
GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you Alan. We will now start the recording. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly meeting on Tuesday, the 28th of July at 19:00 UTC.

We have quite a large attendance today. On the English channel we have Alan Greenberg, Beran Gillen, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Olivier Créplin-Leblond, Vanda Scartezini, Garth Bruen, Juan Manuel Rojas, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Siranush Vardanyan, Eve Edelson, Ali AlMeshal, Leah Symekher, Garth Graham, Allan Skuce, Sébastien Bachollet, Judith Hellerstein, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, John Laprise, Lutz Donnerhacke, Daniel Nanghaka.

On the French channel we have Hadja Ouattara.

On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambronero, Carlos Vera, Aida Noblia, and Alberto Soto.

On the Russian channel we have Oksana Prykhodko.

We also have our liaison Ron Sherwood with us today.

Apologies notes from Sandra Hoferichter, Eduardo Diaz, and Didier Kasole.

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

We have French, Russian, and Spanish interpretation today. If I could please also remind everyone to state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but also to allow our interpreters to

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.

identify you on the other language channels. And if you could please speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

I hope I haven't left anyone off of the roll call. If I have, if you would be so kind as to speak up now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe you left León off.

GISELLA GRUBER: León Sanchez, my apologies. León is noted, and I now hand it over to you. Thank you. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have a rather packed agenda and we have a very full house today. I'm not quite sure what the occasion is, which has caused so many people to join us today, but I'm delighted and I hope it continues.

The first item is the adoption of the agenda and call for any other business. Is there anyone who has a comment on the agenda?

Hearing nothing, seeing no hands, at least I think there are no hands. Ah, and Garth has a hand. Go ahead Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I just wanted to make note of the work that I've been sending out to the list about the compliance function and the

relationship to the domains division. I want to fit that in somewhere, at some point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We'll note that under any other business. Hold on.

If you can give me a moment on it. Any other comments? Then we will start the meeting.

The first item on the agenda past adoption of the agenda is, review of any other action items requiring the ALAC. And I believe, at this point, and I'll ask staff to confirm, there are no items which require the focus of the ALAC at this point. Is that correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi Alan. This is Heidi. That is correct.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you very much. The next item is the policy development activities. And we've allocated more time on this one than usual because in addition reviewing the items that are currently active, I would also like to have a discussion of how we are carrying out this process, because as some of you aware, perhaps all of you are aware, it's not working very well right now.

But first I would like, if I could ask staff to go over any of the items that are currently in process, and review their current status. Heidi or Ariel is going to do that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That would be Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Hello everyone. This is Ariel speaking. I will just going through the statement that is in progress. And recently, we have drafted a statement that Olivier draft a statement, in response to the public comment, draft report to review off the GNSO. And I just pasted the link in the chat.

So the comment period for this statement is extended until Friday this week, and we have finishing [inaudible] commenting, in we're in the process of finalizing a statement. And ALAC will ratify this statement shortly. So that's the first one...

ALAN GREENBERG: Ariel, may I get in for a moment. It's Alan speaking. The comment period on this one has been extended twice, and our original intent was to ratify it after the fact, to make sure that we had the absolute maximum time for discussion of the item, and make sure everyone is happy on it.

I think we'll continue that intent, and that is ratify it after the fact, give people another few days to look at it. It's a very lengthy comment. It has a lot of substance to it, but more important, it's really important. We have been a strong critic, at times, of the GNSO, and the fact that it does not necessarily lend itself to looking at user, at things from a user perspective.

And this is our opportunity to comment on it. So I really do suggest everyone read it. We're not in the position to make extensive changes right now, but if someone notes something that we've really missed, then, or for that matter, note something that they really strongly disagreed with, make your position known. The Wiki is still open for comments.

As normal, we don't necessarily make a change in a statement because one person has an objection, your issues will be considered and in most cases, we do address statements because of it. So, take this opportunity, and I'm taking the opportunity to say this, with a lot of people on the call, take a look at the statement and see to what extent you believe it reflects what you think we need in the GNSO for the coming five years or so, because this is the kick of the can so to speak, the opportunity to make changes.

Ariel, back over to you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks Alan. This is Ariel for the record. So the second statement that is in progress is the statement on the public comment for proposal for Armenian script in root zone label generation rules. And we have one [inaudible] from the Armenian community, volunteered to draft a statement on this.

So that's another one in progress, and I also put the link in the chat. And besides that, we have two other public comments that we haven't decided whether we're going to draft statements on. One is the GNSO

translation and transliteration [inaudible] information PDP, recommendation for the Board consideration.

And that comment period will end August 10th. And another one is the next generation gTLD registration directory services to replace WHOIS preliminary issues. And that one we are already solicited comment from certain community members, and they reviewed the report, and they put something on the work space, and also I'm going to put the link in the chat.

And I believe that's the important public comment we need to consider.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Thank you very much Ariel. First of all, I was negligent on the previous item, on the GNSO paper. I commented on how extensive it was, and how important it is. I forgot to mention that it was Olivier who has been drafting and taking charge of that statement and integrating community comments, and I think he has done an excellent job on that.

So I think we need to give our thanks, even though the actions are not complete, for the work that's gone into this. There is an ALAC leadership team meeting on Thursday. And we will be making decisions at that point on the open statements, on the statements where we haven't made a formal decision yet.

So if anyone has any strong feelings on those, please make your position known. Either be on the meeting, or make your position known to the leader from your RALO.

All right. The substantive issue, and there is a discussion paper that is pointed to at the bottom of item four, and if we can have that in the window please. At this point, we used to be doing a moderately good job of statements and getting them done in time, and voting on them. Recently, for a variety of reasons, sometimes for very good reasons, such as the CWG and CCWG comments, where we went down to the last moment on creating the comments, and we did that quite deliberately, on others we have simply slipped.

And we haven't even got to the point of even starting to draft a statement until very, very close to the deadline. And that's a combination of things. In some cases, we haven't made a decision to do a statement early enough. In other cases, the person who is identified and volunteered to do it has not allocated the time to do it properly.

And regardless of the reason, I think we have to get better at it. We have to get to the point where, for the majority of our statements, we only draft a statement if there is really something important to say. And once we make that decision, that it actually gets done in enough time for the ALAC, and people from At-Large, throughout the community, to have a chance to look at it and comment, and to have it changed.

So we, the document is being uploaded as we speak.

Now I'm not going to go over it in great detail. If we can have scrolling, so people can make it larger.

Could we have control of the document please? Thank you very much. So at least I can see it, if the rest of you can't. There are a number of suggestions there as to things that we should be doing and time we

should allow. And I think I want to focus a little bit on the first one, and that is, if we're going to do a statement, then we really need a draft about two weeks before it's due. That gives a good week of comment period, and opportunity to revise the statement, and then to vote on it.

Given that virtually all comments, and there are a few exceptions, allow at least 40 days, that means we really have to make a decision and get something drafted within about 25 days. That shouldn't be a strain. If it is, then I think we have to look at whether, why we're drafting statements on it, and what we have to say.

So, we're going to start working towards this new target and pushing people. If you volunteer for something, then we expect people to actually deliver. However, at the same time, we really need to get more people involved in drafting statements. And to that end, we are going to be looking at a number of techniques to try to help people get started in doing this.

We will be having, I think, at least one webinar to discuss what we're looking for in a statement, what we expect of the drafter, and we will also be working with staff to do editorial work on statements so people don't have to necessarily be, you know, be authors, and be able to do things in the perfect form.

The real responsibility of the drafter is to get the ideas out, and make sure they integrate ideas from the rest of the community. So I would like people to take a good look at this document. There is a whole bunch of ideas. One of the things we'll also be doing, if you scroll through it, you'll see is, ICANN puts together a list of projected future

comments. And it goes out about a year, and we're going to be looking at those, and to the extent possible, identifying which ones we think we will have to have a statement on, trying to identify the pen holder, the person responsible for the statement ahead of time, and hopefully they can start their work even before the public comment is officially announced.

So we're going to be attacking this from a whole number of different fronts, to try to make sure that when an ALAC comes out with a statement, it is something that has been carefully drafted, considered by the community, and that we've done that with adequate time for all of the [inaudible].

I'm going to stop talking for a bit. Does anyone have any thoughts on this? I don't think I'm the only one who has been upset that we've been so late at getting these statements done recently. And how successful these plans will be remains to be seen, but I think we have to try. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a thought. First of all, I've probably been guilty of a couple of [inaudible] myself. Do you think it would be possible for some of us, [inaudible] a complex statement, to have something like a webinar or something... I know [inaudible]... to the comment in the document.

But sometimes the actual issue is a little bit difficult, and I'm just wondering it can be a way to get involved people?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think if you look at the document, you'll see the last bullet on the first page, says we should consider webinars to brief the community on important statements, and to solicit further input. If that's what you have in mind, I think it's a good idea.

I mean, obviously however... Yeah. I will note however, that there is a danger in that. If we're going to schedule a webinar, we have to do it typically in a few weeks ahead of time. That means when someone is committing to have a statement ready, they're going to have to really do it, because otherwise we'll have no material for the webinar when everyone shows up. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thank you. This is Dev Anand speaking. Well first to point out that, for the At-Large improvements that were approved in 2012, it contained a process called how policies are processed and approved. And I put a link in the chat there, and in essence, it was very detailed with a lot of flowcharts, but essentially, two things, there were two things.

One, decisions were made 10 days about the policies that were for comment, specifying things that [inaudible] whether the ALAC decides, whether to submit the comment...

[AUDIO BREAKUP]

...comment deadline. If whether to assign a standing working group, or ad-hoc working group to create the draft, and to decide whether a briefing call was needed. And if so, request one. And then nine days

before the deadline, and so forth. I posted a link in the chat. And I realize, in a sense, we probably have not really done it.

The second aspect of the At-Large improvements was that there was supposed to be a policy review committee, or PRC. And the PRC would make the decision as to, you know, not just the ALAC, but the PRC would be the ones that would try to decide whether to raise, you know, comments on a policy, or also policies, or to raise issues from the community, for the ALAC to consider.

Since we never fully implemented this, what was supposed to be an improvement, I just thought that perhaps each of us studied what was supposed to be improvements, and see whether that could be tested out. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a few comments, but I'll go to Olivier next.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I'll defer to you since your comments, response is [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess my first comment is, Dev may well be the only remembered that document was there, because I didn't. And he's right, we never did implement it. Looking at it right now, I would identify a number of problems with it. Number one, 10 days is a significant part of

the comment period, and we probably should do our best not to take that much time to make a decision.

And I guess I have an aversion to creating new committees and groups if we don't really need them. And you'll see the discussion papers that I put, that I was discussing before, is talking about the ALT and the liaisons as the people who are probably in a position to make the decision, or know who to reach out to look at the particular subject, and give a judgment call.

So my inclination is to probably do it on a more ad-hoc way than going back to a document drafted, you know, five years ago or so and trying to implement it, since for whatever reason, we never did it then. But on the other hand, we have been much better at it over the last few years than we are right now.

And so I think we have something to fix, not only something to invent. But Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I was going to comment on the thing about webinars. I wonder whether there might be an interest in this community, for a webinar about policy development in ICANN, which could cover both the PDP, the public policy development process, to [inaudible] might seem a bit like a black box [inaudible].

And then also the At-Large policy development or at least, comment development, that might [inaudible] and answer a few questions from

people. And it might also raise the profile of policy development and that we need to engage.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. On the former part of describing the policy development process, certainly within the gTLD, I actually have a presentation I did at the leadership training program last year, which there is, we can actually schedule into a webinar, and that would fit very well.

In terms of the ALAC and the At-Large policy development, the comment development, I am suggesting, well I say we because this paper has been discussed by the ALT already, and we are suggesting that we do have a webinar on the ALAC process, the At-Large process, and how people can get involved. So I think both of your ideas are excellent. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thanks. This is Dev again. Just to point out something regarding the PRCs, the idea behind the PRC was that it would not include the ALAC or the ALT certainly, but it would also include things such as subject matter experts, and the, I would say the working group chairs, to be involved in, during the policy comment schedule.

And deciding to issue a comment or not. So it's not like a totally new committee as such.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I think that's something worth discussing. And could I ask for an action item from staff on further discussion of a webinar on policy development?

Initially on the GNSO policy development process, but and after that, we'll look at, once we have our own process down pat a little bit better, we'll talk more about how to get people involved in it. But initially just the webinar on the GNSO PDP.

All right, certainly please people, if you could read this document, at you leisure, tell us what's wrong with it. It's just a bunch of ideas tossed out there, and let's see what we can do to make this process really work.

The next item is the ALS applications. And before we do that, I'm told we have a couple of people from new ALSs online. And if any of them would like to say hello and introduce themselves, I'm not going to embarrass you by calling you out and forcing you to, but if anyone from any of our new ALSs would like to speak, you need to put your hand up if you are in the Adobe Connect, or just speak up, and we'll give you a moment or so.

Anybody? We have Heidi. Are you a new ALS Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

No. But I was going to...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let her tell you about At-Large.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I have a lot to learn. So I just wanted to let everyone know that we did hold the first of the ALS At-Large onboarding webinars a couple of weeks ago. It was very successful. We had, I believe, seven members. And we will be holding the next webinar with the ALAC chair and the RALO chairs, next week, or in two weeks I believe, to continue that process.

And we have also set up the At-Large new ALS help site, which has some activity as well. So welcome very much everyone, and we hope that you continue to be engaged actively. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And I see we have another new At-Large member, Alberto Soto would like to speak. That's a joke. Alberto is not a new member. Alberto is chair of LACRALO.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you Alan. I want to speak on behalf of Milo Paraison, who is our new ALS in Haiti. Evidently, Milo has serious problems to get online, but I would like to remind all of us here today, that in Haiti these ALS, I mean, there is no Adobe in Haiti. So that is why he cannot log on and he cannot get onto the call.

So we're trying to solve this issue with the staff. It's evidence that Milo does have problems to get online, to connect with us, he may have some trouble using the Adobe Connect. I am certainly going to work with him on that. But then on behalf of everybody, I want to say that

we welcome him, because I really don't know if he's listening to us.
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Alberto, and I think we can all agree on that.
Anything else regarding new ALSs?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we'll go on to the next item. And the next item is another one that we're allowing more time than usual. That is reports from the RALOs, the liaisons, and the working groups. To start with, as is our normal request, is there anyone who has submitted a report that would like to highlight anything?

I will note that Julie Hammer, who normally is on these calls and our liaison to SSAC, has asked if she could, instead of doing this, go on to one of the accountability sessions that's going on in parallel, since that is... At the session that I would normally attend if I wasn't chairing here, I would suggest that it would be a good idea for at least one of our people were on that call. So she is not here to present her own report or comments, but is working on our behalf at an unreasonable time in her part of the world anyway.

HOLLY RAICHE:

It's 5:00.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well some of us consider 5:00 unreasonable, Holly. We have several hands. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Dev speaking. Just a note, something regarding the ALAC subcommittee on outreach and engagement. The call for new members have started, and I urge anyone to contact their RALOs, and ask for members to join the working group. We have a lot of work that needs to be done. And one of the [inaudible] is that we have to develop an outreach strategy for all of the five regions, and submit that to global stakeholder engagement for approval.

If we do not submit outreach strategies by September 10th, then At-Large will be denied funding for CROPP. So we need to get those outreach strategies developed, and we have a short time to do it. So that's my key point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Dev. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question. Part of a lot of my involvement actually is in the GNSO working groups, do you want those as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not unless you have something very specific to report, no. Normally we don't report on those. You're free to if something crucial is coming up, but normally I would think, if it's an issue of real relevance, we should put on the agenda as a separate item.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Alan. Just very briefly. Maureen for the record. First of all, no GNSO Counsel meeting this month, so the report is very brief, and it's online. And also just following up on Dev's request, re the outreach and engagement request for more volunteers. I too would like some feedback from anyone who would have like to contribute to the new meeting strategy group that we've got, where we're looking at ideas for outreach for next year's meetings.

There is a work space and I'm sure that someone will put them up and we can get some feedback on that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that is an item later on, on our agenda.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Right now we have, we're going to have a pop quiz. I don't normally do quizzes on these calls, but today we're doing one. I'd like

to see a tick mark from those on Adobe, for everyone who diligently every month reads all the reports that are posted.

We have Dev, does that. Okay, how about even, anyone who reads some of the reports posted?

Olivier, Glenn, Holly...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am not on the Adobe, so I read some.

ALAN GREENBERG: You read some of them. Okay. We have a fair number that read some, very few admit to reading all. And now I have a separate question. For those of you who read reports, how easy is it to get to them?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Would ruckus laughter do?

[CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: We will record ruckus laughter from Australia, because I heard at least two different laughs from Australia there. No, no, I'm... The question really was serious. I think we have a fair amount of work, and I will be tasking staff with a fair amount of work, to clean up the report structure. Just looking at what we have right now in this agenda, of the

first two links that point to the same place, and the third link that points to a different representation of the same information.

And to get to the sum of the reports, you have to click about five times to get down to the report. So I think we have some work to do to clean up the process, but more than that, when you actually read the reports, some of them are rather discouraging. We have some RALOs that all they do is hold monthly meetings and go to ICANN meetings.

We have reports from other entities that are similarly discouraging. And the whole concept of having RALOs, or working groups, or things, is that we actually do stuff, not only write reports that document that we're doing. And I think we really are going to have to start looking, not only looking at the reports to read them, but looking at them with some judgment as to, do we need to fix the core processes under it.

We are looking at ALS and RALO responsibilities. And over the next few months, we have a working group or a taskforce that will be looking at that. But that's only part of the answer. And I think, I guess I would like to have everyone look at the reports that we're doing, and look at them critically. And if you were looking at these from outside of At-Large, if you weren't the people writing them, but you were the people judging us, as we will have an external examiner judging us, how satisfied would you be that the money that has been invested in At-Large...?

And I know that people don't like the concept of cost benefit analysis, but nevertheless, what is being invested in At-Large? Are we getting a good return on it? Are we actually mobilizing the world wide community that we are expecting to do? So I'm asking everyone, and

we have a good sampling of people on this call from very experienced ALAC members to people brand new to the structures, to look at what we're documenting.

And are we doing a good job? And if not, how can we fix the problem? There is no point in just criticizing other people, but we really need ideas on how we can start doing something more effectively. So I'm not going to preach any more than that, and we've used up more than our time on this subject.

But I would like people to take the time to look at some of these reports, and reflect. Is this accurately reporting what is going on? Because in some cases, you know, I happen to know that there are some RALOs that are doing some decent work, but if there is no report being filed for the last three months, it's really hard to tell.

And in other cases, reports are being filed, they don't necessarily have a lot of substance in it. So, take a look at it, not so much as judging the report writing skills of our people, but are we really demonstrating that we're doing good work.

Again, it's a critical exercise. Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima for the record. Thank you Alan. Just to make a brief comment in connection to the report, and one report in particular, which is the report we need to, during ICANN meetings. In several opportunities I said, I do not agree with those reports, and actually do not do those reports, because I believe that those are not good reports.

They do not have a good quality. You cannot attend the meeting and do good reports of what is going on during the meetings. This is not possible. You do not have sufficient time, instead of showing reports that maybe insufficient, or that do not allow to convey what was really going on during the meeting, it's no use to spend those resources in those reports.

That is what I believe, in connection to those reports. Now with respect to the [inaudible] own reports and the working groups, it is a bit difficult sometimes because we could not attend the meeting, or attend the sessions, or we don't really know what happened, other than what is written in those reports. So that is why, this is what we are asking about this.

Just this very brief comment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Anyone else has any comments on this? I notice there are things going on in the chat, but... Anyone else like to speak? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices... We have Dev and then Judith.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

This is Dev Anand speaking. So to Fatima, I'm a little bit disappointed, because those persons actually put effort into working group reports, it's kind of frustrating when nobody gets them, which kind of like is a self-repeating cycle, because then it's like, well, why should I bother putting my effort into writing the reports when nobody is reading it?

So I would suggest that we do take a look at these reports. And I think actually the RALOs themselves need to really look at these working group reports, and then pick those topics for presentation or review during their monthly RALO meetings. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Dev. Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. I guess we're talking about the daily reports, from where we were attending sessions at Buenos Aires? And for, I understand Fatima's question, I had the same issue. But if we could write, I wrote my report after I attended it, like the next day. So they're behind the day, but at least people could follow and comment, or something like that.

And I think writing them on the same day, and having them, the daily reports, and maybe we could just have them like, try to make daily, but not make them put your input on those sessions that you attended, at least a day or two after that. So we can [inaudible] with people while they're still there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Judith. The original topic was not on the reports from ICANN sessions, but that is what Fatima was talking about. And I do have a comment when I come up in the list about that also. Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yes, thanks. Glenn for the record. I want to point out Dev's report is very unique. One particular reason why it's so good, not only did he do a great job, the three of us were started on feedback to make a really good working group report, but I think what Dev did, is he went back to the ATLAS 2 recommendations, and each and every one that we worked on for the past six months, he circled the wagons and he, you know, he actually went through each and every one.

So as something, if we're looking for examples of working group reports, I think there is, you know, honoring the work that everyone did at ATLAS 2 in London, I think Dev has really, I think he puts the high water mark for everybody. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Glenn. A couple of thoughts. In the chat, Garth asks, "Who are we trying to please? Some external critic, or are we trying to do useful things?" I think the answer is we're trying to do useful things. And, but at the same time, if they are useful, they're likely going to look to use external critics. If they have virtually nothing in them, then they're not likely to be critically useful to the community, nor are they likely to impress someone externally.

So the reason for the report is functional, is to actually serve our own needs, but they should in parallel, serve things, other needs as well. I'll make a couple of comments. I was GNSO liaison for eight years. And over that period of time, I went through periods where I didn't do very good reporting, to be quite candid, and other times I meticulously reported on things.

And uniformly, I could not tell from the reactions, which month it was or which year it was. I would very rarely get any comments, and certainly there were virtually never any comments on the Wiki for any of the reports I did, regardless of how detailed they were, or how sparse they were or non-existent they were. So, that's somewhat disappointing. Someone can put hours of work into these reports. So that's one of the reasons why I started off by saying who actually reads them.

And lastly, with regard to Fatima's comment, although this topic was not focused on those reports, I think it's interesting that we expect our liaisons to participate actively in meetings, and at the same time, report on them. But that's perceived to be too difficult for other people. So I think we need to have a set level of expectations of people.

And last comment to Judith and then we'll go on to the next subject.

Judith, you put your hand down. All right. Onto the next subject then. The next one we had 20 minutes allocated for the discussion of the stewardship transition, which essentially is nothing, I don't think there is anything major to discuss, and accountability.

We're running a little bit late, but I think we need to spend a little bit of time on it. First of all, to update you where we are, as you know, the draft accountability report came out before Buenos Aries, there was a public comment to which the ALAC submitted a very extensive statement. There were meetings held in Buenos Aries, which changed to a fair amount the focus of where we were going with the accountability taskforce.

There was a two day meeting in Paris where the whole landscape changed again, that is we scrapped the ways we were looking at things, and came up with yet another model, which generally people are moderately satisfied with. And we, the various working groups are now furiously drafting text, so that a new document for proposal, for public comment can be issued at the end of this week.

So I don't think we're going to be able to go over all of the details, but I will put León on the spot. I think León is still on the call.

LEON SANCHEZ: I am here, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And I'm wondering if you could just, not summarize the details, but sort of just go over a laundry list of things that we are finalizing, if nothing else, to impress people with how much work is being done.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, of course, I can do that Alan. This is León Sanchez. Well there are lots of things happening in parallel at this stage in the CCWG accountability working group. And we are finalizing, at this stage, our second version of our proposal, of our report, to publish it by the beginning, or by the end of this month. And this will be to collect comments on second public comment period.

And at this stage, we are refining a couple of things like, for example, the corporate model that we want to propose. We have gone through

different models proposed. We were at first proposing membership model, then we were going through an empowered designator model, now we are going with the model that seems to have the most support amongst the community. Is sole member model, which also work in parallel with the community council, for lack of a better word to call it.

But we are in the process of defining, or refining, how this all will fit into place. And we are also trying to define whether the second ACs and SOs will have golden powers among this, or within this community assembly, how these powers will be exercised, the different weights of these votes are going to be weighed.

So we're, as you can see, we're doing different things. We're also refining how we are going to incorporate the affirmation of commitment into the bylaws. We are trying to refine, for example, how we are going to take care of human rights within the bylaws. Are we going to reference to human rights in the bylaws.

Are we going to see if this is a work stream two issue? And just have reference into the bylaws to international law with regards to human rights. We are also trying to deal concerns from the governmental advisory committee, and we have a lot of things travelling in here, at this point. But I think we're very close to finalizing this second version of our report.

We have been going through many calls in the last days. And for example, we had one call today, and we will be having a general call tomorrow. No, I mean Thursday. And in the meantime we are also having calls from the different working parties, working party one and

working party two, have been very busy. Also the working party on stress tests, which Cheryl Langdon-Orr leads that work. They have been very active in this age.

And well, this would be a very brief summary of what we're doing, at this stage, at the CCWG, and we're working, willing or aiming at least to publish our second draft, as I said, the first day or the second day of next month. Back to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I've got a couple of comments. But I see John has his hand up. Joh, do you want to speak or do you want me to read out your comment.

Please read, okay. John says, John Laprise, said the dot Africa reported noted, but did not investigate ICANN potentially failing to follow its own policy. Why should we expect ICANN to follow policy developed to the hard work that a CCWG? It's a very good question. The answer, I think, is that we're putting process in place where the community, if it is significantly dissatisfied can take action.

We will have the ability to, among other things, remove Board members, remove the whole Board, veto budgets, and a significant number of other actions, that will hopefully compel the Board to in fact do things better. Moreover, we are rewriting the reconsideration process so it would be more effective. And we are redesigning the external review process, comparable to the one used by the dot Africa scenario.

And the review process will, in fact, be, at least in some cases, binding upon the Board. So there is a lot going on here. Now, that being said, there are a lot of examples where people say, ah, the Board did something horrible. And when you look at it in detail, there are parts of the community that feel the Board did something horrible. There are typically other parts of the community that are absolutely delighted.

So clearly, if we are going to, as a community take actions against actions of the Board, or staff, then it's going to have to be something that, indeed, the community is pretty united on, because the thresholds for taking these kind of actions are moderately high. But should we come to a situation where there is a high level of dissatisfaction, there will be actions that can be taken, moreover there are other processes in place, and we expect the external review process, the IRP, and the reconsideration process, to in fact, cover most of the, what I will call the sins or the ills, that might be committed, in some people's judgment, before we get to the point of exercising the more diabolical plans.

So, yes we have some belief that we're putting into place processes which will be, yield a better ICANN. I'm not sure to what extent you choose to believe that or think that's indeed satisfying, but that is the direction we're working on. Anyone else have any other comments?

Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. I had a question with regards to the work of the CCWG, on how much work is done to make sure the ICANN community is more accountable as well?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Now that's an issue that has been raised numerous times, and to be candid, was largely ignored by the CCWG until moderately recently. Part of the problem is, when you say the community is accountable, the question is, to whom? In other words, does the ALAC need to be accountable to the RALOs and ALSs? Does it need to be accountable to the user population of the world?

Does the IPC, the Intellectual Property Constituency, need to be accountable to its members? Or to Intellectual Property lawyers around the world? And so on and so forth, one can do this. There are some groups, such as registrars and registries, which include most of the participants in the world, who are in that business. There are other things, there are other groups who represent just a tiny, tiny fraction.

So all of that being said, we are looking at that, and it is a significant concern, and we are among other things, recommending that accountability be one of the things that is considered in the regular periodic reviews of organizations. And we're going to have to do a fair amount of work in defining what we mean by accountable. Certainly there are groups that we believe have at times in the past been captured by small segments of their community, and that's a real issue.

And certainly within groups like the GNSO, where there are many different component parts, is the GNSO captured by one or two particular parts effectively or not? Is a question which is very high on some people's minds. So it's really an issue. It's not an issue with an easy answer, but it is certainly an issue. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And I have a second question, which is one where it looks as though whenever there is some kind of appeal scenario of some sort, one looks at an external process of examiners to make some kind of a decision on that. And the question I had is with the recurrence of such examinations and with the fact that you might have to resort to these independent examiners on quite a few occasions, do we risk, at some point, to have a community of examiners, and therefore what your basically doing is to provide control of ICANN's decision to a community that is completely outside of ICANN, and that, in itself, has absolutely no accountability mechanisms at all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well indeed, the external panelists will be a permanent set of panelists, seven I believe, that [inaudible] individual panel will be picked, and these people will, you know, will be cycled. And the question has been raised, why do we trust these external people more than a Board which is, to a large extent, composed from people that we have selected ourselves?

Either through the NomCom or through our own ACs and SOs? And it's a very good question. The question has been asked repeatedly, why is it that we trust our own communities, but as soon as we elevate someone to the Board, they become untrustworthy? And it's a really good question. And in fact, making arbitrary, making these external panels

results binding, says not only are we going to outside people, but they must be right.

And certainly from an At-Large point of view, we have looked at the kind of panels that ICANN has used in other places, certainly related to the new gTLD process, and we've decided in many, many cases, these panelists are, I won't say crazy, because that may be a medical technical term, but are not coming out with judgments that we would agree with.

So why is it that we trust these people more? And it's a really good question, and I think one of the things that the ALAC is going to have to look at when this draft report comes out, and look at carefully is, are we indeed proposing something that we are prepared to live with? Because it's a really serious question.

Any further questions, comments? As I said, there is a huge amount that's going into this report. There were a number... Sébastien, I see your hand, I'll call you in a minute, there were a lot of things there were very divided opinions on a number of them, and to a large extent, we have come together. People have compromised, and compromises aren't easy. There are still some comments that are being made, and strong comments for instance, the current proposal is that ACs and SOs that choose to participate, will have the equivalent of five votes in a community mechanism.

So the GNSO will have five, the ccNSO will have five, ALAC will have five. There are people proposing that advisory committees, including the ALAC, should not have equal billing with the SOs, but should be subservient, that we should just be advisory, and either we should have

no votes, or just a couple. And I honestly don't think that group will win, as if we're talking about winning and losing, but there are still very strong statements being made that advisory communities should just be advisory, to essentially being told to stay in our place, and not try to run the organization like the SOs should be doing.

So there are still some very strong divisions that we need to settle. Sébastien.

You may be on mute.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you Alan. Sébastien Bachollet. Yeah, I was muted, time to switch. Sorry. A few points, about what Olivier was asking. I think we need to add about the accountability that we are also working, I would say, a concept about a mutual accountability. And that includes accountability from one to the other.

And one could be SO, AC, the Board, whatever grouping within ICANN to the others. The second point is that, I fully agree with the fact that we need to trust the one we know. But sometime we need independent people, and independent people, it's not mandatory that they are outside. But they are not connected or linked with what they are talking about, or what they are taking care of.

And that dot [inaudible] dot [Africa] are the two examples we had. The fact that it was a long process to find the relevant people who were running the IRP, it's why in the, I guess, it's the [inaudible] I don't know if it was one or two, and after the dot [inaudible] case, it was a request

for the Board to have seven panelists to ready to jump in any new IR picks.

The work we are doing in the CCWG will change, I guess things. I don't know if it will be a lot, but I have this impression, but still just the Board just issue a request for proposal for possible panelists. The third point is that, I am one of the people who has agreed to, I would say, a lot of proposals from the group, and I still have a lot of concern about how we want to be, to do with a Board member, by each one, or collectively, think that most of them is the wrong way to go, and I will still argue on that.

I hope that it will be, some part of that they will listen, but at the same time, I must say that there are things that we're going in the right direction. The fact that we are now into a single membership model, it's I think, a really good way to go, and the fact that we are now with this whatever we want to call that forum, general assembly, whatever. The grouping, all the SOs and ACs, trying to work on an equal basis, for each SO and AC, including the RSAC and SSAC.

It's a good model, because I think it's... If we don't think that the SO AC must be work to the other, then we need to change the SO and the AC. But it's not the reverse. But I think there are things going in the right direction. Still a lot to work out, and we will have a call tomorrow, I guess, on that subject. And then we will work on that. Hopefully in the right direction. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Sébastien. Yeah, I tend to agree there is bunches of things that I think we can survive, but it would not be the way I would have designed them. I am somewhat amazed at some of the compromises that people have made that I didn't think we were going to be willing to compromise at all. And that may include some of us in that estimate. So I think we're going somewhere reasonable.

I still have some real concerns with a number of the issues, perhaps different ones than Sébastien does. I think the budget veto is somewhat problematic, the way it's currently done. But we're making good progress, and I think we'll end up with something that will not hurt ICANN, and I believe will help it. Any other comments before we go on to the next item?

And Cheryl says she agrees with what I said. Thank you. All right. The next item is ALS criteria and expectations. We're not going to spend a lot of time on that. We've talked about that before. We talked about it Buenos Aires. We currently have a call out for membership and for other participants in that meeting. And we will be sending out a Doodle, I believe, in the next day or so, to try to schedule a meeting for next week.

My intent is that this group will meet weekly, we will rotate the times, if necessary, to try to make sure that everyone can participate without having to be up at three in the morning all the time. And I'll be quite candid, I'm expecting a significant amount of work and discussion out of this group, and a lot of compromise. Because just like the CCWG, we're going into this with some very different positions, I think we have some real problems.

Pretty much all of us acknowledge. And we have to come up with something that we'll try to do better. And aside from serving our own purposes, there will be an external review starting shortly. And I believe we should be going into this, showing that we don't have our head in the sand and pretending there are no problems. So and I would like to think that we're in a good position to try to fix our own problems, without having external people come in and tell us what to do.

As Sébastien said, occasionally someone with a fresh view, and completely independent, does have good ideas, but I think we should give ourselves a try first. So anyone who wants to work on this, we welcome you, there hopefully will be significant work, and it won't just be teleconferences. We are expecting homework between them. But I don't have anything really to say on that, there is nothing else new on the actual subject matter, other than we finally getting this on, on the way.

Any comments? Sébastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Alan. Sébastien speaking. Just a short, I think it's an important topic, and it's made out to answer the question raised by Olivier about accountability of SO and AC, and here the accountability of At-Large. And maybe, I don't know where you are in that things, but we may open a larger discussion about how we want to be more accountable, and to whom, and so on and so forth, for the At-Large, in addition to what is done in this working group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I see Heidi's hand, I'm not sure if you want to deal with that first.

Just an echo on my phone...

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Just very quickly. This is Heidi, thank you. I wanted to highlight that the call outlined who was supposed to select which members. So just to highlight that there are a total of three from each of the five RALOs, two from each RALO are to be selected by the members, and one is to be selected among the ALAC members. So the ALAC members are supposed to discuss among themselves on who they will be selected to represent the ALAC reps on the group, on the taskforce.

All others will be participants. All other people who wish to join outside of those three, will be participants in the group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for clarity. Heidi said that the two members from each RALO will be selected by the members, she meant by the RALO leadership.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: And just for clarity, the distinction between members and participants, should we ever come down to the position where we cannot reach consensus, that is genuinely everyone agreeing with perhaps a few exceptions, but really needs to take a vote or a consensus call on something, it will be the members who participate in that.

But in the general sense of the actual workings of the taskforce, there will have been no effective difference between the members and participants, and I would fully expect some of the participants to end up being leaders and drafters of things, as opposed to just the formal members. But yes, we are asking the ALAC members to select one of their own, I will be chairing it, but I will not be representing North America.

And we ask the RALO leadership to identify the two other people who will be formally representing the RALO. And as per the style of each RALO, the leaders can simply point and pick, you can hold an election if you can do it quick enough, or any other method that you choose. But we do want people, and it's to everyone's advantage to have everyone named before we do the Doodle, because that means there is a better chance they'll actually attend these meetings, certainly the first ones.

And I have Cheryl next and then Alberto.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. A couple of very brief points on this, and I have put my name into the, be a member in this, and I'm hoping that the leadership time at APRALO will have the good sense and intelligence, to endorse me. Seems I kind of know a little bit about that, that is a less than subtle hint.

That was not my point however. My point was that, I'll first mention that in the very brief and rather crest fallen report from the metrics group for this meeting, I did note that the work of this new group, this taskforce will in fact, have a nexus if not have direct feedback to and from the work of metrics.

So I'm very keen to make sure that we keep these two activities well briefed on each other's action plans and projects. And I think I would like that recorded for the record, formally here before this work of this very important taskforce gets off the ground, because it is a hands and gloves exercise, I think you'll find in more than several ways, with the work of the, and the ongoing work of the metrics working group.

And the other thing was, I wanted to just raise particularly the matter on individual members and mention, although I suspect Maureen and Holly, etc. from APRALO may know to do this themselves, that we are also undertaking, within APRALO, a very detailed analysis, and putting out a discussion paper in the near future about how we as a RALO believe we can better make effective our new, and there are only a couple of them at this stage, but we expect them to be expanding, number of individual members within our region.

And it may be obvious for other RALO leaders and regional interests to keep an eye on what we're doing in APRALO in the near future, noting of course, that we have the long term and fairly entrenched way of managing of individual membership within NARALO, from the very beginning, and of course, the more recent ones out of EURALO as well.

But each of our regions are very diverse, and I don't think, and I mean diverse between each other rather than not just taking the case of outreach in the Asia-Pacific diverse within ourselves as well. But I don't think this is going to be a one size fits all, so I will just caution now, with individual members, that we may have to have a sort of three layer approach, some aspirational bits, that can be applied across all of the RALOs.

Some rather nice and probably bits that most likely will be able to be applied across all of the RALOs, and some very specific bits that will be unique to some of our regions. And with that, I will put my hand down. I have already put down. And thank you for allowing me to have this intervention.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Cheryl. And we'll go to Alberto in a moment, but first, you mentioned the metrics, and I think it's worthy explaining the relationship between this group, the metrics group, and in fact the ongoing work that is going on within some RALOs, to try to define these things. One of the problems that became obvious is we have very few formal rules about what ALSs must do to become members, or what they must do when they are members.

Therefore, it's very difficult for either the RALO, or the metrics group, to define what it is we're going to measure, when they don't have the authority to change what the expectations are. So the metrics groups can only say to measure what, you know, what is happening right now, but didn't have the authority to say ALSs must do something.

Similarly RALOs do not have the authority to say, we will not accept an ALS that doesn't meet certain criteria, because those criteria are cast in stone right now, and there was no easy for a RALO, in fact the RALO cannot change them unilaterally. It has to be an act of the ALAC, supported by an act of the Board.

So the purpose of putting together this group is in fact to come together and decide what are the minimum requirements, and then we can formally adopt them as the ALAC, that the Board the formally endorse them, and then we're in a position to have the metrics group figure out how to measure them, and have the RALOs figure out how to encourage better participation.

So all these things are going to work together. They're not going to pose to each other. And with that, I'll turn it over to Alberto.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just before you do Alan, that was my use of nexus. I think [inaudible]... But you also need to realize that new RALOs are probably not as aware as the quote, new ALSs, are probably not as aware as those that were found in members of the RALOs, because it was deeply discussed at the inaugural timing of RALO formations, and memorandums of which was then put together through the MAU... [CROSSTALK]

...do need to tidy that up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It was discussed, it wasn't actually written in many cases. Alberto, over to you.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking for the record. Thank you very much. Two comments. I do agree with what you have said, and for this type of group, we do not have a problem, but perhaps we have a problem of an initial misinterpretation, and a member defined or selected by ALAC for example, it should be selected by the RALO leaders.

And if I'm not wrong, perhaps [Heidi] said, by the members of the RALO. This is a very big difference. Since we do not have time, we send to LACRALO, a note asking members to be candidates, and telling us why they want to become members for this group. And we also ask those candidates to tell us which members they would like to participate. We do not have metrics for this, but we have assistance measures, so we have to send someone, or we have to have people that want to participate.

I mean, we want to send people who have the knowledge of what is going on. So perhaps in this case, which is a LARALO leaders, the ones that are going to define members, members of LACRALO. This is a... It's not the chair and the secretary should be able to define this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. I will try to be as clear as possible. And what I'm describing is a decision the ALAC did formally take. So, what, the way this group is composed, was discussed by the ALAC, and was decided and formally adopted. So, it's no longer subject to debate. We said that there would be one member of the three from each region, who would be selected from the ALAC members, so they have to be an ALAC member at this point, and the ALAC members, among themselves, would decide.

So for any given region, the three ALAC members, or in the case of North America, the two, because I'm out of the running, will have decided... Now, whether they have decided because of who can do it best, whether they decide by tossing coins, that's their business. But the ALAC members have to decide which of them is the formal member of the group.

For the RALOS, we said that the RALO leadership, that is the RALO chair and RALO secretariat will identify the people, through their own methods. So if in a given RALO, the culture of that RALO says that the chair can simply point to people and pick them, that's fine. If the RALO wants to ask for candidates and select the best one, that's fine. If the RALO wants to ask for candidates and then have a general election to pick them, if there were enough time for that, that is fine too.

It's up to each RALO to select how they pick their two people. So we are not trying to tell how the RALO to do it, the RALOs can decide on their own. I hope that's clear.

Are there any other questions? This was going to be a very short item, I wasn't expecting...

ALBERTO SOTO:

This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much Alan. My question was, or is that in the mail, it says the RALO leaders, and I hear in the call, I heard, the RALO members, and this is an important difference. If we are talking about the members, it's one thing. But if we're talking about the leaders, we can proceed as we are doing it right now. Thank you. Thank you for your clarification.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Heidi said the two members from the RALO are selected by the members. She said that was a mistake. She should have said, they were selected, they are selected, or identified by... I don't care how you select them, but we expect the RALO leaders, the RALO chair to tell staff who the two people are. Whatever method you decide to use is fine with you, you are not obliged to ask your ALSs, you may choose to, but you're not obliged to.

Is that clear now?

Thank you. All right. We are running very late, at this point. We are now up to 60 minutes and we're almost 80 something minutes into the call. So we're going to have to speed up a little bit. The next item is, there is an IDN implementation, a review of IDN implementation guidelines, that we have been asked to contribute a member to. This is essentially a cross community group.

We have solicited requests. We have at this point, I believe, two people that have identified themselves. It is somewhat problematic, to be candid, because of the two candidates, one of them does not look like they have any known ties to At-Large, and the other one doesn't look like they have and known knowledge of IDNs, at least based on their resumes they have provided.

We are supposed to name that person, if I remember correctly, by the end of this week. Heidi, is that correct? Or somebody?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. We need to give... This is Ariel for the record. We need to give the name by August 3rd.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so beginning of...

ARIEL LIANG: So next Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we have, number one, we have a potential problem with candidates, but we've asked both candidates further questions, just in case their resumes were not complete. And I guess what we would like to do is

ask the ALAC, is it sufficient, is it acceptable if the ALT in conjunction with the IDN working group, identifies the person that we will send to this group?

And I'm looking for either a show of hands, not necessarily a show of hands. Is there anyone who feels that is unacceptable? We have to name someone, preferably by next Monday. We have, at this point, not a good set of candidates, and I think between the ALT and the IDN working group, and I'm going to rely heavily on the IDN working group obviously, to identify who it is that we believe we can represent the At-Large, and more important, being able to speak knowledgeably on these things.

Judith is asking why is Satish not a good candidate. I'm not going to go into the question of why he is or is not a good candidate. I don't believe he's actually applied, at least I haven't seen an application, but that's rather mute. At this point, we need to find someone who is willing to do it. They may or may not volunteer actively to do that. But does anyone believe that the IDN working group, in conjunction with the ALT, is not suitable to do this?

If so speak now, otherwise forever hold your peace, I think the expression is.

All right. We have one tick mark and no no's, we have made a decision and gained back five minutes.

The next item is, I think we have a very short item that, let's skip to number 11, because we can get that one off very quickly, I think. As many of you are aware, ICANN holds a leadership training program prior

to the annual general meeting. The At-Large is allowed to send five people. We typically do one from each region. We try to pick a combination of experienced people, who can help train people, and new people who need to learn something about ICANN.

And we normally defer the decision until after the ALAC, until after the NomCom appointees are announced, for any region where there are NomCom appointees, because they may be good candidates for new ones. In this case, we've had a request from AFRALO to identify their candidate right now. The candidate is, Seun Odeji, the reason they would like to do it right now is he typically has had significant problems getting visas and he would like to start the visa process as soon as possible, and we need to know the dates of travel for that.

So I believe that that is a reasonable request. AFRALO is essentially made a firm statement that this will be their candidate, and they are asking ALAC for approval. Is there anyone here, I'm looking for ALAC, who disagrees?

I see no hands. I would ask staff to record everyone on the ALAC who is on this call, and make an attempt to survey the other ALAC members, to complete the vote, if possible, but not to delay the decision unreasonably. I believe we have enough people on this call to say that there is quorum, and the decision is made, but we would like to complete the vote, if possible, as per our standard procedures. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you Alan. Two points. First, Vanda has already sent her vote in, she votes in favor of allowing Seun. And the second is that for all

other RALOs, the deadline for registering is the 31st. And the ALAC is going to be asked to, of August, sorry 31st of August, and then the ALAC will be asked to make their decision very soon thereafter.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I should point out that for Europe and North America, which do not have NomCom appointees at this point, well sorry. North America may or may not have a new NomCom appointee by the time we have to make a decision. Europe does not. They are certainly in a position to decide earlier than that, and should they choose to, we may choose to act on it earlier.

Olivier.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I was going to ask a procedural question here. Are you asking for a vote or are you asking for a consensus call? And secondly, I wanted to... Yeah, so that's my first question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I actually asked for a vote on this one.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND:

A vote, okay. So then [CROSSTALK]... of the ALAC members.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I think I did that. I said was there any ALAC member who does not agree? Other ones are deemed to have voted yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPLIN-LEBLOND: So it would probably be good to read the list of voters, so as to have a proper record of who was here at the time. Secondly, it is in the section for information and discussion, while this should have been in the section for decision. But I note that there is no for decision section, so in the future, might have to put it in the right location, because it's a bit embedded in the agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: The current chair accepts the advice of the past chair to try to get the agendas done properly next time.

And I see the past, past chair is smiling.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Cheryl giggling has been recorded for the record.] I just turned my mute off to get my giggle recorded for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I do ask that staff, having, staff will have recorded those ALAC members on the call, as Olivier has identified. We don't need to call them out on the voice call.

Anything else on this item? Then we will go back to item 10, and ask León and Gisella to spend a little bit of time, and I will ask you to try to do a little bit less than 15 minutes, talking about the government meetings.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alan. This is León Sanchez. And I will go to Gisella shortly, but I just wanted to say that we are, of course, planning our schedule for our meeting. And we will be looking into allocating time for the working groups that are actually active. We will be making a call for the needs of the different working groups to meet in Dublin.

But we will be giving priority to those that are actually active, and that may have some hot topic to discuss in Dublin. This is for the sake efficiency, and in order to accommodate the best of we can, of the sessions that we need to carry on in our Dublin meeting. So with that, I would go to Gisella, and of course, welcome any thoughts or comments on how we can better address your needs of meeting in Dublin. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER:

León, thank you. Gisella here for the transcript. I hope everyone can hear me. I will just pick up on where León left. We are currently working on the skeleton schedule for Dublin. At this stage, we don't

have any insight from the general schedule yet. However, we're not going to go through the scheduling that we're working on.

There are just a few points that I would like to raise, is that in Dublin, we have the leadership training program, which will be running from Wednesday the 14th, to Friday the 16th of October, included. And this is prior to the face to face public meeting. I believe the accountability may be holding a meeting on Friday the 16th as well. We have a new ALAC meeting, which is the ALAC strategy day on Saturday the 17th of October.

Then we have our usual meetings, which we're currently working on scheduling. The RALO general assembly will be held, possibly on Wednesday, and after discussion with the organizing committee, it will, it is likely to be two 90 minute sessions. On Friday, we also have a new ALAC meeting, which is ALAC development session. And this will be running all day on Friday.

We also then are working on scheduling the sessions with the regular groups, the Board, the GAC, the ccNSO, the NCSG, etc. I'm not going in the order of, apologies, of the agenda. I'm just going to share with you, [inaudible] follows on what I've been saying now is, we listed the face to face topics that were discussed in Buenos Aries on the document attached. And this is just an overview of the people who presented and the topics, I think, I'll give everyone scrolling rights.

What we would appreciate is feedback from the ALAC members and the RALO leadership, to find out which were the topics of interest, and which presentations you found useful. This was discussed with the

Dublin scheduling and the agenda setting. Are there any comments to start off with?

ALAN GREENBERG: We've got two hands up from me and Holly, but I don't think they were addressing that question, so we'll hold them until you're finished. Unless someone else put their hand up quickly. No, go ahead then.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, I'll let the questions come now because the second item of the discussion is just a quick overview of staff responsibilities at the face to face meeting. As far as the scheduling, and topics for discussion goes, it would probably be best to take questions now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. I don't have any questions. I do have a couple of comments. So there were a number of statements at the end of the last meeting, that were made to me or to other people, that people within the ALAC or the RALO leadership, were unhappy with some of the topics we, either unhappy with the topics, unhappy with what meetings were scheduled, unhappy with the amount of time that was allocated, either too much or too little, to specific things.

And I would ask people to make your comments earlier, while there is still time. These agendas are always reviewed with the ALAC a number of times, we get virtually no input, at that point. I've asked staff this time to present the information in a somewhat different form, instead of going over the day to day agendas, which is somewhat tedious to go

through. I've asked the information to be presented in a much shorter, concise form, hopefully on one page.

That would make it easier for people to scan, take a look at what we're planning to do, and go forward from that. That being said, some of the decisions get made very late in the game, because certainly this year, it was, for this last meeting, was a very changing domain. The things were changing minute by minute.

But to the extent possible, make suggestions early as to what you want to see, and we'll do our best to try to fit everything in. And the same, by the way, goes for these ALAC meetings. If you have something you want to see on the agenda, speak up otherwise it may not get there. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Alan. Just a couple of things. First of all, I noticed on the presentation, I'm not sure what you mean by that, because I certainly presented on the privacy proxy service. I don't know if that counts as a presentation topic or not. My suggestion would be that there be some time. I don't know if [Marissa] is available, but at least catch everybody up with where we're up to at the ALAC review, because we talked about a schedule which has been changed, and it might be [inaudible] for half an hour, to go over a new schedule and to [inaudible]. Okay? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And I don't think we need to talk about what topics we want in this meeting, but please make your opinions known to Gisella and to León. Anyone else have any comments on the agenda or on the Buenos Aires meeting, or on the Dublin meeting?

All right. Gisella, in the interest of time, I'm going to ask if we can defer the task responsibilities to the next meeting. We'll try to make sure we'll allow time for that and not cut you short. I don't think it's urgent that people know it now rather than a month from now. And I think we have a few other topics that we need to get through before the two hours are up. If that's okay with you.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan, Gisella here. Yes, thank you. I just wanted to add to that, prior to Dublin, we will be holding a webinar for all of those who will be participating remotely. I'll give you the links and tricks on how to best participate remotely, we have cameras in the room. There are various ways of joining the language channels to have the various languages that we have interpreted. So that will be following closer to the time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Gisella. Looks good. Anything else before we go on to the next topic?

No hands, no voices, then we will go on. The next item is the new meeting strategy working group. And again, we're short of time so we're going to try to be relatively brief. I think really the issue is, at this

point, that we've been holding a number of meetings of the working group, we're not making a lot of progress, and I know there have been staff discussions at the same time, so I'm going to ask Heidi to, very briefly, review what's going on in the staff side, and then turn it over to Beran to see if she has anything she wants to say as one of the co-chairs of the group, as to how we move forward and make some progress. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Alan. Yes, this is Heidi. Just very quickly, we have very much heard that not only ALAC, but other groups, are rather struggling with how to proceed with their schedule, given that there are somewhat lack of information coming from staff on what these various meetings will be. So we have been discussing this, and there will be a couple of developments shortly.

By late August or early September, there will be a straw man developed by staff for meeting B, particularly to outreach days, but we are also looking to have more information coming from the ACs and SOs on what you would like to see for that outreach day. There will also be, for the ALAC call on the 3rd of September, Nick [inaudible] will be joining that call to answer your questions.

And that will come the same day that there is an internal team who will be looking at this issue that same day. So you will be the first to hear the thinking behind that. Also, in mid-September there will be a community webinar, held by meeting staff, for this topic. So there will

be more chance to hear what other groups are doing, and what, ask questions for the meeting staff.

Also for meeting B, I know that the ALAC will be developing a timetable for general assemblies toward a summit. It's thought that meeting B will not be a good time to hold the general assembly. So in your thinking, in your planning, that's something to keep in mind. And also, there has been a point made on the meeting strategies working party, that there will be no new meetings outside of the formal days, and I have had that confirm.

That was one of the goals or thoughts inside the meeting strategy working group paper, that the point of, one of the points was to hold the meeting within those formal days. Alan, I think that's all I have to say. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you very much. Two things, I guess. Number one, Beran, you are back on the call, and I hope you heard what Heidi had to say. Is that...

BERAN GILLEN:

Yes Alan. This is Beran. I did hear what Heidi had to say.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I know you've been dropping off on occasion. I think we have a cart and horse problem, in that the staff want to hear what the community is planning, and the community wants to hear what the staff

is planning, and it is sort of hard to get this going. On top of that, some of the ideas that we have, may well take funding and we don't know whether there is any funding available.

So we're really having a hard time bootstrapping ourselves. And I'll turn it over to Beran to make any further comments. Heidi, I will note one thing. The B meeting may not be optimal for regional assemblies, but given that the majority of meetings in Africa and Latin America are going to be B meetings, we're likely to have some regional assemblies in B meetings, or they may not have regional assemblies. So something to keep in mind. Beran, it's all yours.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you Alan. My thoughts exactly regarding the regional assemblies, and also with regards to the B meetings on the outreach, one of the things we discussed on the meeting with the think tank, which was headed by Maureen, I can ask her to come in later. We were also stuck with regards to how to move ahead.

We then decided that we were going to concentrate on the B meetings, and just sort of have the A meetings stay as they are, because they're just a standard ICANN meeting. And then we would look at the B meetings more critically.

Now we got a bit stuck because we were wondering, if we're going to do outreach, we're going to probably need some sort of funding. We can very well come up with ideas on how to go out to the community, whether it's within the country that we're having the meeting, or within the region in the country in which we're having the meeting.

Either way, whether we go to universities or the universities are coming to us, or whether we're going to our ALSs, or whatever it is that we decide to do in the form of outreach, is going to have some [inaudible] to it. So is this cost going to be covered by ICANN? Or how is that going to work out? That was one of the things that came up.

And we, is it guidance with regards to staff, or as Alan said, agree the first meeting which Raf attended at Buenos Aires. The GNSO wasn't very, they weren't very, should I say creative, when it comes to the B meetings. They were just going to do business as usual. So where does that leave us ALAC? Do we just keep the B meetings with ALAC meetings and SO and AC meetings inter rather than any outreach?

So these are some of the things that we discussed. So I just wanted to... I don't know if Maureen is on the call, Maureen can just come in and maybe just give us a bit of feedback on what the think tank, she's the head of the think tank group and Eduardo is also the head of the drafting team. Maybe they can jump in and add a few words. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you Beran. Maureen for the record. I'm not going to add much more anyway, because I think Alan and Beran have actually sort of like outlined what our difficulties are, as has Heidi. I think that we just need a little bit more clarity, and I'm sure that Heidi can put the workspace link down so that people can actually sort of see the discussion of the things happening to date. I will continue of course. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Anyone else have anything to say on the issue? Clearly there is work to be done and we're going to have to figure out how to do it.

All right. Next item is a discussion on CROPP. Well, it's not really a discussion, just a heads up. As Dev said earlier, we need to put together an outreach strategy, if we're going to be eligible for CROPP funding at all. Assuming we pass that hurdle, we need a CROPP review team to actually make the decisions and approve these requests. And as we said much earlier in the game this year, that you know, we're going to really look to this group to not just rubber stamp requests, but to make sure that we're getting good events out of this program.

The CROPP review team is made up for each region, one person named by the finance and budget subcommittee, and one person named by the outreach and engagement group. Dev is scheduling an outreach and engagement group and one of its first tasks is going to have to be to identify the CROPP members from each region, and we will be scheduling a finance and budget subcommittee meeting shortly, that will have to go through the same process to find a finance and budget person to represent each region.

So this is a heads up that this is going to be happening really soon, and don't be surprised when the call goes out for the meetings, and within these two meetings, we're going to be tasked with identifying the right people. So start thinking about it right now.

The next item, perhaps we'll flip them around. Heidi, can you do the staff announcement first and then we'll go onto item 14?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Absolutely. With great pleasure, I have the honor of announcing some staff promotions that were just provided. So Gisella, please take a bow, you are now AC SO support specialist for At-Large. [Cheers]

Nathalie, I don't think you're on the call, but you are now AC SO support specialist for the GNSO, even though she will still be working her magic on the ALS applications, and now the ALS At-Large onboarding program.

And Ariel, take a bow, you are now policy analyst. Congratulations everyone. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And the next item is geographic regions. As some of you know, there has been recently, in the process of selecting the ALAC member to replace Fatima, there was a nomination, and the nomination was followed, as is the process, by LACRALO of a poll, and the results were announced yesterday that the candidate has not been ratified, and therefore the nomination process will likely reopen again.

That has caused a bit of consternation among some of our members within Latin America. And raised the issue of, I guess I'll be blunt, that should the Caribbean members be a member of the Latin American RALO or not? And the, as some of you who have been around for a long enough time will remember, there was a geographic geo-regions group chartered many years ago, that reported out about two years ago. That report has not been acted on by the Board, but we're told will be acted on by or at Dublin.

The report provides a number of abilities for the, for ALSs, sorry. For individual countries to move regions, should they choose, or for an AC or SO to recommend to the Board that for their, within their environment, certain regions are configured differently than they are normally. And I guess, I think, Dev would you like to speak on this? Because I know that's the, the issue has come up within the Caribbean region.

John, I see your hand up. Was that a hand I missed before or talk on this subject? Hand is down, and is back up again. Dev, would you like to take up the floor while we figure out what John wants to speak or not?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand speaking. I don't think I want to add too much to the summary what you give, Alan. And that, well, that, yes that several ALSs in the Caribbean are unhappy with the [inaudible] in LACRALO. And ask more about the status of the report of the geographic regions review.

But actually I would also want to say that there was also another reason I wanted to [inaudible] this report, for [inaudible] how geographic regions are being treated in ICANN. And what happened at the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aries, ICANN 53, I met a Fellow who was from Curaçao. Now Curaçao is specifically located in the Caribbean, but it was formally a Dutch colony, and was actually a member of EURALO.

Given that Curaçao is now independent territory since 2010, my question was that, raise awareness as to well, what exactly does that such country set up, change their status and the Board declaration?

We've asked in 2002, 2003, when the Board resolution defines what countries territories belong to which ICANN region.

So and that was, in a sense, these new territories are in limbo, as regards to At-Large. So that was really my key interest in this issue regarding region.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Cheryl go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excuse me. [Inaudible]. Sorry, I have to clean my throat and you all did not need to hear that. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And for the record, I am the current chair of the geographic regions review working group. And both Carlton and I were continually are long serving members of that committee from the very beginning.

So I can assure that the Caribbean and small island states, including those territories, who the one that Dev has outlines is not alone, I'm afraid. The plight that you and concerns that you find yourselves in regarding how you are being handled as countries in the allocation to the five geographic regions, were well and truly front and center in our minds, when we put together the recommendations.

So with the presumed Board acceptance of the geographic regions review at the Dublin meeting, if not before, the one off chance for shifting will be opened, not just to small island states and countries whose situations have considerably changed, since the geographic review diving up was done, as Dev outlined.

For the purpose of the advisory committee, in our case, this is a discussion that I would strongly recommend we hold as a committee of the whole, with the regional leaders and as many At-Large structures as possible. Because there are often unintended consequences to making these decisions, and whereas a whole country, with the support of its government, will have the opportunity to say no, we would like to belong to Asia Pacific, or to Europe, or to North America, or to wherever, and they will get one chance at that, you won't get to chance again, not until there is another review. That's one thing.

But for the purpose of our advisory committee, I would strongly encourage us to have a full, frank, and furious discussion about the consequences of whatever changes and recommendations you may wish to make as an At-Large advisory committee. It is very likely that you will want to make some specific changes, but I would also suggest you don't do those changes without knowledge of any country that is formally shifting from one current geographic region to another.

So we are going to have to be very careful in how we proceed in this. That said, there is still no reason from a policy perspective and a joint interest perspective, why, for want of a better term, I'll use one out of the Internet Society world, birds of a feather type of behavior cannot be encouraged. And so, we've already seen it in the Internet governance

world, where [inaudible] gather together [inaudible] from whatever geographic region they are formally shoehorned into, and find good reason to work as a group on particular issues.

That kind of a non-answer, but it is an answer that says, you will have the opportunity by no later than the end of this calendar year, and that I would caution the ALAC as an advisory committee to do this very, very cautiously and very, very sensibly with a very deep understanding of the consequences, because you are going to be stuck with whatever the outcome is, for at least three, if not five to 15 years.

And you are going to be in a very, very busy time in that period of ICANN's growth. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Cheryl. And we'll quickly go on to the last item, any other business. Garth, you wanted a few minutes to talk about an issue, and I note that it is two minutes before the hour. I don't mind staying for a few minutes longer, but some people will be leaving. Thank you.

And sorry, Maureen, Garth, I'm sorry I'm going to put you on hold for a moment. Maureen had an issue on CROPP to bring up that I ignored her hand before. Very quickly, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. [Inaudible] Alan. I just wanted to raise an issue that was, there was a question that [Siranush] put on my mind earlier to Dev, just in relation to a CROPP application by APRALO. And the fact that the

tight timeframe that was expected for RALOs to put in their strategy plans, as well as their CROPP requests, meant that there has been less time for the community to consider to request, and that one of their applications may now have less, because of the time constraint, the time constraint.

And Siranush has asked that there must be [inaudible] and that the application has not been approved, but there should be more consideration for CROPP timing issues when applications go through. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Maureen. For the record, although we don't have a new CROPP review team, we have said the old existing CROPP review team will handle all CROPP applications until the new one is in place. So the CROPP review team should not have been the limiting factor, but the strategy, I believe, is.

Garth, over to you now.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. This is Garth. I will be very brief, I appreciate everybody hanging in there. Many of you have already commented on the ALAC list about this. Two main things. One is that the function of compliance was reported to the community several years ago as being a direct report to the CEO, in reviewing budget documents and structural documents from previous years.

It appears that the COO was overseeing compliance for a period of time, and then following the creation of the global domains division of ICANN, it appears as though the function of compliance moved from the COO to the director, the president of the global domains division. Now there is a few problems here. The first problem is that we may have been misinformed as a community about the structure, and two, there appears to be a conflict of interest, in terms of the global domains division, overseeing compliance.

It would be better served, and this has been a recommendation of the community, that compliance be under a different structure, either a subcommittee of the Board, directly the CEO, or something else. And I think that we should be consistent in recommending that ensuring that that's the case ahead of the transition.

Comments offline, etc. etc. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Garth. I will point out that this note was originally circulated on the ALAC internal list, which some of you are on, some of you are not on. Heidi did post a message on behalf of Alan Grogan, saying that the strategic plan project management system on the web, is incorrect, and the reporting structure is as reported.

We have all asked for clarity from ICANN. They should not be saying two different things in two different places, and I'm hoping that we will get some clarity really soon. And I thank Garth for noticing these things. These things have been posted for years, and no one has noticed this. So thank you Garth.

Anything else before we adjourn? I apologize for going over by a few minutes, and I apologize for cutting people short, to try to make the time. Try to do a better job of budgeting time, as we ask ICANN to budget money in the future.

No other comments? Thank you all for your attendance. We'll see you by and by. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]