
GISELLA GRUBER: We'll get the recording started Alan. The recording has started.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome on today's ALAC leadership team meeting, mid-monthly meeting on Monday the 31st of August at 20:00 UTC.

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

No apologies noted today.

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

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Gisella. All right. First item on our agenda is policy development activities. I think we're in moderately good shape here, but if I could ask Ariel to take us through them.

ARIEL LIANG: Sure. This is Ariel Liang speaking. So for now we have a separate statement receiving comments internally. The first one is next generation gTLD registration directory services to replace with preliminary issue reports, at the internal [inaudible] comments were closed today, and we will start the vote on that statement shortly.

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.

And that's the first statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, I hope your date is wrong on the agenda.

ARIEL LIANG: The date is already fixed, and I'm not sure why the agenda is not reflecting the change. It's probably a copy paste.

ALAN GREENBERG: Say that again?

ARIEL LIANG: The date has already been changed. I don't know why the PDF is not reflecting the change.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, you mentioned that before...

ALAN GREENBERG: ...copy I turned out a few minutes ago, it said 6th of August.

ARIEL LIANG: I changed it 20 minutes ago. The copy too early.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. And the next statement is initial report on data and...

[AUDIO INTERFERENCE]

GISELLA GRUBER: I have no idea what's happening. Let me just find out what's going on.
[Inaudible] the Adobe Connect.

Does anyone have their lines close to a storm, close to an open door, window, standing in the open air?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well since we can't hear Ariel anymore, I suspect...

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, it's not my line. I just muted. Okay, it's all good now. Okay, the next statement is initial report on data and metrics for policy making. Maureen has drafted that statement and the comment will close tomorrow, and will have received some comments from Cheryl and Sébastien.

And then we'll also open the vote shortly, after that public comment closes. [Inaudible] and the third one is, IANA stewardship transition

proposal that Olivier drafted. The call for comments will close on 2nd of September, and I believe Alan, you want to talk about that statement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, let's defer it to the session on the CWG ICG.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay. And the one thing you do need to know is about the vote schedule, because the public comment will close 8th of September, and we may not have enough time to ratify the statement before submission. So that's just the one note for you.

And the next one that is currently seeking comment is the one that Alan drafted, the CCWG accountability second draft report. Public comment will close on the 3rd of September, before Alan goes away for vacation. So make sure you're putting comments in for him to digest and incorporate into the draft.

And now we do need to open the statement, the vote on the 6th of September. For that statement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

On that one Ariel, we may keep it open later, depending on how things are going. But at this point, we're saying comments close on the 6th, on the 3rd rather. But we still have to go through this week, and we'll see how it goes at that point. There were a lot of changes introduced last week that we talked about.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, so you...

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll keep that one fluid.

ARIEL LIANG: Will you work on the statement when you are on vacation?

ALAN GREENBERG: If necessary.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. And the next one I want to draw your attention to is a proposed ICANN bylaws amendments, GNSO policy and implementation recommendations. That's the one that Alan, you have volunteered to draft, but we are already just a few days left for this public comment. It's going to close on the 12th of September. What was your status on drafting that statement?

ALAN GREENBERG: I want to talk about that a little bit, we can do it right now. My intention, when I accepted the responsibility, was essentially just to reiterate the two comments we had. Number one, that we have concerns about overall timelines. That we support the concept, but we have concerns about the overall timelines, and we have concerns about

the ability of the GNSO to handle issues where there are conflicts between the public interest and contractors interests.

And the only question I have, we already made the same statement three, I think two or three times right now. It's just a matter of wording. The question I have for this group, is do we want that to be, in addition to being a comment to the public comment, to be official advice? Which says we want an answer from the Board about how they are addressing the issues.

My inclination, and I'm not quite sure how we word it, because we're mentioning worries, not giving a particular recommendation on what to do about it, but nevertheless, my gut feeling is that we want this to have the power of advice that compels the Board to think about it.

And I guess I'm looking for input from others. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I would tend to agree with you. If we've been saying the same thing over and over again...

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, can you speak up? You're very faint.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry. I would tend to agree with you. We've been saying the same thing for about three or four times, and being ignored, my suggestion would be we craft something and we all promise to have a look and say,

we would like a response as to what would be done about either of these concerns, or something.

I mean, I can't think of an immediate answer, but I think, I do think we need to say something a little bit stronger since we've been ignored. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I wouldn't say we have been ignored. I said, in each case, we have said we've supported the issue, the recommendation, but have some concerns. And in this case, I would expect the Board's reaction to be noted, and we will be monitoring, or something like that.

You know, I'm not sure they can do anything more than that, I don't think we're suggesting they don't approve the recommendations. Anyone else have any thoughts on this? I'll draft something and obviously you'll have a chance to comment on the specific words. But, as I said, my gut feel is we should make this a strong statement that requires a response from the Board.

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I will assume that is tepid agreement, and waiting for the words that I will draft, and Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks Alan. This is Ariel speaking. The last statement that is in progress, I mean it's not a statement yet, it's for the public comment on proposal for Arabic script root zone label generation rules. So that's another IDN related comment. Satish did reply to my email, and said

we should approach the Arabic speaking ALS and solicit some input and see who is interested in drafting a statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I wanted to go back to that when we get to, last ALAC [inaudible]. We talk about the Armenian [inaudible] plus the Arabic ones. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a comment on the very first, the registration... Sorry, I've got to speak up. The registration data, I would say it is almost a no brainer. It's the first step in the, the sort of the whole [NWG?] process and the Board's response to that. Carlton and I have had a really good luck. They have pretty well reflected everything that we have. Olivier has had a look, he approved.

I just think there are more important things for people to do, and I mean, if you want to have a read, fine, but I'm really happy with that statement. I just don't think it needs any other work from anybody here. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That one, if I remember correctly, the comments close tonight, and barring someone coming in with an absolutely out of left field comment we haven't considered before, that one's going to a vote starting immediately.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. Regarding the IDN Arabic script, the best one in At-Large who can speak about that is Mohamed El Bashir, who was to work on it. He was a member of the working group, and he is our speaker. So I think Mohamed El Bahir would be the best one to say, if we have to have a statement or to draft the statement itself. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you Tijani. As I said, we'll talk about that when we get to item eight on the agenda.

Anything else on the statements? On the policy actions?

No? Okay. Next one is the CCWG item number four, and we'll also do the ICG at the same time. Olivier, have you had any indication that the statement is not ready for prime time at this point?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So on the ICG, the statement for the ICG, CCWG, IANA and all the associated IANA stewardship transition proposals, we've been through three iterations of adding things, removing things. And I think that it's ready for final,

for being, you know, proceeding forward basically. I haven't had any additional feedback or requests to change anything.

And so far, all of the responses have been positive. So I think we can move forward. What I was going to do was to ask the working group, tomorrow, for one final read. And that was going to take five minutes, and if no one suddenly raised a flag, this, I think, can move forward for a vote.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The comments are officially due to close on the 2nd, which is Wednesday. So we can certainly make that note, but at this point, I'm not expecting to change radically. And I would suggest that you liaise with Ariel on Wednesday, make sure, give her the go ahead. And once comments officially close, we can put that open to the vote.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. AFRALO has drafted its own statement. I will send you a copy of it. It is not yet official, because it is pending approval of the members of AFRALO, but it, and it may change, but it is an indication.

You can have a look at it and perhaps decide to improve something.
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Has Olivier seen that draft yet?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Can you give us...? I received a copy, but I haven't looked at it. I was focusing on the CCWG part, on the accountability part. Is there anything there which is counter to what we're saying, or anything substantive which you think needs to be added from your perspective?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think there is more details in our statement than the ALAC statement. You will see it's more, if you want, more elaborated. So I will send it to you, to read it. If we have almost the same answers to the questions, but with nuisances, with more elaboration. Yes, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, no, go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Could I ask you to get it to Olivier quickly, and Olivier if possible, could you review it before the meeting tomorrow, so if there is anything there you see that you feel is a compelling change that we should include in ours, then be prepared to suggest what it is on the call so we can perhaps get by, or people's comments on it.

You know, I see no reason that they have to be verbatim identical, and if they're consistent with each other, you know, that's probably as good as we need to be. But Olivier, I'll let you, you use your judgement on, to what extent there may be something there, which will really add to our proposal.

And of course, we just, that's going to conflict with it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier speaking. Sure, I'll do that. No worries.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani, is there something else?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, old hand. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Okay. I think we've finished that one. On the CCWG, sorry, I keep on saying CCWG, which is right. CCWG accountability. I'm a bit sleepy today.

I'm not quite sure how I'm going to incorporate all of the changes we've been discussing by the time of this meeting tomorrow, but I will do my best, and it won't be ready a lot earlier than that. But we will go over it on the meeting tomorrow. I'm going to try to incorporate as much as I can from the suggestions that Olivier made, and the things that are in the AFRALO statements, that I think merit, you know, widespread, that I think have widespread support, and that we want to echo.

It's going to be tight. One of the things I wanted to discuss, and it's related to the email I sent out to the ALAC earlier today, and that's on the whole issue of Civil Society. And the private sector. It, I spent a fair amount of time looking a lot of different definitions of the two, and one of the things that becomes obvious is, it is quite clear that At-Large, ALAC, are by the definitions, part of Civil Society.

There is actually no question that we fit into that definition. And for the definitions of the private sector that do not have three components, that is, private sector, the public sector, and the volunteer sector, as some definitions have it, we are clearly part of the private sector. On the other hand, if you ask what is the status of users? Not this formal body, but users, users are part of the private sector in the definition where there is only private and public.

If you add in the voluntary sector, then users disappear completely. And if you look at most definitions of Civil Society, most definitions talk

about Civil Society as being groups, or organizations. So ALAC, At-Large, RALOs, ALSs, are part of Civil Society, but individual users clearly do not have a, fit the formal definition. That doesn't mean, you know, I on my own can't go register for a meeting and say I'm part of Civil Society, but we certainly, I certainly don't need a definition that says I am.

So that's a little bit problematic, and the real question is, when we talk about, and I'm going back to the ICANN bylaws and core values at this point. When we talk about the stakeholders in ICANN, who is the stakeholder that we're talking about from our perspective? Is it us? In which case, we do meet the definition of Civil Society. Or is it users, in which case they fall through the cracks.

And I guess, you know, you can answer now or you can answer to my email, but I think that's an interesting little bit of discussion we need to know, we need to have. What is our image of who we are and what we are? Now, interestingly, the question is, what is ICANN? Is ICANN part of Civil Society? It sure fits that definition. That is, a not for profit group designed to do good things.

On the other hand, it has parts, components in it, which are very definitely business. And traditionally, if business interests get together and form a not for profit association, that not for profit association, a trade association, for example, is normally deemed to be business, even though they themselves are not for profit.

So interesting questions. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

The one thing I would add is, consumers, which is a well-known and used term. And that's everybody who is not within, well, in your role as consumer, you are not business. So it is a very clear and well-known term. It's not covered by Civil Society, but it is focused on the actual user as opposed to business.

So I did reply to your email, and I think consumer fills the gap. We tend to also talk about academia as a little bit separate, but I think academia would see in Civil Society, maybe, that would be the other group that I think the RALOs include, and should be included in the multistakeholder terms. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. It's interesting. It certainly is, in the wording that is being proposed in the bylaws, academia is listed.

Any other thoughts? As I said, I'm going to leave the discussion open on email for a couple of days. But I, you know, at this point, I don't think we have a strong case to make, to say that At-Large is not covered by the Civil Society definition. But the question is, is At-Large really the stakeholder we're talking about it or is it users, and we're there on their behalf?

And I'm not really sure I know that answer.

Anyone else want to follow on this?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, this is Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, sorry, I'll raise my hand now. I think Cheryl is on the call, and we can talk a little bit about this. And I like her term. She uses the term that At-Large shows aspects of both societies. You know, I think that's...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am on the call, I just keep dropping out of the blasted AC room, unfortunately.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So Cheryl, I don't know if you want to say more about that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. If I could stay in the room, I could actually type something as well. Without wanting to get into an extremely long debate at this point in time, yes I'm liking the concept of aspects. And in answer to Alan's specific question, I suggest we probably are both, because we would be in terms of stakeholder, the advisory committee and At-Large per se would be defined differently to the representation or role, or the active and best interest of groups that we're trying to operate with.

But we can have this discussion, but we do not fit ALAC and At-Large just into one of the particular shapes and silos. We are, of course,

several of them, as you discovered, depending on the definition for the [inaudible]. But aspects works for me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well the real questions, and the short-term question, is do we go to the wall saying we demand that users be listed in that laundry list of the bylaws, of who the private sector stakeholders are?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, your feeling is that the ALAC and At-Large falls close enough into the role of Civil Society that we can live with that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At this stage, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I do think that most of the At-Large structures are organizations of Civil Society. There are some who are not. By the way, Alan, when you have some professional, some business entities that constitute an association of, for example, ISP, this association is a Civil

Society association. It is not business association, because they are looking after the interest of their members.

They are not looking for the benefits of their work. So they are a member of Civil Society. At least it is the definition of Civil Society and there were some kind of [inaudible] society. And I don't think we will gain a lot holding this discussion, because it is so complicated, so complicated.

So I think that we are part of the Civil Society, and some are part of the business, and perhaps we have other parts, but we are not government for sure. I don't think we have to go further in this discussion, but I assure you that most of our organizations are Civil, at least in Africa, all the At-Large structures in Africa are Civil Society associations. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Two points. Number one, on whether trade, nonprofit trade associations are Civil Society or not, that depends on how you look at it. You know, for instance, ICANN's business constituency says they're businesses. The NCSG says they're definitely not non for profit, even though they're technically non for profit, their views are not non for profit and therefore they're not allowed in as members in that.

So that's why I said the situation is somewhat confusing, and is viewed differently by different people. I guess I have a question following on to what Tijani said, are there any of our ALSs that are not Civil Society?

Some people have claimed that is the case. I can't think of an example.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I would have to do a review on that Alan. It would not surprise me to find that there are some that are not, but I would like to check on that before I make a response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Certainly all of them, I think all are primarily not for profit. So from that perspective, they pretty well don't fit into the business sector. There could be some that are closer to academia, I guess. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Alan. Its Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And indeed, yes the academia part, I think is the one. I can think of a couple in Europe that are in academia, just trying to think about it. I haven't got the whole thing with me.

[Inaudible] Yeah, I haven't got the full list there, but I think that there are a couple in Europe that are in academia. And since you've mentioned that some business organizations could also be Civil Society, such or any club of some sort could be Civil Society that could hinder that as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah... [CROSSTALK] ...overlap between academia and Civil Society, depending on how it is constituted. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I mean, I could almost argue, and Holly is the director of this organization, so she can rebut this if she so chooses, I could almost argue that ACCAN, the Australian Communication Consumer Action Network, is not Civil Society. It's [inaudible]...

HOLLY RAICHE: Absolutely consumers.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right. And it's certainly not what I would classify as Civil Society. Like I said, I'm pretty sure the answer is yes, but I'd have to do an audit to tell you which ones were what.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I mean, Civil Society definitions vary. One of the common ones, says you're not funded by government, you're not for profit, and therefore you are Civil Society. [CROSSTALK]...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We are funded via government, by industry, eh? We have members who pay fees, so you know, [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, is that a new hand or an old one?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's an old one. But if you wanted to look into your Skype, Alan, and take a look at my thoughts, you want me to say that?

ALAN GREENBERG: You can say it. I have no objection. I'm not sure it's relevant to this discussion...

HEIDI ULLRICH: So basically we have, I'm not sure if you know we have a resource, a staff resource, a [separate?] staff resource that's available for the ALS criteria and expectations taskforce, and through that, we will be working, reaching out to all ALSs with assistance from our fabulous multilingual team.

But one of the questions might be, what does these organizations, these ALSs themselves, identify as Civil Society? And you know, the identification, they believe that they are, does that make it so? I mean, these are issues that need more discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not clear what we do with the answer to that question, but we could ask it. Olivier next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And coming back to the whole thing about Civil Society and so on, I certainly would be concerned if we do not insist on having users listed for the very reason that, as far as I'm concerned, consumers aren't Civil Society. They, in fact, in some cases, might embody a different view, because you have a lot of Civil Society that are anti-consumer, as such.

So that doesn't help so much on this one. But the other thing that is maybe even of more concern rather than being a philosophical argument is that in ICANN, we do have the At-Large community that is defined as being there for end users, and I really would cringe on not having that listed, because we are in ICANN at the end of the day.

To me, it's the first step to removing the end user component out of the ICANN bylaws by saying, oh, they're not going to be part of that, so now we can do next is to also close At-Large down. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The point I was making is that At-Large, as an organization, a loose organization, but an organization, very clearly falls into Civil Society. The component parts of it do not necessarily, and that's where the question is, who is the stakeholder? Is the stakeholder only the body representing the groups?

Or is it the larger entity? And you can ask the same question about business, you know. Are all businesses the stakeholder or just the ones in the business constituency? Tijani first and then Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. If you were in [inaudible] society, you will know that academia, technical communities, were included by Civil Society. I was a member of the Civil Society Bureau and [inaudible], representing the [family?] of science and technology. And we had with us academia, and other community, in other communities. There are 21 [inaudible] in Civil Society.

In fact, in some of the [inaudible] Civil Society, there was only four stakeholder, or four, yes, four stakeholders. You had the governments, Civil Society, private sector, and organization, international organizations. So that's, and this plate of the community, the everything which is not government and which is not private sector, is Civil Society. That's why now, now it seems that it, people begin to split the academia and the technical community from the Civil Society, but I think that this discussion will not lead us to anything, because we're not...

If we mention the end users plus the Civil Society, it will not harm anyone to do it. And if you want that to think about these difficult, the physical aspect of it, we can think about it. But I don't think we'll solve it today. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I think we're getting into a dangerous spot if we start quoting the definitions of various groups have used, because in general, every entity

defines them the way it suits their purposes. So you know, I don't think we're ever going to go back to the WSIS definition at this point, certainly we have any say in it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

May I add another point? You spoke about stakeholders at ICANN. My point of view is that the stakeholders are not the same everywhere, because the stakeholders in ICANN are different. In ICANN we have... It doesn't mean that we don't belong to the other groups, to the other stakeholders of the WSIS, of the IGF, no.

It means that, in ICANN we have other stakeholders, which are the end users, which are the business constituencies, which are etc., which are contracted parties, etc. So we don't have to stick to one kind of stakeholders. And in ICANN, we say stakeholder, end user, stakeholder, it is stakeholder...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Understood Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record. I agree with what Tijani says, absolutely. And I was going to point out that it really depends on how one is defining the term stakeholder. So, you know, we're going to start becoming a snake that's eating our own tail here if we're not rather careful, and of course stakeholder in some parts of ICANN have entirely different context than what it is in others.

So yes, that's a debate. But when it comes to what we will or, the CCWG public comments, I think perhaps might need to pass some of the more academic aspects of our deliberations. It has become a little bit pragmatic. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My inclination, at this point, is to put in words, essentially what we have now, but enhancing them a bit, pointing out that all definitions of Civil Society really talk about organizations. We believe that users are one of the stakeholders of ICANN, and therefore, they should be there, identified as such.

To what extent it will be listened to, is a different issue...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You may wish to use the term, of course used in the framework of interpretation words, which of course, I'm not suggesting that it replaces the term stakeholder, but it could be an alternate, you know, a slash alternate. That is of course significantly interested parties.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry Cheryl, I didn't hear the word you actually said we should use.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Significantly interested parties.

ALAN GREENBERG: Significantly interested parties...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Defined in the framework of interpretation work, and specifically does include end users and [CROSSTALK] ...in fact. It's a very useful term, banting it around freely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. If there are no other comments on this. Are there any other issues we need to discuss on the CCWG accountability discussions? The next meeting is being held in some number of hours from now, what 15 or 18. And yes, León, go ahead.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. This is León Sanchez. I would only ask that, as you may be aware or not, we will be holding a series of calls this week on the CCWG, with the Board, and well, we held already one with the advisors. So I would definitely invite you to join us, because I think that interesting things are ahead of us. And my sense is that we will be seeing a shift of the point of view of the Board with regards to the CCWG proposal.

So it would be good to have you with us in those calls. That's all I have to say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is this away from support or for support?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I think that the Board will support. The Board will support, only with a couple of, with a couple of tweaks, of course, but I think that the major, the major [inaudible] is that we will see overall support by the Board to the proposal, and as I said, just requiring maybe a couple of tweaks. And we can actually expect some kind of, I wouldn't say a counter proposal, but at least guidance on how we can solve the main issues raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Can you tell us, very briefly, what the agenda is for today's meeting? Because I will not be able to attend... I'll be able to attend only the very start of it.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes. Well mainly the agenda for today's call is to go through the slides that we've reviewed a number of times in different webinars, and mainly collect the first concerns put forth, would be our opportunity to brief the Board. And then we will have a longer call on Wednesday, which I would assume the agenda for that call would be to actually address the different concerns and make the tweaks that the Board

would be expecting us to do in the proposal, so we can get to a final version of the proposal.

So the agenda for today is only [inaudible] Board, and of course, taking them through the different slides that we set up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. We have a queue. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl for the record. Holly, I suggest you go to the framework of interpretation and look of what the specifics are of significantly interested parties in terms of DNS, and I think you'll rest relatively more comfortable after that. Why I raised my hand, however, was to do with the Board call, or the call to the Board, that León was just referring to.

And I particularly wanted to suggest, this is one of those read between the lines moment, Alan that it would be wise, in my opinion, to not concrete in our final documentation, and have enough opportunity for possible deliberation after the next, after the call that happens on Wednesday. Not the call that's happening immediately now, as we wrap up this call and move to the briefing call that León just outlined.

I think the following call will be the one of particular significance which, if my crystal ball is clear, I would suggest would give us as an AC, a little bit to chew on, and we will need to discuss, deliberate, and perhaps edit our documentation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted Cheryl. Anyone else with any comments on this particular item?

All right. Then we will go ahead. Where are we? ICANN 54. Do León and Gisella have anything they want to share with us?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alan. This is León Sanchez. Well, we reviewed the matrix for Dublin, and we're still trying to manage some slots for the working groups, I believe we're falling short for the slots of working group meetings. I think that we would need to be holding a call, between Gisella you and I, by inviting Alan to make the last tweaks for the proposal.

So there is really not much to update you on, but we would be requesting a call with you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: You know where to find me.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay. So I hope Gisella can arrange this to happen. And I don't know, Gisella, if you want to add something to what I just said.

GISELLA GRUBER: Hi León. Thank you. It's Gisella speaking. That's great, we have a slight document that I've uploaded. The last pieces of the puzzle are coming

together. As you can see, we've got a blank document. The last pieces of the puzzle have come together. We're blanking the Dublin meeting, my apologies.

I'm trying to get all the working groups onto the schedule, and that's proving a tad challenging. I've been waiting for, to see the main schedule, to see if I can have a preview of any important meetings that no more than what I've sent through the last time, except that we have scheduled the two ALT meetings on the Saturday the 17th, from 8 to 9:30.

And on the last Friday, the Friday the 23rd, from 8 to 9:45. And we've also put the ALAC and regional leadership wrap up session on Thursday from 10:30 to 12:30. That is parallel to the ICG working session as it stands at the moment, but Alan gave me the go ahead in scheduling that. And what I'll try to do once my Outlook decides to let me use it again, I'll send you the draft schedule that we currently have, which is an Excel table with all of the columns, and you can have a look at that.

And if you could give me feedback within the next 24 hours, that would be very much appreciated. And that's all from my side. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Then I guess that is all done for that session. Next item on our agenda, ALAC development session and strategy sessions at ICANN 54 in Dublin. Okay. Just to be clear, because there have been a few more emails around, the things that we are calling the strategy sessions, which is Saturday, is effectively the same as Sunday. We can move meetings between the two, they are used interchangeably.

So let's try to make use of the best of that time so we do things in the right order, and split things between names, days if necessary. What I would like to speak about today, is what do we want in the development session? We have asked for a most of a full day on Friday, to meet with the new incoming ALAC, and I believe the liaisons. Heidi, are we correct on that or not? I really don't remember.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I believe, yes, I believe the liaisons are coming as well. But the new liaisons. So again, we need to have that vote before Dublin obviously.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Understood. I don't believe we're planning on doing any changes with liaisons, but if someone believes that we should be, then we should be talking privately on that. We're talking about the three mandated, the three official liaisons to ICANN groups.

I guess what I'd like to hear is what people want. We have to start doing some planning really soon. We have the opportunity of having a facilitator to do some of the either the training, to the extent that we want training, or the kinds of group activity, you know, group building activities that one often has in these things. We need some direction pretty soon.

So what kinds of activities we want? What has worked well in sessions that you have participated in the past, in similar types of things? And what do we want out of this? So I guess I'm looking for input right now, and I am also soliciting input via email in the next little while. We don't

have a lot of time to do it. Tijani, go ahead. Heidi? Did you want to say something?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, just really quickly. If you decide to go with that facilitator, again, she's from Insight Learning, and she's going to be one of the two facilitators for the leadership training program this year. So she is happy once you confirm and I'm hoping that you can do that really soon, she will be able to get on calls with the ALT and help plan that session as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understand. But first, we need a little bit of guidance as to what we want, unless we want to turn it completely over to her, in which case, I guess that's fine too. But I wanted any thoughts from people, and I know a fair number of people on these calls have participated in similar sessions before. Tijani, did you have something to say?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you Alan. You said Friday. Friday we have a full day with the CCWG.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which Friday are you...? I'm talking about the Friday after ICANN.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: After ICANN, okay. Sorry. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: There will be an ALT meeting in the early morning, and then followed by the rest of the day. Yes, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As you know, I've done a few of these things, and I'm very keen to make sure that there is a goodly but successful component of team building, and particularly assuming we'll have some new people that need to now work and keep the ground running. You may want to get some team building exercises done as an important part of the day's activity, but that doesn't mean that it can't be to topic and task.

So I'm quite sure that the facilitator would be able to do a mix of more general ice breaking and team building work, which is important regardless, even those of you who think you know each other well, will benefit from that. But I would also suggest that doing some on topic case work can also go to building teams as well.

And that's going to help when you've got people who know when they can just in fact channel and reach out to and say, now just before I [inaudible] this, what was the background on that? And that helps the dynamic, and I'm sure we'll allow for a faster ramping of input from new members. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Anyone else have any comments? I've got just a couple, but I'd like to open it up to anyone else first. Nobody. I guess I support strongly what Cheryl said. The team building, and that comes in a variety of ways, you get noticeably different interactions with people when they have some knowledge of who you are and what your interests are outside of ICANN, or outside of the particular endeavor that brought you together.

So that's part of it. We're really trying to get people who feel comfortable with each other, and reduce some of the formalities that certainly in some cultures, are significant barriers to people working with each other. At the same time, if we can get particular training in something, and facilitate the barrier breakdown at the same time, then that's killing two birds with one stone.

So Cheryl, I think we're talking about pretty much the same thing. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I just had a question regarding the logistics of this, because I mean, constituency travel informed me I have to leave on Friday. So that's why I find it strange. Is it the full day?

ALAN GREENBERG:

You're not part of the incoming ALAC, but you are, at this point, likely to be a liaison. We need to deal with that offline.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Exactly, thank you Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I wasn't aware. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: They should have been aware. Sigh. Anyone else?

All right. Then again, if anyone has anything they would like to share on planning this session. Again, it's one of these things that if you don't participate now, then you don't get to complain afterwards that we didn't do what you wanted. So please, give your input. The next item is the leadership training program. And just a very quick review on where are we on each of the five regions.

Africa, we've already selected our member. Where are we...? Heidi, are you in a position to tell us where are we for each of the other regions? Either that we have identified the two people that the region is suggesting, and how do we go from there to picking the one person that we're allowed per region?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. This is Heidi. So we know that AFRALO is [Seun]. For APRALO, the candidates will be Maureen and an incoming NomCom person, I believe. From EURALO, it seems that we now only have one, even though I have heard earlier would be two, but that's [Yurijo]. From LACRALO, we have two, Humberto and Alberto. And from NARALO it's Judith and Glenn.

So I believe what was decided earlier, Alan, was that you would be working with Sandra, and then move that on up to the ALT, and then the ALAC would need to confirm those remaining RALO people.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Could you send a note to me and Sandra, giving those names? And I'll work with Sandra after that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, we will do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

Just a question on logistics, and I...

And I'm saying it multiple times. For LACRALO, [AUDIO DIFFICULTIES]...

This is really frustrating. And Alberto, when do their terms expire?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. And their terms expire, I believe, by March 2016.

ALAN GREENBERG: With the ability to be renewed?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

I won't comment further on that one. Julie.

[CROSSTALK]

JULIE HAMMER: Sorry about that. I just wanted to let you know that SSAC actually, after [Seun] just spoke to us, and I've been [inaudible]... SSAC had three volunteers for the leadership program, and had to do a random selection, and the SSAC people who will be attending at Dublin are [inaudible] and Russ Mundy. And I think that will be really good for them, but also they'll bring some useful knowledge to the program. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Julie. Next item. We have the ALAC meeting. And the only... There are two items on the ALAC meeting I would like to further discuss. The first one is a follow on to the Armenian LGR rules. As you may recall, we have three ALSs in Armenia. One of them, the author of the statement came from one of them.

The other one is essentially the author of the LGRs, and decided that it was not appropriate for them to participate or comment, or ask us to comment. And lastly, there is Siranush's ALS, and Siranush felt very strongly that the ALAC should not be in the business of making these language specific statements.

Given two out of the three ALSs did not feel that they... ISOC Armenia also said they didn't think ALAC should be doing this, it's not only they couldn't contribute. So given two out of the three ALSs said we shouldn't be in this business, I didn't feel it was appropriate that we then endorse a statement on the Armenia LGRs.

[Naureen] then said, and she has not explained, and I have no understanding of it, that she is not in a position to comment on her own either.

Either on behalf of herself personally, or her ALS. I have no understanding why that would be, and she hasn't responded to me, so that's the way that one is left. I'm a little bit... I must admit, I don't know how it came about that [Naureen] was asked to write the statement on behalf of the ALAC. Does anyone have any insight into that? About just how that particular sequence happened.

Go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I believe that she volunteered during, it was either a face to face meeting, or during a conference call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Well the question then... Ariel, go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Yeah, this is Ariel. Actually, I asked the IDN working group about that public comment and [Naureen] emailed me and said she is willing to draft a statement. She won't [inaudible] but via email.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. So the question comes up on the Arabic LGRs. Should the ALAC be in the business of making statements on language specific things? Now, this particular, the Armenia one ended up with something in it that might have been political, but the decision not to do it was not based on that aspect of it.

I certainly don't want to be again in the position where we asked someone to draft a statement on behalf of the ALAC, and then we decide whether we want to issue a statement or not. That's certainly doing this backwards. So the question is, should the ALAC be in this business of drafting, of issuing statements, where the ALAC, to a large extent, has no knowledge or authority on that issue, and we're relying on other people.

And should we be doing it in the absence of support from the ALSs where they speak that language. I open the floor. Olivier.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was an old hand, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan, Tijani speaking. You said that At-Large is not concerned those issues. And they are [inaudible] people outside of their community to write statements, etc. It's not the case at all, we are At-Large. In At-Large you have people speaking Arabic, people speaking Armenian. You have people who participated in the IDN working groups, and who are very well skilled.

I give the example of [inaudible] who is very well, who worked on this group very long. Mohamed El Bashir also. So I think that we have someone who has the knowledge, and has the language, because he must be speaking this language, we may issue a statement about this particular language.

If we don't have, we don't do. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Tijani, to be clear, I didn't say we don't care about it. I said, I asked, should we be in the business of issuing statements where we do not, within our, within the community of the ALAC, have the specific knowledge. So, let me continue with the speaker list, and then I'll give you my personal opinion. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Alan. It's Olivier-Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I was going to say yes to your question. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Anyone else what to get in?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, if I may? Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, certainly Cheryl. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Declaring vested interest, having worked for well over a decade in the world of IDNs and ICANN, and indeed, outside of ICANN for that matter, I'm also going to say yes. And I'm going to say yes and yes to the two part question, because I don't think we should have a blanket rule on, if we don't have ALSs speaking that particular, or using that particular script, that we should or shouldn't make some level of comment.

And I would suggest, however, that an intelligent way forward would always be to engage with the script using communities, wherever possible, either our At-Large structures, where they exist, or using our At-Large structures or regional hubs, the script using communities as a matter of good outreach and principles of looking after the best interest of our end user community.

So I think it is yes and yes. Now that doesn't mean that not doing a comment or even withdrawing a potential draft from becoming a final

statement for review by the ALAC is a bad thing. I don't think that, you know, all things, every time a pen goes to paper, it's necessarily needing to be public. In fact I've seen some things published under the name of the ALAC which were a waste of the funds that were committed to them, let alone the time that people took reading them, and not just within the IDN world either.

But I do think that we also need to perhaps ensure that things are done with the knowledge that not everything written will become sanctioned, and that the view of the community, both specific and wider community, will have to be looked at from time to time. But yes, I think we should do that. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Let me ask a follow on question. Let us presume that for any given LGRs, the people who are experts in the area look at it and say they did a fine job. Do we need to comment on that? In other words, do we need put in the somewhat gratuitous comment saying, the ALAC thinks it's great [CROSSTALK]...

Sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, it actually depends, Cheryl for the record. It depends on how [inaudible]. There are times, in fact, where an affirmative, supportive, and positive comment, particularly from an advisory committee, can be extraordinarily useful thing. Sometimes it is simply to give heart to those who've worked long and hard on something, put something out

for public comment, and not one blasted person read it. And that is in fact more [inaudible] something to do with contention sets, and the wonderful world of script usage.

It's going to be, you know, new gTLD aspects. But there is also sometimes where something has gone out for public comment with still a fair degree of tension between parties that may not have been able to reach at the root consensus on matters. And when that's the case, an agreement can be a powerful thing indeed. Now do when do we decide when that's worthwhile?

That's where your IDN working group and the people who do have the knowledge and skills need to advise, and that's pretty much what you've been doing before you decide to do most of your public comments. And here I would like Ariel to, as she works more and more with public comments, listen very clearly to what I'm saying.

And that is that just because someone volunteers, doesn't mean that that is going to be a worthwhile exercise. We do need to also make sure that the ALAC itself is happy to have taken advice from someone says, yes we should say something, even if it is just an affirmative and supportive thing. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Olivier, you're next, and I think I get a pretty well gist of where we're going, but go ahead please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I would support what Cheryl has said, when it comes down to positive action. Giving accolades is sometimes very helpful, especially if we do feel that there might be some significant blowback from some parts of the community, and therefore what is drafted there needs our support.

That said, there is also a need for the ALAC to comment, the ALAC or people notice any amendments or corrections that are needed. And so that's why I'm a little disappointed of the outcome on this specific occasion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Yeah. Just to be clear, we've always said that if we're expecting pushback from someone else that we feel is something good, we must make a statement. So that part is clear. Okay. What I'm hearing is, when soliciting someone to advise whether there is a statement, make sure we set the ground rules out clearly, that the decision whether to issue will be made later, and we can separate the recommendation on should there be a statement from the drafting, perhaps, that the recommendation to make a statement should be made, and we're talking about language specific LGRs here, should be made either by a significant part of the community that speaks that language, and/or by the IDNs working group.

In other words, that we're getting input from someone, saying a statement is warranted in this case. And again, we said expectations that Cheryl identified going out, but we certainly don't have a rule

saying that we don't do it, and we also similarly don't have a rule saying we will every time.

Does that pretty well go along with what people are saying?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yup, green tick from me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then I will put out something to that effect. The other item from the ALAC meeting is working groups. You will recall that I was suggesting that we shut down inactive working groups. Olivier made the plea that we shouldn't do that, but should try to reinvigorate. I will then request, if we have a volunteer to lead the group, and that person can put together a very brief mission statement for what the group is going to be doing, then it stays alive.

If we can't meet that minimal requirement, then we shut it down and can always reinvigorate. Does anyone have any strong problem with that?

Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Sorry, you're going to send an email out then to the ALAC and At-Large list for everyone? Because I think one needs to make sure... There are two things really. The one thing I would suggest is, since you are going to have a new

ALAC lineup in about a month's time, you might to put strong pressure on your new ALAC members who are not that new in the game, that they should also be leading a working group, rather than just having their two hour call a month.

That was one thing which I did try and push back when I was chair. And secondly, I would also say you need to be pretty clear that one does not need to be an ALAC member to be leading a working group, and it might be a good way to get some new members who are eager about a topic to get more involved and to do things. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Yes, I think all that's wise. I'm not sure we're going to have a lot of incoming ALAC members that are not on one of the lists already. So I'm not sure there is any reason to defer it. But we may want to defer the decisions until giving people some time to reply. And as you point out, the new ALAC will be well-known within the next small number of weeks.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I don't think it will be productive to put pressure on people to make them leading a working group. And I don't think that everyone can lead a working group. So I think that we have to, how do you say, to feel, or to find the right people, and try to and to [inaudible] to take a working group and lead it.

Also, as you said Olivier, you don't have to be a member of the ALAC to lead the working group, so we have to encourage everyone to do so. So we try to not [inaudible] but to [identify?] people who maybe a good leaders of working groups. And we have to [inaudible] to do so. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. One more question for the group, and I'm not asking for answers right now, but think about it for the next day or so. My habit has tended to be to send things to the ALAC list, with explicit instructions that say please forward to your RALO list.

Right now, we still have a mishmash of lists. We have the ALAC announce, which people cannot respond to. And it is a subset of people. In theory, it has one person from every ALS on it, unless they have unsubscribed themselves, which they may well have.

We have the RALO list and then we have the At-Large list, which is not quite a super set of anything. And I'm not quite sure what the right lists are to send these things to. So interested in people's thoughts on it. But think about it, and I will perhaps solicit questions from one or two privately, if you don't contribute them to me voluntarily.

And is there anything else, any other business in this meeting to discuss or should we adjourn a few minutes early?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, thank you all. We'll see you in a while.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]