

---

TERRI AGNEW: ...and begin at this time.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team meeting taking place on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of December 2015 at 19:00 UTC.

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

We have apologies from Sandra Hoferichter, Silvia Vivanco, and Gisella Gruber.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Yesim Nazlar and myself, Terri Agnew.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We may have an in-camera session at the end, a very short one, but I'm not sure yet. I'll decide along the way. The first item on the agenda is the policy development. We just reviewed it yesterday. I think everyone on this call was there yesterday with the exception of León, and he's a quick study.

---

*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.*

---

So Ariel, if you can go over whatever the changes were that we approved and if there is anything else that we need to be alerted to here.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay, thanks Alan. This is Ariel Liang for the record. The changes, it's not that many. So for one is the public comment on continued status of analysis of root server system stability study plan. And Julie Hammer is going to review that public comment and ask the ALAC whether the ALAC should comment on that.

So that's one change. And then the others, not so much. It's just Alan has got to write a statement for. Several action items for Alan. And then one more thing is about the ratification votes on the statement on CCWG accountability draft proposal. Now we have 14 yes, there were no abstentions, and just waiting for Garth to vote and then we'll have the full house.

So that's all from me.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Ariel. Any questions or comments?

Seeing none, we will go onto the next item which is the review of the ALAC call. The first item is the, the first two items actually are about Marrakesh. The first one is the time allocation. I had originally done some calculations on how many hours we had compared to Dublin. Staff, I don't know, was it Gisella, I think? Who went back for a few further meetings and looked how many hours we had various activities

---

in Marrakesh compared to other meetings. And we knew the numbers were going to be less than in Dublin, because if you remember correctly, in Dublin we asked for and got the Saturday, so that added a full extra day.

In Marrakesh, we also asked for and got the Saturday, but then we were told, we're holding a meeting on Saturday anyway, so we're taking back your day. I'm sure that's not the version as staff phrases it, but that's what happened. So we are, we don't have that day, and because of the outreach, because of current allocations of working group meetings, we have significantly fewer hours than we have ever had before in recent history.

And the question is, what do we do about it? I can write meaningful letters to people which will be ignored. One of the suggestions has been, impact the outreach, but we'll talk about that separately, and the other suggestion that has been made is reduce working group meetings.

We have virtually no working groups that are active right now with the exception of outreach, is really the only one that is very active. And I'm sorry, technical...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Technical taskforce... [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: The name has, the taskforce, yeah sorry. The technology taskforce, the name alluded me. So the question is [CROSSTALK]....

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ...talk about anything, so they don't really need a face to face.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the question is, do we simply tell most of the people who are going to say they have to have a working group meeting, that simply we don't have the time for it? And to the extent that there are any, we hold them in parallel and have one slot allocated to working groups and hope that there aren't too many people who want to go to multiple ones.

I've asked Heidi to have a meeting scheduled with me, Gisella, León, towards the middle of the first week in January. So that's the time we're going to attack this with fervor, but I think we need some guidance from the wider ALT in terms of, you know, what are we going to sacrifice? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Two points. The first one is, you mentioned the working group, active working groups, outreach and [inaudible], you forgot about capacity building. No problem. Another point, you are speaking about a lack of time in Marrakesh. I'm afraid I don't understand why. I have a big problem to understand.

Yesterday I asked Gisella and she said the working group gave some limitation. So I don't think there is something which is compulsory. We relay to want we want to do in Marrakesh. We have the time, and we have as much time as in any other meeting in ICANN so far. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Well the numbers don't quite show that. At this point, we don't have the number of allocated... As the meeting was planned out. Now that clearly is something we have under our control. Pardon me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Who planned the meeting? Who made the plan?

ALAN GREENBERG: The group we chartered to come up with meeting plans at this point. You know, obviously we're going to have to now tailor it to the specifics of Marrakesh, but at this point, if we look at the number of hours that was on the meeting strategy, the ad-hoc meeting strategy working group, the numbers are less than we had before. There is no question.

By the way, Tijani, I didn't mention the capacity building, not because I forgot about it, I didn't think that at this point you needed a face to face to a great extent. If I have misspoken, then I apologize for that. I certainly didn't forget about you or the work you're doing. Holly next.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think my question is, what else is being put on our schedule that people say we should be doing? And maybe there is some flexibility in us saying I'm sorry, but because for us, actually doing, understanding what's going on in the working groups and in our policy stuff is a bit more important.

---

I mean, is it that other things, other organizations, or other areas, are saying, “Well we want to meet with you,” and is that what is queuing up the time? In which case, well we say no. I would have thought. I really don’t know, but I’d like to go into more details, and say, “Well what are we being scheduled to do that we ordinarily don’t do?”

And maybe it’s time to say, well we don’t want to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well certainly the four hours allocated to outreach is one of those.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, and maybe we start to say well, understand that’s part of the rationale for the way that the meetings are being arranged, but do we have any outreach plans? And if we don’t, can we have that time back please? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Before we go on with the queue, I had them as separate items, maybe it makes more sense to merge them. My intro to the outreach was going to be, at this point, we have lots of people saying it’s really, really important, but I haven’t heard any real plans of how we are going to use it. And more particularly, how we’re going to use it for the 27 people that we’re transporting to Marrakesh, or roughly 27.

And that becomes the real question. Are we going to be effectively using time, or do we take three of the people, say there is an outreach event going on, and the rest of us are going to talk about other things?

---

So, you know, that's the kind of question that we need to come to grips with. Next we have Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And you mentioned, so just four hours of outreach, but we are starting on, on which day are we starting? On the Saturday, is our first day, isn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we actually have more time than what we're used to have before in ICANN meetings, since we used to start on the Sunday. I don't see why we're so short for time. And four hours to meet would just be like four hours on that Saturday, and then the rest of the week is totally clear. I'm a bit baffled.

ALAN GREENBERG: It should have, but we also have avowed we will allow people to actually have a lunch hour. And we have vowed that we will not start everyone at 7:00 every day. And all of these things come together to do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So okay. Fair enough. So that's one thing, the other thing... This is Olivier still speaking. The other thing is looking at the schedule, which

---

is the [inaudible] draft schedule, that has just a few things on it, and I've sent the reference to it in the chat.

The ALAC is meeting with the Board, it says ICANN Board and At-Large on Wednesday, not on Tuesday, on Wednesday the 9<sup>th</sup> of March between 1:30 and 14:30, so 13:30 to 14:30. That is playing against the GNSO Council public meeting, and I just think we're... I just wonder whether we're going to be short changed on this one, whilst everyone else is meeting the Board on the Tuesday. So that was just something I wanted to flag. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think actually the Board is now split between Tuesday and Wednesday. I don't think it's everyone else, but I may be wrong on that. Yeah. Heidi go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, that is the case. In fact, that was one request that was made by the meeting strategy working party was that the Board meet with the ALAC on Wednesday, so that was granted.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Cheryl?

Cannot hear you.



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's because I'm muted myself instead of unmuted myself. That's better now. So we... We had a time where in this [inaudible] of ALAC, we were solely criticized by just about everybody and it was not, I would suggest, totally unjustified, that they transported, in those days, you know, just 15 people and the occasional regional leader that, you know, very much just the ALAC at the beginning.

And then later on, the regional leadership as well. And when I say the ALAC, I do mean the GNSO and ccNSO liaison. At that stage, people had no idea what was happening to the security and stability Council liaison, that's a very good question. Anyway, we managed to sort that out in the more written parts.

But all we did in the [inaudible] was sit in a room and talk to ourselves. And that was in the early formative years, it was in the days while the RALOs were trying to become formed, in fact it was in the pre-RALO days. And that was a valid criticism. We didn't interact with all the other things, people. We didn't get out and interact, and we didn't do working groups, we were basically, you know, well questioned.

Now, we've swung so far away from, and I do mean so far away, and that's not a bad thing, from that, and I'm pleased we did, that we have an incredible schedule. I think some rationalization to scheduling, as Alan alluded to, to allow people basic bodily functions, you know, and I think there is probably some human rights violations that we go through under normal circumstances, looking at things like lunch and not starting at 6 AM for a 19 hour day, that sort of stuff.

---

It does need to be looked at. But we are also in a habit which may be worthwhile looking at from a review point of view, of always doing exactly the same things at each meeting. And I do think the A, B, C meeting does give us the opportunity to not give up on everything, and not say everything has to be done at every meeting, but have a plan over a year that says, for example, for working groups, with the exception of exceptional requirement of a working group, they will meet at...

And they, given, you know, which particular to meetings, or you know, all that they generally won't meet at, and give it whichever the shortest meeting is. So you know, there are ways forward, but we have taken on heroic workloads, for very, very good reasons, and I think you're doing a very, very good job. But there is still unresolved history here where it used to be sorely criticized because they were basically wasting money to cart these people around the world, and they were locked away in rooms and no one ever saw them, they just talked to themselves.

And we need to make that whatever you do is still public and interactive enough that your rest of ICANN learns who you are, what you do, and how important the role is. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Alan. Maureen for the record. I guess, Cheryl sort of like said a little bit of what I was going to say. Our new meeting group hasn't met for a while, Beran being unavailable, and I know that she's

---

been talking to staff about various activities that, and she brings them back to our meetings to discuss. And we haven't had that.

But I suggest that, I have suggested that our, that outreach for the ALAC could possibly be... Because we've been told that it has to happen inside the ICANN meeting, that these meetings, these times could be used for our meetings for our internal engagement, whereas sort of like some of the other groups like the ccNSO, GNSO, GAC, etc. as well as the RALO meeting.

And as Cheryl said, it's really enable and then to invite people from outside of ALAC to come along and learn more about how we, about our role in relation to others within ICANN. And as well as that, I sort of like understand that others have outreach activities sort of like planned, and as you say, you know, it might only require two or three people from the ALAC to join with those, to give an ALAC perspective, but it may not require everyone.

So it could be business as usual during that time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Maureen. Anyone else want to get in? I will point out that every time we've talked about the outreach being perhaps just a small number of people, there have been outcries from a number of people saying that's not what was planned. This has to be real outreach for everyone, and I will point out several of the other parts of ICANN, certainly the GNSO, and I think SSAC particularly, others haven't said much, are very much saying, if people want to come see us, that's outreach, but we have business to do. Tijani.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. Tijani speaking. I don't think that it is the Bible to say to say that we have an outreach session. If we don't have real outreach things to do, we don't have to organize one each session. If we will do other activities that will make them as outreach and they are not outreach, we have to call them by their names.

We don't need only a name outreach. When the outreach was setup during the meeting strategy working group, the global meeting strategy working group, it was for... So if the purpose will not be there, we don't need to do it. And at least for the first meeting, for the A meeting Marrakesh, I don't think we have already something ready for that, and I am not sure also that we have an agreement on somethings.

By the way, I notice that we make, that we need, we need to have a discussion in [inaudible] not inside the group. The group is preparing the work, and ALAC should discuss the issue, and should validate the finding of the group. And right now, I don't remember, perhaps I was absent, but I don't remember ALAC did that.

We need to, no, okay. So we need, ALAC needs to validate this one, and so far, it is not done so we will not stick to this recommendation, especially because we are not ready for it, and because we have [inaudible] and I am hearing people saying oh, this time we'll not be able to do this thing because we don't have time. I don't agree. We have to do exactly what we want to do in Marrakesh, regardless of what the working group recommended now, because ALAC is very [dated], and because we are not ready to implement them. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. If I could get in the queue please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I'll put you in the queue. Thank you. Just for the record, we had the discussion on meeting strategy at two successive ALAC meetings. Last time we ran out of time, and this time, Beran was not on the call. I don't know if anyone told her, her item was on the agenda or not, so that's why we haven't had that discussion within the ALAC.

Unfortunately, we are now getting down to the point it's no longer an issue, a meeting strategy issue, but in middle January, we have to start putting meeting request forms in. So we're going to have to make some hard decisions regardless of what meeting strategy has said. Heidi, do you want to get in first before Olivier?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Just on the point of, perhaps the outreach and engagement subcommittee could be put in charge of dividing the outreach and engagement at these meetings. Just a thought.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, we don't have a lot of time for groups to go out and start consulting. One of the things I don't know, and maybe Tijani knows, or

---

maybe we need to ask Aziz, I don't know what the outreach opportunities are in Marrakesh. I don't know if there is a university there. I don't want other things are around that might be, make it reasonable to go do something.

So that's something I think we need an answer on moderately quickly. Olivier, you're next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I've heard this discussion for several months now, and I'm a bit baffled that we haven't, I mean we're speaking about outreach activity, the placeholder. Were we told what kind of outreach activities we could do? Because I remember a discussion as to whether we can could go to a school, whether we could... And nothing seems to have happened since.

We're still in the same question mark. Obviously right now, it would seem that everyone is finding outreach as being a bloody waste of time because we don't even know what it is.

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is we demanded and received confirmation that we would get transport to go somewhere, although no one has said where the somewhere is.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, yes please, go ahead Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I think we, that we need to have the objectives, what we want to do in the outreach. Not the meeting will be available if we have a program, if we have something. This is the issue. And I think that the main task for the meeting strategy [inaudible], I think we called it, and I say that, was especially to look at the meeting B, and especially for the outreach.

So was there any work done on that? Is there any practical recommendations from the group to the ALAC for that? This is the issue. This is the problem. So now we are too late for that, we are preparing Marrakesh. So we need, in my point of view, we need first to hear all our needs before, and if we have time, we will try to make outreach.

And I think if we have time where there is an interest in Marrakesh, and we may do something, but before that, we have to fill all of our needs. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If I could try to summarize. At this point, using the output of the meeting strategy ad-hoc working group, we do not have nearly as many hours as we normally have, never mind Dublin. And which means never mind a fixed day, even though we've increased the number of days, we do not have nearly the number of hours we're likely to meet.

---

Something has to go. Working groups is one place that we can do some contraction. We have not had any concrete plans on outreach, and I guess I should ask, does anyone have any strong opposition to either cancelling outreach, or restricting it to a small number of people so that we can schedule other activities in parallel with it?

Does that sound like a reasonable way to go forward? And if anyone wants to say, “Yes, we have to have outreach,” then I want some concrete plans coming out of that same person, not just hand waving, saying someone else should be doing it but it’s important. I think we have general agreement on that. Olivier, yes, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Alan. Olivier speaking. Again, we’re speaking about outreach as a placeholder. It really depend who to use if we’re going to do one type of outreach or another type of outreach. So saying that you’re going to have both things going on in parallel is one thing, but we just don’t have enough to know what the outreach is.

That’s what I think. We have a problem at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have a problem, but although the subject has been raised multiple times, because I’ve raised it multiple times saying, “Tell me what it is that 25 or 27 people are going to do in any outreach scenario?” And nobody has come back with an answer yet.

So I understand....



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...if you go and visit a university, then, you know, two people per class, explain what At-Large is, in the different parts of the university, and you can do that in a couple of hours, and that's it. But you know, we don't seem to have been given any kind of feedback, or advance information about what is there on the ground in Marrakesh, and I really do not know how we're meant to find out what is in Marrakesh by ourselves.

I think it's a total shambles to be at this point in time, asking such questions, when the meeting strategy said, "Go and do outreach," and it's basically throwing us on the defense. It's going to be a total failure, I can tell you now, if we don't actually have a ground team. And you know, people from ICANN, many people have traveled over there so far. They've gone many times.

That's the information I get from the ground, and yet, we don't have any information at all about this outreach can do or could do, and it's bizarre, because there was something that was done in South Africa, if you recall. I don't know who did the groundwork for that, but obviously groundwork was done, and the same people that did the groundwork for there, or a similar team, should have been doing the groundwork.

I think it's ridiculous to ask for volunteers to do the groundwork because we don't have anybody locally. Thanks.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Forgive me, Olivier, but painting a school makes people feel good, but it's not ICANN outreach. Let's try to wrap this up moderately quickly. Maureen, you're next.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you Alan. Maureen for the record. As Olivier has mentioned, within the new meeting, and within the outreach and engagement discussions that we've had too, with this particular, and so we've actually sort of like put it out to the ALS and local personal. You know, there is no way that we, from where we are, can organize anything that's going to be of value and meet an outreach need for their community if we don't get any feedback and find out what's available and who needs what.

So I certainly agree with Olivier. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record. Look, I couldn't agree with more, and obviously I'm a card carrying supporter of, I'm carrying a lot of cards this time, it's Christmas time. I'm an absolute supporter of the concept of outreach and engagement. I don't spend all that time in all of those meetings for the good of my health. I think we do need to have a placeholder concept, and I do think we need to recognize that sometimes, [inaudible] identified and worked out well in advance, it's just not going to be as meaningful as [inaudible] worthy of other times.

---

What Maureen said was absolutely correct, but we also need to recognize that we are specifically [inaudible] and at this [inaudible] in this location, all right, and that's a good thing, and I think that's fine. There will be other places, let me think, San Francisco for example, where there might be an entirely different set of opportunities to have different sources of outreach.

I mean, for example, you know, bussing in a bunch of university students for outreach at a meeting works different if you're in an Asia-Pacific area than it does if you are in Sidney. So, it [inaudible], we do need to save the worthiness and requirement for outreach opportunities as a concept, but let's not throw the baby out with the bath water, but let's realize for this meeting, what we can and cannot do, and just plan accordingly.

But not so that we prove outreach is not a worthy activity, because some of the town hall meetings, some of the different things that happen. And the other thing with outreach is that there is going to be greater benefit for a more cross community outreach activity from time to time, then there will be from various parts of the organization actually competing for the few people who could be motivated to come and learn how to sell ICANN.

And yes, I agree with you about painting the school. It was all very good to do in [inaudible] on Thursday, but you know, it's not having one on next March.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Tijani and I'll close the queue.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. And I agree that for Marrakesh, we may need to forget about the outreach. I want to remember everyone that the meeting strategy working group, when they decided about A, B, C the [inaudible] outreach has been put in meeting B, and it was especially because we are going to places or to countries where we've never gone or never went before, because of the venue.

So there is a big need of outreach there, much more than in Singapore or in any other country that we've been in before. I think that we have really a duty to make the outreach in meeting B, but anything A and C, it is as is possible if we can do, if we have something to do, yes. If we don't have, okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will try to reflect this in the message I will send out. And I think we can go onto the next item. The next item is Civil Society. Adam just sent a message to a few of the chairs saying that one of the reasons... I'm not sure what instigated his message, but what he said is, one of the reasons they are doing this, is the confusion in people such as first time attendees or Fellows, as to where to go.

And the Civil Society strategy will make it clearer to people where they should be going. My reply was I believe it will have just the opposite effect. Introducing the term Civil Society, a term that's well defined and used other places, but is effectively orthogonal to the structure we have in ICANN, is likely to add a level of obfuscation and confusion, not clear it up.

---

No matter what the strategy says, just using the term is likely to do that. That being said, I don't think there is an opportunity to stop what's going on, despite what Sébastien believes. There is too much support from the parts of ICANN that always used the term Civil Society and have used it, even when ICANN wasn't formally using it, to stop this.

So the question is, if this group agrees, what do we do to mediate it and to lessen any potential harm and perhaps get some good out of it? At one point, when we started talking about this, I was told well, there was going to be funding for events and things like that. Now people are saying there will absolutely be no money available for this.

This is just a document and nothing else, so I'm a little bit at odds as to how we proceed. Clearly there are very strong opinions on both sides, and we need to make some decision as to how we go forward on this. And I'll open the floor.

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I still don't know what actually they're going to do, and I don't know how they're going to respond to a group that is going to be formed without any task in mind. I don't know what they're going to do that actually relates to the work of ICANN. If, for example, they were going to say, well we are focusing on privacy, I'd say fantastic, you can join all of the WHOIS activities. There are loads of them.

But I don't understand what they're going to do other than talk to each other and feel good. And to me, that's a massive waste of time. So, I

---

don't know how to plan to coordinate activities with them if all they're going to do is talk. I just totally confused as to their mission and their activity, other than talking to each other and feeling good.

So if somebody can tell me what constructive stuff they're going to do, then we can plan how to join. But I'm still totally confused as to what they're going to do. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a speaker's queue, and I would not mind if Heidi could intervene and just clear up the one point of, is there money and activities planned, or is this just a document?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Did you want me to respond to that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, if you could because I'm getting very different messages.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So from what I've heard is that yes, there would be minor funding for example, joint events of At-Large members who are interested, NCUC, NPOC members on the sidelines of agreed to conferences, where they could discuss issues that affect all of them related to Internet governance or ICANN.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Adam is saying there is no money is incorrect you're saying.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think that this is, it's not fully correct, shall we say. Again, I've heard from Jean-Jacques that there might be some funds for At-Large structures, or interested people, to partake, for leasing rooms. For rooms and some food, and in small possible cases like support train rides and things to events within a country. But definitely...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Heidi. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And hopefully I've taken myself off mute, not put myself on mute. Cheryl for the record. Thanks for that Heidi, perfectly time, because I think it also goes to some extent to answer Holly's question as to what the hell these people are supposed to be doing. And I'd like to actually suggest that I count myself [inaudible] if I could possibly get APRALO support, to be amongst these people, because I think it needs, it's one of those we have to be in it to win it exercises.

I have been, I was [inaudible] CCWG has stopped me involved whatever meetings are being held, and I think I do understand what the intent is quite reasonably. And Holly, I'm happy to sit down and give you a one on one, if you like, but it is very brief, an opportunity for when something that is under the wider worldview, classified as Civil Society, is going on, and ICANN is engaged...

---

Remember ICANN the entity engages in a lot of meetings globally, that when, people like At-Large structures and people like NPOC members and organizations or noncommercial user's constituency academic, wanting to find someone who have I treated about if again, or whatever it is. Yes, that is [inaudible]. But what [isn't that is?].

What are able to engage locally when that's happening, this can facilitate. At the moment, there is no coordination. We end up with At-Large structures saying, ICANN was at this meeting and we didn't even know about it. Under the guise of self-identifying themselves as interested in Civil Society, however you define that, activity and interested specifically in what ICANN identifies as their work within Civil Society.

This is a facilitation exercise for outreach and engagement. It's opportunity, but yes, it looks to be carefully managed, and more importantly, because it's growing [inaudible] in the left hand is not understanding what the right hand is doing, it needs to be what supposedly is from our community perspective, so that we do not end up being disenfranchised.

And I would like to suggest we think about it as micro-opportunities and micro-funding for those opportunities. And it's good ICANN PR, and it should be, for some At-Large structures, good ALAC and At-Large PR as well. But it will otherwise end up just being a strengthening of the noncommercial stakeholder group membership roll. Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. Maureen.



---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I like following Cheryl because she already answers the question before I asked it. But I must admit, I did initially find the explanations that were given by the group quite confusing, and I guess like Holly, I was wondering what the purpose was, and I found it confusing because it wasn't the text in context for me.

So yeah, there in lies most of the confusion that I had. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. I was just going to add that I agree with what Cheryl has said. And really to me, this looks like it's an opportunity for federating or coordinating the outreach and the engagement to find new At-Large structures and get them involved in ICANN, especially when it comes down to Civil Society.

Having us looking in one direction and having the [inaudible] and NPOC, and NCSG look in their own direction, isn't really very helpful because we end up with organizations that get very confused between having a visit from people from At-Large and a visit from people from NCSG.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Holly?

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Old hand. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have anything they want to add?

No one? Then we consider the subject closed. I'm not sure how to proceed, but so be it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, did you want to suggest that, from an outcome, that the ALT has discussed and believe we do need to continue an active engagement with this activity within ICANN as more than a working brief, and that in support of that, any region which wishes to put forward a liaison to this activity should do so post-haste. You know you've already got Wolf from Europe, I stand hopefully to be endorsed by the AP, and the other RALOs can fall into line should they wish.

And then it gives you an opportunity to close the loop and get it off your agendas, at least. And then the liaisons feedback.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think that's how we left it at the ALAC meeting yesterday, so I wasn't saying [inaudible] just we had no different decision out of this one. Tijani.

[CROSSTALK] First Tijani then Heidi.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much Alan. I didn't ask for the floor because I thought the structure was clear, and at the end, you said you don't know how to proceed. I think that the [instruction] in the group, in the ALAC in general, and the NCSO, is to be in the process, not to be out. Try to take the advantage of this Civil Society activities in ICANN, and for sure, I agree with you that it adds a new confusion for people because it is another dimension.

But the initiative is there, we are not able to remove it. If we can remove it, we will do, but we cannot. So we have to be in and to participate, and to be [inaudible] so that we will not let the [inaudible] for only the NCSG and people from GNSO. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. I just wanted to say that at the end of the call, the ALAC call yesterday, Dev wrote into the chat that in his view, the outreach and engagement subcommittee was a good home for future activities, to coordinate that with the GSC and regional reps.

ALAN GREENBERG: We seem to be giving everything to them. Okay. Next item on the agenda is CCWG next steps. There is not a lot to say except in the interim since the ALAC meeting, I have been reading a fair number of public comments that was posted. I don't know if anyone else has done that to a large extent.

---

There, we are the only... I believe we are the only chartering organization that has laid down essentially redlines that would prevent us from ratifying. We are far from the only entity that has done that. Certainly if you look at the GNSO, there are almost everyone has some redlines in it, in the positions that have been posted.

How the GNSO will resolve that is not clear, I'm presuming they are going to end up voting piece by piece on each of the 12 recommendations, and be able to come up a GNSO position on each of those, depending on how each group has made its decision. That won't make some people happy, but I don't see any other way to do that.

That being said, we have a real tough way going forward, because there are lots of dissenting views. There are also a number of people who have said, very loudly, that there are too many gaps, there are too many things which are not completed to sign off on this. And that's including at least one of our external advisors, who has submitted a comment.

So I guess I just wanted to update on people of what I have noticed and solicit any input from anyone else who may have anything. It's not going to alter what we do at this point until the CCWG meets on the fifth, and we find out what kind of timeline we're looking at. There is not a lot we can do to plan anything.

But I think just we all need to have a common idea of where we're going. And we have a speaker queue of Tijani and then Olivier.

Tijani? Was that an old hand? In that case it's Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I've been following what the GNSO is working on at the moment. There are a little bit taken up by time and somehow trying to catch up. So a number of people have volunteered to spend some time over the holiday period to be able to review specific parts of the proposal.

And their concerns, of course, is that the SGs and the Cs, so the stakeholder groups and the constituencies, not all of them were able to submit comments in time. They are hoping to get a first link to comments submitted by SGs and Cs by the 24<sup>th</sup> of December. Coming up with a small sub-team to review the submitted comments and draft a formal GNSO position for review by the Council.

And the target for this 7<sup>th</sup> of January, but they're not speaking about the actual voting that will take place. I gather that James [Ledell] is hoping that positions are aligned enough so as to be able to give a clear idea on whether counselors should vote yes or no, but at the moment, they're still very much trying to find the solution on this one.

I think that our position, by the very fact that we've already held so many webinars and we pretty much clearly know where our redlines are, is probably an easier position than the GNSO Council. So I'd be looking at trying to devise their own way to move forward. The big concern, and that's also a concern of many people in the GNSO Council, is if there are some significant negative feedback from the community, and so therefore, some significant changes needed to the end result, is that likely to change the game completely?

---

Very much like what you said, if they decide to reduce the number of people from At-Large, the power of At-Large in that community Council. So I don't know, we're in big question mark territory at the moment. Well I don't that the work CCWG as a whole will do that, but there may well be a redline drawn, you know, at this point, it is only, I believe, the NCSG or parts of it that have said that.

So given that, if the NCSG... If there were to be a vote on recommendation by recommendation in the GNSO, that would probably not pass, that would fail.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

It's Olivier speaking. If I may add to this. Actually the, in the contracted stakeholders group, there is also, I believe, the ISPs and the Intellectual Property, the IPC has been very adamant on a number of things that they see as being redlined. And we're also seeing, I believe it could be the BC is also looking at a few things.

So it's all up in the air. And some of the points that the IPC are making go directly against some of the points that the NCs are making, and both are saying this is a redline issue. So [CROSSTALK]... on our own thing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, that's exactly what I said. I said, each of the groups are coming up with redlines, they don't necessarily align to each other. For any of those redlines, and let us look at the ones saying we should decrease the power of ACs. If the GNSO chooses to vote recommendation by

---

recommendation, I said that one would likely not succeed in getting a majority of the GNSO to support it.

I haven't done the analysis on the other issues. I'm saying that may be a way forward for the GNSO. And I'm not pretending that I will make that decision for them. I'm just saying there are lots of redlines there. Some of them may make their way through the GNSO to come up to be a GNSO position.

How the CCWG will reconcile all of those, is simply the point I was making. I wasn't saying we do anything about it, I was simply stating that it seems to be something that is likely to be an issue as we go forward. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Hi. Cheryl for the record. Look, yeah. GNSO is a bit of a [inaudible] at the moment, and we knew that was going to be the case. But we've got to recognize that with anyone put in redlines as such as a chartering organization, and that's fine, we, a couple of our redlines, hopefully will be, yeah, just a couple of our redline [risks] will hopefully be [inaudible], such as the reduction of how to, the advisory committee because every time I talk to anybody who is not just a constituency of the GNSO, they say no, no, that couldn't possibly happen.

But I say it's important that we kept it in our report so that it was clear this exists, we will not endorse this to make sure it doesn't happen. However, we are going to have at least three, up to seven, of the recommendations that do need particular work done on them. They've hopefully will then mean that no one would have redlines about them,

---

and here I'm speaking as someone who has been thinking about this as part of the leadership team, fairly extensively along with León, and León might, you know, tell me to shut up or back me up on this shortly.

But we really hope that no maintenance of redlines will go past a next draft. We also hope that with work done in January, and it's going to be a lot of work done in January, that we'll be able to get to the point where a final draft can go out and get 100% of necessary endorsements. Now that may mean that some chartering organizations will remain silent, and it may mean that one chartering organization may not be able to get its act together enough to endorse. And that's okay.

But I don't think we're in a lockout situation yet. I do think that it's useful that ALAC has put there its redlines are, and we won't know about GNSO and ccNSO until at least the first week in 2016. So be prepared for lots of CCWG calls, I did say it might go up to twice a week. Guys, we're talking about three hour meetings as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yup. Thank you Cheryl. And I'll point out that, at some level, we are in a fortunate position that several of our redlines are also Board redlines. So, it's moderately clear that we can be ignored. It's harder to ignore the Board since they ultimately are going to have to approve these bylaws.

Anyone else? We are running later than I thought we were going to. I was hoping the whole meeting would be over in an hour, but we're getting towards the end. No other comments on this? All right. Then I



---

think it's just a watching brief at this point for most of us until the beginning of January.

Just a quick comment on working group revitalization. We've been talking about it forever. We haven't done anything. I'm just serving notice that in January, we are going to have to do something about this. And I'm going to be asking for support from other people on the ALT to try to come up with some sort of plan for either to abolish working groups or put them to sleep, at least temporarily or actually have them active.

So I don't want to have a discussion right now. We've done it several times. We're going to have to take it seriously come the New Year. The next item is FBFC and CROPP. And we seem to have... Tijani, did you want to say something on this one?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, about those groups, yes. I would also like to think that we need to have a charter for each one of those working groups. Second point, I have a lot of tasks for this week. I will try to finish everything that is still in my duty and that I didn't do, so perhaps at the end of this year, I will deliver everything I have to do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I wasn't accusing you of not. Missions, you know, whether we need a charter or a mission for each one, I tend to think a charter may be overkill in some cases, but as I said, I don't want to have the

---

discussion today. But we are going to have to have it in January and be serious about it.

FBFC and CROPP is just a note that finance and budget committee is going to be obliged to, very early in January, identify a person to represent each region on the CROPP team. And to the extent any of you care about this, and I think we all should, you may want to start thinking about who that should be, and perhaps socializing it with your colleagues.

I know some of you are on the FBFC, some of you are not. But as ALT members, I presume you all have the right connections to start thinking about this. The CROPP program in general, there is a lot of feeling within ICANN, certainly within ICANN staff, and other parts of ICANN, that it has not delivered what it was promising to.

And if we can't make it deliver I think in this year, with real results, then it's like, my feeling is, and I have no inside information, is this likely to not continue? So either we need to make it work or we need to help kill it. But one or the other. I think at this point, our focus should be on trying to make it work, which means a more cynical view of the people on the CROPP team as to whether it is going to be functioning or not.

And Cheryl was trying to solve the problem in this meeting and I refuse to jump to the bait. The next item is...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bad man. Bad, bad man.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: [Laughter] Sorry, I refuse to go into [inaudible] in this meeting on that issue. The next one is focus of the ALAC in 2016. When Heidi first drafted this agenda, she had me telling you what our plans were. And I refuse to do that at this point.

I would like input again, in the early part of January or before from everyone on the ALT, or anyone else who has an opinion at this point, what should our focus be in 2016? Clearly I have a number of priorities. It's inevitable that CCWG is going to take far more time than we ever scheduled in 2016, at least at the beginning. But I'd like some guidance as to what people believe is where we really should put energy, and putting energy in one place implies taking it away from somewhere else.

So again, I'll be following up with email, but something to think about. Olivier, you have your hand up, and Heidi I see. I don't know what order they came in, so let's go with Olivier first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Heidi came before me, so she might wish to speak. I was going to just speak a couple of words on CROPP as well.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, that was my point too, so feel free Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Heidi. So regarding CROPP, one of the problems is that if each one of the RALOs that proposes people for CROPP, and so each

---

RALO is really at fault, it's not the CROPP team, and I think that the way that CROPP is actually run is pretty expertly run. The second problem we have is what kind of a return on investment do we want from CROPP?

Are we going to have metrics on the number of people that have been recruited thanks to somebody travelling to a meeting? I'm not quite sure. The only thing that I would say as if the people that have travelled are not submitting reports, maybe that's one of the things. The reports might not be put out there well enough or displayed easily enough so as to be able to find them.

Those people are not producing reports. There should be some, either some kind of a metric to penalize those people and never let them travel on a CROPP travel again, or something like this. There are some improvements to be made on CROPP from our point of view. But I think that the way that it has been run, especially by Dev, has been expertly done. And the wheels are running well.

Secondly now, just on the focus on the ALAC in 2016, my focus would be, and that's just for the things that I'm in charge of, really putting out those recommendations that come out of ATLAS 2, and close the door on them. So really either allocate them to working groups, or say that they're complete and produce a final report. That's something which I hope to be doing before July, or before June, the June meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just for the record. I was serving notice that I was asking for input, not asking for the input right now. And we have a long speaker queue. And

---

please, let's not talk about fixing the problems. It's stuff we have to go onto as we move forward. I have Heidi, Tijani, and Cheryl in that order. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you. Just very quickly, internally, what I've heard about the CROPP that actually At-Large is doing okay. I mean, at least they're taking the slots. I agree with Olivier that more feedback and [inaudible] better promotion of the results of those trips would be useful, perhaps to Rinalia, etc. But I've heard the risk with the CROPP was that some groups are not even taking the slots. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you Heidi. People are, in general, or at least when I've looked, are submitting reports, but they end up saying we've met with 49 people and we gave out 103 brochures. We're not getting any real feedback as to what the benefits are. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I speak about exactly that. Do you know that each traveler needs to be pick the objective of his travel? And when he can come back, he has to make a report about the result of this trip, and they must [inaudible] that it matches with the objectives that he put.

So this is done. It is not perhaps, it's not published in ICANN, but it is in the CROPP. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And it's Cheryl for the record. And following on from Tijani, look as a member of the CROPP teams, things were actually spelled out in the first place, I'm very happy with the way it's running internally. I do understand that we need to get this current group of CROPP members to be aware, particularly seeing as At-Large is the group that is making greater use of CROPP, to better promote and advertise the benefits, when those benefits do occur.

As Tijani said, it is certainly being published, you know, it's one of those, it's there, but nobody is looking for it type material. So there is a couple of smart ways that I immediately thought of that we could solve at least that problem. And I'm happy to work with people to make that happen in 2016.

I think it's all about promotion and advertising and reporting. And Heidi, if you'd like to let Dev know that our work specifically was in on that if you like, for example, I do know, for example, that Asia-Pacific, at the regional meetings, we have at the meeting after a CROPP funded activity, we have quite an extensive presentation on the outcomes of that activity.

But that may not be happening across all the RALOs for example. So there is some harmonization that can happen at the regional level internally, but more importantly, it's the outward facing stuff, the getting it to Rinalia, getting it to the other parts of ICANN. And there is ways of that. So happy to help on fixing that.

---

And just while you all are thinking about your main objectives and desirables for 2016, just let me remind you, in 2016 we've got a review on that will be high on all of your priorities. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. And just for the record, since several people have said, talked about how well the CROPP group has been run, I was not at all criticizing that. My concern when I introduced this subject, is selecting the people to serve on it, is in the past we have had an issue with some people essentially believing consciously or subconsciously, they were there as a rubber stamp.

And weren't allowed to, you know, look in-depth and question the requesters. And I want to make sure that nobody on that group is taking that attitude. Whoa?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

We are vicious on that list.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I said some people on the [CROSSTALK]...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Well then we need to mentor some of your CROPP people because if anyone is remaining silent, the assumption is they are agreeing with the discussion. We have been brutal.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I wondered that very carefully. [LAUGHTER]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maybe I'm just too aggressive. Again.

ALAN GREENBERG: I won't go into any more details now, we've already put enough time into it. Okay. I would like to call the public meeting to a close, and go into in camera to discuss an issue. I think Ron Sherwood is the only person on the call right now who is not an ALT or a liaison appointed by the ALAC.

TERRI AGNEW: And I concur with that Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So if you can let us know when Ron is off, and we will stop the, and if you can stop the recording please.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you one moment please.

And recording has started. Please continue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. It's Alan Greenberg, Chair of the ALAC. The ALT just met in camera, and we were discussing a travel funding issue, which



---

was not resolved. And do we have, I have a call for any other business. I'm told Olivier has an any other business. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I have to apologize for not having brought this up prior to the meeting. I was going to ask, is there any follow-up on the letter that Ron [Androff?] wanted the ALAC to send regarding the, what is it called again? The sensitive string issue and picks?

ALAN GREENBERG: There has been nothing done on that. Would you care to do a first draft for my consideration?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, sure. [LAUGHTER]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well done. [LAUGHTER]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, no, that's fine with that then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, you know what I said in Dublin, that we're willing to put work into this. We are not willing to put work into it, just to come up with resolutions which will then be ignored. But as a forward looking

---

exercise, using what we have already done as our triage, we are willing to put some work into it, assuming we can actually find a volunteer to do the work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Alan, it's Olivier speaking. If you give me the greenlight for proceeding forward, I'll proceed forward. It's just I wasn't mandated to do something like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm asking you to draft a letter for my consideration is what I said.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [LAUGHTER] Just briefly on that Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, yeah, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just, well because I'm very aware that picks is going to come into discussions with the CCWG on an ongoing accountability, can I ask that León and/or I are brought into the loop on that so we don't trip over each other with what we're trying to do with our work currently on CCWG and this? For example, you note [Becky] asked in the meeting

---

whether there was a possibility of getting access to what work had been done on our triaging.

I think, you know, our work on the triaging of the sensitive string stuff could be very useful, for example, to the CCWG, as opposed to paying millions of dollars for, and that is an exaggeration, I know, for the record, but a huge amount of money to our external legal counsel to go through thousands of picks and validate them as risks.

So can we just work closely together? I'm not suggesting it has to keep coming back to everybody, but I think if it was León and/or I keep our finger on the pulse of this with Olivier, make sure we're not crossing each other over or...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I really don't think there is any chance of that, but glad to include you. Becky has thought we had done an evaluation and a summarization of all picks, which is far from what we did. We actually looked at a compilation staff had done, and I in fact, went back to some of the picks because there was lack of clarity on them with just a few of them, and that information, the public document, we're certainly willing to share that.

Just for the record however, with the current wording in the proposed bylaws, and even with the changes the Board is proposing, picks basically are going to disappear in the second round unless the new, the PDP on the next round decides that picks need to be there in one form or another.

---

I mean, that's virtually a certainty. They are clearly going to be deemed to be policy under the new policy and implementation rules, there is no question about that. And they weren't specified in the last one, so I think we're going to be going back to zero, and either this PDP will have to reinvent picks like the Board did, or they will disappear.

But that's looking forward out of PDP which is going to take years as far as I'm concerned. So, you know, we're really just talking about this round in terms of the current bylaws, because everything is moved afterwards. Olivier, is that done to your satisfaction at this point?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Any other business?

In which case, I will call this meeting to an end. I will wish everybody the absolutely best holidays [CROSSTALK]... I'm saying Merry Christmas to those that celebrate Christmas. To those that don't celebrate Christmas or celebrate something else, enjoy your holidays. Enjoy your time off. Try to get away from ICANN for at least a day or two.

Try not to turn on Skype for a whole day and not have it [inaudible] at you. And enjoy yourself, and get some energy back so when we start up again, that same goes obviously to all of our loyal staff members who put untold numbers of hours into this, above what they're paid to do, and the volunteers who put obviously more than they're paid to do into this.

---

I thank you all. And enjoy your life for a week or two.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**