
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team Mid-Monthly Meeting on Thursday, 19th November at 21:30 UTC. On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Leon Sanchez, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard and Ron Sherwood. Apologies noted from Tijani Ben Jemaa. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could also remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcripts. Apologies, I missed Sandra Hoferichter off the roll call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Gisella. This is a packed call today, and hopefully on some of the items we'll make up a bit of time, and maybe have a few minutes' gap at the end before some of us go onto our next call. The first substantive Item on the Agenda is the ALAC policy development. Ariel, can you take us through the Items that need our attention please?

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Alan. I'm just going to repaste the Agenda into the chat, because other statements in progress are over there. We have three that are in progress, and the first one is plan the implementation of the new registration data access protocol – RDAP. We have an internal commenting period that will close tomorrow, so I encourage you all to

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

take a look at the first draft, which was drafted by Holly Raiche and Carlton Samuels, and provide your input. The next one in progress is at statement on the removal of searchable WHOIS service form that needs registry agreement. Harold Arcos, a new ALAC representative from LACRALO, is taking the lead to draft the statement under the guidance from Holly. The commenting period will close December 4th, so I'll follow up with him tomorrow and check the status of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to talk about that one a little bit. Holly, this is under your guidance, did you know that?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I do.

ALAN GREENBERG: What direction are you going in? I read the RSAP last night and noticed that Lutz had made a long comment, which was, I'm afraid, completely irrelevant. What sort of statement are you looking to make on this?

HOLLY RAICHE: The statement on the access protocol...

ALAN GREENBERG: Removal of searchable WHOIS for the .meat registry.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm tempted to make very little statement at all. If you read the background, as I did, there are precedents for this where, in fact, it's been gone into, the searchable WHOIS is not against the RAA, the data is still available on the WHOIS, so I'm not sure we should be saying anything, frankly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am. I'm sure we shouldn't be saying anything.

HOLLY RAICHE: All right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's do a level set for everyone. There was a perception that what they were removing is a web-based WHOIS capability. That is not the case. The searchable WHOIS is an optionable feature some registries committed to, some didn't. In this case, .meat was originally an Afillias TLD application. Afillias had chosen to include searchable WHOIS. They have transferred it to Google and Google chose not to have a searchable WHOIS, and therefore they're trying to align this one with the rest of their TLDs.

A searchable WHOIS is not a WHOIS query. A searchable WHOIS allows you to search the WHOIS database for matches or partial matches on a

whole host of fields, so you could search on the email address. Essentially you can do searches that there are paid services for, but the registry is offering it. You could search on the letter N and any domain that has the letter N in the name would pop up, or you could do more complex searches. As far as I can tell right now, the only domain registered under .meat is nic.meat. So there's a limited number of successful searches you could do.

Moreover, the searchable WHOIS is specifically designed to be restricted to people who are authorized – targeted at law enforcement or other such agencies. I can see no reason why we should be objecting to someone removing a completely optional service, and one that's not generally available, and one presumes law enforcement does prescribe to various other services, which would allow them to do the same kind of search.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I absolutely agree with you. I've started off with the same, "Oh my gosh, they're going to remove WHOIS," and then when I read the stuff I thought, "No, this is optional, not in violation of anything that's committed under the RAA, it's just them saying they're not going to do something that isn't required anyway."

ALAN GREENBERG: It's committed under the RAA because Afillias committed to it, but I can't get my knickers in a knot over this. Is there anyone else who feels strongly about this? Then who's going to talk to Harold?

HOLLY RAICHE: Somebody give me an AI and I'll send a sweet little note to Harold saying I really don't see the problem. If you read the background, there are also precedents for this happening before. This is just yet another removal of searchable domains.

ALAN GREENBERG: The other removal was a closed domain, so that one was even less onerous, but I really can't get upset over this, and I couldn't make a good case for it either. Yes, you have that assignment.

HOLLY RAICHE: Ariel, make an AI for me? I'll deal with that one.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. So the third statement that's in progress is the one on guidelines for developing referenced LGRs for the second-level. I was informed in the APRALO call today that Edmon Chung is drafting the statement on this, and the public comment is closing December 5th.

ALAN GREENBERG: Keep an eye on it for dates, other than that it's fine.

ARIEL LIANG: The next one seems to be solved. It's the one on IAG initial report and proposed revisions to the ICANN procedure for WHOIS conflicts with privacy laws. Holly and Carlton drafted a statement and it's already been posted on the Wiki. Alan, we're waiting for your direction in terms of internal scheduled, but unfortunately the public comment closed November 17th, so what do we do now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll go to Holly to ask is there something of such substance that we want to get them to accept a late comment on this?

HOLLY RAICHE: Part of me says accept the fact we missed it, because in fact there are two dissenting statements, both of which contain the things I would have said anyway. It isn't that there's not a viewpoint. If we simply want to say, "Yes, we agree with the whole premise of this particular thing," then we should do something. What we would have said has already been said and incorporated into the report as an appendix.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so the position we're supporting is already in the report?

HOLLY RAICHE: It's in the report as a dissenting appendix.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. We had a very long comment there. Were there any comments on it? there was something from Christopher Wilkinson.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, and we're agreeing with Christopher really.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is a very long comment from Lutz.

HOLLY RAICHE: That was completely irrelevant. My comment to Lutz was, I thought, very tactful, and trying to show to him that what we're really talking about is the fact that this Working Group started off with a job that's starting from the wrong place. Thank you Lutz for contributing, but it made no sense. I tried to be tactful pointing that out.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we have dissenting opinions within our Wiki. We've not really gotten any input from the rest of the ALAC or At-Large, and the comment period has closed. With the agreement of the ALT I would suggest we

miss this one. We're busy with other things. There's no clear position that I could simply say I'm submitting it on behalf of the ALAC, because I know they're going to ratify it. My feeling is it's unfortunate we missed it. We may have been able to alter how things go forward but I don't think we can submit something after the fact on this one. I look for input from the others on the ALT. Holly obviously agrees.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I agree with you, I'm just a little bit sad, because I would have liked to have had Christopher and some of the other people – Stephanie particularly, who wrote the other dissenting opinion in the appendix – I'd like them to be aware that ALAC actually supports... I don't want Christopher to be seen out there on his own as if he's some lunatic. He's actually saying something incredibly sensible, and the only reason I would say I'd like a late statement is just to say to Christopher, Stephanie, and everyone else who's looked at that and gone, "This is starting from the wrong place"...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Assuming the email address is still open, would you consider submitting a personal statement saying that due to the fact that IANA has been focused on the IANA transition and other issues, we missed the deadline on this? You believe that although there is some dissenting views, you believe significant parts of the ALAC would have agreed with the

dissenting statements, and go on record as saying that? Recognizing that Lutz and maybe others would not agree with you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I take that. I'll check the transcript for the wording you just gave, but I would be happy doing that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Holly. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: The next one, we need a little urgent attention on this new public comment request decision. One is about the preliminary issue report on the GNSO PDP to review all rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs, and the public comment will close on November 30th. I reached out to Holly and Leon regarding their opinion on whether the ALAC should issue statements. I guess I will turn the floor to Leon and Holly to talk about that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Ariel. I'm not in the AC room, I'm only on the phone. I do think that I can set up moderately short statements on these, because I do believe there is at least one issue we should be looking at. I apologize for not replying to Ariel's and Holly's email, but I do think that for example the Trademark Clearinghouse is an issue we might as well be

looking into from the user's perspective, because so far I believe that the fact there's only one provider of these services, which is Deloitte's, is a possible barrier of entrance for the users to actually apply for the Trademark Clearinghouse.

My comment on this would be in the sense that while we support having a centralized and single database, hosted by IBM, that providers should be open for more players in the field so that competition can bring down the prices of actually protecting the registrant rights in the Trademark Clearinghouse. If you agree with this or have any comments, I'd be happy to hold the pen to make an initial draft, but I'd be doing so in the course of today so that we can finalize this in time for submitting it to whomever it needs to be submitted to.

ALAN GREENBERG:

the original design was that there would be multiple front-ends. There was one for the initial implementation, just to keep things simple. Was the issue of multiple front-ends raised in the preliminary issue report?

LEON SANCHEZ:

I haven't gone through the full report, so I don't have an answer, but I'll review the report today and based on that I'd be happy to draft some kind of statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was certainly in the original design. The other question is is there anything in the preliminary issue report on chilling effects from the trademark notices? That again was one of the user concerns that people getting a legal notice would be dissuaded from registering a name, even if there was no real conflict. If there's no mention of that in the things to be reviewed then I'd certainly comment on that as well. Other than that, I'd tend to agree with you. I don't see any other issue. My understanding however was that Holly had said that we don't need a comment. I may be misquoting you.

HOLLY RAICHE: That was my initial view, but I look forward to seeing what Leon says and reviewing it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we have a way forward. Leon, the comment closes in 13 days, so we need to get something moderately quickly so we can put it out for ALAC or At-Large comment for a few days and then have a quick vote on it.

ARIEL LIANG: Actually, 11 days left.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're right. Leon knows how to work fast.

ARIEL LIANG: We have three other public comments that require decisions. The first one is the New gTLD Program implementation review draft report. I sent an email to the ALAC work list, and Maureen volunteered to be one of the commenters, but not the main penholder. So we're still waiting to see who thinks we need a statement, and if so, who wants to volunteer to be a penholder. The second one is the proposed implementation of the GNSO policy development process recommendations on inter-registrar transfer policy.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh my god.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the implementation of the approved policy. Unless we have some reason to believe the implementation has been done exceedingly badly, I don't see any reason to comment.

HOLLY RAICHE: The only thing that, in the end, since having sat through lots of Working Groups, is there were two issues from a user perspective, neither of which we could do much about. The one from the user perspective was what kind of remedies do particularly small and cash-strapped providers have? The idea was we at least you could go to ICANN Compliance and

say, “People haven’t complied with the rules.” That should be somewhere. The point was made, “Is there somewhere on the website that people can understand that?” and the answer was no. The other was a more general, “This process is so bloody complicated. How does anybody find out?”

Ultimately, the comment I would have made is, “God help anyone who tries to figure out what ITRP ABCD means, unless there’s some explanation on the website.” That’s part of the implementation, although not strictly so. I don’t know if it’s worth making a comment about that or not.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My inclination is to say we’re past what the PDP recommended. We’re past the Board approving it. We’re simply saying, “Did they implement it properly?”

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes, I know.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Unless we have some blatant place where the implementation has gone awry then I don’t see a need to comment.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's almost as if I might personally just say something to the GNSO Working Group saying everything's been done perfectly, all the implementation's happened, except somewhere on the website we were going to make it far more clear to people who are asking the question of what the hell it means. Because right now in one Working Group I said, "Everyone look on the website and tell me where you can find a group diagram," and nobody could. From a user perspective, it's still an issue, but in no way...

Any time you put something up is better than nothing. I'd hate to have it lost that we've got a whole process there that's supposed to protect users, and there's absolutely nowhere on that website that you can find something that says...

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, let me ask you a question. Could they have done what you wanted them to do and be true to the recommendations? Because the Implementation Working Group is not allowed to make up its own rules.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know, and there was a recommendation there. I think it's gotten lost.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you want to check your homework and really find something that was recommended as a formal recommendation that wasn't implemented,

then go for it. That's marvelous. But it's got to be there, otherwise we're simply coming in and saying something again where it perhaps got ignored earlier, but it's a bit late.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll have a look again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Back to you, Ariel, and now we're back on the new gTLD implementation review draft report. If I remember correctly, this is a staff report on how they think the new gTLD process went. Has there been any comments on it? Is there anyone else who's speaking up? The only one is someone we're not going to worry about so far. Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I put my name down to help anyone who was wanting to do something on that. I've had a quick look at the report anyway, and I don't mind making a statement, but I have asked if Cheryl can be a back up so I've got someone to pass it over to to have a look at it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to do so, Maureen, no problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: There aren't too many people around today who were very active in the new gTLD process when it was being worked on. There's me, Cheryl, Carlton to a lesser extent... Once you come to the point where you can explain in a paragraph what it is we want to say, I wouldn't mind seeing that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, that's good, I'll work on that.

ARIEL LIANG: It's the last one. It's the new public comment on gTLD marketplace health index proposal, public comment and volunteers. That just opened yesterday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone know what that is? Is it the health of the gTLD marketplace, or the gTLD marketplace for .health TLDs?

HEIDI ULRICH: It's the index that analyzed the global gTLD marketplace.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do we care?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think we actually do. Someone should read the report. How big is it? Is it ungodly or a reasonable length thing? It's taking a long time to download and that's not a good sign. Actually, it's only seven pages long. I'm going to assign it to myself. Do we have another volunteer to read it? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I believe this is all part of the reviews that are required under the AOC, looking at a healthy gTLD expansion, and it's looking at the geographical diversity, it's looking at whether there's competition and trust that's been promoted... It's pretty much cut and pasted from the AOC; competition, trust, stability, and all of that stuff. I think it's quite important, because it's a little bit a parallel process to the Working Group on competition and trust and metrics for these.

ALAN GREENBERG: It sounds like they're trying to create an index that will be used by the Review Team on an ongoing basis. That sounds like a good thing, if they're actually having good input into it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, it's quite likely, so I think it would need to have our support. It's got in there some interesting things, such as the example of the proposed KPI – total number of unique phishing reports, number of dates of security breach reports made to ICANN, number of registry level

compliance issues per TLD detected per calendar month. This is the sort of stuff we've been asking for, and I think supporting this would be of great help, because it's quite likely some will not support this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, do you want to draft something, and I'll work with you on it? Cheryl, do you have any interest in this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. This is consumer trust metrics, isn't it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is. I can drop a few lines. I haven't read this in detail, but having had some experience of the CCT as well, it looks at the data source, ICANN competition, consumer trust, and consumer trust metrics projects as one of its interests. I can read through it and come up with a first draft.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if you can take the lead I'll be happy to work on it with you, and I'm sure we'll find other people.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think we've now finished the five/ten minutes we were supposed to be spending on that. We're on Item #4 now – next steps on CCWG Accountability. We just spent an hour and a half on the IANA issues call. I expect at least some of us were on that call. Let me try to summarize where we are right now on accountability. What was going to be an executive summary, which got changed to an update and is now called a “preview” of the proposal was issued last Monday or so. It is essentially an overview of where we believe we're going, and with a number of things still to be completed.

Largely where we're going, according to that report, I believe is pretty well in line with current ALAC positions. To be filled in are a number of things where we have some red lines. We're going to have to watch carefully, but I think we do want to get a number of people who have not read this report to read it, and see if there are any things flagged in it that are problematic. As I see it, the areas that are problematic as we go forward are the mission statement and making sure that any of the things we identified in the last proposal as being important have been addressed.

How the community powers are exercised; that's the number for, the number against, and how we count who is participating, I think it's going to be critical to the ALAC, because I think we're particularly worried about powers being exercised by a small sub-set of the ACs and SOs. Are there any other red-line areas? There had been a proposal from John Nevit saying that if a Bylaw change affecting an AC or SO is proposed,

then the SO has to support it. I made the statement to that that if you say that, you must also say the same thing about ACs.

However, the concern was morphed into a much more relevant one – that if a Bylaw is required to implement the results of a PDP which has been approved by the Board, then that SO must be able to veto it, essentially, and I don't think we can say "me too" on that one. I think that proposal is reasonable, as it stands. From others paying attention on this, are there any other red lines you see that would stop the ALAC from ratifying if we were to go forward as we envision now? Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

I just wanted to say that I don't see any other red lines other than those you've already highlighted.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will note that a message from the Board came through today. For the first time they're commenting on mission things, and although this statement was largely supportive of what's being proposed, the implication in the tone of the message says they will be following it up with others, and the implication is they're likely to be saying that certain changes in the mission are not something we should be doing in Work Stream 1. If they indeed say anything like that in a strong way, it's going to be received many in the Working Group in an exceedingly negative way, and I don't know how that's going to be handled.

But they're clearly putting up their hand and saying, "These are not things we're willing to approve at this point," and as the group that must ultimately approve the Bylaw changes, that's a significant statement. That's a prediction on my part – not necessarily an issue today, but it could well become an issue over the next couple of days. Any other thoughts on the accountability and where we're going on that? The timeline is exceedingly aggressive.

At this point, if the GAC says they don't need a face-to-face, and they're the only ones at this point who are most likely to, but the GNSO could also, then it looks like the ALAC may be required to be asked to ratify the proposal, hopefully in the end of December, but I think realistically in the first ten days or so of January. I have made it clear the decision of the ALAC that if anyone is meeting inter-sessionally, we believe it's important that we meet also – both for our own internal discussions, and to have inter-community discussions.

Again, the timeline is aggressive, but I can't decide with the people who say this timeline is justified, and therefore we really need to try to meet it, although it's clear we may slip. Any other comments on the accountability? Hearing none, we'll go onto the next Item. The next Item is update from the IGF. I've got three potential speakers. I only have a short bit to say. Olivier, you're the most experienced of the IGF people amongst us, so why don't you go first? We have 15 minutes allocated for this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. The IGF went pretty well this year. The major topics for discussion were pretty varied. One which has really raised a lot of eyebrows was one about zero-rated networks, which are those that are offering connectivity at no cost to the end user, but it's not quite Internet connectivity. It's a sponsored connectivity. Facebook is one of these organizations that is providing this. They're providing Facebook access to people with a restricted number of Internet services, to customers in India – and they all them customers, not users – who have nothing to pay.

Everything is paid for by the local Internet service provider, but you do not get a full Internet feed. It used to be called internet.org. It's now called Free Basics. The feedback was so negative on calling it Internet that there was some pushback and change of strategy. Facebook is not alone in that. There are quite a few other organizations that are offering these types of services, and so the discussion was really about whether this breaks network neutrality rules, whether it doesn't, and whether this is something that is desirable for equipping the next billion people who are not on the Internet today and connecting them.

Is it better for them to have some connectivity with very [limited 00:36:30] services, or to not have any? Needless to say, the discussion went on and there was no overall consensus on the matter with very extreme views being held for and against this. In the ICANN world, the process for the CCWG on IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability was showcased by the CCWG on Internet Governance.

We invited a number of speakers from the other operational communities, including those of the IETF, and the RIRs, as well as members of the community that were to comment. Alan was one who was invited to speak and involved, and he shared his experiences both on the Working Groups but also experiences in how to spread the word with the At-Large community.

This Workshop focused specifically on the process showcasing the multistakeholder model, and the multistakeholder models that were used in the different operational communities to reach consensus and come up with a proposal. The Workshop was extremely well attended, with the room being nearly full. There were other workshops that dealt with the actual contents of the proposal. The next day one that was organized by Milton Mueller and his colleagues treated the actual topic of the proposal itself, and raised some points regarding ICANN accountability, et cetera.

Unfortunately I missed that session and I'm yet to listen to the recording, but I'd recommend that you go on the IGF website and listen to these discussions, because it provides a good idea of what the rest of the world, outside the ICANN world, thinks about how ICANN performs and what should be done in ICANN. Sometimes, perhaps based on not quite the relevant data that they should know about – but it's interesting, because these are the kinds of responses that we are likely to receive when the plan finally gets sent to the NTIA, but more so when the plan gets sent over to the US Congress.

Reminding you all that the US Congress will have to agree on the plan, and they are likely to get somehow canvassed by their constituents. Citizens are likely to write and weigh in, one way or another. Apart from this, other topics – ICT for development has continued to be very high on the agenda. There was also a session on the Net Mundial initiative, providing some details of the projects that were funded. Just to remind you all, the Net Mundial initiative is a follow up to the Net Mundial Summit that took place in Brazil last year.

One of the follow ups was to have some kind of a way to organize having worthwhile projects coming on one side requiring funding, and finding, on the other side, some potential funders for the these projects. The first couple of projects that were funded, one of them was created by ICANN's very own Bertrand de la Chapelle, who is leading a project that's looking at Internet jurisdiction. That's something that started out with domain names, but has now expanded to the jurisdiction of the Internet in general.

So there's a first laureate for this. There were other discussions that took place around the Net Mundial initiative, and so far it seems that people have not really moved much from their positions, and everyone is still on the [unclear 00:41:03] on this. Apart from this, just raking my mind for any other discussions that were around, the usual discussions of privacy versus cyber security has been very heated, as per usual. A lot of discussions on this, and still not very much movement so far on that. Finally, the other discussions that were around were all about human

rights and a follow up on the fact that ICANN seems to now be moving forward with the concept of human rights being included somehow in its Bylaws was quite well received.

But obviously there's a lot more that has to be done in the wider Internet world – the rights and principles; the rights to Internet access, and so on – it's still very much alive in IGF circles. The overall composition of people in the IGF – quite a few governments this year. It's good to see them. There was also a strong component of businesses that came with the International Chamber of Commerce leading the group, and companies like Facebook made their first really strong appearance there, in my knowledge.

There was Facebook, Google, these guys were all present, and were very active in many of the panels. Vint Cerf of course was jumping from panel to panel, but there were also a few other superstars that were around, including some discussions that were taking place regarding intellectual property issues. I'm not quite sure that any intellectual property issues relating to domain names were dealt with, but certainly the piracy and intellectual property is still a very hot topic. That's it. There are a couple of pages that link up to all of the workshops that were organized by people related to ICANN.

I'd like to thank At-Large staff for having put these together, and I'd refer you to these. There should be, in time, a report on each one of these workshops that should be published on the IGF pages. Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. A couple of comments. The zero-rated one was interesting. It was interesting from several points – not only the issue of net neutrality. There were debates on whether it should be called zero-rated. It was not only the concept that was a problem, but the name. zero-rated is a term that comes from traditional telephony that says it's a service we provide at no charge onto your basic telephone service. There are people saying this is not a telephone service, therefore we shouldn't even be using the term that's extracted by it.

There was one number I heard quoted in a meeting, and I cannot even remember who said it, although it may well have been a Facebook person – that in the first 30 days of usage, half of the people converted to real paid services. That is they were sold so quickly that they found the money to convert. I'd like to see that number in writing somewhere to really understand exactly what it means. If indeed that is true, then it's a marvelous statistic, and it says the floodgates have opened, and this is the way to get people connected – that is give them a taste and they'll want to pay for it. But I'm a little bit cynical on it.

One of the interesting discussions I took part in was one on trying to define public interest, and although it was a general discussion, it ended up being focused very largely on ICANN, and it's got to be one of the few meetings I've ever participated in where my ideas on the subject really changed, based on the interventions and based on the discussions. I thought it was quite an interesting one, and we may out of it have some

methodology. The overall conclusion is you can't really define the public interest, because it varies for every case that may come up.

But I've always said that we need examples, and I'm less convinced that examples will help at this point, again, because each case will be different. But the processing by which you analyze the examples does have some interest, and that is by going over the process a number of times, you may start to get a feel for how you do it. That's probably something worth doing before the crises comes. I'm optimistic that we may have a way to go forward, although clearly it's not going to come up with a hard definition, nor would we want it to. Sandra, go ahead?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Yes, I was also at the IGF and would also echo what Olivier said – it was quite a friendly meeting. We had others in the [unclear 00:46:46] much more subject to discussions, arguing and fights, so this was one of the more logistically very well organized and friendly meetings. Regarding the public interest, as we started the discussion within EURALO, I also found some interesting comments that made me think about this. People [unclear 00:47:15] we can agree on public interest as a concept – maybe not trying to define the public interest.

Also, an explanation behind [unclear] public interest varies over the time, and views change. There was another public interest years ago, and people considered things as being in the public interest, which would be totally out of scope as we see things today – like the equality

of men and women. So this was also very enlightening to me. This is just a side-note – I was participating in the IGF wearing my hat as EURODIG Secretary, at the European IGF. I followed those tracks of national and regional IGF, and we also had the booth there, which was between ISOC and ICANN, very prominently placed, so we were very happy about this.

The discussions there were mainly about how to better connect national, regional, sub-regional and the global IGF. For instance, the topics, should they come from the bottom up, from the national to the regional to the globe? Or should the global IGF design an overall topic and say this year it's connecting the next billion and then the national should take up on this? At least for Europe we agreed that it makes no sense to discuss in [unclear 00:48:52] to how to connect the next billion, because this is not an issue on a national level.

From the European perspective we'll try to bring some more input on how we can develop the global agenda, or how we can contribute to the global agenda, and how we can develop an agenda within Europe, which is more inter-linked and inter-connected to each other. Just the last side-note – I heard from other ICANN regional [suspects 00:49:22] that ICANN scheduled so many meetings during the IGF that actually this was, for some people who followed all the scheduled meetings, it would have been a small ICANN Meeting and not an IGF anymore.

Maybe ICANN should reconsider this approach, because people have to contribute to the IGF and not do an in-between small ICANN Meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Sandra. Leon, do you have any comments on the IGF? I think you're the only other person on this call who was there. I'm guessing Leon is no longer with us. If Leon has something to say on it, we can go back to it afterwards. The next Item is Item #6 – review of the Dublin Als. Are there any we need to review? Heidi, Gisella, Ariel?

HEIDI ULRICH:

Yes, there are. I think if we can just go through the ALAC ones, that would be useful. The Chairs of the other Working Groups – just as a reminder, you may as well take a look at your Als as we go through them – we have, during the ALAC strategy working session, Alan to follow up on the issue of establishing procedure to endorse the candidates for Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team. There are various criteria. Another one – I am to coordinate with the ICANN Meetings Team to provide transportation from local outreach events for one day, beginning with Marrakech. That's been completed. They've reserved it.

Next one is the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session Part One. Gisella to invite the GSE Team Regional VPs to join the Outreach Sub-Committee calls. I believe that has been done. Next one is I am to ensure the Five-Year Operating Plan takes into account the needs of ALAC, and I'm following up on that. I'm moving down to ALAC Part One. That one's completed. I was to coordinate with Xavier to provide

additional details to Garth Bruen on finance questions. I did that, and Xavier reminded me there was a response during the week of the ICANN Meeting, and that Garth has not yet responded. What I can do on that one is just write a note to Garth to see if he has any comments on that, if you'd like.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Copy me in please.

HEIDI ULRICH:

Okay. ALAC Part Two – the At-Large Website Revamp Task Force to hold calls to review the mockup of “Get Involved”, ALAC, and remaining pages. I saw today that Ariel put a Doodle out for that call, so that one's in progress. Next ones are for Ariel – Ariel to organize brainstorming sessions with RALO Chairs and Secretariats to discuss content management and workflow of new RALO pages. That's going to happen during the next Secretariat Meeting that's been planned, so that's in progress.

Then Ariel and Laura to look at feedback across the At-Large community for the beta website during the beta testing period, which will continue through the end of 2015. Ariel, I believe you're doing that? You wanted to comment quickly on that?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes. Sent emails, went to calls, and will continue to do so.

HEIDI ULRICH: Okay, thank you. During the wrap-up session I was to prepare a list of all At-Large Working Groups, which ones were open and which need Members. That one is in progress. I will get to it very shortly. The last two meetings – the ALT Meeting, I am to work with Melissa King, who's the VP for Board Operations, to set up a call between the ALT and ALAC, and Board Members, which will be an open call. Did you want that one to be... It's a one-off meeting, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess so.

HEIDI ULRICH: Okay, so when would you like that to happen? January, or December?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think December is going to be crazy as it is. If we can defer anything, we should.

HEIDI ULRICH: End of January, if possible. Then I'll follow up with Melissa to follow up with Steve Crocker on the issue of RDAP. I wanted to stress the ALAC

development session ones. We will be sending again as a reminder to all the ALAC Members that were there the AIs that came out of that development session. There were several – the ALAC will identify the people in a small drafting group to develop the mission statement of the ALAC. That's right. That's something we probably need to move on. Anyone interested in being part of that group should contact Alan.

Also, the group is to review the part in ICANN Bylaws pertaining to the ALAC and come up with a clear mission statement. Then, as is on today's Agenda, later on, the Mid-Monthly ALT Meeting needs to set the Agenda for the ALAC Meeting for the corresponding month, which is next week, so any feedback on that would be useful. Then Alan Greenberg to take the lead. The ALAC has a training session on how to deal with differences in opinions and COIs. Then two relate to Ariel, but I think we need your confirmation on this Ariel – to set up a Skype chat group for the ALAC Members, including the 15 ALAC Members, current GNSO, ccNSO and SSAC Liaisons, and the former ALAC Chair. Should she do that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes please.

HEIDI ULRICH: Okay. Thank you. Ariel, there you go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Former ALAC Chairs, going back to Cheryl.

HEIDI ULRICH: Correct. Then Ariel to set up a test group for Slack and alternative instant messaging tools. That one, you may remember there was a little bit of pushback, but we just wanted to see if you wanted to have a small group going ahead with that?

ALAN GREENBERG: People can try anything.

HEIDI ULRICH: Okay, thank you. That completes the Als.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'd like to have a very short free-for-all at this point, but please continue via email. At this point, we're starting to plan the next Meeting. Do we have any wisdom as to what worked well, what didn't? For those who were not on the meeting planning session today a couple of things came out of it. By my count we had close to 21 hours of ALAC and Regional Leaders meetings in Dublin. That was partly because of the extra day we added. It was partly because we had a significant amount of time for the CCWG discussions, which we thought was going to be coming to a decision in Dublin.

At this point it looks like we'll have something under seven hours in Marrakech. Now, of that we had about 12 hours of meetings with other groups or people. So over half of the 20 hours was used in meetings with other entities. We are looking at a total, including meeting with anybody, possibly excluding meeting with other ccNSO type groups or the GAC, we'll have about six hours. We're going to have to radically change how we're scheduling time. There's no way we're going to meet with anywhere near the number of people we've said we'll have productive meetings with.

I don't know how we're going to go forward on this, but that's where we are today. The ALT Meeting is currently scheduled with one hour. The ALT closing meeting is at one hour, and no chance of getting any of the guests we normally have. There will be no ALT intra-meeting, or something very brief, and the breakfast before the first day. Our work methods are going to have to change radically because of this new work schedule, as it stands now. I'm looking for input. Also, what didn't work well in Dublin that we need to fix? What did work well that we want to replicate, to the extent our schedule allows us to replicate it?

Heidi points out there are five to seven hours of Working Group meetings. We may choose to curtail those radically and have ALAC meetings there instead. There's still work to be done. It may get better. We could say there are no RALO meetings, or all RALO meetings have to be held at the same time, and somehow staff have to cover them. That will buy us more time, but add an expense that we'll have to decide is

worthwhile. Open the floor. I see we have a whole bunch of hands.
Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to touch on the logistics for accommodation, because it looks like we are going to have a very busy meeting again, especially since this is going to introduce some big differences in our work practices and our usual chugging along type meetings we're used to. What I understand from early discussions with Aziz is that there are some hotels that will be based in the Palmeraie itself – the location of the conference center – and there are some that are located in town. The advantage of the ones in town is that in the evenings you can go and mingle and enjoy other places and visit Marrakech.

The inconvenience is that you're far away from the location. The advantage of the hotel in the resort is that you're on-site so when you start at 7:00 AM you can get out of bed at 6:45 and be there at 7:00 AM.

ALAN GREENBERG: How far is the town?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The trip to town might be half an hour or more. It's unknown as of yet, and I'm not quite sure what the actual logistics are going to be with regards to coaches. If it's the same as the coaches we had in Dublin,

where the coach took nearly an hour to go from the hotel that some of us were in, which was basically in another time zone than where the conference center was... I ended up taking the tram. I know that Sandra was using cycles daily. I know others had to take a cab sometimes. For 7:00 AM meetings it was very difficult. 7:00 AM in Dublin, fine, there's transport. 7:00 AM in Marrakech, I'm not sure. This is a holiday town. I don't even know if anybody is awake at that time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Your point is taken. Heidi, can you put an AI for you and I to work on some statement on that in the next week?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We need to decide – do we want to be in town or do we want to be in the conference center? I would prefer the conference center for work reasons, but I'm not sure where everyone else will be. I would say conference center is better for work reasons.

ALAN GREENBERG: My opinion would be the ALAC can be in the conference center. If someone wants to say they want to be in town, it would be delightful if we can give them that prerogative. If that can be accommodated, fine, but the default should be they can work.

HOLLY RAICHE:

What about if one were asked to make a choice, I would like to know what the arrangements are for getting people from the town to the conference center. I absolutely agree with Olivier. It was really difficult and we all made our own way, which was not the way planned. If we're going to have some kind of system that will get us from town to the center in a reasonable space of time, that would be fine, but I got to the conference center by walking for half an hour. I'm not sure I'm necessarily going to want to walk for half an hour in Marrakech.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let me try to address that. I've only been at 28 or 29 ICANN Meetings, so I don't have full perspective. I cannot remember any time when we were given that information ahead of time, where it was anything we would be willing to put a bet on. I would say don't hold your breath. If anyone has different experience, I'm willing to listen to it. Gisella has her hand up, and then I'd like to go back to the queue. We are going to run out of time soon, and some of us have another meeting buttered up against this one. Please be brief.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Just a quick one on this – we are meeting with the Meetings Team in ten days in LA during the Policy Workshop, and all of these points will be [unclear 01:05:34], we will already be able to have much better insight on the hotels that will be used. But my understanding is that funded travellers will be at the Palmeraie, and travelers who book their own

hotels obviously can book them in Marrakech and in the center of town, and we don't have any control of that. But I think that we all be at the Palmeraie. In ten days' time we have a meeting with the Meetings Team. We're going to cover shuttles and hotels, and get as much information on restaurants, on logistics. I have a long list of questions. I hope we can get back to you in the second week of December.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Gisella. I'll ask you to pass on a message from me then. As Chair I have a somewhat hectic schedule. If I am ever assigned a hotel or I have to spend an hour and a half to two hours traveling each day, to and from my hotel, I'm not going to get on the plane. You can quote me verbatim.

GISELLA GRUBER:

It will be passed on.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

I have two comments. One is in regards to the structure. As I put on the chat, I think that we will need to re-design our schedule, based on the new structures of the AC Meetings. You all have put on the table options like avoiding having RALO meetings or... We'll sort that out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Leon, let me interrupt. You haven't been attending the New Meeting Strategy Meetings. It's already been done for you. You don't have any work to do.

LEON SANCHEZ: That's perfect. So I worked my magic even here.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was said tongue-in-cheek. There's going to be a lot of work to do.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, good. The other one is more like a [unclear 01:07:47]. I kindly ask staff or whoever arranges AM meetings for us, 7:00 AM or 8:00 AM meetings that require breakfast, to please, please let us have some decent breakfast. I can surely work on sleep-deprived conditions, but I really cannot work on an empty stomach. I would really appreciate it if we could get things arranged so that whenever we're having breakfast at our meetings, we do have a decent breakfast, and by decent I mean something hot, something that is protein-rich, and not only tasty.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not only sugar.

LEON SANCHEZ: Exactly, not only sugar. Those are my two comments. Sorry for whining, but I cannot stress how important that is for, I think, most of us.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay. There are going to be no meetings before 9:00 AM and we'll finish every day by 5:30 PM I'm told. There's no cynicism here at all. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: What's bothered me – and I did have some discussion in the chat with Heidi about it – was the 75 minutes that's been allocated to each meeting time, and 90 minutes for lunch, and 30 minutes for coffee breaks and things like that. When we're in a situation where we're going to be really pressed for time, I can't see why these sessions are extended for 15 minutes to allow people to pack up and leave and go to another venue. All [unclear 01:10:06] not have its own meeting room, as we normally do, so we won't be moving around all that much anyway.

Also, according to Aziz, we would be staying very close to the venue so that really it's just a time thing. The 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM, considering our hour-long meeting schedule, we've actually still had to create 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM meetings. I know we're going to be asked to okay the schedule that's been proposed for the Marrakech Meeting, but it's those sorts of things that are going to be taking up time. We're probably going

to be having meetings during lunchtime, and meetings after and before.
I can't see anything else happening but that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier, you just put a comment in that you may want to say out loud?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Today on the GNSO Council call there was a presentation by Aziz about the security arrangements at the Palmeraie. Understandably, with the recent events, there were some concerns about security. Aziz provided full details of the arrangements that will be there on the ground, with dozens and dozens of security guards. He also provided details that the hotel has sent him in a presentation as to the recent big events that have been organized on the grounds themselves – some events being with 5,000 people, big, multi-national enterprises, also some diplomatic meetings within the past six months.

All of this to say that the security situation seems to be well in hand, and a well-oiled mechanism as such. Unfortunately I had to drop from the call at the time, since I had meetings that were running over. It might be worth asking Aziz to provide a copy of that presentation, or to perhaps brief the ALAC during the next ALAC call next week so as to reassure our community about the arrangements – or not even reassure them, just let them know what the arrangements are.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I'll note for those who weren't at the IGF that they had pretty good security there, but you could also wait in line for the security scanners for a good 45 minutes or more in the morning to get into the building. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes, the IGF level of security is probably what we'll be expecting, if not higher. I had the dubious honor of attending the Hyderabad IGF shortly after terrorism on the sub-continent of India, so I've done the higher-level stuff, and yes, it takes time. That said, that's another specific advantage of being within the enclave. You are likely to have higher levels of security to enter the enclave than you are once you are within the enclave. Maureen, I personally find it very comforting to have breakfast with AK-47s around, but then I've had a little bit more experience with that sort of thing. If it's discomfoting for you, I'm sorry.

That's an aside, because we really did have ground to air covering, and men with AK-47s at our windows. We may not have that in Marrakech, but then we may, and it doesn't matter, as long as they're not pointing them at us. The thing is, being in the enclave will be of particular use, and I will strongly endorse what I think you're all saying, and that is what the current plan is, it's a good one, for you all to be within the enclave. Security is much easier managed in an enclave, so that's great.

What I had my hand up for however was when you were talking about extending or expanding your meeting requirements to go well beyond the timing that is currently being proposed. If at all possible – and I know you're going to have to make some hard choices – I think this time around in particular you should try and fit what is absolutely essential to do into the proposed timings – this 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM, or whatever it is. Obviously, you'll probably squeeze in lunchtime ones as well.

Because it is the test of this new system, and if you do workarounds, you won't be doing justice to testing the system. If, at the end of the Marrakech Meeting you need to say, "Two-thirds of the wordy work we usually do was not able to be done, and that made a difference because..." then that's important. I really would encourage you to try and squeeze what you can in, in the space allocated.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. Since we're being told we're not allowed to meet before or after the meeting – and I haven't yet been told we're not allowed to meet for breakfast – we may or may not have that option, even if we wanted to. Anything else before we go on? We have another 12 minutes and a significant number of Items to cover. I'd hope we can go on. I see no hands. I'm not giving anyone a chance to raise one.

Item #7 is ALT and ALAC meeting times. You will recall when we started the last ALAC year that we did a bunch of Doodles to try to rearrange the meetings. We were unsuccessful. We had an eight-hour gap between

time zones, because we had no one who was attending meetings in China at that point. That's not the case this year. We will have to do rotations, and Gisella and I will be working on sending out a Doodle soon for meetings after this coming one. I'm going to be talking to people individually and trying to find out who it is that's likely to be most flexible, and we're going to try to set some good examples, but that is coming.

The next Item, Item #8, was the whitepaper Olivier is working on on GAs and Summits. Olivier, we don't really have time to talk about it. Can you give us a one or two-sentence summary on whether you have a document? Did it die? Or is there a document that's getting close to something we can look at and comment on?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Aside from the original table I had put together, I've not had chance to work on the document, since being otherwise engaged with plenty of other things, but I will work on this. I can't say it will be ready for the next ALAC Meeting, but hopefully the December one. As long as we have this way before the Marrakech Meeting, and certainly in time to circulate it to other SOs and ACs and the Board and everyone else by new year, I think we're okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, we're trying to influence the overall budget, not the special requests, and we want Fadi's support. He's going to be less and less visible over the next several months.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're right. It's gone out of my mind.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. Consider this a reminder. Item #9 – volunteers for Competition and Consumer Trust. I've put out a call for Members. Sébastien has suggested that we make this a group that will stand for a year. I believe to do that we're going to have to set some ground rules and get approval of the ALAC. We don't have the time for that right now, so my recommendation at this point is we put together this group, we do this evaluation, and then we try to formalize what the group will be doing as we go forward in the year. Is there any strong objection to that?

I'd like to be able to say the ALT supports that plan going forward. Thank you very much. Next Item is the FBSC. We now have a full membership convened with the new ALAC and new RALO Leadership. We'll be convening a meeting soon. One of our first tasks will be to start the process of budget requests and to do something we never got around to doing last year; name CROPP representatives, so we can have a new CROPP Review Team. Comments? Questions? All right.

Last Item of any substance is the ALAC Agenda. If you have any Items you'd like to put on it, the ALAC Agenda is going to be set within the next 24 hours. Please get to me and/or Heidi if you have any specific Items. One Item that will be on the Agenda is the follow on to NARALO's Meeting with Alan Grogan, and the draft letter that Garth submitted to the ALAC. I sent you last night, and attached to this Agenda, Garth's original letter, and a red-lined and clean version of my revisions. I'd really like to send it to Garth again within the next 24 hours.

If anyone has any reason to believe that my revision is not acceptable, or the rationale I gave in the email for omitting issues is problematic, then speak up now. We have a few minutes for anyone who's actually read it. Or please read them tonight, or whatever the rest of your day is, and get back to me really quickly. Again, this is something that should have been done a few weeks ago. I, like everyone else, ran out of time. Any other comments? Again, Items for the ALAC Meeting – we're supposed to be setting it a full week ahead of time.

We didn't make it. It's Thursday today and the meeting is on Tuesday, but I really need to set it before the end of tomorrow. Any comments, and particularly on the issue to Garth, the deadline of that is I want to send it to him tomorrow. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Very briefly – what about if we’ve got time, just a few minutes, for any feedback to Ariel on the website? That’s if there aren’t other Items crowding that out.

ALAN GREENBERG: You want to allow some time at the ALAC Meeting for feedback on the website?

HOLLY RAICHE: I’m suggesting that, but that depends on what other Items are there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. I just want to make sure I clearly understand what you’re saying. Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Just a reminder that we have a webinar coming up, dedicated for the website. I’d love as much input as possible. If we have a packed Agenda, we can use the webinar time.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, that’s fine.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi pointed out to me that we skip the Item on the review of Dublin on the development session, if anyone has any input on that that will be on the ALAC Agenda, but if you want to provide input that you don't feel free in airing in an open environment then you have all our email addresses. Anything else? Sorry about the rush. We do have a meeting immediately after this on the At-Large review, and I don't think we can be too late for that one. I thank you all for your meeting.

HEIDI ULRICH:

Very quickly, just a reminder for everyone that next week, Thursday and Friday, is US Thanksgiving, so the three US-based staff will not be working those days, but the other three will. I'll be off most of next week. I will be on the ALAC call. Then all of the policy staff will be in LA for the Policy Workshop the week of the 30th of November, and during that entire week emails will be very slow to be returned. There are a couple of meetings that are planned, like the AFRALO one, and we can cover those. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Heidi, I will make a comment that having the policy meeting immediately after Thanksgiving takes a significant amount of the staff out of circulation for almost two solid weeks. That's not the best of planning from my perspective.

HEIDI ULRICH: Noted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just a bit of news about the GNSO Council, who as you know fails to be able to have a Chair selected during the face-to-face Dublin Meeting. Following intense negotiations and discussions, it looks like there is an agreement, and so with the vote due to start, James Bladel is very likely to be the next GNSO Council Chair. [Donald Austin 01:25:11] will be the Vice Chair from the Contracted Parties House. Heather Forrest will be the Vice Chair from the Non-Contracted Parties House.

Mason Cole will remain GAC Liaison, and the discussion is starting on having an SSAC Liaison, or a reverse SSAC Liaison. They're not quite sure which way, but they do believe that there is an interest in this. A lot of things happened in the GNSO call today. I'll spare you any report, and we'll speak to you about them during the ALAC call, or you will be able to read my GNSO report. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier, thank you all. See you online.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a really good outcome from GNSO though.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]