So perhaps if you don't have time, you could, perhaps you and staff can take a look at it, and have a discussion afterwards.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay. Thank you. All right. The other item I had was, and this came up during this meeting, is revitalization of working groups. We've been talking about that now for, I'm guessing, two years running. We have a small number of working groups that are active and doing things. We have others that exist in name only, some without chairs.

I think we just made a decision, but correct me if I'm wrong, that we would put the future challenges working group on hold. I think there was a discussion held in Buenos Aries, and we made that decision at this point, but other than that, the question is, how do we go forward.

Do we need to reorganize the groups? Are the current group names still applicable? How do we staff them? And how do we actually get some productive work out of them? And I see two hands up. I will say, out of this discussion, I would like to have some volunteers to work on a plan, not to do that work, but to propose a plan how we go forward and do this. Tijani first and then Olivier.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Thank you Alan.  I think that we need to make a call for confirmation [inaudible] group or [inaudible] working group, each year, once a year, because we have people who are coming, people who are going.  So we need new groups inside the working group.  And we have to be sure that people who are on the list, are still willing to be members of the working group.

So we don't have to take the original members and continue as standing members, we have to make an evaluation each year, and ask people if they want to continue, and ask other people if they want to join.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Tijani, I take it from you that statement that you are volunteering to put together the plan.  Since you've just described several aspects of that plan.  Do you agree that you have just volunteered?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Yes, I can participate, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay, thank you.  Olivier.

I would, to the extent possible, to not do the plan here, but get volunteers to do the plan.  Go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. And I'm going to be quick, because I need to be on another call, I'm already five minutes late, but I agree with Tijani. I don't think we need to redesign our working groups. I think that we've got exactly the right working groups. What we're missing is reliable chairs. So if we have a reenactment of the chair, or a confirmation of a chair, yearly, that's great. But if the chair hasn't done anything, then that chair is out, and get a next chair in.

We have plenty of people that can chair working groups. It's sad that the best working groups that are working, are all chaired by the same person and that's Dev.

ALAN GREENBERG: We now have another aspect of the plan that needs to be written. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Dev Anand speaking. I guess I will be willing to join the group, because I'm very concerned about how the working groups are structured, and be involved in the various working groups. I'm concerned more from the ALAC side of things in terms of improving the communication, but I think also at the RALO level, what is happening is that, [inaudible] are not giving the working groups there any props or recognition.

So it's hard to attract members when they are being ignored by the RALOs. So and I think that should be looked at as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Good point.  Olivier, your hand is still up.  Anything else?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:     That's all.  Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay.  We have three people.  If anyone wants to volunteer, please talk to three.  I presume among the three of you, you'll decide who is leading the effort, and who is drafting, and who else is participating.  And I will not set a deadline for you, but clearly, since we've been talking about this for a long time, the sooner you can get to it, the better.

But I understand time is constrained over the summer.  Any other items?  If not, we will adjourn 20 minutes early.  Yes.

Or are we adjourning seven minutes late?  I'm not sure which it is.

HEIDI ULLRICH:     Alan?  Just really quickly.  I don't believe that we covered the item on agenda items regarding ALAC calls.  So perhaps we can do that on the ALT chat.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I called for suggestions.  The call is on the 28th, I'm asking for anyone have any suggestions, or comments, requests for what should be on the agenda.  That was one of the items under 8A.  Perhaps I didn't say it clearly enough.

And we are not ending 20 minutes early, we're ending seven to eight minutes late.  My apologies.  Have a good day.  And for those who will be in Paris, see you there or see you on the Skype chat if not.  Thank you all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**