
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team, ALT, Mid-Monthly Meeting, taking place on Wednesday, 12th of August 2015 at 20:00 UTC. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Ron Sherwood and Julie Hammer. We have apologies from Rafid FATani. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Terri. As the first AI, can I ask staff, next time we prepare an Agenda, to flip Items #1 and #2, since we always do them in the other order? Presuming that will now happen, I'll now give my three minutes of introduction in my standard 12 seconds. This is the ALT Mid-Monthly Call. There are a lot of little things to discuss; relatively few that will take a substantial amount of time. One of the Items that we do have that will take a substantial amount of time is the CCWG, and I'm not actually sure we have a lot to discuss, but we'll do that when we come to it.

First of all, is there anything else that needs to be added to the Agenda? Seeing no hands, hearing nothing, we'll assume it's accepted as displayed. The first Item is the ALAC policy development process. We have a number of statements that are in various states of being drafted, and I'll quickly go over what I know to be the status of them, but we may want to go to some other people along the way. The one on Armenian

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.

script root zone level generation rules, I have talked to Narine about it. She has a couple of issues she'd like to raise. One of them is the fact that the report ignores the fact that there's a large Armenian population in Russia. I candidly told her I don't know if that was an admission or a political statement that they didn't want to mention it, but I didn't really know which.

The other one is an issue of a homoglyph that is two characters that look the same, but have different sounds and meanings in Armenian Cyrillic and in Russian Cyrillic. I feel a bit awkward with the ALAC making a statement on that, because it's not something the ALAC as such really has expertise in. I suggested she has two alternatives - one is to make a personal statement, along with any one of her Armenian colleagues who wants to make similar statements.

The second is if she can have other people, not only her - just adding Siranush may well be enough - to advise the ALAC that these are things, then we can make a statement saying we have been advised by our Armenian-speaking members that there's an issue that we should call to the attention of the group. I feel comfortable, if we phrase it like that, having ALAC make a statement, because that gives us credibility in not pretending we're all Armenian experts. So I'm going to talk to her about it, but I think we'll go one of those two ways, depending on how her and Siranush want to push it.

It's the first time she's volunteered, so I don't want to squash any eagerness in her, but on the other hand, I want to make sure that if the ALAC makes a statement, it's in making something we credibly can be

talking about. If anyone has any comments, I'm presuming you'll put a hand up. I'll just keep on going otherwise. Tijani, then Holly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I do agree with your methodology. I think that Narine should have to make a personal statement or at least propose one. As ALAC we may support her statement, or not. We may perhaps make a statement that will be based on her statement, but before that we need to be sure that we're doing the right things with the help of other Armenian people. Thank you Tijani. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to add that [Ilyana] is also Armenian, so maybe we should put her in the loop.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, who?

HOLLY RAICHE: [Ilyana 00:05:22]. She's also ALAC, and she's Armenian. I will send you her email address.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please. Anything else on this item?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hang on. Let's not just grab Armenians around the place. Just like I don't think we would randomly say, "We need some Australians. Let's go directly to the Membership of the ALS that you've got in Australia." I think it's appropriate as an Asia Pacific issue that you ask the ALT to reach out to our Armenian ALSes. Ask them too, that we would appreciate some input in a timely manner, so it can be considered - even as a minority report - in the ALAC statement. I don't think we need to reach out to odd people - I don't mean odd. I think if we're going to use a regional structure, we should be using a regional structure, is what I'm suggesting.

HOLLY RAICHE: I did the short hand, you did the long hand. Fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I've been avoiding people's bunions unless I deliberately want to break their feet and legs for a very long time, Holly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. I'll take it under advisement and try to do the wrong thing, and probably fail. All right, anything else on this statement? Next one we have is the initial report on data and metrics for policy making. That one has Maureen's name on it. Can you give us an update?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks Alan. Yes, I've been through all the documents, very interesting reading. I have made some initial observations, but one of the things I

neglected to do was find out where I could put those observations - like where a Wiki page was that I could put them onto so that other people could make comments, especially those who are aligned with GNSO and can give me some extra information too about their processes. So when I get the Wiki up and running I'll notify people so that they can comment on what I do.

I've got some initial thoughts about the document. It's very comprehensive, of course, as I notice that a lot of the GNSO stuff is, but there are some good takeaways and there are some interesting observations that have been made in the report. One of particular interest to us at the moment is that they do mention that the GNSO is really important to involve other SOs and ACs into the process, and through their outreach process, which, in looking at it, is more aligned with carrying out surveys and getting information, and then disseminating it, information-wise, for other groups.

From our perspective, with regards to outreach and engagement, I think that it reflects what we would focus on, and that's engaging other people and outreach types of process. Like our face-to-face meetings with GNSO - we don't do that, do we? - but especially in light of this new process, looking at metrics and reporting, and how that can actually help to improve the PDP. An interesting thing too is they want to create a change of culture within the GNSO in relation to that development process. I think that changing the culture of the GNSO sounds like a challenge in itself. But yes, I will put those thoughts down and hopefully people will look at it and make comments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Maureen. Regarding the Wiki, if you click on the link in the Agenda you'll get to the right Wiki space, so that's an easy one. A couple of comments on the history of this. There have been discussions within PDPs, particularly by contracted parties who've been objecting to doing things, that at times we attempt to make policy based on hearsay and feelings in your stomach, and not on real data. There have also been statements made that in some cases the only real data is held by the contracted parties, who refuse to give it up. How convenient.

When this original project started, there was a tone in it that they were supposed to be looking at things that we should be asking contracted parties to keep track of, so that we could have data in the policy making process. Along the way, the tone has changed somewhat. I haven't looked at the current document, so I'm not quite sure where we are today, but I think that's something to keep in mind. It's fine to say we should only make policy based on real data, but we need access to the real data that we're going to make the policy on. That's something I think we have to look very carefully on when we look at this particular document. Anyone else with a comment on this? No? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just briefly - as you probably know, I've had more attendance than the Co Chairs in this particular Working Party - I'm quite comfortable with the tone and where we are. There's a plan for not only a pilot, but more importantly to build into the normal scheme of events as a basis from the pilot, appropriate funding models, so there can be a third-party acquisition, as required, and anonymized acquisition, as required, of

data. What we did during this process was work quite successfully to... Ameliorate is one way of putting it, some of the frequently forwarded issues in terms of commercial and in-confidence materials. There really aren't too many places in the shadows to hide, providing the data is required. We also don't want to just do these things for the sheer joy of doing them. I'm quite happy with where we're up to, and I do know Maureen and I should have had a conversation about this, and she's just launching into her [unclear 00:13:40] and I'm just surfacing from it. Or maybe we're both surfacing from it, so we might actually get together. I hear where you're coming from Alan, because you and I suffered through a few of those interesting conversations. But I'm actually relatively, if not totally, comforted that this will work. But more importantly we can iron out any kinks during the funded pilot of five exercises of cases we'll be doing. By the way, Alan, we did use some of your more memorable reference points on this as case studies during our work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you talking about a contractual requirement that will force contracted parties to participate?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not at this stage, but we're talking about a development of a set of expectations whereby to not play ball - and we've got a couple of people particularly keen to play ball - they would be very much out of step if they didn't. But they'd also have the ability to take third-party data on

board, because it's a funded model, and of course the funded model makes a huge difference.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Anything else on this Item? We're taking a little bit more time, but I don't mind, if we're going to end up with some good statements out of it. The next Item is the ICG proposal. That one is in Olivier's hands. I think it's just starting off, and we've already started rattling sabers, trying to get people to read the documents and make contributions. Olivier, is there anything you need to or want to add at this point?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

There hasn't been anything put on the Wiki so far. I've put a link to the document into some of the... There are recent issues that have come up with regards to the intellectual property issues. There's this discrepancy between the different proposals. Apart from this, there isn't very much feedback so far. As you know, we had a meeting yesterday, and we're going to have another conference call tomorrow as well. I hope that we'll be able to extract a little bit further information to draft a statement.

I don't expect it to be particularly huge, except a couple of points raised by Tijani on the call yesterday that we'll try and see if we can put in line with what we have already, regarding the intellectual property issues. Just to let you know, I don't think there's any specific point or consensus as to whether we wish the IETF or ICANN to retain the ownership of IANA.org intellectual property. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. On the issue Tijani brought up, I think that's one we should make sure we try to flesh out. I ask Tijani to put something there if you haven't already. On the intellectual property issues and the domain name, I think we'd easily get unanimity saying we all prefer ICANN to keep it. I'm also starting to sense however that there is a growing feeling that if we can come up with something acceptable and protect the names community, then we're willing to live with it.

Certainly that's the strong position I've taken, and that pretty well maps to the IETF trust with sufficient contractual terms or a new trust. That seems to be the alternatives coming out of this. I'm certainly happy with any of those. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just briefly - I thought because of the discussion - and I may even bring it up in our AOB in our next call - but I'm in the camp that feels that the overlay pattern that ICG has come out with is pretty much a "here is a modification of situation normal" and I'm okay with that. I'm also actually more okay with the intellectual property going to a specific trust, or more preferably the IETF, with enough bells, whistles, belts and braces to make sure it's a protected for public use asset.

But I do think, just like we need to do outreach on the CCWG paper that's out now, we might need to do a bit more deliberate outreach on this topic, specific to the ICG paper, than just our meetings of the usual suspects. I wanted to raise a question of whether there was going to be an in-house or supported outreach webinar. The slide decks and

materials are there. I'm not suggesting we bore everyone rigid with, "This is how the DNS works," but there are a few slides out of the ICG webinar slide deck that we could use and deliberately see if we could get more than just the usual suspects in. Just a suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have a fair number of webinars coming up on CWG and CCWG. I'm reluctant to add another one, but I'm wondering if perhaps we can fold that into that one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sure it could be an adjunct. It's a similar topic. I'd like to see it out wider than just a half dozen of our usual suspects, to go into the mulling pot.

ALAN GREENBERG: My only concern is when you raise this as people haven't thought of it before, the initial answer is always a simple one, which is likely implementable at this point. I'm a little concerned for that. Can I leave it to you and Olivier to work out?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can but try.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier said there's no consensus about the assets. I don't agree with you. I think a large consensus is to keep it in ICANN, but what we can feel also in our community is that if the operational community comes up with a common solution that they trust, we will not be against it. So we are looking for a solution that has the agreement of the three operational communities, but we prefer that the asset stays or remains with ICANN. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do enjoy the irony of the whole IANA transition failing over a dispute over a domain name. [laughter] Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. I note that in the actual discussions on the CWG that the attitudes of some of the participants is softening up, and they are saying, "At the end of the day, provided we have the right details, we wouldn't mind it going over to the IETF fund." The concern I have at the moment is there doesn't seem to be very much discussion between the different IETF and RIRs, or CRISP and CWG. It seems to be happening at Chair level. I'm not really sure what's going on there, because I'm reading things that are going on in the other mailing list, and sometimes I think there could be a problem, sometimes I don't.

It's pretty clear this issue has been known for a while, and nothing has been done by the Leadership of the CWG. I don't think it's going to be a deal-breaker, ultimately. We could always punt it until later and say,

“That will be discussed in the future, if we really are in front of a very hardcore opposition.” But I’ve noticed others are saying, “We would prefer ICANN.” We’re not feeling that strong on it if it went over to the IETF. I do have one person though, of a double initial, next to N, that is very adamant that it should not be ICANN under any circumstances. I don’t know how much pull that will take. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It’s not likely to be ICANN just because of the words in the CRISP proposal. I think we probably have to accept that. Cheryl? Last words.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very briefly, I agree with that Alan indeed. The reason I put my hand up was when Olivier mentioned it was going to be Chair-to-Chair, and because I’m in the CWG Leadership Team, I wanted to make the point that yes, there’s been a good communication pathway across the Chair levels, and perhaps not enough of it has dribbled down to the CWG. But a lot of it was waiting for the IP information briefing paper, which we now have.

I don’t think there’s been lack of attention or collusion, I just think it was a matter of we had decided in the CWG that we didn’t have time to deal with it as early as we’d have liked to. Just to make sure there’s no misinterpretation of what’s going on or what’s been planned. That’s all.

ALAN GREENBERG: It’s quite clear we could have done something a lot earlier. We probably should have. At this point, I’m quite happy to have the Chairs do it, if

they actually do it and keep us informed. We're told that the IETF trust people are looking for some legal language that might satisfy everyone, so I'm hoping it's going ahead properly at this point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll make that point on our behalf then Alan, okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next statement - the bylaw amendments on GNSO policy and implementation. I think at this point the documents have been approved. My gut feeling is we want to make a statement to the Board, noting our discomfort with the potential elongation with the process - the same ones we've made every time - and the potential inability of the GNSO to address public interest issues.

Just to put it on record, but not objecting to the bylaws being implemented and the new procedures being tried. If anyone has any objection to that then speak now. I'm willing to draft it. I've already drafted about five statements like that over the year, and I'm willing to draft another one quickly. Comments? No hands. One tick mark. Thank you.

Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing Accountability, second draft. I think we had a very productive IANA issues meeting - perhaps misnamed - yesterday. We're having another tomorrow. I've started posting some comments and will hopefully be finished some time today. Hopefully we'll get some other ones. The target is to have a draft

statement ready early in the week of the 24th, which is a little under two weeks from now. I'm hoping we'll have comments. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. My hand is for a mistake on the Agenda. The comment will not end on August 12, but September 12th.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel will note that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 12th of August, that wouldn't be good! Alan, I just wanted to make sure that at this point, as you and I back-channeled the other day - we're going to focus on the webinars, but I wondered about regional outreach. It seems to me that right now we should perhaps be asking the regions if, at some of their upcoming meetings, they wanted to have a small presentation section. If that's the case, I'm quite sure that Leon, you, Tijani, Olivier and I, and those of us who've been entrenched in this, should be able to make ourselves available.

If we do that, I'd suggest that, for example, the time zone of the meeting... I wouldn't want to do AP as much as you or Tijani do AP. I'll do Latin American or Africa. But I think we should switch it up, so they're not hearing the same old voices, that's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Got it. How many regional meetings do we have between now and then?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe there's a full cycle.

ALAN GREENBERG: Staff? We have LACRALO, it's next Monday. NARALO we just had.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It should be before the 12th of September.

ALAN GREENBERG: APRALO is the end of next week, and EURALO. So we've got three of them anyway. AFRALO I think is too late for it. We missed that one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: They've also done their joint papers.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the sentiment is correct. I think we need to get out statements to the RALOs. It needs to be done in a concise way that captures people's attention; not long messages that people never look at. I'll ask staff to put something together, and Cheryl would be glad to proofread them and comment on them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The FAQ document will be out shortly, and I'd suggest if little more than the attention be brought to the FAQ document at these meetings, that will help.

ALAN GREENBERG: When is shortly?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Shortly, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: The LACRALO Meeting is next Monday.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You'll have it well by then.

LEON SANCHEZ: We're in the final stage of reviewing the FAQ. I think maybe it will be published tomorrow or the day after that, at the latest. I think we're already getting there, so by tomorrow or the day after, it will be already published.

ALAN GREENBERG: The day after tomorrow is a bit late to send something out for the first time. May I suggest we try to get something out to the RALOs concerned tomorrow and say the FAQ will be forthcoming? Something to give a heads-up?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm talking to staff and perhaps Cheryl doing some proofreading.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, that's not a problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have an AI there. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Just to say that AFRALO, even if our meeting will not be before the deadline, we'll prepare a statement about the ICG and CCWG proposal. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you want that integrated into the ALAC one, we should get something available next week.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. What we'll do this time is I'll try to work with you on the statement of ALAC, taking into account the point of view of AFRALO, and we'll work the statement of AFRALO in the meantime. Because we have a problem also of bandwidth. As you know, now it's summer and people are on leave, so we don't have a lot of people to work together. We will try to work on both tracks at the same time.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's good. Last time we ended up with a frozen AFRALO statement at a time when the ability to perhaps do a little bit of negotiation and coming to a common point would have been useful. Hopefully we can bypass that this time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I hope so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, statements that seem to be stalled. We have the Next Generation Registration Services. That's one that Carlton made a statement on. His statement was largely that we are supportive of the overall gist of the preliminary issue report, which is very complete. We highlighted a number of issues that we feel strongly about, which we would particularly not want to see disappear in the final version, and raised a concern that the amount of work that this is going to generate is going to be so large.

It's going to be very difficult to get people without money or some very strong ideological direction - and privacy is one of those; where they will

contribute, period, because it's so important to them - but for the other issues related largely to users and to the more mundane things, it's going to be very hard to get a commitment. Although we don't have an answer for that, he believes, and I agree, that we do need to highlight it. Again, that reinforces the ATRT 2 statement, and other things, saying people without funding have a hard time participating in this game.

I'd like to try something on this one. Carlton has essentially put together the gist of what we want to say, and we've had several discussions over a while that we want to get staff more involved in helping us write documents - not directing what they say, but actually put it together. I'm asking, without warning, Heidi and Ariel, could we have perhaps Ariel do a first draft of an actual statement?

ARIEL LIANG: I'm taking down the AI.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I've passed this by Carlton. He's delighted this is happening. Then the next step is Ariel and I will get together, and I'll try to give you some direction as to what to do. We'll put together a draft and see where it goes. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to say, just to agree with that. This is a huge issue. This is the first step of implementing the EWG, and at the same time we're working with WHOIS. It's like this huge privacy WHOIS issue and Carlton's absolutely right - it's getting bigger, not smaller. Maybe at some future

time, Carlton and I can sit down. The many-headed hydra is what WHOIS is becoming, and this is the first step of another hydra being formed. I agree with him. I just look at this and go, “Oh my God, here we go again.”

ALAN GREENBERG: It’s almost worse. Each arm of a hydra is a hydra. It’s a fractal!

HOLLY RAICHE: You’ve got the WHOIS conflict, and it’s a stand-off. You’ve got the privacy proxy service, and we’re trying to deal with 10,000 statements. We’ve had three groups that I’m in, that are all WHOIS and this is just another one. Only this is saying, “We’re now going to replace WHOIS with something else, so we’re fixing up WHOIS but also replacing it at the same time.”

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s right. You’ve got it. Next Item. We’re all happy with this one. The next Item is the Design Review Team for a plan for the DNS root zone key rollover. We have a recommendation from Julie, which I and Olivier strongly support, and that is that this is a very well done, professional paper. There’s nothing we can really say, and our prudent advice is to not say anything. Is there any objection to that? One tick mark, no objection. Decision has been confirmed. The removal of the searchable search service from .sharp registry agreement. This is a single user domain. All of the domains are owned by Sharp.

The concept of not having a searchable WHOIS service makes complete sense to me, although I'd think they could implement it without actually having to search anything, and just give back the same answer to everything. Nevertheless, they have asked to remove it. I have absolutely no concern over this. I presume our privacy people have no concern over this? We have a privacy person who's ticked off yes. Decision is confirmed, and that is the end of our policy discussions.

ARIEL LIANG: I have one quick note. Maureen already uploaded her first comment on the initial report on data and metrics for policy making. That's in the Wiki. I welcome you all to look at her comment there.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I understand correctly, what you're telling us is that Maureen is not paying attention to this meeting and is doing other things instead?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I was waiting for that page to get available. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I couldn't resist. That was a humorous comment, not a chastising of Maureen. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to say that regarding the policy development, I didn't vote on the two statements of ALAC. It was only because I didn't have time to read

them. I tried to, but believe me, I couldn't have time to read them. So I cannot vote on something I didn't read. I apologize for that. It is the first time I haven't voted, but I am sorry that this time I couldn't. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I won't make any comment about putting it on your permanent record. Thank you Tijani. I understand how much you've been involved in it, and I don't think we have any real problem with this. The next Item is the CCWG on Accountability. We have talked about it peripherally at this point, and are [unclear 00:40:07] at how we're going to go forward. Do we need any more on it? I'm certainly willing to put some more time into it, but I'm not sure there's a lot we haven't already said. We do already have an AI to try to push some of this out to the regions and get some input.

We are scheduling a special purpose webinar that Leon has offered to host next week. We are having the webinar to review the statement the following week, and we have several IANA issues meetings on it. I'm not quite sure what more we could do, but I open the floor if anyone has any comments they want to raise at this point. Seeing none, hearing none, we'll go onto the next Item.

We're now almost up to time. The next Item is the ALAC input into civil society engagement. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

This is basically an update on what Jean-Jacques Sahel presented in BA. It's a shorter version and it outlines what the aims are of this new group. It's an internal group working very closely with the community. I'm on that group. What the thoughts are is that we'd like to have four deliverables in this current FY. The first is a structured approach to how GSE and Policy outreach to civil society groups. I know there are issues within At-Large, but they did say [unclear 00:41:02] civil society. The second point is they'd like to have more tailored content and communication. The first one is cataloguing what exists, and then we want to work with the community on what kind of communication they might need. The outcome to that will fit in a little later.

The third one, very important for At-Large, is engagement activity. Jean-Jacques and I have had a long talk on what that might mean for ALSes. I do believe this is something that At-Large should partake in very seriously, and heavily, because I think it says a lot about ALSes over the next couple of years. That's really the key area we need feedback from, and that recent [unclear 00:42:53] that I sent out.

Then the fourth area is capacity building, and that is again a catalogue of existing capacity building for civil society organizations, and then what they might need. For example, Tijani, we had a thought about if we could get that FY16 special request that was not approved for your idea of getting a session in a developing country, perhaps, let's say, Africa. If we could get proposals or suggestions for such kinds of capacity building activities, they would be given a good look at. I encourage you to develop those kinds of proposals.

At the bottom of this document there's a roadmap of external activities where possible collaboration might take place. Again, what we did right after BA was we sent out a note and a Wiki for the collection of RALO activities. When I looked a day or two ago, only APRALO has posted their activities. This is something I'd urge you to work with your regional leadership to really complete in terms of what possible activities are in your region, where GSE and Policy can work with you on identifying some activities where collaboration could take place.

Now, it might be where an event, a workshop, a panel, or local ALS or regional ALS is, as well as NCUC or NPOC, NCSG, takes place on the sidelines of this event. These are all things we'll be talking more about hopefully in Dublin. That's what I wanted to highlight.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll make clear what you didn't - that there is a conceivable possibility that along with involvement, goes funding.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you Alan. I had told Alan about that. Thank you. I don't want everybody to get terribly excited. It's not going to be travel funding. It's going to be funding for room and catering. On perhaps a very rare occasion, for local ALSes there might be a little support for that, but that's not been on the table yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm dangling the fact that there could be some money involved. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, I was really interested in the projects of Jean-Jacques Sahel. I proposed to make use of his projects to implement our project of the Capacity Building Working Group, to make a face-to-face capacity building in the regions where we never go, and for people who really need capacity building. We discussed it and I ended up with an understanding that Jean-Jacques doesn't have a budget for it, and he directed me to the Regional VC of Africa, while my work is not in Africa only, but he said, "You can go to the other VCs if you do it outside Africa." He's still waiting for my program, but I don't know why I'll prepare a program and send it to him if there's no funding for it. We cannot implement the Capacity Building Program in the regions we never go without budget. This is the first point.

The second point, Heidi, you mentioned the CROPP and the strategy we need to prepare before implementing our trips. This is something I didn't appreciate a lot, because it will restrict our work, first, because you have to come up with everything you can do during the year. In our region, in Africa, a lot of times, events are announced or decided late. So if we don't give it, it means we won't be able to implement it. This is an obstruction for us.

Second point, I think that the CROPP as it is done now is a good thing, but it's not as I was expecting. I mentioned that to the people of the CROPP several times. For me, the outreach we need - if we speak about that - is the work on the field for the ALSes; not going to the other events and trying to do outreach. As we've spoken before about, Alan, outreach, now we need more engagement than outreach in this form.

But if we manage to go to our ALSes on their field, first to see if they exist and second to try to do activities or do capacity building or any activities that can enhance their engagement inside At-Large and ICANN, this will be much better. So the way it's designed, the CROPP, it's good, but for me, for At-Large, for ALSes, it's not the best way to use this money. Yes, Africa will make its strategy, but I'm afraid we'll lose a lot of opportunities because they come after we design our strategy. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Tijani. I put my own hand up because I have a comment on that. I'm taking the name of this document seriously and treating it as a strategy. It's not an operational plan and should not be a list of events. It should be what you're trying to achieve in global terms. I think if you name a particular event, it's as an example of something that might be applicable, but no more than that. I think you just need to be a little imaginative in how you phrase it, and I would, to the extent you can, shy away from naming individual events and walking yourself into those.

I think it very much should be a strategy, and I would like to hope that they're not going to refuse an individual trip because it wasn't mentioned in exact detail. Because you're right - a lot of these things come up close to the last moment. Other funding opportunities come up. You've got to be able to move quickly and nimbly. I completely support the intent of what you're saying, and I hope that the fact that they've called this a strategy indicates that they support it also. Any other comment on the overall civil society?

I'll point out that in the rewording of the bylaws, as proposed by Accountability, despite the fact Tijani, I and others have said that we support the idea that users get mentioned, chances are it's not going to happen and we are going to get lumped with civil society in that section of the bylaws. I think we need to do our homework and make sure that we don't get forgotten and we don't have - to be blunt - NCSG claiming they are the civil society part of ICANN.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hear hear, and that is a big risk!

ALAN GREENBERG: It is indeed a big risk, and it's an area we vacated willingly in the past because we didn't want to be lumped together with them, but nevertheless, I think it's a reality. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. We have two problems. The first is that the NCSG tried to make this case fighting their own kin, and we have another problem, which is some of our community don't want end users to be part of civil society, and this is a big problem for me. We are a majority, civil society. There are organizations or ALSes that are not civil society - they are individual people that are not civil society - but in majority we are civil society. I don't like this [calligraphy 00:5:47] saying, "No, civil society and users are different things!" We need to make it clear for everyone that the most part of civil society is with us, not elsewhere.

ALAN GREENBERG: I tend to agree. There are two ways to go forward. We define civil society as being all-encompassing, or we add users to it. You have to have it one way or the other. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I echo Tijani's concerns, whilst also adding the fact that we also need to be careful about not labeling At-Large as being solely civil society. We're seeing in some of the RALOs that some people are being given hassle and trouble because they're actually not from civil society and they might have some kind of commercial involvement one way or the other, and are then labeled as business. We're users, and we need to be quite careful about this. We're going to have to play this one quite smartly.

Finally, we also have to be quite aware of the inner wars of NCSG and play this one without getting involved with those inner wars, no matter how much we're being willingly pulled into them, because at the end of the day, if there are two that can work together, let's bring the third one in. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else on this point? We have a happy face. Good. Next Item on our Agenda is the ALS criteria and expectations. I want to have hopefully a brief discussion on are the targets that I have set acceptable, realistic? I know they're aggressive, to have something to discuss in Dublin. I think having what are close to three days of meetings in Dublin, which we will probably not replicate for a while, it's a time I think we really want to go into it having documents to discuss, and having some draft things to discuss.

I'm going to be pushing very hard to try to be in a position where we have substantive discussion and might even come out of Dublin with some decisions. I'm not going to claim we will or won't, but certainly we'd like to try. I guess if there's anyone who believes this is something we shouldn't be doing, I'd like to hear it. I think if we go into engaging the external reviewer, without having done our own homework and some prep work ahead of time, we are setting ourselves up for a bad time.

I really don't see how we can avoid doing this, but I know there are some people who think we're too busy and we should put it off. I'd like either unanimity in the ALT, or at least to understand the other views. I open it up. I see two tick marks. Anyone like to speak? Or do we all agree at this point and not have an issue?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Looks like sage-like wisdom.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then we'll move on and get ourselves back ten minutes. I have added a small AOB Item on Dubin. It's a very targeted one, not a complete review of the meeting or anything. The next Item is ALT and ALAC timing. We put an immense amount of effort into trying to find a way to rotate ALAC Meetings, and we ended up unsuccessful, certainly with this particular group of people. Perhaps next year, with a slightly different mix of people, we might end up with a different situation.

But with this group, we really couldn't find a single time, more than one time, that was acceptable to most people, even though far from optimal. Tijani has raised the issue of the ALT Meetings, which seem to have drifted into the same time zone. He's said that although he'll make them if necessary, they're far from optimal for him, and wondering if we can schedule something else.

I'm asking staff, next time they do a Doodle for an ALT Meeting, don't just put in a small range of times, but something a little bit more flexible. I ask everyone to be as flexible as they can, and see if we can get a little variation. It's hard, because of exactly where we have people. There's only a narrow window, and unfortunately that puts Europe and Africa in late-night meetings most of the time. We'll try again. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Just to say that my concern was that I saw that it's always the same time slots that are proposed. I am ready to do very painful times, if this is the best time for a lot of our colleagues. But I'm not ready to have it all the time - this is the problem. There is no particular selfish behavior. It is more sharing the pain, and as I said, I'm ready for that. I have never been trying to make only my case the most important, and you can ask Gisella, when we are preparing our webinars for capacity building, she always asks me what the best times are for me.

I say, "What's the best time for the majority?" and we have half of our webinars done at this time. I'm happy with it, because it's the best time for the majority of those who'll attend the capacity building webinars. Please don't take it that I'm trying to have my case always the one

considered. The contrary - I want it to be shared for everyone, and that's all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. I don't think anyone misunderstood. I think I was clear in simply saying we may end up in this time again, but let's at least provide some options so we have some chance it might be somewhere else. I think that's completely reasonable. From my point of view, this meeting is at 16:00. It's perfect. I love it. But it's not that good a time for everybody! It certainly wasn't picked because it was my favorite time. Thank you Tijani, and we will try. Whether we succeed or not is a different matter.

Next Item is Dublin development sessions. This is the session we're going to be having on the Friday for the new ALAC. We originally had presumed there'd be a facilitator. Then we found out there's no budget for a facilitator, so we planned to use an internal facilitator, who we then found couldn't do it. We're now looing again about maybe we can get a half-day facilitator. There are a number of people - Cheryl is one, I'm another - who've done this kind of thing.

My personal feeling is if we can get someone from outside, it sets a different dynamic, which I think is useful. I'm still pushing for that. I'm going to ask Heidi to summarize where we are today, to the extent that I haven't covered it already. The related part is that if people have any suggestions for what kind of things we should be doing... Part of this day will be getting people up to speed, for new people, and perhaps old

people up to speed about things they may not fully understand about ICANN and what we're doing. I suspect there's some of that already.

The other thing is exercises, processes, which can get the group working if not as a team then at least feeling comfortable with each other before we all disappear for several months and only see each other via email and in conference calls. I'm not looking for suggestions on this call for what to do, but if people have thoughts about what kinds of exercises, what kinds of things they've experienced in other venues that have been useful at bringing groups together, I think we want to start collecting those and putting together a game-plan for the day. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I don't have a whole lot more to say, but just to let you know that that day is now likely going to look like an 8:00 - 10:00 ALT Meeting, and then followed by 10:00 - 18:00 for the Development Session, with the new ALAC and Liaisons, and there'll be a lunch served in the venue - right now, that's the plan. In terms of the facilitator, we are still looking at the budget. It might be that we can get an external facilitator to fly up from London. It's the same person who will be helping to facilitate the Leadership Training Program, but I need to look at the budget to see if there are funds for that. Otherwise we'll need to look again at that Item.

What I'm going to do as soon as I finish speaking is put up the Wiki page that's been created for the implementation of this activity. Certainly please do start putting in your ideas. Staff are preparing an updated onboarding document for the ALAC using various Beginner's Guides that they'll be providing in PDF format on that day, or right before. If you

want to go through that, that might be useful, et cetera. Alan, I think that's where we are right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi, do we have a Wiki page for this yet?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I'm going to put it up in just a moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Probably as comments on the Wiki page is a good place to make your suggestions for what kinds of activities you think might be useful, and for that matter, offers of what you think you can do, if any of you think you are an appropriate leader for some aspect of it. Please volunteer there as well. Let's get it as a working document that we can then pull pieces together and come up with a good plan. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. The impression is intended to be made with, or for, the ALAC Members, the RALO Leadership perhaps, and the Liaisons.

ALAN GREENBERG: No-no, Tijani, for correction it's ALAC only, and maybe the Liaisons. I don't remember.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, the new Liaisons that will have been voted on right prior to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, but not the RALO Leaders.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. This will give more to my statement. I see that it says this is for ALAC Members and Liaisons - people who must be knowledgeable in all the issues discussed in ICANN. I don't think that this session will be about issues at ICANN or any policy issue. From my point of view, the most needed thing in our community is the facilitation. It must be a facilitation session, because this is where we need skills, and we don't have a lot of skills in it. I think that we all still need more training in facilitation. This is my point of view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Tijani, I'm not getting that word. Are you saying presentation?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. I think the [questions 01:06:22] should be done as we are doing now, what we do at the AGM every year with Sandra. Something like this - facilitation, only facilitation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Facilitation? Okay. That's certainly one of the things that I suggest you put on. That's clearly one of the things we have talked about. I'll give an example of another one, when at the last Leadership Training Meeting I was asked to give a talk on the GNSO PDP, and the reaction I got from

people who've been around ICANN for years was, "I didn't know it worked like that!" So that's the kind of thing we might find doing... Although we may have people on the ALAC who've been around for a good number of years, they're really in a fog as to how some parts of the organization really work.

So it's something to consider. I'm not pushing that, I'm just using it as an example. Heidi will put up the pointer to the page. Make your comments, and we'll try to come up with a really useful program. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

As you know, I'm very passionate about both the team-building aspects here and the orientation aspects for both new and existing Members of any group. But we do need to make sure that it's focused on not having to bring everybody back to basics. I wondered if there was going to be preparatory materials developed, and a few of the existing tools that we have in our toolkit sent to people to use - the online training modules, those sorts of things. If you're going to do that, and I'd strongly suggest that you do, I'd make it mandatory for everyone, old and new, to do them.

Now, if you haven't gone through the online training module, or if, like me, you did it years ago and there may very well be new modules, I still think you should make it mandatory so everyone at least isn't having to be brought back to the very bottom of the basics tree. The other thing is for the new Members of the ALAC, they really do need to be encouraged to do a lot of the first-timer sessions and things like that in the normal

scheme of events, so you can leapfrog - because you do only have a very short day.

It might seem like a long day, but that's not long to do both team-building and establish proper facilitation, role distribution, and effective strategies for a bigger and better ALAC output for 2016/2017. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I'm going to cut you off. We're really running short on time and we have a substantive issue. Please put things on the Wiki. I have one very short Item under AOB. There's an Item on Items for the ALAC Agenda. If anyone wants to see something on the Agenda, please send it to us via email and make sure we include it. The AOB Item is that I asked staff to put together a list of all the groups or ICANN Executives that we've met over the last couple of years - not each Executive, but which groups we've met on.

This was to try to identify which ones we want to meet with. There have been a lot of comments that some of these are just talking heads, coming and saying the same thing at us each time. It's not a productive use of our time. Other people are saying certain sessions we definitely want and don't want to lose. Was that list compiled? Did that list get done before Gisella left?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. I'm looking for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't want it here and now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It has been, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please make sure I get it, and I'll send a note out to the ALAC list to do something about that. Okay. We are now going to go to an in-camera session. This is for ALT and the formal appointed Liaisons.

TERRI AGNEW: Recording has started.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Terri. The ALT and Liaisons have been meeting for the last half-hour or so, and we've been discussing the ongoing situation in LACRALO and the termination of their selection of an ALAC Member, and restarting that process. There were no decisions taken, and no direct Action Items coming out of this discussion. If there are no objections, I'll call the meeting to an end.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Alan.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, and I ask staff to meticulously check the recording and the chat before posting, to make sure it's appropriately segregated. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]