

---

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team ALT Mid-Monthly call taking place on Monday the 16<sup>th</sup> of May, 2016 at 20:30 UTC.

On the call today we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Julie Hammer, Leon Sanchez, and Ron Sherwood.

We have listed apologies from Gisella Gruber.

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

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

Thank you very much, and back over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and welcome all. What is the status with Sandra?

TERRI AGNEW: I did not receive apologies from her, but I will send her an e-mail to see what information I can receive for you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So at this point no contact. Thank you very much.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

The first substantive item. This I hope will be a short meeting today. We only have 75 minutes scheduled and I think I've been moderately liberal on all of the items, so we might even finish in an hour if we can keep our verbosity under control. And with that, we'll go to the first item which is the policy issues. And I'll turn it over to Ariel while I go pour my cup of tea.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. So we don't have any statement that's in the pipeline, but we do have a few new ones – new public comments – and also requests for input from the GNSO PDP Working Group.

So the first one to highlight is about the draft New ICANN Bylaws. And I know, Alan, you've just sent an e-mail with your personal comments on the draft bylaws. I'm not sure whether you'd like to transform that into a statement or [inaudible]. But I know you're going to talk about it [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

We'll talk about that when we get to that agenda item.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay. Sounds good. And then the other two new public comments that we haven't got any volunteer to draft statement on is – one is on the LGR Rules. It's a proposal for Khmer script root zone label generation rules. And then the other one is on the release of country and territory names within the .hyundai, .kia, and .godaddy TLDs. And these two we haven't got any volunteers.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. On the Khmer LGR, I thought we decided at the last meeting that unless someone has a compelling reason why we will answer it, we will not. So far we haven't done any, or at least not many of these. So unless someone has some reason to say we should respond – and I haven't heard any – then I think we will say that one there is no comment. Unless anyone here can show cause why not. Tijani agrees, our only Khmer speaking person. Not even any giggles. This is a quiet crowd.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR We've got to come off mute to have our giggles and noises, I'm sorry. Registering mirth, amusement, and agreement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. On the next one – release of country and territory names, we have routinely not responded to that. I did get one minor message saying somebody might have a complaint about that, but I haven't heard anything yet. So unless someone causes us to reopen it, consider that one closed also.

Then we come to the really difficult ones, the ones that are going to require some work. We are being asked for input on the two critical GNSO PDPs that are just starting, and we really do need people to work on those. Holly, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You might have to unmute her.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've never had trouble unmuting Holly before.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, but the system has to mute her earlier because we're privy to a private conversation that she didn't realize we were all listening to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And Holly there doesn't realize because she didn't hear us telling her we could hear her, that she [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, that's fine. Let me respond to this one. Alan, I put my hand up, [Carlton] put his hand up. You may have seen the e-mails where... there have been and God knows how many ALAC statements I will go through, but I think the last two repeat what we said, which would be an adequate response to the questions being asked. And as you know, since I've been fairly active on that list, I think we have to write something and I will be doing it.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Alright. But again, this is a subject where At-Large does not have uniform ideas.

HOLLY RAICHE:                    I know.

ALAN GREENBERG:                So we need to make sure that the party line is not what we're giving, but that they understand there are lots of variants here.

HOLLY RAICHE:                    Oh, yes. I think we did a really nice job of finding that fine line in the last statement we did, so that will be the guide.

ALAN GREENBERG:                Okay. On the gTLD Subsequent Procedures, I believe what they're currently asking at this point is, what have we said in the past? At least that's one of the things they are asking if not other things. And that I will be looking for staff to go through our statements going back a good four plus years for anything we've said on new gTLDs or related subjects. There's been a few of those. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:                    One of the things that was the most important at the time – well, there were two – there was the Consumer Trust. Can we take it that some of that issue has been taken up by the new committee? But we said a lot

---

on [picks]. And if nothing else, I think that's worth revisiting and repeating.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, we're not as worried at this point about repeating the message, but identifying all of the previous statements we've made. And going back a long time, we made a lot during the whole process of the Applicant Guidebook. Certainly towards the end we made a number of statements on confusingly similar. These have been going on for a while. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Just to very much reiterate and reinforce what she was just saying, it is more of an audit that we're after. And the meeting for this group follows literally after this one is scheduled to finish. And what we're after, as you know Alan, is very much a review and audit of what has been said historically, if there are any TFs and particular statements that we're expecting the GAC to bring out there, particular GAC advices on the various things. So you're going to have to go back to my era for all of this, guys, because we've been with this [inaudible] the Applicants Guidebook in its various forms for a very long time.

Luckily, some of the statements are relatively quick. And I think the new webpage, if I could just, Alan, is not a bad place to start with its ability to search things out. And we don't need them repeated to a new document as such. [Loops] to them would be enough, because we just want to make sure in the working groups that we take into account all

---

the opinions that have been coming in over the past from the various ACs and SOs. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, that's correct. And the PDP goes back to roughly 2007. The process after that started pretty well immediately. So that's how far back we're going.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. It literally was one of the topics that I had to jump straight into. That's an Ombudsman word. "Here's your platter, Cheryl. Have a couple of things to do."

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like to see a staff action item to do an initial list of document title and link to where to find it for anything even remotely related to new TLDs. I prefer to have to remove some because you've got too many than to have to go over it again and do it a second time. And I and Cheryl and Olivier are certainly available to answer questions of, "Is this a new gTLD or not?" Cheryl says [a tick], Olivier isn't volunteering but we volunteered him anyway.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Is there a timeline for this project?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, according to Ariel's list there is a deadline of the 17<sup>th</sup> of June. So we're not under desperate time but we'd like to start it sooner rather than later. It shouldn't take all that long. I know we have a horrendously long list of things, but it shouldn't take that long to tick off the ones that you think are the right ones.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We wanted to have them to hand and to be properly, or at least the proper reference to be done before we have our meeting in Helsinki. That's the reason for the date.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Thank you. Anything else on these items? I will just give my normal publicity talk that as we will see when we see the list, we've had a lot to say in the past. We really need more committed, real workers who are willing to understand what's going on and slug through this PDP with us. There's lots and lots of voices from what I will generically and unfairly call the opposition. We really need other people on that group. I'm not necessarily talking to the people in this group, but go and beat the bushes and find people who say they care and have them prove it.

Ariel, go ahead. And then we'll have Olivier.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. I'll let Olivier speak first, because it's not about the current [inaudible] input.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Olivier. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I just wanted to remind you, we do have a gTLD Working Group. The last time I looked, which was a couple of days ago, listed as members we do have quite a number of people. That means they were part of many of the discussions during the first batch of gTLDs that was being launched. But if you actually look at the mailing list membership, we have over 101 people – I think it was 102 or 103 people there. Granted there are a lot of observers and people that are actually from the GNSO. But at the same time, you could also find in there some people who have been through the previous WarS with a capital W and a big S at the end as well, and perhaps tap them and ask them and say, “Hey, you know would you like to be involved?”

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I think you’re correct on the tapping. I think we have to be proactive. Just simply saying, “Hey people. Come to us,” doesn’t look like it’s going to be all that effective at this point. We will come to working groups later on in the agenda, so we’ll talk about the generic issue but of course this is one of the more critical ones.

Yes, I saw Cheryl’s hand, but then it went down. Do you wish to speak?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I will talk to you my comment later. It will be relevant [inaudible].

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Alright. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG:                        Thanks, Alan. Just one item I wanted to clarify is about Roberto, he was assigned to draft his ALAC advice about the Registrar Data Retention Waiver Request. Is that completed, this item? But I didn't get an update. So unless you have some [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:                    No, it is not completed. It's still on my table and I need to go back to that. I feel guilty –

ARIEL LIANG:                        Could you kindly reply to [his] e-mail? He asked us.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Sorry? Yes, I will.

ARIEL LIANG:                        He asked us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Anything else on policy? Then we'll go on to Item #4, CCWG Accountability.

---

I would like to discuss a couple of the bylaw changes, but first I guess turn it over to Leon. Is there anything that you need to report as a Co-Chair or simply someone connected – and the same goes for Cheryl – that you want to bring up with this issue before I talk about the two specific ones, either going forward or Helsinki?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Hi, Alan. I have a little bit of background noise here with my kids, but I can say that the comments from the CCWG to the draft bylaws have been sent and of course we have received some more comments from different participants in the CCWG in regard to this draft bylaws. And of course we will be holding our [inaudible] meeting in Helsinki and that's pretty much what we have to report at this stage.

I don't know if Cheryl would like to add something, but I think there hasn't been that much activity in the CCWG lately other than of course going through the draft bylaws several times and writing the comments that we submitted to the public comments. And that's about it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let me ask you a question, Leon. We've had a lot of very generic talks about how Work Stream 2 will be handled and whether we are going to do things serially or try to do them in parallel. At this point, is there any feeling among the leadership of the group as to how we're going to be handling that?

Let me tell you why I'm asking. My belief is on some of the subjects we are going to want to get other people involved – people who either are

---

passionate on the human rights issue or on diversity issues or on a variety of other things. And the question is how are we going to manage that? And it's going to depend heavily on how the working group handles this, decides to serialize the subjects or do them in parallel.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Alan. Many of what you just asked is going to be resolved in our [inaudible] meeting in Helsinki. So far what we have discussed is that we should of course call for different groups that will be taking care of the different issues highlighted for Work Stream 2. And with the creation of the subgroups will come a call for volunteers and this means that new people will be able to participate in the different working groups. And as for serializing or can we do the work in parallel fashion, that remains to be adjusted depending on the different interdependencies of each of the subgroups. While we anticipate that some of the groups may work in parallel, there is also the chance that some work will need to be carried in a serialized way.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, good. Cheryl, go ahead if you have anything to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Very briefly, Alan. I appreciate the concept of "not very much" from Leon. However, his time portal is obviously different from mine. What he said is absolutely accurate and correct, and I do think that some of what we'll be doing with the Work Stream 2 stuff in answer to your question will be preferable to have overlapping. But just as our own

---

staff support human bandwidth is an issue and we'll be managing that process fairly carefully – we're doing what we can – I would, however note just in [preamble] perhaps one of the things you'll bring up in what you're going to say, Alan – not that I am trying to mind read you – I thought Leon may have mentioned it though, we've noted that not only the [catch] you made which was that with the bylaws as [she is written] draft at the moment without an appropriate footnote, etc. it would be starting the ball rolling with what was Whois that will be named whatever they are this week terminology review details the name review behind the eight ball, but as you also pointed out the change of name might help there because it won't be Whois anymore. But the same is also the case [of the] discovered thanks to the [BC] from SSAC review as well. So it's a security and stability one. So whilst it's not going to be fixed in quite the way you would think in terms of us changing our draft, it's kind of out of our mandate, we are well aware of it and something has to be done. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You're now into the substance of what I was going to talk about, so if there is no other general comments then I'll go into that. I put together a list of about, I don't know, 12 or so things I found in the bylaws that I thought was either a little bit cockeyed, that was either downright wrong or could be refined. Of those, all but two of them were either integrated into the CCWG comments which I presume are going to be treated very seriously and do not necessarily need to be backed up by a "me too." And if I'm wrong on that then I will let Cheryl or Leon tell me privately, but I'm assuming that if they're in the CCWG comments, they

---

are likely to be treated very seriously. Not so much comments that come from individuals.

And there are three of the comments that I can add something to. One is a very minor one, and that's on the Board removal of its own members. And I'll put that in as a personal comment. It's a really minor thing in my mind. The other two are not.

One of them is, in fact, the Whois RDS Review. I'm aware of the SSR review also being overdue. I'm not at all worried about that one, because that's going to be done by a completely separate group of people, there is no overlap with other significant other things. We'll have to run a little bit to catch up and get it going. That review was largely well-implemented from what I can tell, at least the check point that we did in the ATRT 2, it was well on its way at that point. So I think that review, other than the load on staff, is not really an issue in my mind. The RDS one is. And yes, technically there has never been an RDS Review so we're not overdue, but that's a technicality which I don't think anyone is going to say with a straight face – but I'd be willing to support it if they do.

The real concern there is I think it's both a misuse of staff time, it's a misuse of community time moreover, and will be a distraction from people who are trying to work on the future things also. Yes, we can always staff a review team with new people. But we really need some of these same people on this review team so that we understand what we're doing and don't reinvent something from scratch again or look at it from a completely different perspective.

---

I truly believe that the work that has to be done can be done by staff, and it would need a bit of volunteer work and I have no doubt that I and other people would put that time into it. So I think it's really a misuse of all our resources to go into a Whois Review or RDS Review at this point.

The second issue is one that I feel somewhat passionately about, and that is one that has been largely rejected by the CCWG. Specifically, the words in the bylaws say that no one can be under consideration for nomination to the Board if they're part of the empowered community – sorry, I don't remember the right word “empowered community management” or whatever it is. Which essentially says the Chairs of the ACs/SOs or someone else if someone else is replacing the Chair. You have to understand the term “nomination” right now is being used in the sense of the Nominating Committee, that is if you are nominated, once the empowered community says you're a Director, you're a Director. So it's the step immediately before designation – if you remember the designator model that we're using.

We, of course, use the term “nomination” at a lower level to find possible candidates within an AC or SO. And that's not the meaning of nomination here. But the wording the bylaws is very wide ranging, and it says to be considered for nomination which does include the first levels.

To be considered for nomination also includes simply submitting an SOI to the Nominating Committee. And given the citations that the lawyers gave for why this is justified was twofold. First of all, they said there is a bylaw that says anyone who sits on the Nominating Committee cannot hold other positions. And that makes complete sense, because the

---

Nominating Committee is actually making decisions. The empowered community – someone give me the correct word for what is the... The [inaudible] community administration. That's it. This is the group of people who actually hit "send" on the e-mail as it were. And it's actually the Chairs of the ACs and SOs acting together.

Under the bylaws, they are not allowed to exercise any discretion or decision making. They must follow the views of the empowered community – of the decision of the global empowered community. So, unlike the NomCom, they don't make any decisions. They're not allowed to make any decisions. And the lawyers cited wording saying that you cannot simultaneously sit on the Board and be the Chair of an AC/SO, which means you have to resign as soon as you're going to take a new position. But there is nothing in the bylaws that says you can't apply.

Now, if this was all purely theoretical, I would not be as upset by it. But if you look at what I would consider two of the most effective Board members we have ever had from the AC/SO community, took that position leaving the Chair position of an AC/SO. And so we have concrete examples that this is not only a reasonable progression path but it's a successful one. And of course, it's reasonable that if you are entrusted to be the Chair of an AC or SO, you may perhaps might be entrusted to be a Board member.

So I think they are misdirected, they are overreaching. I don't see any rationale for what they are saying. And I plan to put this in as a comment, and I guess I'd like feedback from the rest of you as to

---

whether you think this is something I should propose to the ALAC or is this just Greenberg going off on a rant?

I put it in some specific detail in an e-mail which you probably haven't had a chance to read yet. So I guess – I already see a tick mark from Cheryl and I see one from Leon. Am I missing anything in the rationale that the lawyers gave? Is there really any connection in the rationales they gave and the situation we're talking about, because I can't see the connection?

Anyway, I've made my point. If anyone wants to speak then please speak up now. But anyone who isn't speaking up now, please get back to me relatively soon and tell me whether you think I'm barking up the wrong tree or if is this something which we really should worry about. I think given if you look at the specific, Chris and Bruce I think in my mind are among the best Board members we've had from the AC/SO community. And I don't think I want to say we can't do that again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a hear-hear from me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then I will, unless someone tells me I'm really wrong and gives me a good reason, I will pursue this and I will try to get the ALAC to endorse it. By the way, going back to the Whois Review Team, one of the reasons that I'm pushing on this is Steve Del Bianco has just come out with a statement on behalf of the Business constituency saying, "Gung ho. Go ahead with the reviews." And somewhat more disturbing is a message from the IPC saying they'll probably support it. And I would

---

have thought they would be among those on the Whois Review who would not want to see double work. So I was rather surprised by that.

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Look, I wasn't surprised at all. What they're trying to do is keep Whois going as long as possible the way it is if possible, I have read both Steve Metalitz and Steve Del Bianco going, "Oh, my God. I know what's behind this." And I am I suppose as shocked, annoyed, and whatever as you are. I think it is ridiculous we're even thinking about doing it. You have my support on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Given that I don't want this comment to be submitted at the last day- I want other people to have a chance to see it – I'm going to push somewhat aggressively on both of these to get support from the ALAC since I've heard no negative comments on this call, unless I hear them really quickly afterwards.

Alright. Any other issues that we need to talk about on the CCWG? We started a bit late so we're a little bit late but not a lot at this point. Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, the next item is ICANN 56 in Helsinki. And I will turn it over to Heidi since Gisella is not with us.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. Hi, everyone. Gisella is leading on this, so all I can do is point you to the overall schedule and just make a few notes that I have observed.

---

Let me just take a look at the key changes that I'm aware of on this. Sorry, I'm just trying to find a version that I can actually read because I can't read that one. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: You only really need to look at the first few columns so [inaudible] better.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So let me just highlight a couple of things. So what we've done is that you'll note now on Monday 10:45 to 12:00 and then again 12:30 to 13:30 there are now Outreach sessions. This is from the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement. The first one will be with the Newcomers. It will be sort of an introduction to ICANN and At-Large. And then the second one right after the lunch break will be a session with the Fellows. And keep in mind that the Fellows for Helsinki Meeting B will be alumni so they're going to be a little bit more advanced than incoming Fellows might be. So that one will be where the ALAC is coming to that one while the first one will be likely just the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement. And there will be, in parallel to that, an ALAC work session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Heidi, on the second one – the 1:30 to 3:00 – can you give us a compelling reason why all 27 of us are going to be at that meeting and contributing to it or finding it riveting? Not that all 27 of us ever find our meetings riveting, but facetiously.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: So again this was basically one that was thought that picking the few items of policy that the ALAC would be able to engage from and particularly Fellows from their region give examples in certain policy when needed. And that's why it was thought, I believe, that the ALAC should be at that.

So again, someone would lead on the policy session and then those people from their regions could perhaps provide some context to their regional cohorts on that. Is that compelling?

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we need prep work done ahead of time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have to be able to prepare and we want to be able to tell them ahead of time what it is we're going to be talking about. Cheryl, do you find this lesson compelling, or are you just tired?

[HEIDI ULLRICH]: [inaudible] no excuse.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not tired, I'm exhausted. It's an entirely different feeling. I can make myself feel compelled and excited about most topics. It's one of the skills as you well know you have to have as a Chair of the ALAC. I suggest that we should have a yawn icon added in the Adobe Connect room as a special request.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, so you can fabricate compellingness on your own site. What about those who can't?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perhaps Cheryl could then lead this.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we're going to give Cheryl the responsibility for this succeeding or failing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: She is the mentor. Right now she is the first and only official At-Large mentor under the now named Onboarding Program.

ALAN GREENBERG: And last I heard there will be no mentees at the meeting for her.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, good. I haven't heard there's a problem with [Isaac].

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry. Someone told me he wasn't coming for reasons undisclosed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, okay. I have asked him I just haven't heard back that that's the case.  
Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: My information might well be wrong.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I will wait until he tells me. And in this case I will be working with At-Large staff and they will be interacting with us remotely so that won't make a difference.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. Alright. So let us work on the assumption that this will be fabricated into a session that will be compelling and interesting for everyone. But we do have some work we're going to need volunteers. I saw Holly already volunteered to work on one of the subjects. I think we need to identify what the subjects are and get people to put something together so we can not only know what the ALAC will know what we're talking about but so the Fellows will know also.

So there's an action item someone has to organize all this. I'll put it on staff to buttonhole the right people for the Policy issues. I'd be glad to help decide which policy are the good ones.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It could also be Dave as the Chair of the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement since he's leading with Outreach and Engagement I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you want to delegate to Dave, that's between the two of you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We will co-delegate. We will work together.

ALAN GREENBERG: Delegate each other, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We'll collaborate.

---

ALAN GREENBERG :                    Staff may be more tied into what the issues are that we have hot topics on, not the issues are than Dave might be, but yes he can certainly work on organizing it.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                    Okay. So may I continue?

ALAN GREENBERG:                Yes please.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                    Okay. So then Tuesday we have the EURALO General Assembly which I think this is now not the final version that I'm looking at because I believe that these were going to be separated depending on when the GAC is going to be. That is still in flux, so nothing is set in stone here yet.

ALAN GREENBERG:                Heidi, just to let the other people know where we are with that, the GAC very explicitly said they want to have a meeting with us and they would prefer to have it before the public sessions – the afternoon sessions – on new gTLDs, which is now late Tuesday afternoon, I believe. So the challenge is to find a slot that we can meet with the GAC in sometime between the start of Monday and middle of Tuesday. And we are looking at all options including we will free up a session if necessary to meet them. Let's hope it isn't the Outreach session but it might be. We will meet over lunch if necessary. There is an hour and a half for lunch and we're told a half an hour is enough to go find some food and

---

bring it back. Or meet for the first hour and have lunch at the end of it. But we are waiting to hear back from the GAC on that. So everything is in flux until we find out when the GAC can meet on that.

Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Alan. So then again, more ALAC Work Session Tuesday afternoon and two working groups after lunch in parallel. Then what has been announced just today is that every night of the week there is going to be some sort of event in the evening for drinks, cocktails, etc. So the first night will be the local host reception at City Hall which now apparently is one of the considerations for the GAC, but let's wait until that's more final. Then also on Tuesday evening, which is going to be the joint EURALO and Civil Society Showcase, that is now in parallel with the President's Reception likely at the same time. So that is going to be probably in the same room with just a corner set aside for the EURALO and Civil Society event. That detail is to be determined there.

Wednesday – ALAC Work Sessions in the morning. There's an open slot in the late morning, then there's AFRALO-AfrICANN in the afternoon and two open slots later in that day. And there is the Chairman's Reception in the evening of that day.

And then Thursday there is ALAC Working Group. I don't know which one that is going to be yet. More working groups in the morning and then the ALAC wrap-up 10:45 to noon. And ALAC wrap-up continues after the lunch break. And I think that is it, Alan. Because I mean again, as we all know –

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to talk about the afternoon sessions in a moment. But first you're going to tell us what's happening Friday.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, yes. Sorry. And then Friday we are going to have an ALT meeting, likely in a private restaurant, probably the main ALAC restaurant. Gisella is looking for that location right now, the private dining room that is.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we have no confirmation there will be a private room but we're hoping there will be.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if not, Heidi will try to get the meetings people to rent a room for us. Sorry, I'm giggling because Heidi close to said, "Over my dead body." Or that would be the result of her asking meeting staff to do that. But I'm being optimistic. And I'm giving up vacation time to do this, so let's hope it comes about.

Alright. Let's talk for a moment about the afternoon sessions. Monday, there are at this point two sessions. One is a discussion of Accountability and the second one is the Next Generation Registration Services (RDS). It is not clear in my mind at all what those sessions are about or how

---

they are going to be led or how they are going to be productive. But that is what we're doing. And I see there's hands up. I'm going to quickly go over these.

Now, from my perspective I think both of those have to be – are of sufficient interest – to the At-Large and to ALAC that I think we do not want to run anything in parallel with those.

Tuesday, we have – the Privacy/Proxy one is now off the books, which is unfortunate because it was one of the ones that we thought we could run something against. Sanity was regained since they realized there's not going to be anything to talk about at that point and now we have the Drafting Group on Auction Proceeds and I think this one is of general interest to At-Large, and I'm Vice-Chairing the Drafting Committee so I probably will not do anything against that one. Certainly I won't. And the second session is the one that the GAC wanted us to prepare for together, and that's the subsequent gTLD rounds or non-rounds, whatever it turns out to be.

Wednesday – why do I keep on going to Wednesday and I keep on going back to Tuesday for some reason? I am confused.

Alright, Wednesday is the Rights Protection Mechanisms, and my take is we don't have a lot of interest in that. Individuals may and so be it. The last session on Wednesday is the Draft Framework Principles for Future CCWGs. There was only one comment on that and that was from Judith who said that Olivier thought it might be important and maybe we should block it out. ALAC is making comments on that. How much of this interactive discussion is going to be particularly relevant at that point –

---

and Cheryl and I are participating in the CCWGs review of the comments – I hadn't been active in the group but I have revived myself for this part of it.

So Olivier, I know your hand is up and I'm not sure what it was up for, but on this one, how strongly do you feel that we should reserve this time for the ALAC?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Alan. On which thing? Because I was reading another thing at the same time.

ALAN GREENBERG: The general Cross-Community session on the Draft Framework of Principles for Future CCWGs.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Well, it seems that from the feedback that I have so far that none of our comments were considered per se. And that the working group is on a course to go on a collision course, basically another train wreck.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl can pipe in, but there's only been one call so far talking about the comments and I don't believe we have considered any of the ones the ALAC submitted at this point.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so then it's just pure hearsay that's being said and the usual system of basically telling people what the result is before the actual work takes place. Unfortunately.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You shouldn't be able to smell [bullshit].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I was not going to use that word but I can smell it now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] the transcription is accurate.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will say on that particular one, I was a little bit perturbed because one of the discussions we did have is on the concept of should we mandate the concept of members and participants and observers that the CWG and CCWG have used, with the understanding that only members vote should there be a vote. And Cheryl and I and others I guess raised the issue that it has been our experience in the CWG and CCWG that there is an extreme reluctance to differentiate between members and participants. And although, yes, it is there as a fallback should it ever be needed, for all intents and purposes it does not act as our ongoing distinction. Which may be good or bad, without putting value judgements on it. And the Chair of the group basically said, "Well, that's not what our words say." They should listen to our words, not what

---

they're doing. And I found that somewhat ostrich-like. So just a comment.

But we're talking about a month and a half from now, and I think I don't know what stage that group is going to be at. It certainly will have finished looking at the comments by then and probably will be along its way but not quite there to drafting either a final report or another draft to go out for comments. And I'm not quite sure how important this is going to be. My inclination at this point is to tentatively say we'll schedule against it but try to make sure that should in the few weeks prior to Helsinki it looks like this may be an important session, that we free up the time. Certainly that's where I stand at this point.

And lastly, on Thursday the two sessions are [Workload] Scheduling Management. I find that one a discussion that everyone wants to have, but I don't think it has any real effect. So I'm not sure I would want to spend a lot of time on it. And then the Meeting B Review which I think we have to participate in.

And I turn the conversation over to whoever wants to speak, and I see Olivier has his hand up and then Tijani, and anyone else. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I have just regained my senses from smelling whatever was there. I now recall the reason for the concern on the CWG on CCWGs, and that's due to a recent GNSO Council call where I was asked to provide details of the Cross-Community working Group on Internet Governance and pretty much told by members of the GNSO

---

that it doesn't appear to be following the recommendations of the Cross-Community Working Group on Cross-Community Working Groups. So very smelly story indeed.

Anyway, passing on this, I was going to come back and circle back to the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. I have sent you, Alan, and Gisella a request for a session since this new way of scheduling meetings apparently you have to go through the SOs and ACs. So I have asked for this. I don't see it on this latest version of the document and I wanted to find out whether that was being considered. It is a particularly important session. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I asked Gisella to do it. I have no doubt it will be done, but what you're seeing on the screen is an AC/SO schedule that has been frozen probably a week or two weeks ago when Tanzania was working on this. So I would not read anything into it not being there. Now when and where it can get scheduled, I don't have a clue. And they're surely going to end up in conflicts because of that. But I wouldn't read anything into it other than it hasn't been done.

I have also asked that Gisella try to schedule a session that staff on behalf of the CWG overseeing task force requested, and that one, too, staff is not allowed to ask so we needed an AC/SO to ask for it. I think this show that ACs and SOs are in charge, but then we can only say "Sir, may I have another portion of gruel," and be told "No" is somewhat of a fantasy. But that is what we're doing.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please quote that later. That is beautiful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Including the gruel?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely. "Please sir, may I have more." "No."

ALAN GREENBERG: It's one of my favorite point things from literature to recount. Alright. I can do that.

Tijani, you're up next.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can, very well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. So you spoke about the importance or the [inaudible] or whatever you said about having members and participants in the CCWG Accountability. I don't know in which circumstances you spoke about that, but I think that it was something necessary and I think also that the Co-Chairs didn't make use of that or they wanted to avoid some, I don't know, perhaps complaints or

---

something like this. But you know, if you don't respect that, especially in this particular group, when a group once that their interests be [advantaged] they will bring all people from their community, and at the meeting they will be a majority. So if you don't make use of the members only on decision-making, we will not have the opinion of the community. We will have the opinion of those who are there. That's why this concept of members and participants is very important for the groups where there are important decisions to take. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. I don't want this to become a discussion on the CCWG framework issues. But rest assured that statement was made clear at the framework meeting, and we gave as empirical evidence that if two different sets of Co-Chairs were reluctant to use invoke the rule, there is a good chance that future ones would be reluctant to as well.

The Chair of the framework CCWG was under a misunderstanding that the only time decisions were made is at the end, and there the votes could be taken, so to speak, the polls. It was pointed out that simply who is allowed to speak and how loudly they speak at the beginning controls the direction of things, and he had not thought of that kind of concept. So there is more talk to be done. But this is an area where at this point it's not clear that the Chair is following the direction of the group, and there is more work to be done.

Now that being said, Tijani, I agree with you at some level, but I think the reality is we are all so egalitarian that we want to let people speak, that I think in the future it's going to be very difficult to enforce the kind

---

of rules that we're talking about. So we are stuck perhaps with the issue. But let's not spend all of our time on the framework. It is something that may come up in the meeting, which is why I'm saying we may want to leave that slot open.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I put my hand up to mention that another addition into this planning schedule will be something that some of our members are likely to have some interest in, and that is we are as of last week [making] for the use of the country and territory names [asked] that some time be found for a discussion of our work from that work group as well, and that's a Cross-Community working Group as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did you find an AC or SO to put the request in for you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] the ccNSO, the GNSO [or both] and they both are [charterers]. Maybe they'll be told to go and find more pockets to [speak] as well. The matter Tijani raised though is important, but I just wanted to assure Tijani that the tool of being able to call for a member-only vote is indeed a very powerful one and one that I would like to make sure is enshrined in the future guidelines. The ability to use it when you have to is actually more important than using it all the time. And it does stop that issue that you alluded to where you can just stack the votes, so to speak, with well-meaning and vociferous participants.

---

And whilst the Co-Chairs of neither of the current major CCWGs have utilized it as a formal vote, very, very often [inaudible] deal break by using members and participants polling separately to start showing people that if we pull the vote card out is what the end game will be.

So I'm quite comfortable with having that as a strongly proposed guideline and a tool in the toolkit of future Chairs. But Alan, you keep saying the Chair of this group. Of course, there's two Co-Chairs. And John [Berand] is only one of them, and I think that his experience will also come to bear as we move through this review process.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I had forgotten that. Something else, again, we really don't want to go into the guts of this one too much more, but I think one of the lessons learned from my perspective – I don't know who else agrees – is that in both of these groups there was a difficult learning curve for the Co-Chairs. And mistakes were made early on that I think have kept on haunting us for a very long time in those groups. How you fix that next time around is not a trivial thing to address.

In terms of topics, is there anyone else wants... Back to the real schedule – I'll note there's also several GNSO PDP Working Groups that span whole mornings or mornings and early afternoons. Obviously the critical GNSO Working Groups PDPs they're going to be working on and we have a couple of members in both of those that are going to want to split their time. I'm one of them. That's going to be really difficult and I think we're just going to have to play it by ear.

Any further issues on ICANN 56?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are now seriously overtime. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a comment that I wonder if ALT or the ALAC would consider holding a policy webinar for an ICANN 56 webinar, “What to Expect” a week or two prior to the meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: When you asked me that question I said if there’s a real desire on something to do I’m willing to participate. I don’t feel that it’s compelling, but I’m willing to hear from other people. Before I go to Olivier, anyone have a thought on that? This would be a webinar for the ALAC and Regional Leaders or the wider community?

HEIDI ULLRICH: My thoughts initially were the wider ICANN community just because it’s up to people if they want to follow this. But again, if it’s just the ALAC and RALO Chairs, it would be good to have them on a call. So I was just about to write that, this is the first policy format Meeting B so it’s the first Policy Forum, so really it’s up to the ACs and SOs to decide what kind of format they would like. And that to me seems a good way to increase awareness and also get people landing ready to go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I'll be quite candid. Because ICANN management has chosen to call this a Policy Forum, I can't be exceedingly motivated that we're doing this any different than before. I think it's a regular meeting without the public sessions. I'm not sure that makes it a Policy Forum. But I understand in the absence of outreach, someone had to come up with a new name. Olivier, you can answer the question of should we have this webinar and plus whatever else you wanted to speak about.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I'm going to reserve my judgement on should we have the session. I was going to ask specifically actually about the Outreach and Engagement, This was meant to be an outreach meeting. I'm very disappointed to see that it isn't. It's now for 99% of the population there and we still have, I think the ALAC is the only one that has any outreach in there. It's now called the Policy Meeting. Yes, I mean is it worth doing the outreach at the end of the day if nobody really gives a damn? And I was going to use another four-letter word for this. It's just quite incredible and it seems that we always make a mistake of thinking that outreach is the same thing as capacity building, but actually it isn't. And if you go to anyone in the street in Europe and you ask about ICANN, you'll get 99% of the population that won't know what ICANN is. And I thought that outreach was exactly about that, exactly about getting young people interested in these issues, exactly about getting people to know what this organization does. Obviously it's not important to the organization since only the ALAC deals with it, but it's just very disappointing.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier, I'm not going to wring my hands over this, to be honest. Yes, we planned an outreach meeting in a place that no one else had ever heard about us. We're in Helsinki. What we're now doing calling outreach may be technically outreach, but it's essentially perhaps or arguably sessions that we should have been having with the Fellows and whoever on an ongoing basis anyway. And now we're taking the opportunity to plan it a little bit more. So yes, it didn't come through but I live in a world where the world changes sometimes and we're adapting to it. So I'm not going to get upset over it. That doesn't mean we should change the name of the meeting, but nevertheless.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. Once again, it is not an outreach meeting. It is an ICANN meeting with a half a day for outreach. We tried with you, Olivier, in Europe to do outreach and in Helsinki as well. But you said that people would be on leave and there would not be anyone coming to where we are going. So we do want to make the outreach. We want it. For sure it is better to have it in a country where we never go, but even in Helsinki I am sure that people don't know about ICANN and it is important to go and to speak with them, especially with students about ICANN. But it is the situation. I understand. I am disappointed as you are, but what we can do?

So this is the first point. Second point, it is not a policy meeting, it is an intra-community work [floor]. It is our work. We have [got] to do our

---

work. It is not like the other meetings where we had more inter-community work. This is the [inaudible] thing. If you want, you can go back to the report of the MSWG to be sure that this meeting is not policy meeting and is not outreach meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani, to be clear, staff has started calling this the Policy Forum. That's the reason that only ACs and SOs are allowed to make requests for it. I'm not going to say any more about what I think about that, but that is the terminology they're using.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just to follow up with what you just said, Alan, staff [have quoted that] they're trying to simply organize a gathering for normal women in DNS which is to get no ICANN support even as much as putting it on the – if and when we can find the time – putting it on the schedule. The rationale there, Tijani, is this is an AC/SO policy meeting. Now I'd have thought women in DNS was actually good outreach. However, the theory and philosophy of the new meeting schedule is being interpreted somewhat differently by different people, and I think that's the basis for some of our annoyance. And you might even hear it in my tone of voice. However, it is complicated by going to a country which has its major annual holiday the day we arrive. And you're not going to get students interested in selling ICANN unless each one of those letters matches up to an alcoholic beverage. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Or is at least on a lake somewhere.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: True.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, ma'am, may I have more gruel now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm trying to hold my hand up. [Here we go].

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else want to get on this diatribe before we go onto something else? Consider this one closed.

Next item is Working Groups. And there has been some discussion on the list that Maureen if you remember was asked to do a quick review and make some recommendations as to what to do with some of our working groups. This was envisioned as a very quick, small, process. It seems to have grown into something is going to become a major endeavor and I am somewhat worried – and again, I'd like the sense of this group for am I isolated or is there something to worry about? The concept of morphing what do we do with the four working groups or whatever the number is that aren't particularly active right now – do we kill them, do we archive them, do we resuscitate them or reactivate them or revitalize them I think was the wording we're using – seems to

---

have become something much larger of “let’s come up with a whole set of rules for how we run working groups, let’s put it into our rules of procedure.” This has become a major endeavor, and although, yes, we have had some working groups which haven’t done a lot recently, I’m not sure we should or need to formalize things and I’m not sure it’s high on our priority list right now.

So am I overreacting? You can all shout me down and we’ll go ahead on that path. It just doesn’t sound like certainly what I envisioned when we started on this path. So I will open the floor.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. I agree with you, Alan. There is not a big deal, big problem. The problem is that we have working groups that are not active. Since they are not active, we have to shut them down and if we need them again because we have something to do with them we can recreate them even with the same name. It is as easy as that. The only thing that I think we have to do something about is the charter for the working groups. We need to make charters for working groups. Even if it is very simple or someone that doesn’t have a decision to [take] we need to have a charter where you have the mission at least and the working methods. Otherwise, I don’t think that we have to do a big think about the working groups. It is very easy. Groups that are not active have to be closed, and they can be reopened if we have work related to their subjects. That’s all. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I do have comments but I'll go through the queue first. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I must admit when I took this on I thought it might be just a yes/no/leave it open/close it sort of –

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Maureen or did [inaudible]?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can you not hear me? Hello. Hello.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can but you disappeared after the first half a sentence.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, okay. I just said that I had a hope that it would just be a yes/no questionnaire, but the discussion that followed indicated that there were groups that may not currently be active and I think that because of circumstances beyond their control, for example Holly's group – they're actually not meeting as an At-Large group, they're involved in other activities that are related. I don't think that to close it down just because it isn't actually operating at the moment is the way to go. So we do need to look into it a little bit more carefully than closing it down just because it isn't operating at the moment. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sorry, are you done?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes I am. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Olivier next.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. So a couple of things on these working groups. There are a few which might need to be closed because one, they don't have any future requirements, they deal with issues that are past, etc. Fair enough. But there are some which are standing working groups which are there as and when needed. There is one thing which is very important of a working group, it's the members. If you close down a working group, you close down the members. You basically cut out of the potential of At-Large policy, you cut out a whole group of people. And sometimes, as I mentioned earlier the new gTLD Working Group having over 100 people on that mailing list. I also want to remind you all that the ALAC mailing list is a read-only mailing list. The At-Large mailing list is the one that is open for everyone to subscribe to.

So if you are starting to close the working groups down, what you're doing is restricting the involvement of the At-Large community to the 15 member ALAC. You are reducing the total number of people that are involved. And I think that's the wrong way to go. I thought we would

---

want to share the load and have more people involved and add more people that will come from the working groups over to the ALAC and other positions. If you just restrict all of the actual involvement in policy and involvement in things to actual paid positions – paid as in paid travel positions to go to ALAC meetings – to the 50 member ALAC plus the Regional Leadership, then this organization is just going to end up with people fighting for positions to travel and no one actually doing any work. And that's really, really, a concern for me. That's it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Close to reality, sadly. Cheryl, you're next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Thank you for everything you just said, Olivier, and indeed Maureen. And you're not going to be surprised to hear which side of this discussion I'm going to come down on are you? Look, I think that there are several groups as we've actually identified that have run their course and need to be decommissioned and put into archive. Absolutely. But it takes time to set up mailing lists. It takes time to get people engaged. It takes time to even set up the wikis and develop the charters. And I've seen some cases where the charters have taken longer than the [then] ongoing work of the group. I'm all for having an ability to deactivate or put on the backburner or put on hold the infrastructure with their charters and if they don't have a charter, it's the time to develop one for those things which we have identified that are clearly going to be useful again.

---

But let me give you the example for those of you who may not have been around quite as long as I have [in this] game, and Alan has been in this game, there were times early on in the IDN discussions where the fact that we could reach out in fairly short order to a group of people call the ALAC IDN Working Group and get their very specific opinions on some things that very few people had interest in. Right? This was long before IDNs were out there. This is while they were just trying to be considered. These things, even though they look like they're in [torper] sometimes are valuable if they're used correctly. But we need to manage and administer to them effectively. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Tijani, you've already spoken but I'll give you the floor quickly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Very quickly, I really don't understand the point of Olivier. Because if you have a group who is dormant, how in shutting it down you are preventing the community to work? Since it is [dormant] there is no activity in it. So if you say, "Okay, now since it is not working I close it, and as soon as we need it we will reopen it and ask for membership again and have the group reactivated again." I don't understand how he can say that we are restricting the work of the At-Large to the 15 members of the ALAC because we proposed to shut a non-active working group shut it down. That's all. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Olivier, I'm going to take Chair's discretion and talk for a couple of minutes first. As I've said on the mailing list, I cannot get really upset over the difference between shutting something down and reactivating it and I won't use the term "archive" because I think that was a misnomer – archived things are really history – but let's say put it in hibernation. Olivier is correct, the mailing list which has members some of whom may still be live may well become relevant at some time in the future so there may be a benefit in keeping the membership there. To be honest, our mailing list will stick around forever anyway because we don't want to lose the archive so the members can stick with it. So even if we shut it down, the mailing list is still there. We may turn a switch so it doesn't receive mail today, but other than that it's still there.

So there's not a big difference between the words. And if there's some compelling reason, and Olivier has given some, for keeping it in hibernation instead of shutting it down, I don't much care. There's really no difference in an end result between the two. I raised the issue on this meeting today not because of that – because I think we could go either way and find the right words and we'll end up with a good result – I'm more worried about the concept of saying we have to put a level of formality in our working groups akin to what the CCWG Working Groups have or the PDPs where they have a huge manual and rules associated with this. I think that's going to work counter to what Olivier and what others were talking about of trying to motivate people.

When we've had working groups that are active, I don't think we've had a lot of trouble because we didn't have a formal rulebook or because we didn't have members and participants and observers and critically

---

identified the differences between them or because we didn't have equal membership across all five RALOs. The working groups have been generally pretty laissez faire and with anyone who could join them who has an interest in it, and I think because of that they were end up being somewhat productive. And I'm worried that we're going to put a lot of effort into formalizing things which, number one, it's effort that I'm not sure should be our hot topic today, and number two, will end up being counterproductive in trying to get people to actually participate. So those are my words on it.

Should every working group have a mission? You bet. Do we need a formal charter for including working methods and categorizing of types of members for each of them? I think that's going farther than we need to with the exception of things like subcommittees where they have actual work that the ALAC has delegated to them, and there we need a level of formality.

I'll open the floor to Olivier now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. A couple of things. First, this idea of closing working groups in order to open them later on. Now if there was a cost to having a working group just stay there without being closed or mothballed or whatever you call it, I would understand if there was a cost to it you would want to save money and you would shut it down only to turn the lights on later on if you need it again. I don't understand why we are going through the whole process of wanting to shut

---

something down to then say, “Oh but we can reopen it afterwards if we want to.”

I also find something detrimental to actually shutting it down in that if you do, then if something does turn up you can’t just turn it back on within a few minutes or a few hours. It does take some work perhaps to re-establish a mailing list or something. While if these are just laying idle as they currently are, you can fire off an e-mail to that working group and bingo, the working group is back in action.

The problem that I do see, though, is the lack of Chairs for some working groups and we have to actively look for a Chair. And I agree with Tijani that the lack of a charter and clear page on the working group is also some problem. But I do remember that a while ago there was one staff member allocated for each working group and one Chair allocated for each working group, and it is the responsibility of the staff member of the Chair of that working group that all of that information is up to date. And if that’s not happening, then get it done. Get the staff member and get the working group Chair to deal with it. That’s my recommendation for this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I’d like to make a plea for this discussion today, can we put aside whether we close and reopen or hibernate? A number of people have spoken. That’s not the issue I brought up. The question is do we need a huge level of formality and written [inaudible] about working groups and membership in working groups or do we keep on going on a relatively informal way that I think has been successful in the past and

---

we haven't shown any real problem because we haven't had a higher level of formality. So that's the question I'm trying to answer [inaudible].

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you, Alan. I don't have any problem to call them under hibernation rather than closed. It's the same for me. Exactly the same. As for the formality, any group who is taking decision must have a very formal charter with all the formalities. The groups that are only for discussion, they are open for everyone to discuss. There is no need. Perhaps we need of course for each group we need at least a mission and a way of working. But we don't need a real formality about members/observers, etc. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani, I believe you have just- to use an expression I like – you have just violently agreed with me. I think the only groups we have that make decisions – and even those don't make strong decisions – but the only ones we have are the Finance and Budget and Outreach and Engagement subcommittees. They are not working groups. And the CROPP Review Team which we've delegated responsibility to. The other working groups we've always had, I believe, have only made recommendations to the ALAC. So I think we're in agreement on that.

Anyone else like to speak on that? I see no one else. Then I think I have direction from this group and I will put together something that I'll send

---

out that I think is a summary. I'm just really worried that this is something which has caught people's attention and it's going to devote huge amounts of effort, and I'm not sure there's a lot positive in some of this effort and there may in fact be something negative on it.

Alright. Next item on the agenda is the ALAC [meet] and is the At-Large Review. And we are at this point out of time, I believe. And some of us have other meetings to go to if I remember correctly. Let me look at my agenda. We do. So we are trying to schedule a meeting of the At-Large Review Work Party. We're having some trouble with the doodle, so that hasn't worked quite well. But there's a meeting that's going to be held. The examiner has been selected and you've all seen a public announcement of that.

I do have one issue to raise, though, and something that worries me. I haven't had very much time to spend on this. Holly has been up to her ears on both RDS/Whois type things and her own personal life that she dares to try to have one. We didn't give you permission, Holly, to do that so just note that. And I'm worried that we're entering a very critical time in this review and we may have a personnel problem. And I would like to suggest that Cheryl who has been ex-officio in this group [due to] her vast history with the first review and because she knows everything or something like that, that we give her a title and it has been suggested that it could be Co-Chair with Holly. We could perhaps use the term Vice Chair. I don't think we need to discuss the difference. But essentially we then have three people who are in a position to interact with two people primarily plus there's always me at the moment to interact with the examiner and try to make sure that things keep on the rails.

---

I've talked to Holly about this very briefly. That was probably the discussion that you had to mute her about before. And she's in agreement with that. I hope Cheryl is. I haven't talked to her about that, but I know Cheryl is always willing to take on new tasks. And she said yes in the chat, or in the tick mark. And I'd like to go forward on that which will give us hopefully a little bit more stability to make sure that we don't drop the ball on this. Once the examiner comes online, we're going to have a lot of work to do and we're going to have to keep up with them. And I think this may help us do just a little bit better.

Heidi or Holly, is there anything else you want to raise on this particular subject given that we are out of time? And Maureen does but I'll go to Cheryl, Holly, and Heidi. Anyone who wants to speak, go ahead.

Cheryl, go ahead. Or was that Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Cheryl, I just wanted to urgently, number one, welcome Cheryl to your new title, but also secondly now all of you – Alan, Holly, and Cheryl – just to remind you that there are some really important action items that need to be implemented from the last informal meeting of the working party, and probably this week. And that is including to review the draft charter to confirm no updates need to be made, to consider the working party membership, and then following that consideration the call for membership or reconfirmation of members of their working party. And if that could be done again this week because the next working party call is going to be next week.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, you know the three people you have to organize this with, arrange a short discussion.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? The next item was the ALAC meeting, if anyone has anything they'd like to see on the agenda for next Tuesday, please let Heidi know and let me know. And is there any other business?

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I'll try and be quick on this one. You might know that this week there is a meeting organized by ICANN, it's called the GDD Industry Summit. The GDD obviously is the ICANN Global Domains Division. It is a Summit taking place in Amsterdam from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> of May and is basically is primarily not exclusively for contracted parties. It is open to non-contracted parties as well. But it actually has everything to do with how to make money in the domain name business. There's all sorts of things associated with it. And it's funded by ICANN. Is it a conflict of interest for ICANN to fund the promotion of an industry whilst at the same time also being the organization that deals with the policies for this industry? I'm a bit confused. And while I'm not confused but certainly I would like to find out if the ALAC would like to interrogate and ask this question from ICANN. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, is that a tick mark for this discussion or for the previous one?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, sorry that's old.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anyone who feels passionate about the issue that Olivier has just raised and wants to pursue it? I'll be candid, I don't. ICANN has held meetings for registrars and registries forever. They've always been a lot more closed about it. This time there is even an Adobe Connect room. I don't believe they're funding the registrars and registries to go to this meeting, but they are providing the infrastructure which is akin to what they've always done and I personally don't have a large problem with this as long as it's open and above Board.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I understand very well what Olivier said and I agree with him. Nevertheless, I support the report of ICANN when they do the DNS [follow on] and the [develop ingredients]. Because they get somehow a way to introduce the underserved regions in this industry. But doing it for the whole industry and in Amsterdam I think it is, as he said, a conflict of interest. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will point out that these meetings are one of the reasons that we gave in our proposal for GAs and Summits why we want our share, too. Because the other parts are getting their share. If you and Olivier want to put together a less than one page summary and present it to the ALAC, that's fine with me. As I said, it's not my particular hot button but if you think it's an issue we should be looking at, then feel free to draft something and we'll make sure it's on the ALAC agenda. If you can get a draft for next Tuesday, we'll even get it on quickly. But if not that, we'll aside some time to discuss it in Helsinki. Let me know which way you want to go.

Seeing no hands. Hearing no other business. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you. Another issue, Alan. If you want to be ready for Helsinki about our rule of procedure regarding the election or selection of the ICANN Board selected by At-Large, we need to start at least working on the [inaudible] procedure and also perhaps we have to start to work on the charter of the [inaudible] review team if we want to have it before Helsinki.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The rules of procedure I have done some work on and will be sending something out to the volunteer group in the next couple of days. And the charter of the working groups I think you and perhaps Cheryl with her history of the past, I think those things – there was nothing called a charter, but I believe most of that documentation was there and I think it simply needs to be found and perhaps prettied up for the current

---

world. I have no problem with what you're saying however. And Cheryl says it exists.

Then I thank you all and sorry for the meeting going late, and those of us who are due in another meeting will leave. The rest of you can stay talking if you like. Or you can go have breakfast.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Bye.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**