EN

TERRI AGENW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ALAC monthly teleconference, taking place on Tuesday the 22nd of December 2015 at 19:00 UTC.

On the English channel we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, Jimmy Schultz, Maureen Hilyard, Seun Ojedeji, Kaili Kan, Sébastien Bachollet, Vanda Scartezini, Tim Denton, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Barrack Otieno, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Sarah Kiden, Ron Sherwood, Julie Hammer, Garth Graham, Alan Skuce, Le-Marie Thompson, Christopher Wilkinson, and Siranush Vardanyan.

On the French channel we have Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong and Aziz Hilali.

On the Spanish channel we have Harold Arcos and Alberto Soto.

We have apologies from Sandra Hoferichter, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Wafa Dahmani, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, and Silvia Vivanco.

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

Also just joining us on our English channel is Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David. Our French interpreters today are Claire and Camila. And our Russian interpreters today are Galina and Ekaterina.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes but also for our interpreters. Thank you very much and back over to you Alan.

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.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. Second item on the agenda is adoption of the agenda. It's a relatively full agenda, but are there any corrections or any other business that needs to be added?
	Seeing no hands, hearing no comments, we will accept it as distributed. And I will turn the floor over for a moment to Heidi for introduction.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you Alan. It is my great pleasure to introduce a new staff on the policy team. Her name is Yesim Nazlar. You heard her in the roll call. Her title is AC SO coordinator, and she will be working 50% for At-Large and 50% for GNSO. She is based in the Istanbul hub. And I would like to just turn the floor very briefly over to her just to say hello to you, and you will be hearing from her more often going forward. Yesim?
YESIM NAZLAR:	Thank you Heidi. Hi. This is Yesim Nazlar speaking. Heidi has just mentioned, I'm the new member of ICANN support team based in Istanbul, Turkey. A little bit about my background, I've been working for Google [inaudible]… And just joined ICANN three weeks ago. So I guess that's all from me for now. Thank you Heidi.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you Yesim. Back over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. The next item is review of action items that require ALAC action or involvement. I'll give it to Heidi.

| HEIDI ULLRICH: | Yes Alan, there are two action items that require action from the ALAC. The first is, let me just get to that page again. |

Okay the first, they're both coming from the Dublin meeting. And the first comes from the ATLAS 2 implementation taskforce meeting, and that action item is, Alan Greenberg to follow up with the ALAC to discuss the possibility of creating a liaison position to the GAC.

| ALAN GREENBERG: | Okay. Thank you. I don't recall the exact background of that, so I'm going to ask Olivier, offline, but to follow up on, give me the background of the specific recommendation. And I will initiate a discussion online afterwards. And the second item? |

| HEIDI ULLRICH: | Yes. This is Heidi again. And that comes from the ALAC development session in Dublin. And that action item states, the ALAC will identify the people in a small drafting group to develop the mission statement of the ALAC. Anyone interested in that part of the group, to contact Alan Greenberg. |

And the group is to review the parts in the ICANN bylaws pertaining to the ALAC, and develop a clear message statement. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right. That's one that has fallen through the cracks. That was suggested by Kim at the development session, and was supposed to be followed on immediately after the meeting, but it didn't. So we will reactivate that one probably wait to the New Year to get people's attention, but we will do that.

All right. Anything else? I see no comments at this point. The next item on the agenda is the policy development activities. And we'll turn it over to Ariel to review that.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Alan. This is Ariel speaking. Can you hear me well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. So as usual, I'm going to paste the policy page on the new website in the chat, and as you can see, I think the last, 18 November, we have adopted five statements. I'm not going to go into them in detail, but I just want to highlight one that's the gTLD marketplace health index proposal. And that one, there is one thing is only nine ALAC members have voted for this statement, and I sent a couple of reminders, so just as a reminder for the future, please do vote the ALAC statement.

And another item related to this public comment is a call for volunteers, and I sent a message to the ALT list, not having received any input regarding the draft message for a couple of volunteers. So Alan, with your agreement, I will send that out to the ALAC announce and RALO list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes please.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, thank you. And there is only one statement that is in progress. As all of you know, it's about the CCWG accountability, their draft proposal and that means today we will ratify a statement. So Alan, when would you like to do this? Would you like to do this now or later?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. It's on the agenda for later.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Sounds good. And now we do have a number of public comments that are TBD, and this is listed in the workspace for policy advice development. I'll just go through them one by one. The first is not strictly a public comment, but we have got a lot of conversation on the At-Large worldwide mailing list. It's about the notice of preliminary determination to grant registrar data retention waiver request for [inaudible] technologies, INC Denmark.

And Alan, you said you will follow-up with Roberto about whether he wished to draft a statement on behalf of ALAC. Have you followed up with him? Or what's happening?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have not. For those who weren't following that string, this is yet another one of the many waivers that are being requested and granted to registrars largely in Europe, to allow them to obey their national laws, essentially. And Roberto made a comment, and I won't try to quote verbatim because I don't have it in front of me, but he said something to the effect of, this is silly and a waste of time.

And he's right on both counts. We said the equivalent a number of times. I am going to ask Roberto if he would like to draft something that we can give as advice to the Board, as opposed to putting it into a public comment period where it will disappear. And I'm going to ask him to basically word it pretty much as he did in that comment.

Perhaps with a little bit more flowery, perhaps not. If he's willing to. And as a former Board member, I think that may have some interesting results, or at least we'll put our stake in the ground to say where we stand. Back to you Ariel, but that should be an action item for me because I apparently forgot to do it.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Alan. And Sébastien has raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much Alan. And I, just to say, it's not new at all. And when I was a Board member, I say that it's just crazy to do that, but legal, who are very powerful in this organization, say we need to have that and it was passed. But I will support anything that will try to avoid to spend time and money on that issue.

And I will support Roberto doing that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I think, we're not likely to change the RAA on the fly, but there is no reason we can't put in place a smoother and less costly process, less costly on the part of the registrars, and on part of ICANN approving them. And just the concept of going out for a public comment on each one of them, I think demonstrates the silliness, and it's the right word, of what we're doing. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I'd like to inform you that I didn't vote on some of the statements of ALAC, those few weeks because I was really overloaded, so that I couldn't read them. I cannot vote on something that I don't read, that's why I missed, I think, one or two statements. I apologize for that, but it is better than voting without reading. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would strongly support that. We may want to adopt a practice of abstaining and explaining why you're abstaining in those cases. But it's understood, and I'm afraid I'm occasionally in the same position. Sébastien, is that a new hand or an old one?

Thank you very much. Back to you Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Alan. This is Ariel Liang for the record. The next public comment is registration data access protocol, RDAP, operational profile for gTLD registries and registrars. That was assigned to Holly Raiche and Carlton Samuels to review the public comments and advice whether the ALAC should draft a statement on this.

So Holly, do you have any update on this public comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can update Holly on that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Given that we've already commented to the Board, the Board has gotten back to us, and suggested we might want to send something into the public comment. The answer is we will be commenting. And Holly and Carlton will be doing that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you.   So back to me.   And the next one is proposed
                                implementation of GNSO Thick WHOIS consensus policy requiring
                                consistent labelling and display of RDDS WHOIS output for all gTLDs, and
                                that was also assigned to Holly, Carlton, and Alan to review.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the answer is, we will be submitting something, even if it is a short
                                statement. I will work with Holly and Carlton on that.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you Alan. The next one is on the launch of supplementary
                                registration proxy service for gTLDs operated by X, Y, Z dot com LLC.
                                And that was assigned to Holly to review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm already working on the first two, thank you. [Laughter] Really, the
                                questions are coming very quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Put that one on my name then, Ariel.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, I'll have a look but it may not happen before the 25th.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand we have until January, but put my name on it, Ariel, please.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, will do. And we'll follow-up in 2016. So the next one on the label generation rule sets for the root zone verse one LGR one, and that's followed up with the IDN policy working group. Satish Babu said that he is reviewing the public comments and will get back to me with regard to whether the ALAC should comment on this or not. So I will follow up with him.

The next is the release of country and territory names within the dot [inaudible] dot [courses], etc. And I believe the ALAC hasn't commented on similar type of public comments. So Alan, is that safe to presume that the ALAC will not comment on this one?

ALAN GREENBERG: It is safe to presume that.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. Thank you. And the last one is on the continued data driven analysis of root server systems, [inaudible] CDAR [inaudible] plan. Last time, we didn't come to a conclusion who is going to review this public comment. So Alan, would you like to discuss this one now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. Is Julie on the call?

                         Is Julie on the call?

JULIE HAMMER: Yes I am…

ALAN GREENBERG: ….is listed on the call. Do you have any thoughts on this?

JULIE HAMMER: Apologies, I dropped attention just for a minute. Which one is it? I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Root server system stability. There is a public comment open. I don't if that is a SSAC report or an external report.

JULIE HAMMER: I think it's a RSAC report.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would make some sense.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. I haven't looked at it. I'll have a look at it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have a look at it. We're not pressed for time on that one, but if we're not going to do anything, we might as well get it off the list. I suspect it's a competent piece of work and we don't really need to say anything, unless it's saying they're no longer stable, in which case we have a problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Then we're all in trouble.

ALAN GREENBERG: But if we can ask you to look at it please.

JULIE HAMMER: I will definitely do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Julie, thank you Alan. That's all from me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Any further comments on policy development? I'm hoping that as we start likely ramping down on accountability, people will have time to focus on some other issues, but that may be dreaming completely. ALS applications, item number five, and I turn it over, I don't know, is Heidi doing it? I don't see Silvia on this call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi, Alan. I will cover this. Very exciting. We are really approaching 200, that magic number. Recently we had LITA, the Lebanese Information Technology Association join At-Large, as 195. That will be in APRALO. The vote closes today for ISOC Dominican Republic, that will be in LACRALO.

                                And then there is one that is currently pending, which is the greater Washington DC ISOC chapter. [CROSSTALK] That is it Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Next item is item number six, reports from working groups, RALOs, and liaisons and anyone else who has anything to report. Our practice is that we post them. We do hope that people actually look at them, but we have a few minutes on the agenda for anyone who wants to highlight anything that is in their report, or to explain why they haven't posted a report. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking for the transcript. And I just wanted to let you know of a couple of things happening in the GNSO Counsel. The first item of relevance is the fact that, well I think you are aware the GNSO Counsel now has a chair. Yes, the chair is… So it now has basically finally comes to some agreement to be able to have a chair, and is therefore operational.

And it was his first ever GNSO Counsel chairing meeting. So the chair is James Bladel from the contracting parties house. There is a vice-chair from the contracting parties house called Donna Austin. And another vice-chair from the non-contracted parties house called Heather Forest. So James ran his first GNSO Counsel meeting.

We had a vote on the motion to initiate the public development process on the new gTLD subsequent procedures. So that effectively means that the staff issues report has now been agreed, and the working group will proceed to being formed. It's a GNSO working group. There is a charter, proposal charter that has been proposed by staff, sort of a standard GNSO charter.

That will basically say we are going to have a look at all of those issues that have been raised in the report. And in the staff issues report. Very soon, there will be a call for members. So please do look out for that, because I think it's very important that people from At-Large have to take part in this policy development process, and make sure that everything that we stand for is actually addressed in that PDP.

Second, there was another motion which was the adoption of the final report on the privacy and proxy services accreditation issues, PDP

working group. And unfortunately, because this again was saying, well, let's adopt a final report and move forward to get things done. Unfortunately, due to the very crowded scheduled, not many people had read the final report or had actually done any work on that.

And so it was, it's basically turned around and said we'll move this off for a few more weeks. And a few more weeks, of course, means January. So that's being moved over to January. Then there was a motion on the adoption of the GNSO review of the GAC Dublin communique. As you might remember, from one of my previous interventions, the GNSO has put together a procedure to respond to the points that are made in the GAC communique.

And so that procedure was presented to the Council, and it passed unanimously. And finally, no actually two more things. Quickly. One was to do with the endorsement for the candidates for the consumer trust, competition consumer trust and consumer choice review. That's just to remind you all in At-Large that we need to have people in this, and they have to be endorsed.

The GNSO Council was again, a little bit overwhelmed at these things, especially since they did not have a chair for a while. So unfortunately, they received nominations from all of the different stakeholder groups, and they decided to send all 18 of them to the people that will make the final selection.

That's the ICANN CEO and the chair of the GAC. And finally, the last thing that we managed to do, missing a couple of other items, was to look at the cross community working group on enhancing ICANN

accountability. Here again, a lot of concerns expressed about not having a lot of time to respond. The different communities were just unable to ask their members directly and get meaningful feedback.

But each one of the stakeholder groups has come up with something, however, no time whatsoever to have a complete response from the GNSO Council. And at present, no idea on whether the GNSO Council will ratify that cross community working group's report on accountability.

There have been several interventions from several parts of the GNSO stating redline, you know, recommendations that they have problems with. Well, at the moment, what seems to be a problem for one stakeholder group Is not a problem for another stakeholder group and vice versa.

But that's all there is in GNSO land at the moment. So thanks for listening.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Olivier. Next we have Julie.

Julie, are you there?

Guess it takes a long time for voice to come to us from Australia.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hey, hey you just watch it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Julie, we'll come back to you. Holly next.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Just a report back on the working group for the charter, to say that we had a couple of meetings in November, in which members who attended provide some feedback on the actual contents of the charter and on the criteria for the independent examiner. So we can set up and there has been comments, Alan, I've noticed you added some comments.

So today, we will review those final comments. And the idea is the charter will be approved, that's on the agenda, and we are well within our timeline. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Julie, are you there now?

JULIE HAMMER: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay, thank you. I just thought I'd update on what the SSAC has provided for public comment on the CCWG ability third draft proposal. The SSAC has very deliberately not filled out the survey that was

produced, I think, for yes/no on every recommendation, and it's because the SSAC doesn't really want to comment on recommendation seven. It's not relevant to security and stability.

And that's in line with the announced position that it took in Dublin, stating that it doesn't wish to exercise power in the empowered community. So the three comments that the SSAC did make with regard to the third draft proposal was basically supporting the incorporation into the bylaws of the periodic review of ICANN preserving the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS.

It also made a comment noting that the sole designator will only be empowered to appoint and remove directors that are selected by the organizations that currently appoint 30 members. And what specifically that is about is noting that the empowered community won't be exercising any power in relation to Board liaisons such as the SSAC and RSAC and GAC liaison.

And thirdly, to advice that any process empowering the community to object in part or in wholly, the IANA budget needs to be implemented in such a way that the delivery of IANA functions is assured stable and continuous. So they would be issues that SSAC wanted to highlight, but on that basis, [inaudible] doesn't see any problem in providing support to the final version, provided, of course, that it doesn't change very much.

So as I say, it was a relatively short comment, but deliberately crafted to not [inaudible] upon methods that aren't security and stability related. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Julie. It was the shortest and comment that I've seen on that proposal. I was grateful for that, if nothing else. I see Terri has her hand up.

TERRI AGNEW: Thank you Alan. Maureen is having some difficulties with her audio connection. She has a storm in her area. So she's just asking to give a quick report for her on behalf of the ccNSO. There has been a number of interesting interventions from the ccNSO community relating to the CCWG, and the Council will be holding a meeting tomorrow morning, Maureen's time, to make their final decisions to present to the CCWG. And that is Maureen's update.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Seeing no more hands, we'll go on to the next item. And we are almost on time, not quite. The next item is the CCWG accountability. Does anyone know what that is?

That's a joke for anyone who is not paying attention. We have two items on the agenda. The first is the ratification of the comment that we made. The comment is attached to the agenda. It is also distributed to the ALAC, and is in the pod right now. The comment is virtually unchanged from the version that was sent out for any comments, and it is unchanged from the last draft other than to incorporate a number of decisions that were taken jointly in the two webinars.

Those included things like explicitly saying that if the balance of power in the ACs and SOs changes, we withdraw our yes. Flagging the potential problem that if the ASO and GAC opt-out, we have a problem. The GAC has indicated that they will not opt-out, and the ASO has explicitly said they will not opt-out. That they will participate.

So we are okay on that one. Pretty much everything else is as we described. There have been very few comments within the CCWG on the draft I sent out, which was very similar to this. Becky Burr did comment on the items associated with the mission, and I have responded to that.

None of her comments changed, substantively changed anything, but I did change the wording in a few cases to make things clearer, because she had misunderstood some of them. And so that was somewhat clarified.

We had hoped to have this ratified by the time it was submitted, but due to a mistake on my part, it was sent out to the IANA issues group on Saturday. It was not sent out to the ALAC until yesterday, which was why we deferred the ratification until this call. And can we confirm with staff that we do have quorum on this call right now to take a vote?

[CROSSTALK]

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry for jumping the queue. Thank you Heidi. But we do have quorum on the call. We have 14 ALAC, sorry, 11 ALAC members presented. And

there is one note from Sandra Hoferichter, she would like Alan to be her proxy for the vote. Alan, do you agree with that?

ALAN GREENBERG: I certainly do. All right. Then I would like to call the vote. We're looking for a ratification of this statement, to say this statement is a formal statement of the ALAC. Is there anyone who would like to abstain?

Either speak out or raise your hand. Is there anyone who would like to vote against the statement?

All right. Can I ask Ariel, or Heidi, or somebody to call out the people who are on this call and ask for a yes, if indeed, they are voting yes. I'd like to do this with a voice vote so we have clarity about who is responding.

Sébastien, you want to say something before we do the vote?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I wanted to say something, but I will drop off. I am sorry. I didn't hear where you are now, which is why I am asking you to tell me what to do. And the second, I will say something after. Now that you start to call for the vote, I will not enter in between. But just give me the [inaudible] if you can, and tell me what I have to do now. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right now, we are in the midst of voting. If you would like us to halt it and make your statement, that's fine, but otherwise we'll continue. We have had no abstentions and no vote nos. [CROSSTALK]

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Go ahead. And if you ask me, I vote yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Then we don't have to ask you. Can we do it one by one please staff?

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Alan, this is Ariel for the record. I will read out the ALAC member's name, and he or she needs to state yes, or no, or abstain.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just excuse me. Heidi has just reminded me that we don't have a seconder for it. Do we have someone to second this motion? My apologies.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll second it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Holly. Go ahead Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you Alan. This is Ariel Liang. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Tim Denton?

TIM DENTON: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Maureen Hilyard?

                      I believe Maureen has a storm. So we will go back to Maureen after.
                      Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Kaili Kan?

KAILI KAN: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Sébastien said yes. And Sandra Hoferichter.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll vote yes as her proxy.

ARIEL LIANG: Jimmy Schultz?

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Vanda Scartezini?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Harold Acros? And Harold is typing. And he said yes. Thank you. Tijani
                         Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Seun Ojedeji?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. And that concludes the votes. We have 12 yes, zero no, and zero abstain.

ALAN GREENBERG: And our rules call for us to keep the vote open so that staff can contact the people who are not at the meeting and get the vote from them. if you can do that in the next day please.

ARIEL LIANG: Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: The vote will have passed, but we like to make sure that we have votes from everywhere. The second item, and I thank everyone for the work that's put into this. The amount of effort that has gone into this statement from everyone, in putting it at a level where it is deemed to be satisfactory, if not perfect from everyone's point of view, I really appreciate it.

Sébastien, you had something you wanted to say.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you very much Alan. And first I want to concur with just what you said, and add thanks to you because you worked very hard to do that, and allow us to participate meaningfully in this debate. And I think we need to recognize your hard work on that issue, and on other of course, but this one is very important.

I wanted to ask one question. Do we have… And I must know, but I don't know.   Do we have a [inaudible] decision of ALAC to be participating to the community if it's setup to the, yeah, to the community if it's setup after the transition? Do we have a formal vote like the ISO have done, and maybe others?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's an interesting question.   We've always sort of assumed we would, but you're right. We probably should take a formal vote. And I suggest we don't need to do that this moment. The timing is not tight, so I would suggest we do an electronic vote on that, but we will go on record and formally confirm that we will do that. That's a good idea. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I think it's important that we do that. Thank you. Okay, good.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you all very much. How we go forward will be interesting. At this point, as Olivier noted, the various component parts of the GNSO are certainly disagreeing with parts of the report. It's not clear how the GNSO will reach a decision, whether they'll take it a part piece by piece

and vote on each recommendation or not. They do have two meetings scheduled, and I suspect a lot of emails in the near future.

Other than that, we are the only ones, at this point, to have formally said we would not ratify it for specific reasons. So it's going to be interested going forward. The next step, however, is to decide exactly how we are going forward, and there is a second document that I put together very quickly. It wasn't meant to be very prescriptive, but just some ideas of how to go forward. If we could put that in the pod please.

All right. If you can scroll down to the bottom of it, you'll see the timeline that we had been previously talking about. And the timeline said that the comment period would close, and I scrolled down and then it disappeared.

All right, the timeline says that the comment period ended yesterday, it did. Staff will be working to put together a summary, nominally by the 31st, and the CCWG would have a revised report by the 7th. That has been changed already. At the meeting today, and I don't know if anyone has a pointer to the new timeline which was announced today.

There wasn't a complete timeline announced, but it was announced that we would not… I'm not quite sure. I think we will not get the staff summary in detail, the detailed analysis until the 7th of January. Was anyone else on the call this morning, or earlier today, can confirm that?

I believe the timeline for what is now the 31st is pushed down to the 7th. I have no clue how that alters the timeline that comes after that. León is not on the call. Tijani, did you note it? I think they say that what is

now listed on this diagram as the 31st will not happen until the 7th. I don't think they said anything about the timeline after the 7th. So… Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. They said that [fourth?] of January, they we will not have any activity. The staff will be working until the 4th of January. So I they pushed the 31 to the 4th of January, for the staff to finish the draft.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's what I understood.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It may well have been the 4th, but it's clear that although there may be some private work going on, there is nothing formally scheduled for the CCWG or for the working parties, until the 4th. That means, in my mind, we will not have a revised report by the 7th. There is also a significant amount of work to do to mesh what is in the current proposal with the objections that the Board has raised, and the objections that we have raised.

There may be others from the GNSO later. But at this point, at least those vary too. So it's not clear what the timeline is going to be, where we will have a final report to actual vote on. Yes, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: One of the co-chairs, said that, thinking that you will have finished on the 7th, is not the answer. So they said [inaudible]…

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, that's correct. Cheryl, you have your hand up and maybe you have some wisdom. Or at least knowledge.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Alan. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Yes, it's a good question whether I have wit and knowledge or either from time to time. I think the easiest way for me to answer you, Alan, is yes, you are correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. All right. In my innocence, two days ago, I put together a projected calendar, assuming the schedule would not be changed. I would like to… Pardon me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That was silly.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was silly. Of course it was silly of me. I would like to briefly discuss what was projected. There are several scenarios. If you could go to, if can scroll to the top of the page.   Scenario number one is that

everything that we've asked for has been fixed, and there has been no new things introduced which cause us great pain. In that case, we have a really simple situation ahead of time. We're going to have to take a vote, but that's it.

There is not a lot of agony and decisions to make. The second scenario is some of the issues that we have said are important are not resolved. At which point, we are going to have to have some deep soul searching and saying, "Can we live with those things not being resolved?" Recognizing that, if a single SO or AC does not support the whole report, it still goes forward.

If multiple ACs or SOs do not support it, then there are potential problems. And of course, the Board ultimately must support it, or they won't pass the required bylaws. If the scenario two plays out, then I think we're going to have a substantive amount of work to do, both in the IANA issues group as a preliminary, and then following on in this group.

The last scenario is there is new things come up that we haven't even thought about, and I think those fall into the second category. They're going to need discussion, they're going to need work. So what I've put together was a timeline with a number of IANA issues calls scheduled, and a number of ALAC meetings scheduled.

Clearly, there is no point in approving this because we don't know what the new timeline is right now. I'm hoping, and Cheryl will confirm, that we're not going to have to wait until the fourth to find out what the

new timeline is. I'm hoping we will get at least a projected timeline somewhat sooner than that. Is that a reasonable thing to hope for?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, Alan. You can hope. [LAUGHTER]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. I'm not actually being flippant, it's just that we haven't had our debrief call after the meeting earlier today, so that is where we will sum up exactly what where and when we'll be doing what and released, or able to be released. So one of those, our meeting is just between the two things that need to happen before I can answer that more frankly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Does anyone want to object to the concept of what I'm presenting? That is, if there is work to do, then we're going to rely on the IANA issues group to do a fair amount of it, but the ALAC is going to have to meet probably in two consecutive weeks to decide whether to ratify or not.

Obviously, if everything is perfect and we don't have any work to do, we don't have to worry about the detailed schedule at this point. But I guess I'm asking is, is there anyone who feels overall what is planned is unreasonable? The dates will change now that the overall schedule is

going to change, but until we have a better idea of when we're likely to see the report, there is not a lot of point in trying to arrange meetings. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Alan. I know that we already had this discussion about face to face meeting, but I wanted to re-express in this meeting that actually I think we will be missing a face to face and meeting. And my reasoning is the following. When you look to the Board work, they were able to spend time, face to face, and to produce a report on whether they think about, and when they will decide about the next step, they will do that face to face.

And we will not. And we are one of the chartering organization. We are one where we need to have time to explain to each other, among us, all what it is this document. I really feel that we will be missing this part, and we are not on equal footing with the others, because we are really volunteers in this group.

And I think we will, once again, [meet] that now, how we will be able to do the work. We need to be able to have the 15 ALAC member to participate to all discussion. It's important to understand, well, not too much to know where they will vote, yes or not, but because it's an important step for At-Large and an important step for ICANN.

And I really think we need to find time together, one way or the other, to work on that, and I have no problems that [inaudible] working group made a lot of work before, but anyhow, we need to be all the 15, at the same page before working. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And we'll go back to that in a minute, or perhaps immediately.   Cheryl, sorry I thought that was an old hand, but apparently it's a new one. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. Now I put it up… It's Cheryl for the record. I put it up in response to, as you were going through your scenario and your forecasting. I can say, with some confidence however, that there are a few things that will come into play here. First of all, it is more likely, if not inevitable, that in the time you have in your forecasted meetings, that we will have at least, notice that, at least a requirement for two meetings per week for the IANA CCWG.

Perhaps to Sébastien's point about assisting the ALAC members, assisting people who are the ALAC beyond those who are actually like Sébastien and Alan, members of the CCWG and therefore active in all of those discussions.

Some, if not all, of those meetings, they be encouraged, the ALAC be encouraged, to, if not mandated, to attend or failing that, at least review the transcripts and MP3s. What we can do, I think León and I can probably ensure that time stamping goes on as they used to [inaudible], in those meetings so it would assist in a better reckoning to have help, help the ALAC keep up with what would be a flurry of last minute but necessary and fairly detailed discussions on a number of matters.

We do know that there is going to be a couple of issues, such as the response to recommendation 11, which for those of you who don't know all of the recommendations by heart yet, is the one that pertains to what is known as stress test 18, and how the Board should react to what is formal in the comment at the moment, Government Advisory Committee, GAC, advice, with a capital A, that's been wrought with consensus and a proposed bylaw associated with that.

That's just one. There is one or two others, that are going to have a lot of interactions, not only required in some teams but needs to come back to the whole CCWG. I think your forecasting is valid and reasonable, Alan, but I think it's going to be even busier, even in that January period. Also on a note, to say some, what Olivier has also mentioned to you, that the response of the chartering organizations, GNSO, is not going to be available to us until much later in January than even the fourth.

And Alan, this is going to be a bit of a moving feast, and ALAC, like all of the chartering organizations, we're going to have to be extraordinary flexible, but the CCWG leadership and staff is also working on a whole bunch of different scenario timelines depending on what disputing [inaudible] actually fall into place with, and that's probably why you saw and observed, quite reasonably I might say, a kind of break in the timeline at the [inaudible] in the meeting, because some of beyond the fourth of January takes us into a black hole.

Some of it takes us into an Alice in Wonderland sort of scenario, and some of us hope that some of us can continue on so it's settled by Marrakesh. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. All clear as mud right now. Jimmy, go ahead.

JIMMY SCHULTZ: Hi everyone. This is Jimmy Schultz speaking for the transcript. I agree with Sébastien that it would be nice to have a face to face meeting to basically [inaudible] clear and [inaudible] time, but we don't have the time. We don't have the possibility so while six [inaudible] posted have as much teleconferences as possible, as needed, in January, I think we can't decide yet when they should have, when they should take place.

                        While we would then decide, and so stated at least two, but I think we will need much more. If a new topic arises that we have to discuss and we have to talk day by day, but I don't think a face to face meeting is needed, and possible, because we have to [inaudible] in January. I don't see that. That's it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll comment on the safe space, but first let's go through the speaker queue. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will comment, so I will speak after you…

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no go ahead. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Calls or teleconferences, are not helpful for people to understand to follow. It is even hard for people who are following to be really 100% following, especially because it is a crucial decision. So I think that if you want to be the decision of the ALAC, you have to convene a face to face meeting, because it is the only way to have all people seeing each other, and speaking, and trying to explain their point of view and the others trying to understand and to react on that.

This is why, in my point of view, to have a decision that reflects really the point of view of ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. When Sébastien raised the issue of a face to face, even if the GAC was not meeting, remember initially we said that if the GAC meets we will meet, but we're not going to cause a face to face ourselves. At that point, it was almost a guaranteed outcome that the GAC would be meeting. So it was a safe thing to do.

As it turns out, the GAC will not likely meet. When the issue was raised by Sébastien, and I did a straw poll, the majority… There were a few people who supported the face to face, and there were a significant number who said they don't believe it was necessary, and several who said that they would attend remotely, that is don't count on them to travel.

So at that point it was dropped. There just wasn't a lot of support. I guess I'm asking the question again, that if there is a belief that we do

need a face to face for this, at this point we don't know the outcome. We may have, quote, no problems because everything is resolved, we may not. The difficulty of a face to face at this point is, even if this group was unanimous in deciding that we wanted one, I'm not sure when it should be. Because I don't know, at this point, when it is we're going to have something to talk about.

And I'm not sure anyone can give us any better feeling on that. So the real question is, if we find out on this…

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello this is Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, if you want to speak, I'll put you next in the queue. If we find out somewhere near the beginning of January, that we think we will have a report that will come out on the 12th or 15th or something of January, I'm not sure we'll be able to schedule something with travel for 15 people or 16 people, if we include Cheryl as one of our members, that we can do on a few days' notice.

So I'm just not sure it's logistically possible, since we don't know when we'll have a report to work with, when it is we can meet, but I guess if someone understands something better than I do, I'd like to hear from them. Seun go ahead.

TERRI AGNEW: Alan, this is Terri. His line disconnected shortly after he asked for the floor. We'll be dialing out to him.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe in all of our wisdom, we can fix the telephone system.

TERRI AGNEW: And we're unable to reach him on this side, but we'll continue trying.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have any wisdom?   Because at this point, I'm at a loss. Even if we unanimously decided we want a face to face, I don't know how to schedule it.

                       Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, I agree with you. I agree with you 100%, Alan, that it is unknown now.   We don't know [inaudible], we may have something to [inaudible]… I agree with you that with a [inaudible] of gathering of everyone, but this is a very important element to take into account. Who can make it when we decide to have a face to face meeting? We have to decide who, to know who can make it. So if we only have one or two people who cannot make it, we can do it.

                       It will be [inaudible]. But if we have more than five that cannot do it, I think it is dead. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, it will be a matter of visas. Some people need visas for many countries, and you can't necessarily get a visa in the very short term. Seun, go ahead if you're still on the line.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. This is Seun. Thank you Alan. Thank you mention [inaudible]. Visa issue is a very typical, this is why [inaudible] will not be able to make it. Also, the very important point on the fact that you don't even know when, what the [inaudible] is going to look like, and if everything is going to be happening January. That is the plan now.

It's going to be [inaudible] to actually be able to get [inaudible] any possibility to get results, or to even get [inaudible] this for me, for instance, it will be very difficult to do. But I think [inaudible] if one person [inaudible] is not going to be able to make it [inaudible], however, once we start having four or five ALAC members might be able to attend physically, and I don't think it's [inaudible] face to face, we can always try to schedule as many conference calls.

Of course, I understand the challenge that [inaudible] the audio are able to do if [inaudible]… So I think if we can get an idea of what the timeline is, and we're able to [inaudible]…

ALAN GREENBERG: Yup. Thank you. I was asked to try to summarize what Seun said because the interpreters were having a hard time. He was basically, he just irritated the points of visas are an issue, people getting time off and

being able to free up from their personal life to do things on short notice, is a problem, and we don't know when the meeting will be at this point. So clearly there are problems.

Cheryl in the chat noted that she has been suggesting that there be a formal face to face for both the chartering organizations and the CCWG in mid to late January. I personally think that if a face to face… If a face to face is needed for anything, it's the CCWG, and it would make some sense for that, for the chartering organizations to meet two days after that or something like that, to ratify whatever comes out of that.

So I would tend to support that. I think the face to face is going to be more necessary for the CCWG than just for us. But in any case, I don't think there is anything we can do at this point until we have a little bit of clarity as to when we're talking about. So I will send around a note, or maybe staff will send around a note, asking people about their ability to travel and things like that, or their interest, so we can have a little bit of information available, should we want to decide on shorter notice to do something.

But at this point, I don't think there is anything we can do but sit down and enjoy the holiday season, for those who celebrate it, and try to make sure that we're nimble when we get enough information to act. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Now I hope you can hear me now? Yes. Thank you. I change computer. Yeah, I agree with all what was said, but everything that [inaudible] it's a terrible issue, but we can come all to your city, Seun,

and then you will not have trouble with visa. Joke aside, we can find some places. We are not bound by any place or any decision, then we can find a place where [CROSSTALK]…

It's easy to get visa for the people who usually have trouble to get visa. And I understand your point, Alan, about the timeline. Three weeks ago it would have been safe to say it must be between the seven and then the 22. I guess, if we schedule something around the 18th, 19th, 20th of January, I didn't look at the calendar for that, but around the end of the decision, it could be a good way to go, not to say it's in stone, cast in stone, but…

And, yes thank you to ask, I would say again, but I hope everybody from ALAC will answer that, if we can, if they can find availability to come for this important topic to come together sometime in January. And if we ask the 15 ALAC member plus Cheryl, I will suggest that we, as the chair of the IANA stewardship so on and so forth, working group for ALAC, I think those two people are very instrumental to what we are doing now for ALAC. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. The chair of the stewardship? What did you say?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's the IANA, what is the name of our working group? ICANN, At-Large working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The chair of the working group. Okay, Olivier, got it. All right. Tim and then I'm going to call an end to this discussion. We're 20 minutes over, and I don't think we can make any real decisions at this point, and we need to move on to other items. Tim go ahead.

TIM DENTON: Exactly. I support entirely your position. It's a completely rationale, and that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tim. All right.   You will hear more of this, we will obviously have more discussion and the, there is an ALT meeting tomorrow that we'll see if we can make some proposal that makes some sense at this point. The next item on our agenda is the At-Large review charter. The charter has been distributed and comments made. Holly, I'll turn it over to you to tell us what you want to do.

The intent is that we can approve a charter either a document we have, or with specific targeted changes so that it can be updated and then sent back to the staff people so that we can start moving forward on the review. Go ahead Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Right. I just noticed your comments today, so what I've asked Heidi to do is to, in the screen put up the latest version, which has got your corrections. I would like everybody to sign off on it today. It can then go to Larissa. It does have a timeline on it, and we are in compliance with the timeline. We have two meetings, and the task that was set for

us under the timelines was to come up with some criteria for the independent examiner, we have done that.

There is also a, we will have, we being Alan and myself and probably Cheryl, a brief look at some of the criteria for the request for proposal, but that really is a confidential document. It will not be made public, and it will not even be made out for comment other than in a very limited way, but it is a way of, that we had discussed with the Board committee members on the review that are handling this review, what kind of input can we have, and a way of, oops sorry.

Terri is saying, no.

Sorry. I better speak louder for the interpreters. There is, we've got to find a way of having at least some feedback for the selection of the independent examiner. And Alan, staff was covering, I think in the last 24 hours, in the package that Larissa sent us, so that's part of it, but that will just be done by a few of us. But what we have to do in terms of the whole working group, from here on, is to have the rest of the timelines.

Now, I'm still not seeing the charter up.

I don't know what happened. I have to trust that everyone has had a look at the charter. Heidi, your area, is there nothing in the, can we not put the charter up with Alan's comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the charter is what is in the pod. Is that not the charter? At-Large review, elements of the At-Large review working party?

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't see anything, anywhere on my screen.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think your screen is broken. The document I commented on last night is the one being displayed.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, it's not being displayed in my… I don't know what I've done.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Holly, I've also put the link in the chat, so you can open it there. But it is being displayed for myself as well. And I see others are seeing as others. [CROSSTALK]

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, do you want to walk through your comments, because other than that…

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I will be glad to. I only made essentially two comments. One, I corrected the spelling of At-Large Community to put it with a capital C. That is defined term in the bylaws. And number two, I stated my general support for using British spelling over American spelling, but in the case of the organizational effectiveness committee of the Board, and in the regional At-Large organizations, those are proper name.

EN

They are spelled with a z, and therefore I think for uniformity, we should be spelling that word with a z. That was the great, the total substance of my comments. They were both spelling and capitalization. Other than that, I had no comments on the proposal.

HOLLY RAICHE: In that case…

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, consider your hand up. Tim, is that a new hand or an old one?

TIM DENTON: Old one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Old one. Okay, Seun you're on.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you Alan. Thank you for the work on the review. I actually [added] something to the list. I'm sorry for not posting in the Wiki. I didn't know [inaudible] a little bit of structuring comment, just minor comments. Especially most, especially there are two major parts of the comment. The first is in relation to actually listing out the requirements for participation. So it doesn't get [inaudible] with the actual rules.

The requirements should be listed out so that people can actually [here]. They know what they have to [inaudible].

The other part, the other comment was in relation to the membership. So I wondered what I could be, the requirement, the comments could be qualified or whether it's going to be. [Inaudible]… region, just like we have for the budgeting committee, for instance.

So I don't think it should be too much number of people in this particular committee. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Seun. Unless I'm very mistaken, the composition of the committee is already established. We are not, at this point, looking for membership in the working party, that has already been established. All we were doing now is after the fact, completing the charter.   So although your comments would be important, if indeed we were looking for new membership at this point, those who are already in the group should, at this point, what they've gotten themselves into, and have already accepted that.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Alan. Cheryl for the record. Just to amplify what you were going to say, what you've just said, sorry, and to reassure Seun, it's regionally balanced membership.   There is one representation from ALAC, and one representation from RALO from each region, or I should

say by RALO rather than necessarily [strong] RALO. So that's already take care of.

And Seun, my other reason for putting my hand up, is I actually don't think I understood your first point. So if you could perhaps even type it into chat, because your voice is coming across quite muffled. I don't know about others, but if you could give me a synopsis on the first point you made, that would be helpful. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, in the meantime, could I just remind everyone on this call, that there is one Wiki page that's got all of the materials for the review, including the last review we have, the actual documents, the charter, the Wiki. So there is one place people can go and anybody is welcome to contribute at any time, to that Wiki page.

So it's all conveniently located. And the best thing is not to contribute on the list, it is to contribute on the Wiki page, because then everyone can see what everyone is saying. And you'll be able to follow what's going on. So I would encourage people, including Seun, to please look at the Wiki page, and please understand that comments are welcome, although Alan is quite right, membership is closed.

And having said that, Seun if you want to either type in what, or Ariel may be typing in as well, what Seun said, that would be fine. And Ariel has just put into the chat that gets you to the page. It's really useful, and the final version of the charter is there.

Alan, I would like, when this discussion is finished, to just have a show of hands, so that we do have an official ALAC support of the charter. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Holly. This is under decision, if we get to that point. Seun, I know you're not in Adobe Connect, if you can very quickly tell us what the first point was that Cheryl missed.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Okay, I guess, based on the [inaudible] that Alan gave, the first point may actually mute right now. I wanted to reiterate [inaudible], it's about the, in discussion of the roles, I mean, sorry, of the requirements expected of the members, but since the members have actually been formed, there is no need to indicate that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe when we did do the call for membership, we did outline those things. We have to go back in the emails, but we did do that. All right. I guess I'd like to call for an approval by consensus of this charter, that is presuming we make the changes that were indicated in the

capitalization and spelling. Is there anyone in this call who feels they should be abstaining from the decision?

Hearing none, is there anyone who objects to the adoption?

There is a note from Sébastien saying I will not participate, as I didn't, and I'm not quite sure what the didn't is. Didn't read the document yet. I'll take that as an abstention from Sébastien then.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. I cannot say if I adopt, or I refuse, or I abstain, because I didn't read the document…

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we will deem that an abstention as we did for Sébastien. Hearing no one else who is objecting to the document, we'll say it has been approved by consensus. And we'll move on.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we are, at this point, just so you understand, we are 80 something minutes into the call, and we're about 10 minutes behind, sorry, we're about 20 minutes behind. So, I'm not quite sure to what extent we

want to just defer whole sections. The next one is on new meeting strategy, we defer that one from the last meeting. Is Beran on this call?

TERRI AGNEW: This is Terri. She is not on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then Heidi, is there anything that, this was not for decision. Is there any reason not to defer this discussion then?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. No, in fact I would suggest that you do defer further discussions of this, as there are some developments, particularly meeting B. There is one point to that, Alan, if you do wish to show the ALAC meeting time comparison before, you know, where they have been versus what the meeting strategy would reduce them to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If we can pull that up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Terri could you…?

ALAN GREENBERG: …items on number B of the agenda. Those who are following along.

HEIDI ULLRICH:
And Alan, again, this is just a document that Gisella put together showing basically the overall significant reduction in the face to face time that ALAC would have, as they have in the past, compared to what we've had for the last several meetings, versus what they would be for meetings A, B, and C.

So I think just given the time, you wanted to look at the totals, and you can see that section.

ALAN GREENBERG:
Okay. So that basically reflects the numbers I did on the back of an envelope. It's showing a slightly larger number for meeting A, for the Marrakesh meeting than I was projecting, but it is a significantly smaller number then in times past. I will say, I have a very significant problem with it.

If you look at the number of hours that we just have met with other groups, whether it's the SSAC, global stakeholder engagement, the CEO, and you know, various people, our Board member, we will not have enough hours in Marrakesh just to do those, if we don't spend any time talking.

If we spend a reasonable amount of time talking amongst ourselves, we will not have any time to have any visitors. So I think we have a really significant problem here. The suggestion that has been made is, let's go through a year of meetings, and then we can substantively talk about whether it was good or not.

I think we're in crisis mode right now, and I do not think we can accept that. That's my personal feeling. I would really like to hear from others. Christopher, is that on this topic or something else?

Christopher does not seem to be on the line. Is there anyone else who has any thoughts on meeting times? Am I the only one who is worried?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No. Vanda.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. No, I do believe that, you know, comparing with the past, we really are not having time for deeply discussion among us. We stay [inaudible] a lot from other groups, and maybe one or two opinions around, but we are lacking going deeply into the issues that we really want to discuss and to have some, to get some conclusions on.

In my opinion, we need more time, not less time then I see. So, I'm not comfortable decreasing time for our face to face opportunity to discuss. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Let's go through the speaker queue. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm very alarmed at the amount of time that we don't have. A lot of money is being spent getting us to a place, getting us in a hotel, and I don't know how, well, what is ICANN thinking about spending that much money to get us there, and not having us have a lot of time to actually do what we're supposed to be doing, which is meeting?

You know, from an ICANN point of view, I'd be asking, why are you doing this? If in fact, we're not having time. I don't know what to do about it, at this stage. I don't know if it can be changed, and if so, what we can do other than just plain not sleep and have 24 hour meetings to make the time up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, I have Olivier and Kaili in the queue. I'm going to give Gisella a warning that once that we finish the queue, I'm going to ask her, given that the Marrakesh meeting is a, if I remember correctly, we have Saturday through Thursday, that is a six meeting day, six days of meeting.

In the past for BA and Singapore, we had five days of meetings. If we have shrunk the… Now Dublin was an exception because we added an extra day onto it, but if we have shrunk the amount of hours that the ALAC is [inaudible] or can meet, and we have added a day, where is the extra time gone? I think I know the answer, but I'll give Gisella a few minutes to think about that as we go through the queue. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I, it's the first time I have seen this table, and I'm particularly shocked by it, of course. I've always been weary of the changes in ICANN meeting A, B, and C in that, at the end of the day, we were supposed to have more time to meet with each other, rather than to have less time to meet with each other.

So this now is looking like a cost cutting exercise more than anything else, and the ALAC should really fight this. But I'm also concerned on the first draft of the schedule. I don't know whether you are going to talk about this specially, or…

ALAN GREENBERG: We are not going to talk about the generic one. We do have a session later on, on Marrakesh though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Because the schedule, the Marrakesh schedule has been, there is a first draft of it that is out…

ALAN GREENBERG: That is later on in the agenda, if we can get time to go to it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Then I'll wait until then. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Yeah, I think it is because of the budget there. I would either ALAC or suggest the Board, look into the other places where the budget goes, and whether budgets at other places could be cut, rather than [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, there is no indication that this is being driven by budget.

KAILI KAN: Then what is the reason?

ALAN GREENBERG: The reason was a new proposal to try to make the schedule better. But at this point, this is the result. This is a process that has been going on for several years, that started with a Board committee that was actually led by Sébastien, at that point, and has now gone through a number of iterations with staff and other volunteers.

And it's only at this point that we now come down to the, look at what the implications are that we're having this discussion. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Just to be clear, I was chair of cross community working group when I was Board member, particularly on that subject. And we

came out with a proposal agreed by all the member of the working group and by the organizations, very often. But at the end of this was [inaudible], because we now we have to implement it.

And as it's happened, I was struggling to have an implementation working group, and it was denied. And now it's just stuff we stopped working on that issue. Please don't mix the goal with output, because the output, I think I can still explain why and why it's a good idea to do A, B, and C, and nothing with the budget because we didn't talk about money in this working group, it was not in our scope at all.

We tried to reorganize the meeting to allow, and I will be short Alan, to allow specifically to find a way to keep rotating to all of the region, and to allow region like Africa and Latin American and Caribbean, who have less place for large meeting like we used to have, to allow them to have ICANN coming for a meeting.

And it's why the B meeting was created, or part of the reason why it was. And I… [CROSSTALK] …less time. Yeah, I just want to finish, sorry Alan. Just a second. I don't see why we have less time. A meeting is much like the current one. The C meeting is with one day in addition, and the B meeting is completely different.

The B meeting could be a discussion. But for the A and the C, there is no reason why ALAC will have less time to do their work. And if it's so, then we need to find out why. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is exactly what I was asking. Tijani, a very brief comment please.

Tijani, are you there?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes Alan. It's important to unmute. Sorry. So first of all, I would like to tell you that we have more time now than before. The second point, at the beginning, they want to remove one meeting, they only want two meetings a year. So we [inaudible] managed to have this B meeting as an alternative. And third, for A, we have exactly the same number of days. Why we have less time? Because we have more outreach, so we have to give time, that's all.

So that is not a problem of time, there is a problem of organization. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This discussion wasn't to rehash the whole plan. It will either work, or doesn't work. The problem right now is we are trying to schedule the Marrakesh meeting. And if we don't make some changes, I think I believe we're going to have a problem. We seem to be having concurrence here. Gisella, do you have any insight as to where the hours went?

GISELLA GRUBER: Hi Alan. Gisella here for the record. With regards to where the hours have gone. The meeting A, the Sunday session, which is usually a full day session for ALAC has been reduced considerably because it's now a 90 and a 75 minute session. So that's just basically in the morning.

That's what the new meeting stream strategy has come up with, which has reduced the hours.

And on Tuesday, as it stands now for meeting A, we don't have any ALAC working sessions. So that's another additional four hours that's been reduced. And personally, just having looked at it recently and now working on the Marrakesh schedule, which is a meeting A, and which will be a trial, I think we've got far too many working groups meeting.

The working groups need to commit to actually meeting in between the face to face ICANN public meetings, and to be far more active on the mailing list. So I personally think we need to reduce that where you may be able to catch up so more ALAC working time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I think the group working with the actual detailed Marrakesh schedule is going to have to make some changes like that. I will say, however, that we spend a fair amount of time in these ALAC meetings, talking about the schedule. We get virtually no feedback from anybody, and I think everyone has to be more active.

And as we start to present tentative schedules, I think we need people to actually look at it and tell us whether we're going in the right direction or not. Clearly at this point, I think we have a significant problem, if we were to simply follow the template that Beran's group put together, again, you know, in full knowledge in doing their best job based on what was presented to them by meeting strategy.

But now I think we have to make it practical and work. So I don't think we need a lot more discussion here. I see hands up. Heidi you wanted to get in. Gisella, is that a new hand? We really need to go on to the next item.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, just very briefly. I wanted to just point out that, yeah, as in the past, we had two meetings earlier this year where it was decided to have working groups only on the key topics. And that worked really rather well, and then we sort of split back to where any working group who wanted a meeting, could have one. And that's what we're experiencing here.

The second point, as was mentioned, is outreach. And what we're hearing now internally is that some groups actually for that Monday of outreach, will decide to stay, particularly for meeting B, will decide to stay in the venue and invite people to them, to their meetings. So they can continue their meetings at that point, while others want to go out.

So there might be a combination, a way that we can combine that or some people within ALAC decide to stay in the venue, have their meetings, to get those meeting hours in while another group will go out and do outreach. So…

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not worry about B right now. We have a meeting in roughly two and a half months that we have to worry about first. Any other quick comments? We're now 25 minutes behind schedule. We decided not

to hold the 10 minute session on new meeting strategy, and have spent more than that not holding it.

Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry Alan. Gisella here for the transcript. Thank you. Just a quick point that, with regards to Marrakesh, I know that's coming up later in the meeting, I would strongly suggest holding an ALAC single issue topic call, early January, to go through the schedule, to find comment and to actually get feedback from all of those who are interested, because you said it, that we don't get much feedback from the schedule, and it only comes afterwards once the meetings are taking place.

And that's when we need the feedback, we actually need it prior to it. The meeting forms are due in by the 18th of January, and prior to that, as I said, I strongly suggest a call. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We will do a poll effectively to see if anyone wants a call. I have no problem to having three people unilaterally make decisions. But that means we can't have complaints afterwards. But we will do something on the list about that. If you could put an action item for me and Gisella to decide on how to handle that.

Next item is, a zero minute item, is the endorsements for the CCT review team. We did do endorsements, it was ratified by consensus call. We have identified Carlton Samuels, Christopher Wilkinson, Kaili Kan and Tim Denton, to be endorsed by the ALAC, and the selection, as

EN

was noted by Olivier earlier, will be done by the CEO, Fadi Chehadé, and the chair of the Governmental Advisory Group, Thomas Schneider.

There is no set number for the ALAC. I will be exceedingly disappointed if we just got one, my expectation is to get two. It's conceivable three, and I would say, highly unlikely we would get four. So that's where we stand, but it's out of our hands at this point. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And it's worth noting that the, well, there are many voices in the GNSO that are hoping that every stakeholder group will have at least one person on that committee. So having two ALAC only out of, I don't know how many, that might result in, I might think [CROSSTALK] …a lot more than, is it seven? Seven, yeah.

So hopefully we can get more than that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well you said one per stakeholder group, that's not seven, that's four. If you're talking about one per constituency or stakeholder group…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, constituency. I meant to say per constituency, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: If they get seven and we get two, there is going to be a really strong objection raised. Really strong.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I may add, it's Olivier speaking. The rationale that was put behind this, is that this is GNSO policy to start with, so there should be a majority of people from the GNSO. Yeah, that was publically said on the GNSO call. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If I had had an opportunity to comment on that, I would say, this is a public review team critiquing how well the GNSO did. That gives you less, that would give me less evidence of GNSO people. Having people there defending what they did and saying it's perfect, is not necessarily what I see as this review team is for.

We will continue with that. All right, the next item is the letter that we sent to the CEO, Fadi Chehadé on the issue of consumer trust and contractual compliance. We got a letter back yesterday. I had hoped Garth was going to be on this call to give us some thoughts on it. He is not on this call, and at this point, I would say that we skip over this item until a future meeting, given that we are late and the person who originated the call for this letter is not here to comment on it.

Unless anyone wants to make a comment very quickly, I will open the floor to it, but otherwise we will defer to some later time.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Alan, this is León.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: My only comment would be to actually follow up on Marrakesh, as a signal that they will be having that position filled by Marrakesh. So just keep that in the agenda. That will be my comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. And I'm going to respond to the letter, and yes, certainly, we look forward to hearing the news on that, but at this point, I don't think we have anything else explicitly to do anything about it. Okay. The next issue is the ALAC meeting schedule, this will be a very quick one. We had intended to do a Doodle looking for when people can meet, and with the intent of having a rotating meeting, either two or three different time, to make sure that when we meet at inconvenient times, it's inconvenient for different people.

My inclination is to do three different times because then, essentially everyone who is inconvenienced greatly, is only inconvenienced at a third of the meetings. And that ends up being about three a year, because usually we skip a meeting when there is a face to face in the same month. So three a year where you have to get up in the middle of the night, I don't think is totally outrageous.

So we will go ahead with that. You will be getting a Doodle on that. I will ask you, we'll be sending that out very shortly, and hoping that the January meeting will be scheduled according to it. And I ask everyone to be flexible. If you say under no conditions will you meet from 11 PM

to 7 AM, and everybody says that, then at any given meeting, a third of the people are just not going to be there, and I don't think that is what we should be looking for.

So we will try to minimize the pain, and I know meetings from essentially, starting between 2 and 5 AM are really awkward, because they're really in the middle of the night. But we'll try to avoid those to the extent, but I do ask people to be flexible.

Next item is Civil Society and noncommercial engagement. And I've asked Olivier if he could share that so I could participate as a regular participant, and I'll turn it over to Olivier, and I think Heidi will be given an update of where we are either before we start or once Olivier introduces the subject.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan, thank you. Olivier speaking. And indeed, I hold the great fun of being able to run this little part of the meeting. I have unfortunately missed the call, the overall call that took place a few days ago because I was unable to attend it at the time. And so there have been a lot of discussion both on the ALAC mailing list, but also a lot of discussions on the document itself, which you have a link to.

It's a Google Doc at the moment, and there is a lot of changes and movements and so on in that. But as Alan said, let's have first Heidi Ullrich to provide us with an update on this paper and on where we are with this. Gisella, I note your hand is up. Is this related to this or is that a different hand?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that was a hand from before.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Still a hand from before, thanks Alan. Okay, so let's have Heidi Ullrich then to let us know where we are now. Just as… Yeah, Heidi is there, okay excellent.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Thank you Olivier. So just again, for those who have not been following this very briefly. This document was first developed by a small group, including myself, within internally and it's because we just to get the ball rolling. I want to stress that. This is a bottom up approach, and it will be what the groups involved will make it.

This document was updated after receiving a lot of comments in Dublin. There was a call held last week with At-Large members, NCSG, including NCUC NPOC to discuss the current status. I wanted to just highlight that there was some concerns with definitions. So two points there. You can see that one of the changes that was made in this current document, which is a living document, does not explicitly state that definition as used in this document includes end users.

And then again, there are thoughts, or there are similar discussions that each group has to agree to move forward in mass. And that is something else that is not true. It is only for those who wish to join. So those members of At-Large or of the ALAC who identify, self-identify as Civil Society and they wish to engage in this, are free to do so.

And on the second part of the definition is that, we are in touch with Ron [Art Schultz] who is a person that's been working with ICANN, as well as have to, the pleasure to work with him in the past on defining Civil Society. He will be in Marrakesh, and we're hoping to get a meeting together with the members who wish to move forward on this, to define a definition within the context of ICANN.

And that's it for right now. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Heidi. Olivier speaking. And just one quick note, the updated document which you have on your screen, is actually not the latest one. The most updated one is the one which Heidi has put a Google, it's the Google Doc document which Heidi has put a link to on the chat.

So, that's where we are now. Let's open the floor for discussion, and I see Alan Greenberg in the queue. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. There has been an awful lot of discussion on this, both on the At-Large list and on some of the RALO lists. And I want to try to do a level set. There are some people within At-Large who very strongly associate themselves with Civil Society. There are other people who are exactly in the opposite position. They literally recoil from being called Civil Society, no matter how much the formal definition might fit them or not.

Most definitions of, if you look at a formal definition, most definitions talk about Civil Society as groups, and we clearly include individuals and things like that, who by most definitions are not Civil Society. So whether we fin in Civil Society depends on the details of which we we're talking about and individuals' perspective.

So anything which says At-Large is Civil Society, is clearly going to get strong objection from parts of our community. Anything which says At-Large is not Civil Society is going to get some strong objections from part of the community. So that's a reality that I think we have to accept. To the extent that what is being proposed is something which might help us, and the us being parts of our community, the whole community, or you know, parts who want to participate, I don't think we want to ignore it completely.

To be blunt, there is probably also money available, you know, for events and for other things which might be useful to us. So I don't think we can walk away from it, if only because we have some parts, people in the community who are very strong advocates of this. But we're going to have to take a balanced position, and make it clear to the people who are organizing this, that it's not an easy fit for us.

And to the extent that we want to participate, it's got to be something which does not automatically imply that anyone who is working with At-Large will now be wearing a Civil Society badge upon their lapel. On the other hand, some people might want to. So I think we're going to need flexibility both on our side, and from the people who are working on the staff side.

There is a real danger, in my mind, the groups such as NCSG, NCUC, perhaps to a lesser extent, NPOC, who consider themselves Civil Society, will take a dominant role and presume that everyone else is also. And I think we have to be very careful about how we use words and how this is advertised, and how we go forward.

But I think we're divided enough that we can't ignore it either. Sébastien, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thought I was running this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. Back over to our chair, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to ask you Alan, there are great concerns of people saying that this would, with its, take At-Large, the At-Large community and basically sort of divide it, and others saying that, well then you've got the Civil Society people, or that self-identify Civil Society will have some privileges that others don't.

I mean, any of this founded?

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably. I mean, if Jean-Jacques Sahel is giving out, you know, $100 bills to every Civil Society person, then clearly those who say we're Civil Society in At-Large are going to get $100 bills, and those of us who

don't, will not. So I mean, that's putting it in a silly way, but yes, there is the potential for those getting benefits who want to buy into this, but the reality is we are a divided community.

So I think we have to figure out how to make that work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much Olivier. I don't think that the real question here, for my point of view, the questions, do we need to import the organization within the IGF and within ICANN? ICANN was built in a different way, to try to do something different. It was organized with constituency, and there were no Civil Society Constituency, there were NCUC at that time, the only one noncommercial.

There was the question of the end user, and it's why we build At-Large and ALAC. And now, we want to import some of the split use in IGF, and I don't think it's a good idea. I don't think we need that. We need to have the voice of everyone, yes, but the voice of everyone needs to be organized how we want to be organizing it within ICANN.

And that's why it's not the question, I am Civil Society or not. I could be Civil Society outside of ICANN, and not Civil Society inside ICANN with the same organization. I think we are adding to the complexity of the organization. We are adding a new phone call each month. We are adding work for some people, but it's not needed.

If people from NCUC, NCSG, whatever, they need something we are doing, just we will give them. If they do something that can be useful for us, maybe we can work together. But we don't need this overall structure. I really feel that we need to go outside and not to spend time on that.

And once again, it's not at all to say that it's why [inaudible] are not Civil Society or are Civil Society, it's not the question. It's, do we need this initiative within ICANN? And I think we don't need it, even if we add at the end of the title, very long title we use it, we have an organization within ICANN with, we can change it. But if there are a group who want to call them Civil Society, just try to add a constituency or stakeholder group, but really it's outside the scope of ICANN and I feel that we, as At-Large, let's keep on doing what we are doing.

We have already too much to do then, then don't add one topic and one group to take care of. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sébastien. And I thought you had complained you didn't get enough telephone calls. Holly Raiche, do you get enough calls per month?

HOLLY RAICHE: I really share Sébastien's concern. I do not understand why we need another constituency. I thought RGF dealt with those issues as well. If you look at the sort of issues that ICANN generally has to deal with, the only things that really look very Civil Society stuff is to be a lot of the

privacy stuff, which we're all involved in anyway, wearing our ALAC hats or other hats.

So I don't understand what this constituency is supposed to do in terms of input to ICANN. And I guess it's that real puzzlement as to, is this a new constituency, if so, where does it fit? If it's not a new constituency, it's just a group looking for issues, why? Because we're all pretty busy anyway. It's just, to me, I don't understand what this group is supposed to do, why it's even supposed to be a group, and why there are not already plenty of people around who as each issue arises, and as the issues are Civil Society issues, why we don't contribute that?

To me, it's the IGF structure where in fact, Civil Society actually has a real place and a whole set of issues that aren't necessary ICANN. Sorry about that, but that's my view. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly. Next is Alan Greenberg.

Sorry, I just sorry, [CROSSTALK] Tijani Ben Jemaa. I missed Tijani, I don't know why actually. Tijani Ben Jemaa. Apologies. Or has Tijani just dropped? Maybe that's why because I had read that Tijani had just dropped.

I think Tijani has just dropped. Let's have Alan Greenberg and then we'll come back to Tijani when he's back online.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we need an investigation as to why phones drop, either just before someone speaks or after they say three words. This is a pattern we've seen repeatedly, and I think we need to understand it.

I've only a very brief comment. I don't believe, from what I understand, we are trying to import a new structure or a constituency. We are trying to superimpose something on top of what we have right now, to help delineate for those who believe Civil Society is an important component.

Let me be sort of blunt and I'll name names. I don't think you're going to get Bill Drake to stop talking about Civil Society, and the same is true for a number of other people. The Friday session that preceded some ICANN meetings, where they brought various other people in to have a pre-meeting meeting, was usually described as a Civil Society meeting. So it's here. I think we need to figure out how we can both benefit from it and contribute where it's appropriate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Oh no, Tijani is back now, okay. Tijani Ben Jemaa then, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. I agree with you that perhaps there is no need to add this component of Civil Society in ICANN, but the problem is that it was [inaudible], they [inaudible], and ICANN decided, ICANN put a vice-chair, a vice-president for the Civil Society, and they added

EN

potential staff for him, Adam Peake. So now it is a reality, and there is a budget, there is work.

So if we don't want to step in the NTSG and the other small stakeholders around them will claim that they are the only Civil Society within ICANN, which is wrong, absolutely wrong. I think that Civil Society is not another stakeholder. It is horizontal. It is exactly the regional [inaudible]. We have our constituencies, but we have…

For example, for Africa, we have the African ICANN community. And we are working together, we have a vice-president for Africa and we have a strategy for Africa. It doesn't mean that we have a stakeholder called Africa. And Civil Society is actually the same. So we have a situation we have to manage it as it is.

And if we don't step in, we'll be losing in my point of view. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And we have to keep that queue moving swiftly please, because Alan is putting pressure on me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible] to the pressure, Olivier. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Look, I want to agree, absolutely, with what Alan has said, and indeed what Tijani has very clearly articulated. This is not, in any way shape or form, as far as I can ascertain, I guess I should declare myself as a card carrying member of the noncommercial stakeholder group here, but not as a member of the NCUC because I am not a member of the NCUC.

There is overlapping all of this mapping, there always has been. This is an opportunity, as far as I can ascertain, to have those At-Large structures, who should determine they wish to be, locally engaged in what is outreach engagement or other activities is going on in the name of Civil Society, that ICANN maybe engaged with.

At the moment, a number of At-Large structures should, and I believe probably would appreciate, being greater engaged in some of what is going on in their local or regional community activities, and yet, finds that ICANN is there and they are not involved, and this is to remedy that. So think of it as I do, perhaps. As a little bit more of a birds of a feather, during ISOC [inaudible] activity.

If they are primarily there as a specifically interested in an At-Large activity, individual or entity, but you have a clear interest in particular topics which are categorized for the purpose of ICANN, as yet to be defined by [Don] and other imminently qualified people as the Civil Society actors within ICANN itself determine, it's not trying to impose anything on people.

And I think we need to work with it and in it to make it work best for us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Next is Vanda Scartezini.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. Well it's a [inaudible] comment. I believe that this, maybe is a great opportunity to align with [inaudible] NPOC, and whatever it is

around the ICANN, you know, and have one direction and one formal [inaudible] to involve all the people around that wants to be participate on that.

My impression is, we need to be tied because we need to have this aligned, and the users around the world needs to have a clear information about how to participate. That's… My only worry is not to make it [inaudible] and you know, get more confused for users than it is nowadays, because people do not normally know what is one, what is the other, and how they can, and where they can fit.

So I believe we could make this an opportunity to align everything about users in general, be it Civil Society, be it whatever the name is. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun Ojedeji [inaudible] in the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Vanda. Next is Sébastien Bachollet. And Seun, I'll add you to the queue, it's quite long at the moment. I think I should probably close the queue after you Seun. So Sébastien you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, very shortly I just want to say that if we want to stop this initiative, we can do it now. If we are so-so, we will not stop it and we will [inaudible]. There is no money involved, it's worked for some

people, that's okay. But there is no money and we will not win anything, we will lose. And it's up to you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sébastien. Next is Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. This is Dev Anand. Well Cheryl said pretty much what I was going to say. I think we are always looking at trying to get new At-Large structures, and whether the perspective organizations coming to ICANN, you know, they identify themselves as society, and this initiative is ultimately trying to say that look, for those organizations and individuals that call themselves Civil Society, there is a place in ICANN for you.

And I think we really do need to have, to work with this initiative, to find the synergies to ensure that the messaging is that, if you are hearing about end user issues, privacy as Holly mentioned, then you know, the At-Large is there for you. But right now, the messaging is potentially could be just going to the NCSG only if we don't get involved.

So we do need to be really involved in this initiative. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Dev. And next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, go to Seun and I'll summarize.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks Alan. Seun Ojedeji. And Tijani, I know you put your hand up, but I have closed the queue, but then I'll add you and then to Alan afterwards. So Seun Ojedeji first.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you Olivier. This is Seun. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well. Please proceed.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. I think what Cheryl [inaudible] to make some sense, in the sense that the effort is actually to encourage Civil Society organizations to [inaudible] local activities, would be the ALSs [inaudible]… That is a good thing. [And maybe] from there, we could actually get the Civil Society organizations to become ALSs and so on.

The other side of it what is actually the role of Civil Society [inaudible]? So Dev was talking about getting the issues that they want to discuss. I think it's important that if they're going to come in through At-Large, it will be good for us to encourage them to actually join the formal structure, the At-Large formal structure.

Every RALO [inaudible] to getting members. And so in their organizations [inaudible]. I think if we can notify [inaudible] actually getting their [inaudible]… through our own processes. But again, it's

something maybe we should consider, [inaudible] but I think [inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Seun for this. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Very, very short. The initiative is there, are we able to stop it? Are we able to tell Jean-Jacques Sahel to stop to be in charge of the Civil Society and ICANN? Can we stop the ICANN to make this initiative? Of course will. So we have not initiated anything. We have something on the table. So the question is whether we participate or not. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani, and we'll go over to Alan Greenberg for closing words on this topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Look, it is quite clear that if we think people who go into, new first timers in ICANN, or Fellows, are confused between NCSG and At-Large, they're going to be more confused now because we have a new, almost but not quite super structure put on top of it.

Sébastien believes that if we say no right, we can stop it. I don't agree. If someone can demonstrate that I'm wrong, I'd be delighted at some level perhaps, because we don't need more confusion. There are enough people, within the NCSG group and a few selected others that

have been looking for using the term Civil Society, and getting it [blessed?] within ICANN, and they now have found someone to bless it. I'll be blunt.

I don't think we're going to stop that at this point, unless we got a strong message from the Board that it was bad, and I, to be honest, don't think is going to happen. Something we can investigate, but I don't think it's going to happen. In which case, we're going to have to decide within At-Large to what extent do we want to participate. That implies someone who is going to have to be willing to take the time, or someone or someone per region, more likely, to take the time to see is there a fit for any given activities with us, or do we want them to proceed without us?

And I think there is a danger in that because they will occupy a space that probably we should have part of also. So it's not something that I would have recommended starting, but I'm not sure we can stop it at this point. I'm pretty sure we can't.

So I think we're going to have to wing it at this point and go ahead. We, I'll turn it back over to Olivier to summarize, but we lose interpreters in one and a half minutes. So…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. I'll be very fast. It's Olivier speaking. Just to summarize, the group is now seeking interested representatives, I guess from each group, so as far as we're concerned, on a region by region basis, I can let you know that Wolf Ludwig that he has informed us that he wishes to be the At-Large European rep, and there could be, maybe,

reps for the other regions as well, as you said. But anyway, I'll turn it over back to you now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The next item on the agenda is ICANN 55 update. We clearly do not have the time for it, and I'm not sure we have a lot of substance at this point, given the previous discussion that was actually largely about ICANN 55. I will ask Gisella whose hand is still up from the last time she spoke, if indeed, is there anything that we must cover at this point, or can we fake it until January?

Clearly staff, I and León are going to have to do some work on this before our next meeting. But is there anything that we have to bring attention to the ALAC at this point? Heidi or Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Gisella here. No, nothing at this point. I think we need to take it offline. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And someone is going to give me a refresher course in keeping meetings on time, clearly, I've lost the knack. Thank you all for participate. Have a great holiday season, for those who are celebrating. And if you're not celebrating, try to take some time off anyway. The work is going to continue once we get back in January. Enjoy all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]