GISELLA GRUBER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Monthly Call on Tuesday, the 22nd of September at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Eduardo Diaz, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Jimmy Schulz, Vanda Scartezini, Leon Sanchez, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Beran Gillen, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Judith Hellerstein, Allen Skuce, Siranush Vardanyan, Leah Symekher, Harold Arcos on the Spanish channel. We don't have anyone on the French channel. We also have Julie Hammer, Murray McKercher, and Sebastien Bachollet has just joined us.

Apologies from Wolf Ludwig, Sandra Hoferichter, and Hadja Ouatara.

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

Our interpreters this evening are Camila and Isabelle on the French channel. Ekaterina and Galina on the Russian channel. Veronica and Claudia on the Spanish channel.

And if I could also remind everyone to please state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but to allow the interpreters to identify you on other channel. Thank you and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Gisella, and I note a number of people in the non-ALAC members are showing up twice both as being present and non-present. I presume that will be fixed up. All right.

The agenda you have all seen, presumably, and is somewhere on the screen. There is one change to it, and that is item number seven, which is the selection of people for the Leadership Training Program as is our norm, since we're talking about individuals at that point. That part of the meeting will be moved to the very end and will be held in camera with only ALAC members and the formally appointed liaisons. The formally appointed liaisons to the ICANN bodies.

And are there any other issues with the agenda? Any changes? Or can we accept them with that change as noted? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we will accept the agenda.

The first substantive item on the agenda is item number three, review of outstanding action items requiring ALAC involvement, and I ask Heidi, I presume, or somebody else on staff, if there are any such items on the action item menu.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. There are a couple. One is that staff are to organize a potential single-issue call discussing At-Large as an aspect of civil society, and that Jean-Jacques Sahel is to be invited. I wanted to ask if you thought that that was still necessary.

He is going to have a session with the ALAC and NCSG in Dublin. So would you like to have a single-issue call prior to that to discuss the issue of At-Large in civil society or did you want that to take place then?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, what I want is not necessarily prevailing, so I'll give you my opinion, then open it up to anyone else. Given how busy the schedule is between now and Dublin, my inclination would be to see what comes out of Dublin because there will be a discussion there with us and with the NCSG, and likely – assuming the whole thing doesn't die between now and then, which I'm not expecting it to do – a webinar at that point probably makes more sense. So a few weeks after Dublin.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have any differing opinions? I see one tick,. Nobody else has any comments. Okay. Then that's a decision made. Next item on the action items.

HEIDI ULLRICH: There's one for you, Alan. Alan Greenberg to start a discussion on the ALAC list with regard to whether to close inactive working groups to replace inactive working groups, chairs, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. That is an item on my to-do menu. It's not going to get done this week. Perhaps next week.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And then another one is staff to gather a list of CCWGs where At-Large members are active, and that's in progress. And then the final one is Ariel Liang to update the working group list names and links on the old At-Large website after decisions are made with regard to the inactive working groups. Ariel, is that completed or in progress? I guess that's not yet started.

ARIEL LIANG: I was waiting for the decision with regard to the working groups, which ones are [being] active, which ones are not.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's reasonable.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. That's it, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Item number four, the ALAC policy development activities. And I will ask Ariel to take us through that. We have a significant number of statements that have been ratified at one level or another. I was pleased to see that the CCWG Accountability one did

have 15 votes. That was really important. It's a little bit perturbing that some of the others don't, but we'll deal with that separately.

There are a number of statements that are active and these are really active. We're collecting information and we would like other people to be participating actively and contributing, but I'll let Ariel go over them one by one and just give us the details. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. The first active statement is preliminary issue report on new gTLD subsequent procedures. Olivier drafted a statement and Carlton helped and provided comments, and I believe the first draft will be posted on the wiki shortly. And that public comment will close on October the 10th.

And the second active one is on the proposal for Arabic script root zone label generation rules. Currently, the ALAC is calling for volunteers to review this public comment and advise whether a statement is necessary. Alan approached both Edmon Chung and Satish Babu, and we haven't heard response from them.

And Alan, actually, asked you a question whether we should approach the newly selected ALAC representatives to the ICANN IDN Working Group. His name is [Well Nasar]. Sorry, I probably didn't pronounce his name correctly, but he is from Egypt, Arabic native speaker, and expert in IDN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I though the suggestion went to Satish and Edmon. I didn't take any action on it. I don't know whether they did not or not, but perhaps after the call you could reach out to them and find out what the status is. If nothing happens soon or now or relatively soon, I think de facto we've decided not to do a statement on it. But it would be nice if it a conscious decision, not just time passing by.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. I will contact them after the call. And the third statement that is active is the use of country and territory names as top-level domains. Maureen is drafting a statement in consultation with Cheryl, and also, we have a very vibrant discussion on the At-Large worldwide mailing list about this topic. Just as an FYI, I took the liberty to copy and paste the comment into the wiki workspace for Maureen to keep track of the comments, and I will encourage all of you to use the wiki to provide their input.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll note on that one, the current topic is not the full one described in the name of the working group, but just on the use of the three-character codes for the countries and territories. Ones that are currently not used as ccTLDs and in the first round of gTLDs could not be used as gTLDs. And, of course, they potentially conflict with company names, which often are three-letter acronyms. So it's an interesting set of symbols.

ARIEL LIANG: And that's not a public comment. It's more like a solicitation of inputs for the Working Group. So the fourth statement that is active is a new gTLD auction proceeds discussion paper. Eduardo Diaz is drafting a statement and Carlton Samuels is assisting him, and the public comment will close October the 18th. So that's all of the active statements.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I want to go back to the first one. I notice Tijani's hand is up and I don't know when which one you raised it. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. It was about the Arabic script root zone LGR. I proposed to contact Mohamed El Bashir, who worked a lot on this issue who was on the IDN group, and worked a lot on the Arabic script. So I think that this is an important, if you want, resource that you have to use. Otherwise, I don't know. For Arabic script, there is no one who is speaking Arabic so I am a little bit concerned by it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the rep to the IDN review group, it is Arabic speaking. That's who Ariel referred to. But yes, please feel free to reach out to him. We don't have to do it strictly through the heads of the IDN group, as long as you're clear that the first question is, is there a need for a statement? And there is either a need for a statement if they've done something really wrong that we believe we should be pointing out and that we

have the support of multiple Arabic-speaking ALSes to do it. Or whatever.

It may well be that nothing needs to be done because competent people have been reviewing it and were not expecting any pushback from someone else. But yes, feel free to speak to him, if necessary. Siranush?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hand up, Alan.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes. Can you hear me, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Okay, great. My comment is relates to, as you may guess, Armenian root zone. The statement for Armenian script root zone label generation rules. We have discussed this already and I would like this not to be in the list again, just that [inaudible] is not dropping a statement for this proposal. The proposal itself is written by ISOC Armenia and it is done in close cooperation with Sarmad Hussain, ICANN staff, on the root zone staff, and there is working group from ISOC Armenian working there.

[inaudible] just suggested a couple of changes and commented on that proposal, which is everyone can do and which can be incorporated into

the future final proposal. So this should be taken this out and coming to the agenda item seven, is ALAC going or is there a need from ALAC to do a statement on this? I think that we have already discussed this, as well, that there is no need for ALAC to come up with the statement on behalf of root zone local languages root zone type of stuff. So this is my two cents on this issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you, Siranush. I'm not sure what agenda you're looking at. It was on our last month's agenda, but it's not on this one. So you may be looking at the wrong document. We did make a decision not to make on the Armenian [inaudible] root zone, the label generation rules.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: I am looking on the agenda, which is right now in this Adobe space, so if this is not correct agenda, then I'm sorry. But I'm looking into the agenda. The proposal right on the point four, there is the proposal for Armenian root zone, and there is agenda seven, agenda item seven. Let me go…

ALAN GREENBERG: I do not see anything under Armenian on item four.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, if I could jump in. Participants on the right hand side of the Adobe Connect screen, there is actually indeed a line there, which says

EN

Armenia statement with Marina drafting [inaudible] because that's the old agenda.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: And there is agenda item seven, and the agenda item point seven.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Please. Yeah. The meeting agenda that's on the upper-right pod, that says agenda participants, is last month's agenda, if staff can please fix that. The agenda in the middle of the screen is today's agenda. Sorry, Siranush, we're doing this deliberately to confuse you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Okay, good. I like it. I'm just [via phone] and it's easier for me to go to ICANN agenda and just look at this. So if this is not the correct one, my apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it is not. We'll try to do better in the future. Cheryl, you had your virtual hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm trying not to laugh out too loudly. I was having a strong of déjà vu with this subject last time. I actually wanted to have a brief word on the Arabic script, and I would certainly want to encourage reaching out to Mohamed, indeed.

I'm not perhaps as concerned about the Arabic script issue because of all of the scripts communities, the Arab-speaking communities were well ahead of the game with getting their tables and everything else organized even before we were launching fast track IDN. So they are, of all the script areas, the Arabic script is the one that has a community of speakers and users of the script they have worked long and hard. So it's probably the one with the least risk.

However, if Ariel wants to reach out to [Weil], that's great, except then I would suggest that as he did not, when I spoke to him, understand even what job was he put himself in for, and I had sent him documents, which given a bit of background. He certainly… His expertise is in the industry base of promoting and running script IDNs, and that's very important.

I think it would be very important, Ariel, that as he had never penned such a thing as a comment before, that someone like you held his hand through the process. Other than that, I would certainly rely on Satish [inaudible] who know what the worth of putting these things is in, [inaudible] I should say. Otherwise, you may get a yes to a statement and a lot of work being put in by someone like [Weil], when in fact the statement will in fact have fairly little impact for that particular script community.

He has not had the opportunity to go to any of these meetings yet because none have been held. I think there's one coming up this week. So he doesn't even know what the role is that he's got himself in for properly yet. So just make sure that he's not saying yes for the sake of saying yes, and then putting far too much work into something, so

there's probably no statement required. But check with Mohamed, certainly. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. But as we noted last time, and the experience that we just heard about on the Armenian script is not all statement, not all of these are we necessarily going to write a statement on. So we're not approaching someone to write a statement. First of all, is there a need? The needs that we will normally write statements on is do we need to point out something that is wrong? And in this case, it has to be something which the overall Arabic community have told us, since we're alone are not the experts on it.

Number two, is there something that we believe other people are going to push back and we want to make sure it does move forward? I can't imagine that happening in this particular case. And thirdly, are there people who worked on this that we need to pat on the head and say, "You did a good job, thank you?" And I don't know whether that's the case here.

But all of those have to be – we have to evaluate that and that's what we're asking for right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Well, [Weil] wouldn't be able to any of those questions other than if he was able to speak on behalf of the Arabic community, and my opening [Sally], which was about how [well[organized the Arabic script

using community was even way back when hopefully will be taking into consideration, if you have a [inaudible] getting a yes, that's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other issue? Anything on that one? I'd like to go back to the first one for a moment, and then the auction one. ALAC and At-Large has yelled and been involved on the first round of gTLD procedures. There will be probably be another round sometime. Right now, we're looking at a preliminary issue report, which will be followed by an issue report, which will be followed by a drafting team drafting a charter, which will be followed by a PDP. It's going to be a long haul and the purpose of this comment, it says, "Is there anything in this issue report which is wrong or missing?"

And, as I said, many people in the At-Large community have been very vocal over the last six, seven years on the new gTLD process. Everyone should take a look at this document and just see does it pass muster. If it doesn't, let Olivier know. That's on that one.

On the auction proceeds, again, we're looking at a long process. This is a discussion paper, which will lead to a drafting team drafting a charter for a cross-community working group, which will look to the cross-community working group to make recommendations on the funding.

So this is not the opportunity to put in your pet project on where the money should be spent, but make sure that the discussion paper has raised the appropriate issues so the charter, when it's drafted – and you can participate in that because all these groups are open – is well set.

EN

So make sure that when you're looking at these documents, you're looking at them from the right perspective. This is not everything going on at this point is just the start to what will be very long processes. Tijani and then Olivier. And we are taking a lot more than I predicted on this item. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you, Alan. As for the auction proceeds discussion paper, first of all, the deadline have been extended to 8th of November.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Second point, there will be a webinar at the beginning of October to explain this discussion paper and how to contribute, how to comment. And I just sent a mail to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee to ask them please to attend the webinar and to comment. I think it is important that we comment on this discussion paper. We will not comment on where the money will go, but to comment on the content of discussion paper if we have remarks on it, if we don't do video on it, so we have to speak up and I think it is something very important to do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree. And there is no question. We are commenting. The question is the substance of the comment. Olivier, you're next.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And on the topic of the new gTLD next round, it's just to let you know that I have drafted a first draft. I have passed it by Carlton. Carlton has come back to me with corrections and things. I just need to incorporate these. Unfortunately, I was sidetracked just before this call, so I'll do this immediately after this call and put it on the wiki, and I look forward to seeing the feedback on this.

It's a long document. 147 pages is the preliminary issues report, and the statement itself is about five, six pages. So it's not a short thing, but it's definitely something you should read before your bedtime. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: For those of us who have bedtimes. Thank you, Olivier. Anything else on the policy development issues before we go on to the next item. Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, he says slowly, we go on to item number five, ALS applications. And I'll turn it over to who is here. Silvia? Heidi? Don't see Nathalie.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, but we spoke together. So we currently have 193, and the only application so far is from [Load] [inaudible] and the person sending that in, and currently, there is due diligence going on, and we will see if we can move that forward expeditiously. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And can you tell us what [Load] or at least what region it's from?

HEIDI ULLRICH:	It is Germany. It's Jimmy Schulz's organization from Germany.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, thank you. All right. No hands, no voices. Item number six, reports from liaisons. Do any of the liaisons, RALOs, working group chairs, or anyone else want to highlight anything in their reports? Give people a moment. We have Julie Hammer. Julie, please go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER:	Thanks, Alan. I just wanted to highlight that at this stage, the SSAC is one of the few organizations that hasn't commented on the CCWG second round draft proposal. And we are looking at, effectively, reiterating what was said in relation to the first round proposal. We just had a two-day workshop ourselves in Los Angeles, and the SSAC still remains very concerned at the complexity of some of the proposals.

So I thought I'd just mention that. No doubt, you're aware of that and possibly more will be discussed under that item on the agenda, but I thought I'd just mention that in here. Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. We will be mentioning that under item number nine. Complexity is a word that's in my vocabulary this week. Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER:	Yes. Thank you, Alan. Can everyone hear me okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you very well.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes. I just wanted to note I put up in the chat liaison reports for .mobi. There's been a little discussion but not activity in the .mobi. So what is there is up on the wiki, and if anyone has any specific questions about that, feel free to contact me directly or I can take any questions at the moment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any questions for Murray? I presume Maureen is not a question for Murray.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, it isn't.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Then please go ahead, Maureen, on your own behalf.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Now I just wanted to raise that I'd actually put in the ccNSO submission to the IANA function proposal mainly just to, in full, basically exemplify the concerns of their community in relation and comparison to the sorts of concerns we have, and to our discussion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was presuming everyone on the ALAC and RALOs is reading all of the comments to all of the groups, but thank you for that, just in case some of us aren't doing it all. That was humor or attempted humor. We have some comments from Beran, but let's go to Olivier first, and then if someone from staff can read Beran's comments. She is unable to speak today.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And since all of the other liaisons spoke, I felt kind of lonely and felt I'd also say what happened in the GNSO. Not very much, actually, happening this month, especially since we had a recess over the month of August and then an early call at the beginning of September, and there's another call taking place on Thursday. So squishing two calls in one month. Not very much going on, as I said. Of course, discussion on the public comment period for the new gTLD subsequent procedures, preliminary issue report. There is a discussion about whether they wish to extend the public comment period from the current time.

And as you know, a lot of things in the GNSO, it takes time to discuss this, so we did spend significant amount of time discussing this. Apart from this, most of the other GNSO activity is taking place in its working groups at not a very fast pace at the moment. It was well understood that the IANA stewardship transition but most of all, the ICANN accountability process was really taking a lot of air out of everyone, and that effectively took a lot of cycles from everybody.

Thus, some of the working groups have been working at a much lower pace than they were supposed to be going. There are high hopes that things will be all finished and done with by Dublin, in which case, the working groups will be able to work full speed again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope no one's holding their breath for that. If somebody from staff can go through Beran's comments on the new meeting strategy.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I'm going to read, if you're okay with it, just the main comments. And that is the New Meeting Strategy Working Party was working to get their final proposal to the ALAC in time for today's meeting, but due to a clash in meeting times, we could not meet on time. But Alan, if I can just let everyone know that there's a 90-minute session scheduled on the Saturday during the ALAC Strategy Working Session for the ALAC to discuss this. Beran is going to be moderating that session, and if they have something to present to the ALAC by then, it might be possible for the ALAC to vote on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I do hope we'll have some document ahead of time, so people can review it and we can spend the time on substance and not just reading documents. But I say that for every group, and we don't always do it. I see something from Dev in chat. I haven't read it because I'm too far away to read the type size. Dev, is it something that needs to be said or someone who's read it believes needs to be said?

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Just for me to mention that there's been some work done primarily in the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee on the Technology Taskforce. I invite persons to check the link because regional outreach strategies from all the RALOs are now are being looked at by the relevant Global Stakeholder Engagement person for their approval before September 30th. Various comments we received from the outreach strategies presented on the Outreach and Engagement call. Those were updated and they have been submitted to the GSE for review before September 30th.

And I just want to encourage anybody who's interested in Outreach and Engagement, please join the Working Group. There will likely be a call to Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee next week Monday, and a Doodle is out for that call already.

Secondly, the Technology Taskforce, there's been several meetings updating about the LACRALO mailing list issues, and also there's a very informative call with LACNIC and how they handle their PDP processes. It was a very, very informative and it was toward the work on ATLAS II recommendation 26 on a policy management process system. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Olivier, is that a new hand or an old one?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. It's a new hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, then.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I was just going to do a little add-on to my earlier report regarding a webinar on the new gTLD auction proceeds discussion paper that has been published. Jonathan Robinson, the Chair of the GNSO, will be presenting this webinar on the 7th of October, and I think it's important for us to be on that webinar and to follow that process because it's an issue which I think everyone is very interested in.

Just to let everyone know, the auction proceeds is when there were more than one applicant for a specific string in the new gTLD process. ICANN, in some cases, ran an auction and the intake for the auctions altogether went into that pot of money that I believe reached, is it $60 million or so? It's quite a large amount of money, and at the moment, that fund is unallocated. Obviously, there's an ICANN-wide discussion that is just about starting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well the discussion actually started, from my perspective, in February 2007 but it hasn't gone very far. All right. Tijani, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, we heard you say you're speaking, and then nothing after that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: You're cutting in and out.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: We just heard that…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, now we hear you.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. So Olivier, I just said what you said exactly, and I sent an e-mail to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee about the webinar about the public comment. I assume that our participation is very important in the webinar and also in the comment, and we can comment and we will comment as ALAC. But everyone can comment. It will be, I think, an added value.

Coming back to the Capacity Building Working Group, as you know, we finished the first part of 2015 capacity building program until June, and now we are resuming, we are coming back to our second part of the Capacity Building Working Group for the rest of the year. The Capacity Building Working Group have defined five webinars for the remaining part of the year, and we just arranged that with the staff with the speakers, and we sent it to the group for approval.

The first one will be organized very soon in September, and it will be about the input of At-Large and the CCWG and ICG reports. The second one will be about the working groups. So this is what is happening in this working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Is the one on the CCWG and ICG scheduled on next Monday, the 28th?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: 28th. Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: It would be nice if it was on the At-Large calendar so people would know about it, then. And if staff could take note.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And Tijani, my apologies on that [inaudible] because I won't be available, I don't think.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Cheryl. Me too. I will not be available because I will be coming back from LA. But we tried to change it but it seems that it is not possible. You know, we have very little possibilities for the webinars because we have a lot of activities in the remaining part of the year, and because we decided to start in September and to have five webinars. Five webinars is too much for the four remaining months, but we will do them. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem, Tijani. I think I know a bit about the topic. I just wanted my apologies noted. Thanks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other comments on this? We have Murray. Go ahead, Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you, Alan. I'm not sure if this fits exactly here but Dev and I talked about Technology Taskforce and Engagement. Just wanted to update that people the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, the part for North America under Joe Catapano is planning a trip up to Canada. Alan, you know, there's something [inaudible] and I have been working with Joe to facilitate things here in Toronto. If anybody wants any more information about that, feel free to contact to me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Murray. Anybody else on the issue of reports? Olivier, a new hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's an old hand. I'm trying to put it down. One second.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then we'll go on then. Hearing no voices, seeing no hands that we shouldn't ignore, we will go on to item number – we're skipping item number seven and we'll go do that one in camera at the end of the meeting. We're going on to item number eight, appointments of liaisons for the coming year.

A bit of history. The rules of procedure explicitly allow for if the ALAC is satisfied with someone's performance and would like them to continue, we can simply reappoint them without opening nominations. That was an issue that was discussed a fair amount when the rules of procedure

were rewritten, and of course, it's an issue of balancing do we want to have opportunities for new people coming in? We don't want the same people always occupying a seat.

On the other hand, the liaisons are absolutely crucial positions where we are looking to build relationships, have a position of trust in both directions, and if someone is doing the job well, is willing to keep on doing it, and the target body is willing to keep on having them, the rules group felt quite strongly that we should have the ability to maintain a position.

In preparation for this item for each of the four positions, I checked with the ALAC members, with the exception of the person who is being appointed, if that person is an ALAC member, and I received back a significant number of "yes, we support them" and "no" recommendations to not renew positions. The message was posted to that effect saying, I'd like a decision at this meeting, and Sebastien raised an issue that he believes that two things. Number one, we should open real competitions, and number two, the decision should be made by the incoming ALAC.

And there were statements of support in various levels from Garth and Judith. I will point out that as far back as when I was appointed as GNSO liaison in 2006, it was done by the outgoing ALAC, and I believe, with possible an exception due to timing at some point, it has always been done that way. And the reason being that the person needed to be on the ground ready to go as soon as the meeting was over. And that's the history. And I'd like to open the floor. We have Tijani and then Cheryl. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I do agree with you that we do need – this position of liaison is very critical, and I don't think we need to use newcomers for this position. But to understand more or less what Sebastien said, we may decide to make one shadow person for each liaison in our rules, and this shadow person, if the liaison is already funded, because it is ALAC member or a funded member, the shadow, the funding should go to the shadow so that we'll have, in the future, people prepared to take over.

I understand the point of Sebastien, but I cannot agree to send people because they were not here. We need people that really be a liaison with those structures. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I do have a comment, but I will put myself in the queue after Fatima. If someone will not lower my hand, I would appreciate it. Fatima, you're next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I thought it was me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. You're right. Cheryl, you're next, then Fatima, and then me.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Sebastien is just plain wrong. Can I say it again? Wrong, wrong, and wrong again. I agree totally with what Alan and Tijani had said, and it has always been the case that it is the outgoing that put the liaisons out because of the very real risk that the incoming won't know who's good, bad, or indifferent. They've got at least two years and at least in the first year, they may be able to get a measure.

But if you've got anything to do with the extremely delicate balance of trust relationships that happened for the primary liaison role, as Tijani said, you will know that it can be more than 12 months for someone to build that relation up. As you all know, I'm absolutely supportive of having a shadow. I once had two shadows myself and I'm delighted to see that the one that stepped out of my shadow and into the glaring light of day in the ccNSO has gone on to be an excellent liaison.

So no, it does work. It worked with Maureen. But in terms of competition, no. All you're going to do is get in a competition for competition's sake usually because someone wants to get their backside on a plane to go to a meeting, and little more. Was that too harsh? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We wouldn't comment if it was.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Alan. When it comes to these issues, I understand Sebastien's comment and I agree with the fact of having higher engagement by members. Now when it comes to this particular item, I

believe that the role of a liaison should have a certain degree of experience or seniority, and I believe they should be or they should have been ALAC members in order to be able to have these new roles. And if you want to have more people to get involved, I think we should have these liaisons position with a mentoring component so that we can guide new people.

We have already mentioned that in other opportunities, but I believe that it's not easy to have a volunteer and it's not easy to start working with a volunteer if that volunteer has no idea what ALAC is or if that person has no relationship with the community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Fatima. Several comments. Partly in my own, partly in response to things other people have said. In terms of eligibility, we explicitly said I think most liaisons, and certainly the ones to the ICANN groups, are normally expected to be either ALAC members or ex-ALAC members. It's not a requirement but this person is going to be called upon to speak on behalf of the ALAC and often without any preparation and without any guidance.

Therefore, we're expecting someone who really does understand the overall environment, and that's really, really important. In terms of the incoming or outgoing ALAC, although we typically just have two or three or four people changing, we can have as many as eight in any given year, and that's assuming no unusual vacancies because, in theory, we can replace one person that's RALO-appointed and up to three people that are NomCom-appointed.

That's a large part of the ALAC and that was part of the rationale for saying it should be the outgoing ALAC that does that. And interestingly, historically it has always been that way in any case. One caution on the shadow person. When we explicitly had, as in Cheryl's case when she was leaving the ccNSO position and had arranged with the ccNSO to allow other people to be present at the meetings, in general, I believe not speaking, but the present.

But that was done with the concurrence of that group. The GNSO might not take as flexible a role if we asked them. They might. We don't know. But it's nothing that we can do unilaterally, and I think that's really important. In the case of the SSAC, SSAC has requirements. We don't even appoint the SSAC liaison. From the SSAC's point of view, they're a member, not a liaison.

We suggest someone and they then test them, essentially, and say, "Is that someone who we want part of our group?" I would really have a problem opening competitions in a case for any of the liaisons where it is quite clear that the person is interested in continuing, is capable of it, has the respect of the group that they're working with, has been shown to do a good job, and there's no other obvious candidates. Because these are not entry-level positions.

We expect someone for the GNSO, for instance, to have been involved in GNSO working groups for two, three, four years. We may not always be able to make that target, but that's certainly our hope.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maybe actively involved, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, actively involved. So opening a competition just for the sake of the competition, I think, has a problem. But I'll stop speaking at this point and Tijani, I don't know if Sebastien or I don't know who else is on. Garth is not on the call and Judith is on the call, the two other people who may comment. I don't know whether they want to speak up or not, but Tijani, you have the microphone next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. As for the shadow person, I think that we should ask. Perhaps, the SSAC is an exception. But I think that all the meetings normally are open for everyone. All our meetings in ALAC are open for everyone. Even the ExCom meeting or the ALT meeting are open for everyone. So I don't think there is a problem.

Assuming that it is an observer who will not participate in discussion, not etc. So I don't think that this will make [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let him speak.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that point when he gets through.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So that's what I wanted to say. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Tijani, just for the record, the GNSO, for instance, although there is a URL where you can listen to the meeting on audio, they are closed meetings. They are not open to other people dialing into the Adobe Connect room and things like that. That's their rules and we have to honor them. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to say the ccNSO, I was not able to get Maureen and my other shadow access to everything at all, and indeed, there was an awful lot of trust building and time put in by Maureen in particular to be seen as an appropriate heir apparent to get into some of those conversations and having some of those closed meetings open to us. So it is a process and it may be a process that takes more than 12 months.

                        So I think we should make a best effort but I don't think we can change our rules to make it a requirement, and it certainly will only work, even if it is accepted, to an extent and only with the permission and agreement of the [inaudible] body. So we've got to tread carefully but do the best we can. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. One more comment. Mailing lists, for instance, are generally not open. You can go read them on the archives, but they're not open as mailing lists. And I will make one comment, and I'm going to try to word it carefully. We have had at least one occasion where we did have the equivalent of a shadow, and the person caused what would be the equivalent in ICANN circles of an international incident because of speaking out of turn and with very little knowledge.

Glenn, you're on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, dear. You bring up the bad old days here. Well done.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have to mention it. Glenn, you're on.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. I saw the same dialogue, and I understand where some people are coming from, from the selection process. But we need to really stress the qualifications of these individuals and looking at the slate that's been suggested, there are superb people. So would probably come back to the same individual given their background and experience. So I'd like to hear more from people who felt that the process was flawed. Unfortunately, nobody's on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, Sebastien and Judith are on the call, I believe, but Beran in the chat asked…. He'd like to know more about the concept of shadows. The shadow concept came up in both GNSO when I was trying to lead the position of liaison, and Cheryl when she was trying to lead. It didn't work very well in the GNSO for a number of reasons because we didn't really have any volunteers.

In the case of the ccNSO, we did have a number of volunteers and Cheryl negotiated the ability to have these people listen in on meetings and sit in on meetings if they were face-to-face to try to get a feel for what was going on, and then slowly move them into a more active role. I don't think we can define it any more than that because it was an ad lib function at that time and the next one is likely to be done differently.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, just briefly. What was important around in that experience from the ccNSO's point of view – and remember, I'm a member of the ccNSO, as well, so I can look at it from both sides – is that it was very clear by the end of the first face-to-face meeting and two following work group meetings that only one of my two shadows are going to be suitable. The other would not have been accepted by the ccNSO.

So even though there was willingness to volunteer, even though it was from our point of view quite reasonable potential, and we would have put either person into the job if we were just appointing, that exercise did make it very clear that if we'd have made one choice over the other, we would have had a wasted space because there was never going to be

any trust built. That person would have just been occupying space for the 12 months that they were there. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'll point out that formally, with the exception of SSAC, there's no acceptance process. We don't ask permission, but the messages that go back and forth make it really clear whether the person is causing a problem or being a productive member of the community.

Does anyone else wish to speak up? Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, and thank you for having the discussion. I am wrong, I am wrong, I am wrong… I don't think so. But I will start to discuss this issue because you seem so sure of you that you have the experience of how many years in each of your roles. Maybe you need to listen a little bit but I never proposed to have somebody new. I just proposed that we don't automatically [re-conduct] somebody because he's willing to stay on the position.

Or if we do that, I would have – how I will say that? – maybe we need to have done that for all the position ALAC is coming on. Maybe it's because you were very unhappy with my work on the Board, but I will stop here and I hope that the relationship within this group will not be like that with this type of intervention that some are making, and I am obliged to answer.

I think we need to have a smooth discussion and it was not the case. If you don't want my ideas, please tell me, and I will shut my mouth, and I

will not write an e-mail, but I am very upset with what happened. I am very happy with the four people coming to this position, but I still feel that we need, as a group – and I say as a group, we need to have open the possibilities and discuss. At the end, we may have choose the same one for the good reason you came with, but it's not the same process that to have just say, "Okay, they want to come to stay, they will stay." Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. Just to clear up a few things, and I think it's important. You did not suggest it's an entry-level position. Somebody else did. And this was a response to all of the messages that were posted. So that should not be taken personally.

The fact that the person is willing to participate again, it was not, in my mind, negating one. It's a necessary requirement because we can't enforce slavery, but that was not the gating one. The gating one is do we believe this person is doing a really good job in the role? And that is the best we can do at this point.

And one last comment. With regard to the selection of Board members, a few of us fought very, very hard that the process should provide, give the ability for the group – I think it's called BCEC – to select one person, the incumbent member. The community as a whole said, "No way. We must have anywhere from 3 to 15 candidates in every selection." And that was made essentially a mandatory rule. The BCEC has the right to override it, but there was a very strong message sent that we should not be able to do that no matter how good the person was.

So we live with our rules. Not all of us always agree with them when they were set. In this particular case for liaisons, it was debated a fair amount and these were conclusions we came out with, not just the GNSO and ccNSO liaisons.

I would like to move the acceptance of the four liaisons to continue for the next year. I believe that was the overall intent of this discussion. And I ask for are there any ALAC members who oppose the selection? If any ALAC member would like to break this up into four separate votes, we can. They can request that. In the absence of any ALAC member asking that, I'll ask for are there any objections? Is there anyone voting no? Is there anyone else abstaining? Can we see tick marks from those ALAC members who are voting for this?

Staff, if you can please note who is it that is voting, and whoever's counting them, if you can tell us if there are any ALAC members who have not voted or when we can put our hands down. I see Fatima has not voted any way. Has the Spanish interpreter passed on the message?

Fatima says she's in favor in the chat, I see that. All right. If staff has noted, have you noted all the people with check marks?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Ariel?

ALAN GREENBERG: Somebody?

ARIEL LIANG: We have 13 yes and I've seen there are 2 people haven't voted. But I will double check. I've noted the people [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you please note who has voted so you can check via e-mail with the other people and get votes from them? Our rules allow you to extend this vote to get a full vote of all 15 members.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. I took a screenshot of the checkmarks so [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then if you can excuse me for one moment while I have to go to the door, but then we'll go on to the next item. I am back but no at my chair, my desk. Okay. Next item is the IANA stewardship transition.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just, Alan. Sorry. I wanted to say that it can't be certain because there are three member of ALAC who are not participating. And it can't be certain it's 12 at maximum, because you count twice Fatima, and it's 12. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, please double check, and if necessary, contact each of the people independently to verify how they voted if your screenshots don't help that. I don't want to spend time doing it right now.

ARIEL LIANG: Noted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Thank you, Sebastien, for noting that. Appreciate it. Item number nine, IANA stewardship transition and accountability. There is a meeting going on in Los Angeles this Friday and Saturday. That will be followed by a meeting on the first day of Dublin with the intent being to analyze the comments, including but not limited to the comment from the Board, and to try to have something which we believe the community as a whole can buy into to allow the IANA transition to go ahead.

It's moderately clear we will not likely have full closure in Dublin. The current belief is that if we can come close, then all the communities might be able to ratify the final proposal between meetings. That's not 100% guaranteed, but that's the hope. And that's where we stand right now.

Going into the comment period, we were perhaps the only one that had been vocal on wanting something simpler than the full community membership model. There are a number of others who have made similar comments, including the Internet Architecture Board and the NRO representing the regional address registries. And it's certainly the Board.

It's not at all clear how this is going to play out. There was an accountability meeting today that I think ran very well, and Thomas

took the lead and basically said we have to go into this and look at all the comments and try to come to closure to it. Now he's a strong believer, I think, in the community membership model, but nevertheless, we have to play the game and go through the whole process.

So I don't have a lot more to say. We've allocated [15] minutes for this and I guess I'll turn it over to anyone else who has any particular opinions. It's not clear how we're going to go through this. There are some very, very strong feelings on both sides or on all sides of this discussion, but I must admit I didn't understand how we would kill the ContractCo proposal in the CWG, but miraculously, in the middle of one day, it disappeared.

So maybe a miracle will happen here, too. I don't have a lot of insight as to how that's going to happen. And I open the floor. Anybody? Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. As you said, magic can happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we're hearing from one of the magicians.

LEON SANCHEZ: We're not sure how we're going to pull this trick, out but I'm aware that it's something that we definitely need to pull out from the hat and I guess that my sense is that everybody will be… I mean, at least everybody that will be attending personally to the meeting and also

EN

those who will be attending remotely are in the mindset that we must remain, of course, open-minded, not to be married to any single model, and try to combine the best elements from the current outstanding proposals being the single membership model and the MEM proposed by the Board.

I believe that we can bridge the gap. I think that there might be a lack of understanding on both sides on what we're trying to pull together. So I think that this face-to-face meeting will be very helpful in trying to iron out those details and trying to find a common solution.

So I guess, at least I hope, we're in good track to finally reach a common solution that will, of course, carry consensus and will be approved not only by the community but also by the Board, and hopefully the NTIA, as well.

So my call here for ALAC members that will be attending would be to, as I said, remain with an open mind. I think it's crucial that we at least set lists of issues that are those that we can live with and those that we can definitely not live with or live without, and from there, we can establish how flexible we will be able to be in the face-to-face meeting in LA. Thank you.

Alan, might you be on mute?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe Alan had to step away for a few minutes. Olivier, are you able to chair? He's asking [inaudible] Olivier. He's asking.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I am able to chair, yes. Can you hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Yes, we can. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Heidi. Next we have on the queue, we have Eduardo Diaz.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you, Olivier. I want to mention in the case of the CWG, the comment that Alan made about we [inaudible] solution in one day. Really, that's fine when that happens. We came back and sat and we saw the comments that were received, and they were many comments against doing this ContractCo I think that helped a lot to move the group in a different direction.

                           In this case, I haven't read the comments so far, but I imagine if there are not that many comments in pro or in favor of – in con or in favor of one thing or another, it will be create more discussion. But I have faith that there will be a positive outcome out of this meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Eduardo. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Leon, no, we will not reach a consensus. We must reach the consensus. We must. I don't think it will be a combination of the proposals. I think that we have to address each problem and we have to take one of them and correct or arrange what is not good and try to come up with the good model without problems. I don't believe in managing two or a combination of two proposals. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Any other comments on this? Julie Hammer?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Olivier. I might just make the comment that an organization such as SSAC's willingness potentially agree to a particular model is necessarily the same thing as saying that they're going to participate [in it] and I think both who've been deeply involved understand that, but I just make that point for others. So I think there's a difference between agreeing so that something can go forward but not necessarily believing it's something that a particular organization can participate in. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Julie. If I could just ask staff to unlock the scroll on ALAC [inaudible] PDF on the screen, please. I'll hand the floor back to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. One other comment that may be relevant. As I mentioned, the NRO on behalf of the regional registries have said they would prefer something far simpler and it specifically would prefer the designator model. That raises an interesting question. What position is the ASO going to take? Currently, the ASO is one of the three SOs who is being allocated votes.

The ASO never formally said, "Are they going to use them or not?" When asked, they sort of made cryptic comments. So I have requested that the chairs specifically ask the question, and the representative from the ASO said they will respond. If indeed the ASO is not going to participate, we then have the two SOs, both of which are names registries, and the ALAC.

That makes that whole model very tenuous, the whole current membership model. So there's a lot of things in play here. See how it goes out. Anyone else want to talk on the subject? And I don't quite know where you got to. Olivier, your hand is up. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Alan. And, of course, the Working Group or ALAC Working Group on ICANN Accountability and IANA Stewardship had a long discussion today about this forthcoming meeting in Los Angeles. It's important to note, and I think that all understood that this is not going to be a negotiation between the Board and the Cross-Community Working Group. At the same time, though, it really looks as though it's first steps for mutual understanding of the different proposals. Since

EN

you mentioned there is going to be a face-to-face meeting in Dublin, that's probably likely to be where any kind of last-ditch attempts to reconcile the two because it looks like two pretty different proposals, I guess.

I mean, the differences between the proposals make it pretty much two ways. That's where the heavy lifting is going to have to take place to get this understanding and this proposal out in time for the communities to be able to ratify this.

There are concerns about slippage. Time is passing by, but I guess this is still on course for Dublin, [isn't it]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well we're not likely to approve something in Dublin at this point, unless some miracle happens in Los Angeles. But it is conceivable we will come up close to Dublin. I'll have to issue another public comment and then close out six weeks after Dublin or something. That would still allow the timing to go ahead. That would presume the bylaw changes are really simple and can be approved quickly. Remember, there is a process by which we have to go through for bylaw changes, and that includes public comments. So the months start adding up.

Any other comments? I'll point out that the designator, the single community mechanism as a single designator, which we tossed out as a suggestion just before the Board had its say, and was largely ignored, is listed among the options that the lawyers are supposed to put into a matrix of relative powers.

EN

There is a lot of concern, certainly I have concern, that there Board proposal basically says that the AC and SO chairs will act on behalf of, and that has personal liability issues that might not go down really well. On the other hand, the community mechanism as a single designator could act, I think, as the legal persona to take action, whether it's with an IRP or a MEM, whatever that is, or something like that, and avoid the problems that we have with individuals acting on behalf of the ACs and SOs.

So that certainly is one of the reasons that I think it might be interesting. There are also a number of comments – and I have not read all of the comments, but I read selected ones, and there is some concern among some parties about the budget veto issues over and above our concern and the Board's concern. And, of course, the designator model does not have budget veto issues related to it.

Now that really upsets people who want the budget veto, but I think the statement is we live in interesting times. I don't know how this is going to play out. Anyone else want to weigh in on this? Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. And you mentioned the budget veto. I wasn't going to speak about it, but since you mentioned it, one concern I have when seeing some of the proposals in there is that there could be an indefinite budget veto. In other words, we can repeat your veto again and again and again, and to me, that sounds very much like a way to capture an organization, isn't it? Starving it of cash.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: It could be. Now you can only, under the current proposal, you can only veto twice in a given year, but I suppose you can go back the next year and do it again. But remember, the veto has to be exercised… For the second veto in a year, it has to be exercised by 75% of the community. So it's going to be something which is strongly felt. That doesn't make it right, but I'm saying it's not something a single AC or SO can do on its own.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Pay the community enough money and…

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. People might be able to be bought off. That's the whole concept of capture is money does speak in some cases. We don't like to talk about this. In the CWG, I raised the issue of the U.S. has battleships and ContractCo didn't. People didn't take that really well. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much. In Latin America, we have many countries which have had problems when voting the budget. And we started the year without having the budget approved. But there is written background and [inaudible] background where it is proof that if there is a problem with the budget, well, the budget to be used is the previous one. And I think this topic was already presented in some other meeting, in other meetings, but if there is a problem with the current budget, then the previous budget should be used. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. That is the case in the current proposal. That doesn't help, of course, if what the community wanted to do was lower the budget. If, for instance, income has decreased and the Board is insisting on continuing spending, ignoring the fact that it's not a balanced budget, that could be problematic. Using last year's budget just serves to reinforce what they want to do. So it's not a perfect solution and I'll point out that you're correct. Some countries have that rule.

Other countries – there's a little one called the U.S. – when they don't have a budget approved, they stop spending money and stop paying people. So different countries have different rules. Anyone else before we go on to the next item, which is At-Large planning for Dublin. We had allocated 30 minutes for that. We're running a little bit late, so to the extent that Leon and Gisella can reduce that a little bit, that would be appreciated. But over to you now.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. I will completely defer to Gisella on this, as usual. I just want to point out that [inaudible] on the budget issue, the rule for the ALAC volunteers working in ICANN is that we all work as if we were on default in the U.S., right?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. We all get paid exact [inaudible] in the U.S., when people are – what's the expression? Furloughed because they have no more

money, they don't work. they just stay home. You might remember during the last budget crisis in the U.S., the NTIA stopped working.

LEON SANCHEZ: Good. So Gisella, over to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Actually, I'm going to cover this because Gisella has done her excellent job by scheduling all of the meetings and putting them on the wiki pages, and now it is over to me to review your ALAC agendas. So what we're going to do today is only go through the ALAC agendas. That would be, again, Saturday, Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday.

But I do want to just also put an urgent reminder out to those people from the RALOs, the chairs, and the secretaries, as well as the charities of the working groups, please, if you have not done so already, please send your agendas for your meeting to staff by this Friday, the 25th. We're going to be sending all of the agendas to translation on that day, so if you do not send one, we will put in a placeholder, which is literally two points of introduction, discussion, and next steps. So that will be your agenda unless you send us one. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, before we go on to the details, maybe we can do a level set with all the ALAC members and RALO people on what days they're expected to be in Dublin. There has been a lot of confusion.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I was going to get into that.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I summarize before you get into it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just so it's all in one place. RALO chairs and me have events scheduled on Friday, and are therefore expected to arrive Thursday or early Friday. ALAC and RALO chairs have working sessions all day Saturday, and therefore, you are expected to arrive on Friday. The regular week, Sunday through Thursday, is for all regular attendees. That is ALAC, RALO chairs, RALO secretariats, and on Friday, there is a development session for which we have the new ALAC. So outgoing ALAC members are not participating in that.

Existing ongoing ALAC members and new ALAC members are participating on Friday, as well as the three mandated liaisons. So the week varies heavily from person to person. Please make sure that your travel arrangements coincide with what I just said. If you're not sure what it is, check with me or check with Heidi, and we'll make sure… If you got an invitation letter that was cryptic, and some of the invitation letters break down your days by budget item. Why you have to be concerned with an ICANN budget item, we don't know, but they are.

So some people have misinterpreted their travel invitations. Please make sure that they do correspond to what we just talked about. So chairs start on Friday, regular ALAC members and liaisons start on Saturday, secretariats start on Sunday, and the final Friday is for the new ALAC and liaisons. Thank you. Over to you, Heidi. Have we lost Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. I'm just going off of [inaudible]. Thank you, Alan, very much for that. Yes, I had wanted to cover that and did fantastic on that. Thank you. Please, if you're supposed to be at one of those meetings that Alan has discussed, and you have not been booked for those, please urgently contact At-Large staff and particularly me, because I'm in direct contact with constituency travel on that.

So Alan, if we can go through the agenda, is that [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please. Sorry for the change in direction.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. Actually, I did want to make sure that we covered that, so thank you. If we look to Saturday to begin with, and that is in the AC chat, the first day Saturday is, again, the two ALAC strategy and working sessions, part one and part two, and you'll see that it's going to be an introduction and then a review of At-Large activities in Dublin with goals. And the nice thing is if with this extra day that there's a little bit more time, so things hopefully will not be so compressed.

So as those who've gone through the leadership training program know that it's always very useful to have a strategy session at the start of the meeting so you can plan what you hope to achieve, and that's what that section is. Then, throughout the week, there are a couple of sessions that are just listed as hot policy topics, TBD (to be determined) and that is to allow the ALAC to set a closer date what they wish to discuss in those sessions.

So then moving on, there's going to be a lunch break on the Saturday and then in the afternoon, there will be a 90-minute session led by Beran on the proposed ALAC new meeting strategy schedule. Again, followed by another policy topic, TBD. Then what we have not had before, and I think it'll be useful to have a planning session for the meetings with the Board, ccNSO, GAC, NTSG, and SSAC. And those, again, considerable time for that.

And another new item that we're going to have at the end of the both Saturday and Sunday, the review, next steps, and housekeeping items. And that is [inaudible] does not need to speak [for] anyone else when informing people of important housekeeping events. And then at the end of the day, we have the At-Large Ad-Hoc Working Group, IANA Transition and Accountability, and we would expect – Olivier, that that's going to be right now just a placeholder agenda. Things will be determined after we send in the agendas to be translated.

So moving on to Sunday – and you can all get [inaudible] the top on Sunday from that Saturday session. Starting early at 8:00, we have the At-Large Review Working Party. And I believe that is the current agenda.

Then we start with the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session part one.

And again, this is currently in the traditional sessions with ICANN staff, and that's going to begin with Fadi. Just a note that these have not been conserved, so this is currently the plan. So we start with Fadi for just a few minutes. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, if I can interrupt. The Sunday was supposed to go without scrolling, so we can't look at it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So just 15 minutes with Fadi, and then we have a longer, a one-hour discussion with Global Stakeholder Engagement, and I'm seeing if David Olive can join us, as well. There's no senior management team that combines those two groups, and I think that would be more useful to have both directors of that, vice presidents of that.

And then we have Rinalia Abdul Rahim who's tentatively scheduled to speak with you on the CEO selection update between 10:30 and 11:00, followed then after the coffee break by a 45-minute discussion on

actually a longer discussion, from 11:15 to 12:30, on CCWG and IANA transition issues.

Then Alan, your lunchtime will be meeting the At-Large ALS Criteria and Expectations Taskforce, and then everyone will reconvene at 13:30 for the part two of the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session. That will start with a joint meeting of the NCSG on the proposed [inaudible] civil society.

Jean-Jacques Sahel [inaudible] Vice President for Europe will be joining the session. Then we have Nora Abusitta, who is the Vice President for Development and Public Responsibility Program, and she's going to be talking about what her department is doing, including, I believe, some very exciting new developments. And I hope you'll be taking part in.

Then we have a 30-minute session with the SSAC, and Julie Hammer is going to be moderating that. Then we have a session ALS Criteria and Expectations, followed by a meeting with the ccNSO, and that discussion is going to be [inaudible] or developed in the next week or two. Again, in closing item of review next steps and housekeeping.

Alan, before I continue, is that the kind of detail that you would like?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that's fine. You can just keep on going.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So I'm not seeing the AC room at the moment, if anybody has any comments. So then if you can [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I have my hand up for once you're finished.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So then let's go to Tuesday. So we're only doing the ALAC one. So what I would also ask that we do today is set some questions for the ALAC meeting with the Board and that meeting would be Tuesday, 8:30 to 9:30. Then we have between 9:45 and 10:45, a very detailed agenda. Thank you, Cheryl, for the At-Large Ad-Hoc ICANN Accessibility Working Group.

Followed by at 11:00 to 13:00 the ALAC work part one, and this is the normal update of working group, some working groups. And then we have Cheryl first, since she will have just come from that Accessibility Working Group meeting. Tijani, we have the New Capacity Building. We have Dev hopefully can call in with the ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement. We will Sandra, who will give an update on how the Leadership Training Program went, I believe, and next steps we're Academy Working Group.

And then we have the Subcommittee on Finance and Budget. And that particular session is actually to prepare for the next session immediately following, which is going to be an operation and budget update from Xavier Calvez, the ICANN CFO, and Carole Cornell. And that would be something to start thinking about what kind of special requests you would like to submit for this fiscal year '17 process.

Then, again, very long day. This is probably the longest day. We go right into a meeting at the ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce from 13:00 to 14:00, followed after that by back to work for the ALAC part two, and we have an update from Olivier on the just-held ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce meeting, and then we have a very exciting presentation by Ariel and people from the online community services with the rollout of the beta new At-Large website. And you're going to get a little preview of that later on today.

And then we have, again, 30 minutes of a policy hot topic followed by a 15-minute quick presentation by Stephane Van Gelder, the Chair of the 2015 NomCom and the 2016 Leadership Team. Then following with a 30-minute break, we have the ALAC and the GAC meeting that will allow you to get to the GAC room, and again, on the agenda today is the [inaudible] some topics for that.

We also have then just enough time to get back for the At-Large Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Transition of U.S. Government Stewardship of the IANA Function and Accountability. So Olivier again, we're likely going to have a placeholder agenda for you there. And then, Dev, we will have the very late call 19:00 to 20:00 for the ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement.

Then Thursday, just to let you know that, again, at the EURALO GA is most of the day on Wednesday, so if you have time, please come to that, even if you're not in EURALO. On Thursday, we start the wrap-up session at 10:30 to 12:30, and that is going to include a debrief of At-Large meetings at ICANN 54, what worked, what should change, and

then significant time for decisions, and then interactions with the NomCom.

And then on Friday the 23rd, there's going to be the traditional ALT. That's the new ALT team, and that's going to invite David Olive as well as Steve Crocker. And then there's going to be the ALAC Development Session. Again, as Alan mentioned, that is only for incoming and continuing ALAC members and liaisons. And that is going to be facilitated an Insight Learning person, who is going to be actually one of the facilitators for the Leadership Training Program, and she has been in contact and in discussions with the ALT on the kind of session that's going to be, and we're expecting her to send the preliminary agenda shortly.

And I think that's it, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:　　Thank you very much. Just for clarity, the ALT meeting at the beginning of Friday is open as they generally are. The development session, however, is closed. We're just trying to build a team and we feel it's important to just have the right people there.

A couple of comments before we open it up wider. This meeting is different in a number of ways. First of all, we fought hard to get the Saturday session. We don't know what's going to happen with that in the new meeting format, but at this point, we do have this meeting and in Marrakech.

That should have given us a lot more time to have substantive discussions. Unfortunately, the accountability issue has been scheduled for a significant chunk of that scattered throughout the week. The other thing we did in an attempt to make time available was circulate a list of all groups and speakers that we've had in recent years, and asked, "Who do you want to see?"

Unfortunately, there were very few that most people didn't say we need them. So we ended up with an equal or larger number of speakers and visitor sessions than we normally have. I thought the methodology, since last time we had gotten a fair number of complaints from people who said, "I thought such and such a session was useless," that we would have gotten more people being picky as to who they wanted to invite.

But we invited most everyone that we normally do invite. The other issue is the conference center is not open before 8:00 in the morning generally. So although we don't like 7:00 AM meetings, we have scheduled a number in the past. So although we bought an extra day at considerable cost – travel cost that is – much of it has disappeared. So that's life and I don't think we can do anything about it at this point. And I will add the caveat that the schedule as Heidi described it is a work in progress, and as it becomes clearer what's happening with accountability, that may change significantly.

So don't print off your schedules and assume they're not going to change. And that's all I have. Anyone else want to have any questions, comments, whatever? As you might guess, there's an awful lot of work

that goes into planning these meetings, and we do look for input from people so [inaudible].

No comments? No questions? We do have an item on the agenda, which we will not talk about in detail right now. But that says we are looking for comments for topics for the Board, for the GAC, for the GSE team. The Board are the most formal ones because we have to give it to them in some detail ahead of time, and I'm looking for input on that.

Again, there was some criticism of what we did last time. Let's come up with new things. And we don't seem to have anyone sticking a hand up right now, so put it on your to-do list and come up with thoughts of what we should be doing in these various sessions where we're interacting.

The next session – and we are almost exactly on time. We had scheduled five minutes for Ariel to do a review of the web. I had hoped to have a little bit more time. Can I ask ahead of time is there anyone who's going to raise any other business?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan…

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I just realized we're behind time right now because we haven't done session seven.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We still have – exactly. Yes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So we are tight. Ariel, you have five minutes. Sorry.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. Five minutes is enough, because I do not want to spoil the fun in Dublin to show you guys too much about the websites, so we're just going to show a little bit as a teaser. So first, I want to thank all of the ALAC members and RALO leaders that participated in the brainstorm session with us in August, and we discussed about the potential RALO page and now we have a mockup that we can show you and now I want to present this mockup to you and solicit some input.

                       Can you all see my screen?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. So as you can see, this is the mockup for the RALO page and we developed this structure to a tab structure and you can easily go to other RALO page to look at their content. And now we're looking at the EURALO's page. And on the left, we have the navigation. So the top, we have the EURALO leaders and we want to make it very easy for user to

EN

see their name, their profile, and also be able to contact them. So these icons you see, they're all clickable.

And below the leadership, we have the EURALO members that would direct a user to the EURALO ALS and individual member page, and I will show you that after this. So we make it very easy for people to check the ALSes.

And after that will be some hot links that create the gateway between the website and the wiki, and we organized the information based on the feedback we got from you during the calls and also we have conducted our surveys. We think these are the important information people want to know about EURALO.

So, for example, the first category of the information is about the meeting and events, and we want to be able to link out to relevant wiki page for further information. And then we also have organizing documents below that so that people can easily find the bylaws and operating principles. And also, we want to link out to the monthly report of RALOs, and that can potentially serve as a newsworthy item to be promoted on the website.

And the next is if the RALOs, they have capacity building related abilities, we want to create that connection to their Webinar or briefing pages, and we also know each RALO has their promotional brochure and this is also a section we can link out to. And at the end, if RALOs they have policy input work – for example, AFRALO has written many statements – this is another section that we can link out to the statements.

So basically, the [inaudible] navigation create that connection between the wiki and the web, and we want to make it very easy for people to navigate the information.

And then on the right is more kind of a highlighted items, and on the top, we have a brief blurb about what the RALO is and, of course, we will have the RALO's slogan here as well.

And on this section called ALS Spotlight is that we want to create opportunity for each RALO, any ALSes they want to talk about their mission and their activities, they want to give them that space to do so. But this is not just limited to highlighting ALSes. This can also [use] space to highlight other events going on in the RALO. And under this section, we have some type of feed, kind of like newsfeed that shows what's going on in the RALO and the first item you see is upcoming meeting. EURALO monthly meeting.

And this will integrate with the Google Calendar for At-Large. So if a user click on the title, ideally, a Google popup window will show and then you can read more about that event and add it to a calendar. So we want to make it very dynamic. And then we also have a section for RALOs to make announcement. For example, this time we're talking about this example title ICANN 56 showcase call for volunteers.

So if a RALO wants to make announcement, we give that space for doing that, and then you can add a photo to grab a user's attention. And then after that, we'll do some other kind of newsworthy item can be promoted, and this purple icon you see indicates [background noise. Thank you. Thanks for taking care of it.

I said the purple icon is indicates if a RALO developed a statement or some document, we also can highlight it here. And other information [curates] here. They're based on the time when the information was produced and they also have their natural expiration date. So after certain period, they will disappear from the feed.

But they're all housed under a bigger category on the website. So if it's an event, then we'll house under the calendar, and if it's not, then will house under the news page. So they all have their own home for information, and those information will not get lost after a while.

So this is overview for this RALO page and we also have some "would like" items, for example, if we want to showcase the RALO activities in photos, and maybe in the future we have a Flickr account for the RALOs, we can integrate that with this website. And we can even make the meeting page more dynamic by adding those fine print highlighted here, so a person can download the transcripts or recordings or agenda directly from the website.

But these I would like and maybe in the future we'll roll out these features. So I just want to take a moment and see if there's any comments or questions. And by the way, Laura Bengford is with us and she's also happy to answer questions you may have.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hand up.

ARIEL LIANG: Cheryl, you have a comment?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just briefly. I suppose it's a predictable question. We have got this compliance for at least a good level of disability accessibility, have we?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. And Laura, do you want to answer Cheryl's question? Maybe Laura has some audio issue, but [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

LAURA BENGFORD: Hello. Yes, Cheryl, we are very mindful of the accessibility and along with [Jeff's] earlier comments on responses, we have some further testing to do with that, and that is built into the project that you're already aware of with Simply Accessible in Portland, which we're just starting out with.

So we are mindful of that and we will be keeping that in mind as they develop going forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Laura. I'd have been surprised with any other response from you and Ariel, I must say. Just one thing, Ariel, in the future planning, is it going to be possible for some of the social network feeds that some of our ALSes are running to run on the RALO page? I don't want an answer on that now, I'm just aware that a few ALSes do have their own social

network feeds running and it might be interesting to see whether that can populate some of the newsworthy space, as well. And other than that, great.

It's a pity I can't see it. I'm looking forward to Dublin.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a comment on accessibility. I would like to think the people we have working on this project are not sufficiently masochistic as to not be looking at accessibility as we go forward. That's just a hope. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. One more thing is regarding accessibility, being mobile accessible is also a goal for our website. And now you can see how the RALO page will behave on iPad, with tablets. This is on the [last], and this is how it will behave on a smartphone. So we take that into consideration, as well.

And thanks, Cheryl, for that social media tip. And this is in our plan to incorporate that and for the ALS page lead, we'll provide an opportunity, too. So if there's no further comment, I would just show the ALS page mockup very quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, we're really running out of time, I'm afraid.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. No, we don't show that, and you just wait and see in Dublin. Thanks, all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just an editorial comment. I hope it's not only mobile accessible, but mobile usable, rather. One regularly comes across websites that nominally are mobile accessible but they're bloody useless. So I'm hoping this will not be one of them. All right.

We are going into an in-camera session where we're looking for ALAC members and liaisons. Everyone else we ask politely to drop off both Adobe Connect and the bridge. We will report back at the end of the meeting as to the outcomes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The recording back on. If you'd be so kind as to confirm. Yes, recording is back on. Thank you. Is back online.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The ALAC has just met in camera in confidentiality to select the people for the Leadership Training Program prior to Dublin. The ALAC had already approved Seun Ojedeji as the candidate for AFRALO. That was done several weeks ago to make sure he could get a visa in time.

The candidate for APRALO will be Maureen Hilyard. For EURALO, it is Yrjo Lansipuro. For NARALO, it is Judith Hellerstein. And for LACRALO, we are recommending Harold Arcos, who's the new ALAC member just elected. There is a chance that Harold will not be able to make it because of visa issues, and we are going to monitor that carefully and check with the LACRALO leadership for what fallback position we might take if it becomes obvious early enough that he will not be able to attend, or at least not be able to attend the Leadership Training Program.

And that's the summary of what happened in the closed session. I think we have done everything else, including the lack of AOB, so at this point, I'll call the meeting to an end. Thank you, all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, all. Bye.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, everyone. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call. Have a good morning, evening, and day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]