

---

GISELLA GRUBER:

We will start the recording and have a roll call, in that order.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team monthly meeting on Thursday, the 28<sup>th</sup> of May at 21:30 UTC.

On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, León Sanchez, and Julie Hammer.

No apologies noted today.

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

We would also like to add our newest member of At-Large, Theo. I am a little bit confused of the dates, was it yesterday or today, but Cheryl's granddaughter, who we welcome to this world.

And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. And she is little, by the way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

She's cute.

---

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

---

ALAN GREENBERG: She is. Where was I? All right. On the policy development, the draft for the CCWG is going to be much later than it should have been. It should have been out today, but it isn't. I'm going to do my something-ist to get it out tomorrow. That doesn't leave an awful lot of time, and I don't know how to fix that. Holly, you are working on the...? There is one that I asked you to look at and I can't remember what it was.

[CROSSTALK]

WHOIS accuracy?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. There is WHOIS accuracy and that really ties in with the other stuff on the privacy proxy stuff, that I will be do a presentation with [inaudible], one of the [inaudible]. So, but that's my weekend, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Just a correction up on top, Vanda said she would look at the dot travel agreement. I don't believe there was any decision to do a statement. All right. I don't think there is anything else that needs highlighting right now, on that particular item.

Update on CCWG... Yes, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I was trying to raise my hand at the same time. Cheryl for the record. I just wanted to give the leadership team a heads up. I haven't received it yet, but when I receive the file, I would like to pass it on at least to the leadership team, and hopefully get a response in fairly short

---

order. The cross community working group on the use of country and territory names, and gTLDs, our draft document is soon to be published, but there is, with the initial one, there is an excerpt of it, which I suggested at our last meeting, of that working group, we should seek some feedback from the ACs and SOs on.

I did point out, and we would like that before Buenos Aries, if at all possible. I did point out, because it's sort of a pre-public comment for the ones that [inaudible], I did point out that the ALAC was not likely to be formally meeting during [inaudible] before Buenos Aries. But I did say I would bring it forward to at least the leadership team. So you have been forewarned and I will be at your beck and call to explain it.

But I think we can handle it on this anyway. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. CWG, we have just finished six hours of meetings. There are another six tomorrow. We actually did get some things accomplished today. And I guess I would like input from anyone else who has any opinions on it. I'm not convinced, I'm still a little bit worry about the escalation path from the CFC. I think we have agreement that it shouldn't be the ccNSO and the GNSO, but there should be a ccNSO and registry stakeholder group vetting of any escalation.

That is the larger body should be willing to pass it on, not just the people on the CFC. And that's fine. But who it goes to next is not something that we have discussed yet. It's going back to the drafting team. I don't... Do we have anyone on that drafting team? That's one

---

that Donna has been running, on the CFC drafting team. Cheryl and Olivier, neither of you are on it?

Hearing nothing, Olivier has his hand up. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Actually, I didn't put my hand up for this, I put my hand up for a point of order. I don't believe we have, in the agenda, a review of the action items from our last call. We might wish to have a look at those. But in order not to interrupt the floor, perhaps I suggest we look at those after the current agenda item?

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, we can do that. But you're not on drafting team whatever?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Negative, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. Neither am I, but I do have a fairly close relationship with Donna, and I did actually engineer her into running that [inaudible].

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Our comment basically that we think there needs to be a multistakeholder decision to decide whether to escalate, or how to escalate. The comment that was made during the meetings, we don't want another body created just to do this. And I'm suggesting that the body that is being created by the CCWG, that is the sum of the members or delegates, is not a bad body to do this.

I don't know whether they will respond positively or not, but I really think that the decision to formally escalate something, should be a multistakeholder decision. It's the only multistakeholder thing that we are suggesting, before the formal review team or separation group. So I don't think that's unreasonable. I don't know how well it will be responded to.

I'm willing to let them play with it for a while and see where it goes at this point. If you heard the interaction right at the end of the meeting, this concept of, we can name a liaison to the CFC, but then the GNSO and ccNSO have to approve that liaison. I find bizarre, because I don't see how it's going to fix any problems, and all it does is to have an opportunity for ill will. But we'll see if they come back and change that also.

Olivier and then Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I was supposed to put my hand down. Apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Ah. In that case, Cheryl.

---

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It only works if you take the phone off mute, doesn't it? Cheryl for the record. And I'll just repeat what I just said. I think what we can probably get back to on this, is that just as, in a number of organizations, there is an, inverted commas, formality of members being accepted by a, for example, board, or some committee. That it may be that is a formality rather than a barrier to entry.

At least that's where I hope we should be able to negotiate it to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. As I said, I'm willing to leave it with them right now, but the words saying, one group selects their member, and then the other has to approve them, is just setting things up for potential conflict. And especially if the way, if the thing they're trying to do is balance people, then which one from North America are you going to pick to eject?

You know, the person who is in the room, or the person who isn't in the room.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. Your points are...

ALAN GREENBERG: I won't belabor it anymore. Other than that, I'm a little bit concerned about how slowly we're going. We spent an awful lot of time, at the

---

beginning, sort of setting the stage, which I guess had to be done, but it has taken us a while to really get going. So I'm willing to see how far we go at this point. Anyone else have any comments of their impression of the meeting?

I know Olivier and Cheryl were there, most of it, I'm not sure how much Olivier was listening to, given his involvement in other meetings at the same time. Any other thoughts or comments? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. So we're on agenda item four, no?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are on agenda item four.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I must have blanked out or something. Anyway, yeah. I thought, of the three calls today, the first call I manage to have most of my attention on, or no I didn't actually. I was doing another thing. I thought the first call was very slow moving to start with. And it started out not being very productive.

The second call, I missed most of it because I was on stage at the time. And the third call I felt was pretty good. We're starting to gain momentum, and you know, get some movement over. But as you said, setting the scene took a long time. I'm concerned that we're spending a lot of time on some really frivolous stuff, and things that really, we're starting to reopen some old questions.

---

The matter of CFC, for example. And we spent an enormous amount of time on the CFC again, and I thought that this thing had already been canned. But obviously, because we're looking at the comments that are being made, we're then reopening old wounds.

ALAN GREENBERG: But remember Olivier, we're one of the ones reopening some of those wounds.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. And that's why I'm not saying that we shouldn't. I'm just saying that this is going to take us time, and there really is a concern with regards to the amount of time that we have. The face to face meeting that happened this afternoon was over at the [inaudible] forum, where we provided, the whole panel of people provided details of the IANA stewardship transition...

Well, the actual processes of the IANA stewardship transition, ICANN accountability process, and also the IANA plan work that was taking place in the IETF, and the CRISP work, and all of the work of the regional Internet registries. So we had quite a number of people on the panel, and an updated list, I'll put in a moment in the chat. But there were questions that were asked of the whole panel, regarding the timing of the whole process, and whether everything will be done on time.

And the general consensus around the room, and we're talking here about a room of over 100 people that were sitting there, the general consensus was, well NTIA has given a guideline as to saying, okay, we'd



---

like to get the proposal in by now. But it doesn't appear to be this kind of, you know, role that one is going to crash against. And so I'm hearing increasing calls for people, especially a lot of people are reading these comments now, of saying, well, there is still some work to do.

And there is very little faith that we'll be able to finish in time, according to this original schedule. It doesn't mean that we should be complacent and say yeah, fine, we'll find ourselves another couple of months. But it certainly means that there is a growing sense in the community that if we're trying to rush through these comments, then the community will come back and say, hang on. We have not been listened to and our comments haven't been taking into due consideration.

So it's a catch-22 scenario.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not delve into crystal ball gazing, at this point, about well, will we succeed? We don't have very many days to find it if we do or not. So let's the process role at this point. I'm glad I'm not one of the co-chairs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very, very briefly. Look, I agree with most of what was said about the first call, although I do think that there is always, at least in my experience in these intensive work spaces, those activities that we've done, this is almost situation normal for the shout out call. It does take a little bit of getting in for everyone to hit their stride. And certainly I agree by the last call, we will be far more productive.

That said, is just it has to have appear to be done as well as be done. And that definitely goes to the dealing with the public comment, right back to the days of ATRT 1. This was recognized as a critical aspect of the community multistakeholder model, whereby we can show to those who have taken the time to make comments, but those comments have been given due consideration, and full frank discussion.

Yes, it is frustrating, but it is more than a necessary evil. It is something that absolutely has to be done. And in this case, I think, that I appreciate the fact that it has been done by a larger than normal group. Many of you who have served, particularly on GNSO working groups, know that it's a vital activity in a post public comment phase.

But remember guys, we're doing this as a committee of the whole, with a very large group. And while yes, I think we could perhaps cut, the chairs could have cut conversation in some cases a little bit earlier, and reminded people that we weren't really doing these issues, or reopening issues, I think in general, the processes is one from the transparency point of view, and from the accountability point of view. But I think is actually going fairly well.

---

So bear with us, and we can only do better in the next three calls.  
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you Cheryl. And I think staff has done a marvelous job of extracting from the 250 page document, which I was afraid we were going to try to work through, and having summarized the points into a form that we can actually grasp them. So I think, I'm not sure to what extent, it was only Marika or other people, but they've done a really yeoman job on that.

So that I'm really happy with.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yeah. I think Bernie and the rest of the staff deserves a particular amount of thanks at the end of all of this, because they have worked for hours.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Indeed. Although, those who are being paid by the hour probably, are already getting their own benefit. Anything to say on CCWG, other than to encourage me or others to get the damned statement out quickly?

I think we had some really good meetings, both the ALAC meeting and the IANA issues meeting the other day. And I think we came to closure on pretty much every item, despite the fact that we don't have unanimity. I think we have agreement on what to say. Now it's just a matter of putting the words down on paper.

---

And by the way, the first meeting wasn't completely useless, Cheryl produced a granddaughter.

[LAUGHTER]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I didn't actually do the production. I was in the room for the production...

ALAN GREENBERG: Normally for a granddaughter you don't actually do the production, that is how it works out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Although on that Alan, I must say, I did notice that as a grandmother that I would be in the delivery suite. And I do mean, I was there, we were up there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Very good. That doesn't always happen. Okay folks. I think we've finished number one. Olivier wanted to go over and do the action items from the last ALT meeting. Do we have action items from the last ALT meeting?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan. This is Heidi. I have put the link in the chat, and there are a few.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: They're stacking up. That's why I'm concerned.

ALAN GREENBERG: You've put them into the chat. Oh, you put a pointer into the chat.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you're just a worry wart.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier speaking. The reason is actually because the IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability is actually sucking the air out of pretty much everything else out there. Today, for example, the session that we ran actually, we received complaints from a couple of other workshops that were taking place concurrently, that they had five people in the room.

And you guys should have not just done yours at the same time as ours. Well, we had nothing to do with the scheduling. And this is something which is really playing with everyone's mind. I know Alan, we're spending all of the time there as well. A lot of people in ICANN are going at that, and I'm just concerned of dropping balls. I certainly have dropped several balls, but we have a number of things to do in Buenos Aires, meetings with other constituencies and so on.

---

And I hope that these are being prepared.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the deadline for getting those done in Buenos Aries, is going to force them to get them done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The deadline is tomorrow. Indeed, that's the thing. The deadline is tomorrow, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: Really? None of us knew that. To the extent that we can have things settled by tomorrow, we will. To the extent that we leave it and decide things that will not make it into the formal program, [inaudible]... As you yourself have said in the chat room here today.

I don't really see any way out of it. I'm not sure if you do or not.

Would anyone like to go over any of these items that, are there things that can be done and should be done that have not been done? Other than setting agendas for meetings, which we know are an issue.

Heidi?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here. You did say at the ALAC meeting, and I fully support you on this Alan, that, you know, we're just going to have to leave it flexible. That our generic agenda will go up, and as often is the case

---

anyway, agendas will be adjusted and kept up to date on the Wiki. And I don't think our community will be surprised at that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think so either, but Olivier is the one who said that earlier, and now he's saying that we need to set agendas. So I'm not quite sure which items we're talking about right now, and I'm willing to advocate and help someone else tell me what is it we should be talking about right now. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. [CROSSTALK] Okay, the first thing we should do is to actually un-think that page, so that we can actually look at the action items rather than be frozen at the start of the page, which doesn't have any action items that are undone. Then we could scroll to the bottom of the page and find out the [inaudible] list.

There. There seems to be some open action items in the middle here. I'm not quite sure whether these are to be done by, pretty soon or not. I note that the newly assigned action items have all been taking off. Just a moment ago they weren't.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And some of the ones in the middle were ticked, but no one bothered ticking them.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, then that's all. Just to make sure that it's done. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have some things that are nearing crisis mode, but I don't know about the rest of you. I only have enough hours to survive at this point. And the weekend will come and hopefully I'll spend a few hours on a backlog of things on the weekend. And I'm trusting staff will do that as well.

Anything else? All right. Back to the previous program then. If I can find it.

I think we said CCWG, there is nothing that we can talk about at this point. The next item, which is indeed what Olivier has been talking about to some extent, is review of the Buenos Aries meeting to the extent. Now I think the only thing that we actively have to discuss that has changed a bit since the meeting yesterday, or two days ago, whenever the ALAC meeting was, is the Sunday schedule that we've been doing a little bit of juggling on.

I finally took a few minutes to look at it. I was somewhat perturbed that almost the whole day was taking up in dog and pony shows, of people coming in to talk at us. And to some extent, we're going to have to try and fix that and give ourselves a little bit more to... Now, part of that is due to the fact that we have two hours that are allocated to CWG and CCWG.

And that would have been time we could have talked about other things, and we just don't have that freedom at this point. Plus there is



---

an hour with the CCWG Board meeting, or whatever it is, that we're trying to keep less topical. Heidi, can you get that agenda put up? Is that possible?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Alan, I...

ALAN GREENBERG: You said you've re-juggled it, but I haven't looked at what it is yet. Or perhaps if you can give us the link...

HEIDI ULLRICH: If we could, we have 20 minutes for this basically. So if you permit me, I would like to go... Let's start on Sunday, and go to Tuesday, Thursday, Friday. And then if we have time, very briefly, on the Saturday as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Gisella, if you could please put that into the chat. I'm going to go switch over to the Sunday. I'm going to put the link to the Sunday in, thank you Gisella, the Sunday page, so we can start with that.

Okay. So again, I do wish to say that everything here, except for the SSAC and for Rinalia, is totally unconfirmed, so we can change things around as you wish. So let's start, on Sunday morning, we have five

---

minutes Alan, just some introductions for you. Then we have Fadi for 30 minutes, followed directly by Rinalia, 10 minutes for a CEO criteria discussion. And that might need more time.

So if you wish to reduce the next item, which is basically meeting with the GSE, Sally and Tarek, which we currently have 45 minutes for that, if you wish to reduce that to have more time with Rinalia, I'm happy to do so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. On the global stakeholders, is this a let's stroke and each other, and tell us each how important we are, and how much we're going to work with each other?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, one item that might come up, is of the new internal group that we have where the policy, one of the senior people in the policy team, are meeting with several VPs on a regular basis. And that has really increased collaboration. So if you like to talk about that, that might be of interest, it might not.

If you want to reduce that session to 30 minutes...

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's do that.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And then where do you wish to add the extra time? To the criteria discussions, or just keep that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Rinalia wants to be right after Fadi, is that...?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we don't have any control over that? So we don't even know if she has more than 10 minutes or not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. But I would think she has a few more minutes for all of you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Get a hold of her and find out if she wants more and has more time. If so, enlarge it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Half hour global... If anyone is objecting to these arbitrary decisions I'm making, please speak up. Don't raise your hand, just yell. Change global stakeholder, 30 minutes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And I'm going to give RInalia 25 minutes then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, but check with her if that's actually possible. If you're going to invite global stakeholder engagement people, you have to have a time to give them. Verify with Rinalia, push global stakeholder engagement right up against whenever she says is enough. And then if we have others, leave the NTIA IANA at an hour, and assuming there is any time left over after that, do it, to be determined.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, right now, there is no time. Once we get those...

ALAN GREENBERG: I said if.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Moving on to the second part, 13:30 to 17:30, that's a long afternoon. So we begin with one hour ICANN accountability and transparency. Then we have from, we have 45 minutes ALS criteria and expectations. Then we have just a quick briefing, 15 minutes, of discussion of next steps for fiscal year 16 special requests with ALAC.

---

And Alan, I think I can get something together, at least a Wiki page on some updates on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the rest of you, that's going to focus mainly on what we do with the Friday after the Dublin meeting, of the new ALAC, let's get together and be nice to each other. And I think the discussion only has merit if we have something to discuss. So if Heidi can pull something together, then we do that, otherwise that time becomes free at this point, and we do it online afterwards. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Then we have 30 minutes with the ICANN meeting staff to talk about new meeting strategy. And hopefully by that time, the new working party on the new strategy will have at least a draft scheduled together.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not convinced, but we can hope.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Then we have 45 minutes... And that is confirmed. 45 minutes with the SSAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right let's, Julie are you online?

---

JULIE HAMMER: I am Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Can you give us a rundown, some language us illiterates can understand [inaudible]...

JULIE HAMMER: It's about the use of, I guess, pre-determined search lists that browsers use to try and find websites on the Internet, when you just type in an arbitrary term into a browser search bar. And the pitfalls of that, and the fact that most of the global community uses search lists that are provided by volunteers from places, organizations like Mozilla and that sort of thing.

So I guess making people aware of, I guess, the vulnerabilities associated with these search lists and making some recommendations about how that can tighten up. And the reason why it's now a little bit more relevant than in the past, is because in the past, there haven't been that many new TLDs, coming on to the same. And therefore, what the search lists use has been fairly static, but now with all of the new gTLDs, continually being added to the Internet, they need to be a lot more agile.

And having it based on volunteer effort is perhaps not the best way to go. So it's highlighting all of the issues surrounding that topic of public suffix lists.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Including [gory] examples I hope?

JULIE HAMMER: There are some examples in it, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. If you think it warrants 45 minutes, that we'll be able to use the time productively, we'll keep that.

JULIE HAMMER: I think if you want to cut that back to 30 minutes, and ask the SSAC to just talk about the new report, I think that would be fine. I mean, it's a matter of how you want the meeting to flow. I know the standard presentation of SSAC goes through what various work parties there are, as well as a bit of stuff about, we all know how SSAC is structured and formed, etc.

If you want that skipped, we can do that. So it's really up to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We're putting pressure on everyone this time to keep it short. So I guess it's only fair to do the same to SSAC.

JULIE HAMMER: Happy with that. And I can explain...

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I just don't want to cut down to the topic...

JULIE HAMMER: ...that you would like to just...

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead. I won't talk until you finish.

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry, I can't hear you. No, no. I had finished.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. There seems to be a really long delay in this.

JULIE HAMMER: I think Olivier wants to say something.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'll give it to Olivier in a second. Yeah. I just didn't want, I was afraid from what we were saying, but cutting back the time we might actually cut into the discussion of this report. But if you think 30 minutes is sufficient, then let's focus on the report and go onto other things. So that's good. Olivier.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I just wanted to bring to your attention that we're looking here at a single four hour session, that will span the whole afternoon, with no break and no actual buffer between any of the sessions. Which is likely to make this very frantic. And I'm not quite sure that we'll have much life in the ALAC after four hours without a break.

Also on the next page afterwards, there is a typo in [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I will leave it to Heidi and Gisella to put a break in somewhere, knowing it may move.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We don't have time for a break. Everything is back to back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, even if there isn't a break shown there, there will be a break.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, if I might, Olivier and Alan? Just, we're going back and forth on whether we show the coffee breaks or not. If you will recall, in Buenos Aries, the coffee basically is out there, quite a long time. So we had been informed that the best thing is just remove the official coffee break, and whenever anyone needs coffee or a nicotine break, just go out and come back in.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. But regardless, we will take some sort of a break. Once we see when the invited people are coming and going, we will figure out a reasonable time to take a moderate break.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And also, we try to have the type of discussions vary a little bit. So people might, their interest might fade in and out depending on what their interests are. So we have meetings with SSAC, ccNSO. We have then a quick break with the ICANN's meeting staff, things like that. So there is a little something for everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: And just so everyone knows. I cannot sit for four hours solid. It won't happen. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. It's Olivier speaking. The reason for the coffee breaks also is that they do act as a buffer when we're running late. If you're planning to have a very tight meeting, then you'll probably have to stop at a meeting, and then give five minutes for a change over of people at the head table and things, because that's how long it takes. And sometimes, the recording, and I don't know, all the other associated stuff.

People coming onto the table and all of that. When you have something that's very short, you know, 45 minutes with the ccNSO, well that's going to be a very short discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: But do notice Olivier, we have the first two hours, we can rearrange completely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's right. So I take it that these might be changed. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can guarantee they're going to be changed. I mean, at this point on accountability and transparency, we may have nothing to talk about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, right.

ALAN GREENBERG: No comment. I said may. You may be sensing this, I'm getting really, really tired here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, I'm biting my tongue.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope it's tasty. I would add some Tabasco.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Julie, we do right now have a 45 minute meeting confirmed for SSAC, we would only regain 15 minutes. Because the ccNSO meeting is confirmed as well. So if you would allow me, just leave it 45 minutes and if we finish before then, then we have a bit of a break.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, the problem with that is, we end up having the 15 minute break before other people come into our room, or we go to someone else's room. It's not a useful 15 minutes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So would you like a coffee break put in there?

ALAN GREENBERG: What I think Julie and I are suggesting is, you make it 30 minutes and start it 15 minutes later, and then it runs into the ccNSO meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so I'm going to break between... Gisella, do you know what time the coffee break is officially? Is it 16:00?

GISELLA GRUBER: Heidi, Gisella here. I actually brought that up in our meeting today, here in Istanbul, and I said it would be really useful to have the times for the coffee breaks. Because on Saturday and Sunday, we don't have the times for the coffee break, bearing in mind that the meeting has not

---

officially started yet. So I've tried to get the information, and hopefully we'll have it over the next 24 to 48 hours.

On Saturday and Sunday, what are the plans for coffee, and then during the week as well. And just as an aside, moving forward, hopefully we'll have that information for those who are scheduling like, for instance, you and me for the At-Large we'll have that ahead of time, to allow us to know exactly whether there is coffee outside of the room, whether the coffee breaks are exactly 30 minutes.

In some places, the coffee breaks run over, and in other places, the coffee is removed after 31 minutes. So that is something that was addressed today. As for Sunday, I will find out.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I've added 15 minutes then. They can take it...

ALAN GREENBERG: Do what we can, and we'll be flexible. We've even, on occasion, moved a guest, if necessary.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So moving on to Tuesday, we're just doing the ALAC ones. So here is Tuesday, into the chat. Gisella, if you could put that up please.

Okay. So we do now have the questions for the ALAC meeting with the Board. What we do not yet have Alan, I believe, is who from ALAC would be up on that round panel.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. Can we put the questions up on the board? Are we going to get them up on the board? Can we paste them into a chat?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I'll do that right now.

I'm putting them into the action item pod, just because that's the only space I can see, that is open.

Okay. Can everyone see those?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So the three topics, and this is, they have been slightly reformatted since then. The first topic, essentially, is equitable treatment of all volunteers. And that specifically says, people who aren't privately funded by industry, should not be disadvantaged. There is an ATRT recommendation on which we have seen no action.

There is the recent case of Beran. And there is the issue of, when people rotate out of jobs, they generally tend to disappear, because the lack of funding translates in almost certain terms, there are occasional exceptions to someone largely no longer being very active except perhaps in a very occasional sense.

So that's all aspects of the same thing. The second topic we have is a shorter one. And that is what happened when we discovered the At-Large review is going to be delayed. There were extremes sighs of

---

relief. And it dawned on me that despite that, despite many of us, and certainly I'm among them, believing that there was no real way we were going to be able to pull this off and do a good job of it, we were just letting it happen.

And that sends a message to me, that really scares me, because that means a conviction that either, if we had complained, no one would have listened, and we would simple be told, "Tough, that's the rules." Or, something equivalent. And that's not a healthy culture. So I thought that is worth raising. And the third topic is, and I put it down as potential, because I'm not sure of the timing whether we want to try to have three or not, is the issue of the picks in category one TLDs.

Not the substance of the issue, but the process and the outcomes. The fact that we did meet. We did discuss things. The Board seems receptive to this. On the other hand, it demonstrates the futility of it trying to address something within our model, when some people have essentially a veto that they can simply stonewall and say they don't want to talk about anything.

And I want to somehow develop those ideas. And I put it as optional because I think we need to decide whether we can come up with a good way of presenting this or not, not just making it sound like we're complaining. So those are the topics. The question is, at this point, who are we going to have on the stage, or on the round table?

Heidi, is there any real need to announce ahead of time who the speakers are?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think, this is Heidi for the record. I think we should have that in the next couple of weeks. I don't think that's urgent. They first need to select whether these are unique questions that will be discussed with the ALAC, or will they fall into the more general ones that will be discussed at the public forum session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you're saying at this point, we don't know what's going to be discussed. So at this point, until we know that, there is no point in selecting people.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. I would think that. But, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then the item is no longer on our agenda for the day.

JULIE HAMMER: Excuse me Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes?

JULIE HAMMER: Julie here.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Just with regard to topic two, can I make what you might like to think of a devil's advocate comment. I'm just wondering why that is a topic for discussion with the Board? It's almost as if this is something that should be discussed internally within ALAC, and then if there are aspects that might impact on how the ALAC interacts with the Board, then it might be some specific things to raise.

But I'm just, to me, that's more something that should be discussed in detail internally first, and apologies if that's already happened and I missed it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I'm not sure it has happened as such. But when I talk about the we who were not willing to go to the masters and say there is a problem, the we includes me and Cheryl. Not known to be the meekest people around.

JULIE HAMMER: No. But I guess my point is... Sorry. Continue.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'm just saying, if both of us were willing to simply say, "Okay, we have no choice but to go through." But the Board suddenly realized, hey, maybe the community is overloaded. We should do something

---

about it. But we didn't believe that there was a chance of anything being done to make it our time worthwhile in complaining. That indicates a lack of openness in communication. And that troubles me.

It's not so much the At-Large review, it's the fact that we weren't willing to raise an issue like that.

JULIE HAMMER:

To me, though, I just think, well, what's the Board going to say to that? To me it's still more something to be worked out internally, rather than something to be raised with the Board. Unless it, you know, you've concluded by a discussion within the ALAC, that there are some specific issues that... You know, at the moment, it's well, we've misjudged the Board because they actually realized that we were overloaded.

I'm sorry, I'm not being very clear. It just seems to be that it's worth internal discussions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I'm going to put Cheryl on the spot for review, because I think it's relevant. But I must say, I see we talking the old poster on the wall came to mind. You know, in your job, saying the whippings will continue until morale improves. Bosses who put that up, you don't go to talk to and say we have a morale problem.

And yes, that's a somewhat extreme statement to say. Cheryl, do you have anything to add to that?

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Am I off mute?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yup.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Okay. Look, Alan, I was about to put my hand down, but someone did it for me. Thank you. Look, I empathize greatly with what you're saying, and I do think Alan, it is a complication that we need to have. I certainly however, understand where Julie is coming from. And so I don't particularly mind if we deal with it at Buenos Aries or Dublin, but I do think we do need to deal with it.

I actually was positively surprised, if not [inaudible], that from a top down perspective, the example of the ALAC review, okay. Someone needs to mute. Was that, was put on, was put back because I firmly believe it was as the bylaw mandated review processes, and something in terms of time that had been presented from the subcommittee of the Board, in public at a number of previous ICANN meetings.

I actually thought it was taking a tone, and I think it was a perfect example of the, to be buggered with what the actual effect is on the community. We will plow through because it is said in some bylaw that thou shalt. So I think it is a conversation we do need to have. I don't particularly mind whether it happens in Buenos Aries, or in Dublin, or in both. But yeah.

I didn't bother, I'm putting up an argument on this one because I felt it was yet another example of, because it is write, it so shall be. And that

---

is something that is a cultural change we need to deal with, particularly in an ICANN 3.0 accountability world. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl, you said what I was trying to say, somewhat more eloquently. But that is exactly the reason why I'm raising it, because our perception was it was written in stone, and therefore it was futile and a waste of energy, and will probably count as negative points against us if we raised it. And clearly that was wrong in this particular point of time, with this particular Board.

But that was our perception, and I think the fact that it is our perception matters. And that's why I'm raising it. So I think you're agreeing with me. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just to, I suppose a comment. Two and three strike me as interrelated. I think from two, what, maybe the question is, is this part of a communication breakdown. Certainly three is, I want to say a communication breakdown, it's perhaps worse in that we were putting our hands up with GAC, and they just didn't seem to be listening.

Is two part of that, in that we didn't think we'd be listened to?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I think so. I think three is, the sky has opened and they did listen to us, and then actually decided, not only to listen to us, but to actually talk to us. That's marvelous. The fact that it didn't turn out very well, is

---

also an interesting twist. So yes, I think three as an example of when it did work.

Our perception... Despite three working, we still presumed that two wouldn't. So in that way, they're both communication issues. One of them, there seems to be a bit of enlightenment, the other one, there apparently was some enlightenment, but we were absolutely convinced there was no chance in hell. So they are related from that point of view.

All right. In any case, they're on the agenda. We can certainly pull one of them, should we choose to. But I'm not uncomfortable. There seems to be, at least, some interest in all of the topics. And I don't want to overload the hour so we don't really have enough time to talk about it. And I was presuming none of these would be of such global interest that they would be taken away from our meeting and put into a general one, but I will wait for the word from on high to come down.

Heidi, you wanted to talk about Tuesday I think?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, we're continuing. So we also have the agenda for the ALAC meeting with the GAC still to be determined.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess I better write to Thomas and ask what we want to put on it.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you. Moving on. Then we have the two ALAC work sessions, part one and part two. The first is, if you can just take a look at the agenda items currently on there. I basically put down the working groups that I felt would be due for an update, and those are, these are 15 minute updates each from the Academy, the ATLAS 2 implementation taskforce, capacity building working group, and the At-Large new meeting strategy working party.

But these are all up for discussion, if you would like to have updates from those?

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone believe that we will hear something that will be used to the people hearing it, and/or create discussion that will be useful on any or all of these? I'm asking for input.

Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, I'd actually be interested in a 15 minute, just what are you doing and stuff. Because sometimes in these discussions, you don't know what somebody is doing. It's useful to know, and if you survive. I think 15 minutes, I mean, it may be too much else happening, but I find those briefings interesting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure who you are asking Holly. Can you be specific?

---

HOLLY RAICHE: If we are making decisions about time, I actually value the updates from the working groups. If that addresses what Heidi is saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is. She's suggesting that these four working groups be given 15 minutes each.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. I'm happy with that because there seem to be a question, at the end, if you're interested, and I thought, well yes I am.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. My only question is 1D, and that is the At-Large new meeting strategy, because we do have the 30 minutes on the Sunday. So I don't think there will really be anything too much more to say from that group, but then who should we replace it with? Cheryl, I'm not sure if you would like to have some time for the accessibility or metrics? The accessibility may have some updates.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's Cheryl. If I can answer that Alan. Yes to accessibility and no to metrics.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, perfect.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Then let's replace it with accessibility.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I'm going to go ahead and do that.

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: IDN program update. I'm a little bit concerned about that one, but tell me why we're putting a half an hour into that right now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Because [inaudible] has asked for at least 15 to 20 minutes, so we have a 30 minute block and I didn't know what else to put there, so I gave him 30 minutes, as a bit of a buffer as well. So if you have something you'd like to put in there, for 15 minutes, I can reduce that to 15.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't we do that? If he runs over, he runs over.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So what would you like to have in that 15 minute slot?



---

ALAN GREENBERG: To be determined.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: You might notice a pattern here.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Next one then is a 30 minute update from [W. Calvez] and Carol [Carnell], an operations update to discuss any of these four items, public comment feedback on the draft fiscal year 16 operating plan and budget. A fiscal year 15 financial update, dashboard progress, and the business excellence update.

Again, they asked for at least 15 minutes, I gave them 30.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's reasonable, and I think we should have a meeting with them an informal with them before that, and decide exactly what we're going to... But I'm happy to leave those items on the agenda. But I think I'd like to have a short discussion prior to Buenos Aries, to talk about what we really focused on at the time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. We'll setup a call for that. And just to confirm, [Leeza] is at 30 minutes.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Yeah, I think so.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                    Okay. Cheryl, as a reminder, an agenda for accessibility. I can, or Silvia and I can prepare a draft for you if you like?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:            I would appreciate you doing that. And I was going to bring up an any other business point on metrics, but when you get to metrics, come back to me.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                    Okay. We actually skipped that because that's on Sunday night, I believe, but we'll come back to that. So action item, if I might, Silvia to prepare a draft agenda for the accessibility working group. Moving on to the ALAC work part two, we have one hour currently, but that's going to be reduced. An update on the At-Large website.

So I think about 45 minutes, will that be okay? Or would you like that to be reduced more on that?

ALAN GREENBERG:                    I'm not quite sure what they're going to be doing. Are they going to be showing a live website? Are they going to be soliciting input?

---

ARIEL LIANG: Alan, this is Ariel speaking. If I may, for the update, we are going to show quite a few pages that developers have been working, and that would be a live show and tell. And we'd like to have more than 30 minutes because based on the last meeting, it was a little bit rushed, and we were not able to show all of the pages, and we'll be able to get enough input from the community.

So I think this time if we have a little bit more than 30 minutes, it will be very helpful to get feedback from the participants.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're asking for 45, okay, let's do it with 45.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So then, again, this is Heidi. We had 30 minutes with Ashwin and Chris to talk about online communities, talk about the information management plan. But that's basically was there from Singapore, so I just kept it in, because I thought you might want an update. But I'm not sure if there even is an update.

ALAN GREENBERG: Assuming there is a substantive update. Chris did a really excellent blog entry a few weeks ago. I don't know whether anyone else read it. It was a humble entry saying, "We have a lot of problems. We don't really

---

know how to fix it.” And some of the problems are almost impossible to address.

It was a really good blog entry and presented some of the difficulties. It wasn't one to imply that they have a good handle on the solutions. So the question is, what are we going to talk about for a half an hour? We don't need to reiterate to them that we have a problem. I think that's understood. So the question is, how are we going to address this?

So if they have a half an hour of new material to talk to us, or want to solicit input on whether X or Y would be useful, that's fine.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. I could give them 20 minutes, so that will give a little bit more time for the extra time we have left over from the website, otherwise we only have a 15 minute session. So let's say 20 minutes...

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think it's a really important subject, but we, you know, the question is, will they have anything substantive to present? I don't know the answer. I'm not saying they don't.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, I will follow up on that. Okay. And then finally, we have 30 minutes confirmed for Holly and Carlton on the update on the privacy and proxy services accreditation issues. And they have confirmed that.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And I presume, Holly, that coming out of that, this is not only going to be talking at people, but soliciting input so that you have some guidance on which to draft a statement, of which you only have a few days to do at that point.

HOLLY RAICHE: This is Holly for the record. Absolutely, absolutely. What I'll try to do is very, very briefly, some of the issues... I have to say, last night, or rather this morning, I was on the webinar explaining the whole report. And I got to say there is a lot to the issues that have to be discussed. So it's going to be a packed half hour.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well then that opens the question, this is Heidi. Holly, do you need more time? We now have about 15 minutes. Do you want that time?

HOLLY RAICHE: I would seriously love that time. And the reason that I would love that time is, this is a terrific opportunity to get the sort of feedback, just explaining what some of the issues are, if you go through the report, or even just look at the webinar slides, you will see a lot of the stuff is actually in brackets because we have not agreed.

And it would be really good to be able to bring people up to speed, and then highlight and say, "These are the things that are still contentious. Need your feedback. And you know, it won't take me long to write something, but I would like to have a bit of a discussion beforehand to understand where we are up to.

---

So I can [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Holly, you've got 45 minutes. But let's spend some time before the meeting, and I don't mean in Buenos Aires, talking about how you are going to use that time.

HOLLY RAICHE: Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you. This is Heidi. Let's move to Thursday. And we have two ALAC wrap up sessions. The first one in the morning is basically only for the [inaudible] from [inaudible] and RALO chairs. Then the afternoon one, we have a half hour for primarily a review of action items and ALAC action, including any votes or public comment statements that need to be worded on.

ALAN GREENBERG: And it's a completely open agenda at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'm happy to leave it like that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

Moving on to Friday, now these...

ALAN GREENBERG: Julie, you have your hand up.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks Alan. Just to point out that with that Thursday agenda, I have a little bit of an issue with the timing of the liaison reports. I might have to give mine first and run because the slot for the SSAC public meeting is always 8 to 9 on Thursday morning. That's been the case for some years. And so, I might have to sort of report and run.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since our meeting is supposed to end, that part is supposed to end at 8:05, we shouldn't have a problem. But remind us when we get closer.

JULIE HAMMER: I can, yes.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Alan, I mean, I can remove the introduction and just have it start right away. 7:30 to 8 for liaisons and put them in order.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not a problem.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Moving to Friday. Now this one actually is pretty much confirmed, because we reached out to Steve Crocker and to David, and they've confirmed, the link is in the chat. So we have five minutes just a welcome. Then we have David Olive for 40 minutes, confirmed. Then we have ALAC strategy going forward for one hour. Followed by 45 minutes with Steve Crocker.

Then we have 30 minutes of any other business.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sounds good.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, great. So that one is done. Alan, may I just very quickly go over Saturday? Literally 30 seconds.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go for it.



---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So here is Saturday. It's up to all of you for the ALT meeting and the meeting with Rinalia, very quickly put this in. I do want to just mention what we're thinking, and Wolf has agreed for the RALO chairs meeting that's going to take place.

The Saturday... So what we were thinking for that, is that we would have the current chair of the region, that would be Alberto, and then followed by the next region. That's going to be Europe, so that's Wolf. And so we were thinking of having a discussion with Jean-Jacques. Silvia, can you help me with that?

ALAN GREENBERG: We know who you mean. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I blanked out. [CROSSTALK] Basically having him go speak to the RALO chairs, to talk about activities involving civil societies more broadly. Including At-Large, NPOC, NCUC, etc. A lot of collaboration being planned informally, but if they can, Jean-Jacques could discuss this with them, that would be very useful. So how we can have more collaboration there. Wolf thought it was a good idea, I just wanted to pass that by all of you before contacting Jean-Jacques.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that's fine.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH:                               Okay. And then that's it, basically.

ALAN GREENBERG:                           All right. The other thing that we do need to discuss, and I would like some input, is we have a meeting scheduled with the NCSG on Sunday morning. And we don't have any topics at this point. The meeting was scheduled largely because [Rafik] felt that people are always accusing us of not working together, and we should work more together.

It's not clear what it is we're going to discuss. And we really need to go into it with an agenda that has some meaning. The picks, and category one TLDs, was the only ones he suggested. That's an item where NCSG has not decided yet to, whether they want to take a stand or not. There are some people who feel strongly that they should not.

I'm not quite sure how productive that meeting would be, but I'm not quite sure what else we want to talk about also. And I welcome any input, either at this meeting or very soon after it.

Olivier, Cheryl, any of you have any input? Holly? Go ahead Holly.

HOLLY ULLRICH:                           Just a thought. Some of their membership, in fact, probably three or four of their members, are really involved in the sort of WHOIS privacy proxy stuff. And because we will be actually looking at those issues and maybe the specification, it's one area that both of us are actually interested in.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Are we on opposite sides of the table?

HOLLY ULLRICH: No, I don't think so, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Usually we are on privacy proxy issues.

HOLLY ULLRICH: No, actually people like Kathy, Stephanie, David, Kate, and I have been involved in a lot of, kind of, our own private little discussions before we go out to the whole working group. So we're pretty much on the same page, but I don't know where the rest of them are, but I think those people are the ones who have been interested.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe the rest of us will be on a different page from you then. You may have gone on over to the other side.

HOLLY ULLRICH: No, no. They've come to the right side Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you have something to say?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. One potential topic that currently is very much flavor of the moment in many other forums, is the human rights agenda. And you might be aware that there is actually a human rights working party that has been setup within ICANN. It's not a cross community working group, it's just a working party as such.

Several of the actual real drivers behind this are in the non commercial stakeholder group. That said, they base this also on work that was done by some governments in the GAC. And so there is definitely an interest from a, well from some parts of ICANN, for this. There is a concern, and I have read criticism of this, that these days, at the moment, many of the government led processes around the world, mostly around the United Nations, etc., make it mandatory to put in their charters that they have a human...

That none of their actions and so on, will go against human rights. And that is extending to Internet governance on privacy arena. And there is increasing pressure on ICANN to start looking at this, and to also have in its bylaws something that basically says ICANN won't act against human rights.

Of course, it's the same thing as saying, I'll see you an apple and that's going to act in any way against human rights. It might not fit at all with me selling you an apple, apple as in the fruit, but at the same time, I think things have moved on a little bit. And certainly this issue of human rights is something which I think our community hasn't really looked at. And perhaps it might be interesting to discuss this with people in the NCSG.

---

There will be certainly a lot more talk talking about this, then talking about WHOIS, where I think that there is very little consensus. That of course, is really civil society pushing for these things. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I have been talking to them, and I did actually get a message from them a few days ago, or maybe now a few weeks. I've lost track. And I should pull it back, because it was something that I was supposed to have forwarded it to the ALAC, and I don't think it was a request for a meeting, but we may want to look at that.

I had some very candid conversations with them. And I was pretty blunt that if we want to talk about human rights, we really have to focus on the issues that are relevant to ICANN. That the concept, and some of you are familiar with it, of someone in the room says human rights and half the people's eyes roll back, and they completely phase out and stop listening.

And that's the reaction we have to fight against. And they seem to understand that, but that doesn't mean you change how people act. So I think that's a good thing to investigate and I'll follow up on that a little bit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Alan, it's Olivier. Can I just follow up one quick thing? I think I was one of the people whose eyes were rolling when I first was told, oh, ICANN needs to follow human rights agenda. And I went, sorry, but we're dealing here with domain names. How does that play? However, as

---

we're saying, this is a private not for profit organization, and politically, there is pressure for organizations that might not be government led, to actually also declare their interest in this.

And I don't know how it fits, but that's why maybe it would be helpful to find out what do people in the NCSG think about it? They might actually be able to explain it a little better to us.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I do recall, the last one I'm thinking about, and Cheryl was sitting beside me in a room in, damned if I know where it was, probably Istanbul or Frankfurt. I can't remember where. And someone in the room mentioned human rights. And there was a silent collective moan that went out throughout the room.

And as long as that's the reaction, then we're not going to fix any problems. So...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

As long as that is the reaction, ICANN is going to be criticized the way that it currently is.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. But as long as someone says there are human rights issues in everything that we do, in every aspect, you're going to get that kind of reaction. So we have to focus. The paper that was being used by the small working party, is indeed far more focused, and that's not bad.

---

Okay. I will look into that a little bit and report back to you. Anything else on the agenda? I've lost track of what the agenda is at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So I think that we're finished with the review of the Buenos Aries agendas and meetings. So the next item was going to be the review of the previous ALAC meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anything that we need to review? I thought it was a useful meeting in terms of the CWG and CCWG. I think we had a good discussion there, and we actually have people contributing. I don't think there is anything else that fell over into this meeting, but I may have been forgetting something.

And I've been running full out since then. If anyone doesn't have anything, then we'll drop it, but if someone can come up with an idea. Heidi has the action items out of that meeting. That she has put in the agenda.

The only thing that isn't related to public comments is Maureen is supposed to be in touch with Olivier, re the ccNSO agenda, and let's get

---

some specificity. I support that strongly. I walked into the last meeting, supposedly going to co-chair it, but I really didn't have a clue why the items were on the agenda, or how the discussion was going to go. So I think we need a little bit more detail as to who is telling, who is saying what to whom. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Maureen for the record. We [inaudible] council meeting this morning, and we were, [inaudible] and I were actually having discussions, and there also have been discussions with Gisella, just [inaudible] for example, just the date, day, and time. And we, Katrina and I will, are having discussions and we will be, yeah. We will be talking with Olivier, and Cheryl, and others to about what is the most [CROSSTALK]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe even let me know too.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That goes without saying. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is this meeting officially no longer on Tuesday morning?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Apparently. It just includes out of our program of people talking to people. And with people...



---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. Yes, the ALAC meeting with the ccNSO is now on the Sunday afternoon, for 45 minutes, and not on Tuesday.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So I can tell the business constituency, or the non commercial, the commercial stakeholders group, that if they still want to feed us breakfast, if they haven't found anyone else in the last month and a half, then we're now available.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, except EURALO members, who are now having their EURALO meeting at that time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Do we have anything else to talk about?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I have to get rid of my check mark, I did have my hand up under my check mark. Yeah, Cheryl here. I want to go back to the time slot

---

we had for the metrics working group meeting. And Maureen and I have mashed our teeth, and wrung our hands, and hung our heads low, and I suspect Olivier and you, Alan, are likely to do the same when I remind the leadership team that we have had the time and the human bandwidth of a match to do anything with our metrics work.

We have work in front of us. We have work that is well over due, but we have not addressed it. And I want to ask the leadership team to make a decision, because I don't mind which way, or which of the two options I'm putting towards, for your consideration, you decide upon. I would like to suggest that one of two things happen.

We have a recap and review agenda, and nothing more specific than that, for the metrics working group as its established timeslot, or we simply admit that shit happens and cancel it. Over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll make a recommendation. My recommendation is that we put the metrics group on hold, pending some substantive output from the ALS and RALO criteria and expectations. It takes the pressure off. It says we're not having two groups working on almost the same thing at once. Gives us a bit of breathing time, and we don't have to embarrassingly figure, what are we going to do at this meeting where we haven't managed to have a single teleconference in the interim.

I think that makes complete sense. Does that make any sense to you?

I've stunned Cheryl. This has never been done before.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: She's been disconnected, Gisella.

ALAN GREENBERG: Even worse. I've sever the telephone line by what I said.

MAUREEN HILYARD: She's in shock.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back. Don't worry, I didn't miss it. I just turned the volume up on the tablet, so I didn't miss what you're saying. Cheryl here for the record. Alan, I agree and disagree with you, surprisingly enough. I don't think we need to put the working group on hold, because as a standing working group it doesn't need to be put on hold, and it doesn't, you know, it simply needs to be in its [inaudible] phase, which is at the moment, pending.

The input from the regional and ALS work. But the regional and ALS work is in fact, the work of the working group as well. So that's why I'm disagreeing with putting it on hold, because what you need to recognize is that this work, being currently done, is born out of the metrics work group anyway. And so I'm happy to have our activities put in stases for want of a better word, pending the further updating of what's happening at the ALS and regional level, but they're not disassociated.

There is a spirit of not just a nexus, there is an absolute parent-child relationship there. So I don't want to see one take over the other. I do want that continuity to go on.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I am not really sure what the difference is between stases and putting it on hold, but if there is a difference, I am willing to use your words instead of mine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: One would basically act as a [inaudible] of the metrics group, and the other would not. [CROSSTALK] ...disconnected.

ALAN GREENBERG: Put on hold. I don't want to use the analogy of put something on the table, which means opposite things to two different people in this group. [CROSSTALK]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll pen something as a piece of specific advice. Maureen and I will work on that, but I want to see a clear and continuing relationship between what is still filtering along with the ALSs and regions going on. And to that end, I would propose that we, in fact, give everyone back an hour of their time in Buenos Aries, which I'm sure will be used.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I certainly support that. I would use words like, allow the people in the metrics group to focus on the other activities. And when you say the regional work, I'm not talking, although there is some going on, I'm not explicitly talking about the work that's going on within the regions,

---

I'm talking about the group that will be looking at, from an ALAC perspective, ALS expectations and criteria.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that ALS expectations and criteria, is work we still need to do, but it hasn't been, it's not going to happen, basically, before we get between Buenos Aries and Dublin.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is going to start a little bit before there, and we will have... It will start enough to...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We'll have it before Buenos Aries?

ALAN GREENBERG: It will start enough to have a discussion at Buenos Aries. It should have been started out of Singapore, it didn't happen.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I understand that it should have been, but I'm astonished that you're going to squeeze it in between now and there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if I will, but my intent to, I may be dreaming in Technicolor. I still try to do that once a week.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That said Alan, if I may, what would be worthwhile is to what we can the metrics working group meeting, that you still give the metrics working group slash this new activity, five or 10 minutes, probably only five minute slot in your agenda, so that if you haven't managed to get this thing started, and it really should be as an integral part of the metrics working group, with additional people focusing on it of course, that that is discussed and kick-started at Buenos Aries.

I think that's worthwhile.

ALAN GREENBERG: But we do currently have a 45 minute slot allocated to it. So clearly we can shrink that... Pardon me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's see how we go with that, but I think it will probably take less than that.

ALAN GREENBERG: It may well, in which case, extra time is not going to be an issue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So I think the result of that is a specific slot for metrics is no longer needed. Is that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The metrics working group meeting on Sunday is now off the agenda, but we will remain on the agenda in the integrated discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just wanted clarity on that so we can go forward. Any other items folks?

Cheryl has her hand up, but I'm assuming it's an old...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR; No, it's an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Many of us have old hands at this point. I'm sorry for the disjointedness of this meeting. And it is now adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**