GISELLA GRUBER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to everyone on today's ALAC Monthly Call on Tuesday, the 24th of November, at 19:00 UTC.

On the English channel, we have Alan Greenberg, Garth Bruen, Tim Denton, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Kaili Kan, Sebastien Bachollet, Sandra Hoferichter will be joining 15 minutes late, Vanda Scartezini, Seun Ojedeji, Ron Sherwood, Julie Hammer, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Christopher Wilkinson, Beran Gillen, Glenn McKnight, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Siranush Vardanyan.

On the Spanish channel, for now we do not have any participants. Harold Arcos is with us, but on Adobe Connect only for the time being.

On the French channel, we have Pierre Dovanou, and Wafa.

We have apologies noted today from Alberto Soto, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Leon Sanchez, Eranga Samararathna, Murray McKercher, and Bastiaan Gosling.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Gisella Gruber. Aziz Hilali has also just joined us.

Our interpreters tonight on the French channel are Camilla and Isabelle. Russian channel, Ekaterina and Galina. And Spanish channel, Veronica and David.

Could I please also remind everyone to state their names when speaking not only for transcript purposes, but to allow the interpreters to identify

---

you on the other language channels. It's very important. Otherwise, they'll only hear man, woman. Also, if you could please speak clearly, loudly, and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

Thank you, and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Gisella. We have a really packed agenda today, so I'm going to ask everyone to try and keep their interventions short and concise. Hopefully we will be able to get through the agenda and cover all of the items. Is there any other business to add or any other comments on the agenda?

Hearing no voices, seeing no hands, then we will adopt it as shown. It didn't quite come out a week ahead of time as we had hoped, but we're getting a little closer. And much of it was there close to a week ago. It has been changed because a lot of the situations are changing literally y the moment as we go forward.

The first item is a review of any outstanding action items that have required the attention of the ALAC. Who will be handing that? Is it Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The [inaudible] action items are from the ALAC meeting in Dublin. There's an item on the agenda that addresses those directly, so if you wish to address them at that point on the agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine. We will do them at that point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. The next item is review of the policy development activities. Ariel will take that one. I understand we're going to be looking at part of the new ALAC website in the process of doing so. Ariel, over to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you very much, Alan. I'm going to paste the policy section on the new At-Large website to walk through the public comments that the ALAC has been developing statements on.

So as you can see, we have six public comments that the ALAC is working on. And the first one is gTLD marketplace [inaudible] index proposal public comments and volunteers. This one Olivier has drafted a first draft. It's already been posted in the wiki workspace and you can see it from the page. It's my understanding is he's waiting for Alan to comment before we open public comments for the entire community to solicit feedback. So Alan, do you want to…

ALAN GREENBERG: My comments are open it for the entire community.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, so I will open comments for that statement. Then the second one in progress is [proposed] implementation of GNSO policy development process recommendations [inaudible] registrar transfer policy, IRTP Part C. Holly has drafted a statement and we opened a call for comments 20th of November. So if you want to comment on that statement, just click on… Community started commenting on the first draft from this page and that will take you to the wiki workspace and you can add your comments in the comment section down below. So that's the second one in progress.

The third one is the planned implementation of the new registration data access protocol (RDAP). And this one, the final draft has already been posted and the ALAC is in process of ratifying the statements. So for all the current ALAC members, please [access the] [inaudible] and cast their vote for the statement. The vote period will close on the 27th of November. So that's the third one.

Then the fourth one is guidelines for developing reference for label generation rule sets (LGRs) for the second level. This one, Edmon Chung is drafting a statement at this moment. I will follow up with him close to December the 1st to check on his progress. That's the fourth one.

Then the fifth one is preliminary issue report on GNSO policy development process to review all rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs. This one, Leon has drafted a statement and we also opened the call for comments recently, and you can review the statements through the wiki workspace and you can click on this line to go to the workspace and add your comments over here.

Then the last one is new gTLD program implementation review draft report. Maureen has uploaded her first draft and we just opened public comments today. And that will end the 30th of November, so please provide your input before then into the wiki workspace.

So that's all the six public comments in progress. The ALAC has decided not to issue a statement, one is the removal of searchable WHOIS service from [.meet] registry agreement. That's all the public comments for now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Ariel. I'll note a number of the ones that are open for At-Large comment right now. The time period ends relatively shortly, so if you plan to do any comments or want to read the statement to make sure it's reasonable before you have to vote on it, please do look at them very soon.

Any other issues related to these policy development activities that anyone wants to raise? There's a lot of things going on and we do think it's important – I think it's important – that more people get involved and do read these statements. Add comments to the wiki if you think it's good. If you don't think it's bad, identify what the problems are. But please, we do need more people participating in each of these drafting exercises. Any comments/questions?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we'll go on to the second item – or to the next item, rather. And that is the review of current ALS applications. Before I turn it over to staff, I'll note that the ALS that – sorry, my mouth is not working. Jimmy Shultz's ALS was just ratified as

an ALS yesterday and our congratulations to him. I think that's the first time in quite a while that we've had an ALAC member submit an application for an ALS. And I'm very pleased we didn't reject it. I'll turn it over to staff for further review.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. This is Heidi. I will briefly go through where we are. We are currently at 194 At-Large Structures. We're very close to reaching that magical number of 200. Again, the latest one was [inaudible]. Congratulations, Jimmy. Currently we have no applications being voted on and staff are processing due diligence on ISOC Dominican Republic. There's also an application pending on the At-Large application for the Lebanese Information Technology Association where regional advice is being expected shortly. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Heidi. I'll note, in the discussion that we have been having on ALS criteria and expectations, a number of the RALOs reported they know they have some ALSes that are essentially inactive or defunct. And I would encourage those RALOs to start doing their due diligence, and if indeed there are ALSes that are non-existent or clearly no longer eligible to be ALSes, that we start looking at those and processing them. There's no point in waiting for new expectations if indeed we know no one exists anymore or something akin to that. Thank you for whoever laughed.

Anything else related to ALSes?

We will be revitalizing or reactivating the group looking at expectations. It did go into a little bit of a sleep with the Dublin meeting and followed by the more accountability actions, but that will be waking up again very soon.

Next item is reports from working groups, liaisons, or anyone else. They're, in general, posted, but we normally allow a little bit of time for anyone who wants to raise anything that we think really needs the attention of the ALAC and At-Large community, and we want to do it in a way that's harder to ignore than just the written reports. I open the floor to any of those who have submitted reports to identify things of interest.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Can you hear me well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thanks. So a lot of things have been going on in the GNSO Council. The first thing that has taken place during the meeting – the last meeting, if you recall, the one in Dublin, was that there was no solution, no actual voting in of a new GNSO Council chair. So the GNSO had to run with its two vice chairs at the time who did a very good job in assuming the interim. And the last GNSO call that took place last month

was somehow trying to find some solutions as to what the next steps were going to be.

The one which has taken place this month that just took place on the 19th of November took place at the same time as bilateral discussions that were taking place in the background between the different houses in the GNSO. If I remind you, there is a contracted party's house that encompasses the registries and registrars, and as a non-contracted party house that encompasses some commercial stakeholder groups and some non-commercial stakeholder groups.

Anyway, thanks to all of the discussions that have taken place, the elections have taken place now and there has been a full 100% vote for the following people. So the GNSO Council chair is James Bladel. The GNSO Council vice chair from the contracted parties house will be Donna Austin. And the vice chair from the non-contracted parties house will be Heather Forrest. So they're really looking forward to getting the work done. They're well aware that there is a mountain of work that is due to take place. So they're very hyped up and looking forward to it.

Apart from this, there was a lot of discussion that took place in the call regarding the adoption of the charter – the PDP Working Group. So Policy Development Process Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to replace WHOIS.

As you've just heard now, there's a statement from the ALAC on this matter, but there was also a lot of discussion there for some amendments to be made to the actual charter itself, amendments to the motion. First, there was a friendly amendment. Then a non-friendly

amendment. Then about an hour later, it ended up being a friendly amendment again. So the motion was passed, but it was amended in a way that I couldn't quite understand. I don't think anybody else on the call by that time understood, but they just thought let's just get the darn thing adopted and get the work going because that's well understood. We need to have this moving. So on the spot deliberations and so on, if you do wish to listen to them, to the hour of fun and entertainment, then I'd say just go onto the recording or get the transcript, which is easier.

As a result, most of the other motions were deferred to discussions on the mailing list or to the next call. So not much else has happened than this. That's it for the time being. The rest of my report is online, as you know. It's got all of my little notes on them with the action items, etc. Take care. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Olivier, do you have any insight as to why James was not elected during Dublin but was now, other than perhaps him promising his first born to some parties on the Non-Contracted Party House or something like that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. One of the difficulties with the selection process is that a number of people who had to vote – the difference between the ALAC and the GNSO is that it is the new council that selects the next chair. And some of the new councilors were not quite aware of the rules, it appears, and therefore thought that there was going to be

another round afterwards. They were going to express their concern about James in that round, but then support him in the next round. That's all the discussions that have taken place on the [dinner] that took place after all of this with everyone around the table going, "What in the world happened there?" Because it did shock quite a few people.

So as a result, there was some kind of a fumbling in this matter. It was really understood that this was quite embarrassing and some discussion should really be taking place before a vote takes place, so at least everyone knows where everyone else stands. It was quite a shock for this to happen.

That in no way reflected on the interests and on the respect that James commands within the GNSO. Yes, he is from a contracted party and some might disagree with the way his company does business, but he certainly has proven himself to be a very valuable member of the community and to be a very fair member of the community as well. So he has both the balance and the knowledge to be able to run the GNSO in the next year.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. Does anyone else either have any questions for Olivier or anyone else want to raise any issues from their own reports?

I'll take that as a no and we will go on to the next item. And we are ahead of time at this point.

The next item is item #7. As you may recall – or hopefully will recall – during the Dublin meeting, the NARALO monthly meeting included a session with Allen Grogan, the Chief Compliance Officer. A number of issues were raised there, which resulted in answers which were, to put it mildly, somewhat less than satisfactory.

As a result, Garth has suggested that a letter be written by the ALAC. He submitted a letter to the ALAC. I have done a number of revisions of it. I'll let Garth speak if he wishes, but he has not agreed with all of the changes I made but believes that it's more important to get the letter out and work on that first. Garth and I will be discussing the specific details. But at this point, from a message he sent to me, I believe he is agreeing that the letter as currently drafted, or some revision of it, be distributed as soon as possible. So I'd like to open the discussion on that particular subject.

Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Alan. I want to be clear about this. I actually… I stated this. I had no problem with the corrections to the letter. I had a problem with some the reasoning that you put in the e-mail to me and I explained that back to you. In terms of just some of the factual matters – and now I'm wasting everybody's time because I'm talking about private conversation between Alan and I.

But anyway, to get back to the point, most of this is really around the issue of consumer trust and the way that ICANN represents consumer trust, the way that it is going to keep that commitment to the

community in promoting consumer trust. And there are really three issues that the letter addresses.

The first issue is that over a year ago Fadi Chehadé announced that ICANN was going to hire a special person. They created a new position called the Director of Consumer Safeguards. They were going to hire this new person and this person would be reporting directly to the head of compliance and they were going to specialize in consumer safeguards.

A year has gone by. There is no evidence that this position was created or filled. While we were at the Dublin meeting and meeting with the head of compliance, I asked him how many people on your staff are dedicated towards consumer issues, and the answer was none. We're wondering mostly what happened to this position that was announced by the CEO? Where is it? Where is this person we were promised? That's item number one.

Number two, in discussing the general application of consumer trust as a philosophy, I noted that consumer trust is part of ICANN compliance's mission statement. The compliance director in our meeting seemed to reject that that was part of his mission statement.

I think that this needs to be clarified. It's in their documentation, on their website, as being part of the compliance department's own mission statement. So that's number two.

Then number three, there have been a number of blogs issued by ICANN compliance where they talk about meeting with the community to discuss consumer trust, to discuss abuse issues. And when you look

at the list of the different stakeholder groups, the stakeholder groups that compliance met with, At-Large and ALAC are not in that list. ALAC and At-Large – compliance pretty much met with every other major stakeholder group, except for the At-Large community.

Also within these blogs they make a point to say compliance is going to meet with different consumer groups to discuss these issues. I tried to ask the compliance director, "Well, which consumer groups have you met with?" And as an example, I used some of the consumer groups that are members of At-Large. So these people would actually be easily accessible to ICANN either in person at the meetings or through contacts. And he and his department have not met with any real consumer groups.

So we're trying to correct this lack of coordination/collaboration between compliance and the At-Large community. I mean, you can't say that you're meeting with [all the] stakeholder groups. You can't say that you're meeting with the ICANN community and then completely ignore At-Large.

So those are the three things that I'm trying to address in this letter. I spoke with many of you directly in Dublin about this and I got the support of many of you. I'm hoping to push this forward so we can get clarification on this issue. I think it's extremely important. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Garth. Good summary. Anyone else have any comments? I note the version in the pod is not the final version, but the original version Garth supplied. The correct version is linked in the agenda. If

anyone hasn't seen it, then please do take a look very quickly. At this point, I'm assuming that the lack of any comments other than they support the changes is such that this will go out in the very near future. But I will hold it open for another day or so if anyone wants to do one more final read of it, identify any either typos or major glaring problems with it. If there are any changes, I will let the ALAC know if it's anything than cosmetic.

TIM DENTON: I just want to say that occasionally [inaudible] in this business with large obvious things that need being said and that the points being made by Garth are of that nature. I'm not too [fussed] about particular wording, but I think that we need to support the general thrust of what he's saying is that if ICANN has committed itself to consumer interest, then these need to be expressed in allocations of staff time. And I think that's a very sensible suggestion. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I take it you are supporting the concept.

TIM DENTON: Oh yeah!

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, just to be clear. Then I'm asking. This is a consensus call. Is there anyone… This is a call within the ALAC. Is there anyone on the ALAC on

this call who believes we should not send this letter or a slightly modified version of it out with due haste?

Hearing no voices, seeing no hands, we'll deem this to be approved by the ALAC by consensus and we will go on to the next item. Thank you, all.

The next item is the At-Large New Meeting Strategy. As you will recall, we had a group meeting for the last several months led by Beran and Raf to try to come up with a general plan for the new meeting strategy – the Meeting A, B, and C. Now, I will add a caveat because we will be going over this in a little bit of detail for the next 20 minutes or so. I'll note that we all understand that although this looks like a detailed plan of exactly how we'll be spending the week, as we get closer to each meeting, there will be a large number of changes. That's simply the reality of meeting planning, because we cannot plan a meeting purely on our own. When we're meeting with someone else, we have to do it at a time that is convenient to them. There will be other meetings that will be added completely out of our control which will likely upset the schedule in perhaps significant ways, but nevertheless, we have put an effort into trying to put out a grid that will guide us as with do the initial meeting scheduling. So take it from that perspective and understand that there will be changes, but this is our best effort at this point without knowing the details of those meetings.

I will turn the call over at this point to Beran, and I suspect to perhaps Gisella who also has a lot of meeting work but I'm not sure how they will be actually handling the details here. Beran, it's all yours at this

point. Is Beran with us? She's on Adobe. This may be a very short session. Gisella? Is anyone still on this call?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Beran is only on Adobe Connect. I'm just checking with her on Skype. Just bear with me for a second.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I can hold very fast meetings if no one else is on.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Beran does not seem to be responding, so you may wish to come back to her. Apologies for this.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I will not do the introduction over again, though. The next item is… And it's here for discussion/decision and the reason will become obvious. The endorsement of candidates for the consumer trust Affirmation of Commitments Review Team.

You will recall in Dublin, I had made the proposal that for expediency's sake, if nothing else, that the ALT do the first triage of the candidates who have asked for our endorsement, and then pass it on to the ALAC.

There was a very strong and vociferous disagreement with that and a recommendation that we put together a specific endorsement team, probably for the same team to be used for any future selection endorsements over the next year, and go ahead, proceed that way.

A week ago, I put out a call for members for this endorsement group. We are looking for one ALAC member from each region and one person identified by the RALOs. So a total of ten people. To date, we have one. Vanda is the only person who put her name forward with the agreement of the other ALAC members. We have had no other ALAC members identify themselves and we have had no members from the RALO.

We are now starting to reach a critical point that if we don't start this review soon, we will not have anyone endorsed by the time the endorsements are required and that's in about three weeks.

I'm looking for guidance from the ALAC. How do we proceed? We have to call a meeting in the next week or so. We do have to have a team identified. I think I heard Tim talk. Is that correct?

TIM DENTON: Yes. I am probably mistaken. You're talking, Alan, about a proposal for a structure to identify volunteers. Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: To endorse volunteers. We already have the list of volunteers.

TIM DENTON: Fine. Okay. [inaudible] list of volunteers. I'll shut up now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct, you are. You are not eligible for the endorsement team. Holly, go ahead. I think I heard Seun. We'll put you in the queue.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: This is just clarifying. This is really just a selection committee, in essence.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not a selection committee. It is an endorsement… Well, it is a committee which will be endorsing. We have the right. We have, I believe, nine people who have identified themselves as asking for endorsement from the ALAC. We have to either endorse or not endorse any of those. We can endorse a subset, we can endorse the whole set, we can provide prioritization and guidance to the people who [are] making the actual selection.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, I misunderstood. I'm sorry. I'm happy to do it for APRALO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not actually asking for the volunteer list at this meeting, although thank you and staff will note that. We are asking for one ALAC representative with the support of the others. If you can't agree among

yourselves, then you need to draw straws or something, and one recommendation from the RALOs.

My point is if we don't identify a significant part of this group in time to hold the first meeting, we're not going to be able to do any endorsements. So the ALAC either needs to change this recommendation on how we do these endorsements, or we're going to need some action. And I'd like concurrence from the people on this group that they will come up with names soon and we will be able to proceed. Otherwise we're stuck not being able to endorse anybody. Sebastien, go ahead. I'm sorry, Seun first, and then Sebastien.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I think [inaudible] issues on this particular subject. I recall that you sent the proposal of what [inaudible] and I also [went] back after the discussion and asking you whether we can now proceed to actually discussing among ourselves to actually select the members of the committee. But you did not respond, so I think there was a communication issue and [inaudible]. I thought it was a proposal. And then [inaudible] agreed that this was going to be [inaudible] of getting the members of the committee.

So now that it's clear that that is the dire we're going, I think that you should get [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Just for the record, Seun, I'm sorry if I didn't respond to that. I must've missed that. There's an awful lot of mail flying around right

now. The e-mail I did send out ended with – and I'll quote – to be clear, I am looking for, one, any objections to the process [that's named]. Number two, the name of the ALAC member from each region to participate in the endorsement process. Number three, the name of the regional appointee from each region to participate in the endorsement process. I'm not sure how I could've made it clearer what I was looking for, but for the record, that is what I'm looking for at this point.

There was only one objection to the process identified, and therefore I'm deeming that to be agreed to by consensus and now I am looking for five ALAC members and five other people from the region named by the regional leadership to sit on this committee.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. I see the difficulty of the situation. May I suggest that we revert our position and we suggest that ALT takes the lead on that, and if any RALO came with somebody else to join the team, you will take them on board. But we have the trouble of the dateline and I don't think if we spend too much time on the process we will be successful. I really suggest that you take the lead with the ALT members, and if the RALO came finally with some proposal outside of those people, then you will take care of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. We have a motion from Sebastien that we revert to the ALT augmented by any RALO people that are identified. I'm

happy to second it for expediency's sake. Can I ask for any discussion on this? Is the rest of the ALAC happy to go this way or do we want to continue on the course that was planned in Dublin? We have a tick from Maureen. I'd like to either hear negatives or get support. Holly is supporting it. Wafa says she supports it.

Okay, [explicitly], is there anybody who disagrees? Is there anyone who would like to abstain? Tim may choose to abstain because he is known as a candidate at this point. Seun, go ahead.

TIM DENTON: I must abstain.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible], thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I didn't catch what you said, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. I said [inaudible] should abstain.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're abstaining. So we have one abstention, no disagreements, several agreements. Then I call this to have been agreed to by consensus. I will issue a new mail immediately after this call saying how

we have decided this, and again asking RALOs if they have any choices, any people to contribute to the process to do so.

Next item – and miraculously, we are way ahead of schedule at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think Beran is with us now. Remember we skipped that, so we're not that far ahead.

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, I am. I'm right here.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We actually still are somewhat ahead. Go ahead, Beran. For the record, we're back on the new meeting strategy. Beran, did you hear my introduction last time?

BERAN GILLEN: No, I have some audio issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'll summarize very quickly, just pointing out that this is the effort that we've been going over to try to identify how to use the new

meeting strategy. We well understand that as we get closer to each meeting there will be lots and lots of changes, and this will be the outline that we use to start with, but may not be what we ended up with. But nevertheless, this is how we think it would be wise to use the sessions before we start seeing what the actual details are associated with each meeting. And it's over to you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. I think most of us understand the new meeting strategy will be starting in Marrakech next year in March, which will be meeting A, a six-day meeting followed by a meeting in Panama, which will be a four-day meeting (Meeting B), and a meeting C which will be the AGM, a seven-day meeting at the end of the year.

So just looking through Meeting A, basically I'm presenting these schedules to you, so hopefully by the end of the presentation, you'd be able to give your feedback and say what you can live with and what you can't live with.

So Meeting A starts on a Saturday. Now, let's bear in mind that we have some – we actually applied. In AFRALO, we applied to have some NGOs come in for some capacity building. That's why if you notice, throughout most of the week, you have capacity building starting at 8:00.

Now, this is tentative. It isn't fixed yet. So it is not something that… It's something we're toying with, something that the organizing committee is toying with, but we haven't really fixed. There isn't any [certainly] to it, basically.

So if you also notice the day starts at 9:00, which I think it's a great change from what we normally have from 7:00 to 8:00 in the night. Hopefully we'll be able to maintain that 9:00.

That would be fantastic if we can. So just quickly zipping through, we have [started] Saturday of the capacity building and then we have the strategy sessions for most of the day. Then we have working groups [inaudible] in between two working groups.

So what I have done – or what the team has done, actually. What the team has done, we've put a lot of hours into this. We actually separated the working groups. We tried avoiding concurrent working groups meeting at the same time, because we do appreciate that people belong in different working groups and they can't be pulled in two different places at the same time. So we decided to have the working groups in separate – not running parallel, but on separate time slots.

We also have… On Sunday, we have the regional leadership meeting following the capacity building. Then we have something new on the schedule: one-hour meeting with the ALAC board director.

Now, before I really delve into the schedule, just to point out two things. If you notice, most of the slots are [inaudible] minutes long, but the new structure of the meetings now. Only the beginning and the ending of the day have 90-minute slots. So the 90-minute slots will be for the… Okay, we have a bit of a typo here. If you notice, the one-hour session is marked 90 minutes. That's supposed to be 60 minutes. But the strategy sessions and the regional leadership and anything starting

from 9:00 is a 90-minute slot. Then all the other slots are 75-minute slots. These are all the main sessions will be one hour, 15 minutes long.

Now, going back to Sunday, we have the ALAC with the Board Director for 75 minutes. Then I've also introduced the Regional Secretariat Meeting on that Sunday. Then we have a RALO Regional Meeting. I've also tried to make sure we have all the five RALOs having their one-hour, or in this case one-and-a-half or one-hour-15-minute sessions during the course of each meeting. So everything we schedule, we'll keep it to five RALOs having their meetings on the schedule.

Then moving on to Monday, we have the normal session of the Welcome Ceremony. It's an hour-and-a-half. Then we have a lot of high-interest topics. Now, we had a lot of discussion during the meeting working party in our last session in which we discussed that we had some other sessions happening concurrent to the high-interest topics. But we decided to move those session to the other days because we felt these high-interest topics were quite critical to most of the ALAC people who would want to attend these sessions. So [inaudible] of what is actually happening in the main room, which will be the high-interest topics for most of the day, and then you have the public forum at the end of the day. That's Monday.

Tuesday, we have another RALO regional meeting. Then we have the rest of the day for outreach and engagement. Now, the reason this was slotted in here is because AFRALO will be going out into the community to engage either NGOs or the universities for outreach and engagement. So we have allocated about four hours for this outreach and engagement for going out. The meeting team will be providing

EN

transportation during this time. Then we will top it off at the end of the day with a regional showcase in the evening.

Now, the regional showcase usually happens on a Wednesday, but the reason we've moved to Tuesday was we got feedback from the organizing committee – and Aziz in particular – that a lot of people will be leaving on Wednesday. And [inaudible] is going to be the gala. So a lot of people will be leaving on Wednesday evening. We decided to move the regional showcase to Tuesday, and then leave the gala on Wednesday evening.

So on Wednesday, we have a couple of working groups in the morning. Then we have ALAC with the Board. The reason ALAC with the Board was moved back a bit to the end of the meeting is to allow us to have more face-to-face policy discussion before we actually meet the Board, so we're able to have, in my opinion – or in our opinion – a more structured meeting with the Board. I have slotted it in for 105 minutes, which means we would have almost an hour-and-a-half. Or an hour, 45 minutes. I don't know how you feel about that amount of time with the Board.

We also have another RALO regional meeting after meeting with the Board, and then we have the ALAC wrap-up, and then the gala following that in the evening.

Then Thursday is the last day. We have some cross-community work happening, which would be the working group. It could be the CCWG or the CWG [inaudible] or the CWG, whatever it happening at that point in time.

Then we would also have the ALT meeting following that, and we'll have the second public forum. Remember, this is Meeting A. There is two public forums. Then we'll have the public board meeting.

Now, there's one thing that might likely change, which would be the ALT happening at the end of the day rather than the beginning of the day because the public board meeting might be moved up to the morning. But this is something that is [tentative]. So if the public board meeting is moved up to the morning, then the ALT meeting would be moved down to the meeting. But that's the only change we sort of anticipate at the moment. Meeting with the organizing committee for AFRALO we sort of got some really good feedback with regards to the days and what is actually planned. So [tentatively], this is what we have for Meeting A. I would open up any questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have one comment, but I'd like to open the floor to anyone else's before we go ahead. Tim, go ahead.

TIM DENTON: Just, the first day I did not follow properly. Do we start on Saturday our meetings?

ALAN GREENBERG: In this coming meeting, yes we do start on Saturday.

TIM DENTON: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It varies from meeting type to meeting type, but the A meeting which is scheduled for Marrakech does start on Saturday, with the exception of a few events that happen Friday afternoon. Now, that may, of course, change based on emergencies or other things, as has happened before. It's not envisioned that either the CWG or the CCWG is going to have any emergency work, but I would not be surprised if the CCWG decides they need a full day of meetings to start working on work stream 2, assuming work stream 1 ever completes. But at this point, nothing has been said about that.

TIM DENTON: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Then I will go in with my comments. As Beran noted, the ALT meetings which have traditionally been held the day before the first meeting – typically when our first day of meetings was Saturday, typically the ALT would meet for several hours on the Saturday and the ALT has typically meet along with anyone else who chose to come on the Friday after the meeting, when meetings normally ended on Thursday, and we would meet both to recap the week, to do some planning, and typically for pretty interesting sessions with a number of ICANN senior people, and usually at the very least, David Olive and

Steve Crocker – sometimes other people. Those would be very candid, open sessions and they have resulted in a lot of good things happening.

The new meeting strategy does not really allow for either of these things to happen. We may be able to squeeze in a very short ALT meeting perhaps at breakfast on the day before – or, rather, on the first day of meetings. And we may be able to put an hour or so of a meeting with the ALT on the last day. The timing would be such that we wouldn't have any visitors of the type we had before, and certainly would not be an opportunity to really review the week and to do any planning going forward.

I find that very distressing, and I will say that we welcome any comments here, but the ALT will be discussing it and looking for other opportunities to be able to make sure that the week is being used effectively.

Certainly in the past these planning and recap sessions have added significantly to the value of the week, and I'm, as I said, quite distressed that we can't do it. We'll see whether we have any alternatives going forward. But currently it's a significant problem.

The other problem that is quite clear is if you look at the number of hours that the ALAC and regional leadership spent in Dublin, both meeting with itself and discussing issues and meeting with other visitors, it was I believe about 21 hours in total. A significant part of that – I don't remember the exact number, but about half of that was with other groups, whether it was the SSAC, with the global stakeholder

engagement people, the web people. We had a lot of meetings, and I think overall they were quite productive.

In Marrakech, it looks like we have about 6.5 or 7 hours total. So cutting it down to about a third of what we saw in Dublin, and perhaps about a half of what we have seen in previous meetings. Clearly we are going to have to change our work methods and who we talk to. We just will not be able to meet with all the people that, in the past, we've found productive meetings with. So there's going to be some really hard decisions that are made over the next couple of months in how we plan this meeting. So that's just a head's up. It's not clear what's going to suffer most, but it looks like there is going to be a lot of pain along the way in many different areas.

Comments, questions? Is anyone awake?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes. I just want to comment on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Go ahead, Beran.

BERAN GILLEN: With regards to the ALT, judging from the feedback I got from our last meeting, I was able to – if you check [inaudible] day six, I was able to squeeze in another hour-and-a-quarter to get you about two hours – or four hours altogether – for the ALT.

ALAN GREENBERG: Beran, your voice is getting pretty warbly.

BERAN GILLEN: [inaudible].

GISELLA GRUBER: Beran, sorry to interrupt. Beran?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think she can hear you while she's talking.

GISELLA GRUBER: Beran, if you can hear us… Beran, you can hear us?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, I can hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We also have another Beran talking at the same time.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay, I just moved to the audio bridge. I think that will be clearer. Is that better?

ALAN GREENBERG: Beran, we like you a lot, but two of you may be a bit much.

BERAN GILLEN: I can hear you fine. Okay, great. Now I'm on audio bridge. I've gone off the AC. What I was saying was [inaudible].

GISELLA GRUBER: Beran, we seem to have a problem with your audio. If you're on the phone bridge, can you please make sure that your Adobe Connect microphone and speakers are muted, please?

BERAN GILLEN: I have completely [inaudible].

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Beran, are you on the audio bridge or are you on the Adobe Connect?

BERAN GILLEN: I am on the audio bridge. Can you hear me now?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, we can hear you. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:	Okay. Alan, just to reiterate what I was saying earlier until I decided to split myself into two different people, the ALT meeting at the end of the week, has actually added another slot for the ALT meeting, so you will have a cumulative amount of hours – four hours including lunch. So taking maybe an hour lunch, you will have your three hours that you normally get at the end of the week.

So I think now the concern would be the beginning of the week, since the meeting you would want to have at the beginning of the week.

Now, with regards to the number of contact hours, as I said, during the meeting that we had for the working party, we're starting later. So it's going to have an impact on the number of hours, number of contact hours, we're going to have. We have longer lunches. We have an hour-and-a-half lunch rather than a normal hour that we have on a normal meeting. It's going to impact the number of hours that we have. We're going to have 30-minute coffee breaks compared to 15-minute coffee breaks. That's going to have an impact on the number of hours that we have.

Another thing we should also consider is the 75-minute slots, which means we're going to have less slots and longer slots. So we're going to have less contact time based on… Culminating all these things together is definitely going to have shorter hours. It's the new meeting strategy. We just have to figure out a way of living through it.

I really would want everyone to have a look at this and have fresh eyes. If we can get fresh eyes, that would be great. I know I'm spending a lot of time on this. I'm going to quickly move over to Meeting B, which is I

think the one that changes the most, if we could just have that on the AC. I have disconnected my [inaudible]. I was having too many audio issues. I don't know if it's up and we can move on to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one quick comment. The additional hours for the ALT on the last day doesn't address the ability to get the selected speakers in and that is a significant function. It's nothing you can fix. I was just noting that.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay. Just to add to that, we're still talking to the meetings team and getting feedback from what everyone else is doing, including the board. So hopefully [inaudible] will come together and it will be a bit clearer as to [who] will be available when, and then we'll be able to hopefully confirm that those people will be available. Thank you for that. I will note that down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Turn it back to you.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay. Is the Meeting B up and ready to go?

ALAN GREENBERG: Looks like it's being loaded right now.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay. Meeting B is going to be a four-day meeting and it's going to start on a Monday and end on a Thursday. This meeting will be held in Panama, which will be the first Meeting B.

The first day we're looking more on outreach. The beginning of the day would be a small plenary. There wouldn't be an opening ceremony on this meeting. It will be a small plenary with a welcome remark by David Olive and Steve Crocker. It will be an open session, of course, and it will be only about an hour-and-a-half. This will be inviting all the SOs and ACs. Then the rest of the day we plan outreach and engagement. This means going out. We haven't decided yet where we're going to go out to. This is something that we are trying to pin down.

We have created a subgroup for the LAC region where we'll be identifying the areas where we will be doing the outreach and engagement. So for the rest of the day after that plenary session from 9:00 to 10:30, the rest of the day from 11:00 right after the coffee break up until 5:30 would be outreach and engagement.

Just to confirm, is the schedule up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it is.

BERAN GILLEN: Great, okay. Moving on to meeting two. Now, if you notice, this meeting, we had some feedback from what actually the other working groups are doing. So we have some other columns where you can see what the GAC is doing and what the GNSO is doing and what the SSAC is

doing compared to what we're doing. And also what is happening in the main room.

With this meeting, there's a lot of emphasis on policy work. So we decided to identify working groups that only deal with policy in At-Large. So we haven't actually labeled the working group meetings yet, but the plan is to use only the policy working groups for this meeting as these are the working groups that will actually add value to the meeting itself.

Looking at day two, we have the [inaudible] on Strategy Exchange. What this is, we're trying to get RALOs together to actually set the table and discuss issues that they had and things that they're doing, where other RALOs can actually copy from and be able to learn from.

We really thought that this would be a good idea, because the only time we see RALOs actually [inaudible] is when they have the secretariat meeting. So we thought this would be a good idea to have an exchange of ideas of what some regions are doing and how other regions can also copy and learn from those.

We have follow-up ALAC policy work part 1 and part 2 after lunch, and then we have two working group meetings, and these again, will be policy working groups mainly.

Then moving on to day three, we have the intra-community work still going on within At-Large. We have ALAC with the board on Wednesday. This is a new addition. This wasn't actually here when we had our working party meeting a few days ago, but I just got some confirmation – or some feedback, rather – from the meetings team as this schedule

will evolve again. We have some feedback from the meetings team that the board will be available Tuesday or Wednesday, so I thought to [inaudible] on Wednesday morning, so that the later we have it, the more time we will have to have policy discussion and be able to see the Board face-to-face. We have working groups following the meeting [inaudible] and then we have a policy discussion wrap-up at the end, and then showcase in the evening of Wednesday.

Then Thursday is the last day, day four. We have lots of cross-community work happening in the morning and early afternoon. Then we have ALT wrap-up, which is the three-hour session at the end. Any questions or comments before we quickly move on to Meeting C, which is very similar to Meeting A?

ALAN GREENBERG: There are no hands up.

BERAN GILLEN: Great, moving on. Gisella, could I please have Meeting C up?

ALAN GREENBERG: And it is up.

BERAN GILLEN: Wonderful. Meeting C is going to be the longest meeting, a seven-day meeting starting on a Saturday and ending on a Friday. We've done Saturday and Sunday, we have mostly internal work happening, working

group meetings, regional leadership, strategy, what we probably normally have on a normal ICANN meeting, excluding the working groups of course. Then we have a RALO regional meeting. One of the RALOs will be meeting on that Sunday.

Then on Monday, we kept exactly the same as what is actually happening in the main room. We have the opening remarks, the opening session, and then we have the high-interest topics and then we wrap it up with the public forum at the end.

Then on Tuesday, we notice everything blank on the right side of our list, because no one has actually submitted anything specific yet. We're the only ones that actually have broken down our day.

You can notice that on Tuesday we have another RALO regional meeting in the morning and some working group meetings. Then the rest of the day, you have the general assembly. I know you realize that there's no general assembly on Meeting A. That's because there was space for general assembly, but the general assembly [inaudible]. But by the time we get around to Meeting C, we hope to have a general assembly for whatever reason that [inaudible]. Then we will wrap it up with the showcase at the end of [inaudible].

Now, on Wednesday, we have a high-interest topic coming in, and then we have ALAC with the Board in the early morning or early afternoon. Then we have the regional meeting. This time we would need to have two concurrent regional meetings. Now the reason for this was we have spread out the RALO regional meetings throughout the bulk of the day, but realized that we would have been missing out on a lot of the high-

interest topics. And I've decided to actually put them together and have them concurrently run for that one hour, 45 minutes and possibly maybe split that time slot – have one regional meeting in one, and then close off, and then have another regional meeting in one in that exact same time slot of one hour, 45 minutes. So the overlap would only be about 15 minutes or so.

Moving on to Thursday, that's the cross-community work. We have the working groups for the better part of the morning. Then we have the regional secretariats right after lunch. Then we have public forum number two, which happens from 3:00 to 5:30. Then we have the public board meeting and the wrap-up cocktail.

Then on Friday, we have ALT meeting for two hours. It could be three, depending if you really want to get up at 7:00 in the morning. We could have it from 7:00 to 10:00. Then we have the ALAC development session for the last day of the week from 10:00 to 6:00 for those new incoming ALAC members.

Any comments or questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: There are no hands up. I hear no voices.

BERAN GILLEN: Alan, I don't know. Would it be too much to ask for perhaps maybe it would be a bit too much to actually ask the ALAC to vote on this or possibly endorse this to move forward? How do we move forward?

ALAN GREENBERG: Hold on a second.

TIM DENTON: Can I speak for a moment, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, you certainly can. Go ahead, Tim.

TIM DENTON: First of all, this is my first year in this and I don't have enough wisdom or experience to speak authoritatively. It's one of those issues that I would prefer to defer to a leadership group that's had a few years on this committee, on this council, than myself. I really do feel that those who have experience having these meetings and having gone through agendas and devised agendas should be heard from. People like me who are just in their first few months don't have views worth listening to. Sorry, but that's true.

I think on this matter something I would defer to the council's leadership. That's all I want to say. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, Tim. Normally on this kind of thing, we do ask for ratification from the ALAC, although that may well just be a pro forma thing. I will say that there have been a significant number of people with the leadership involved in the process. As I noted at the beginning of the

section, that what we have here isn't outlined. It will change. So we're not really casting something in concrete. We simply want to be able to tell the rest of the community what we're thinking of at this point. And from that perspective, it really should be endorsed by the community.

My inclination, however, given the fact that this is a lot of meat to digest that we do do the endorsement by a consensus call online afterwards, but specifically ask people to review the documents to the extent they can when it's a little bit quieter – and I'll try and follow online.

That's my take. We did list it as an item for potential decision today, but my inclination is to defer it. Heidi, what kind of timeline are we on that we really need to… By when do we really need to make a decision at this point. And obviously the Marrakech meeting is the crucial one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe it's around the 14th of December. Internally, though, the meeting forum is open. At that point is when people will start submitting the meeting forms for Marrakech.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So we certainly have a week or so to give people time to digest it and then do a decision online. Given that, that's my inclination. That also gives people time to ask Beran questions if they've identified something that is less than fully understandable to them. If that's okay with Beran, then that is my inclination is to defer the decision. But we will bring it to the ALAC for a formal agreement.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. I completely agree with that. This is a lot to take in in a two-hour meeting online and I think we need to have time to be able to digest everything and be able to get back to me. I would really want to get some feedback on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of us have looked at it a lot already and still find it a lot to digest. Holly, you had your hand up. Is there anything you want to say?

HOLLY RAICHE: I put it in the chat. Could this be put in an easily discoverable place on the website, so we can actually have a look at it and think about it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I suspect it is somewhere, but staff will be sending out a message either after or during this meeting, identifying where it is and setting a deadline of, let's say… It's Tuesday. Let's say by the end of Sunday. Does that sound okay? To make any comments or ask any questions.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Look for an action item on that. Going on to the next item, the next item is Item #10, the ALAC meeting schedule. This is a great time for me. It's

2:00. The meeting started at 2:00 in the afternoon. For Kaili, it started at 3:00 in the morning and we're now going on to 4:15. And everyone else in between.

Those of you who are on the ALAC or participating in our meetings a year ago will recall we did an extensive set of Doodle polls to try to find better times for the meetings. We, at that point, were looking to rotate meetings around so that no one would always be stuck with a meeting at 11:00 at night or 4:00 in the morning. We didn't succeed. We, at that point, had the fortune, I guess, to have an eight-hour section of the time zones where we had no one resident.

So we ended up with meetings that were held at inconvenient times for some people, and they were always inconvenient, but we did not have to rotate.

With the addition of our new member from China, we no longer have that gap. From my personal perspective, I think it is unreasonable to hold meetings for a group like ALAC with people around the world and always have certain people who have to do it at 3:00 in the morning, and other people like me who end up doing it in the middle of the afternoon, which is quite convenient. And of course, we have some people for whom the middle of the afternoon is very inconvenient because it comes during their work hours and they can't take the time off.

So we will be sending out some Doodles again. It will be a full 24-hour one. We ask everyone to be as flexible as they can be. Nobody really likes getting up at 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning for meetings, but

somebody is going to have to some of the time. We ask everyone to take on their respective responsibilities. Identify the times that are really inconvenient and we will try our best to accommodate. But please be as flexible as possible. We will try to spread the pain around.

When I did this last year, I rarely had 3:00 AM meetings or 4:00 AM meetings. Since then, we have had the CWG IANA and CCWG Accountability. I have now had much more than my share of such meetings. It's not nice, but you can survive it.

I see Kaili's hand is up. I will turn the floor over to him in a moment. I will note that before you have an opportunity to say anything Kaili, this is not you forcing us to change our business patterns. It's you being in a position where now we have no choice but to change them because it's not fair to people not to change them. But I'll let you speak up anyway. Go ahead. Kaili, if you're talking, we can't hear you yet.

KAILI KAN: Do you hear me? Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Now we can hear you loud and clear.

KAILI KAN: Okay, thank you. Thank you and ALAC to be able to be considerate, but I figure out that my time zone, I'm in a minority and also I'm a night owl, so I'm okay for this. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. You're not the only one who will be disadvantaged. Cheryl spends much of her nights awake on conference calls. Holly and Maureen do it on occasion also. But we really are trying to make sure that we all acknowledge we're working in a worldwide group. We'll see if we can make it more convenient for you, but thank you for your understanding to the extent that we can't. We do appreciate your flexibility, as we do other people.

I thought I heard Heidi, but I'm not sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, you did. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: We heard Heidi and Sophia. Heidi, maybe you need to introduce your daughter to the rest of the group.

HEIDI ULLRICH: She's actually taking notes at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That's our little interlude. All right. We are actually, I think, ahead of time a little bit. The next item is the update and next steps on accountability. I was hoping we'd have Leon on this call so I wouldn't have to do it all myself. And I didn't give any of the other accountability notice that they would be called upon. But certainly anyone else who's

been active in accountability is very welcome to speak up should they choose.

The first item is the timeline we're now looking at. Could we have that up on the display, please? Gisella, are you there? There we come. This is really not a diagram I can talk to without it being in front of everyone. It is linked to in the agenda for anyone who's not on Adobe Connect. If you can possibly pull up the graphic, it's hard to describe it other than that.

We are now partway through the first part of the comment period. An update on the accountability status was issued that gives a brief overview, hopefully an easier-to-understand language that was previously used in the earlier proposals. People who have not looked at that document should. It is not actually linked to this, but we'll send out a link to the ALAC list at the end of this meeting, if I could ask staff to do that. That's the update document that was issued on the 15th of November.

There is furious work going on to try to incorporate into the formal proposal which will be issued on November 30th, which is the end of this week. All of the changes that have been identified in the discussions in Dublin and since then that need to be changed in the report. The third draft proposal that we're talking about is quite different from the previous one. We are no longer talking about a membership model. We are talking about a designator model which is a lower weight structure, and we have changed an awful lot of the other details in the report.

The intent is to issue that on the 30th. There will then be a short 20-day comment period. That's 20 days following the 15 where the update was available for anyone, and particularly the ACs and SOs to issue any comments.

That brings us to the 21st of December. By the 24th of December, there will be a staff summary of the comments. The working group – the CCWG has until the 7th of December to amend the paper, the proposal subject to the comments. Then on the 7th of January, there's a two-week period under which the chartering bodies of which the ALAC is one have to approve the proposal. So even though there will be changes, according to the charter, we do not need to go out – there's another public comment at that point. It reverts to the chartering bodies.

Now, I will point out that at least one chartering body, the ccNSO, hopes to make a decision on the 23rd on December. That is, they will take their own look at the comments and decide whether they believe with the proposal on the table, subject to the comments they were willing to accept it. That may or may not go ahead.

There is the possibility that there would be a face-to-face meeting of some or all of the chartering organizations sometime between the 7th and the 22nd. The ALAC's position, the decision we took in Dublin and we have – at least I have – reiterated on behalf to the ALAC is that although we will not demand a face-to-face meeting, should there be one for any of the other ACs and SOs that we will attend. That is, we will have an opportunity to go through the report, the proposal in detail, make sure everyone is comfortable with it and do whatever we have to

so that we hopefully can approve it. There's always the chance, of course, that we don't approve it if there are things in it which we decide are simply unacceptable from our position. The CCWG charter says that as long as all but one of the AC/SOs approve it, that it does go forward. so that's where we sit right now.

So we may end up meeting as the ALAC somewhere, presumably probably somewhere in Europe sometime in early January or we may not. We will have to accommodate that schedule, and when we get a little bit closer, we'll know whether there is going to be a face-to-face meeting, or if indeed we will have to schedule appropriate webinars and/or ALAC meetings to be able to ratify remotely.

So that's where we sit right now. It's a complex schedule. It's very tight. But according to the timing that we now understand from Washington, it's about as late as we can deliver a report and still expect the transition to possibly happen this calendar year.

There are, of course, also all sorts of political issues going on in Washington. We don't know how it's going to turn out.

The next item is there is a link on the agenda, on the second bullet, to the third draft report. It points to current draft. And these things are changing day by day, of the report itself and a large number of annexes.

I would suggest for any of those who want to look at the details themselves, the report is quite different from the last format and I do recommend that you look at the report. At least the overall report, if not the annexes.

Each of you on the ALAC will be called upon to make a decision whether to support this or not, so you really do need to understand it.

The next thing on our agenda is the summary. We made a significant number of comments on the second draft. The document linked to the agenda is the current assessment. That is, it's our statement and with a number of items highlighted in yellow or green. The green ones are the ones where changes have been made in the report, in the proposal, to accommodate what we have said. The yellow ones are items where they have not yet been yet changed. Many of these are in process and will change over the next couple of days. But at this point, there are still a number of issues that we considered critical that have not been incorporated into the report, into the proposal.

Now, as the week unfolds, we're going to see if any them remain at the end, and again, these are issues that we will either have to decide to simply accept, to comment on again, or to make a statement saying if this isn't fixed, the ALAC will not be able to ratify – or probably will not be able to ratify.

If you scroll down, you'll see I've tried to identify most of the paragraph and try to say, "Are these issues that have been fixed?" In some cases, they were statements that are not relevant anymore because our understanding of the report changed. In some cases, they're things that simply don't exist in the report anymore, so it wasn't a matter of saying whether the change was made. But it's a quick summary and it will give you an idea of where we are.

The last issue I want to bring up is the comments from the Board. The Board issued a number of comments a few days ago, and again yesterday. The comments were general feelings where the Board is uneasy about certain topics. The Board has said that they will issue formal comments by roughly the middle of December, which if you look back at the timeline is just a week or so before the end of the comment period.

It remains to be seen how these will be addressed. If there are indeed things that come out in the final comments where the Board is saying they cannot accept certain things that are in the draft proposal, how those get resolved is not going to be quite clear.

The indications are that some of these may be things that have been discussed a lot within the CCWG, and the board is simply at odds with the recommendation of the overall community.

Now, since the Board ultimately does have to approve the bylaws that come out of these recommendations, if we end up with a final report approved by the chartering bodies that is not acceptable to the Board, it's not clear how that unfolds.

On the other hand, it's not clear how in the one-week period, essentially between December 31st and January 7th the CCWG would suddenly change its mind on these things.

It's interesting, I think, is all we can say. I'm not sure I want to predict more how that will unfold, or even if there will be things in the Board comments which are categorical refusals of things in the document that remains to be seen.

That's about as much as I can say. It's a changing world. The last call was my time 2:00 to 4:00 AM last night. There is another call Thursday morning my time. Now, in the US, it is Thanksgiving which is the holiday at which most people travel to see family on Thursday with travel happening Wednesday going into Thursday. So it's going to be interesting to see what the attendance at that meeting is like. But there is a meeting scheduled, and presumably we will use it to try to make some final decisions on many of the issues that have to be resolved before the report can be published.

I'd now like to turn it over to anyone else, particularly other people who are on the committee or have been active within the CCWG. Sebastien, Cheryl, Seun? Yes, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. I'm away from the AC room, otherwise I would've put my hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can pick up on a number of points. The main one I wanted to raise was the part where you went to the link on comments that ALAC has made in the past. I just wanted to mention that with regard to the current draft of our final report that will be going out at end of month, we have in fact spent a good part of my night, other people's days, and it's still going on now, as part of the leadership team with the rapporteurs to

work with staff to make sure where there is an items – and I must say, ALAC and Alan Greenberg's name has gone across Skype chat channels a number of times in the last 8-12 hours. Thank you, Alan!

We made a particular quote. We have asked about the [inaudible] clear enough or either is not raised in the report. So we are going through diligently to try and respond and work in where we believe a decision has been made and [inaudible] to add it into text, where for example – let me give you one at the moment, the point you raised on section 3 of the Affirmation of Commitments with regards to ALAC's previous comments on consumer choice, trust, and confidence.

The belief is – and we went back through our records – that when we talked about that, it was generally agreed that section three is really an umbrella, or hat as well as some legal people suggested it was, statement and talking in generality, and that whilst during our work stream 1 activities, it was essential to bring things like the CCTRT – in other words, the review team aspects – across from the Affirmation of Commitments on consumer, trust, and confidence into the bylaws. That it would probably be better to leave any additional bolstering of ICANN commitment beyond he general statements already made and to be put into a future bylaw change as a result of a review team comment.

So we are taking it all very seriously, Alan. If you don't get an affirmative addition of everything ALAC has said, trust me, we have definitely looked deeply into why or why not. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I received enough other comments during the day that I was quite aware that was happening. I will point out some of them are not simply [miffs] that the ALAC had. Some of them were significant omissions in the document itself. Things like…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's been a number of [lucky] catches and this is where going through it all so closely is very important. I just want to [inaudible] we weren't being ignored as a chartering organization.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I just wanted to point out I'm not just trying to be annoying. I am trying to be helpful. Although being annoying is not a bad thing at times. Any other comments? Sebastien and Seun I think are the other people. Olivier to some extent. You've been involved in these. Or is there anyone who wants to ask a question or is everything I said crystal clear or so confusing that you don't even know what the question is. I'll take silence as a good thing in this case, then.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you. I just want to… There's been some comments about omissions on the third draft and I'm wondering is this something we should worry about? Is there any reason to believe that [inaudible] intentionally removal of words from the draft, or it's just a matter of [inaudible]? Is this something that we need to worry about? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I'll give my answer and other people may have theirs. It depends on what you're talking about. There may be some things that were omitted deliberately and there was some logic to it, and hopefully someone can explain it. There may be things which simply disappeared by accident, in which case we need to identify them and make sure that they get put back in if it was just an accident. I don't think there's a general answer to that. I think you have to identify the very specific issue and try to understand, have someone try to explain why. Or point out where it is, because in some cases, there are things that have not been omitted, but have been moved in ways that were not crystal clear.

So I don't think there's a general answer. I don't think you can assume that everything is a conspiracy or a mistake. But you're going to have to identify them one by one.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible] comment in relationship to [inaudible] to the ALAC about the [inaudible] given to the GAC, proposed for GAC. [inaudible] not to accept the advice of GAC. Is this something that ALAC maybe thinking of also asking from the [inaudible] as well? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Seun. Seun was referring to what has generally been called stress test 18. Stress test 18 was attempting to say that the Board does not have to give GAC advice to special treatment that is identified in the bylaws unless the GAC advice is developed by certain consensus models.

The current consensus model says some people want it and nobody objects. There have been a variety of attempts to change, but nobody objects to significant objections. There have been discussions on whether the Board can reject advice by a 50% majority, 51%, or needs a super majority. There are a lot of discussions. This is a very sensitive issue with many GAC members. It apparently is something that is potentially a very great concern to the US government. That is that they don't want ICANN to have to respond to GAC advice, which perhaps many countries are objecting to.

As an example, there is some worry that a decision on advice could be made by a simple majority of GAC members, despite the fact that 49% of them object to it, the Board still has to treat it with the certain methodology that's outlined in the bylaws.

My personal position is… I won't say I don't care. I of course care, but I don't have a large stake in this. If we can come up with the solution that the GAC can accept, or at least not object to – because, remember, the GAC is one of the chartering bodies, that the US government can ultimately accept that the Board can accept, I don't really care if it's my favorite answer or not.

So I have largely stayed out of the discussion. From my perspective, I don't see the ALAC getting in as one of the really involved bodies in this. It's a great importance, but there are enough people with a stake in this game and strong opinions that I don't think we need to participate at that level. That's my personal opinion. That [currently] is where I plan to stay.

EN

We have two speakers right now. We have Sebastien and Olivier. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. I hope that you hear me well.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. About stress test 18, I agree with you that it maybe not the right place for us to be in because it's very complicated debate. The impression is that there is GAC on one side and there are a lot of US cities on the other side trying to push for something or something, and the reverse. We will not gain anything as At-Large to be there. At the end, if the agreement can be find within the GAC and that they come with a proposal, I think it could be a good things to agree with that, but nothing else.

I have two main concerns. I have the impression that now we spend a lot of time on very specific issue, important issue but very specific. There is no review of the [global] situation. That concerns me because I have the impression that we will end up to some solution that we will dismiss even if everybody says the reverse, that the multi-stakeholder is – we are introducing a lot of risk against the multi-stakeholderism.

For example, if we're able to split the IANA function in different parts, all the parts will be outside of ICANN, will be without the participation of the end users.

The other point when you look to the push for changing the bylaws, the mission of ICANN, it's also at the end, will not allow it as the voice of end user to participate in those situations. It's a big concern from my point of view.

Second, a large question is about diversity. You know that it's one of my favorite points. It seems that in some sense you have the world, and then the next title with the same sentence is without the world, and we were talking about diversity, overall ICANN, and now it's important but just about SOs and ACs. That means that the rest of the [inaudible] need to go to any diversity work and that's the other point I am concerned about.

I am still [inaudible]. I know that we have already read the second version this one. It's not yet finished from my point of view, but from my work, that's the point I wanted to raise now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. I certainly share a lot of your concerns that the changes in the mission may end up sending ICANN in a way we don't want to go. To some extent, the Board is saying the same thing. I'm not quite sure I know how to fix the direction right now without simply killing the transition. I do ask you and other people. I have been sending in things on my own behalf with regard to what the ALAC has said. But if you've identified things that you think are red lines for the ALAC that is,

as they stand now, we cannot ratify it, please identify that to the ALAC so that we can make a decision on behalf of the group whether indeed this is something that's just your problem or is something that we all agree with. We don't have a lot of time left to do it.

I have Olivier in the queue. I will note we have 14 minutes left in the meeting. We will spend at least ten minutes with Aziz on the Marrakech meeting. There are some important issues to discuss. This discussion will go on for another four minutes, at which point we will go to Aziz and we'll come back to this afterwards if the interpreters can stay on for an extra ten minutes – I see they can for an extra ten minutes.

Olivier, I turn it over to you. Please be as brief as you can, and I will interrupt you if necessary when we get to ten minutes before the hour. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I will be actually quite fast on this. Just looking at the document, you've already actually touched on – well, Sebastien has touched on many of the points that I wanted to make, but you've also touched on the issue of a red line and that's where I'd like to get a bit of clarification on this.

We are making a number of comments here where we are effectively saying this is unacceptable. And we are pointing out some points, which seem to be red lines. At least the way that this comment is worded, it seems to be a red line. And yet, this is the very last public comment before this thing, this document, gets sent over to the Board and so on and gets ratified and whatever.

I just wonder how much time there would be. With the points that we are making here, how likely is it that those points are going to be taken into account and what happens if those points are not taken into account? Bearing in minute the overall floating of this glacier, because I think it feels like a glacier now that is just trottling down the mountain and the ALAC trying to push the glacier in one direction or another, but being completely ignored. How resolved are we to go forward with something that we're not happy with, where we actually say, for example in paragraph 187, "ICANN shall have no power blah, blah, blah." We're saying this is not acceptable. And either the change must be omitted or clarified to make it explicit that the domain name itself is excluded.

Well, let's say, you know what? We're not interested in making those changes. Does this mean the ALAC doesn't ratify?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Are you done?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I certainly am. I thought that was big enough. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. On that particular issue, there is a change going in. I hope the wording will be satisfactory. On one where I suspect the change will not go in is the one that is labeled as paragraph 218 where there is – we will let market mechanisms… And the wording has changed slightly. But essentially market mechanisms will control things,

and the words "where feasible and appropriate" were omitted. I suspect that is one where it will not be – where we will not be accommodated. I do not know for sure, but that's what I suspect.

We're going to have several choices. When we see what actually comes out in the draft at the end of the week, we are then going to have an opportunity to submit comments. If we still believe that is really important, and in my mind, we're past the point of simply using theatrics to identify things that we would like to see people convinced of. When we haven't convinced them of something for three drafts, the last one is not likely to. If we're really serious that this is a red line for us, then in this comment period, we're going to have to say something like that. Then there will be a 7-14 day period on which the final draft proposal will become the final proposal, prior to ratification by the bodies.

So there may well be things that we think are absolutely essential and someone else thinks would kill the proposal from their perspective. We're going to have to make some hard decisions on those. I don't think there are a lot of them. There may be some. Yes it is going to be interesting. I don't think I can say anything more than that.

Certainly we took strong positions in this current draft, but we're now going to have to decide whether we change. We did decision in Dublin that what's going to come out of – what we will issue as comments to the third draft are things that we're really serious. We agreed that we would not say the ALAC is divided. Some of us feel this, some of us feel that. The time has passed for that. So we're going to have to identify the

real hard lines and make them really clear. How we're going to do that, I don't have a clue, but we are going to have to do that.

At this point, we are nine minutes before the other. I'm going to curtail this discussion. If we want to go back to it afterwards, we can. But I'd like to give Aziz some time to tell us a little bit about what's going on in Marrakech. I know among other things there have been discussions of security issues, and I think that's part of what Aziz wants to talk about. But I will turn it over to Aziz at this point. I hope he is actually on the line. Is Aziz with us? Can he speak? We have a diagram.

GISELLA GRUBER: Aziz confirmed that he will be joining on the English channel via Adobe Connect for this session. I'm hoping he is just going to be joining now.

ALAN GREENBERG: He is on Adobe Connect. His microphone is muted. Aziz's microphone is now unmuted. Perhaps he can speak.

AZIZ HILALI: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

AZIZ HILALI: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Hello, everyone. I will try English to speak about Marrakech. I am already in the French channel, but I will try to speak English.

Let me to present you first the venue where our meeting will take place. The site is a [inaudible] palace, as you see in the slide. This slide shows a global view, which is a zone of 200 [hectors]. In the meeting, you'll see the convention center, which is located between two [inaudible]. Will be accommodated in these two hotels. Bookings have already started by participant and by some groups.

On the right, you'll see the [golf] palace hotel, which is very nice with [inaudible]. And on the right, you'll see the hotel [inaudible], which is more modern and really nice also.

The capacity of this hotel is about 750 rooms. These two hotels as well as villas and apartments which are at the right have all been [inaudible] by ICANN meetings.

The site you see, also the site we have a golf course with 27 holes, and this has any [inaudible], you can take your [inaudible] with you.

In slide two, please [inaudible] this one. This slide is to show you that the city of Marrakech is a city in which—

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost you, Aziz? Aziz, we can't hear you if you're talking.

GISELLA GRUBER: I'm just trying to locate the issue with Aziz.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. He just dropped off of Adobe. Is it possible we can dial out to him?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Aziz is already on the French channel. I see he's just come into the Adobe Connect. We'll give it another go. Aziz, are you able to speak now? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have our ship beacon going also.

AZIZ HILALI: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can. Thank you, Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI: This slide three I presented this slide yesterday to the GNSO group that wanted to have information about security and I think it is useful to show you, ALAC members. Please, it is a confidential slide. I ask the staff to put it in the website, please.

As you see, the site is closed and monitored [inaudible]. It is [inaudible] with cameras everywhere with anti-intrusion equipment in a controlled area [inaudible] all the sites. They have also video surveillance 24 hours camera are currently [inaudible] area, etc.

In the slide four, we have the [inaudible]. You have also other measures of security the hotel gave me, and it shows the [inaudible] of the security in the [inaudible] palace. In addition, there is also [inaudible] carry out [inaudible] around seven days, 24 hours.

Other information I can give you, with the ICANN meeting team, we choose other [inaudible] in the city with Nick and Nancy to host the other participants and it is in the center. These hotels are in the same avenue that leads to the site of the meeting. This avenue will also be totally secure during the week and transportation will be provided by ICANN.

For those few who will stay in the center of the city, you can ask ICANN Constituency Travel to take a room for you in this hotel. If you want I can send you the list of the hotel identified with ICANN meetings.

Finally, with the slide five, I would like to remind important event will take place aside from ICANN Marrakech. It's about the GAC high-level meeting March 7th. This meeting will take place in 7th March and it will be chaired by the Moroccan minister, which brings together representatives from governments.

We will have also a special meeting of African minister in chart of ICT and the [inaudible] currently on Sunday [on March 6th]. The objective of

this meeting will be to see how to promote the digital economy in Africa.

And regarding the AFRALO activities in Marrakech, as Beran said in the beginning of this meeting, whenever ICANN is holding its meeting in Africa, AFRALO tries to involve as many African end users as possible to better inform, sensitize, train and understand the role of ICANN and what it is [inaudible] in the policy development.

We would like in Marrakech to bring in NGOs from different regions in Morocco, as well as from other Mediterranean countries. We would also like to be a real celebration and [inaudible] to Fadi for all he has done and brought to African regions.

We have [inaudible] with speech, and after speech, we would like to end the showcase in [inaudible] enjoy ambiance with original socio-cultural and [inaudible] which we highlight [inaudible] Morocco and its neighborhood values and cultural because Morocco its main root is Africa, Middle East, and Mediterranean.

We will have also another event is the third [inaudible] of DNS Forum of Africa and it is [inaudible] in charge of this, and if he wants to take the floor to speak about the [inaudible] from South Africa, he can. Thank you. If you have any questions about the security over the program of Marrakech, please don't hesitate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Aziz. I have one question. As Aziz implied, all of the At-Large participants will be housed on the site. You may ask to be

in the city if you want to do more partying, but certainly being on the site is going to make it a lot easier in terms of timing and security.

I have one question for you, Aziz. Is there going to be specific security getting into the convention center or is it the overall site where there is security?

AZIZ HILALI: Yes. As you know we received the last month – one of the [inaudible] of the security in ICANN. And we had three meetings with high-level management of the security at the national level and the regional level.

After this discussion, we decided with [inaudible] to – because, as you know, ICANN is open for everyone and [inaudible] do his registration with a false name and false identity. We decided, and maybe it should be the first meeting of ICANN and maybe other ICANN meetings it will be done. We will verify. I don't know if it is good that the name verify the identity of each participant at registration. The site of [inaudible] palace, we have a principle entry to the village. And after this country we'll have [inaudible] for convention center. Therefore, we will have a double check or control of stability to go to the convention center.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The reason I asked is at the IGF meeting last month, there was x-ray machines and security at the entrance of the convention center, and because they only had three machines, there were lineups that took as much as 45 minutes to get in. I'm just hoping that if there is security at

that level, it will be able to handle the volumes needed at the start of the day. That was the only reason I was asking.

Olivier, a quick question. We're over time already, but if you have a question, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I was on the GNSO Council call when Aziz gave his wonderful presentation as well over there. Some of the questions turned around the fact that there was a plan in the presentation that shows the position of various guards or whatever. They were concerned that this was effectively giving out the position of the guards to any terrorists or anyone that would be interested.

I would guess, and I just wanted to make sure with Aziz that this was the case that this was just to give an idea of the people that were there but not the exact locations of the guards, because obviously that would be a bit of a concern.

Secondly, there was also some question regarding the people on the ICANN team that are dealing with security. One specific individual was mentioned – a person called Chris Clark – who is working for a company called Control Risks. ICANN has hired some specific contractors that have a very, very good feedback on all of the work that they've done. They were doing project management for the FIFA World Cup in Brazil for very large events around the world. Counter-terrorism officer for the United States military, liaisons, etc. You can see the caliber of people that will be there to make sure that there is no security risk, or at least that's minimized or [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for scaring us all, Olivier. Aziz? Go ahead, Aziz.

AZIZ HILALI: I will speak in French.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have our French interpreter with us?

INTERPRETER: Yes, I couldn't hear Aziz, but I think he's coming in now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

AZIZ HILALI: So to talk to what Olivier said, yes, of course the positions of the guards are no precise. It is just to give an idea to inform people that the site is secure. And in order to even get into the area, you need to drive through a door with cameras everywhere. So as far as security is concerned, you can be sure that we are secure.

As far as the person that was mentioned, Oliver, yes I welcomed him. I talked to him and I took care of him over three days.

INTERPRETER: It seems I have lost Aziz. I cannot hear him anymore. Hold on one second.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, dear.

INTERPRETER: I cannot hear him. He seems to have disappeared.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I'll ask you if he does come back if you could interrupt us. Otherwise we're going to go on and finish up the other items on our agenda, but please interrupt us if you get him back.

INTERPRETER: Okay, I will.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One of the item on the agenda is… Is Heidi still with us? Heidi does not seem to be with us.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I am.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then you have 30 seconds on item 14.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, 30 seconds. Basically, Gisella, could you please put those links into the chat? There is an updated civil society and non-commercial engagement document now available. We did take your comments into account from Dublin and comments are now available through the 11th of December, and there will also be a webinar probably the 14th of 15th in December for an update of what is happening for fiscal year '16 for civil society and non-commercial engagement. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And that document is linked into the agenda. If you go to today's agenda, you can find it. Is there any other business that anyone wants to add? We will stay on the call for another minute or so. We will have to lose the interpreters very soon, however. Yes, Sebastien, we register your objection. All we're saying is this document is available and you can look at it.

In that case, I think the meeting is close to over. I encourage people if they have any thoughts of the accountability issue where we had to cut short the discussion, please put things on the list. We have a very short time and we do need to identify things that are critical to the ALAC.

We will have to decide if they're showstoppers, if they're red lines or not, but if you think that there is something which is critical, we all have some concerns – or many of us have some concerns – on the changes to the mission statement and how that might change the nature of ICANN. That is something we'll have to consider.

AZIZ HILALI: I am back. I don't know exactly when I was interrupted, but what I was saying is basically that Chris Clark came. I think that's where we got cut off. As Olivier said, he works for a private company and he is in charge of security for ICANN, so he takes care of that for the ICANN meetings in general. I spent three days with him. We spent some time in Marrakech. We met high-level leaders in security. We were welcomed by the governor of the area in Marrakech, and he invited us to meet a month before the meeting for a meeting where we will talk about not only physical safety, but ALS medical [inaudible], hygiene, and so forth.

So just to let you know that the meeting should go along as planned. The area is completely secure. If you have further questions, I am available to answer them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Aziz. Olivier has something he wants to say. We're just about over time with the interpreters, so I would ask you to be as brief as you can, but the floor is yours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just on what Aziz just said, I think it's going to be a great meeting. It looks like it's going to be particularly secure for anyone who's concerned about this. I look forward to this.

The top paragraph reads:

I'm told Aziz is back, if he can speak in either English or French, we'll give him a minute or so.

Quickly on the statement that you mentioned there. What are the dates in which the public comment will open and the public comment will close? In fact, I guess it's going to be primarily just a comment from SOs and ACs will open and close. So we can all be ready, set, and go to be able to contribute to this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the public comment I believe is open. The CCWG is specifically looking for comments from the chartering bodies, but of course it is a public comment. The draft report with the details in it will be published on the 30th of November, so clearly for some aspects we're not in a position to comment before then. The comment closes on the 21st of December. To the extent we can get a document ready before then, the better. I really don't want to be doing this on the last day.

If nothing else, if we are going to have any really strong comments, we want to give the rest of the CCWG a head's up as soon as possible. We have technically until the 21st.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is nothing at the moment in the public comment page, the ALAC policy advice development page. Perhaps it would be good to [inaudible] ready.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps it would be good. Thank you. Noted. If there is nothing else, then I thank you very much. I thank the interpreters very much not only for their excellent work, but for giving us the extra time. I thank all of

the ALAC members and At-Large people who have stayed with us for a meeting that ran over. Occasionally it will happen, and I think it has been a very productive and useful meeting. Thank you, all, and we'll see you on the list. Bye-bye!

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]