
TERRI AGNEW: Conference call taking place on Tuesday, the 26th of January, 2016 at 4 UTC. On the call today, we have Kaili Kan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Jimmy Schulz, Wafa Dahmani, Ron Sherwood, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Siranush Vardanyan, Vanda Scartezini, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Julie Hammer, Satish Babu, Sébastien Bachollet, Beran Gillen, and Seun Ojedeji.

We have apologies from Wolf Ludwig.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber; and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our French interpreters today are Camila and Claire.

Our Russian interpreters today are Yuliya and Ekaterina.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and for our interpreters.

Thank you very much and I'll now turn it back over to you, Alan. Please begin.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Terri. Welcome, all, to the call at our new time. We'll talk a little bit about timing in a little while, but before we do that, I'd like to ask if there's any other business to be added or any other comments on the agenda or can we accept the agenda as shown.

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.

Hearing no voices, seeing no hands, we'll accept the agenda and proceed. Heidi, are there any action items we need to discuss?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan. No, not at this time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The first formal item on the agenda is the review of the ALAC policy development activities. Is Ariel on the line or is someone else doing it?

ARIEL LIANG: Hi, Alan. This is Ariel Liang, for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, you are there. I didn't see you on.

ARIEL LIANG: Of course I'm here.

ALAN GREENBERG: The people scrolled down and you were off the screen. All right, I'll turn it over to you then.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. Again, I'm going to share my screen. As you can see, this is the statement page of the new website and we have the two ALAC statements are in progress. The first one is on the final report recommendations of the geographic regions for the working group. This one, Tijani has been leading a small drafting team to draft the first statement – first draft – and the comment period will end in April, so we still have plenty of time for this public comment.

The second public comment that the ALAC already responded to is on the proposed implementation of GNSO [inaudible] consensus policy requiring consistent labeling and display of RDDS outputs for [inaudible] gTLDs. Alan has finalized the draft and it has been posted on the Wiki and the ALAC is going to vote on this statement, and in fact, I just opened to vote starting at [inaudible] UTC today. So the vote will end on this Friday, so I will remind all the ALAC members to vote for this statement.

Besides that, we recently had approved one statement that's on the registration data access protocol operational profile for gTLD registries and registrars. That statement was just ratified last week and now you can view the statement on this website here.

That's all from me. In fact, all of the other public comments that are open, we decided not to draft a statement now. So Alan, do you want me to talk about those public comments or do you want to skip it?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I don't think there is any real need. If anyone has any specific questions, we'll open the floor in a moment. Is that it for you then, assuming no questions?

ARIEL LIANG: I see Holly and Sebastian raised their hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: We do have several questions. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: A comment on this heading, what's [on] the list, there is now a [inaudible] from comments that were received. It was the WHOIS stuff [inaudible] stuff, but it was the WHOIS conflict and it was an [inaudible] that I sat in on and [inaudible] Carlton. It was the review of an implementation group, what to do about a general policy which the GNSO adopted saying there should be something to handle conflict between national data retention laws and requirements to the RAA for WHOIS data to be public.

The policy is fine, but the implementation [group] came up with a solution that's virtually unworkable. The working group that looks at the unworkable solutions came up with a lot of comments. The Registries Group basically said, "Well, actually, we don't like what you've come up with at all." Christopher Wilkinson has gotten on the line and he [inaudible].

My [intent] is to say, “You didn’t read our comments. You’ve unfairly interpreted them.” Maybe I’ll talk about it offline. But the so-called solution that they’ve summarized doesn’t quite grasp the fact that a lot of people in that working group—

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, you’re talking complex stuff that I don’t think many people are grasping and your line is very noisy. How about putting something in an e-mail identifying what the problem is and we’ll discuss it offline?

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. It’s a bit of frustration. There’s a solution that’s being proposed that actually wasn’t what was proposed. Let’s put it that way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Why don’t you try to put it down? Because you’ve lost me and I suspect that means you’ve lost a lot of other people also.

HOLLY RAICHE: I’ve probably lost everybody. Okay, will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Hello, everybody. Thank you, Alan. Just to know when I [inaudible] had a comment in my vote, I'd like to know what's happened with those type of comments made during a vote. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know. You're talking about during an online vote or a vote in some other form?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I talk about specifically the online vote, just closed now, is the [RDAP]. It takes me some time to figure out my thinking, then I decided to vote yes. Not to be in the same situation as that previous vote, but I had some comments there because it was the time where I vote that I put comments [inaudible].

My question is [inaudible]. There is a place for comments, and what's happened with those comments, if anything?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's a very good question, and I honestly have no idea, because I don't think – I can't recall when the issue has ever come up before that someone registered a comment, and told us they did and [inaudible] do something about it. So we'll look into that and try to find out where they go and make sure that they are captured. I really don't know the answer. If any past chairs or anyone else knows the answer, feel free to speak up. This is a new one on me; I'll be honest.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. In general, when votes are taken, there is the opportunity for somebody who is abstaining to register a comment, and usually these are then put over with the vote. They're recorded as such with the vote and [inaudible] on the results of the vote.

So I would I imagine that if there is a comment when making any other type of vote, that comment could also be recorded and displayed [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Okay, I think I've said it. We'll try to find out what happened on that particular vote. If Ariel can't find anything, then she'll contact you and we'll try to figure out where these things go. So good question. Thank you.

Olivier, is that a new hand? I'm guessing not.

All right. Any other issues related to policy statements or policy votes? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we'll go on to agenda item number five, review of ALS applications.

Heidi, is that your hand or Silvia?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan. Currently, we have two At-Large Structures that are undergoing review [for] due diligence, and that is the Greater

Washington DC chapter as well as the ISE from China. That is it right now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: What's the status of ISOC Gambia? It says it's suspended. I didn't think we actually had a suspended category.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I will need to check on that status.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. If you can get back via e-mail on the internal list, thank you.

All right. Next item is reports, and as is our norm, we don't have all the formal reports but we'll give the opportunity for any of the working group chairs, RALO chairs, or other RALO people on the call, or our liaisons to make some comments. I suspect Olivier will make some very brief comments on the state of affairs in the GNSO and what's going on, but I see a hand from Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Good morning, Alan and everyone. As for ISOC Gambia, we were waiting for the formal advice from ISOC [word] that [inaudible] us that ISOC Gambia is not yet [inaudible] and we are waiting for their [inaudible]. So the application is not... We are waiting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you very much. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. The GNSO Council had its call on the 22nd of January which was just a few days ago last week. It decided to pass several motions. The first one is on the final report on the Privacy Proxy Services for Accreditation Issues (PDP Working Group) and that motion was passed unanimously, which means that the PDP Working Group is starting its work. So you should look out for a call for members on this because imminent working start on that.

On the vote on motion about the charter for the Policy Development Process Working Group on the new gTLD subsequent procedures, there was a lot of discussion that took place with concern by some to avoid collision of another PDP that has been deferred regarding rights protection mechanisms. The concern was that the two PDPs would actually be walking on each other's turf and be addressing the same thing. Then they needed to be addressed separately.

After a small friendly amendment, the motion was passed unanimously, so that work on new gTLD subsequent procedures is about to start, too. I get that's of much importance for At-Large as well.

Thirdly, there was a vote on the [inaudible] of another PDP to review all the rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs, the one that I just mentioned just now. And that has been withdrawn, so far due to lack of time and preparation on several things and some concerns about the way the charter was drafted. So that will probably... Have been moved on to next month.

Then there was a vote on – there was supposed to be a vote on the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, that famous statement that everybody was waiting for from the GNSO Council.

As it happened, the end result of whatever they brought forward was actually some kind of collection of all of the inputs from the different stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO Council. Our own ALAC Working Group on IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability have actually gone through each one of the points that were made.

There was at the end, because it was such a collection of views, which sometimes actually don't agree with each other. There was no vote as such. And the action item that was put down was to have a final version circulated to the GNSO Council with a consensus call. As in, asking for no objection to sending this over. That took place, and as a result, that document was sent over. But it certainly was not I guess the same resolve and standard as far as its proportionality is concerned, as the input that the ALAC had supplied a month ago I think it was – no, over a month ago – in the process.

One thing to note is that there were some concerns that if many things were changed in the final report of the Accountability Working Group, there might be a need for another comment period. Yes, wash, rinse, repeat. Start again. I'm not sure where that would lead us.

That's pretty much all that happened in the GNSO Council call. It did run a little bit over time and that's because so much discussion was brought in on the ICANN accountability discussions.

Any questions? I'm ready to answer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two questions, Olivier. First of all, when do you expect the new gTLD process to actually kick off? I'm assuming that... Is the charter accepted as it was proposed in the issue report or is there now a charter group going to be formed?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I might have to check on that. My impression was that the charter had already been discussed and that the charter was going to be accepted as presented by staff in the Issues Report. But I would need to check, because that's one thing that's been a bit unclear for me for the creation for many of these PDPs. Staff has been quite overwhelmed with things, so I haven't seen any movements since that vote has taken place, either. And I'm not quite sure therefore what the next stage is. But I will come back to you on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Once you know the timing, let us know. We want to start [inaudible] the bushes to get people prepared to apply to work on that working group once it's actually formed.

The second question, I'm not sure whose world it's in. There was supposed to be a cross-community working group kicking off to look at how to use auction funds. It was supposed to be a cross-community group. I presumed it was going to be led by the GNSO. Have you heard

anything about that? It may be in abeyance because of all the other work going on and we just don't have time to do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I think that this was actually already looked at in the previous GNSO Council call. [inaudible] proceeds. Here we go. There was a discussion on council action on this process, and that's still not moved forward yet.

As you said, it was [inaudible] cross-community working group, so that appears to have been pushed back a little bit. If you recall, Alan, there was a bit of a concern or some question mark over the whole process, because originally there was this idea of having a cross-community working group, but then if you recall, the Board asked for a process to be started that was not only just working group, but [inaudible] other parties maybe even outside of ICANN to decide on where those auction funds would be used. And I think that somehow this has put a bit of a chilling effect on the whole process. So I haven't seen any movement on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It's clearly not urgent in a sense of today or tomorrow. Thank you very much, Olivier. Julie, go ahead.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Alan. Just a very quick one that the SSAC has issued SAC 077, which is a comment on the new gTLD marketplace [health] index proposal, and in that, very brief comment. The SSAC makes a number of

observations about the types of metrics that ICANN should concentrate on to actually measure the [health] of the gTLDs and the amount of abusive behavior. That particular report was produced by the same work party that produced the Credentials Management Report a couple of months ago, SAC 074.

So just bring that to your attention, most of you who didn't get my e-mail [inaudible]. Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Anything else on reports, working groups, RALOs? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, thank you very much. I do encourage everyone to actually go to the wiki and read these reports. That ends our standard items.

The first item on our "for discussion/decision" is regarding the At-Large New Meeting Strategy for the meetings A, B, and C. As you will recall, we have had a working group looking at this over the last number of months. They in fact drew up a proposal which we used as the core to start planning the Marrakech meeting, and as expected, there have been significant changes demanded by the reality that surrounds scheduling real meeting as opposed to doing the theory on it.

So as we discuss the meeting strategy here, do keep in mind that this is not locked in stone, but this is an overall game plan that we start with as we're looking at how to schedule the meetings.

And I'll turn it over to Beran.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very well.

BERAN GILLEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Yes, I'm going to keep this quite short actually. I'm actually dialed in on the Adigo line, so I don't know what's on the screen. I was hoping we could just quickly scroll through the three meetings just to give you a general overview. It's been on the wiki for some time now, but there has been a bit of changes.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have the A block schedule on the screen right now and people can do their own scrolling.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay, great. Excellent. So with the Meeting A, I did get some feedback from both the taskforce as well as the ALAC when I presented it last year. So I took that into consideration, especially about the face-to-face [hours] that we're lacking on the first schedule that I've presented with regards to mainly the ALAC work and the time we're spending with the rest of the community. So that's also been taken into consideration.

And looking at the schedule as it is now, you will notice that that's been moved around a bit and more time has been allocated to ALAC work and ALAC and the RALO leadership work.

We've also taken into consideration Monday's high-interest topics and moved the outreach to Tuesday.

I think I'd like Gisella to come in here. I think the only hiccup that I foresee – two things. There isn't any provision for ALAC work at all. I think maybe Gisella can shed a bit of light on that, or perhaps you, Alan, because I believe there would be some concurrent work going on when the outreach and engagement activities are happening.

I think that's mainly the only thing that's missing. And then regards to the meeting with the Board, Wednesday afternoon might be a bit off the timing. So maybe that can be moved around. But other than that, all the comments were taken into consideration, as you can see on Meeting A.

So I'd like to let Gisella comment, or yourself, Alan, with regards to the ALAC work or doing outreach and engagement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll let Gisella go first and I'll add anything I have to.

BERAN GILLEN:

All right. Thank you. Gisella, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Beran, Gisella here. Thank you, Alan, for passing it over to me. Yes, on the Tuesday afternoon in Marrakech, we have currently scheduled ALAC work parallel to the outreach session. There will be a few designated members going on the outreach which will be to a local university. That hasn't yet been confirmed, but we are working with the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee on this, on the program.

And also secondly, the other clash that we did pick up on the Meeting Schedule A, which I notified Beran of, is the current time of the ALAC with the ALAC with the Board on Tuesday from 13:30 to 14:30. It does clash with the GNSO Council meeting. So we will look into that closely for possibly the next Meeting A, and also to make sure that Meeting C, we try and avoid that clash. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I don't think I have anything to add on A. As I said, it's been an interesting experience, and given that the Meeting Strategy Group is still working... As you've heard, there's been some feedback and iterations as we try to use the agenda and then set it back into the generic one for use for future meetings. It's not clear we'll have that opportunity with B since I'm not sure Beran wants to keep on doing this for the rest of her life. It's been an enlightening experience trying to transform this into reality and see how it clashes with things that are being schedule out of our control completely. And of course we still aren't quite sure what's [inaudible] with the accountability issues at this meeting. So the world may still change.

Tijani? Is that on Meeting A still?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I see on the Schedule C is that the showcase is on Tuesday. Why is it? It should be on Monday. And I agree that we have to schedule activities of the ALAC and the At-Large during the afternoon because people will participate in the outreach will not be the [full group]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. I'm not quite sure why it shows Tuesday. I think Tuesday was where we were going to have it in the general case, but for Marrakech, it was put on Monday. So I think that didn't go back and alter the general one, but just was a [inaudible] change for this particular meeting. I think that's what happened regarding the showcase.

Beran, did I get it wrong?

BERAN GILLEN: No, you didn't. We just basically missed moving it to Monday when it was actually announced that it was a Monday. So Tuesday was provisional.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. But is the intent to keep it on Tuesday in the general case?

BERAN GILLEN: No, not at all. It's moving to Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I have a question whether you knew or anyone on the call if the ALAC was the only community in ICANN that has changed its scheduling due to it being [inaudible]? The reason is because I have brought this up on scheduling for other meetings in one of the cross-community working groups. Everyone else looked at me and thought, "Why is ALAC changing its schedule? We're not changing our schedule. It's just a normal ICANN-type meeting." I was a bit confused.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me try to give you answer there. First of all, this is a meeting which is going to be starting the official meeting on Saturday, like other meetings for the GNSO. For the ALAC, in the general case, Dublin was an exception. We don't start meeting on Saturday, so we couldn't use our normal schedule. So I think that's part of the answer.

If you were talking about the GNSO, then they could ignore to some extent the fact that this is a Meeting A because the days that they're scheduling are the same days as they were before. I think that may be part of the answer. And maybe the answer is we're more obedient than other groups. I'm not sure there's a better one than that. Unless, Olivier, you wanted to follow on?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Well, I wondered whether that was the case in the ccNSO, whether any changes had been done there. I'm just asking because I know we've spent a lot of time and we're going to have a whole afternoon on outreach. Was that something that all of the SOs and ACs needed to do?

ALAN GREENBERG: In theory, but remember, for the Monday afternoon outreach, we're only sending a few people out. The rest of us are going to do the regular work that we're planning. I wouldn't go too far in saying that we're changing the schedule completely for that. We did at one point, but that's one of the changes that we made to adjust to the specifics of the location. We found out it didn't make a lot of sense to send 27 people out to the local university or something. So we've made adjustments to cover that.

I don't know about the ccNSO. Maybe Maureen can make a comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Did you say Monday afternoon outreach? I thought it was Tuesday afternoon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe it's Tuesday. I've lost track at this point. I thought it's Monday, though. Anybody?

BERAN GILLEN: If I can comment, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

BERAN GILLEN: Heidi, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just very quickly, the outreach in Marrakech is going to be on Tuesday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tuesday, I'm sorry. My mistake, then. Or Maureen, if you can answer, maybe you can quickly address Olivier's question with regards to the ccNSO.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Yes, I was just going to say that for the ccNSO it's business as usual. They'll just do their normal program. They're not planning on making any particular changes. The whole outreach thing has not been given [inaudible] because they believe that what they're doing in their normal program is a lot of outreach anyway. So for them, it's business as usual.

ALAN GREENBERG: Presumably, the ccTLD in a country that we're actually active in is already active in ICANN. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that Meeting A is very, very close to the normal meeting of ICANN. My feeling is that we had a real need to think about Meeting B because it is very different. Meeting B has two [inaudible].

The first one is that we have a [inaudible] outreach day. We have to think about what we will [inaudible] and how we will do outreach. And the second [inaudible] is that it is shorter. So we have to accommodate our work and we have to concentrate more on our own work. It will be less cross community to be more... [inaudible].

This is something that needs to be [inaudible] to have a new structure of the meeting. But for Meeting A, I don't think we need to change everything. Perhaps we can shift a bit the days. Perhaps we can change some small things. But I don't think there is a need – except if we feel

there is a need to change the structure of our meetings, of our normal meetings, of ICANN.

As for Meeting C, we need to think about it because we have more time. So it will be easier to [inaudible] because we are under constraints. We have more time, so we can develop better. We can do our work better. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Tijani introduced Meeting B. Maybe we can go back to Beran to talk about Meeting B.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. If the staff can just help me put Meeting B up on the screen and we'll quickly zip through it because I know...

ALAN GREENBERG: We are running overtime now. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: So just to quickly... Not much has changed in Meeting B. I didn't get much feedback on it. So the first day is just outreach after the [inaudible] opening ceremony. Then we have the second and the third day intra-community work, and then you have the fourth day cross-community work.

I also tried to include what I received so far from the other parties or from the other ACs and SOs, so there you can have an idea what's

happening with other people as well as the board. So basically that's what we have for Meeting B.

Now, with regards to the outreach, we don't have anything structured yet. We will be having more [inaudible] LAC community subgroup, in which we will be discussing in detail what the outreach and engagement activities will be for Meeting B. So I'll open the floor for any questions on Meeting B.

ALAN GREENBERG: No hands, no questions.

BERAN GILLEN: All right. Well, then, we'll move on to Meeting C.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Beran.

BERAN GILLEN: Meeting C, as Tijani pointed out, is very, very close to Meeting A – just a few extra days.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes? I'm here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Beran is talking, Tijani. Did you want to speak?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, no. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We seem to have an echo now. Beran, go ahead.

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, we do. But for Meeting C, I believe we still have sort of a [inaudible] schedule because... As Tijani pointed out, with time, [more things] will fall into place. But it's looking more like a traditional AGM meeting except for the extra day, the seventh day. So basically, that's really it for Meeting C.

Right now what we're trying to do is finalize Meeting A and then concentrate on the outreach and engagement activities for Meeting B, and hopefully by the time Meeting B rolls around, Meeting C would be looking more complete.

That's it from me, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Beran, how do you want to proceed? Do you want the ALAC to accept these plans right now and you're going to [inaudible]? Do you want us to accept them with the understanding that

there will be some additional work going on over the next number of months? What do you think is the right way to do this? And Heidi, if you have any input as to what we should be doing to meet some overall ICANN end point, please speak up also.

BERAN GILLEN:

If I can just comment, I still think a lot needs to be done for Meeting B, especially with regards to the outreach and engagement activities and the structure of the meeting. Like you said, nothing is cast in stone yet. So we still do have a lot of work to do for Meeting B, especially. And then we also need to finalize the structure of Meeting C, which I believe may not necessarily take as much time as Meeting B.

So yes, I would like to get some feedback from ALAC. Since I've put information out on the wiki, I believe if I could get official feedback with regards to the structure of the Meetings A, B, and C, that would be great.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Alan. I echo Beran's comments. This first series of A, B, and C is going to be sort of a pilot in the sense that things are going to change. So I would think that given the good work of the Meeting Strategy Working Party, that they are retained to evaluate each of the first sessions of A, B, and C and then perhaps can offer suggestions on how to improve the activities going into the next series. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Do you think we need to take any formal action at this point, though?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Do I?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. I think that as long as you... Perhaps just a view that the ALAC does support this in general, understanding that it is a framework and things will change as needed. I think that'll be fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Then I would like propose that I'll do a consensus call by e-mail since we didn't give any specific wording ahead of time for this discussion, that we thank the Meeting Strategy Working Party for its work, acknowledge the work, and ask them to proceed as we go through the full series of meetings in doing final planning and a post mortem analysis of how things have worked. So I'll do that by e-mail as we go forward, if staff can note an AI for me on that.

I thank Beran for this session and we'll go on to the next item.

The next item is meeting times, of which this is the first one. Gisella, do we have a slide to show on this? All right. I'm not sure if this was sent out or not yet, but this is the proposed meeting schedule with the rotation that we are looking at.

On the right, it shows the time in a variety of different time zones factoring in Daylight Savings or not depending on what time of year it is and what part of the Earth you're on.

The greens, yellows, and the reds are sort of spread around. The people in Europe are slightly harder hit than some. But overall we're doing our best to spread it around.

Now, one of the challenges is going to be to actually get people to attend these meetings, especially when they're red. We have 17 people, the ALAC plus the two liaisons who are not ALAC members, who are deemed to be – essentially must be – at meetings to the extent that they can in the real world.

We had no time around the clock that more than 15 people said yes to, either yes or maybe. So clearly we are going to be missing people on occasion, and if we're not missing them, then they're going to be attending the meeting at a very awkward time for them. That had more sympathy from me. Before, I had been attending meetings at 2:00, 3:00, 4:00, and 5:00 on the various CWGs and CCWGs recently. If I can do it, I guess anyone can. We won't even talk about what the people in Australia have been doing for the last number of years.

With thanks to everyone who's putting themselves out for this schedule. Hopefully it will allow everyone to participate on a semi-equal

ground where no one is very disadvantaged. We'll all work together and hopefully be able to do a good job.

This is a trial. We haven't done any rotation before. There are other parts of ICANN – for instance, the GNSO. Even though it's not heavily split over the regions as we are – has been rotating times for a long time now. Certainly the CWG/CCWG has.

Hopefully, we can make this work. If it turns out that any of these times are particularly bad, don't work out as well, we'll adjust if necessary. But short of finding things out that we need to, this is the schedule we'll be using for the next year. If we find any real mistakes in it, we will adjust. But at this point, this is how we're going forward.

Any comments or questions? Then I thank you very much and we'll go on to the next item.

The next item is a request I received today to speak for no more than five minutes – there is a document, if you could display it, please. It's a request I had from Steve Crocker. Apparently, part of the new meeting strategy is that at the first open forum, which is an hour-and-a-half on Monday I believe late Monday afternoon, there will be time allocated for the seven ACs and SOs to give very short updates. You can see the exact instructions that I received today.

I would welcome input from everyone on what you think I should be mentioning, what I shouldn't be mentioning, and how we go forward on this. I will be sometime in the next month or so put out, not a draft, but a set of bullet points of what I plan to be covering. If you'd like to influence that before you see it, then please let me know. If not, then

comment on it when you see it. I don't think I have a lot more to say other than that on it right now.

This almost goes back to something we used to do at the end of the meeting, of giving a meeting report from all the chairs. That was killed a while ago. I think this actually perhaps makes more sense than just recounting what we did over the last week of giving a State of the Union, so to speak, in US political terms of where we are, what we're doing.

I see some hands. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. You just summarized what was the aim of this reintroduction of the [inaudible] to have the chair of the SO and AC talking to the whole community. There were two ideas. The first one is that [inaudible] not just a Board meeting [again] the rest of the community. It's also chairing between each group in the community.

And the other point, it was if we as ALAC have something very important to talk about, it will be the time because the rest of the week, we will be able to share with the other group to discuss those issues. And if needed to come back on that issue at the end of the week for the second public form on Thursday, it's why also the public comment, it's split in two. It's to, I will say, introduce the questions and at the end to answer the question.

It will not work like that, but it's the aim. Yes, if you can give this type of [inaudible], not too much. We have done 20 reports. But what is the

more important things we have discussed or agree upon during the three or four months between the meeting, the previous meeting and this one, will be a good idea. [inaudible] important for us. Not too much that we are the best, we are 300, we are whatever. What are the topics we would like to have a subject when the people cross ALAC members in the corridor or in any meeting room? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sebastien. I will point out that when the past chairs were occupying the position, they on the morning of the last day would have to get up early and give a talk to people who didn't perhaps care what they were saying, and the rest of us could sleep in a bit and watch the session from our hotel rooms. I'm very grateful I never had to do that and I'm very grateful this is an afternoon session, not an early morning session on the last day. So thank you, world. And thank you new meeting strategy.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. What happened before was different. It was more or less [inaudible]. It included the activities of the week. Now it is on Thursday [inaudible] including the activities of the week.

So I am happy that [inaudible] again, but I will prefer that [inaudible] second public forum [inaudible] not be a question [inaudible]. It will be more based on the [inaudible] of ALAC. And it is better that [inaudible] includes the activities of the week. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. Any other comments on this item before we go ahead? As I said, I welcome anyone's input. I may follow it. I may not. But I do welcome input. Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we'll go on to the next item and that is ICANN 55.

I hear we're meeting in Marrakech. Would Gisella like to tell us about it?

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you very much. We're going to be putting up on the Adobe Connect room something that we have worked on, the At-Large schedule. Yes, we are going to be meeting in Marrakech from the 5th to the 10th. You'll all be delighted to know that the hotel rooms are all at the venue. There will be a little bit of walking, so if you do bring your stilettos, please bear that in mind.

We're now going to go on to the At-Large schedule in order not to waste too much time. The final version, but not the final version set in stone, has been posted on the wiki page. If you'd like to go through this, it's just uploading now. Thank you, Terri.

As Beran said, Meeting A is pretty much a regular ICANN meeting. There has been a few amendments and we've had to take a few other meetings into consideration.

The last piece of the puzzle that [inaudible] more information on I suppose is coming close to the meeting are the CCWG sessions. But we have tried to put these into the schedule with as much possible, and with all the information that we currently hold. Again, if a few other

sessions pop up, we will just have to amend our schedule accordingly. You'll see that we've left quite a bit of flexibility for this.

We start with our usual Saturday. We've got the AFRALO program for African NGOs. That is something that Tijani and Aziz are working on. I'm happy to leave the floor to Tijani if he'd like to give us a quick presentation on this.

We have the NGOs coming in who will be meeting every day, much like we did in Dakar with the capacity building with the ALSes. There will be an hour session every day and a debrief on Thursday.

Tijani, would you like to say a few words or can we just go back on to the schedule?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you, Gisella. More or less, [inaudible] program for those NGOs, and the program includes the capacity building which is a daily work from 8:00 to 9:00. It will be a session similar to what we did in Dakar, but perhaps it will be different in the content because people [inaudible] be there [inaudible] ICANN is about or where ICANN is going. So [inaudible] different.

Can you hear me?

TERRI AGNEW:

Yes, we can hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

So the program [inaudible] daily capacity building session, it will include also a [inaudible] program for all those [inaudible] NGOs. And we will try [inaudible] in the ICANN session, other than the morning capacity building. Particularly for the At-Large, we will follow more or less much of our work, but it will also be included in other [inaudible]. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Tijani. We're just going to get back into the schedule, again not to run over.

One item that I would like to bring up for Marrakech and how the [inaudible] like to move forward is well is that we will be respecting the coffee and the lunch breaks. As it stands now, there will be no services during the lunch break, i.e. no audio/visual, no technical services, and no interpretation.

You'll see that we haven't scheduled any meetings over lunch like we usually do. We try and keep the lunch and then – while we don't have a place for the working group, let's put it over the lunch break. We haven't done that in Marrakech at all. And we will try to have all the coffee breaks at the times that are indicated as well.

The working groups that we have put on the schedule so far are not set in stone. We do need to confirm with a few of the external guests whether they are available at that time. And this is new to everyone, so if you do have any comments, please do put them in the chat or raise your hand and we'll address them.

So Saturday, the usual ALAC strategy session part one and two. We've currently scheduled the At-Large review that evening. We are looking to have an ALAC dinner on the Saturday evening. I will send a "save the date" and work on details and keep everyone posted.

On the Sunday, again, we start with the AFRALO program for African NGOs. We're also trying to schedule an APRALO monthly meeting and we'll be having our ALAC and regional leadership meeting throughout the day, ending with the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee.

Monday we've only got one meeting so far, which is the NGOs again. You can see in the left-hand column that we've got all the main sessions listed, and with Meeting A we have the Public Forum Part One on Monday afternoon. So that's a change and there won't be any meetings scheduled opposite that.

We are potentially needing to put a working group on the Monday afternoon. More to come.

Tuesday is again Constituency Day, Board meetings. So we have put... The change here is that we've got the AFRALO/AfrICANN meeting on Tuesday morning. That fits in well with our students visiting us from [inaudible]. We have for the outreach and engagement approximately 70 students visiting from [inaudible] and they'll be able to attend that meeting as well.

We've got, as Beran mentioned, ALAC Work Part 1 and Part 2 which is scheduled parallel to the outreach and engagement. The outreach and engagement will be offsite visiting a local university, but there will only

be a handful of party going to that designated by the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee.

Apologies. I did forget to mention Monday evening we do have the AFRALO Showcase which will be combined with a farewell for Fadi. We're still working on all details Monday evening.

Tuesday evening no social events at this stage.

Wednesday we have a very full program again. There will be a few meetings running parallel. For instance, the Capacity Building Working Group with the ICANN board and GAC. But again, there are some overlapping meetings that we will not be able to avoid just due to time constraints.

We've put a couple of working groups on Wednesday. We have in the new New Meeting Strategy for Meeting A the ALAC and the Board meeting on Wednesday afternoon.

Now, we have picked up that this is running parallel with the GNSO Council meeting. As Heidi mentioned, there will be a few [teething] problems with Meeting A, B, and C as this is new to everyone. And we've already made note to avoid this in the future so we can allow Board members to attend the GNSO Council meeting on Wednesday afternoon.

We have another clash I've picked up on, but we'll be working through that. And we've got the wrap up now on Wednesday afternoon as opposed to Thursday morning. Another change.

And the Regional Leadership Meeting will be on the Wednesday evening as opposed to the Wednesday lunchtime. Again, keeping all lunch slots open.

We are due to have a gala on Wednesday evening. The details haven't yet been confirmed, so hopefully that will be a nice distraction on Wednesday evening and local hospitality.

On Thursday, we've got an ALT meeting. Times yet to be confirmed. And we're waiting for a couple of accountability sessions to come through. But again, no major meeting on the Thursday morning except for the debrief for the African NGOs. And we've got the afternoon Public Forum session as per our usual meetings.

Are there any comments at this stage just having a scroll through the agenda?

ALAN GREENBERG: I see Olivier has his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I'm seeing the ALAC meeting with the Board. Is that with the full Board?

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't know.

[HEIDI ULLRICH]: Olivier, which session was that? The Tuesday morning one or the Wednesday?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, the ALAC meeting with the Board.

[HEIDI ULLRICH]: Yes, as far as I know, that will be a normal full meeting as we have had in the past.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I have a question. Our meeting with the Board has been changed. Was it under our request or under the Board request?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't actually remember. Gisella or Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: My understanding is that was a request of the New Meeting Strategy Working Party. Gisella or Beran?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes, I'm here. Yes, it was a request from us because we were moving around working groups. And when we spoke to the meetings team, they told us to give them what we wanted and they will try to work around our times. So yes, it was our request.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's probably too late to do anything about it for this meeting, but if anyone finds that inappropriate and we want to try to revert back, then that's what we need feedback for.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. One thing I have noticed is that some groups get 60 minutes, some groups get more than 60 minutes with the Board. I just wondered whether there was a logic to this specifically because the timings are different than as to how much time a group gets with the Board. The timings are different depending on the meeting. They have changed in the past, but for some reason, we always remained at 60 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess we should be glad it hasn't gone down to 30.

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may, Alan....

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, that was meant at [inaudible]. Yes, go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may, just as an insight as to some of the meeting requests we have received with ALAC, the GAC initially gave us 30 minutes. I was very surprised at why they were only giving us 30 minutes. By the time we get everyone seated, we've already lost 10 minutes.

So with the toing and froing and finally finding the slot on Tuesday morning to accommodate us now from 9:30 to 10:30, we've got a full hour.

As for the Board, it's been 60 minutes for the ALAC over the past meetings. We'll see if that changes possibly for Meeting C.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly if people feel that it should be changed – longer, shorter, or whatever – then we need feedback. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Two points, Alan. First is that we normally have Rinalia, who is the board director selected by At-Large who comes to speak to the ALAC on the weekend for a good length of time. I believe she's going to be speaking with you for one hour, and she is a direct conduit back to the board.

The second point is, starting with Meeting B, there will be no formal board meetings with the various groups. What will be happening,

perhaps, is that the members of the board on an individual basis or by working group, etc. may be asked by the various ACs and SOs to come to their meetings. That's something that—

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, Heidi, may I interrupt?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you mean for Meeting Bs, or starting at this Meeting B?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Starting at this Meeting B, there will be, again, no formal meeting of the board-

ALAN GREENBERG: And continuing to Meeting C, or only for Meeting B?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, just meeting B. Sorry, just meeting B, because again, that is—

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. That's not what you said, and I was worried.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Again, starting with this Meeting B coming up in Panama City, the board will not have formal meetings with the ACs and SOs. Again, you may wish to invite individual board members, etc., to the ALAC meetings. Marrakesh might be a good way to start that practice of inviting specific board members up to come to ALAC sessions on specific topics. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and just for the record, I don't consider meeting with our director as equivalent to meeting with the board, no matter how good the conduit is.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. It's normal for me B because we think B will be [focused] on the [inaudible] work, not for the constituency. It's normal that the board wouldn't need to [meet] the constituency during Meeting B. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani, I wasn't reacting to it. I was reacting to what I thought Heidi said is starting with this Meeting B and forever after, the board would not meet with us. She corrected that that is not what she said. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's all I had to say. Thank you. Put my hand down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Gisella, back to you then.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. At this stage, I have nothing more to add, except that we will be finalizing the schedule, as I said, just reaching out to the various chairs of the working groups and the other guests invited to the working groups to make sure that these times work.

The Wiki pages will be updated over the next 48 hours with the meeting so that you've got a better overview. This schedule is available for download on the ALAC agenda. If there's anything else in the meantime, please do send us any comments. We're still able to make a few tweaks at this stage, but by the end of the week, it will be too late. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The next part of this agenda is talking about what we do during our meeting sessions. If you remember correctly, when we first looked at the Meeting A, we were down to only about six hours of actual meeting face-to-face with ALAC and regional leaders. We have now pushed that way up, closer to what it is on a normal meeting. Therefore, we're now looking at who do we want to invite as guests? That is ICANN executives, other AC/SOs, or anyone else.

As we did last time, we'll be circulating a poll, essentially, asking to what extent do you want to see someone or a group? To what extent do you

not want to see them? There will be an opportunity to explain why you think someone's important or not. If we're not careful and we take everyone who someone thinks is important, we'll have virtually no time to talk among ourselves. We're going to have to pick and choose, and therefore, when you fill in the survey, fill it in with some discretion.

We're also looking for suggestions on issues to raise with the board, the GAC, the other ACs or SOs we meet with. Take some care when filling it in, but fill it in quickly, please, because as Gisella said, we don't have an awful lot of time to finalize this. The item C actually is covered by the previous one. It's the questions for the board and the GAC. There are Wiki pages. You can contribute things or you can put them into the survey as you fill that out.

I think we've already done D when we were talking about the Tuesday. I'm not sure there's anything else that we need to say, but the floor is open for questions or anyone from staff, if we've omitted anything that needs to be covered. Seeing no hands. Hearing no voices. Dev, are you here? I see your name is also on the agenda for the outreach session. Do you want to add anything to what Tijani already added, if you're still on the call? There you are.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead. Yes, we can.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. The Outreach and Engagement Working Subcommittee has had two conference calls this month to discuss the various AFRALO outreach event, possible outreach event activities at Marrakesh. I posted a link to what is the tentative schedule so far that we've discussed with ICANN staff, Aziz and Tijani.

Tentatively, what's going to be happening is two sets of activities. One will be bringing in some students from the university in Rabat, which is four hours away from the venue. They will be coming in tentatively on the Sunday or early Monday morning and be able to attend some sessions on Monday. The schedule of that is already up on that AFRALO outreach event workspace. They will also be able to take part in some of the activities on Tuesday.

Also on Tuesday afternoon, a group of persons will be going to a nearby university, which is about ten minutes away, and we will be speaking to the university students there and we'll be doing presentations, bringing in lots of outreach materials about ICANN and At-Large and how they can get involved. That's the general summary.

The working group is going to be working closely with the AFRALO leadership and ICANN staff, with probably weekly meetings to finesse the scheduling of the outreach activities, including, I would say, the pre-outreach that needs to happen before Marrakesh. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Dev. Any further questions before we go on to the next item? Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Do we know who these people are going to be, who are involved in this from the ALAC side?

ALAN GREENBERG: If your French is good enough, we can send you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh dear, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Dev, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Tentatively, the persons that would be going on the Tuesday session will be a mix of English and francophone speakers. Aziz, Tijani, Daniel Nanghaka from the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee.

We're probably also looking at persons like perhaps Sébastien and Olivier to probably also go on that Tuesday session. Again, if you scroll down the page – I think I'm scrolling right – you will see the tentative schedule. Again, it's all still being worked on. It's still all in draft right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Dev mentioned pre... Is it pre-outreach activities or pre-meeting activities? Could you expand on this please?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. What are we going to give to the students before they reach the ICANN venue? In other words, some sort of homework so they're not totally confused. I think if anybody was to be [inserted in] to an ICANN meeting for the very first time... I remember for the first time I was. It was a very baffling, confusing experience.

We need to work out what material do we send to the students. That's what I meant in terms of the pre-outreach before the Marrakesh meeting. We need to be sending out some materials, some electronic documentations or presentations about certain stuff so hopefully they'll be a little bit more prepared. That's the idea.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier, did you want to follow on?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. That was exactly the gist of my question. The question was what is it that we're sending them? Has that been worked out? Because I think it needs to be prepared and if it arrives... Usually if we have documentation or things that we need to have there, that needs to be sent early enough. ICANN has a record of getting paperwork and outreach material to arrive on the day after the last day of a meeting. I just wanted to alert you to that. This has happened on several occasions at IGF. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Before Dev answers, let me make my closing remarks now. We've been talking about the outreach event for Marrakesh for months and months, on the theory that there should be one, and we haven't talked specifics.

At a meeting not too long ago, someone suggested maybe we should get the Outreach and Engagement Committee involved in this outreach event. I thought that was a brilliant suggestion, and I didn't make it so I'm not saying that because it was mine. Dev and his group has embraced it, has been working with the people from AFRALO, so this is not being done unilaterally by the subcommittee without the local people involved, and is doing it very diligently. I have no fears that they're leaving details like this un-thought of. Dev, I'll go back to you and then to Tijani.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Yes, Olivier, we are well aware of that. We had a call for the Outreach and Engagement today. Was it today? Yes. Maybe yesterday at this point. It was yesterday. Anyway. We had a call just earlier and this was one of the concerns that we had. We created a Wiki space to start listing the type of documents that are needed. There's also been discussion of giving the students USB flash drives if the budget allows with even more materials and stuff like that, in case there are bandwidth issues. It's in progress.

ALAN GREENBERG: For a project that the subcommittee has only been working on now for about two weeks, I'm very pleased.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Tijani. We heard the "thank you very much" but nothing else.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Now you hear me better.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

The first thing is that more people will be going to the university. We talked about [inaudible] a lecture between lunch and [inaudible] mainly French speakers because people, they understand better the French than English. I [propose] that Alan would be [from] people who will go there, and also Cheryl because of their experience, because of they are also [inaudible] in this kind of work.

The second thing I [will] ask to be added to the outreach list, at least until Marrakesh so that I will [inaudible] all the calls and help with the [inaudible] to shape, more or less, the contents of the outreach. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. We're going to have to look at just what we're scheduling opposite it and make sure that we're using the time effectively, and at the same time doing the best we can for the outreach event. We seem to have a very bad echo now.

Any other questions? Seeing no more. Then we will go on to the next item. We are a little behind schedule, but not too much.

The next item is CCWG accountability, something that no one's ever heard of before. The first thing we're going to be looking at is the plan for next actions. Just how are we going forward to try to complete this? I'm going to ask Leon to address the slides we have and the description. Now, he's going to have to use all of his best techniques as a lawyer. The reality is, we really don't know how we're going forward, and we're not

quite sure what the timeline is and how the end point is, but he's going to make it sound as if he understands completely and it's all under control. León?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, you're right. If I can't convince you, I will confuse you, so we're definitely on the same track.

We received input from the GNSO and the GAC today. Well, from GNSO a couple days ago, and from the GAC, we received their input just hours ago, some six or seven hours ago.

I went through the GAC feedback and it seems pretty good to me. There are, of course, some open issues that still need to be further assessed by the GAC, since the discussion, the CCWG itself, hasn't been closed on several items. Of course, we have the [inaudible] for the GAC, which is Stress Test 18, recommendation 11. But overall, they didn't reject it so far, so that's a good sign for me. They are only telling us that they don't have a consensus position on it so far, so that in some kind of point of view, it is actually encouraging.

Of course, the next steps would be to review the timeline. We are pending reviewing the timeline so we can tell not only the chartering organizations, but the operational communities and the number communities that are expecting us to deliver these proposals to the board for them to forward it to the NTIA. They are waiting for us to provide a timeline, so I guess that will be something that the cultures will be doing within the next few days, and hopefully we will be able to present a draft review timeline in our call on Thursday.

As you know, we have been holding two calls per week, each one of them three hours. We have some issues that are already in third reading, like for example, the human rights issue that tomorrow will be having its third reading. We have also some issues that are already closed, and some issues that are far from being closed.

The next step would be to of course check the reviewed language that is contemplating or incorporating the different comments that we're getting, not only from the public comment period, but also from the discussions that we've been holding in our last meetings. The working method that we have adopted is to go to each of the recommendations, try to incorporate the feedback that we got from the public comment period, discuss it with the larger working group, and get their feedback on whether these first amendments on the report actually reflect the different concerns and comments raised by the community and the public comment period. Afterwards, if it does reflect the input received, then we, of course, ask for approval from the group or for any feedback or any comments that we might have not been considered. Then we will be amending each of the recommendations accordingly.

We have done this with pretty much all of the recommendations so far, and this will produce a supplemental report, but I want to be clear that the supplemental report doesn't mean that we will be drafting an additional annex that will be addressing the different concerns and comments. Rather, we will be, as I said, incorporating the different concerns and comments into the third proposal and producing a final version, which would be this supplemental report. After that, we will be

publishing the supplemental report and hopefully not opening it for a fourth public comment period, but instead, approval of the chartering organizations.

This would, of course, hopefully lead us to having the finalized recommendation before Marrakesh. If a vote needs to take place at the different chartering organizations, it could also take place before Marrakesh or, at the latest, in Marrakesh so we can deliver this proposal to the board, and then the board forwards it to the NTIA.

We have had also a couple of calls with the NTIA and we have asked them as co-chairs to begin reviewing our document instead of waiting for the final version and having them review it and, let's say, that three or four months' time from now, and in the end finding out that there is something wrong with the report and going back again to the drawing board. We kindly ask them to begin reviewing it so that they identify any red lines already. They can tell us so we can, of course, fix them accordingly. Then when the proposal actually gets into their hands and the rest of the agency that needs to go through it will have something that is pretty much consistent with what they're expecting, and we will not have any surprises of needing to go back again to step one and rebuilding the proposal. I guess that's an overview of the next steps, and of course, I am happy to answer to any questions.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I have two questions. I'm asking them both to León Sanchez with the knowledge that you have as a co-chair but not in your position as co-chair. The GAC's comment on recommendation 11 that is Stress Test 18 and how it will be changed to satisfy the US government and the board and not dissatisfy the GAC, their answer at this point is – and I quote – “There is no consensus within the GAC to adopt a formal position on this recommendation.”

Do you read that as saying they may choose in the final result also to simply be silent?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Well, that's a possibility. So far as I can tell, I know that, or I've been told at least... I can't tell you that I know for a fact, but rather, I have been told that there are opposite views within the GAC. There is a group that is okay with Stress Test 18 as it stands today. There is, of course, another group of countries that is opposing stress test 18 as it is, and there is a lot of other countries that really don't mind how Stress Test 18 goes forward. I think that you're absolutely right. We have three paths from which the GAC can choose to go with.

As I said, the only good thing about this input is that they are not rejecting already Stress Test 18. I would have expected maybe a more violent reaction from them on Stress Test 18, and it wasn't the case, so that's, as I said, kind of encouraging.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Certainly, there's also people within the GAC who do not want to see them being the impediment for their transition not going forward.

The second question is somewhat related to it. The charter, if I remember correctly, says something like – and I'm not trying to quote verbatim – that if only one chartering organization objects, the proposal can go forward, and the others agree.

There has been a discussion at various levels that we should make that decision on a recommendation by recommendation basis.

For instance, the ALAC could categorically reject Recommendation 1 and the GNSO categorically reject Recommendation 2, but since not more than one AC or SO is rejecting each recommendation, it can go forward. Is that an interpretation that you would think might be taken ultimately?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Yes, Alan. I think you are right in that there has been wide discussion about having one of the chartering organizations not approving the report at all. I think was some kind of interpretation from [Silvia Vivano] in our charter, but our charter doesn't really say that. Our charter says that in the case... I am of course paraphrasing. I'm not quoting verbatim, as you said. Our charter said that if any single chartering organization or any AC or SO does not approve on the report, it can file their minority view and it is up to... I'm not sure if it's up to the co-chairs or is it up to the CCWG to actually just include that [inaudible] and forward that version of the document to the ICANN board so the ICANN board would

forward it to the NTIA. Having a single SO or AC reject the proposal doesn't mean, in fact, that the proposal would be deemed void.

As for your question on having random recommendations rejected by one single SO or AC in different cases, I think that [too] could fly. So far as there is not much push back or there is not collective push back on a single recommendation, I think that could actually fly. In that case, the CCWG would be able to file those recommendations that are being rejected by the single SO or SC as minority reports in my view.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. Your interpretation of the charter is not right because the charter is to [think] about the [application] of the proposal, and not the [inaudible] of the recommendations one by one.

I think that it is the SOs and ACs to decide if they reject one recommendation, it will affect the full report or no, means that we may disagree with recommendation number one, but accept the report in general.

In another case, we may reject one recommendation and because we reject this recommendation, we reject the whole report.

The charter is speaking only about the application of the proposal as a whole. If we go recommendation by recommendation, it will really

[inaudible] the point of view of the SOs and ACs. It means that you can pass the proposal issue, even if you have all the SOs and ACs [disagree] with some parts of the report.

It is our duty as SOs and ACs, our duty as chartering organizations, to decide whether our position regarding one recommendation may affect the whole report or not, but we don't have to accept this rejection of one single recommendation to pass all the recommendations one by one and see if we have more than one chartering organization rejecting it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. I asked the question because I'm well aware that some ACs or SOs, or certainly one specific one, may not actually be in a position to make a decision as a unit, but will simply combine the votes of those component parts, and it may not have the discretion to decide whether one recommendation is enough to break the camel's back, so to speak. That's why I was thinking about flexibility, but we'll see how it unfolds. Any other further questions on this item?

There is a second thing with regard to accountability that we need to do, but I'd like to close the discussion on the current state first. Seeing no comments. No hands. We'll go on to item number B.

Item number B is something that Sébastien had suggested, and I agreed with him. We have been talking all along that on the assumption that the ALAC will be a participant in the empowered community. That is, should there be a power to exercise, we will choose to participate in it.

He suggested that we should actually take a formal vote on that and be on record saying, “Yes, we will participate.” I'd like to have a brief discussion if anyone has any input. If you're just saying, “Yes, we should,” then you don't need to say anything right now. If there's anyone who feels this is not the way to go for one reason or another, then I would like to hear about it because barring any significant concerns, I will put out a motion and start an online vote in the near future.

Just to be clear, the motion will essentially say that ALAC reaffirms or affirms that should the bylaws be adjusted to have an empowered community as per the proposal of the CCWG accountability, the ALAC will be participating in that community process. Seeing no hands, no complaining.

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Alan. I wanted to [inaudible] I was wondering, [inaudible] taking votes [inaudible] approve the statement we [inaudible] isn't that' sufficient enough to indicate the fact that [inaudible] actually going to participate in the [inaudible] one by one for some of these things? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is it's not clear. You may well be right that by accepting the second draft proposal – and ultimately if we accept the third draft proposal, by accepting the recommendation that there will be an empowered community which mentions us, we are tacitly agreeing that we will participate. But I don't think it hurts to go on record before we get to the proposal to make it really clear because over the months of the CCWG, every once in a while, someone says, “And we don't know if the ALAC is going to be participating or not.” Even though we had gone through the process you're describing, that has still been said. An online vote costs very little, and I think it's a good thing to do just to make our position crystal clear.

Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I think it's important to have this [decision] because there was discussion about which community will participate. The GAC will be there, the GNSO, ccNSO, ISO will be there or not. I think we need to say formally that if we are going in that direction, we will be

participating. To be blunt, I will vote yes for that and I may vote no for the report. That's two different things.

If the reports pass, I like to be part of that. I am not sure that the report is a good one today for ICANN, but that's another topic and I don't want to link the two things. I think it's important that in the discussion on how we build the [empowered] community, we can ensure that ALAC will be there if there is an [empowered] community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Sébastien. Any other comments? Hearing nothing. Then we'll go on to the next item. Just for the record, we are ten minutes over schedule. We may be able to make it up, but we may not, so if I could ask staff to check with interpreters if they could go a little bit over if necessary. I'll turn the floor over to Olivier at this point. Is Olivier with us?

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Olivier has to find a way to actually undo the mute on his phone.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That explanation has taken 30 seconds of your five minutes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Oh, God. That's the speed at which my mind is working at the moment. At the moment, I think you might see it. I hope that you can see it on your screen somehow. I sent a document out over to the Finance and

Budget Subcommittee, but also to the ALT for feedback on this document. If you can scroll through it... I think that you all have scrolling on it, yeah. You can scroll through it.

The document itself starts with just a brief introduction of what we're going to set out on this. There's a historical background of the fact that At-Large has conducted a lot of face-to-face meetings.

The audience for this paper is not only the board but also the rest of the community because ultimately, if one looks at the accountability process, you can see that there will be a lot more emphasis on the community approving budgets or being able to veto budgets. Obviously, when we are going to be presenting this whole proposal for having multi-year budgets for our face-to-face meetings, there is likely to be an increased emphasis on the feedback from the rest of the community.

The start of this paper is really there to try and explain, first, the fact that we're not just asking for something new. This is something that we've done for many years. This is something that we have done, in fact, since before the different RALOs were created, etc. Then also that it's very important for this to happen. It's not just one of these optional things of saying, "We're going to get the At-Large community meet every now and then optionally, and if we don't have the time or the money or if we can't be bothered, we just won't let them meet." It's an inherent part of what At-Large does.

There is an extensive section on why our face-to-face meeting is important, and then it goes into trying to also show the advantages of

why our multi-year budget is better than this ad-hoc system that we've used so far, which is there to, as you say, the additional budget requests. That's primarily based on the feedback that we have received in past processes where, for example, when we asked for the second At-Large Summit, this pretty much came up as a shot in the dark or something brand new for everyone in ICANN. Certainly, ICANN finance looked at it and when, "Ooh, we wished we could have had a bit more notice on this sort of thing," but they couldn't have forecasted it.

Multi-year budgets are, in general, for any organization, better than single-year budgets. Being able to have some kind of a visibility towards the future, being able to forecast, plan, to look at the state of finances of the organization is definitely a good thing. The emphasis was really on [their] saying not only does it benefit At-Large, but it benefits the whole organization, and it's good practice to move forward with. Then there's a section on how to read the table itself. I am just checking.

There was a little bit more information on this, which I have shared. There's a new version of this document, by the way, because this is the 6th of January. There's a new version that is somewhere. I can't remember where. I will share it. Anyway, there was a little section that just added also some feedback as to what this table was all about and explained the table. The overall view that we were to look at a five-year cycle between each At-Large Summit, but also in between these five years, there would be at least one general assembly for each one of the regions. We're looking pretty much at two and a half years' cycle for the general assembly, since we also know that each RALO will have a general assembly at an overall Summit.

The table is a document that's on a Google Doc, so it's easily accessible. I think it's quite important that whatever audience reads through this is going to be able to understand the table. I really ask for your feedback on the table, because I've already made some improvements based on the feedback received. Hopefully this table can be self-explanatory, but there's a lot of information that's on there. It starts all the way back in November 2008, looking at our first At-Large Summit. It looks at every bit of money that was spent throughout the past few years and looks at the forecast.

The forecast taking us all the way to a potential ATLAS III, third Summit, with a rotation of the general assemblies next year and the year after. Looking at the columns, pretty straightforward. The first column is the meeting number. You've got not only the meeting number, but also the reference of what fiscal year that is. I know it's a little bit confusing for people because, if you remember, years and fiscal years don't actually agree with each other. The fiscal year starts in July and ends in June. Hopefully that actually shows the split in the year.

Then you've got the date. Then you've got the fiscal year again. Then you've got your Summit year, so that's pretty much a counter that tells you how many years it has been after... Year zero is the year of the Summit, but it's also the same as the [fifth] year. The ATLAS column is just one that is filled up when there's an ATLAS Summit. The meeting type column is only used from this meeting onward in Marrakesh, meeting type A, B or C. Obviously that would be important when choosing when having a general assembly or specifically when having an

At-Large Summit. The meeting type B would probably be completely unsuited to receive an At-Large Summit.

Next line is the city, country. That's quite forward. Region and RALO, you can see where the meetings are taking place and where the location is. I've tried to use the coloring used in our usual RALO colors. GA Due is whether a general assembly is actually due at that meeting for that RALO. GA Granted is whether a general assembly was granted or not. One if it's yes. It's a zero if it's a no. That's a Boolean operator because afterwards, the next four columns are all about calculating things.

GA Cost at an ICANN Meeting gives you the theoretical cost or the calculated cost of the meeting. GA Cost at Other Events is self-explanatory. At-Large Summit Cost is self-explanatory, too, but what then happens is if a GA is not granted or an At-Large Summit is not granted, it doesn't show into the total cost for the year.

For example, if you look at fiscal year 14, there was an At-Large Summit that took place in London, and it shows \$650,000 that were spent there, but there was a saving of GAs in two other regions, so we had the ability to do a minus one for each one of the other two regions. That calculated the automatic cost in the fiscal year 14 totals. That's probably the more complex part of the sheet.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I was just going to say finally the last two columns are pretty self-explanatory, too, so I'm open to any questions or comments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I think this is an awful lot for people to absorb, so I think we really want to give people a chance to take a look at it and comment, but perhaps you want to highlight what timeline we're looking at. How much time do people have to get input into you?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Yes. The timeline is very tight. I can't remember offhand at this time of the morning when is the special budget request cycle ending, but we really have to have this out before that special request budget cycle ends. I guess we'll probably have to do both things in parallel. For next fiscal year, we need to have the special requests for the general assemblies to be filed on one hand, just in case we don't manage to reach an agreement with whoever it is we need to reach an agreement with on the process of having a multi-year budget.

Ideally, next couple of weeks, I would say. We're the 26th of January now, so next couple of weeks, but of course, I'll work with the ALAC Finance and Budget Subcommittee on this. Alan, perhaps you could let me know what your timings are for this. I'd just like to [inaudible] as quickly as possible so we can then go ahead and contact the board, go and share it with other parts of ICANN as well, and engage the discussion prior to Marrakesh, hopefully.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Staff will distribute the documents and we'll put a timeline there, which will make it clear what our requirements are. We will try to give people as much time as possible, but it is a short turnaround, so please don't put it off if you want to have any input into this process.

Any quick questions? Sébastien? We are very over time right now, so try to keep it short.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. I think first that it's important that... I don't think the B meeting could be a place to hold an ATLAS meeting at all. We need to be careful for that, because it's four days and it will be very difficult to have three or two more days. I think B will need to be outside of the scope. The second point, I think it's very, very important what Olivier's proposing and what we are doing because if you remember – maybe not – the decision taken in 2008 was the first Summit.

I just want to give you one sentence. The decision of the board at that time was, "Board approves a proposal to hold an ICANN At-Large Summit as a one-time special event, directs ALAC to work with ICANN staff to implement it, and note it expects ALAC to look to more self-funding of At-Large travel for the fiscal year [than planned]." We've never done the last piece of this sentence, but if somebody else like me can read that and [come] back, we will get into trouble. I really think that it's important what we are doing here. Thank you, Olivier, for bringing that to our consideration. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien. I'll point out that that was a comment at that point that we should look for funding for our travel, period. Not necessarily for an ATLAS or for Summit. That was a different world than we're in right now. Yes, someone may find the words and say, "Did we ever do it?" but the GNSO hasn't done it either, and the GNSO since then has doubled its funding for travel. Yes, the world was different. I'm not sure I really want to worry about that particular item, but nevertheless, we do have to make the case.

Tijani, quickly?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Excellent white paper. Thank you very much, Olivier. We have to comment on it very soon because, as Olivier said, time is very short. Having the ATLAS and the general assembly as a [inaudible] event and included in the ICANN budget is something very important. If we manage to have this approved, we really have had a very good step forward. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Tijani. Seeing no more hands, no more voices. I thank Olivier. This work is excellent, and we need to push forward on it as quickly as possible.

The next item is Fiscal Year 17 budget requests, coincidentally. I'll turn it over to Heidi. Given that we have not been able to get this document out to you early, we probably will not use our full 15 minutes, but we'll

just do a very brief overview and ask for [solicit] comments on the list or by attending the various meetings that we'll be having relating to these budget requests. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Alan. I'll just take a few minutes, actually. The deadline for Fiscal Year 17 special community requests was this past Friday, and we have, as you can see in the workspace up on Adobe Connect, we have now posted all of them that we have received. We have six ALAC or ALAC Subcommittee or Working Group requests, and we have 13 from the RALOs, so a total of 19 requests at the moment.

We've done a little bit different on the workspace this year. We've added the request, who it's from on the table, and then we have added the description as well. That allows easier access to understand what these various requests are.

As a quick overview, we have received requests for ALAC and RALO development sessions for ICANN 57 in Puerto Rico. We have an ALAC strategy session. We have received two general assembly requests, one from AFRALO for Meeting B in Africa next June 2017, and one for NARALO for a general assembly in Puerto Rico this autumn. We have several requests for training and capacity building sessions. We have two IGF requests.

In terms of communication, we received another request for the next phase in the captioning project, a request for an augmented reality to transfer existing documentation within At-Large and ICANN into

augmented reality, and then also a request for the LACRALO translation tool to be fixed.

That's a very general overview. In terms of next steps, there will be a call of the FBSC this week with relevant staff. That includes a person from the finance department, as well as Rob [Hogar], who will be able to discuss some of these requests with the FBSC. The requests will then be reviewed by the FBSC and comments will be then sent back to those first people who have submitted those comments with the ability to revise. They will be sent back to the FBSC for final review, and then a decision will be made to submit them to the ICANN controller by the 15th of February. I think that's it, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. So 15th of February is about two weeks, two and a half weeks away from here. That's a lot of steps in between now and then. Let's cross our fingers and hope we can actually pull it off. Any comments or questions? Most people haven't had much chance to see any of this, other than the ones you may have submitted yourself, so I really don't want to detailed discussion right now, but are there any questions either on the plan going forward or the timing of it? Seeing no hands.

I think we've made up a fair amount of the time. We are officially at the end of the meeting. Do we have the ability to keep on going? Yes, I see we have a note for ten more minutes for interpretation, and we should be able to cover it, I hope.

The next item is the letter that the ALAC sent to Fadi Chehadé on consumer trust and compliance and the response that came back. Garth, are you in a position to give any brief comments on it and we can have a discussion on how we plan to go forward? We should give him some answer going back.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. I'll be as brief as possible because we're running late. There were four major concerns in the letter and there were four responses in the letter from Fadi. I think that the responses require a response.

First, in terms of the consumer safeguard director, they pledged 15 months ago to hire such a person. It hasn't been done yet. They say that they've been working on it, yet I've gone and tried to look for the open positions in various places on ICANN's website and different job hiring sites. Haven't been able to find any postings for this position, so we need to clarify that.

In terms of number two, the compliance department's philosophy accepting to preserve the security, stability, resiliency of the Domain Name System and to promote consumer trust, they have affirmed that this is one of the goals of the department.

Number three concerns their consultations with ALAC, which they seem to have missed earlier. I think that we need to make sure that we follow up and request a specific appointment in Marrakesh to discuss this, as they've noted in the letter.

Number four, in terms of outreach to consumer groups, it sounds like they need help in identifying consumer groups. We should actually provide a list of consumer groups they should talk to, including some of our own membership.

The overall concern in this letter is that I'm not sure if they completely understand who the consumer really is. They cite a number of industry groups, government agencies, different types of industry groups. I don't see any real consumer groups in the list of groups they've talked to. I think that we need to make sure that they know what a consumer is and have a clearer idea of who they should be talking to. That should be the basis of any of our responses. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Garth. I tend to agree with pretty much everything you said. I'm not sure I agree with the first one. I don't know what level this position is at, and if it's being done through headhunters and whether I can normally post such positions. I just don't know. They may or they may not. That, we need to look at. Short of calling them a liar, saying, "You haven't been looking," I think we're going to have to accept it at face value, unless, of course, they don't meet the commitment of actually having someone or close to someone by Marrakesh.

The rest of it, I think I agree, and specifically on the last one. That's as close as I've seen from compliance coming to humbleness and saying, "You may be right. We don't know what we're talking about. Please help

us.” I think we have to make sure that we don't ignore that one and then they can use us as the excuse why they're not doing anything going forward. There's not a lot of substance in what they're saying in terms of the past, but there's an implied commitment that can be called. That way they can be called on at this point. Yes, we'll have a new CEO by that time. Hopefully, the new one, we can indoctrinate quickly to make sure that it's not dropped.

I thank you, and I follow up with you on... I see your hand up. I'll turn the floor over to you in a minute. We'll follow up together and try to put together a response and pass it by the ALAC. Go ahead, Garth.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. In terms of point one, they list lots of different open positions directly on their website for different positions that they've budgeted and they need to fill. I think in terms of this particular position, this consumer safeguards director, this is one position that really should be consulted with the community.

We need to know what their hiring standards are, what the qualifications for the job are, at least, and what type of people they're looking for because here, they're saying in this letter, they don't seem to know who the consumer is. They don't know who the consumer groups are, yet we don't know what their search criteria is for a person in this position. That's a problem right there, and that's what I want to ask them is, “What's your search process been to fill this position?”

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure we want to ask them what their search process is, but what the qualifications they're looking for certainly are relevant. That's a good point.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. That's all, then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else on this one? No? Then I think we are finished other than any other business, unless anyone has any. There was nothing suggested at the beginning. Would anyone like to add anything at this point? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices. I thank you, in that case, for the meeting at this new, inventive time. I thank people who are doing it at a rather awkward time, on a rather awkward day. This is the first ALAC meeting in my nine-year career that I think I started on a Monday instead of a Tuesday. It's interesting for all of us. I'd like to thank all the staff on the call for contributing their parts, and thank you very much to all of the interpreters for their superb work, as normal.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everybody.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll see you online and at the meeting next month. Bye, bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day, or evening, or morning.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]