
HOLLY RAICHE: ...family is over the other side of the world, so it was just myself, my partner, and all of our friends. And it was lovely, and it was hot.

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, I can't imagine having a holiday season in a 35-degree Celsius climate.

HOLLY RAICHE: It is hard to get used to, I've got to tell you, but I've done it now for years. It's just... How do you do a roast turkey when it's, like, 35?

LEON SANCHEZ: That's true.

HOLLY RAICHE: You do [inaudible] food. You do hams. You do cold salads. You do everything cold. Otherwise, the food [inaudible]

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, I'm glad you had a good time.

HOLLY RAICHE: I had a lovely time. I trust you did?

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.

LEON SANCHEZ: I did, too. Yes, I did, too. I was home with my family and my parents came in, and also my in-laws came in. So it was good. Yeah, it was good.

HOLLY RAICHE: Terrific. Now you're looking forward to seeing the rest of your family in Marrakech?

LEON SANCHEZ: Absolutely. Absolutely. I do miss you all.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, we'll be there. We'll be there.

LEON SANCHEZ: Excellent.

HOLLY RAICHE: Have you made travel arrangements yet?

LEON SANCHEZ: I have done my travel arrangements, yes. I will be arriving in Marrakech on the second, and then on the third I will be having a prep meeting for the CCWG on accountability, then the meeting on the fourth.

HOLLY RAICHE: Will you have any free time on the third? Because Maureen and I will have a free day.

LEON SANCHEZ: I think I will. I am not sure still of what time will the prep meeting will be scheduled. But I would say that, yes, maybe the morning of the third. It might as well be a free morning for me. So if you plans and you don't mind me joining, that will be great.

HOLLY RAICHE: We'd think that would be terrific. [inaudible] around in Marrakech.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. I would certainly love to go around Marrakech with you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fantastic. This will be great. I was hoping to stay afterwards, but I've got teaching commitments. I just couldn't stay any later, which is a big disappointment, but never mind.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yeah, me, too. I need to leave on the 11th as we finish. I need to get my plane back to Mexico because on the 15th, we are going on holiday with the family. If I don't get to the plane in time, that's going to be very ugly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Are you going anywhere? Where are you going?

LEON SANCHEZ: We're going to Japan. I'm taking my family to Tokyo.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fantastic.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. My wife is becoming 40 this year, so I thought that it would be a nice present for her to take her on a trip with her kids and her husband to celebrate her 40th birthday. Also, my eldest daughter is becoming 15, so that's kind of an important date for girls here in Mexico – 15 years old. So I'm trying to kill two birds with one stone and celebrate both birthdays in Japan.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, that's terrific. So you're coming to this side of the world. Now, hopefully, there'll be at least a couple of meetings where you'll have to [inaudible] people at three in the morning.

LEON SANCHEZ: I will definitely be online those days.

HOLLY RAICHE: Join us. Fantastic. Who else is on the line? Sandra? Good morning, Sandra. We're getting near. Actually, it's past time. Where is everyone?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi. This is Yesim speaking. We still currently have the ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach call going on, and we're expecting some participants from that call as well. So apologies for the delay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. All right. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, okay. That's from AFRALO, so that would be Ellen. But Cheryl should be here. Very naughty. Maureen should be on the phone. Olivier.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Both of them re on the other call.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: On AFRALO. Oh, at other calls. Okay.

YESIM NAZLAR: Oh, yeah. ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach call. I just heard some kind of small delays. [inaudible] believe they will be joining in a couple of minutes.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, okay. Well, we'll talk amongst ourselves. That's fair enough. So, Leon, how's accountability going? Are we close?

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm sorry, Holly. What was that?

HOLLY RAICHE: How is the accountability going?

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, I think – or at least I hope – it's doing well. You know there are some issues still on an outgoing discussion that are a bit thorny.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

LEON SANCHEZ: But I think we're almost there. I think we're almost there. Culturally, yes. We still need to get feedback from the GNSO and from the GAC, but my feeling is that most of their feedback will be supportive of the current proposal. Hopefully they will not be trying to modify anything substantially. That would enable us to make some tweaks, to incorporate the comments received from this third public comment period, and after that, just roll the ball back to the chartering organizations to see if they are in a position to actually approve of the final report.

HOLLY RAICHE: Gee. Wouldn't it be amazing if we get there finally?

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, that will be great.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not before time, I might add.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have 20 minute on the agenda on this subject later on.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Alan, since we're not in the meeting, we're just having a chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm just pointing it out.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm looking forward to it.

LEON SANCHEZ: So yesterday we had snow falling in the mountains that surround Mexico City, which is a very rare event.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, really? [inaudible].

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm sorry?

HOLLY RAICHE: It would be. Isn't it? Because Mexico is [inaudible].

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. Yes, it's not something you get to see very often here in Mexico City.

ALAN GREENBERG: We had snow falling in Montreal, which is something we get to see very often.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

CHERYL LANGON-ORR: Holly and I went from 39 degrees to 19 degrees in one day.

ALAN GREENBERG: 39 to 19? Oh, we did better than that. We went from +16 or something – actually, from before Christmas to Christmas day, we went from +16 to -13, I think.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ooh! Should we brag that our storm at least killed someone?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, well, if we're going to go into that kind of thing, sure. Why not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So half of Sydney has no power. It really was an incredible storm, and it still is, in fact, in some areas. Enough of this frivolity. I'm sorry, Alan. I just [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: We had a windstorm the other day, and a large part of a 30-story apartment building fell off.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wow. That is not a good look. My [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I don't remember if it was 30, or 27, or 33, but it was a tall building of which the sheeting on the top half is no longer there anymore.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not good.

LEON SANCHEZ: Wow.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not to the cars underneath it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Sandra still has major audio issues, which is interesting.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes she is because she's not on mute.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is she on a dial out, or?

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't know. I don't think so. She's not listed as a dial out. Maybe she should be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm not seeing staff – oh, Heidi's here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can she not hear on the phone or not hear on Adobe Connect?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think it's Adobe Connect because she's not listed as a dial out participant. Maybe she should be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. She's going to try dialing in by phone. She's just using the AC, and AC has been really flaky in the last couple of days.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of us actually have the ability to dial our own calls.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Really? How does that work?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, it's an adventure we have. It'll get to the nether regions soon, though.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You leave my nether regions alone, thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ooh. This is going to be a good call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I should give you fair warning before the recording starts. I did a 1:00 to 3:30 A.M. CCWG meeting, and then I got up two-and-a-half

hours later to listen to the feeblest GNSO meeting I have ever attended in my life.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, really? That's disappointing. I was going to ask you how that went.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I'm not in great shape.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are you going to brief us on the GNSO? [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: I certainly will.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Why is it feeble? Is it bad chairmanship?

ALAN GREENBERG: I know you want me to hold the meeting before we start the meeting, but I refuse.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have everyone here, and can we start? It's rather late already, and we have a rather full agenda.

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible] – oh, hi. Go ahead, Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: Oh. Sorry for [inaudible]. Yes, I guess we can start because we're already twelve minutes passing the call start time. So, Peggy, could you please kindly start the recording? Thank you.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's ALAC Leadership Team meeting call on Thursday, the 14th of Januar, at 20:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Sandra Hoferichter, Holly Raiche, Leon Sanchez, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Ron Sherwood.

We have apologies from Julie Hammer. On staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. So, over to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And what about Tijani? Is he expected and late? Or is there an apology, or something else?

YESIM NAZLAR: Well, actually, he is expected, and they are trying to reach him out. Yeah. Still trying.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

YESIM NAZLAR: You're welcome.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The agenda has been published for about twelve minutes now, so I assume you've all had a chance to look at it. The final version, anyway, has been updated as recently as that. Nothing really substantive, however, has changed in the last hour or two.

Is there any additions or any other business you want to add?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we'll go on to the first item, which is the policy development process. I'll turn it over to Ariel for that.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, Alan. It's mid-January already, but I still want to wish everybody a Happy New Year. I'll just share my screen quickly and I'll show you the public comment that the ALAC is drafting statements on.

Actually, the statement is in progress. We have a series of public comments that are in progress. From top to bottom, the one final report recommendations of the geographic region, review working group is being drafted. Tljani is leading the drafting of the ALAC statement with assistance from Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Narine, and that is due in April, so you'll have plenty of time.

The second one in progress is on the proposed implementation of GNSO Thick WHOIS consensus policy requiring consistent labeling and display of RDDS with output for [our gTLDs]. Alan has published actually the first draft, and it's currently soliciting comments internally from At-Large. The internal commenting period will close on the 22nd of January. So I welcome all of you to review the draft statement and provide your input.

The third one is on the registration data access protocol operation and profile for gTLD registries and registrars.

The final statement has just been posted, and now the ALAC is voting on that. Votes close on the 20th.

So that's the three ones that are in progress. One more that's at the bottom of the table is a notice of preliminary determination to grant registrar data retention waiver request for [inaudible] Technologies, Inc. Denmark. Alan has follow-up with Roberto and then is going to draft the statement on behalf of the ALAC. Because this is not the regular public comment, so we're not really in a rush to produce that statement.

There's only one that is [inaudible]. It's on the continuous data-driven analysis of root server systems, stability, [inaudible]. Julie Hammer has

been reviewing that public comment. She hasn't got back to us about her review, so I will follow up with her with regard to that public comment.

Now we have three public comments that ALAC decided not to draft a statement on. They are listed in the table here. I'm not going to elaborate. So that's all from me.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Ariel. Correction on the one where you said Roberto will draft a statement. That is not a statement in regard to the specific waiver request. That is a statement that we're simply going to make as advice to the Board.

ARIEL LIANG:

Got it. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Our practice has been we do not comment on the waiver request as such. I believe that is the practice, in any case.

The substance of that one, if you remember correctly when this one was announced, Roberto went around saying, "This is a waste of time and silly," and I asked them to put that in nicer words.

Okay. Any other questions on policy issues? Then we will go very quickly on to the next item, the update on the CCWG. Let me try to give my version of it, and then Leon will tell you the real answer.

Work is progressing nicely. There's a lot of work being done, and there's a lot of progress being made. The interactions with the Board to a large extent have been exactly what we should have been doing all the way along. That is, recognizing that the Board has to be made happy and figure out how we can enter into discussions and come up with a common ground which will indeed be accessible to them.

To a large extent, this is working very well right now. There are changes being made to the proposal, where indeed I think we're going to be coming into something which may well be acceptable. We'll talk about the groups that haven't spoken up yet as such – the GNSO and the GAC – in a moment.

In terms of the ALAC issues, most of them are being addressed, and I think we'll be reasonably happy with where we are.

The one that will not be addressed – it's quite clear – is the one on consumer trust. The amount of opposition to it is enormous. There has been a special purpose call on it, and yesterday, we spent – I don't know – well over half-an-hour, I would think, within the CCWG altogether. It is quite clear that it will not be addressed.

There is discussion at this point that the issue of consumer trust will be put into Work Stream 2. From my perspective, that is a virtual guarantee that it will not be addressed because that will require essentially a change to a fundamental bylaw, which is going to be controversial among some groups. There are significant parts of the community that do not believe ICANN should be involved in consumer

trust at all, that it's a national consumer protection issue and not a trust issue.

Cheryl had suggested that this could be recommended by the CCT Review Team. I'm dubious of that, to be honest, because their mandate is very, very much restricted to just the expansion of the gTLD space, and really the concern that we have expressed is what about the I don't know how many million/hundred-million domains that are within .net, .com, and the other TLDs that have been around for a while not part of this expansion.

I have a real worry that, because there are people who believe consumer protection should not be a concern at all of ICANN, it is theoretically possible – whether it would happen or not, I don't know – that the IRP could be used to essentially question whether Compliance's mission, which is specifically focused on consumer trust, is indeed within the mission and within the bylaws of ICANN. So that's why I would be pushing hard on it. But there's no way at this point it's going to get into this version. I think that can be said with some authority.

That's all I've got to say in general. As I said, overall our concerns are being dealt with. They're being dealt with in public ways that I think will end up with most of our points being addressed, and probably all of the points that we have identified as really redline issues.

So from our perspective, I think things are going moderately well. The workload is exceedingly heavy. We do need to talk a little bit about the GNSO and their position. I see Olivier has his hand up, so I'll turn it over to him. Unless you want to talk about something else.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I was going to defer to Leon first because you said you were going to first give your points of view, and then Leon's, and then [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Go ahead, then. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. I really have nothing to add to what you just said. You have provided a very accurate state of the work in the CCWG. My only question is whether we are willing to die in a ditch on the consumer trust issue, or whether we are willing to let it go and see how it goes in Work Stream 2 and try to push for it to happen in Work Stream 2 if it actually goes that way. So that would be my question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, my answer to that is I think most people will not die in the ditch over it. How Garth Bruen reacts and what supports he gets when the issue comes to light at the ALAC level is a different issue.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Well, the next comment that I would make is that, of course, the timeline has been defaced as per the original plan. While we expect to have a revised timeline shortly, we are depending, of course, on the

input from GNSO and the GAC to make an assessment on such input and present a review timeline to the group for approval.

Hopefully that will still enable us to get to Marrakech with something that could be approved or voted at least, at the latest in Marrakech, so it can be forwarded to the Board and to the NTIA.

But that's of course just my feeling. It's highly dependable on which kind of feedback we'll receive from the GAC and the GNSO. My feeling is that the GNSO will be providing feedback that will be mostly supportive of the recommendations, and I don't anticipate something that would substantially change the third report on the CCWG.

But I cannot say the same for the GAC. As you know, stress test 18 is something that's critical for them. There's been a lot of discussion around it and very little information, at least on my side, on how it's going on the inside of the GAC. So that is something that we as co-chairs in the CCWG definitely need to have a detailed look at. Depending on the kind of feedback that we get from the GAC, that could as well impact the final timeline or the next proposed timeline, or it might as well just be a good input or not substantial input from the GAC, and that will of course cause a lesser impacting the next time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Leon. Olivier, do you want to talk about the GNSO, or was your hand up to talk about other things?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I was going to comment on the points that you've made.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Then I was going to defer to you to speak about the GNSO and comment on the points you make about the GNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So on the points that you've made, I've been following not the calls of the CCWG but certainly the e-mail discussion in the CCWG. My understanding here is that we have two different interpretations of the AoC. One side is primarily actually consisting of registries – both country code registries and generic name registries. It appears to be pointing at the fact that the points which deal with consumer trust in the Affirmation of Commitments only apply to new gTLDs and to the New gTLD Program. Others are saying that this applies to all of ICANN.

I know that tomorrow we have our on call on the IANA Issues Working Group. I sense we'll probably have much discussion there. But one question I wanted to ask, actually, was what was the actual AoC? Is the AoC the only contract between ICANN and the U.S. Department of Commerce at the moment?

My understanding is that it replaced the MOU that was in place prior to the AoC.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If that's correct, my understanding would then be that the AoC refers to all of ICANN, not just the New gTLD Program. That's where we then have a major problem because looking at the discussion on the CCWG mailing list, people are really digging their heels in, and it's a redline issue for everyone.

Finally, my own view on this. I have real concerns that we are now seeing – and we have seen ever since the beginning of this process – a taking-apart of ICANN's actual functions, turning ICANN into a purely technical organization that will render itself pretty much obsolete once we've finished with that process, which might well be the aim of some of the players. I'm very concerned about this.

Finally, I totally agree with you that if these issue are sent to Work Stream 2, that's it. It's the end. We've basically given up. It will be impossible to change anything as fundamental [inaudible] once the transition has taken place. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. One of the issues to note is it's not only the registries. Steve DelBianco in the Business Constituency, who is

normally one of our supporters on issues like this, is adamant – they’re not saying the AoC is only related to the new gTLD. They’re saying the reference to consumer trust in paragraph 3C of the AoC is only referring to the expansion. His support there makes it significantly harder to push the point any more than that.

Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. You [inaudible] in our belief that we can in fact pick this up probably most effectively in a future review team, and you mentioned your concern that current Consumer Choice and Trust Review Team may not be in a position to do that because of its specific focus on gTLDs. In fact, I agree with you on that. I think this specific process on gTLDs may make that difficult.

But it will not make it difficult for a future accountability transparency review team to do so, and that’s going to be the next [inaudible]. So I am normally a relatively concerned about risk person, but I still maintain that is not necessarily a total harbinger of doom if it goes into Work Stream 2 and to the bylaws, as many of you are concerned in Work Stream 2 to get [inaudible] to modify the fundamental bylaw.

Two things are probable in my view. Should the most hopefully unlikely, but nevertheless theoretically possible, IRP come in that were to challenge the role of Compliance, that would be a strong motivator to find another way around this problem because nothing will shake up an organization’s direction quicker than having one of its primary organs attacked. That would be a good way of motivating a whole lot of people

to be supportive of change, I would suspect, as much as anything else. And we could find another way of getting it into a bylaw – not necessarily a fundamental one – and that will work just as well.

But the other thing is I don't necessarily think that a future review team couldn't put it in. I think it could do. In my view, we should not die in a ditch over this.

Most importantly – and I think this is something that the leadership team needs to know – out of their last CCWG call on this matter, we are actually asking the author, or one of the authors, of the AoC is it a [inaudible] only with referring to [inaudible] Section 3 the particular review team's in Section 9 or not? So we won't have to guess what was meant. We will be told what was meant, and that should also help us somewhat as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. That's assuming we get a specific answer. It is possible that they'll say, "Once the words are written, they stand on their own." So we don't know quite how that will be.

There's an echo. Does anyone know where it's coming from? No? Okay. One of the problems – this is really annoying. If staff could look into it, please.

One of the problems with defending the position that we have taken is the actual wording in the AoC is Promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace." That could imply not

only gTLDs but ccTLDs, and could probably imply a much wider overall scope than even ICANN has.

So the wording there was particularly poorly chosen, since ICANN doesn't have any input into most of those things in the ccTLD space, and therefore, that makes it rather hard to defend. At least some of the people who are against trying to incorporate these words – by the way, the DNS marketplace was not in the Article 1 bylaw change that was removed after the first proposal. But it is the words in the AoC. At least some of the people who are adamantly against doing an incorporation of the words right now are because the term "DNS marketplace" is such a wide-ranging thing where clearly much of it is out of scope for ICANN. That makes the whole thing rather inappropriate.

Anyway, that's where we stand on that one. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

[inaudible] I would have thought that some of the things that Fadi said – I don't remember the exact wording, but going through the letter, when he tried to defend in the context of the [inaudible], what should be at least part of the case we can make. I would actually turn your argument around, saying "in the DNS market" – all he's talking about is promotion, which means we don't have a total role, but we should have a role. So why can we not turn the argument of this being used against us [inaudible]? Seriously. If we have a role, which I think we do, then why don't we saw we have a role? Not the only role, but we have a role. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: My only response to that, Holly, is trust me, all of these arguments have been used.

HOLLY RAICHE: Good. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Wasn't there a definition of what the DNS marketplace was at some point in ICANN's history, or at least in the way that this has been done?

I certainly think that the Consumer Trust Working Group has come up with a number of definitions which are not applicable only to the new gTLD process but certainly applicable to general things in ICANN. I would be very disappointed if the work of the Consumer Trust's definitions would only apply to new gTLDs, because at that point, what we're talking about is having gTLDs that have radically different rules and are seen in radically different ways within ICANN. That to me is already a consumer trust issue at that point if legacy TLDs are completely different from the other TLDs out there.

The other concern is if we now take the consumer trust thing out of the equation, then we can pretty much put a cross on anything to do with PICs (Public Interest Commitments). That just goes even further down

the road of how we don't want ICANN to turn out to be. So I'm very concerned about this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, I don't have that level of concern on that issue. We have PICs right now without the words "consumer trust" in the bylaws. We didn't need them to get this far, so it's not clear.

Now, as Cheryl said, if anyone ever tries to claim that not only is it not something that should be in the bylaws, but it's something that we shouldn't be thinking about, that would be a rather interesting turn of events and I think would motivate parts of the community to do something.

I'm going to be very blunt here. I've spent a significant amount of my political capital on pushing this issue against virtually everyone, and it's not going to change right now in the coming versions. At least I cannot see it changing. I'd be glad if Cheryl or Leon or anyone else involved in the process tells me I may be wrong, but at this point, it's dead. I'd put money on that at this point. It's not likely to be revived again in Work Stream 1.

So we can keep on talking about it, but I really think it's something we have to move on for and decide ultimately if we do not support the report because of it. But that's a different issue.

Olivier, your hand is – no, your hand is not up.

Can we go on to the GNSO? Then I'll give my brief report. There was a two-hour GNSO meeting scheduled this morning, my time, starting

three hours after the ending of the CCWG meeting, which ended at 4:00 AM or close to 4:00 AM, my time. I dutifully got up to listen to it. They spent the first hour with various people talking about essentially why they are meeting today and “What are we supposed to be doing?” and a fair amount of the discussion on really core issues of transition and accountability and “Why are we doing this?” and “Does the CCWG understand the GNSO is diverse?”

I do not understand. They did not seem to do any of the prep that I thought would have been done to make this meeting an effective meeting, even though there was a working group of knowledgeable, good people who did a lot of work ahead of time. But it seemed to have gone for naught. It’s also one of the first meetings that James Bladel has chaired, and I think he let the speaker queue take over the meeting.

In any case, round about halfway through the meeting, they actually starting discussing some substance. They did basically go through all the recommendations, or most of them. A letter will be written. They decided not to do any voting at this point but just simply write a letter, which is roughly what the ccNSO did. That letter will be drafted by James. It will be discussed on the list. It’s not clear how quickly that letter will be sent. I would think, given the GNSO, it’s likely to take at least a week or possibly longer.

All that will come out if it is a very brief summary of the positions that the various constituencies and stakeholders have already taken. There will be a strong statement against Stress Test 18 wording. There are people in the GNSO who will die in the ditch over the two-thirds majority change because – well, for a whole bunch of reasons that I

don't think we need to go into right now. Then there are these standard positions that other people have taken.

There was no real attempt to assess during the meeting whether if the GNSO were to vote on each recommendation by recommendation how many of them would actually pass and how many would not. Then of course you have the problem that there are people who, within the GNSO voting scheme, would vote against the particular recommendation, but perhaps for a different reason than the person sitting beside them. So two different constituencies or stakeholder groups may vote against something but for completely different reasons, so the vote itself does not fully characterize what the issues are.

Anyway, that's where it stands. It was not a meeting in retrospect that was worth getting up for. But so be it. That's where we are right now.

I open the floor. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I was traveling at the time when the call took place, and I have pretty much the same conclusions as you. The process by which the GNSO arrived there was that they effectively are having the discussions that we've had in the ALAC in – was it December or before the holiday period. Unfortunately, due to them spending a lot of time on other issues prior to the holiday period, they put together a small team of people throughout the holiday period who worked on this, and it didn't come out too well. I think a lot of people came to that call today without much knowledge of [this].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, yes. I think there are two things. One, a fair amount of people came with any real knowledge of this overall process. They have not been following it at all and really did not seem to understand. At one point, there was discussion of should they have a vote on whether there should be a transition or not. Someone pointed out that, indeed – hold on a second. Sorry, I've got someone at the door. Yup. Okay. And someone pointed out we're not having a vote on should there be a transition. There is an implied vote on should there be a transition based on the fact that, if Accountability does not go forward, and if the GNSO is the reason the Accountability does not go forward, then in fact they have nixed the transition. But it's an indirect set of circumstances.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

If I could just add to this, then, my understanding or my reading of the situation in the GNSO is that, on the one hand, we do have a very inexperienced GNSO Council at the moment because this is really the first big issue that has now come on their table. As you might be aware, quite a few people have been replaced on this occasion. Of course, the GNSO Council started its work late because of the difficulty they had to elect someone to chair them. So that's the first problem.

The other problem I think is we are seeing some of the old skeletons, if you want, coming out of the closet. I've certainly read on the list also that with the strain between the different stakeholder groups and then constituencies and the Council, if I can remind you that some constituencies are saying, "Well, we're independent, and we are not

bound by anything the GNSO Council says.” It really starts going back into these things.

I have also noticed that some of the people that have had very strong positions in the Accountability Working Group who also happen to be councilors and who have an equally strong heels-dug-in attitude to the discussions they’re having in the GNSO. So we have now a number of recommendations made by the CCWG which are not getting consensus on the GNSO with a request for many of those constituencies asking for their minority opinion to be included in the GNSO’s response.

Admittedly and unfortunately, this comes at a rather late time. It would have probably been better if that had come over in December. Then there would have been a bit more time to discuss things in the CCWG. But we’re now very late on this. I was hoping that some people would come to the council call today to actually say, “Right. Let’s work something out together,” and all it was was just a repeat of what their positions were and certainly no step forward to bridge the gap.

I really don’t know how they will do this. They might approve a subset with consensus. One of the things of course is this issue that we’re looking at here with the consumer trust, but there are others as well.

There is one issue, which is interesting, in that they’re asking for the fact that the headquarters of ICANN should remain in the United States to be part of the bylaws.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What?!

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I don't know how the CCWG has dealt with this or whether that's been raised on the CCWG, but they seem to very adamant that that needs to be in there. So, yeah. It's an interesting moment we're living at the moment, and I don't quite know how James is going to be able to work this one out. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Yes. "Interesting" indeed is the right word, and I don't think we can fix it. That little part of the discussion on where ICANN is headquartered or where the corporation resides was a complete red herring from the point of view of the current discussion. But once it's raised, they had to deal with it.

We're way over time at this point, and I have one more issue on accountability I want to briefly raise, so if we may go on, if that's okay with everyone.

As you know, one of the thing we objected to in our comment was lowering the threshold for removing the Board in case not all groups were active, not all five people or AC/SOs voted one way or another, and that's been fixed. It's generally accepted that the only one they're going to lower at this point is the fundamental bylaw, which indeed was something we supported. So I think we're good to go, and that's a good example of the kinds of changes that we are talking about here.

As I was going over the document in preparation for the meeting, I suddenly had a doomsday scenario come upon me. The issue is, with

the change, it only requires three ACs or SOs to approve a fundamental bylaw change, or likely the Articles of Incorporation will be subject to that same rule.

What if some point the future in a position where several of the ACs and SOs are really not in a position to do anything? They are close to defunct. They are dysfunctional, and to be honest, the first hour of the GNSO meeting suddenly rang bells of a group that simply cannot make a decision.

But in a real doomsday scenario, if ICANN is falling apart for one reason or another, we are in a position where the bylaws and Articles of Incorporation cannot be changed with positive approval from three groups. If there are no longer three groups that are functioning and meeting, the organization cannot change. The Board of Directors cannot fix the problem because the requirement to have three supporting is an absolute requirement. There is no escape hatch.

It dawned on me that there really needs to be. If for instance a community forum is called and no one shows up, what happens? It's not clear. ICANN is essentially unable to fix any structural problems if the structural problems are associated with ACs and SOs.

The reaction that people gave overall was can't happen. Can't imagine the ccNSO or GNSO not being able to make a decision. In a doomsday scenario, you don't say what the chances are. You say, "How do we get out of this?" If you never have to exercise that provision, so be it.

So I raised the issue. It probably will not be dealt with. I'm just wondering if this resonates with anyone else here. Particularly, Cheryl

was on the call, and I'm curious, did I not present it well, or is it indeed that no one cares?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You presented it very, very well. I was actually thinking we might have to get an intervention worked out [inaudible] psychology, actually. I think we need to get on out of here before it becomes personally dangerous for him. No, that was only partly joking, for the record.

You presented it perfectly well, perfectly validly. But doomsday scenarios are the extremage of stress testing. I don't believe we're going to put the time and the energy, nor do we have the inclination to do it as part of the exercise at this stage.

However, my personal reaction was, "Oh, honey. If we are in such a bad state, who gives a shit?" Yes. And I suspect I wasn't alone. I just didn't say it. I controlled myself because I'm trying to be a good rapporteur and leader, and "Who gives a shit?" does not give the right [inaudible].

But seriously, Alan, if the SOs and ACs are so dysfunctional, then, boy, I think most of the rats will have left the ship from all sorts of spaces, and ICANN will be gone, anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It just dawned on me that we shouldn't have bylaws that effectively cannot be changed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which is the scenario that we are building.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, if I may, there is another possibility, and particularly since you did raise it, and I thought quite eloquently and well, when we move into implementation, another thing happens when you have highly paid and therefore of great reputation legal advice. Leon, I'm not picking on your species, all right? Just make that clear.

You switch from the "here is the advice you wish us to give you" to "here are the delineators because we are not going to not tell you anything that could come back and bite us at a future point in time." So we are now not necessarily at the end of legal advice coming in whilst implementation goes on with a "oh, and of course, I'm sorry. We need you to do this differently because." Yeah. Leon, tell me I'm wrong, but [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: It's like an architect signing off on a design where the bridge will fall down, or a structural engineer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly. They got to tell you every risk possible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Anyway, I didn't really want to debate. I just wanted to raise it. It's one of these things that just came to me, and it may be due to lack of sleep. But it suddenly dawned on me that we have never discussed the issue, and that seemed to be inappropriate, so I raised the issue. I really wasn't about to have a heart attack over it, but I really thought that the idea must be introduced.

Now, Thomas unfortunately then pressed me for "What is a possible solution to it?" and I came up with something out of thin air, at which point, Jordan said, "I don't like that alternative, that solution." That wasn't what I was trying to say. I wasn't trying to propose a solution. I was simply trying to make sure that the group was aware of the potential problem. I did that and at this point I'm done. I'm certainly not going to raise it again. We'll see where it goes.

May we move on? We are a good half-hour over at this point, or close to it.

Next item is finance and budget. Heidi's name is leading on this, even though that isn't the way she typed it in. Heidi, over to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you. Sandra is here as well, so I'm going to ask her to talk a little bit about the one that the Cross-Community Committee on the ICANN Academy is developing.

But bringing us back to the ALAC, I've developed a few proposals. The first one is, again, for the development session. So two questions on that one. As you all know, this will be at Meeting C. Meeting C goes to Friday, officially. The Meeting Strategy Working Party has scheduled that development session for that Friday.

The question is, do you wish to stick with that, or do you wish to put in the request that we would like that on Saturday? Not that you're going to get that, but do you wish to do that? That's one issue.

The other issue, it currently requests the participation of the incoming ALAC, the liaisons, ccNSO, GNSO, and SSAC, and a facilitator. Who it doesn't include are people like experts, like the Cheryls and the Oliviers, etc. Olivier is GNSO liaison, but it does not include travel and participation of experts like Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If I may give you my analysis of your question, we have several choices. We either say that the development session is on Friday and take the regional leaders and say, "You're on vacation for the day. Enjoy it. It's a nice place we're in," or we widen the session – by the way, and outgoing people; outgoing people and regional leaders – and say, "Enjoy your day off. ICANN is giving you a free day." Or we can include all of these people in the session, increasing the size by probably 60-70% and not focusing on the coming year, but focusing on whatever their

interests are. Or we can say, “If this is a truly development session, then it is not done within the ICANN week.”

Now, for those of you who aren’t aware, there was an interesting happening in the CCWG the other day. The CCWG had requested that the Friday before ICANN be a full-day working session for the CCWG. ICANN came back and said, “No. We’re using the new strategy. It does not fit. The new strategy says you are not allowed to do anything outside the window.”

There was a revolt – a strong revolt – and the general message was, “That’s the ICANN meeting. This is not the ICANN meeting. This is something else, and it doesn’t fall within the purview of the ICANN meeting, and if we want to meet on Friday, we need to meet on Friday.”

Sebastien, who chaired the New Meeting Strategy Group, got up and said, “That’s not what we intended the strategy for. The strategy is how to run ICANN meetings; regular ICANN meetings with all the 2500 attendees. Anything special like this is not necessarily to be done within the window.” He then added that if he had been in the implementation, he would have made that clear.

From my perspective, the development session is also outside of the ICANN meeting window. It’s targeted at a very small number of people, not the 2500 attendees, and therefore is quite reasonable to hold it on the day after.

The question I have for this group, however, is that would make the eighth day running – ninth if anything is done beforehand. Is that too much to ask of people?

I open the floor. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I just wanted to remind everyone that, when we announced the development session in Dublin – and admittedly we may have officially announced it too late for those who were not paying too close attention – we did get a lot of pushback from some ALAC members saying, “Eight days or eight hours at the end of an ICANN meeting? Ridiculous!” So that’s something to keep in mind as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and that was only the seventh day, not the eighth.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. I meant eight hours.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. But it was the seventh day. I’m just [inaudible]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. Correct. Yeah. So now Meeting C will be running from Saturday to Friday, plus that extra one day. So that’s something to keep in mind.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I’d like to hear from the ALT. Nobody has any thoughts?

LEON SANCHEZ: Sorry, Alan, could you please—

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Leon says, “In the seventh day, I shall rest.” Meeting strategy has already said that you can’t rest on the seventh day. We’re now onto the eighth day.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because you’re beyond God. That’s why.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. May I just suggest that you’re asking the wrong people? Because by the very fact that we’re in the ALT, we have no life outside ICANN things, anyway. So make it nine, ten, eleven, fifteen days. That’s fine with me.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Olivier, to be clear, I’m not asking the ALT if the ALT will attend. I’m saying is this something we should be pushing for or not? We have to make a budget request soon, and if we are going to have a developmental session, it’s going to be either outside the window, in the window, including everyone, or in the window and other people take a vacation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I'd say you should ask the ALAC and the regional leaders and find out what their feedback is on this because in there, you do have varying levels of involvement, and it's specifically those people who are not able to spend so much time who are not on the ALT. So you'll probably get a much better answer from them. I have no idea.

I have heard, indeed, what you've said. I have heard some people saying, "Well, you know, this is all my holiday time that's gone, and my marriage is on the rocks because of this," and this sort of stuff. So, anyway, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hi, everybody. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Great. I was very skeptical I must say at the beginning, and I think it was very unfortunate to have strategy sessions before the ICANN meeting and a development session after the ICANN meeting.

But finally I must say it was a pilot program, it was a test drive, and I think it had some value in it. I would actually go for at least for the development session during the C Meeting when new people are taking on their seats because I found if this is going to be organized very well, announced in advance, then we really could make a big value for the ALAC [inaudible] sessions.

For instance, including new people like Timothy and Kaili, I think this was very valuable. They could onboard much more easily and could get involved much quicker than people before. I mean, there were also other people who had to leave earlier and [inaudible]. I think this was just a matter of difficult organization. As Heidi said, [inaudible] people are following their e-mail so closely and so on and so forth.

But I would go for at least for the development sessions. I'm not quite sure about strategy sessions we had before the ICANN meeting. At Dublin this turned out to be sort of a fight and I'm not sure if this was the purpose of the session. But I would go for a request out of the normal ICANN meeting, so [inaudible] an additional day for the development session to onboard the people at the ALAC much [inaudible] than we could do this in the past.

I would have wished this would have been in place when I joined the ALAC in 2010. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. You're saying even if it requires an eighth continuous day, that we should do it, that it has value and it should be outside the window. Clearly putting 12 people on vacation for the day is not going to be

acceptable in the ICANN context. My personal position is that adding them to the development session I think will dilute the benefit of having that session.

So the only alternative of the three scenarios I think is the eighth day, and we have one vote from Sandra saying, yes, even though it's an awful long meeting, it's probably worthwhile. I tend to agree on that.

Tijani?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Two others agree.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that for Meeting C we don't need to extend the stay of people outside their home. It is very long. I think that with seven days meeting we may have time to make our development session inside the week, perhaps at the end of the week. I don't know. We may find a slot that will be convenient for this kind of session. But I don't think it is appropriate to extend the stay of people outside their home in Meeting C. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. But the implication of doing it within the window is we have all the outgoing people, all the regional leaders who are not otherwise occupied at that point for that day. I don't see how we could sell that, to be quite blunt.

So we have two different views. We have Sandra saying yes it is worth the extra time, Tijani saying under no conditions. Okay, anyone else want to get in? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I'm going to come in with a hybrid approach, a little bit of a hybrid. Perhaps rather than Saturday to reduce the development session by just a couple of hours, to perhaps have it between 12:00 and 18:00 on that Friday afternoon to allow the outgoing people to either sightsee or to leave so they'll be home by Saturday. That's another option.

ALAN GREENBERG: And you think that would be acceptable to the powers that be in ICANN?

HEIDI ULLRICH: For Friday, yeah. I mean, Friday is currently scheduled for all day. So if you wanted to have...

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm saying giving the people the half day off is acceptable to ICANN?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh yeah. Well, on Thursday you already see everything being wrapped up. Maybe you don't see it because you're in meetings all day, but Thursday afternoon already people are heading off completely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Requires more discussion. Obviously we have different viewpoints on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. May I continue?

ALAN GREENBERG: You may.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, coming back to the strategy session, as Sandra mentioned a little bit, what we have right now is a request for a strategy session on that first Saturday. Again, travel and that extra day are not being asked for. What is being asked for at this time is a facilitator. That person could help, for example, with project management tools on how to prioritize issues, etc.

I think by adding that kind of component, it would force us to think about it a little bit before, which we didn't really do this past time. We would need to plan the agenda much more. And then what also happens is that because of CCWG meetings, some of the key people (i.e. Alan) I don't think were really there. So the planning of that, the implementation of that, was a little bit ad hoc which I think we can improve upon.

The second component, just really quickly, [inaudible] request of adding is a working lunch, a hot working lunch, for all of you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Let me make a couple of comments. The concept was we wanted to meet on Saturday. The GNSO has always met Saturday and Sunday. We were running short of time to actually have discussions and meet people and whatever, so we wanted an extra day.

To be able to sell it to the Finance & Budget people, we had to give it a fancy name. We called it a strategy session. We decided operationally it was equivalent to Sunday and that's why it wasn't scheduled and planned carefully, because it was just another working day that we could use to spread out the meetings.

There is no chance we could get another working day under the new meeting strategy outside of the window. So we are not looking at increasing the window. So the real question is not "Is this is a strategy day?" That was an artificial name that was invented so we could put a title on the budget request. The question is: is there benefit of having a facilitator or outside people come in and work with us on the first day of the meetings? That really becomes the question.

Anyone? Sandra, go ahead.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

I am in favor for external motivation because it prevents us from losing ourselves in endless discussions. I'm not quite sure if we cannot solve the strategy discussion in another way.

I still believe that we could use the Sunday, which is at some point tiring, at least in the second half of the day, for me. I'm speaking from my personal experience now. Maybe we could use half of just Sunday to have a strategy discussion which has no budget implication for bringing people in a day earlier, and we could maybe use half of the day on Sunday for such discussion. Maybe the afternoon to get an into in the morning because this was always very enlightening and people are there to meet and [inaudible].

But maybe use the Sunday afternoon really for why are we here, what are we doing, what are our aims, what do we want to achieve during this meeting, who is going to speak at the public forum on which topic, and what are the issues? Who is going to attend which meetings in order to mingle with the other constituencies and SO/ACs. Maybe we can change our own agenda a little bit towards this approach to include the strategies of ICANN in the Sunday and not adding an additional Saturday. This would be my proposal. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sandra, we're not talking about adding an additional Saturday anymore. That's out of the... It's not an option. But for the C Meeting, there is a Saturday meeting. It does start on Saturday.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Okay, sorry then. I didn't follow it too closely.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Clearly we need to think more about how we schedule meetings. The last two meetings have been – I don't even know what the word is – because the agenda was being changed as we spoke because of the CCWG and CWG meetings at the last few meetings. There was so much time taken out of them that it became almost a completely random combination of when can we get visitors in and when were certain people on the ALAC going to actually be there.

The planning has not been done as well for the last couple of meetings for the weekend sessions just because of the environment we're in, or maybe my incompetence as a chair. Take whichever you like.

Clearly the issue is are there things that would benefit from having a facilitator that we want to plan nine months out at this point? To be honest, I'm not convinced. That's the decision we're going to have to make in the next few weeks. Think about it. We'll talk about this more during the ALAC meeting.

Heidi back to you. Back to you, Heidi. I will point out that we are so far over schedule, this is ridiculous.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Just very quickly, we have been in contact to some degree with regional people. Right now I know that – I don't know what AFRALO is doing. Tijani, if you know, please let us know or please let me know offline. APRALO, Cheryl and Holly and Maureen, I'm aware that Maureen you mentioned that there would be some discussions internally. I have not heard anything since then. Just keep in mind that deadline is coming up

and that there will be a call of [inaudible] the week of the 25th and we need to have those RALO approved requests coming in.

Again, same thing with EURALO. I have not heard anything. From LACRALO, what I just heard from Dev is that he is planning on submitting a request to “fix the bug in the translation tool” of the LACRALO list.

Alan, Dev and I were in discussion about that and he wanted to get your thoughts on that. My view to him was I don’t think that this is something that should go through a fiscal year request, which would just start basically again in July. I think if you wish to escalate this to staff, that would get a lot more attention and it would happen a lot quicker than any kind of fiscal year request.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would suggest we do both. That is, we make the request, we escalate, and we put in a budget request. Should you ignore us for the next six months, then we’d like to formally have a budget request to do it.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Fine, okay. I will pass that on. Then from NARALO what we have is a captioning, another captioning request, which actually we’ve asked [her] to do, so that’s in order. The other item is NARALO general assembly for Puerto Rico which I will be looking at the next several days.

Again, one more before I hand it over to Sandra for the other [course], is there is an idea from staff – and I think we [approached] it with the RALO leaders in Dublin – is the idea of a RALO leadership development

session. We had a very small one in Dublin just late in the evening. But we think that given the success of the ALAC development session, we should suggest in the upcoming secretariat call next week a RALO development session. I'm just wondering if there's any kind of thought on that one. If not, then I'll hand it over to Sandra.

ALAN GREENBERG: Before you hand it over, how many people can stay past this call? We have another 45 minutes of things to do and 12 minutes left in the call. Are people able to stay late or not? A quick show of hands, something.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sandra can.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, let's go ahead. Sandra, over to you, then.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you very much. The last leadership program was... I mean, it was a real success, yes, but it turned out and this was somehow the conclusion drawn by the community that a lot of the ICANN processes depends on the skills working groups or an AC or SO chair has or does not have.

The idea came after we offered – in the framework of the Academy Working Group that we offer a course for working group chairs to run a meeting effectively in order to get things done more effectively, to build consensus, and to [inaudible] support.

Inside this learning, this group of people we are working or we are cooperating with for the Leadership Program, they said yes we can offer such a course. It needs some time, at least two or three days. And I think even this is not too much. But the idea at the table now is that we offer a course for working group chairs, cross-community and cross-constituency wise which is not the same as the leadership program where the socializing aspect and to get [inaudible] is one of the main focuses. But this course should really focus on facilitation skills and being effective, building consensus, and so on and so forth.

I wouldn't say it was an outcome of the last leadership training program. It was an idea. We are spinning on this idea. We had a call last night with Heidi and other staff members. The idea at hand is now to find out what is the temperature in the room from the community side. Is this really something they believe is needed or not?

If it's needed, then we will go for it and I think it will take place during – Heidi, please correct me if I'm wrong – during the C meeting this year. And if it's not needed or if there is not a good reply on "yes, we want to do this" then I think we should be honest, not wasting money, and just skip it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I thought we were talking about the B meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. I think because Meeting B is so intense and the main focus is going to be on having policy discussions versus any kind of training. And then secondly if we wanted to have something in the transition year, then it would need to be Meeting C since that's in Fiscal Year 17.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sandra, question. Right now the Leadership Training Program added days for people who were already going to be at the meeting, but Friday no travel because those were all people who were incoming leaders, so to speak, and already funded travel if they needed funding. Working group chairs are not in that category, so I presume this would have to be a budget including travel budget.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: And presumably, also, for the rest of the ICANN, the whole duration of the ICANN meeting, not just for the training program period.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: For the Leadership Program, I think we keep the current policy of involving those people who have secured travel funds [inaudible] own budget or on the ICANN budget.

For the working group development session, we discussed – and this is an option and this is still under discussion – but staff and myself, we could agree on this, that we set up a sort of emergency fund. Let's say something like 5,000 or 10,000 Euros or three people or five people or whatever – it has to be defined. That we say, okay, if there are some working group chairs who really desires to be a participant of such a training and has no funding at hand, at this specific meeting, then we have an emergency fund or emergency budget to cover his or her travel for this specific training.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I suspect you'll need more than that, but that's just my guess. Anything else anyone has on Sandra's issue before we go on? Heidi, yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just very quickly, Alan. I'm conscious of the time. Basically, right now I have it limited for all groups outside the ALAC and GNSO, one person, one working group chair. And then within the GNSO and within the ALAC, it would be two. So we're talking about a very small group. And this is a pilot, as well, so things can change. But the idea is to get this approved.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I would honestly not call it working group chairs, but call it people – get a name so that people who clearly need training on how to run

meetings and things like that are eligible for it. I could think of, in our case, RALO chairs who need this badly. Think about it.

Next item is ICANN 55 update. Gisella. There is only one issue that I want to focus on at this point, other than to raise the fact that it's something we need to work on, and that's [inaudible] social events. But Gisella, I'll turn it over to you for all other issues.

GISELLA GRUBER: Just checking that everyone can hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

GISELLA GRUBER: Wonderful. I'm then going to put something up on the screen which I've literally finished now. I've actually even done another format and I have managed to download it. Give me one second. I'm going to put something up on the screen.

Marrakech schedule, we have a call earlier on and that was internal ICANN call for the Marrakech schedule. One of the points that has come up is that we have to respect the coffee breaks and the lunch breaks.

Now, I've frantically been trying to get a hold of the meetings team, and I've had confirmation that on Saturday and Sunday, it's not that important in that we're in our room, we can work through the break, but we will have [inaudible] during that time. However, Monday

through to Thursday, we have to respect the breaks. If there's slight tweaking to do closer to the time, I will work with them on the issues.

What I've put up on the Adobe Connect is the schedule that I've put so far. We don't actually have that information. We've got an internal Marrakech schedule which I've been using and you'll see the meetings on the Adobe Connect room now.

What I've done is I've used the template for the new meeting strategy schedule A. We worked with Alan, Leon, and Heidi earlier this week and I've done my best to fit things in. I haven't fitted all the RALO and working group meetings yet, but hopefully with your input today, we'll maybe make further progress. I have to get the forms in by the end of the weekend. So needless to say, I'm a little pressed for time. But let's go through it, if we have a little bit of time. I'll go as fast as possible.

The first day we see here is the Saturday. Every day in Marrakech we'll be starting our days with the AFRALO forum or program for African NGOs – five NGOs that we're currently bringing in. They'll have similar to the Dakar event. We had the Capacity Building Program there. We're going to have an hour in the morning. We're still working on the program with Aziz and Tijani who are developing the program. That is now Saturday through to Wednesday morning and then Thursday they'll have the debrief.

Saturday we'll start with the ALT meeting from 7:00 to 9:00. I just need to get confirmation that we'll have services from 7:00 to 9:00. And then running parallel to that is the AFRALO program. We then have our ALAC strategy session from 9:15 to 17:15. I've put a 15-minute slot in

between the AFRALO forum and the ALAC strategy session just to be realistic for the turnaround and not to have our usual problem of running late and having to hurry on through the agenda. The coffee breaks are indicated in the left column.

We'll end that session at 17:15 and have a 15-minute break and then we have two working groups which we have not yet identified, one that can run parallel. Don't worry, the schedule isn't that long, so I won't take up much time.

The Sunday session again starts with the AFRALO forum and we're thinking of running parallel a RALO meeting which currently would look like the APRALO meeting. We then have a 9:15 – again, a 15-minute slot to allow for transition. 9:15 to 16:00, the ALAC and regional leadership meeting. There in the afternoon, even though we're going to be in our main room, we're going to be cutting the session. That means recording and possibly interpretation changes, etc. We'll have to respect the afternoon coffee break.

We've got a regional meeting for an hour and then followed by the – sorry, the regional meeting being a RALO meeting or a working group meeting, and then followed by the regional leadership meeting.

What I've noted there is – and we can perhaps discuss this further [inaudible] – is putting the regional leadership meeting first, maybe reducing it to an hour, so that we don't [lose] the other regional leaders. Because if we have a RALO or working group call meeting prior to that, we might lose the other regional leaders because they won't know what to do for the hour there of dead time.

We have had a request through from the ccNSO to meet on Sunday afternoon from 17:00 to 17:30. Due to the ALAC Regional Leadership Meeting ending 16:00, I have asked the ccNSO if they are able to move earlier and they have said no that they're not able to meet before then, and Tuesday seems pretty full as well. So that is one of the first issues to deal with is when we meet with the ccNSO.

Monday the only meeting we've got at this stage is the AFRALO forum for African NGOs. We haven't scheduled any meetings and you can see that we have some of the meetings already penciled in.

The meetings that have not yet been confirmed are the CCWG meetings, but I'll get to that later.

Tuesday, again, our 8:00 to 9:00 AFRALO slot. We have the ALAC and GAC meeting, which is suggested time by the GAC is 9:30 to 10:30. I have told the GAC that we will confirm after today's meeting that it's suitable. I'm not 100% sure where the meeting will be held and I'm thinking it might be in the other building which is great because then we've got time to get to and from the meeting, and [inaudible] schedules.

Again, after that, a RALO and/or work group meeting, lunch, and the afternoon we just had an Outreach & Engagement call prior to the ALT call, hence it being late, on what the outreach and engagement will be that afternoon. I'll leave that to Tijani and to Alan to speak about it just as soon as I've finished.

We then go on to Wednesday, which is a little bit of an issue, but I've come up with in the third column a suggested schedule. Again, starting

with the AFRALO forum, we've got the ICANN board and GAC meeting which has been confirmed by the GAC staff support for 8:30 to 10:00.

We are trying to place the AFRALO AfrICANN [inaudible] meeting that day in the afternoon. We've always had the AFRALO AfrICANN meeting from 14:00 to 15:30, and in the new meeting strategy, it hasn't quite appeared that way so we're seeing how best to accommodate the request to have the AFRALO AfrICANN meeting in the afternoon.

The third column, the suggestion is to have the wrap-up part one before lunch, and then have the ALAC with board meeting from 13:30 to 14:30 which has been confirmed by board staff.

Then possibly to have the ALAC Wrap Up Session Part 2, and that will be after the board meeting. Maybe more topics for discussion.

Then to end the day off with AFRALO AfrICANN meeting. The issue there that you see in red is whether the IANA transition session will be held that afternoon. In that case we can't have it clashing with the ALAC Wrap Up session, in which case we could probably bring the AFRALO meeting to run alongside the IANA transition session if that is something that the AFRALO team will consider.

And Thursday we end off with an ALT meeting. I've put 7:00 to 9:00, or 8:00 to 10:00. It will depend on the start time of the CCWG. Hopefully we don't have to get you out of bed too early. And again the debrief of the AFRALO NGOs. The other sessions that they will likely be IANA transition and public forum in the afternoon.

So that is as far as the schedule goes. Any comments, suggestions, thoughts?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have hands. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Thank you. Can we just freeze on this page, please? Tuesday, the 8th of March. The afternoon we have the ALAC Outreach & Engagement. The discussion which we had... The question that came up on the session we just had just before this call was whether this was going to involve all of the ALAC and the regional leaders or was that only going to involve a subset of the ALAC? If that was the case, if only a subset of the ALAC or of us were involved in this, what was going to happen to everyone else?

ALAN GREENBERG: May I answer that, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anybody. It's a question for everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: At the beginning of the meeting, Dev asked is this outreach for just a selected number of people or is it for the whole group? My answer was you come up with an outreach plan, and if the outreach will make good use of the 27 or so people we have at the meeting, then we will devote

the afternoon to outreach. If the outreach plan you're proposing uses three or four people, and in the case of Marrakech, three or four French-speaking people, then we will plan other sessions for that afternoon.

That was a decision that was made seconds before this meeting started. Leon, Gisella, and I have not had time to confer and say what to put in those slots. But at this point, as I understand, the outreach [inaudible] will be a limited number of people doing something Tuesday afternoon and therefore we will schedule other things against it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I raised my hand for something, but first I will answer the question of Oliver. I think that outside outreach, [inaudible] use the full ALAC and [leadership] people because of logistics also

because we are already 27, plus the [inaudible] of the outreach. We want to reach out for them I think will be an issue. So this is the first point.

The second point, for [inaudible] and Alan very right when he said, “Come with your problem and I will tell you.” Because if it is only to speak to a group of people when we are 27, it will be very difficult to speak all together or to give the floor to every one of us. It will not be an interactive session and the people to whom we want to reach out will not have the opportunity to ask questions. We will use all the time speaking [inaudible]. This is the first one.

The second point, my understand of the Meeting Strategy Working Party was done especially to think about Meeting B and especially about the outreach. Now I am not seeing that Gisella says that this format [inaudible] is dictated or is... We are obliged to follow this because it is the output of the Meeting Strategy Working Party. For Meeting A particularly, I don't think the work party for a meeting strategy should do anything about it because it is almost the same meeting that the normal meetings of ICANN. This work party is there to solve the problems that come with the new strategy, and the problems come especially for Meeting B.

My point of view, there is nothing in concrete, nothing in stone. We can do whatever we want, except for Meeting B because Meeting B will have the obligation to make outreach for one day. So this is something special we have to think about and the work party was done for that.

So, for this meeting, we changed all the structure of the meeting because the Meeting Strategy Work Party said that. I don't agree. I think that if the work party had an output, it must be discussed in detail in ALAC meetings, so that at the end we can say we [did] everything [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I moved outside because I have other things to do. Sorry about the background noise.

I wanted you to move back to I think it's Sunday where the proposed time for the ccNSO meeting with the ALAC comes in, Gisella. I'm not at my screen, so if I'm wrong, just let me know. I wanted to suggest to you that if at all possible, you accept that proposed time to meet with the ccNSO. I think it's a valuable meeting and I'm sure Maureen will want to buy in on this conversation as well. But it's a meeting that I think will be worthwhile having. Now we do have a little bit more time to play with in terms of the Tuesday afternoon. I think some of what would be done in the alternate session, which is clashing in that time might be able to transferred across. I just want to propose that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, Cheryl, we will schedule the meeting and if this is the only time they can do it, we'll do it in that time. The meeting is not

at risk. It's only a discussion of when we put it and what we put adjacent to it.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. The question I have is are there any plans at some point at an ICANN meeting – and maybe not in this one, since it is a shorter meeting, an A type meeting – any plans to meet with any of the stakeholder groups of the GNSO or even the constituencies, separate constituencies, of the GNSO? I'm [speaking] specifically, let's say, of the NCSG, for example.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is the kind of time that we start reaching out to each other. If you think there's a need for a specific meeting, then you should be speaking up. Otherwise it will not happen. We probably should've said that earlier. Given that the NCSG's position at this point is essentially the ALAC should be squished as much as possible, I'm not sure I feel real receptive to having a meeting with them. But maybe it's the politically correct thing to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe a meeting with the CSG, then.

ALAN GREENBERG: They've been inviting us to breakfast for the last year or so and we've been saying no because it clashed with the meeting with the board. I'm presuming they were going to reach out. They haven't reached out to us yet, Gisella, as far as you know?

GISELLA GRUBER: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we should check with them. I'll check with whoever... Olivier, do you know who's the chair of the CSG right now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a good question. I was just thinking about it a second ago. I'll come back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Again, we're running really tight on time. We're already almost 15 minutes over the agenda and we have a few other really important issues, so let's try to keep interventions brief. Cheryl, is that a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is not. As I said, I'm away from my computer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Olivier, what is the need of the meetings with the NCSG? If there is an objective, we can think about it, but now I don't think that there's, in my point of view, any interest in having a meeting [inaudible]. Even if they have very good people [inaudible]. I don't suggest that [inaudible] CWG regarding the power of the SOs and ACs.

But at this time, I [inaudible] the majority or the lead of this group is really against that. So if there is something to say or something to do with them, yes. But if there is not, I am not in favor of this kind of meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, there's a new chair and the chair is not necessarily against us. But I think this meeting is probably a good time to talk to him and plan for the following meeting, not just do something on an ad hoc basis.

Julie?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Alan. Yes. I just wanted to inquire what people were thinking about having a meeting with SSAC? I always think it's good to sustain that relationship, but at the same time I recognize the time [inaudible]. I also think it can be a bit embarrassing if not many of the ALAC members turn up and there's only a small handful of people there for the briefing. I'm just wondering what your thinking is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two things. As usual, if we think we have something specific to talk about, then I would strongly support it. Just to maintain the relationship, I don't think the relationship is going to fall down if we don't meet for one meeting. In terms of ALAC and regional leaders attending, maybe we need to purchase 25 sets of shackles to tie people to the chairs. That may or may not be a joke. I'm not sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, if you ask me, we don't even need shackles. It's all right. I can manage to keep them there. Not a problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, whips or shackles. You can decide where we spend our money. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Alan. Just coming back to you on the leadership of the CSG. And by the way, regarding the NCSG, I wasn't pointing specifically to the NCSG. In the Stakeholder Group, there is the CSG, too. I wasn't aware of the new chair. There is an interim chair at the moment and that's [inaudible]. I know that there have been several changes in the CSG. I think it might be worth having a meeting with those people with names that we already know, Steve DelBianco being there, David Farris, Jim [inaudible]. So yeah...

ALAN GREENBERG: When Tony Holmes was—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And of course there are points which have been put forward, such as the PICs, for example, and other things which [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I will reach out to whoever is the current chair and see whether we're doing anything or not. Certainly when Tony Holmes was chair, he was pushing heavily for us to meet.

Sorry, anything else? I have one other issue to raise on the meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The chair is not Phil Corwin. It's the chair of the Commercial Business Users Constituency is. There is no chair at the moment in the CSG. It's all on the website.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Olivier, if I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry, I found the chair of the NCSG. It's Tapani Tarvainen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, that's correct. As I said, he's a moderately good guy. We've talked a little bit. I don't think we want to schedule a meeting without a subject. If we schedule a meeting right now, I think we're going to show arrows at each other. The relationship at a personal level is not very good right now between many of the people in the NCSG and At-Large. They are, within accountability, have targeted both the GAC and the ALAC, but certainly very spirited targeting of the ALAC. So I'm just not sure this is a good time to kiss and make up.

I have hands by Olivier and Cheryl. Do either of you want to speak or do we want to go ahead? Cheryl is outside and not going to lower. Olivier has lowered his hand.

The last item on the agenda is listed as social events. The question is we had an ALAC pay for yourself dinner on the Saturday in Dublin. Do we want to do something similar this time? Looking for a show of hands. I think it's a moderately good idea to try to talk in a non-business environment. And we have a whole slew of hands up. Cheryl may or may not have her hand up. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no. You can have that hand [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no. You asked for—

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Cheryl. I'm not sure if you're talking or not. I couldn't hear what you said.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: When you said show of hands, [inaudible] hands up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, a show of hands. All right. Everyone thinks we should have a Saturday event. We're having a Saturday event. Thank you all.

Next agenda item, update on the white paper on general assembly summits. Now, this is something that just prior to Dublin, Olivier met with a number of people and came up with the idea that said within a week or two we had to put together a white paper to establish the general assembly and summit schedule over several years and we had to do this well before the annual financial requests went in.

Clearly we didn't do that. So I guess between Olivier and Heidi, do we still have a window to do this at this point or are we just going to revert to the regular FBSC request for this coming year, and in parallel try to do something on a longer term? Heidi first and then Olivier.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, apologies, Olivier, for not getting back to you. I'm working my way through it. I think we still have time. I can confirm that this week

with Xavier and others and then get back to you on that in time, and to make sure that if we do need to submit a fiscal year request we have time for that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, at this point, given that we don't have approval from the Board Finance Committee to do a three-year plan, we have no choice but to submit the request for the Fiscal Year 17. The question is do we try to do this in parallel with that process or put this on hold and do it in the new year? That means we lose Fadi. Fadi has been one of the supporters. What his support is worth, I'm not sure. But as we go well into the calendar year '16, I think the board is going to be focused on other issues and I think we lost our window, to be blunt. That's my guess. So the real question is do we really have a window to do something else?

Olivier, you're the one who initiated this following discussions with board members. Where do you think we stand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

You mentioned Fadi. Indeed Fadi is one of the people that would be a strong supporter of this thing. I believe that as far as the board is concerned, we would probably have a majority of supporters there. The feedback that I got prior to putting this plan together was that we had to convince the community that this was a good thing. Therefore the paper which I've drafted – and this I emphasize is just a first draft and I would really like some feedback on this as soon as possible, if we are able to send this, to move forward on this. The first draft is there.

The whole idea is that this is not aimed just at the board. This is aimed at the whole community. There is a historical background of At-Large face-to-face meetings, so as to bring everyone on the same page and say this is not just a first time we're asking for face-to-face meetings.

There's a list of requirements of why are face-to-face meetings important in the At-Large community, and there's quite a few – I hope – number of significant points put there.

Then there's also a whole page on why a multi-year budget is better. The ALAC has been asking for a multi-year budget for many, many years and it really focuses I think a lot on the whole idea of being able to have predictability over the budget, more proactive planning. And this goes directly in line with the ICANN plans. We're talking here about strategic plans of making ICANN not only more accountable, but also making better use of resources, etc.

Then finally it's got a section explaining how to read the table because upon first sight most people get totally lost and have no idea what they're looking at. So there's a bit of an explanation on that. So that's the accompanying paper.

I was hoping to get your feedback and Heidi's feedback prior to sending it to the Finance & Budget Subcommittee, and then to get the FBSC feedback as soon as possible.

I have also sent a copy of it over to Tijani as he is involved always with the finance and budget process. I see that he has put his hand up, so maybe he has some feedback to put on this.

But I really think that we still have time to move forward with this. If we don't, as you said, we lose that window, and then we're going to end up with another year here. We risk ending up with another year missing out on the number of general assemblies that we need. At that point then we're going to have two hell of a years afterwards if we have to have three general assemblies during that year.

ALAN GREENBERG:

May I suggest you send it to the rest of the ALT and liaisons as well? You've already covered several people. Make sure everyone on this call has a copy of it so they can look at it and comment. That's number one.

Number two, the point I was trying to make was we are not going to get this approved before the budget request cycle. When we talked about doing it very shortly after Dublin, we hoped we could get this pushed through in lieu of making Fiscal Year 17 budget requests. Clearly at this point they have to be done in parallel. We can cross reference them, but there's no way we can avoid making the specific budget requests for Fiscal Year 17. Otherwise we risk not having any general assemblies in Fiscal Year 17.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

If I may comment on this, Alan – directly on this, actually – yes, we should do these two things in parallel, the reason being that when these are being reviewed, when the extra budget requests are being reviewed, there is always a chance that the review will be “see note number 5” and note number 5 says “this will go into the main budget.” Yes, we do have [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: They have to cross reference. You're saying yes? You're agreeing?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. First of all, yes I received the copy from Olivier and I told you I will come back to you. I didn't yet. I will do it soon, I hope.

Second point, I think that for this year, for FY17, we submit the request for the general assembly. [inaudible] from that year. That was [inaudible] last year, and that wasn't accepted but there is a [inaudible] that it will be done this year. So we will not [inaudible] which is already [inaudible] second point.

I think that we don't have to lay on or to [inaudible] Fadi very important. He can help us. That's right. But we need an approval even

without Fadi, because Fadi is going and everything can change immediately after his leaving. So we need to convince. And I agree with Olivier that this white paper or this document should be addressed to everyone, to all the communities, because the community will have to speak up. There will be a public comment about this I think. I suppose that in the future we will have a lot of positions. I think that we have to make our documents very intelligent but it can be accepted by the majority so that it can go.

And for this year, we have to ask for [inaudible] and also we have to go ahead with the document and [inaudible] so that, as you said, we can cross reference and make [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. Any other last comments before we go to the next item? Seeing none, the next item is ALAC call timing.

You will recall that, now that we have people in pretty well every time zone around the world – or at least there are no big gaps – we were looking at again trying to have meetings at times that are rotatable. We sent out a Doodle and got very varying responses. You'll see it up on the screen in a moment. We range from a number of people who said that either willingly or grudgingly they will meet any time, and they have indicated... Can we blow that up just a little bit? Or give us our own scroll, whatever you want.

Here you see the obvious. The green ticks are, "Yes, I will meet then," orange is, "If necessary," and empty says... The way they filled in the Doodle, they will not meet at all.

Now, clearly, under duress, some people, if the meeting is scheduled, may in fact meet then, but we don't know that.

The answers ranged from people gave the full 24 hours, as I said, down to two windows within the 24-hour period. And there were a number of people – a few people – who gave very few windows, two or six. I can't read the numbers exactly on the chart.

There were no time slots throughout the whole day that everyone said they will attend. We're looking at the ALAC, which is 15, plus the two liaisons who are not ALAC members makes 17. Of those 17 people, the most we got in any time slot – that is, the most green plus orange – was 15. So in every single time slot, there was [inaudible] who said they couldn't attend. A fair number of them being the people who gave relatively few slots altogether. But they varied all over. You can look at this. We can distribute this. Well, you can download it. It's on the agenda.

Out of that it looks like we have four different slots that are viable. That is, they had 14 or 15 people willingly or grudgingly would attend. They're scattered over... Who can't attend at any given meeting is scattered over the range of people. The times are all in UTC, 4:00, 12:00, 14:00 and 21:00.

As it turns out for January, if we're going to have the meeting on the standard Tuesday, the last three slots are not available. The only one that is available is the least preferred one at 4:00 UTC. That is when we're scheduling this particular meeting. This will turn the tables on

people who have to get up in the middle of the night or very early in the morning. It remains to be seen.

The fact that we had no hour within the 24 hours where everyone said that they could attend indicates that we are either going to push people past their comfort zone and they will attend or we will have people missing. But we have people missing from every meeting anyway.

That's where we stand right now. The announcement is going out, or has gone out – I'm not sure – for the meeting for this month. Then we will try to find three slots that we can rotate. That means that no matter how inconvenient the time is, it's probably not more than three times a year. I don't think that's a lot to ask out of people. They may disagree.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Pretty much, Alan, the next call will be at 4:00 AM. It is very hard for me, but I'm happy to make it, because if we rotate, it will be helpful for me once every – I don't know, every two months or something like this. It doesn't matter. I am very happy to have this [inaudible] of rotating, not always having them exactly at the time that is convenient. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We'll try to have it exactly at the time it's not convenient for everyone. I do note that you put this one as green. As awkward as the time is, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Unfortunately, there are enough people who have given limited time slots either for reasons we don't understand or in at least one case, the person is trying to avoid taking calls at home because their connectivity is so bad. I can support that. It's just not clear that we can do that for every meeting. So we're going to try this. We'll see how it goes. I think what we've done is kinder to people than simply arbitrarily setting the time instead of asking them ahead of time. We'll see how it goes for a while. We are going to get people who are complaining.

Yes, in light of Sandra's comment, people are not necessarily ruling off times because they're being difficult. People have real lives and real commitments that make some times a lot more harder than other times. We understand that. But given that there are no times that are good for everyone, we're going to have to do this, and if people miss meeting occasionally, then they'll miss meetings occasionally. That's all we can do.

Yes, go ahead. Cheryl, I didn't see your hand. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's all right, Alan. Sorry, I haven't got my microphone at my mouth. When you publish and make the point very clearly that these times will be rotating and everybody's least preferred or difficult times will only occur perhaps two if not three times a year, that will soften the blow but I think it's the only way to be fair and reasonable. And as you should all know, Holly and I – and indeed Maureen – have very little sympathy of people who [inaudible] time and don't get up through the night.

A lot of these times I think you might find are limited because they're actually on other ICANN calls.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is a concern. As I pointed out for this month, three of the four time slots are already occupied by something.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I would've filled it out, it would've been a number of those times I couldn't say yes simply because I'm already doing other calls.

ALAN GREENBERG: By the way, I'll point out that with the current schedule, people in Australia seem to have all of the meeting options at reasonable times. You can say thank you to us later.

ALAC agenda, you can read it for yourself. At this point, we have four items that are going to be on the agenda that we've already talked about. FBSC meeting time, CCWG, and Marrakech. If anyone else has anything they want to make sure is on the ALAC agenda, please let me or Heidi know really quickly.

With that, we go to any other business. Is there any other business? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Leon is still on the call, or did he leave?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't see him in the AC room. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: He never was in the AC room.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Leon, are you there?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, he left. Leon left. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to give him the right and privilege to share some information with you. I'll take that opportunity myself now. Just going back to one of your earlier agenda items, Alan, where you were talking about consumer trust and the CCWG work and my intervention indicated we were asking the author. We have in fact got some feedback from NTIA now and [inaudible] UN language coming out to the [inaudible].

I wanted to [inaudible] with the CCWG language, but I will tell you [inaudible] through all of this other stuff – what was in the leadership team.

Someone spoke to Fiona. She will be formally responding. So there's an e-mail going to Fiona for NTIA and she will be formally responding, but the response will say the DOC was addressing gTLD expansion only and it talked about consumer trust. If the community wants to debate ICANN's consumer trust mission, that's fine. But it should not be based on the AOC. So then there's a whole [inaudible] going on out of that, but I thought it would be useful for you to know that, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. That makes our discussion in the ALAC a little bit easier, without going into any more detail. Anything else on AOB? Hearing nothing, we are now two hours and eight minutes into the 90-minute meeting and I call the meeting to an end. Thank you, all, for your endurance and we'll be seeing you around. Bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, everybody. Bye.

YESIM NAZLAR:

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]