

FINISHED FILE

ICANN
APRIL 26, 2016
ALAC MONTHLY CALL
4:00 P.m. CT

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call on Tuesday the 26th of April at 21:00 UTC. On today's call we have Alan, Maureen, Holly, Sebastien, Sandra, Harold, Vanda, Tijani, Seun, Wafa, Julie, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier, Ron, Candice, Cheryl, Alan, Daniel, Taylor, Siranush, Sara, Rinalia, Kaili, Alberto, Aziz.

We have apologies noted in Monna, Garth, Leon, and Ali. From staff, we have Heidi Ulrich, Gabrielle, Silvia, Yesim, and myself, Gisella. Our interpreters this evening are, on the French channel, Claire and Camilla, Spanish channel Sabrina and David, and on the Russian channel, Galina and Ekaterina.

You may have noticed, bottom right on the Adobe Connect, that we have a live captioning pod. This is a trial for the ALAC call. We have had it on several other working groups and webinars. Hopefully everyone will find this useful. This will bring me back to reminding everyone to please state their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but also for captioning purposes, as well as for interpreters, for them to be able to identify you on the other channel.

And if I could please ask everyone to please speak at a

reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Gisella. If we continue having attendance this good we're going to have to start deferring having an attendance roll call out like they do in another meeting. All right. We have a pretty packed meeting today, and we also have a pretty horrible echo somewhere. If we can try to find that out, I would really appreciate it. The first substantive item on our agenda -- first of all, is there any changes in the agenda or any other business?

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we'll presume it is accepted as presented. And we'll go on to the first substantive item, and these action items. Heidi, do we have anything that needs our attention?

>> HEIDI ULRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. We do not. The action items from are either in progress or have been completed.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent. Thank you very much. The next item is policy items. Now, a number of these are included in the agenda as we go along, so we won't spend any time talking about those in depth, but Ariel, if you could do a review of open items, and any new ones that have come in.

>> Thank you, Alan, this is Ariel for the record. There is only one statement that's in progress. It's the one on the draft ICANN FY17 operating plan and budget, and five-year operating plan update. They drafted the first drafts, and published on the 25th of April. And we have an extremely short internal commenting period due to the public comment will close 30th of April. So the internal commenting period will end on Thursday 28th of April, and I invite all of you to take a look at the draft statement.

I'm going to put the link in the chat. And that's the only one that's in progress. We do have two new public comments. The first one is on the draft new ICANN bylaws. And that one will close on 21st of May. And people who are active in the CWGR for the public comment. And then the second one that's just opened is on the proposal for Khmer generation rules. That will close 28th of May. And I'm going to put the link for those in chat. And that's it.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Thank you. On the draft bylaws, we will be talking about that briefly under item eight. On the root zone generation release, I don't believe we have commented on any of those to date, and I'm going to assume unless I hear from someone that we believe there's something that needs to be said on this one that we will also presume there is no comment. Is there anyone who has any input on any of the policy issues that we want to discuss now?

Hearing nothing, we'll assume there is nothing to be brought up right now, and we go on to item number 5, review of current ALS applications. And who will handle that?

>> HEIDI ULRICH: I will be doing that today. And Natalie has also stated that, and she has reported to me that there is really nothing in addition to what she's updated -- currently 198 At-Large structures with one currently being voted on, that is WBRI. That vote closes tomorrow. We will likely be one step closer to 200. And then there are several applications pending. And Natalie has reached out to the leaders when there is regional advice being awaited. And there's also some due diligence being carried out by staff.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Any comments from anyone on any of these? I thought greater Washington was recently certified. I don't think that's all that recent.

>> HEIDI ULRICH: Yes, Alan. I was thinking the same. It's been some time now.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: But we wouldn't want that line to be empty. (Chuckling) Any comments on this item before we go ahead? I'll mark that we still have an echo. If people can make sure you're muted, and if it stays around, if staff can try to figure out where it's coming from. It's quieter now, but it's still annoying. All right. Tijani, go ahead.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I'd like to inform you that one of those applications that are under due diligence is from one of the NGOs that came to Marrakesh, that we brought to Marrakesh, so it is really a fruitful program. We already have one. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Any other comments? Nothing. We'll go on to item number 6. This is reports from the working groups, liaisons, and anything from the ALAC itself. Normally we do not spend a lot of time on this, but do any of the liaisons, working group chairs, or RALO chairs have anything they want to bring to the attention of the ALAC right now? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I think this is the first time this has happened in a long time.

And we will go on to the next item. Item number 7. We are now well ahead of schedule. Let's see if we can keep this up and end the meeting early. The first item is the Board Member Selection Process Committee report and recommendations, and I'll turn the floor over to Tijani for this.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. Sorry for the echo. It was me. Okay. So, as you know, I already sent the report of the BMSPC. Each BMSPC nominee, the BMSPC makes a report so that we know what didn't work, so that we try to correct it for the next -- for the upcoming selection.

This was the aim of this report. And we collected all the remarks of all people, including the chair of the BCEC, who was always with us, who attended all our calls, participated in the direction of this report.

So, I will not read it again. You will receive it by email. It is on the wiki. But I will give you headlines on this. So, we made the recommendation about the replacement of the defective members of the BCEC, or the BMSPC. In fact, there was a problem in the BCEC, and Roberto told us that we need to put the procedure for replacement of people who are not performing properly. And the BMSPC chose two models. We'll not enter into function if the two models are working normally.

And -- but this is for the BCEC, because the BCEC is deciding on people who will be put on. So we cannot admit that -- the BCEC decides with few members. This is why we propose that. And Alan spoke that we are considering one person defective, but if there is two, what will happen? And this will be for the discussion of the BMSPC, since the BMSPC is overseeing the process and dealing with the process.

But to solve the problem upfront, defective member, we propose that we choose -- together with the two members that we choose normally. The second point was -- the first point -- the starting point of the process, of selection. Last year we started late. We started in the third meeting of the year. We are proposing to start it in the second meeting of the year. And I think we are in agreement with Alan, also, he thinks the same. With we need at least to have the chairs of the two committees selected.

So the process starts at this moment. The next point, confidentiality. As you know, there is nothing mentioned in the rules about confidentiality. And the BMSPC proposed that we set up deadlines, guidelines, in which we define what information will be collected. We have access to what -- to handle -- and also what confidentiality agreement has to be signed. The procedure -- we propose to put it in there, in guidelines.

We propose to create guidelines. Of course, the rules, the actual rules, saying that each of the two committees have to set up procedures and publish them. Last time, the BMSPC didn't do, because we didn't have special things. I even discussed with some of the members, and we didn't have special rules to set up. We only followed the procedure. And the BCEC, normally they had one, but Alan said it wasn't published. So, we are proposing in the BMSPC that we define guidelines for the whole process in which we put all the things that we collect now, which are not part of the procedure.

One of them is confidentiality and those points. Last time,

there was a date -- was very angry, because we shared his with the reference person he proposed. And so the BMSPC proposed in this case to put in a procedure that the -- should be shared with the referees, and that we have to give to each a copy of the procedure so that he knows that it is an obligation, it must be done. Okay.

The 360 evaluation. Okay. Normally, as I understood it, because last time we had a letter from Steve asking us when we think we need the 360 evaluation. And we answered the question. And I think this information will be given sometime. But, they recommend that --

(Noise)

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And the request of the BCEC chair. Since the chair -- to provide the 360 evaluation.

(Noise)

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The BMSPC thinks that we need to -- the procedure -- provide more than one reference for more than one candidate. And shouldn't -- participate in the 360 evaluation.

>> Tijani, Tijani. Tijani.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: I'm terribly sorry to interrupt you. We have a noise on the line. It is preventing us from having captioning and interpretation. Could I please ask everyone to please mute their lines if they're not speaking? This will avoid any interference. We now have heavy breathing and noises. We are trying to locate it. Thank you.

>> It sounds like someone has a wild hyena near them.

>> Breathing.

>> A very angry hyena.

(Laughter)

>> Apologies for this. We're having to locate the noise before we can continue. Peggy, if you could please -- there's no way we can continue.

>> Hello?

>> Alan, is it not possible to mute all lines excepting Tijani? It sounds like someone breathing extraordinarily heavily into the microphone.

>> I think it's better now.

>> It's gone right now. Cheryl, I have no clue.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here. I believe we've located it. Thank you very much. And just a reminder to please state your names. Thank you. You may continue, Tijani.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Tijani speaking. So, the next point is about technology. And Roberto gave a list

of technical problems during the 2014 selection process. And so the BMSPC have now the list, which is now on the wiki. And we're planning that this list -- those issues should be tested ahead of the selection. And we have to be sure that each time we make a selection we check them before the selection process.

Next is about communication between candidates and At-Large community. Last time there was a problem, you remember very well, some candidates were very angry against us because the BMSPC decided that -- through the wiki and through something else. The candidates wanted the interaction through teleconference. But we changed our mind and we made the live interaction. So the BMSPC recommends that the practical procedure for communication between the At-Large community and the candidates for their campaigns be -- the selection should be included in the guidelines.

So, there is a confusion between proxy and (?). Proxy is only for someone who cannot participate or cannot vote, some electorate member who did not vote for some reason. He may be in the hospital. He may be on the plane at this time. So, he can appoint someone to vote in his place. And in this case, the BMSPC recommends that the person who is holding the proxy will vote according to the will of the person replaced otherwise, for the replacement.

If we have a candidate, he is the same -- member. He doesn't have the right to vote. So, the RALO would select a replacement for him. For those people, they don't -- the vote of their replacement. If their replacement is -- RALO, and vote according to his own beliefs. So, all this is not very clear. We have problem last time. And also there is another problem for the replacement. If one candidate who is at the same time -- member -- dropped at the first round, for example, someone ask me to recover his right of voting for the second round.

And it was a tough question for me, because I didn't know how to do. But fortunately, someone very kind with us now, found a procedure that -- for the board member selection, board member election or selection, where the candidate cannot be voted -- or cannot participate in the vote during this round of voting. In the selection -- the person will be selected. So, this was the way how we solved it. And what the BMSPC is proposing here, is that we change -- we define in our guidelines clearly -- no, the procedure, not the guidelines.

We put clearly that any replacement cannot recover its right of voting even if he is not at any of the vote. Also -- so, this is it. And let's go to the next point with the voting methods. We had several discussion about that, because nothing is mentioned in our rules. We are proposing today that the

voting methods be clearly specified in the procedure for each step of the selection. And we propose that we do that with the help of one specialized external person who can give us the best voting methods for each step, since sometimes we are choosing between two or three, etc.

It's not the same aim of the vote. So it might be different voting methods for each step. And now our procedures saying that even if we have in the first round one of the candidates who has more than 60% of the votes cast, he cannot be declared winner. And we propose that this change. And if he -- if someone has more than 50%, he must be declared winner. How -- this is also another issue that we faced last time.

And we think that -- the BMSPC proposed that the tie-breaking process must be clearly defined, detailed, in the procedure. Because -- for example, the procedure today says that we can run a second time the vote only once for each step. If we have time, we can run it twice, but no. For example, this is something that we have to discuss. We don't have specific recommendation for that. But we say that this tie-breaking should be clearly detailed in the procedure so that for each selection it should be always the same.

It shouldn't be each selection different from the other. Publishing the results. Here we have the request from Alan Greenberg that in the future, we will -- he has to do -- enough time, but I said I cannot do it. He proposed that we publish the result. For example, for the first round, we publish exactly what are the score of each candidate. And also, his proposal should be also valid for the steps of the second round. I don't have -- personally -- a specific recommendation for that, but we have to agree on something and put it in the procedures.

So, if we agree that we publish the result, it should be put in the procedure. And I think that. So, what else? Yes. There is another discussion about what we have to put on the guidelines, what we have to put in the procedure. And I think that we have to make the procedure very detailed. We have to put anything that is not at a certain level, we have to put it in the guidelines. But the high level, all things in the high level should be in the procedure.

What else? I think that's all. Proxy, placement, defined. Yes. I think I made the whole report. I know that Alan will have a comment on it. And I stop here. Thank you very much.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Tijani. That was very good. One or two minor corrections. Tijani and I did discuss the summit extensively already. One small item is that Tijani suggested that the rules about what -- who can share the expression of interest and confidentiality would be put in the

rules and procedure. I'm suggesting that they not be put in the rules and procedure, because there's no reference to expressions of interest right now.

But they must be published by the BCEC, and all candidates must be aware of what the issues are. So that's certainly something that's very important. The only other item that I suggested that wasn't already covered by Tijani is currently it says the BMSPC, either the ALAC will name the chair, or the BMSPC will select its own chair. I can't imagine a world where we would not -- where the ALAC would not want to take responsibility for putting the best person in that job and naming the chair, so I'm going to suggest that that be changed as well.

One small comment on what Tijani said, in terms of publishing intermediate results, the first round -- the first election done in 2010 did publish the intermediate results. That was a precedent, which is why I was not necessarily giving my opinion when I said the intermediate results should be published, but in following the tradition, even though it hadn't been documented anywhere, I did think that that is indeed how it should go.

But other than that, I think, Tijani and I are in complete agreement. And I see two hands. Tijani, do you want to comment first before we let Cheryl in, or do you want to go in the queue?

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I fully agree with the that account that the chair of the BMSPC should be appointed by the ALAC. And also, we may choose a nonvoting chair. There is no vote in the BMSPC, in fact. There is decision. And sometimes we cannot say it is not voting, because sometimes the chair has to make the decision, because it is immediate. You cannot wait. And you can validate it a few moments later. So, I agree that the chair should be chosen by the ALAC, but we cannot say it is a nonvoting chair. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I agree with that. I did suggest, Tijani, that maybe it be nonvoting. But he pointed out that in the real world where decisions have to be made and committees cannot always be convened, the chair does have to have discretion. Cheryl.

>> Thank you, Cheryl, for the record. I am in support of the now slightly modified report here, and the changes therein. I do want to make it very clear that, as the one who nurtured and shepherded the first run-through of board member selection from the ALAC and at-large community, that I was a little surprised when some precedents, including the rules of confidentiality that we decided to put in place in the first

round were not followed because of a precedent.

The reason that was was a matter of recording. I think some of the things we had assumed might be captured in standard operational procedures, they simply weren't, and that's not good enough. And that's what this now fixes. Apart from support for the change in recommendations here, Mark discussed and made in short order, as few changes to the rules of procedure as possible. In other words, at the high level and absolutely essential changes recommended from this report put into our rules of procedure, but have a established and published SOP, or standard operational procedure for the board candidate evaluation committee, which is this BCEC thing that Tijani and the report refer to, to follow.

Now, if we have a community-agreed set of SOP, standard operational procedures, put together in advance of this next selection process, I would like to suggest we consider going even one step further. And that is we change our rules to have the BMSPC, the selection management group, which are the overseers, for want of a better word, and that's what Alan and Tijani were just talking about, the chair selection from the ALAC, etc., that that group maintain its role, and that that group does an into the future review of how these rounds should go, and what changes may need to be made into the standard operational procedures for the board candidate evaluation committee council, as it does now.

To group, in consultation with the BMSPC. And we then make it simple that the future BCECs, and hopefully even the one for this next round, simply run on those published procedures. In other words, we take away the writing responsibility from the BCEC to make up its own rules going on so that we have greater predictability and certainty for all candidates and all the electorate in future years. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I will note we managed to use up our extra time at this point. A couple of very brief comments. For those who haven't been following this process for N years as some of us have, the first group of -- the people who were involved in the first selection, which Cheryl managed, by the way, or Cheryl chaired, both groups, I believe, if I remember correctly, produced a huge volume of information, including their own rules and processes.

If someone could try to find that echo, I would really appreciate it. But the problem was, it wasn't very well organized. And the second groups that did their job several years ago were somewhat rushed and never really refined the published documents, at least not that I can find record of at this point. So I think we need to be better-organized right now

than we were last time around. The procedure going forward is, I did already asking for some volunteers and received someone to work with me on the redrafting the rules procedure.

That will be going ahead over the next few weeks, and the intent is to present the final ones in advance of Helsinki. The rules and procedure do have some details about when the rules were -- how amendments are ratified. And they will be published in advance of the meeting. I think there's a 21-day requirement. I'm not sure. So the intention is to redraft them over the next few weeks, pass them by the ALAC for comments, and then have them ratified in Helsinki to allow us to start the new process with the new revised rules. Tijani, go ahead.

>> We can't hear you.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You hear me?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'll repeat. So, thank you very much, Tijani speaking. Thank you, Cheryl, for those useful comments. I think that if your comments, or your recommendation -- if the confidentiality rules that you put from the first time, since there has not been an official document -- and official, I mean, that you made the report. But perhaps there wasn't a formal guidelines so that it would be used in the future compulsory for each BCEC. That's why we are proposing that we establish these kind of guidelines, in which we put everything we have now.

And each BCEC or BMSPC who has something else to add, they can put it in their own operating procedure. I think this is the way to make it more uniform from one election to the other so that every time we add any comment from the BMSPC to the guidelines so that in the next round, in the next selection, they would be taken into consideration. Thank you very much.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And I'll note that both Tijani and Cheryl have agreed to work on the new redrafting of the bylaws, so I'm sure this will be hashed out and some common ground found. Any other final comments before we go on to the next item? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, the next item is the CCWG accountability. I was hoping Leon would be on the call, but unfortunately, he isn't. Cheryl, maybe I'll ask you for a couple of --

>> Hello. This is Seun.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Seun. We can hear you. I'll put you in the queue.

>> SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: The real issue right now, the immediate issue is, we are out for a public comment period on the bylaws. The bylaws have been reviewed somewhat exhaustively, but nevertheless, I think there is -- the ALAC has a responsibility

to review the changes and try to identify anything that we feel may either not reflect the CCWG report accurately, or that may reflect the report accurately, but is something which we believe is so wrong that it has to be addressed some way -- one way or another.

And there have been a few items like that that have been found along the way. So, short of assigning it, I will be asking for a few volunteers of people who will commit to going over the laborious job -- and this is a large document. We're talking hundreds of pages now. To commit to reporting back to the ALAC relatively soon as to what they have found, and if there's anything they feel warrants further discussion, and perhaps comment by the ALAC. And I'll open the queue first to Cheryl if she has any comments, and then to Seun.

>> And as one of the people, along with Leon, who is putting in a still-extraordinary amount of time working with the bylaws drafting committee for both the CW -- sorry, both of us are on the CCWG, the one about accountability bylaws, but, I'm also on the CWG, the transition bylaws drafting. I can assure you that an extreme amount of discussion is going on between the subject matter leads who were believed to be in a good position to make sure to the best of their ability that the bylaws that are being drafted by the legal experts are as closely in line with the reports out of the CCWG and the CWG as possible.

But as Alan did point out, it is a huge, dare I say mammoth, not only task, but volume of legal changes that have been agreed upon. Now, to that end, I would not be able to guarantee to you that there is not an I not dotted, a T not crossed, or a small thing where something's been changed in one thing and perhaps not in identical language or done perfectly in another. So we definitely do need a fresh eye to go through and just see if there is any oversight or error that we haven't picked up on.

Remembering, of course, that as we go through the public comments for the draft bylaws, that all of these public comments will be considered, and that the language will have yet another run through and filter based on those public comments before it goes through what I believe will happen, and that is to have an independent editor go through it. And that's a professional writer who often goes through these sorts of documents and makes sure that some of the simpler errors and oversights have not been missed, because it does get to be a little bit like the forest and the trees.

So what I can assure you all is that a huge amount of investment has been made to ensure that we have accurately as possible captured the intent of all of the outcomes and

recommendations from both the reports, the CWG and the CCWG. However, the reports were silent on a couple of things, and so some people may find fresh language. And I don't think that's a problem. I think that is an essential tidy up which allows us to make sure there are as few as humanly possible loopholes and opportunities for misinterpretation in the document.

And I would also suggest that Leon and I would be more than happy, along with any of the leads of the drafting team for subject matters, to work with community during our public comment period now to attend any webinars and follow any discussions, and answer any questions as he will go through and look at it. This is an extremely important task. I am very satisfied that it's pretty darned close to as good as it's going to get, but there may be some imperfections that we need to look for. Thank you, Alan.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And I note the deadline for submitting comments is the 21st of May, and that will not be extended like some public comment periods are.

>> No extension.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Currently we have Seun and then Tijani in the queue. And I ask people to be brief to the extent that that is possible and practical. Thank you. Seun.

>> SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, this is Seun. Can you hear me?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

>> SEUN OJEDEJI: My first comment is in relation to previous agenda item, actually.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't we wait until after this discussion? We'll go back to it, Seun.

>> SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, you said your first comment. I gather you don't have a second one then, right now. Tijani, we'll go to you. If Seun has another item on CCWG accountability, we'll get back to him. Tijani, go ahead.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani speaking. As Cheryl said, it will be the group that Alan wants to form to do this job. Have the task of ensuring that the bylaw draft reflect exactly what is in the final part of the CWG. So it is not only to read the bylaw draft, to read first the draft and be sure that we have the first -- the final result of the CWG in mind when reading the bylaws and compare them. So it is a real task work in a short time. So I really encourage you to participate as much as we have people, it will be easier, because we have to share the work. It is too long. It is a huge work. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. To be clear, I wasn't planning on forming a group. I'm looking for some volunteers who will take some responsibility upon themselves. And yes, we can

share, divide up the work. But I am looking for volunteers. And as Tijani pointed out and implied by Cheryl, you really have to know what's in the CCWG and the CWG for those parts of the bylaws, reports, to be able to understand and recognize whether the bylaws are an accurate reflection of them. Any other question on the accountability? There is another item -- I will be deferring that to another item. That is workstream two. Seun, go ahead.

>> SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you. So, my second comment in relation to the accountability is, one suggestion that we probably should state the -- if it's possible to have someone look recommendation by recommendation, so one person can look into recommendation one, or just like you did during the development of the response to the last report. I just want to also ask -- the ICANN -- I mean, the ICANN -- at a second look. That is, the [indiscernible] of the draft before publishing what was published. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Let me try to answer, Cheryl. You can modify if I'm wrong. I am assuming that both the ICANN legal team, both in-house and perhaps out, external, and the CCWG, CWG legal team that has been involved in drafting are staking their professional responsibility on the fact that they are doing a good job. No one has presumed that the other group is going their job for them. Cheryl, do you have anything to add?

>> Cheryl: Apart from the fact that, yes, you're correct, there is a professional sign-off on these documents, because both of the -- in fact, all three of the legal houses, if we could find ICANN as a legal house, has been working in close collaboration debating, discussing, with bylaws, literally, this documentation. They have only put forward to the subject matter leads and other experts, board members, etc., the proposed language as draft for us to discuss after they have agreed or raised some questions.

There has been a huge collaboration with all parties, community, and both in-house into the ICANN and outside global experts all working equitably and as a team.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. With regard to dividing the work recommendation by recommendation, I haven't heard any volunteers yet. I'm presuming you are willing to volunteer to do some work. I haven't heard any others. It may be really easy for the two of us to divide the work at this stage. I would like one or two other people who have been involved in this process and have not been part of the first pass, as Cheryl has, to step up to this. I will be button-holing one or two people if they don't volunteer, but I'm not going to do that on this call. Any other further comments before we go back to the previous item for

Seun's comment? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, Seun, you have something to mention with regard to the board member selection report.

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

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

>> SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you. Just something about the alternates. And alternate will come in when the main is not available. I don't know how that is going to work. I think unless the alternate -- active and participating -- the only way -- try to be useful. So, get an understanding of the intent of the alternate. If the intent is to have -- something from the region to always be able to respond promptly, then straight up -- need for alternate. But -- intent for the alternate. But I think the alternate needs to be active in the process before he can be useful in actually being there.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Seun, noted. I'll note, however, that the suggestion of an alternate is in place of -- right now there is nothing. And the RALO would have to initiate a process to identify someone. The intent of the alternate proposal is to have someone ready to drop in. And yes, that would be a somewhat difficult job, but the real critical issue is having a voice from the region, perhaps at a critical time in the process such as selecting candidates. So, yes, it may cause some problem, but to augment the group to have 15 people instead of ten probably makes it unwieldy. But the drafters will consider that. Thank you. Tijani, go ahead.

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Alan. The intent of having the alternate is not to replace the defective member when he is not available. It is to replace him definitely if he's not performing properly. But because -- imagine, the BCEC is handling the personal information of people. So the confidentiality is very important. We cannot make people entering and going out when they want. So we have a pool of people working. We cannot have less than a certain number to decide on the people to make on the slate. It's a very important decision.

So we need the whole regions represented, and with two persons when possible, and I hope it will be possible all the time. That's why we propose to have an alternate. And once he replace one defective member, he will be member of the group, and will never leave it. The one who was defective will leave it and will leave it definitely. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm going to call this discussion to a close right now. There are discussions that will have to be had, but they can't be had right now. We are ten

minutes over, and the scribe doing the transcript has a hard stop on the hour. So we will have to go ahead. And we will have to make up the ten minutes at this point. The next item is non-At-Large work group participation. It's a very short item. And it's just some comments from me.

There's a lot of work going on at ICANN right now. An example is the work group that will be setting the rules for new GTLD rounds, or whatever mechanism is used in the future to allow new GTLDs to be applied for. In the past, the ALAC had an awful lot to say -- ALAC and At-Large, because it was far larger than just the ALAC -- an awful lot to say about how they weren't satisfied with the last procedure. This is the opportunity to set the rules and work on helping to set the rules, and the number of people we have in this group is not large.

We have about six people, but only active ones being a very small number. And it really is important that people who care about the new GTLB process from a user perspective get involved and become active, and be actually -- speak up and work. So it's a real serious thing. I'm not necessarily pointing to the people on the ALAC, but somehow within our regions we have to get the right people to contribute.

The same is going to be true in workstream two of accountability. There's a diverse number of subjects that we're going to be looking at. The people who are the formal representatives are not necessarily the experts on those subjects. And we need to get people involved. I'll add one more comment. We have several ALC affirmation of reviews commitments coming up in the next year. I have no doubt that when we solicit volunteers for that, we will get a huge number of people putting up their hand.

Whether it's because these are -- seem to be important, or because there's travel associated with them, I'm not even going to guess. But we can't have people just volunteering for the really glamorous work and not be willing to do the work on the real hard work that's going on in the background. So I would really like to somehow see more people involved. I'm not going to tell you how to do it. I have some ideas.

But if you think you know someone who's good at one of these areas, who has an interest, convince them to get involved. Thank you. The next item is the crop review team. If we could have the document up on the screen. All right. The history on this is the CROPP review team was put together a number of years ago when CROPP, the pilot program on -- Community -- I don't remember what the R stands for. Somebody remind me. Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program.

>> Correct, thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We decided that we wanted an At-Large group to work with the RALOs, make sure that the requests that went in met a certain level of -- a certain standard, to be quite blunt -- and that there be a resource that the RALOs could use in submitting these requests. This is a pilot program. It still is. It probably will be continued. But there was a lot of danger at the beginning that if people used this program for things that did not have good results, that it would be discontinued.

And we had a significant worry about that. So we put together the CROPP review team, and it was made up of people from the finance and budget committee, because there's obviously finance issues, and from the outreach subcommittee. And at that point, the members were selected by the RALOs. We presumed that everyone would use good sense, but to be honest, we never really gave anyone any guidelines, and various people went into this group with very different perspectives of what CROPP should be and how it should be used.

And that ended up with some disagreements at various levels. Last year we changed the rules of how the people are selected and said it's the finance and budget subcommittee and the outreach and engagement subcommittee that selected the people. That presumed there was going to be discussions with the RALO. Sometimes that didn't happen properly. And there have been a number of issues recently where on individual CROPP requests there have been people who felt that decisions were not made according to some proper rules, even though there aren't any rules.

I really don't believe there's a lot to be -- a lot of benefit in going back and analyzing the past problems to determine whether there was a problem, in fact, or exactly what the problem is. I am suggesting that we have a -- I'm tempted to call it a rechartering process, but, in fact, there never was a charter to begin with. That will look at the process by which we select the people. I'm not expecting a significant change, but I think we need to carefully document it and make sure everyone buys in on it, and the overall guidelines under which the group will operate.

I am not expecting a large document. I am looking for something that's pretty lightweight. But make sure that we have a level playing field so everyone understands what's going on. I would like to have this drafted over the next number of weeks, and optimally approve it in Helsinki. That may be a bit optimistic. And I have some suggests as to how this drafting group be staffed, but first I'd like to open the floor up to any comments on the general concept.

And, again, I do not want to do a postmortem on what problems we've had in the past, but trying to make sure going forward, we do it well. Cheryl.

>> CHERYL: Thank you, Cheryl. It's important that we codify or formalize this going to the future as to how the crop review team is populated. We did have a RALO and ALAC agreement on how we populated the original review team, and we ensured that we had members of the finance and budget subcommittee and regional representation that were balanced. And I think, obviously, the outreach activity was clear. And so we had people from both the outreach committee and the finance and budget subcommittee as you said, but we made sure we had a balance.

Note that it was regional balance, not RALO appointments that we were after, and I think that's important to realize as well. That was more clearly reflected when -- in the last ALAC, put forward, rather than the ALAC making the appointments as such, that the finance and budget subcommittee and the outreach subcommittee made the appointments themselves, and that they had -- they did -- perfect synchrony. And how that could be done in the future probably needs to be codified, and I think that is important.

I also just want to say, just for the record, the CROPP review team operates with the best interests of making sure that any of the applications that go through for funding approval are in keeping with existing and now well-developed and ongoing improved regional outreach plans. And I think that's important. That's actually something that happened between the original CROPP review team starting its work and what goes on today. We have a number of ways we now work that have changed over the couple of years we've operated, and that also needs to be codified so the new people coming in in the future understand exactly what their role is and what their requirements are.

But, of course the rules we operate on are the CROPP rules. And they are ICANN-wide. So, it's not that we're ruleless. We do have very particular sets of rules. But we have different operational procedures that have developed over the years, and I just want to agree with the benefit of codifying them so regions don't, perhaps, think that their interests are being cut out. In fact, it's all about the regions, but it's not just about the RALOs. Thanks.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Tijani's next. We are getting really short on time, so I ask people to be concise. Thank you. Tijani?

>> TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. I hope you -- discuss the substance of the CROPP review team. I will say only that I agree fully that we have to target the

future and not speak about the past. I also agree that we have to set up things in which we put the mission of the CROPP review team, the working methods, and the way -- not the way -- and the compliance with the CROPP program guidelines. I hope that we will solve all the problems. And I really hope that this will be a fruitful work. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I will -- given our lack of time, I will suggest by email what I'm suggesting for the group to do this work. And I will now turn the floor over to Rinalia Abdul Rahim, the At-Large board member.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. How is my audio? Can you hear me?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: It is beautiful.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you very much. What a pleasure to be at an ALAC meeting again. So, I would like to address two topics today. The first one is from ICANN 55, and the planning for ICANN 56. But before that, a quick update about the At-Large review. We have identified an independent examiner for this review, and contracting has come in. One successful. The At-Large review working committee will be notified. And I expect if there are no problems, that will take place within one week.

So, moving on to followup from ICANN 55. The board has a tracking document where we keep track of what action items come about from meetings. And I'm keeping an eye on the things that came up during the -- in between the board and the ALAC. And I just want to give you an update on what's happening on those things. So the first item is the ALAC proposal review on the effectiveness of the Public Interest Commitment for the category one, to inform the development of safeguards.

And this action has been followed up with a call involving Alan, as chair of the ALAC, James as chair of the GMFO, and Tom Snyder, chair of the GAK. I participated in the call. David was the staff responsible for making it happen. And there was an agreement that the board would send a letter to the chair of consumer choice review, as well as the co-chairs of GNSOU, subsequent procedures working group, requesting that a review of the concerns reached by the GAK and the ALAC, a review of PIC and other protection mechanisms used by registry to the completion of their work.

And these chairs, all of them, have responded with a letter to the board saying that they will, indeed, take on these issues and considerations in scope of their work. So I think that's a successful completion. The second item is the ALAC requested a level of predictability to allow better planning in the organization of the At-Large summit, and suggested a sub mission

of a white paper with a budget for inclusion in ICANN's core budget, and not on any special request.

And finance has been tasked to provide guidance to the ALAC on a budget submission timeline and parameters, plus evaluation process and criteria. And basically, finance is awaiting a draft of the proposal. And I know you guys did a deep dive into the document, and that document will be submitted as a public comment by the end of April. And if there are any issues, someone will come back and give you guidelines on this.

Yes, I see your comment, Gisella. I will try to slow down. The next item is basically gaps in ICANN mechanisms for escalating issues, and we identified three items. And the first one was a problem. That problem existed because I cannot have a ticketing system for out issues. Actually, someone explained that there is now a ticketing system. And if you have issues with ICANN tools and it's not being picked up, please flag so that we can tell them that the ticketing system is not working.

And also, Ashley was waiting for ALAC, a solution that they are proposing. And if you approve that solution, it will take them about one month to produce the tool. So please let them know whether or not what they proposed works, and if it does, then they will start to produce it for you. But the next item is the inflexibility in use of travel slots allocated to the ALAC.

I think that problem is being addressed by David. And I know that Alan has to assign those two seats to relevant members of the At-Large community. If there is a problem with that moving forward, please let me know so that I can address that. But otherwise, I think that we will be good with that one. The next item is related to the lack of cohesiveness in ICANN processes related to the new strategy meeting, it will be designed to have one day for capacity-building, onboarding, team building, but implementation requires special budget requests instead of planned allocations.

During the meeting, David said there would be no budget requests required from SOs and ACs. For this purpose, this training will be conducted by internal facilitators, both community members and staff with relevant expertise for cost-effectiveness, so this action is completed. The next item is a request for ICANN action on the position of consumer safety director in compliance. The position was announced 18 months ago and continued vacancy raises questions about ICANN's commitment.

So the followup on this is that the compliance department will post the job description and send to ALAC with a link to job description, asking if we have comments. And they're saying that they welcome comments, and the job description can be amended if needed. So if you have comments, please do provide

that, because I think that would be invaluable for them. I checked on the job posting from ICANN yesterday. I have not seen this job description being posted. I expect that it should be done within the week as well. And if not, I'll follow up with him.

And then the last one, as I recall, Tijani made a request a personnel be added to support someone's work, and community travel. As far as I know, there has been -- addition to the team, but I need confirmation to check that it is meant to support community travel. And I don't have that confirmation yet, but we are following up on that. So, those are essentially the action items from ICANN 55. And I expect that by the Helsinki meeting, all of these items can be closed. And I'd like to move on to the planning for ICANN 56, because I think this is quite important.

And I want to address two aspects of it. One is, the CEO. And the second one is a meeting with the board. And I think that the ALAC needs to send a request very soon to the CEO's office, as well as to board operation, requesting for time in Helsinki. Because I think that if not, you may not get time. Now, in terms of meeting with the CEO, I'd like to make a concrete suggestion. I suggest that you ask for a minimum of 30 minutes, if not more. And I suggest that you prepare an agenda.

And the reason that I suggest that is that you really don't want a CEO who goes off into a monologue for a long time and does not leave you time to address the issues that you care about. And an item on the agenda for a meeting with the CEO must be on operations. Even if you don't have operational concerns, you can just say, on this agenda topic, we are quite happy. And then you can move on to the matters that you want to address with the CEO.

But I think that this is -- this will be an improvement in moving forward. I know that Göran has a keen interest in engaging on end user matters, so he will come to the meeting with questions for you. And if you ask for questions from him in advance so that you can prepare for that meeting with him, I think you will have a more productive meeting. Moving forward, in terms of meeting with the board, as a followup to consumer in Marrakesh, which I know there is dissatisfaction in the ALAC, I think that we can look forward to more discussion.

And I know that Göran also wants to discuss the topic, but together with the board at a strategic level. To, I think that we need to prepare for this, and I think that I would like to encourage you to approach the issue from a high level and to look proactively into the future and think about the question of how ICANN is able to move the interests of end users and

consumers, and whether or not you think it is possible to do so, and what are the challenges.

Because it's likely that you will get this question. And the community experts from the end user side will be able to lay out what the issues, considerations, and concerns are. And from there, I think all the problems that we are experiencing now in terms of gaps for end user and consumers will be in the future with a new frame of enhanced community and with the new bylaws coming into force.

So some thinking is needed, and some preparation will be required for this. That's all I have. And I welcome comments and discussion. Sorry, was that too much?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: The floor. I'll make a comment. I see Dev's hand up. We'll give the floor to him in a moment. Göran did make a commitment to meet with the ACs and SOs. I would hope that they would -- I certainly have no problem going and asking for time, or demanding time, but I would hope that the reverse will be true and that we are going to be asked either how much time we want, or how do we want to organize it, or something like that. We shouldn't have to ask.

>> Yeah.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: To be --

>> Correct.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. But I note we should not have to ask. We will anyway. Dev, go ahead.

>> Thanks. This is Dev. Can you hear me?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

>> Lovely. Thanks. Thanks, for that. Just a clarification of the issues. The At-Large Technology Task Force has been working with ICANN's staff to document and remedy this issue. There's a wiki link that I pasted which goes into detail on the previous problems, and the approaches to solve the problem. What has been a big problem is that there's been one volunteer working in their spare time for the past year on this issue. And, you know, he doesn't have much spare time.

And the technology task force submitted a budget request, actually, for ICANN to have a developer to fix this problem. Because it should not be relying on the developer working on his own spare time to try to fix this long-standing issue. The ALAC approved and submitted it to ICANN finance. Subsequent to that, at the technology task force meeting in Marrakesh, we were introduced to Mark, who is the delivery manager for community services, and would be the point person to direct inquiries regarding the issue.

And what is happening now is that Mark has been made aware of the reports being posted by the CTS, and it is -- they are

now looking for an outside developer to help fix those bugs. They have not gotten the developers yet. So -- fixing the bugs. That's it.

>> Thanks, Dev.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Dev. Next, we have Olivier. And, again, I'll point out we are short on time. We have an item on the proposal for the face-to-face meetings that we have to discuss at this meeting, or we will not be able to submit it in time to meet the budget comments period. So let's try to keep this brief. Olivier, you're next.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. I'm going to be very quick. Just to let you know that the GNSO is also working on its schedule, and it is going to ask Göran to join. So I would also emphasize that we need to ask for Göran to attend the ICANN meeting -- well, the ALAC meeting and to ask for him to come, rather than thinking that he's going to visit everyone and do the rounds. Thanks.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have no doubt that Heidi has noted that, and the email is probably already sent. Anyone else? Seeing no other hands, Rinalia, any final comments?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: No, that's it.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Then I thank you for giving us back a few minutes. The next item is the review of ICANN 56. We are going to do a first cut at reviewing the agenda, and looking for input either at this meeting right now, or via email in the next few days on what kind of policy issues we want to talk about. And I will note as we go through it that there will be no board ALAC interaction as such at this meeting.

We have been asked to identify which sessions we want board members to attend, and which board members. It goes without saying we'll probably be asking for Rinalia a fair amount of the time, but we have an opportunity for other members as well. And that's something that as we go through the agenda, we need to keep in mind, because certainly those invitations are going to have to be issued more than five minutes before the meeting. I turn it over to Gisella.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, Gisella. Holly, I see your hand up. Was that for the last session or this one?

>> HOLLY RAICHE: This one.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Go ahead. Dev, I see your hand is still up. If it's an old one, please put it down. Gisella, it's yours.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. I've put up a schedule, and I sent it out on the mailing list, and apologizes for the delay in sending it. I've just been fine-tuning it. And thank

you all for having a look at this now on the screen. I've also, in the chat, put the link to the ICANN 56 draft schedule page, which has all the draft schedules that have been submitted on there, as well as the topics of interest. There is a meeting planned for the end of this week, internal again, which will discuss the topics of interest and hopefully after that we'll be able to give you more information.

What you see up on the screen there, I believe you all have Sync, you all have access to it, are the four days of the meeting. Right at the top, I've added just on the Sunday there will be a CCWG meeting, and the usual ACSO, ASGO, RALO chairs meeting followed by dinner. But the meeting will start on Monday. And as we know, meeting B now has a duration of four days. We have two ALAC columns. They both have colors in them.

The one is the main session which will be held in the main room. And then we are planning on having a couple of parallel sessions. I'm just briefly going to run you through what you see on the screen. And then open for discussion. Again, nothing is set in stone. This will be submitted to the meetings team to be able to update the wiki page, the link that I sent you on the Adobe Connect chat. Please note that that link has not been updated, so the most recent information for ALAC is what you see on the screen, what you have in your inbox, and what you have also now attached to today's agenda.

On Saturday, we have a couple of working sessions, a working group, and the new format of the afternoons is a cross-community discussion between 3:00 and 6:00 p.m. So that's 15:00 to 18:00. That's Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. On Thursday we end up with a wrap-up meeting to discuss how meeting B went and the new strategy. As far as the ALAC goes, we have ALAC working session. So have we have identified five working group slots, as well as one holding slot for an ad hoc meeting that we are still yet trying to decide on whether we're having it, and Alan will update us later this week.

And we have at this stage only three regional meetings, AFRALO, EURALO, and the NARALO meeting, and the monthly call but also to prepare for the next meeting, which will be held in the North American region. The schedule says it all, and open for comments. And if Alan or anyone would like to add anything at this stage?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. This is going to be a challenging meeting in many ways. It's short, and yet there's certain things that we are going to have to carry out. And we're trying to allocate as many hours as possible for the ALAC and regional leaders to meet. We -- as Gisella said, we are setting aside some slots for working groups, but it's quite clear that

unless the working group has something -- and there's an echo again.

Unless the working group has something they can really deliver, and there's significant added value for doing it in person, we are going to be very careful in which we select. It is very clear that there'll have to be meetings of the At-Large review group, and that will be one of the meetings deemed to be a working group meeting. It's a real challenge. We're expecting the external reviewer to be there and to be conducting interviews. How we're going to find the time to get the people who are already committed to many of these meetings to do these interviews is going to be an interesting challenge.

But there's not a lot we can do to plan that ahead of time, other than to put together lists of people that we believe need to be interviewed who the external reviewer may or may not choose to follow our advice, but, nevertheless, I think that we have an obligation of doing our prep work on that. Those are the only real comments I have at this point. And I -- Holly did have her hand up. It's not up anymore, and she seems to have disappeared.

>> CHERYL: Alan, Holly simply wanted to make sure that the ALAC review had space in the working group activities in Helsinki. And you've already covered that. And in fact, you covered the point that I raise my hand up, which was the fact that we will also be meeting to conduct interviews with the external reviewer. And there will be contracts in advance of Helsinki. I would suggest we probably also want the external reviewer at the work group meeting, if not in an agenda item to brief the whole of the ALAC and At-Large leadership so that they all understand the working methodology and what the plans are, so the operations for the next couple of months of the external reviewer. Thanks.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: There is no doubt that there'll be a slot or slots within the ALAC and regional leaders agenda to be discussing the review and interactions with the reviewers. And I have no doubt the reviewers will be lurking at the backs of the room for a fair amount of the time, anyway. Any other comments? As noted, people who believe there are policy issues or administrative issues that have to be addressed during this meeting, please put your ideas forward and send them to me and Heidi.

The rules and procedure changes that we talked about will be on the agenda. We will be looking at ALS criteria. There's a host of things which simply their time has come, and they will be there. But we -- we're trying to allow a fair amount of time so that there will be an opportunity for other issues. But we do

want to prepare for them ahead of time. It's likely to be a very tight and packed agenda. And lastly, don't forget, thinking about which board members should be present.

Does anyone want to speak on the outreach and engagement activities in Helsinki? There is a lot of discussion going on right now about whether there should be any at all. It's been pointed out that everyone is going to be on vacation, essentially, when we're there. The vacation starts with the midsummer's festival, which is the weekend that we get there. It's not going to be a real busy time from a business perspective in Helsinki. We should have the city to ourselves.

So it's not clear we're going to be doing any outreach, but that is still under some discussion. Anyone else have any comments? Going once, going twice. That's it. We're now officially ahead of schedule again. Thank you. The next item is the proposal for a multiyear budget planning for GAs and At-Large summits. We're not going to read the document, but if we could have it in the screen. There was a meeting a week or so ago, I think last Thursday.

I think it was last Thursday. I've lost track now. That went into the document in some detail. It was a very successful meeting. There were a number of issues raised at the meeting that had been not thought of by any of the people who had been editing the document to date, and they've now been incorporated. So I think the document's in better shape. It does need some people reading it and making sure that, you know, we haven't forgotten anything, there's no half sentences.

So I do ask everyone to take their responsibility seriously and review the draft 2.0 document that has been distributed. It's attached to this agenda, among other places. It's also on the wiki. And we're going to try to finalize that. It has to be submitted by the end of the comment period on the budget, which ends this coming Saturday. I am assuming we will probably ratify after the fact, because this is been reviewed so much, and I don't believe there is any opposition within At-Large to doing it.

So I'm not worried about it not being ratified in time. And I want to give us the maximum amount of time to get it perfect. But that is where we sit right now. Would anyone like to discuss this? Olivier, you have been the lead on a lot of this. Is it getting to a point where you're feeling comfortable with it?

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much, Alan. Am I feeling comfortable with it? I'm starting to get sick of it, perhaps. (Laughter) I'm not sure. But, no, I think it's certainly gone through a number of iterations, and it's certainly improving on each iteration, and more input being

brought in there. There are a couple of points which I think might have not been yet carried over. And I'm not sure on this latest version. The metrics that we collected for the previous summit, we had spoken about this, Alan.

And I don't know whether they've now been included in there. That might've fallen through the cracks. So that's one thing. Secondly, there is a link to the Google doc at the end of the document, specifically in annex C. I will be doing a bit of work on that Google doc. Now that we don't have the tables in the main document, and that we instead have a diagram, which I admit is much, much clearer and much easier to see. It looks a bit like a musical partition with all these notes.

And so it shows a certain cycle. It shows the distribution of the general assemblies, and the summit. And so the overall, more detailed document is one that I have to check, since I remember that you have a few mistakes in the actual dates, etc. That's fine. I can certainly do that in my own time. Apart from -- as I mentioned, the metrics was one. Secondly, we had to -- and this is where I'm asking people here, even people who have nothing involved in drafting something, imagine that you are part of the ICANN community, you are in the GNSO, imagine you're reading this document.

Will this give you a good idea of what the ALAC, or the At-Large community wants to do? And are you likely to be happy with this? Because this is not a document that we're just sending to the board or to ICANN finance. That's just part of the people that we have to convince. We have to convince the whole community, especially with the new community powers that are coming up. So, I think that especially for people who haven't had a chance to read through this document yet, maybe giving it a first read like this and providing feedback, and saying look, I'm convinced by the first chapter, the second, and the third, but the fourth, I think, you know, that one really reads too much like X, Y, Z.

Then I'd say, please bring that feedback. We still have a little bit of time to improve on this. That's really all. Just a quick summary, executive summary at the beginning, then the background of the whole story of At-Large, and the need for general assemblies that have happened, the context of the showcases, etc. And then after that, we base our proposal on three big pillars. The first one is the importance of face to face meetings. The second one is the importance of having a multiyear planning system, not only for the ALAC, but also for ICANN itself in order to have things.

And the third pillar is having the cycle, the first year with no general assembly, the next one where you have one or two

general assemblies per year, with a total of five general assemblies, and year five, the At-Large summit, with this being the ideal time to keep people involved and keep the At-Large structures updated as to what's going on in ICANN and set them on more projects. That's all for the time being. I mean, we probably will run out of time if we get feedback here. But that's all the points I wanted to make. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. In regards to metrics from the summit, if we can get some numbers, then we can probably include them. I have not seen any presented in this round. I will note in the annex there is still a URL missing. You'll recall in the earlier documents there was a detailed report, essentially, from the last summit, which we said we would not put in the printed document as it were, but would simply point to.

I presume that information went somewhere on the web, but I don't know where it is. And someone needs to point to it so we can find it. And lastly, we decided on the meeting last week that we want some metrics for teleconferences, that is, to get some idea of how much work ALAC and At-Large does do in between meetings. There's a perception in some members that all we do is go to meetings, and then we take the rest of the time off.

And I'm still waiting for that from staff also. Olivier, go ahead.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, you mentioned there's some perception by board members that the ALAC isn't doing work on conference calls. And so it's the same thing with other communities, as well. I've had some GNSO counselor ask me whether we also had working groups, and whether we also did intersessional work. Admittedly, by the way, a new GNSO counsel.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: What can I say. (Laughter) So, we would like those numbers if we can get them. Anyone else have any comments? We are ahead of time now. We can actually allow someone to speak. And now no one wants to. Okay. As you read over this document -- and I believe that each of you will -- look in particular for arguments that are weak. If we are making a statement and when you read it you say, that doesn't convince me, then please identify those.

It may just be a wording issue. It may be that the whole point isn't a strong one. But we really need to make this a strong document. So if there are weak points in it, please identify them. If you have suggested rewording, make those, too. If you want to work from a Word document, I will distribute the Word document or put it on the wiki or something, so people can make edits, we can track changes, if that's any easier. Otherwise you can use the line numbers to just comment on --

make a comment in email or something like that. Whatever you find easiest.

Maureen's only comment is she still thinks it's too long. Well, I don't know what to do. It went from 17 pages to 6, and now it's sort of crept up to 7 or so. I'm not quite sure if Maureen or anyone can identify parts that you think are really not needed, and don't add anything to it, then please identify those as well. Just like with the bylaws, after you've read it so many times, you stop seeing the details. Seeing no hands. Final comments?

We will, before we end the meeting, do a brief survey on the captioning on the transcript. We do have an opportunity, if anyone has any last -- any other business they want to bring up, or any other issues they believe we need to be focusing on within ALAC. Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I turn the meeting over to Gisella -- sorry, we have Cheryl.

>> CHERYL: It took a while for my hand to appear. I kept pushing it. Maybe I was putting it down. I just wanted to note, in looking at the metrics in the document we've just been discussing on the planning, I have noticed a considerable increase in the attendees and activity in action -- really, the chats, etc., etc. in the ALAC meetings. And what that is saying is that we have many more than just the ALAC. I remember days when we -- ALAC to actually attend the ALAC meetings.

So I think that's also an outcome of the type of enthusiasm and encouragement we get at the At-Large structure on the regional level because of the GAs. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Anyone else? And yes, it is a pleasure to see the number of people on this meeting. And unless -- maybe it's not obvious. Speaking rights are not only with ALAC and liaisons. Obviously if we run short of time then we try to make sure ALAC members and liaisons have an opportunity to talk, but other people should be free to speak up if you have something to say as well. Gisella, it's all yours for the survey.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, thank you. Gisella here. We now have -- that came up. A short survey with regards to the captioning. This is a pilot project, and we'd just like to get your feedback and your thoughts on having the captioning for the ALAC meeting today. I'm aware that we did have a few audio issues, but I hope that the captioning that you got was useful. So, question number 1. The captioning feature of the Adobe Connect room is part of a pilot. Please choose the suitable term. Very helpful, helpful, less relevant, not helpful. If you would be so kind.

>> Sorry, Cheryl here. Some of us won't be able to cast a

vote because it's unsupported content.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here. Thank you very much.

>> Yeah, Gisella. It's (?) here. It's -- they will send out a survey link to you that will work. We know it's unsupported content. It's the pod. But the link will work just like the Streamtext will work. It's an issue with slash. And so when they finally upgrade all the Adobe to non-slash, we won't have these problems. But they are taking a long time.

>> If I may, I know that very well, Judith. What I'm saying is that for this survey now, some of us at this meeting won't be able to answer these questions. So there will be less than a full response. As long as we're aware of that. I don't want to put in more -- which is what I will do, because I have unsupported content. So I am not going to answer these survey questions so that I don't bias the survey in a negative way.

>> Right.

>> That's my point.

>> No, you can answer the survey when you get it on a link to your email.

>> I have no problem with the survey, Judith. I have a problem with the captioning being unsupported content. The survey is supported content.

>> The survey is supported?

>> Yes.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Let's have the discussion on Adobe Connect features some other time, please.

>> Survey.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here. Cheryl, thank you very much for feedback. We've made note of that. Yes, we will send the survey afterwards, but for all those who are on the call, and who are able to give feedback via this little survey, it would be very much appreciated. We now --

>> And who have seen the captioning.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: And, correct, thank you, Alan. Gisella here. And who have seen the captioning. I'll go on to question number 2. (Chuckling) Please self-identify all categories that describe who you are. A person with disabilities, participant for whom English is a second language, participant who doesn't speak English, participant who has limited or low bandwidth, and the last option is none of the above.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Some days I feel like I have limited and low bandwidth.

(Laughter)

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Were you referring to mental bandwidth or electronic bandwidth?

>> Just to specify, seeing that Alan did ask the question,

this is meant -- sorry. Electronic bandwidth.

(Laughter)

>> GISELLA GRUBER: We have --

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Why is one of my answers surrounded in a blue glow?

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Gisella here. That must just be personal to your own computer.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much for all those who have responded. We have a fair amount of responses. We shall now go on to question number 3. Question number 3, what benefits did you get from accessing the captioning stream? Option one, greater understanding of the topics. Option two, ability to understand the session more effectively. Option three, provided the correct spelling of technical terminology. Option four, personal benefits of being appreciated. Option five, able to more fully participate and engage with the presenter. We'll give you a few -- a minute or so to complete. Thank you.

I see that we have a few votes still being cast. Thank you again for taking the time to complete this survey. I see less responses than usual.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: That's because the right answer wasn't one of the options.

>> Gisella, if I may jump in, I put my hand up on this.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Olivier.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, sorry. It's Olivier speaking. I don't quite understand the question. Greater understanding of the topics, ability to understand the session more effectively. Isn't that the same thing? There should've been an "other," because otherwise, I just put no vote, because none of the above applies to how I used the captioning.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. My answer would've been, it allows me to catch up when I wasn't paying enough attention.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's exactly what I did.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier and Alan, thank you for the feedback. This actually has been noted. And we will edit the question. We will now go on to the next questions. Oh, my apologies. If others, please describe. So for those who wish to, we have time to describe those. For Olivier and Alan, we have made note of your comments, thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella, on behalf of everyone, I apologize for us being difficult. This is the end of a very long day for some of us.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, Gisella here. I fully agree on the end of a very long day in my time as well. So I'm with you on that one.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: It's about 1:00 or so where you are. Not quite that.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: It's 2:00 a.m. So I'm still . . .

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: I see that we've got quite a few responses there as well. Thank you again for that. We're going to just go to the second last question. Where else do you think captioning should be required? Several options. Working groups, task forces, ad hoc groups, RALO calls, ALAC calls, cross-community working group calls, or other constituencies. We'll give you a few seconds to vote on that one, thank you very much.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I note this one really should have had -- should've allowed you to select multiple answers, not just a single one.

>> GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, yes. Unfortunately the survey in the Adobe Connect doesn't allow us to select multiple answers. Which is something we are concerned with. Hopefully there'll be a general consensus on this, a general idea of what people think -- not a consensus, an idea. And last but not least, in order to speed up and to allow Alan to have a few closing comments, we have the final, which is any final comments.

And what I'll do, Alan, is I'll leave this part up. And please write any final comments in the pod. Please also note that we're happy for you to write comments in English, Spanish, or French. And we will translate them. And back to you, Alan, to end the meeting. Thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Since I'm talking, I can't type in my final comments. So, Gisella, if you could ask me later, I'll give it to you. This has been a good meeting. We're ending a few minutes early, despite the packed agenda, despite the fact that we were quite a bit late at one point. So I thank you all for your attention. I hope this was as good a meeting for you as I believe it was. And I look forward to working with everyone on the lists, and on teleconferences over the next couple of weeks. We've got a lot of work to do.

>> Thank you. Bye-bye.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Bye-bye.

>> Thanks, Alan. Thanks, everybody. Bye-bye.

>> Thank you, everyone. The meeting has been adjourned, and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for joining, and wishing you a very good morning, afternoon, or evening, wherever you may be. Thank you.

(End of Session: 5:56 p.m. CT)

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
