ALAC Meeting Notes
11, 12, 14 July 2005
Luxembourg ICANN Meeting
(Note: these are informal meeting notes provided for public information; they are not transcripts and accuracy is not guaranteed)

Monday 11 July – Vittorio Bertola, Izumi Aizu, Jean Armour Polly, Annette Muehlburg, Roberto Gaetano, Bret Fausett, John Levine, Sebastian Ricciardi, Tommy Matsumoto; Denise Michel, ICANN; and members of the public

- Agenda and scheduling discussions
- Liaison reports
    - RG – no consensus yet on approving Strat Plan; it is tied to budget and operational plan; discussion continues; he recommended Board approve a short strat plan document with key issues and have an annex that says discussions will continue and details will be added; Board spending lot of time discussing sTLD applications – particularly long discussions on .xxx and .cat; need to have strategy for new gTLDs and operational plan for approving them; .NET decision very controversial and Board was split; Verisign was awarded contract in tight vote; GNSO input stating Telcordia did not apply criteria was strongest argument in favor of temporarily extending contract and continue consideration – this was rejected by Board; RG would prefer to speak from consensus of ALAC, but also shares personal opinion and shares received input/comments with Board.
    - BF – WHOIS task force continues to have weekly meetings to "take temperature" of people and getting reports and gathering information, especially from Registrars and Registries; these two constituencies have issued a proposal – name servers and administrative contact would be public and rest would not; registrant contact data would be offline, coupled with tiered access; should consider giving ALAC support to this; new gTLDs – cross-constituency white paper under discussion at constituency level and will be raised; expect a task force; Aug 1 deadline on new TLD question paper and ALAC should provide input; should have public discussion on mail list about this and he will draft position; message from Board is everyone needs to be working on this; GNSO wants to be the conduit for all input on new gTLDs (ALAC has responsibility to advise Board as well); GNSO public forum is evolving as important place to advance At-Large positions – WHOIS privacy should be addressed now;
- New ALSs
    - VB – problems with ALS approval process; many members don't vote or take too long to vote; have discussed changing process in past and Denise has circulated proposal for change; need to reconsider process now;
    - AM – need regional ALAC members to verify applicant's qualifications; should have regional members report on applicant
    - SR – when responsibility is diluted among 3 people it is often difficult to get action/closure; see proposal he circulated; suggests 1 member be "endorser" of every applicant; co-chair responsible for ALS/AL network building selects "endorser" if is none;
    - VB – asked for focal point member in each region;
    - IA – procedural question and commitment question; suggests members be removed if they are not active;
    - AM – all people in region should have first vote on proposal and then all of ALAC votes;
    - SR – not practical to not have an enforcement mechanism to make ALAC members do their jobs; you cannot require all 3 regional members to be involved/approve
    - AM – agree; should have short period to allow regional members to object;
    - IA – suggest ALAC address issue that we lack quorum; problem is often no responses;
    - VB – problem is if there is any problem or question about proposal people don't vote and you can't get 10 votes; problem is if 3-4 people aren't convinced and abstain we can't get votes

- o SR – need to have outreach strategy and what we want accomplish;
  - o JL – problem with accreditation process is it is stuck;
- Self Review
  - o AM – EURALO, new TLD workshop, and GAC meeting yesterday, but not happy with preparation of ALAC strategy for RALOs; should do more promotion on workshop; for GAC should prepare and be more strategic and define potential alliance;
  - o IA – sent draft review in MdP meeting and observation hasn't changed; has doubts about model working in timely manner; criticism of ALAC from outside; should try to create RALO under framework given and think of plan B
  - o JA – congrats to Bret for successful workshop and pushing policy statements; concerned about lack of activity by some members; need to look into getting rid of dead wood; on cusp of doing something great
  - o BF – if we have people who aren't responding we need to ask them to resign (move them to observer status); ALAC can change its procedures when it has quorum
  - o RG – problem is replacing deadwood with living wood; need to raise with NomCom need to have stand-by or mechanism to replace someone who resigns; for RALO there is rising criticism about model and its potential value; try hard until end of year and determine value; if we succeed and create RALO it will help with outreach and replacing ALAC members; will give up at end of year on RALO
  - o JL – no chance of having NARALO; N.Americans have many other ways of influencing ICANN; At-Large can make a difference with website/communication and engaging members; reduce quorum and move forward; accrediting ALSs – votes yes on all of the ALS applications to save time; ALAC doesn't have much power so don't see point in encouraging people to become involved
  - o SR – disagrees; thinks ALAC is one of the most influential bodies; Board asked for our opinion and community responds to ALAC statements; in ICANN's bottom-up process At-Large is important and ALAC has made important accomplishments; if you want more power show more leadership;
  - o TM – agree with SR and has made much progress; ALAC activity of forming RALO is way of getting user voices to top is major focus and is promoting involvement – especially for developing countries; in AP we have small numbers but many here and interested in forming RALO – and this is very important (along with certifying ALSs).
  - o Ku Wei Wu – it is good we have chance for individuals participating; difficult to understand application process and it needs to be more transparent; doesn't know of better mechanism and will work to form APRALO;
- Other
  - o SR – share problems of committed members with NomCom; must address Bret's proposals on mission and vision statements
- .MOBI
  - o Wants 2 At-large representatives on it advisory committee
- Meeting with NCUC
  - o Agenda bashing… discuss shared issues, ways of coordinating our activities; WHOIS, new gTLDs, IDNs, .NET, Registrar auctions, WSIS/WGIG and USDOC statement
  - o New gTLDs discussion… [no notes]; IDNs proposal to split – go forward with ascii TLDs and wait on IDN TLDs, since the latter needs different process, and IDN policy should not be the purview of the GSNO; worry about separating it would slow IDNs; Adam Peake drafting a potential statement for consideration; concern expressed about giving IDNs to ccTLDs and thereby allowing a country to control a language in the DNS (language communities instead of countries)
  - o WGIG – VB doesn't expect much effect on ICANN internally, but should use it to push for ICANN change – more transparency, accountability, translations; another WGIG member said report would broadly recommend changes for inclusiveness and a focus on including developing world participants; another WGIG member also noted civil/human rights and intellectual property issues;

Tuesday, 12 July – Annette Muehlberg, John Levine, Sebastian Ricciardi, Tommy Matsumoto, Vittorio Bertola, Izumi Aizu, Pierre Dandjinou, Jean Armour Polly, Roberto Gaetano; Denise Michel, ICANN; and members of the public

- ALS approval process
  - RG – identify problem; difficulty approving due to low attendance in voting;
  - VB – 3-4 people who don't vote/participate; not resolving issues, asking questions
  - SR – need co-chair to deal with AL building and run process; one person in charge of application and interact with members and resolve questions/issues
  - AM – want regions giving positions; don't know if some ALAC members are alive or dead; ask people to resign if they aren't involved in ALAC; could reduce the amount of number needed for vote
  - IA – some of members aren't active (raised in MdP); contact them
  - JA – likes Annette's suggestion of regions making recommendations; say here's the vote and who recommended
  - PD – asked members if they want to continued involvement
  - DM – this was done late last year and every member re-confirmed their commitment
  - VB – proposal: require clear opinion from members from region (with deadline?); minimum requirements for member participation, or be excluded from the cmt; change of approval requirements in bylaws; one person tasked with responsibility to push applications through?
  - SR – talk to NomCom about problem of non-participation
  - DM – Bylaws created as safeguard facing uncertainty of community response to new AL structure; quality of groups that have submitted ALS applications to date show that there is not a need for such a high threshold of approval – do not need 2/3 vote to approve; ALAC challenge is to get people involved, not keep them out; amend the bylaws and move on to real work.
  - TM – thinks process is OK, but how to involve all members in discussion and encourage participation is important?
  - PD – ask colleagues why they aren't participating; may be scheduling/other commitments; its important we hear from them and ask them specific questions;
  - VB – DM and I will write members who are not here; make proposal for …[no notes]
  - IA – wants warning and then impeachment of non-involved members
  - SR – emailed members and asked if any questions; requiring full report on pending ALS applications in their region (as someone suggested) would be burdensome
  - RG – discuss application on teleconferences
  - RG – a quick response; ask for explanations and suggest corrections; all no votes should respond to rapporteur
  - AM – should have to explain if vote NO
  - VB – will make proposal for bylaw changes edit etc.; Pierre and Sebastian will report ASAP on applications from their regions
- Regional Reports and Outreach
  - TM – using APNG sub-group to involve new people and developing country groups;
  - IA – APRALO meeting Thurs. morning; does not know if RALO structure will work
  - PD – had consultant support in Accra and conducted outreach event earlier in year; Kenya event was cancelled; did outreach at AfriNIC; interest in forming RALO
  - RG – EU RALO meeting; EGENI outreach resulted in ISOC Pacific Islands application for AP; concerned about predominance of ISOC in Europe; need to provide some value for ALS certification and focus on involving ALS/RALO in ICANN work SR – MdP ICANN meeting was a big help in soliciting interest and applications; Carlos Afonso's comments opposing ICANN was problematic and hurt Brazilian involvement; more activity in Internet arena so situation improving; focus on Caribbean this quarter; thinking about how to get real participation from ALSs;
- Ombudsman (Frank Fowlie)

- o FF - Took ALAC suggestion on multilingualism; posted information in 6 languages and will post Ombudsman report in 4 languages; 130-140 complaints thus far, not counting 900 emails from religious website on .XXX (typical complaint on this was form email opposing pornography/.xxx and he responded with "outside my jurisdiction" statement); 8 ADR, 2 system improvement recommendations; others resolved…[no notes]; true ICANN issues - 2 from organizations/large companies and the rest from individuals (and small businesses)
  - o IA – any complaints about ALAC?
  - o FF - Confidentiality – can't discuss unless notifying ALAC will help resolve; hasn't received any about ALAC; has provided Denise advice regarding unreasonable delay
  - o RG – important to distinguish between complaint and improving system
  - o FF - Made at least 2 recommendations for system improvements; if he were to receive ALAC complaint and went through ADR and arrived at recommendation for change, he would give ALAC formal recommendation; if receives significant # of complaints would examine need for change in process
  - o FF - Not an advocate for complainant, is an advocate for fairness
  - o VB – public comments on .NET
  - o FF - Determine if issue is they have not followed advise or if they have not given reasons for decision
  - o IA – do you see significant change after Ombudsman instituted
  - o FF - Wasn't in ICANN before so context difficult; has worked through some individuals expectations of him being a "policeman" or tool for people's anger; happy that this program is unique – probably only ADR program that works entirely over Internet;
  - o IA – hard to find on website; need explanation of what Ombudsman
  - o FF - Don't want to make it too easy… [no notes]
- NomCom (George Sadowsky; Jeannette Hoffman; Adam Peake)
  - o GS - Process report – data must be opaque; confidential input; don't allow data sharing from year to year; distinguished people would not want public to know they were not selected; non-selection due to geographic, gender balance
  - o AP – if public it would open NomCom to lobbying, which they aren't set-up for
  - o GS – Initial deadline extended; always get applications in the last few days so extend; 20 July; always encourage submission of more qualified names; concerned about disillusioned rejected people; will suggest some changes in process; mid-Sept final decisions and vetting selections; need to announce Oct 27 or before;
  - o AP – if you're asked for a reference please give detailed reference;
  - o JH – if you don't like someone you can contact person and tell them you can't give a good reference; person gives NomCom references to contact; references are a decisive resource
  - o IA – Does NomCom need any help?
  - o GS – NomCom and community need to solicit volunteers
  - o JH – especially need statements of interest from women and developing countries
  - o SR – people with strong credentials sometimes don't have time to participate
  - o GS – changed somewhat to address this; use references
  - o AP – spent more time telling people how much time it will take to serve
  - o GS – look at position description of ALAC and determine if it needs to be changed
  - o PD – challenge of involvement for Africa individuals
  - o JH – striking difference between ICANN and WSIS; need to make extra effort in developing countries
  - o JA – suggests booth at WSIS events (DM – already doing that)
  - o TM – need to remember important mission of forming RALO; need people with leadership and vision to help form RALO; outreach ability
  - o IA – consider some ways to smoothly fill interim vacancies; as Interim would like to go off and use NomCom process to be involved again'

- o GS – are asking people if they want to be considered for interim vacancies; filling vacancy on GNSO Council
  - o JH – NomCom still thinking about how to improve process; is it enriching competence, etc;
- Proposed Statements for Luxembourg Public Forum
  - o Proposed IDN joint statement with NCUC -- Need to get ALAC members input; will email to list and seek Hong advice tomorrow morning when she arrives
  - o Budget Advisory Group statement -- Removed "gTLD" and "for the coming year" and emailed to ALAC list for comment
  - o Statement on Transparency and Public Participation -- Edited in various places and sent to list

Thursday, 14 August -- John Levine, Sebastian Ricciardi, Vittorio Bertola, Izumi Aizu, Jean Armour Polly, Annette Muehlberg, Hong Xue; Denise Michel, ICANN; and members of the public

- Budget – VB - Will send email to PT regarding expenditures
- Positions – VB – Will discuss process for new appointments to ALAC positions; Vittorio stepping down in Vancouver
- Review –
  - o ? - New developments since previous draft of review; AP meeting well attended and productive this morning;
  - o ? - Discussed Malaysia application (Denise will send email regarding closure);
  - o IA – suggests ending original ALAC members terms; members can be appointed again but important to avoid perception as "squatters"
  - o VB – need to ask members again if they are able to serve; present formal set of resignations; NomCom could possible appoint;
  - o VB – concern about perception if all resign at once
  - o DM – bylaw change may be needed
  - o SR – does not want to send message that we think we have not done a good job; should get on with our real work
  - o IA – resignations not tied to review, just that 3 years long enough; although critical in past, we have done a lot; will this RALO thing really fly; may want to reconsider another structure – global one so don't need 5 MOUs, secretariats etc.
  - o VB – determine if agreement to change bylaws or resign or…
  - o JL – for bylaw revisions people should draft and share language to consider; don't think should change bylaws for temporary appointments, but should determine if RALO feasible and then may want to change bylaws on that
  - o HX – need long term planning,
  - o IA – In MdP agreed to try until end of year
  - o JA – should not discuss bylaws until Vancouver
  - o HX – evaluation or self-review?
  - o VB – ALAC did not receive the self-review and long-term plan Izumi Aizu and Clement Dzidonu were supposed to do;
  - o …[no notes]…
  - o PD – conduct complete review and give to Board by Vancouver
  - o SR – appears JL is setting inappropriate standard for approving applications; when think of applying process we decided to invite anyone interested and then once have structure try to improve it; if we think it won't work then we can discuss it, but lets not waste time
  - o JP – can groups have organizations too? (yet) I don't share JL and WS point that it is hopeless and will approach groups that haven't approached; …. [no notes]
  - o VB – Board was going to do away with At-Large and then used an advisory group that suggested structure
  - o AM – Germany disappointed after elections and Board seats done away with

- o HX – do we need self-review? And then consider time table for self-review? Should link self-review with outside evaluation?
  - o AM – we will have done our job if we do outreach and address policies and involve good people in process; need to find way to involve individual users by Vancouver
  - o IA – consensus in CapeTown to write review, wrote TOR, not complete; should be prepared ourselves for review that is coming up for entire ICANN;
  - o SR -- will finalize the review by end August; will provide timeline
  - o VB – original members will be contacted by DM on whether they want to continue or resign ??
  - o AM – MOU language should be discussed first;
  - o PD – move on with review
- Positions
  - o SR – has proposal he sent; if vice chairs don't have practical functions should not have them; should have co-chairs responsible for policy and outreach
  - o AM – could also have functional appointments
  - o VB – it is important for people to do jobs they volunteer for
  - o IA – tend to burden chair for too many things; functions should be distributed; still need chair to coordinate the coordinators
  - o DM – leader for policy, leader for outreach and 1 person in region responsible for meeting planning
  - o HX – could have floating chair focusing on outreach;
  - o PD – agree w/ DM; pose to others
  - o AM – chair should set agendas, need 1 chair - 2 chairs would be to hard to coordinate,
  - o BF – proposal would be 3 co-chairs at all times – determined by where ICANN was meeting
  - o IA – chair is face of ALAC and it would difficult all the time
  - o JM – chair, co-chair and functions
  - o HX – need 2 leaders – 1 permanent and 1 rotate to region (permanent policy) (rotate outreach in region); could be equals or
- Positions/statements
  - o Keep present practices or change?
  - o AM – keep
  - o HX – if joint statement with another constituency we use more formal process for approving
  - o AM – clear deadline is good
  - o DM – keep in mind important to solicit At-Large community comment on draft positions when possible
  - o SR – getting ALS groups on board and asking them to consider draft statements;
  - o DM – ALAC members ask ALSs directly for input **send email**
  - o VB – can ask ALSs about new gTLDs
  - o AM – meeting with GAC on .city
  - o IA – should try to get meeting with Board members
  - o SR – need leadership from ALAC to get good interaction with Board
  - o BF – silos – Board meeting with constituency groups ..[no notes]
- Outreach
  - o SR – presented slides on Reaching the At-Large Users, communication issues and some ideas
  - o IA – likes approach; consider change name of "At-Large"
  - o SR – change name of newsletter
  - o SR – would help edit/shape messages on website
  - o JP – slides on website; could have banner ads and allow ALSs to subscribe .. banner of the week
  - o SR – use hot topics to start discussions on forum; maybe matter of interest and not accessibility
  - o JM – likes using different domains
  - o SR – brainstorm on list for domain names
- ALAC Conference call schedules

- o Aug 2 at 22:00 UTC; Oct 4 at 14:00 UTC; Nov – first Tues and first Thurs alternating days and times