GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC monthly teleconference of Tuesday, the 25th of August at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Vanda Scartezini, Glenn McKnight, Jimmy Shultz, Leon Sanchez, Sandra Hoferichter, Tijani Ben Jemaa will be joining us later. We also have Roosevelt King, Avri Doria, [Dan Ratland],Siranush Vardanyan, Garth Graham, Allan Skuce, Chris Mulola, Sebastien Bachollet, Judith Hellerstein, Daniel Nanghaka.

On the Spanish channel, we have Fatima Cambronero and Alberto Soto.

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

Apologies noted form Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Holly Raich, Sara Kiden, Barrack Otieno, Beran Gillen, and Hadja Outtra.

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

On the French channel, we have Camilla and Claire who are our interpreters. On the Russian channel, we have Galina. And on the Spanish channel, we have Veronica and Paula.

If I could just remind everyone to state their names when speaking not only for transcript purposes, but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channels, and to speak at a reasonable pace in order to allow for accurate interpretation.

Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Gisella. The first item is the adoption of the agenda and call for any amendments or any other business to be added. Would anyone like to add anything? I will not for Olivier that this time we do have a decision and it was categorized as a decision on the agenda. Thank you for the reminder last time. No additions, no changes. Then the agenda is adopted as presented.

The next item is the review of any outstanding action items requiring ALAC involvement. Heidi, can you take that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Hi, everyone. I'm not at my computer, but from my memory I do recall that there's one for Tijani and that was to consider having a webinar on the policy process. I believe it's the GNSO policy process. I believe that's the only one, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Can I ask someone to remind Tijani after the meeting? I believe they actually have a meeting of the working group scheduled sometime later this week or early next week, so that may be on their agenda for that one. Any other action items or things that need our attention? That's it?

Then we go on to item #4, the ALAC policy development activities. I would like Ariel to take us through that one.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks very much, Alan. We have about five public comments that will close within the next two weeks, so I'll just quickly walk you through that. I'm also going to paste the policy development in the chat. One moment.

The first one that will post is proposal for Armenian script root zone label generation rules (LGR) and that will post on 31st of August. Narine drafted a comment, but we're still pending decision whether we want to transform that into a statement. I believe Alan will talk about that later.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's later on in the agenda.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. The next one is next generation gTLD registration directory services to replace WHOIS preliminary issue report. Public comment will close on September the 6th and we already have a first draft posted in the wiki. I'm going to paste the link in the chat as well, and now we're open for comments, so please take a look at that draft and leave your comment in the wiki. That's the second one.

The third one is initial report on data and metrics for policy-making. Maureen Hilyard drafted a statement on that and also it's updating the wiki and we just open for comments. So [inaudible] provide your comments there.

The fourth one is IANA stewardship transition proposal. The public comment will close on September, the 8th. I believe Olivier is drafting a

EN

statement on that, so Olivier, if you wish, you can let us know the status on drafting. Okay, I'll keep going.

The next one is proposed ICANN bylaws amendments, GNSO policy and implementation recommendations. The public comment will close on 12th of September and Alan is in process drafting a statement.

The next is cross-community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability, [sending] draft report Work Stream 1. Alan already posted the third draft statement in the [big] wiki and we are soliciting comments across At-Large community. We will also have a webinar on this particular statement this week.

ALAN GREENBERG: And it shows up later in our agenda.

ARIEL LIANG: I will also put the link in the chat as well. The last one is a proposal for Arabic script root zone label generation rules (LGR). That public comment just opened yesterday and will close October, the 6th. Now we're soliciting input from the IDN Working Group [inaudible] At-Large. Actually, Satish just recommended that we approach the Arabic-speaking ALSes and see whether any of them are interested in commenting on this public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll also be making reference to that one under item 7 on the agenda.

EN

ARIEL LIANG: That's all the updates for public comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, thank you very much. Any specific comments? We will be
                                talking about a number of these. The LGR rules [were done]. Label
                                generation rules for the two different scripts and the various things
                                related to the accountability and the ICG later on in the agenda. But on
                                any other items, are there any other comments or things to note?
                                Seeing no hands, hearing no comments, we'll go on at record speed
                                onto item #5 on current ALS applications or approvals. Do we have
                                Nathalie, or who will be taking that one? Silvia? Anybody? I'm running
                                out of staff people to identify.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I believe Heidi was going to take us through this application.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. I'm not able to speak at the moment. There's nothing pending
                                right now and there's only one each RALO is doing regional advice on.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Then we're going to end this meeting in under an hour at this
                                rate. We're now on item #6, reports from At-Large working groups,
                                RALOs, ALAC monthly reports.

As I discussed last time, these reports are often few and far between, and what they report are often not much more than describing what was in the agendas at their last meeting, which is not necessarily very satisfying. But ask is there anyone who has a report that would like to highlight anything in this meeting? Seeing no hands, nothing's going on in any of the working groups? Olivier, I know that's not the case for you. Would you like to talk to us about some of the more interesting or controversial issues in the GNSO?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I was going to speak to you about the more controversial things in the GNSO this month. However, the GNSO has not had a call in August. They've taken a break. So I cannot report on any formal progress in the GNSO.

The only discussion that's been going on so far on the GNSO Council list is to do with the issues report, the preliminary issues report, for the next round of new gTLD applications. We've just gone through one round and they've all been launched and now we're starting to roll them out. The GNSO Council is looking at the next round, and there are some intense discussions as to how quickly this next round should – or at least work towards this next round should take place.

Some are saying that the GNSO should take its time. There needs to be a PDP (policy development process) in order to make any amendment to the Applicant Guidebook based on the lessons learned from the first round, and on this occasion at the moment, staff has produced a

preliminary report which is ready and which lists out most, if not all, of the issues that have been identified so far.

The question is whether the GNSO Council should deliberate on it before voting on it and then launching into a public comment period, for everyone to read that preliminary issues report and then make decisions. The big discussion is whether it should be done quickly or slowly. There are some concerns from some members of the GNSO that if time is taken to give, let's say, a 60-day comment period rather than the shortest time which is the 40-day comment period, then they would miss the opportunity at the ICANN face-to-face meeting to be able to deliberate and make a decision to formally launch their policy development people to start tackling all of the issues that have been identified.

It's a bit of a religious, should I say, discussion between those who want the next round to come as soon as possible and those who want things to take it at a more leisurely pace.

That's pretty much all what's been going on at the GNSO on this side of the world. Now, the other movement has been of course in the ICANN Accountability and the CWG IANA. I think that we'll probably speak about this at another point of the call today. So I'll step back on this and give you back the floor. There is nothing else to report in the GNSO land. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. That was the item I was alluding to. I do have some concern. This is one of those times when I wish I was still a liaison to

EN

council and could vent my spleen personally. For those who are not native English speakers, that's an expression which says express my dissatisfaction.

There was, if you will remember, a push to decide how quickly this overall process should be going and there was a request by some to delay the PDP until we had the results of the consumer satisfaction. I think the way that was resolved was to say the PDP wouldn't finish before then, but we could certainly start.

Now we're seeing a push to cut days off of a significant comment period. I understand the reason why some members of the GNSO might in a public meeting want to have the glory of starting this PDP, but I would think an opportunity for people on Constituency Day to discuss the issue face-to-face is a far more pressing and far more important issue that I would certainly like to see happen. So anything that you can do to contribute to the conversation and ensure that it is not pushed forward too rapidly I think would be a good thing. Certainly from an ALAC point of view, I would like to be able to discuss that face-to-face at the meeting.

Olivier, your hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. As you know, having been in that position, I cannot act on behalf of the ALAC or say anything on behalf of the ALAC if not mandated to do so as such. I'm very careful to respect this role. And I wondered, since we do have the ALAC here present at the moment whether there is any objection to me to actually voice what

you've just said, and basically to show or express the ALAC's preference for the public commenting period to not close before the start of the Dublin meeting but to remain open so that the issues could be discussed in the Constituency Day or even in the public forum as such.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would certainly ask right now for a consensus call. Is there anyone on this call specifically from the ALAC, or anyone else for that matter, who would disagree with Olivier strongly making that request? I see no disagreement, Olivier. You have a charge.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I do apologize for the fact that it's just come up on the table, but it literally came up on the table a few hours ago in a recent exchange of e-mails. It's all been going very fast. I will certainly, then, express the ALAC's preference for a comment period that remains open during the Dublin meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right. Remains open with sufficient time to be discussed in Dublin both in Constituency Day and the public forum, and then for organizations to submit a comment after that, which means it has to go on for at least a week or so to allow groups to approve it.

Given that this process is going to take a long time, I understand why they don't want to waste another 30 days, but I find this totally unreasonable given the importance and given the number of problems that we had with the previous process. That I think is it for item #6.

The next item is #7. This one is formally referred to as a discussion on the Armenian script root zone label generation rules. In light of the newly announced public comment on Arabic root generation rules, that one [by] implication is going to be referenced also. Can we have the text of the proposed statement? Once it's up, I'll give you a history.

What you see is a very short statement. Narine volunteered to write this statement, to look at the documents and to write it. From my point of view, the points she's making seem valid. Clearly, the first point, which is potentially a political one, and that is the report calls out where there are people who speak Armenian, but doesn't include Russia.

Now, I don't know whether that was an omission, a political statement, because there are sensitivities in the region or what, but it's certainly fair game to identify, from my perspective.

The second one is the fact that there is an Armenian level and a Russian Cyrillic letter that look the same and are pronounced differently. Apparently this was not identified. I have absolutely no clue on the impact of that or whether this was an error or something that was deliberately done.

Both of these statements seem to be reasonable things for someone who is knowledgeable about Armenian to say. The question is should this be an ALAC statement? I don't think the ALAC, as a whole, has any credibility in making this statement on its own behalf, and the same would be true to a large extent for an Arabic one or almost any of the label generation rules that are coming out.

EN

What I suggested to Narine was that – and I see there's a speaker list – is if this has the support of all of the Armenian ALSes, then the ALAC could make a statement on behalf of them and give it our rubber stamp, but make it clear that we didn't read these label generation rules ourselves and discover these problems, but this was done by the Armenian ALSes.

It turns out that there is a problem there and the problem is that there are three Armenian ALSes. One of them, ISOC Armenia, is the lead group writing these rules, so they certainly can't comment on them.

The question is should the ALAC be in the business of endorsing these things, which are really local issue that we have no expertise to speak on? And if we should be doing it, is it sufficient to do it on the recommendation of our two Armenian ALSes who are not actually part of this process? The same question, of course, will come up on Arabic or any LGRs that go forward.

The alternative is for Narine or anyone else who feels this is a valid statement to submit the comments on their own behalf or on behalf of their ALSes, should they choose. But not have the ALAC make a statement.

I guess I'd like a discussion on should we be in this business? And if we are in the business of making statements like this, exactly how do we structure it to give ourselves credibility? We have a speaker list of first Vanda and then Olivier.

EN

VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Okay. Well, this is a very sensitive issue. I personally don't believe that ALAC should endorse any kind of political locally aspect of anything. Also, to support ALS looks like an indifference of ALAC in a local political issue. I don't support any – both – suggestions.
	If the Armenian people should do something, maybe by themselves independent from the ALAC because it's a very, very political issue. Even I don't know if the ALS [guys] are in the condition to analyze political impact of such statements. That is normally the NGOs in any countries have not much condition to diplomatically sensitivity. If they don't have theirs, maybe they can expose themselves in a way they don't want to. ALAC should not go to this [bat]. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you, Vanda. I'll point out that the first item I said might be a political issue. I don't know. The second one I don't think is a political issue. The second one I think is really the core of what these label generation rules should be looking at. So just to make that clear. Olivier?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Alan. I was going to respond to Vanda in exactly the same way that you've said so just now. With regards to the ALAC actually having a statement regarding script zone label generation rules, I think we have to be careful here not to close the door on the ALAC writing any statement as far as IDNs are concerned.

We have in the past drafted statements on Chinese script. We have drafted on CJK, so Chinese, Japanese, Korean script. We have an active IDN Working Group. And yet, we're now ready to withdraw the ALAC's support for the IDN Working Group regarding specific script. I'm a little concerned about this, because that then opens the door to any issue that might be localized. For example, WHOIS issues where the WHOIS affects the local laws in Europe, for example. You might then say the ALAC is not going to comment on that because it's only for something that happens in Europe. Then we start moving about things that only happen in Asia or in Latin America when it comes down to translation or it comes down to any other issues that are localized.

I would be very careful about saying, "No, the ALAC will not be moving forward with this and the ALSes can make an individual statement." I would say I would not support saying this is none of the ALAC's business. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. A question for you, though. As I suggested, the first part may well be a political statement. I don't know if it is and I haven't consulted other people who have knowledge of that geographic and political area whether it is a political statement or not. Therefore, there is the potential in this particular case with the first point that it could well be that the ALAC is wandering into an area that we shouldn't be in, if we do it without formal consultation.

By the way, you introduced a third option that I hadn't thought of. That is that it could be endorsed by the IDN Working Group and sent to the

ALAC from them. That would perhaps have more strength than simply coming from, at this point, which is one person writing it. That's something which perhaps we want to ask the IDN Working Group, although there's not an awful lot of time left to do that.

Eduardo, you have your hand up.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Alan. I will agree with you that the second statement sounds like it goes to the point on the script, and we're commenting directly to the script. The first line, to me it's most important because they forgot to [inaudible] and give all this information [about how many people]. How is that related to the script and the things that are happening in the script? It doesn't give me a good feeling.

I agree with Olivier also that we should comment on this, whenever we need to comment on any of the scripts. But if we're going to send a statement out, I will take number one out and do the other one. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. But the question then to you, Eduardo, is do we have the credibility to send out point number two on our own behalf?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, who wrote this, is the question?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: It was written by one person right now who may or may not be representing her ALS and may or not have the support of the other ALSes at this point. I will ask Siranush to speak if she has any thoughts on this before we finish.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, I missed that before. I think you mentioned that. Yes. If this was [inaudible]. I thought this was something that ALAC was [inaudible] the process of commenting. But I understand now. No, I wouldn't send it out just because one person put it out there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, just one other comment. I know we have done once before. Some of them are quite different. For instance, you made reference to the CKJ statement. I speak none of Korean, Japanese, or Chinese. I strongly endorse that particular statement, and that was the statement saying when you have multiple ideographs that have the same meaning, that the rules should factor that in. That's in fact what created the concept of label generation rules.

I know I could say that on my behalf without speaking these languages. I couldn't make point number two without being an Armenian and Cyrillic expert.

I'm sensing a divided group. I'm tempted to take a poll, but I'm always hesitant when we do that. We've had three people right now speak. One's very strongly against, one very strongly for, and Eduardo is sort of saying there are merits in the various different points. I really don't

EN

know where to go at this point. We could forward it to the IDN Working Group and say it's their problem. If they want to endorse it, we'll endorse it.

Do we have anyone on the call? We have some more people. We have Olivier and Eduardo to speak again. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Yeah, rereading this, I put it down actually on the chat. I'm not sure whether context is with regards to making those two remarks whether there is a need to say where the Armenian [inaudible] lived in the world. Unfortunately, I haven't had a chance to read the actual full proposal as such.

What I do note is that the first three lines say that the proposal is generally reasonable, and secondly – and unfortunately it doesn't appear to be showing on this PDF, so the person who's generated the PDF has a PDF maker that's faulty.

But if you look at the actual wiki itself, it will show you something which even being someone that does not you the Cyrillic languages do notice that the letter ayb, which is an inverted "M" and the Cyrillic letter "sha" which is an inverted "M" as well look very similar, visually similar. I think that was probably the intent of that point. And it does say here that this also corresponds to the letter alpha, and the most frequently used letter of the Armenian language.

Again, I don't know what the context is for mentioning this, but this looks like a pointing out of a fact that might have been caused by an inaccuracy in the report.

Now, with regards to your step forward, I would thoroughly agree with your suggestions of asking other Armenian ALSes about this and getting an answer from them pretty quickly. Secondly, asking the IDN Working Group to come back with a concerted answer, so it doesn't just come from one ALS, but it comes from the IDN Working Group. At the end of the day, the whole point to get an IDN Working Group is for them to work out a statement on behalf of the ALAC, and for the ALAC to vote on the working group's work.

I would, again, be careful about isolating and saying this is just one person that drafted this, and because we know nothing about this, we're not going to be proceeding forward with it. There are quantities of topics which ALAC members don't know anything about and which actually they read, they trust the penholder, they trust that the system has worked properly and they will vote for the statement.

If we start now going, "Well, we're not going to vote for things that we're not an expert in and we don't know about," we're not going to get many votes through anymore. That's going to be very worrying. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Just a couple of clarifications. You're describing what those characters look like. That is what a cross-script homoglyph means. It means there are characters in multiple script that look the same. The

first one – Narine did make a further comment privately to me. Her point really is that the list of where Armenians live should either be complete or not there at all. I could certainly agree with that. I'm not quite sure. But that's a political statement in its own right and in the ALAC – I don't feel comfortable with the ALAC wandering into that particular territory.

I take your word that there are lots of things that everyone on the ALAC doesn't know everything about. In general, one can become informed about certain things, should you choose to do your homework. This one is past that level, from my point of view.

With regard to support of the ALSes, as I said, I was willing to put it before the ALAC with the support of all three ALSes. One of them is not eligible because they are the people essentially who wrote the document, so they can't comment on their own document before they then judge the value of the comments. So we're down to two ALSes. I'm presuming Narine is speaking on behalf of hers and the other one is Siranush's ALS and she may choose to make a comment at this point, or not. I don't know.

Sebastien, your hand is up. You're on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to take a step back. Here we have, for the first time, one member of one ALS doing this type of work. I think we need also to be positive and thank her for this work. Now we have to see how we can [inaudible] discussion here. It's how, from one person

who seems to have a good knowledge of the situation, and that's good. We can turn it to an ALAC proposal.

I think if we don't have inside our IDN Working Group the people with the knowledge, we need to find if we can find in the ICANN community some people who can give input on that.

I really think that, because it's coming from an At-Large Structure and it's the first time, it's important to take it in a positive way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Yes, this is a relatively new member of the At-Large community who took on this responsibility, and that was not lost on me. That's the reason that we're spending this much time talking about it.

Olivier, and then I have one other thought. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. You mentioned that one of the three Armenian ALSes was involved with the original work that produced that report, and thus are saying it prevents that from commenting. When has that ever stopped anyone from commenting? I have seen on many occasions – I'm not saying ALSes, but people, organizations, that were directly impacted by things that took place at ICANN and that actually commented on public comments, etc. In fact, at this very moment the CWG IANA and CCWG Accountability are receiving comments from organizations that are directly impacted by those processes.

EN

So could you give me an idea or give us an idea why specifically this ALS might not be able to comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. There's a substantive difference in that the ALS is not one of a large group of people contributing to the document. They basically wrote it. So that's number one.

Number two, because the head of the organization told me they won't. They have made a decision on their own which other people might make a different way that they are not going to be commenting on it because they are the judge and jury who will be looking at the comments. That's a fact. We can't debate that one. But it's a good question.

I'm not hearing anymore comments. I'm going to consult with a number of people quietly and I will take it – essentially make a recommendation to the ALAC within the next day or so. I will consult with the ALT, but I think time is of essence right now. The comment does close in six days. We don't have a lot of time with which to do this.

Seeing no other comments, I will go on to the next item. And the next item is an umbrella item partly on the IANA stewardship, also in the ICG statement. Perhaps because it's shorter, Olivier, can I ask you to tell us where you stand on the ICG statement? There have been a fair number of comments on the wiki. Are you at a point where you can start drafting something soon?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Let me try and turn over to it, because for some reason, I can't scroll on the screen at the moment. Nope, don't have scroll. Here we go, thank you.

I haven't looked at of course the comments or I'm not showing on the screen. That's usually what happens, unfortunately.

There have been some comments, Alan. Let me just quickly go through these because there are two main points which are being made. One of them I think has probably fallen by the wayside because of the [movements] of things that have basically happened ever since.

The first of the two comments was the problem of having the IANA.org and the intellectual property of the name IANA and anything associated with IANA to either remain with ICANN, be transferred to the IETF Trust (Internet Engineering Task Force Trust) or be transferred to a new trust being created specifically for this purpose.

About a week ago, the chair of the board of the ICANN board sent an e-mail to the different operational communities and announced that they had discussed this point and had no objection to transfer the intellectual property and the IANA.org domain name to a trust which could either be the IETF Trust under specific conditions. Some changes perhaps to the trust, or to another entity basically that could be created for this purpose.

That will probably be decided I guess at implementation phase, and therefore for the ALAC to comment formally on this probably would be arriving after the ship has sailed now

If we say, well, we would prefer the IPRs and the intellectual property and the IANA.org to remain with ICANN, it's already been decided that it will most probably be transferred out. [That's relieved] some of the pressure out there that there was with regards to the discrepancy between the three proposals that were on the table: proposal from the names community, the numbers community, and from the protocols community.

The second issue which we had been discussing was the one regarding some of the discrepancy between the three proposals, and one of the concerns being if the three – well, if one of the operational communities, or indeed maybe two of the three operational communities, decided to break up and change IANA operator, and therefore you would not have all three of them housed under the same hat.

At the moment, they're not going to be strictly under the same hat. The numbers and the protocols community will be contracting with ICANN. The names community will be contracting with post-transition IANA (PTI), which is a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN.

So it's pretty much the same sort of thing, ICANN for the numbers; and for the protocols community, we'll just subcontract this over to PTI and PTI will perform the work for everyone. It's just a little detail in between the three.

But, if the numbers community or the protocols community decides that they're going to go somewhere else because they're not happy with whatever aspect it is of the service they're receiving from ICANN

EN

since they're contracting with ICANN, then there is going to be some weakness, certainly a problem with regards to the operational stability of the Internet.

The statement after the discussions that we've had back and forth, Tijani believes it's a very serious issue. It's something where there is actually nothing written in the ICG IANA Coordination Group draft about this. Avri Doria, I believe, [inaudible] not that much of a big huge issue. But what we should perhaps say is to recommend that there should be a better coordination between the three operational communities, and certainly better communication so as to increase stability; and make sure that if there is one – or more than one – of the operational communities that are unhappy with the IANA function, then they should really discuss it amongst themselves and see, well, should they all three work simultaneously to change IANA functions operator or all three join up together to push the IANA functions operator to actually do the work correctly and to make them happier, rather than seeing this danger of splitting the functions.

That's pretty much what the proposed text is now at the bottom of the page. Do you have that on screen now, or we just swap over? No, it's not on screen. I'll put it in the chat. The text – and unfortunately, it lose its formatting.

But it's as follows: "In the event of…" Alan, do you wish me to read through this or…? It's really up to you. I can read through. It's short.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I don't think so. Let me make a comment. I've made it in other forums, but I'll make it here again. I really don't think this is a big issue that we need to be concerned about. Right now, the groups could go their own way. Certainly, IETF could cancel their agreement with ICANN and set up a private registry somewhere else, and they would do so if indeed ICANN was not being responsive. And they've said that very clearly, that they could not afford a court battle and the time it would take to fix the problem. Appeals are of no interest to them. It's either having it work properly or doing something else. It would be awkward to do it without the name IANA and without the domain name, but it would be done.

The impact on the names community is less than IETF, than on the IETF. And the impact on the RIRs is even less again. So it's not really an operational crucial issue. It would be awkward, and we really don't want to go that way. But that's only if it really falls apart completely. There should be no reason that we cannot set up rules such that if the IANA function is split among different operators that it be manageable. We know how to redirect domain names and parts of sub-domains to different places. We have the technology to do that, and it really shouldn't be problematic.

I don't see a problem with coming to an agreement, and should the agreement fall apart 17 years from now, I think it's recoverable anyway. I really don't see making this one of the go-to-the-wall issues. That's my personal position. There are just too many ways that it could be fixed along the way with goodwill, and I think there is goodwill.

I think it's unfortunate we got to this stage and ignored the issue all along, but we did and we are where we are today. I really don't think it's a major issue at this point.

Olivier, your hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. I agree with you. It's not a major issue. But it is still an issue that we might wish to point out. If we don't point this issue out and we do get a problem with a split – and I have noticed discussions at the moment taking place in other operational communities on other matters and also being difficult. And huge exchanges of e-mails and so on going on about the support of other operational communities. There is, for example, a discussion at the IETF at the moment whether the IETF should support the overall ICG report, or should they just make a statement supporting their part of the IETF so that the protocols community of the report…

Well, that's a weird discussion in my point of view because they wrote the protocols part, so of course they would be supporting the protocols part. The interesting thing is whether they would be ready to support the other parts, and there seems to be voices saying, no, we shouldn't support the other parts. We should just support ours.

When you say yes, I'm hoping that there would be some good collaboration between the three operational communities. I'm not entirely convinced. I agree with you. There should be. But I'm not convinced that this will happen in some cases due to some parties believing that it probably would be better to split them and divide and

conquer type tactic. So it would probably be worth reminding all parties that it would be a good idea to continue increase direct operational coordination between the operational communities rather than keeping it at this point.

If we don't mention this, if we don't have a statement on that, then we really have nothing else to say on that. Then I would say we shouldn't release a statement.

These are the only two issues: the intellectual property issue which now seems resolved, and this operational coordination being the second issue. If anybody believes there are other issues, please bring them forward ASAP so we can include them in any draft, but if you or others think that we shouldn't move forward with drafting something about the coordination between the operational communities, then I would say we have nothing to write about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. May I suggest you're in a good position, since you're the penholder, to draft what you think is the right thing to say. The rest of us will either agree with you, ignore you, or tear it apart. That's where we need to be given the timeframe right now. I'm not going to try to dictate what it is you write. Obviously, you're the penholder. You interpret the various comments, and quite obviously, factoring in your own position and let's see if we get agreement or not on it.

I certainly am not saying be silent. I was just saying I don't see it's a go-to-the-wall issue. And we have Olivier who wants to…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry for this, Alan. I apologize for the length of time this is taking in the back and forth discussion here. I have cut and pasted into the chat my proposed text. It's unfortunate, staff actually had put the other statement on there, which had nothing to do with the CWG IANA on the screen. I can read it. It's very short and it's in two paragraphs.

"In the event of an operational community reaching the decision to replace the IANA functions operator, they should discuss their decision with other operational communities prior to proceeding forward, seeking always to keep all of the IANA functions undertaken by a single IANA functions operator. A split resulting in IANA functions being undertaken by more than one IANA functions operator would be likely to introduce instability. The ALAC, therefore, recommends that although no measures were introduced by the IANA Coordination Group to increase direct operational coordination between the operational communities, this should be promoted at implementation phase with the aim to reduce the likelihood of a split in IANA functions operators. This direct operational coordination should take place as enhanced communication and continuous dialogue."

That's the full length of the proposed statement at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I would support something. I may quibble with some wording, but I would support that concept. Cheryl has a tick mark. Jimmy has a tick mark. So you're on a good basis. I would suggest that

you put something… Whatever you read out, was that from a comment?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a comment on the wiki page, which unfortunately doesn't show on the screen. There you go. It's on there.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I suggest you change it as you feel fit and post it as a first draft?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. I'll do that immediately. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have Sebastien's hand up. I'll point out we haven't got to the substantive part of this item yet. Sebastien, you're on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. I didn't read. I just heard you reading your statement. I have just one concern. If it goes outside of ICANN – and I already said that a few times – we are losing the multi-stakeholder model, and we'll lose as end users a little more than everybody else. It's not just the fact that we [inaudible] everything keep together, but it's even more important that it keeps within ICANN. I don't know how you want to say that, but I think you need to have that in mind when you write your statement.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I would take caution on that particular statement. There are significant people in other groups, and in ICANN, who would say if our motivation is just to keep it in ICANN, that's ill-conceived and that's a good reason to do something else. So I would be a little bit careful of that. As I said, Olivier, draft something and then we'll tear it apart.

The main item we were going to talk about, but perhaps we will skip it to a large extent is the current draft. We're now on version three. There have been a fair number of changes from the previous one and some new issues highlighted. Not yet in version three is integration of Sebastien's minority statement, which is appended to it right now. Actually, what I would like up is the PDF of the version three statement, not the wiki.

That will be done hopefully by the end of tonight. I did spend some time with Sebastien yesterday going over it and I think I understand what his intent is and I think most of the points he's making are reasonable and consistent with what the ALAC has been saying.

I don't think we want to spend a lot of time going over this piece by piece. We have either one or two IANA issues meetings that will be coming up over the next two days, three days, plus a webinar that we'll be reviewing the then current statement in great detail. I don't think we need to do anything more here. I'm hoping that anyone on this call who has an interest in this subject will be participating in those other calls, or at least I certainly hope so. Or we'll listen to them after the fact.

The intent is try to come close to finishing the statement by the end of this week or by this weekend. That will give us another few days to polish it off before it is submitted. We had agreement already that, if necessary, the statement will be submitted without being ratified, but having known that it has been looked at carefully by all ALAC members.

On the other hand, if we really finish it early enough, we may try to ratify it before we submit it.

As I said, I have no real desire to go over this in great detail right now. If there's any issues that anyone feels we really should highlight to the ALAC and to the group, then please speak.

The general philosophy is we're saying we support it overall. We have some real problem with a few things. One of them is the lack of mention of the users and grouping us together in civil society.

The other one – and that's something which maybe we should have a couple of minute talking about right now. I thought I had added it onto the agenda, but it isn't there. I don't quite know what agenda I added it on to.

There are some other issues that have to do with core values where there have been editing changes made in the last version which I believe – and they're identified by Sebastien. I'm in complete agreement that they changed the tone of the core value very significantly. Specifically, you'll see it highlighted on the screen right now in one case that the expression "to the extent feasible and appropriate" has been eliminated from several of the core values.

The one that's being shown, it basically says policy issue have to be determined by the policy body, the GNSO. The previous version gave the board some discretion, which I think is important.

In the second one which is on the next page, it is saying the free market should determine what happens in the gTLD world. Again, the previous version says "to the extent feasible and appropriate." Again, that gave the board some flexibility to make decisions that the free market should not be reigning in some cases because there are real issues of public interest. I believe that those should be reinforced. We will be talking about those as we go forward.

If anyone has any particular thoughts reinforcing, agreeing with what I was just saying or what the document is saying, or disagreeing with it, then please speak up. Anything else anyone else wants to raise on this? We have a tick mark, but no other comments.

The issue that I thought was on the agenda and isn't, it was a question. The question is: "To what extent is the ALAC civil society?" We have been grouped together, for instance, in this proposed bylaw change. There have been discussions in Buenos Aires about civil society and getting involvement in civil society with the ALAC being one of the participants. To what extent do we believe we are civil society? I don't think we have the time for that discussion right now, but I will initiate it on e-mail and give people an opportunity to weigh in. I think it's an important issue. There have been some statements made that certainly parts of At-Large are civil society, and there are others who feel very strongly that parts of it are not civil society. I think it's worthy of some discussion.

Any very brief comments? As I said, we will do that on e-mail, but I think if anyone has anything they want to add before, just in terms of seeding the discussion, I'll give people an opportunity. No? Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I just wanted to remind everyone that there is currently a document out for just comments to the, I believe, 4th of September. This is an internal document prepared by Jean-Jacques Sahel who is leading the engagement [for] civil society within ICANN. Again, it would be very useful if people could add comments to the draft as well as list regional meetings where there might be collaboration between ALSes and GSE staff. I'm going to put the link up in one moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Heidi, if you could end it directly to me also, and I'll make sure it's in the e-mail I send out. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. I am concerned about using the same wording that's in the WSIS or IGF. The WSIS was obliged to organize one way all the different stakeholders, but with ICANN, it was not organized the same way and we don't need to use the same wording at all. There are people who feel that it must be the [inaudible].

For us, we are representing the Internet user, individual Internet users. We can be users even if we are working for government or if we are working for a private organization or whatever. We can't be split or put into one or the other subcategory proposed. I am very – how I can say

that? Upset with people from staff who arrive not so long ago within ICANN and who know something outside of ICANN and want to [plug] the [inaudible] they know from outside ICANN. It's not the right way to go. That's basically targeted the comments asked by Jean-Jacques Sahel.

I don't think it's a good idea and I don't think for ALAC and At-Large specifically it's a good idea to go in that direction. I think we need to have the discussion, and thank you, Alan for opening it. And to find the best way for Internet user represented in the future bylaw of ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. We see a tick mark by Glenn. That item wasn't on the agenda. I thought I had put it on, but somehow it got lost, but nevertheless. Okay, the next item is item #9. Cheryl, do you want to speak?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, very briefly on that point. Because there is a recognized "disconnect" between well-meaning and enthusiastic, but nevertheless, [inaudible] from ICANN point of view risk that Sebastien has identified, and we do have this for review and public comment document that Heidi drew our attention to again – I know we had looked at it before, but we hadn't had enough human bandwidth to perhaps give it its due. I know I had only very cursorily interacted with it and suggested a couple of changes [inaudible] directly.

We could do a single purpose interaction with Jean-Jacques indoctrinating to a broader and perhaps more in synch with our

EN

individual end users and responsibility for those not even yet on the Internet points of view. Just a suggestion that my [caucus] deal with a little bit more effectively. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Can't argue with that. All right. Can we have the document up on [inaudible] working groups? Thank you very much. We've had numerous discussions over the last number of months on the state of our working groups. How do we reactive them? How do we invigorate them? How do we kill them? Whatever the appropriate thing is. And we haven't actually done a lot in many cases.

So I thought I would take the bull by the horns, and what I did is I took the list of working groups that are identified via the ALAC, the At-Large homepage. There's a link to working groups on the homepage. We have a list there which are the first three groups. They are sub-divided by committees, standing working groups, and ad hoc working groups. The terms have been used varyingly over the years, so there may not be a lot of consistency between what is a standing group and what is an ad hoc working group.

In addition to that, there are a number of groups that seem to be existing, but were not listed on the homepage at all. I grouped them all together and identified what I believe is the status. I did pass it by staff this morning and made a number of adjustments, and I think this is moderately active.

If you look at the sub-committees we have two: Finance & Budget, and Outreach & Engagement. Outreach & Engagement's name has changed recently, but other than that, they are both active.

Metrics has not been very active, but it's almost a conscious effort because of the focus on other issues and the ALS expectation and criteria work that has just started to put it in [inaudible] for the moment. But that will become very active again in the near future.

Of the standing working groups, we have, of the seven that were listed, one was explicitly closed. That was an action of this body a number of months ago. That's Future Challenges. We said if and when we need it, we'll create it again.

There are four of them which are effectively inactive. That is, they have not met for varying amounts of time, some as much as five years. Some relatively recently, but with very little action. If anyone feels that those are indeed live efforts, then I guess people need to speak up.

So we have two of them that are left, the Capacity Building and Social Media, which are quite active.

Ones that I referred to as ad hoc working groups, there were a total of eight. Four of them are still quite active. The At-Large Improvements was completely inactive, but we believe we're going to use the same group or the same name out of the current At-Large review. So we'll probably keep that one around and revive it.

Then there's something called the ccNSO At-Large Coordination Group that I'm not quite sure. Does it exist? The wiki page says they meet via

e-mail. Perhaps Maureen can illuminate us on whether that's a group that needs to [stay around] or is it [one] that can be erased. Maureen, are you in a position to speak?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. This is [inaudible] really coordination before and after the meetings. We basically coordinate the ccNSO ALAC meetings, actually, rather than the At-Large. But I guess there may have been something [inaudible], Cheryl. Is there something [in there]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, there is, and part of it is historical. For those who answered [inaudible] liaison to the ccNSO before Maureen's reign over it. It has in fact taken very much the administrative role. It's a light touch, but necessary, administrative role that Maureen has described. But previously to that, it did have some ad hoc activities, including some joint project work which is where we did the mapping comparisons between what countries had both ALS activity and ccNSO membership of ccTLD operators and things like that.

I think it's able to be seen as, in this listing nowadays, as a continuing object which just does admin work. And if a future project comes up, it can create a sub-team under it or a separate ad hoc one could be chartered. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to note, the current membership is listed as Maureen, Ron, and Dev.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It wouldn't need more than that other than whoever is doing the meeting organization on the ccNSO side. It's usually no more than five or six people.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My real question I'm asking is does this need to be in our public list of working groups or is it just a group of people that do things when necessary?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm ambivalent on that. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think it should be kept on there because it is another responsibility that we have. Granted, it's when needs arise, but it is another group – formal group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, noted. Perhaps it belongs in a separate category of groups that exist but we're not soliciting members for and things like that. Judith, you have your hand up. Is it about this particular item or the subject in general? If it's the subject in general, I'd like to wait until we finish the list.

EN

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's about this particular item. I was wondering where does the groups that CCWG, like the one on Internet governance that Olivier is co-chairing, where do those fit? Because At-Large people are on those as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we could wait until we finish. That's a good question.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Because I didn't see them on this list.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. Thank you. I said it's a good question. We'll get to that. The last list are the ones that were not on that homepage, most of them because they've been created relatively recently. All of them are inactive, except one that it was called the Ad Hoc Joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group on NTIA Topic Coordination. It hasn't seemed to have done anything in somewhat over a year. Olivier was listed as the chair, in general. Olivier, do you have anything to say or is this one that just should die a natural death because it doesn't exist?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Which list are you speaking about?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the very last one on the page in the pod on the display [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The Ad Hoc Joint At-Large and NCSG Working Group on NTIA Topic Coordination. Yes, that's a very good point, Alan. Sorry for not paying attention on this. I'm typing at the same time a response on the chat.

You're absolutely right. There hasn't been much coordination at all on this. I think we can just let it go. It was an ad hoc working group that was put together just in case there was any interest in coordinating. I did try on a number of occasions to coordinate with NCSG on our points of view, but as you know, the ALAC has had a point of view that differed from the NCSG on many of the points that were there, and we were told on a number of occasions that the points that were relayed into the CWG and CCWG and ICG were those of the individuals concerned, so the coordination didn't happen in the same way in the other groups that it did in our own working group, and therefore we can leave this one to die.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I'm going to do a consensus call on e-mail then to officially close all of the ones that are deemed to be inactive, and we will then update the list and try to have… My whole concern is that we are continually telling people that they need to get involve, but the only list we have accessible to people have been out of date and not necessarily particularly informative. If someone sees a name they like and clicks on it and finds an unresolved link, as is the case in some cases, or finds a group that hasn't met since 2012, they're not going to be

really invigorated. So I'd like to get all of that up-to-date. I will take some action on that.

Olivier, you had a follow-up point on this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Alan. I don't the last one on the list to be closed off, but I do have an issue with closing off – they're not just mailing lists, they're working groups, on each one of these issues [on the] list here. You mentioned you wanted to close off all the ones that were with status inactive. The very reason for them to not have any activity on there is probably because the chair of that working group is not doing their job. I would suggest that we replace the chair in those working group that are inactive. The reason being that if we start closing working groups, then we're going to have all of the discussions about anything and everything taking place again on the ALAC list, and we had created those working groups specifically to take them off the ALAC list because of the volume.

ALAN GREENBERG: On the other hand, Oliver, we could create new working groups if indeed they're needed. I will take an in-between pass and I will start a discussion on whether we should remove, make any of these inactive and let people show cause if there is, in fact, interest in having such a group. I'll modify what it is I said I was going to do.

These are all the groups that, as far as I know, At-Large has control over. Somebody is unmuted, if you could fix that please; or staff, figure out who it is. Thank you.

These are all the groups that we have control over. As Judith mentioned, there are other groups that At-Large people participate in and that we want to make it easy for them to know about. So I think there is a second part of this that we should be making information readily available on what working groups are there, be they cross-community working groups, GNSO working groups, or working groups of some other part of the community that we participate in, and either we want to be able to tell people what's going on in these groups, or perhaps in some cases, solicit participation in.

I'm going to be suggesting that we have a second readily findable area that we can tell people what their activities.

A lot of this is going to be fixed on the new website, but I think we have to make sure that since that's still some number of months away that we at least have pointers to the things on our current website to make sure that we are providing the information to our ALSes so that they can find things if they're eager enough to even try.

Anyway, I have nothing else to say on that. We will be following up as I suggested to Olivier to look at whether these groups should be inactive, and if they are inactive to close them. If not, how do we reinvigorate them?

But I think we need action. I think we need to either move forward and get them alive again or decide that they're inactive, or maybe that

EN

they're sleeping but they will revive at some point in the future. But in that case, we at the very least need an active chairperson.

Cheryl, yes, please. We are going to be running out of time, so let's try to keep it brief.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood. Very briefly. With your proposal for a better listing and accessibility of who's doing what with us outside of our own working groups, very supportive of that. You know, of course, my own bio on the wiki space always listed all of the working groups that I am currently or previously active in.

The other advantage of having things listed, even if it's just "this person's here and that person's somewhere else" is that we can then have a mentoring or introductory relationship, so an ALS member or member can just go, "Oh, I'm interested in this topic, but Olivier is there. He will help me transition into the work I want to do there." It's really important that we do do what you're saying. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: You bet. I support that 100%. All right. Next item we have is Dublin. There are two parts to this. The first part, we have a superset of guests and joint meetings that we have had in the recent past. Recent past goes back to London, I believe. It's on the screen right now. There's an Excel spreadsheet that is attached to the agenda.

In past meetings, particularly the last one, but in previous ones at all, after the fact, people have come up and said, "That was a really useful

half-hour we spent," in reference to some particular guest being invited. Or on other occasions, "Why didn't we invite X?"

Well, this is now your opportunity. If you feel strongly that we should have some group or some joint meeting, then fill in the spreadsheet, send it to me and staff, and put a "yes" in the third column. If you object strenuously to meeting with these people again, because we've done it 12 times and you find it a useless waste of your personal time, then say "no." If you leave it blank, then you're leaving it up to others because you don't have any very strong feelings about this particular group.

Now, this is for the Dublin meeting. We could change our minds for another meeting and that's fine, but if you have any strong input into the programming for the Dublin meeting in terms of joint meetings and invited guests, speak up and do it quickly. We only have a short period of time before we start needing to lock in meeting slots then invitations to people, because everyone's schedule fills in.

I'm not requiring anyone to do it. If you don't want to do it, then don't. If you do, then at the very least, send it to me and staff. If you want to share it with the world on the ALAC list, you can do that, too. I don't really care. But speak up if you want to have any input into this process. Any comments or thoughts? I know there's a couple of things on chat.

Sandra said, "Will the XL be shared by e-mail?" We can certainly do that. It is linked in the agenda, so you can just click on that link and download it. If you think you need a copy by e-mail, we can send it to you.

Jimmy says, "Should we have a Doodle?" We could, but to be honest, I think this is a perfectly viable way of doing this, and explicitly really only

says if you have strong feelings. If everyone feels they want a Doodle instead of XL, then we can certainly do that. It's easier to staff to work with afterwards. I don't much care. Is there anyone else who strongly feels we should have a Doodle?

Alberto, you have your hand up. Please speak.

ALBERTO SOTO: Just a brief question. The objective of this meeting is to have speakers to speak about certain topics that we can make them questions or provide our input, so that we can make the most of the time. Is that the objective of the meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is I think it depends on who it is we're talking to. If we're talking to the SSAC, then normally they present things and it will open up the issue for questions at the end. There are other people – for instance, at times with compliance, when we have given them questions ahead of time to answer. So I think it varies depending on who the person is or who the group is.

In the case of the ccNSO, we normally jointly come up with an agenda. It varies. The question is do we allocate some time to do any of these things? If someone feels that, yes, we should be talking to global stakeholder engagement, for instance, but only on a certain topic, then you have the opportunity in filling out the form saying "yes" and qualify that. That's something that perhaps is easier on a spreadsheet than a Doodle.

The questions are up to you. We're trying to make sure that these meetings are productive and good use of everyone's time. So if everyone feels that we shouldn't have a meeting with some particular person or group, then it's important to know that ahead of time. There may well be some people who have some people say absolutely no, and the other people say absolutely mandatory. Then we'll make a decision.

Any other questions or comments?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It might be useful to have a Survey Monkey questionnaire for this. We can put basically the same information on here and just send a link out and people can log in and it will be very easy to collect the data.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fine. Jimmy said a Doodle or let staff decide. If you'd like to do a Survey Monkey – but we have very limited time to do this – if you want to spend the time or have someone spend the time doing that and getting it out quickly, then fine. But please, we don't want everyone to answer yes and no to every question. We're really trying to identify the people who feel strongly that something is important or feel strongly that something should be avoided. Sebastien, you're up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. You take the question before mine and the one after, but I wanted to be sure is it just for the ALAC or At-Large in general or is it also for [sub-groups]? Because, for example, the Meeting Strategy Team, it could be useful to have a meeting with the sub-group or with

the working group we have within At-Large and not necessarily to have a whole ALAC meeting them.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, this is very specifically the ALAC and the leadership group meeting in general on our Saturday, Sunday, and Tuesday days. If you are a working group that is requesting a time slot, and that's a separate issue, then who you invite to your time slot is not something that we're looking at globally.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Alan, to come back. It's just a question of repetition. I get your point, but the answer could be no, but to be done on a sub-group, or yes with a sub-group. Whatever, it's yes or no. But [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we had the definitive list of what working groups are meeting, that would be a lot easier to do. We don't have that. But in the case of the new meeting strategy, that's almost certainly that work group is going to be meeting. We can take that into account as we're processing the information. Again, if you feel it's essential that new meeting strategy people meet with the working group and not necessarily with the ALAC, then say so. That's a group that you particularly have knowledge of, and certainly you can make that kind of comment. If we use Survey Monkey, I'm sure they'll be an opportunity for you to say that.

Any other questions? I'm not reading all the comments in the chat, so if there's anything someone wants to highlight, then please speak up. No more comments? Then I turn it over to Leon and Gisella. I know Gisella is just back from vacation, but would you like to update on where we are in the overall meeting planning?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. I haven't been really able to keep up with Gisella's work as the CCWG has absorbed most of my time, so I would definitely defer this to Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much. Just checking everyone can hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, you have got me on the spot. I got back this morning from my vacation. However, I'll try to update the scheduling as much as possible. I've got a few updates with regards to, for instance, the working groups. We e-mailed the working group chairs an e-mail to find out whether they wished to meet in Dublin face-to-face. And as it stands now, we have seven working groups who have confirmed their desire to have a face-to-face meeting in Dublin and one still to be confirmed. That will be pretty much a chess board on trying to get these slotted in during the free time – bearing in mind that, for

EN

instance, the IANA issues and the ALS criteria may be integrated into the Saturday and Sunday working sessions. Nothing has yet been confirmed.

We also now know that there's a gala on the Monday evening. It hasn't been set in stone yet, but that is what we're currently holding on the schedule for the Monday evening.

And I've done like many have seen before in past the XL spreadsheet with all the different colors and all the different meetings and the conflicts we have to date, etc.

Now, because we don't have the block schedule after it, I haven't sent anything yet on the ALAC list. I'm just trying to find out when we're likely to get the block schedule, or at least a global view of what has already been put into the system. And I'll then happily share with everyone what we have at the moment.

What has just come through literally a few minute ago was that the traditional meeting with the GAC on the Tuesday morning from 9:45 to 10:45 that we had in Buenos Aires has now been moved to later during the day from 16:30 to 17:30. That is their [inaudible] time slot, which will be confirmed with the GAC next week. They have their scheduling meeting at the end of next week. I'm still waiting on confirmation from the [inaudible] meeting on Tuesday morning.

So once we have a few of the answers coming through, this puzzle will slowly start piecing together. That's the only update I'm able to give at this stage. As I said, I'm happy to share this document with you, but it's not yet complete. Any comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: None from me other than there's lots of work to be done. Welcome
                         back.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any specific comments? In that case, we are down to any other
                         business. From almost running over, we're going to look like we're going
                         to finish a good 20-25 minutes early. Are there any – anyone has
                         anything else they want to add at this point? Any other issues that have
                         come to your mind during the meeting?

                         In that case, I thank you all for your participation. It's been a good
                         meeting and we'll see you all on the net. Bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye, thanks!

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay, thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, everyone. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio
                         will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call and enjoy
                         the rest of your day or evening, or morning. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]